

596

THE
DICTIONARY
Historical and Critical
OF
M^R PETER BAYLE.

THE SECOND EDITION,

Carefully collated with the several Editions of the Original; in which many
Passages are restored, and the whole greatly augmented, particularly with a Translation
of the Quotations from eminent Writers in various Languages.

To which is prefixed,

THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,

REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED,

BY

M^R DES MAIZEAUX,

Fellow of the Royal Society.

VOLUME THE FIFTH.

S—Z.



L O N D O N :

Printed for D. MIDWINTER; J. BROTHERTON; A. BETTESWORTH and C. HITCH;
J. and J. HAZARD; W. INNYS and R. MANBY; T. WARD; W. MEADOWS;
T. WOODWARD; W. HINCHLIFFE; J. WALTHOE; E. SYMON;
T. COX; A. WARD; J. and P. KNAPTON; S. BIRT; D. BROWNE; T. LONGMAN;
T. ASTLEY; S. AUSTEN; L. GILLIVER; H. LINTOT; H. WHITRIDGE;
R. WILLOCK; E. WICKSTEED; C. BATHURST, and J. and R. TONSON.

M D C C X X X V I I I.



Mr BAYLE's

Historical and Critical

DICTIONARY.

S.



SABELLICUS (MARK ANTONY COCCIUS) was a learned man, flourished towards the end of the XVth century. He was the son of a Farrier, and was born in a little town (a) of Italy upon the Teverone. He applied himself so early to his studies, that before he had a beard he was found qualified to teach a school at Tivoli. Having got some money by that means, he went to Rome in order to improve his learning by the lectures of Pomponius (b), who admitted him into his academy with the usual ceremonies, and particularly with the imposition of a new name, it was that of Sabellus. This new disciple of Pomponius reformed his style in that school. He left Rome to go and teach at Udine near Aquileia. Some books that he published got him such a name that the magistrates of Vicenza offered him twice as great a pension as what he had; and by that means drew him to profess Philology in their city. He did not stay long there, for he had an invitation from the senate of Venice, to accept of two honourable and lucrative employments: the one was to write the History of the republic, and the other to teach the *Belles Lettres*. He discharged the second better than the first, for his Historical work was full of flatteries and lies [A]. He undertook afterwards to compose an universal History from the beginning of the world, and applied himself to it till he died. This work has been published, and is not much esteemed [B]: Sabellus died of the Pox, being about seventy

(a) It is called in Latin, Vicus Varronis, or Vicus Valerius. See Leander Albertus Descriptio Ital. pag. m. 224.

(b) Thus Paul Jovius calls him. It is the famous Pomponius Latentus.

[A] He discharged the second better than the first; for his historical work was full of flatteries and lies.] He was paid to be sincere and exact with respect to his scholars, but not with respect to history; and therefore he discharged better the duties of a teacher, than those of a Historiographer. *Nec ibi diu mansit, evocante Senatu Veneto, ea conditione, ut civitatis res gestas à fine Justiniani conscriberet, & trecentis aureis in gymnasio proferretur. In hoc munere perutilem juvenuti operam præstitit, quum in altero adulatione parum sobria rerum veritatem adumbrasse videretur* (1). Scaliger, the father, says, that Sabellus confessed that he published or suppressed matters of fact, as he was directed by the money he received from the Venetians. Thus I paraphrase somewhat freely these five Latin verses:

Venalis item penna Sabellii latronis,
Qui dat, admittique, ut libitum, cuique quod vult.
VOL. V. No. CXVII.

Falsa qui rogatus, undenam tot esset ausus?
Monstrans Venetum perditus aureum nomisma,
Te, inquit, quoque lux hæc faceret loqui si haberes (2).

Also Sabellus's venal pen,
Who gives, and takes from ev'ry one at pleasure;
And who, when he was ask'd the reason why
He publish'd such a multitude of lies,
The varlet answer'd, holding in his hand
A golden coin of Venice, this same light
Would make you speak, had you but once receiv'd it.

(2) Jul. Cæsar Scaliger de Regnor. everfionibus, pag. 329. Part. II, Poemata. Edit. 1591.

[B] His universal history is not much esteemed.] Paul Jovius says that things are so crowded in that work, that they appear only like points. It is the usual fault of

(1) Paulus Jovius, in Elog. cap. xlviii, pag. 214, 215.

SABELLICUS.

2

(c) Taken from Paul Jovius in Elog. Viror. doctor. cap. xlviii, pag. 114, 115.

(d) Freherus in Theatro, pag. 1434.

(e) Sueton. in Tiberio, cap. lxxviii.

seventy years old [C]. Not trusting his bastard with the care of his burial he himself caused his epitaph to be engraved upon his tomb-stone: it is an inscription which is not very modest (c) [D]. He had been library-keeper to Cardinal Bessarion (d). His eyes had the same faculty with those of Tiberius (e); for when he waked in the night he could plainly see his books and his chamber for some time (f). All his works were printed at Basil in the year 1560 [E] in four volumes in folio. When he died he acted like those fathers, who are more fond of their weakest children, than of those who are the handsomest and the most healthful. For he recommended the printing of a manuscript by which he could get nothing but dishonour. His colleague Egnatius got it printed, and was blamed for it [F]. You will find a noble encomium upon Sabellicus in

(f) Pierius Valerianus in Hieroglyph. apud Freherum in Theatro, pag. 1434, says that he heard him say so.

(10) ed. v. loc.

of those, who undertake to include the history of the whole world in one or two volumes. They murder all the facts, explain nothing thoroughly, every thing they write becomes obscure. Read these words of Paul Jovius. 'Sed in Enneadibus omnium temporum, ab orbe condito memoriam complexus, uti necesse fuit, ingenti operis instituto festinanter indulgenti, res illius præclara cognitione dignissimas perobscura brevitate adeo vehementer offuscavit, ut excitatam uberrimo titulo legentium cupiditatem passim eluserit, quum omnia in acervum angustissimè coarctata, nequaquam certa effigie, sed exiguis tantum punctis, & lineis annotata designentur (3).

(3) Jovius, Elog. cap. xlviii, pag. 115.

But in his Enneades, containing the history of all ages from the beginning of time, he has so crowded and obscured the most memorable and illustrious transactions, (as was unavoidable in so large an undertaking hastily executed) that he hath disappointed the hopes of those, who by his pompous titles were induced to read him, all things being so heaped and buddled in a narrow space together, that they have not their due dimensions, but seem only to be marked with small points and lines.

[C] Sabellicus died of the Pox, being about seventy years old. Paul Jovius does not say in what year he died; but Vossius shews that it was in the year 1506

(4) Vossius de Historicis Latin. pag. 670.

(4). Pierius Valerianus was more reserved than Paul Jovius about the nature of his disease, he does not affirm that he died of a venereal distemper, but the description he gives of his illness contains several symptoms, that may be accounted for, if we suppose that it was the pox, as Paul Jovius will have it. These are Valerianus's words: 'Eo plus infortunii, & ærummarum pertulit Sabellicus, vir ille scriptorum copia, & elegantia multò clarior, quàm mea ulla possit commendatione crescere, miserabilem vitæ finem cum sortitus est, quod putrida, pernicioque corruptus elephantiasi per annos aliquot miserabiliter cruciatus interclusa vocis via, cæterisque tam spiritus, quàm cibi meatibus computrescentibus, gutturisque corruptis omnibus organis, venisq; corosis, non sine cruciabili tormento annos aliquot peregit, eaque tabe demum confectus interit (5). - So much the more misfortunes and troubles did Sabellicus undergo, being a man more famous for the number and elegance of his writings, than any encomium of mine can render him. He miserably ended his life: for being wretchedly infected with a putrid and consuming leprosy for some years, having the channel of his voice obstructed, and the passages for his breath and vitæ rotted, all the organs of his throat, and his veins corroded, he lived some years in excruciating torments, and at last being worn out by this corruption he died.' Paul Jovius does not hesitate so much; see the margin (6). Vossius observes that it is said, in the list of the historians of Udine, that Sabellicus wrote till the year 1513. This is proved to be false by two letters of Bembo, written in the year 1506, wherein he mentions Sabellicus's death. The fifth letter of the fourth book (7) says that he died the 17th of April, 1506. The same Vossius tells us that Leander Albertus testifies that Sabellicus lived three years after he had made an end of his Enneades, which he had carried to the year 1504.

(5) Pier. Valerianus de Litterat. Infelicitate, lib. i, pag. 28.

(6) Ad septuagesimum fere annum pervenit Gallica tabe ex vaga Venere quæ sita non obsecuro consumptus. Jovius, ubi supra. See also the verses of Latomus, recited by Jovius.

(7) Pag. m. 531.

(8) Pag. 224.

(9) Insigne quidem & meritum elogium fere certe honestius fi a- lieni ingenii pietas inscripisset. Jovius, in Elog. cap. xlviii, pag. 115.

I find in Leander Albertus that those Enneades were brought down to the year 1507, and that the author died in the same year. I have consulted not only the Latin translation (8), printed at Cologne in 1567, but also the Italian original folio 149, printed at Venice in 4to, 1561.

[D] An inscription that is not very modest. If any body else had made it (9), one might excuse it. Here it is,

Quem non res hominum, non omnis cepert ætas.
Scribentem capit hæc Coccon urna brevis.

M. Anton. Coccius Sabellicus vivus sibi F. (10).

He, whom no bounds of history restrain'd,
Is now within this little urn contain'd.

(10) See Freherus in Theatro, pag. 1434.

M. Anthony Coccius Sabellicus made this epitaph upon himself before he died.

[E] All his works were printed at Basil in the year 1560. Before this edition in four volumes in folio, printed for Hervagius, there had been an edition in two volumes in folio, printed in the year 1538, for the same Hervagius; but this contained only the Enneades, and the ten books of his *Exempla* (11), with an

(11) See the remark [F].

Historica Synopsis, which carried the Enneades to the year 1538. This continuation was made by Gaspar Hedion. Cælius Secundus Curio (12) had the direction of the edition printed in 1560, to which he added a continuation of the Enneades to that year. The fourth volume contains most of Sabellicus's *Opuscula*. I say most of them; for they did not infer in it his paraphrase, with notes, upon Suetonius (13), nor his critical observations upon several authors. They are divided into two books, and have been often printed, and namely at Venice in the year 1508, in folio. Badius inserted them in a compilation of the like pieces in 1511; Gruterus put them in the first volume of his *Thesaurus* (14). As for the rest, those who reckon the Enneades of that author among the books printed soon after the invention of Printing are grossly mistaken. Beughem mentions an edition of that work made at Mentz in the year 1442. Sabellicus's *Historie Enneades septem* (15). It is true he doubts of it; but he should have positively said it is false; for Sabellicus, in 1442, was not yet seven years old, and when he published those sixty-three books of his history, he dedicated them to the Doge of Venice Augustin Barbarigo, who was not promoted to that dignity till the year 1486 (16).

(12) And not Carion as Niccolò Toppi calls him in his additions to the *Biblioteca Napolitana*, pag. 164.

(13) It has been often printed by it self, and inserted in the editions *Variarum*, even in that of Paris for Sebastian Cramoisi 1610. in fol.

(14) See Toppi, ubi supra.

[F] He recommended the printing of a manuscript . . . Egnatius . . . was blamed for it. Here is the title of that work (17): MARCI ANTONII COCCII SABELLICI de omnium gentium omniumque seculorum insignibus memoriaque dignis factis & dictis exemplorum libri X. Quæ ad vitæ mores, prudentiam sapientiamve comparandam conducunt plurimum. Idcirco quum omnibus qui illo libero beatoque literarum ocio perfruuntur, tum vero imprimis qui vel adolescentiam in scholis, vel populum in concionibus docent utilissima sunt (§ 2).

(16) Chevill. Origine de l'imprimerie de Paris, pag. 21.

(17) I have it of the Basil Edition. 1541, in 8vo.

[(§ 2) I do not know whether the Basil edition in 8vo, 1541, has preserved the date of Egnatius's preface. In my edition, which is of Strasburg, in 4to, large paper, 1518; this preface is dated on the last of December, 1508. The title of the book is: Marci Antonii Cocci Sabellici Exemplorum libri decem, ordine, elegantia, & utilitate præstantissimi. Ad Christianæ pietatis augmentum & decus. REM. CRIT.]

Never did any book deserve more than this to have the following thought of Pliny applied to it: 'Inscriptiones propter quas vadamoniū deferi possit. At cum intraveris, dii deaque quam nihil in medio invenies (18)! - - - - Inscriptioni, for the sake of which one would almost forsake a recognition: but when once you enter, good God, how will you be surprized to find nothing at all in them!' We are told in the title page that it is a book very useful to those who study, but chiefly to those who teach youth, and to preachers. Indeed it may be of some use to those, whose business it is to prescribe exercises to young boys. Egnatius having published that book was blamed for it: some taxed him with inconstancy, under pretence that there had been a long enmity between him and the deceased. They found fault with him for having reassumed the part of a good friend by the care he took of that manuscript. Others said, that he had published it only from a hatred he

(18) Plinius, in Pref. Natur. Histor.

still

in Jacobus Philippus Bergomas, who was cotemporary with him (g). Moreri has committed some faults [G].

(2) Jacob. Philippus Bergomas in *Supplemento Chronicorum*, pag. 435, 436. Edit. Venetæ 1506. apud Leonard. Nicodemum Addizioni alla Biblioteca Napoletana, pag. 165.

still bore to Sabellicus, and that he knew well enough that the printing of such a book would tarnish the glory of the author. Egnatius wrote a preface in his own vindication (19). He maintained, that constancy does not require that a mortal man should cherish an immortal hatred, and that nothing can be more reasonable than to free ones self from the slavery of passions. He added that any body, who had not a heart of stone, would have been moved by the entreaties of that dying man, and that he was so affected with them that he could not deny him that good office. We shall see his thought better in his own words. *Nos verò cum alijs honestissimis causis adducti, et prius Sabellicum funebri laudatione profecti sumus, et nunc pro virili opus hoc emendavimus. Cujus editionem meritis mihi ad se accersito, et gratam recordationem pietatis in se Michaelis Trivisiani Nicolai filii, qui sub eo non parvo tempore meruerat, quique opus hoc literis plenum exhibendum curarat, commendavit, ut tam obsequium, tam durum, tam denique ferreum esse putem neminem, quem suprema illa vox moribundi hominis, atque addò ab omni suspitione immunis non emolliisset: me certe addò emolliit, ut nihil pro humanitatis jure negare homini præsertim jam morienti poterim majorem hoc facto laudem à bonis sperans, quàm quicquid de me Amasini, et Rabinii isti recentes oblatrent attendens* (20).

(19) Egnatius in Prefat. sub fin.

(21) Leand. Albert. in Descript. Ital. pag. m. 214.

(22) Castellum nunc est cum natura loci tum opere munitissimum. *Id. ibid.*

[G] Moreri has committed some faults. I. The place, where Sabellicus was born, is not a small borough: Leander Albertus (21) says that it is a strong place, both by its situation, and by the works that have been made to it (22); and he adds that in 1533, Lewis Gonzaga, General of Clement VII's troops, besieged it, and was killed there by a cannon-ball. II. Moreri's way of refuting those, who say that Sabellicus descended from the Cocceian family, is a very bad one. He tells us that it is likely enough that Sabellicus was the son of a poor Farrier, if one considers only the fir-

name Coccius, which is only to be found in the epitaphs, and upon the monuments erected to him after his death. What an argument is this? The surname Coccius is only to be found in the epitaphs, &c. therefore it is likely enough that Sabellicus's father was a Farrier. Here is another false reasoning. Moreri supposes that if the surname Coccius had belonged to Sabellicus's family, one might very well believe that he was descended from the Cocceian family. What an absurdity. Let us add to this, two errors in fact. It is certain that Sabellicus took the surname of Coccius in his life-time, and that the inscription of his tomb was not made after his death. He himself caused it to be engraved. III. He did not teach young boys in little boroughs, but at Trivoli, which is an episcopal city. IV. Moreri has these words; *we have his Historia Enneadum in XI books from the beginning of the world to the year 1504*: than which nothing can be more absurd. He had read in Vossius, that Sabellicus made himself famous chiefly by his history of eleven Enneades (23), that is, by an history divided into eleven Enneades, and he fancied that Sabellicus had writ a history divided into eleven books, which contained the actions of the Enneades. The reader must know that Sabellicus, affecting to imitate the Antients, divided his history not from ten to ten books; or into Decades (24), as Livy did, but from nine to nine, or into Enneades. V. When Moreri says that the epitaph, which Sabellicus made for himself, is reasonable enough, but modest (25), he perverts the sense of Paul Jovius, and gives a wrong judgment of the thing itself.

(23) Maxime celebratur historia Enneadum XI.

Vossius, ubi supra, pag. 690. Note, that the last Ennead contains only two books.

(24) Note that he divided his History of Venice, into Decades, into Decades. It contains three whole Decades, and three books of the fourth.

(25) Perhaps the Printers have left out some words, and Moreri had said, but not very modest.

Note, that many other authors; as well as Moreri, have misunderstood the passage of Vossius relating to the Enneades. Zeillerus tells us that Sabellicus wrote the history of two Enneades: *cujus maxime celebratur historia Enneadum II* (26), and Konig says that he has left us eleven books of Enneades (27).

(26) Martinus Zeillerus de Hist. Parte I, p. 127.

(27) Konig. Bibl. pag. 712.

SABEUS (FAUSTUS) born in the territory of Brescia in Italy, was so much esteemed for his learning that Leo X invited him to Rome and made him keeper of the Vatican library. He undertook several long and painful journeys in order to enlarge that library, which he did to good purpose. He was ill rewarded for his pains, and complained loudly of this disgrace [A], but his complaints made no impression on four other Popes, who kept him in their service. They gave him no preferment, which made him renew his murmuring at this bad state of his affairs. He died at Rome eighty years old, under the pontificate of Paul IV (a). We have some books written by him [B]. I have told in another place (b) what share he had in the first edition of Arnobius.

(a) Taken from the Libreria Vaticana nuovamente aperta da Leonardo Cozzando, Part. I, p. 108, 109. This book was printed at Brescia, in 1685. Ghilini supplied Cozzando with all this.

[A] He was ill rewarded for his pains, and complained loudly of this disgrace. This I prove by the following passage. 'Di che egli agramente si querela e duole. Il che pure gli successe sotto quattro altri Pontefici quali con multa sua sinistra fortuna infelice mente servi (1). - - - Of which he complains heavily, and laments his case. But such was his ill fortune, that the same thing happened to him under four other Popes, whom he served without success.'

(1) Leonardo Cozzando, Libreria Vaticana, Part. I, p. 109.

[B] We have some books written by him. Five books of Latin Epigrams, which he published at Rome in the year 1556, and dedicated to Henry II, king of

France. He was pretty well paid in money and cloaths for his Epistle Dedicatory: 'E ne riporto da quella Maestà una collana d'oro, doicento scudi del sole, e una giubba di veluto pavonazzo. - - - For which he received of his majesty a gold chain, two hundred crowns of the sun, and a waistcoat of purple velvet.' He wrote a book of Cosmography, and had a great share in the collection printed at Frankfurt, in 1580, with this title, *Pisla poësis Ovidiana: thesaurus propædæum omnium fabularum poetarum Fausti Sabæi Brixiani aliorumque clarorum virorum tam veterum quam recentiorum epigrammatum expofitarum* (2).

(b) In remark [E] of the article ARNOBIUS.

(2) Taken from Leonardo Cozzando, ubi supra. See also Ghilini's Theatre, Tom. I, pag. 51.

SACRATUS (PAUL) a canon of Ferrara, where he was born in the XVIth century, was one of those, who applied themselves to the purity of the Latin style. He succeeded in it, as appears from his letters to Paul Manutius, Riccobonus, Muretus, and several other learned men, which he published in the year 1579 [A]. He dedicated them to JAMES SACRATUS, his brother, bishop of Carpentras. He had spent several years in his studies at Padua, and in travelling (a). There are two short discourses at the end of his letters, wherein he apologizes for two prelates, who, contrary to custom, had writ their mandates in the vulgar tongue; which they did, because the greatest part of the clergy in their dioceses did not understand Latin. He composed some other books

(a) Paulus Sacrat, Epist. Dedicatory.

[A] The letters. . . which he published in the year 1579. I have not seen this edition: that which I make use of is of Lyons, 1581, in 16mo. There

was another published at Colognè in 1583. See Morhofius's Polyhistor (1). The other works of Sacrat are, *super Genesim liber unus. In Psalmos Davidis liber unus*.

(1) In the 24th chapter of the first book, pag. 309, 310.

SACRATUS. SADEUR.

4

(b) See the remark [A].

books (b), and died at seventy five years of age [B]. James Sadolet, bishop of Carpentras and cardinal his uncle by the mother's side (c), had the care of his education.

unus. In *Epistolam Canonica B. Jacobi Apostoli liber unus*. See the *Apparato de gli Huomini illustri della città di Ferrara*, written by *Agostino Superbi da Ferrarà* (2).

(2) Pag. 16.

(3) Ibid.

[B] He died at seventy-five years of age.] So says (3)

the epitaph engraven on his tomb in the cathedral church of Ferrara, by the care of the bishop of Carpentras, his brother. The year of his death is not mentioned in that epitaph, which is a very extraordinary neglect.

(c) See *Sacratius's Letters*, lib. i, pag. m. 13, 34; lib. 6. p. 381.

SADEUR (JAMES) author of a *New Voyage into Terra Australis*, printed in the year 1692 (a). His father's name (b) was James Sadeur, and his mother's Guillemette

(a) Note, that this book had been printed before at Vannes, in 1676, in 12mo.

(b) *Avantures de Jacques Sadeur*, pag. 2, Dutch Edit. 1692, in 12.

(c) *The countess de Villafraña*.

(d) Pag. 92.

(e) Pag. 147.

(f) Pag. 59, 62.

(g) Pag. 92.

(h) Pag. 69.

(i) Pag. 71.

(k) Pag. 69.

year 1692 (a). His father's name (b) was James Sadeur, and his mother's Guillemette, *Itin: they were both natives of Chatillon upon Bar, in the jurisdiction of Retbel in Champagne*, and had gone with design to settle in America; but after nine or ten months stay at Port-Royal, they took shipping the twenty-fifth of April, 1603 to return into France. The wife, fifteen days after they embarked, was delivered of the boy who is the subject of this article. Both the father and mother were cast away near cape Finisterre, where their ship run a-ground: the child was saved as it were by a miracle, and given to an inhabitant of that coast; and then having again escaped in another shipwreck, he went to serve a Portuguese lady (c), and studied with her son. He was taken by pirates in the year 1623. He had like to have perished in a third shipwreck; but he was saved by a feveral accidents which no body is obliged to believe, occasioned his landing in Terra Australis. The manner how, as he says, this came to pass, and how he overcame the wild beasts that were ready to devour him, and at last left that country after he had been there thirty two years (d), and arrived at Madagascar, is so strange that I do not think there are any fictions more ridiculous in either Ariosto or Amadis. Neither do I mention James Sadeur here as a person that ever existed, or his voyage to Terra Australis; as a true History, but only because I spoke of him in the article of Adam, and that I may give a supplement to the chimerical fancies of Antoinette Bourignon; for you must know that James Sadeur, who pretends to be an hermaphrodite, tells us that it was that very thing which preserved his life, in a country where every body has both sexes, and where all the men of our continent are treated as sea monsters, and have no quarter given them (e). All the Australians, says he (f), have both sexes; and whenever a child comes into the world having but one sex, they stifle it as a monster. He does not clearly explain the manner how they generate [A]; but he gives us very plainly to understand (g), that children grow in their bowels as fruits do upon trees (b) [B]; that they live without having any libidinous inclinations one towards another, and cannot so much as bear of them without horror; that their love is neither carnal nor brutish; that they are wholly sufficient to themselves, and want nothing to make them happy and contented. In a word, the arguments he puts in an old Australian's mouth, suppose that each individual person is the sole and total cause of the children he brings into the world. He introduces him (i) raising difficulties against the generation, which depends upon two persons, one of which is the father and the other the mother. The old man concludes, that man cannot be a perfect and compleat being without both sexes, because one sex is not capable of production without the conjunction of the other. Sadeur comprehended those principles and their consequences so well, that to shew that he understood them, he uses these words (k): *I considered the manner in which the supreme being acts; I was sensible that a creature could not better resemble him than by acting alone in its productions as he does, and that an action performed by the*

concourse

[A] The manner how they generate.] He says that all the time he was amongst them, he never could learn how generation is performed in that country (1), and that they have so great an aversion for whatever concerns the first beginning of life, that a year, or thereabouts, after his arrival, two Australians hearing him say something about it, went away expressing as much horror as if he had committed some crime (2).

(1) *Avantures de Jacques Sadeur*, pag. 60, 92.

(2) Pag. 91.

(3) In Remark [G] of the article ADAM.

(4) Preface to the *nouveau Ciel*.

[B] As fruits grow upon trees.] I have quoted in another place (3) a passage of Antoinette Bourignon (4), wherein she says that sin has disfigured the work of GOD in men, and that instead of being men, as they should be, they are become monsters in nature divided into two imperfect sexes, unable to produce their like alone, as trees and plants are produced, which in that respect are more perfect than men or women, who cannot produce without the help of another, nor without pain and misery. If you except the consequences of sin, the doctrine of that woman, and that of the Australian Philosopher, are as like one another as two drops of water. I wonder neither of them perceived that their pretended superiority of plants above man, with respect to the faculty of generating, is a false supposition; for it is true indeed that each plant produces its grain, its fruit, and its seed, independent on another plant of a different sex; but it is not true that it produces

another plant in itself, and by itself. What has it then above man? Does not a man produce in himself, and without the concurrence of the other sex, the seed, which is like the grain or kernel in plants, from which another individual proceeds? It is true, will some say; but that other individual will not proceed from the male seed without a conjunction with the other sex. I answer, do you think that the seed of plants does not want to be received into a womb that it may become a plant? Must it not be received into the earth? Is not this as great tho' not so pleasant a dependency upon another Being as you, Mrs Bourignon and James Sadeur, find on the other side? It is certain that according to their system, the perfect state of man would not be like that of plants in this respect; man would produce in himself, and by his own power alone, not something wherewith to make another man in another subject, but another man. A plant does not do that; it produces in itself, something out of which, the earth, produces another plant. I remember to this purpose to have read the following verses.

J'ai vu vif sans fantôme
Un jeune moine avoir

Membre

intercourse of two persons could not be so perfect as those that are performed by one and the same person. Thus the inhabitants of Terra Australis are of Mrs Bourignon's opinion; and one would be apt to think that James Sadeur, whoever he was, designed to insinuate that those people are not descended from Adam [C], but from an androgyne, who did not fall, as Adam did, from his state of innocence. This might be a pretty good device to impose upon the censors of books, and remove the difficulties of a licence, if one had a mind to try the success of a pre-adamitical system [D]. If la Peyrere had made use of this device, he would have avoided a great deal of trouble. Cyrano Bergerac did not wholly neglect it in his travels to the sun and moon. Perhaps the author of the History of the Sevarambes (1) has taken advantage of this artifice. I shall observe by the by

(1) See what judgment Morhofius makes upon him, p. 75 of his Polybistor.

Membre de femme & d'homme
Et enfant concevoir
Par luy seul en luy mesmes
Engendrer, enfanter
Comme font autres femmes
Sans outils emprunter (5).

(5) Les faits & dictz de feu de bonne memoire Jehan Molinet, fol. 229. verso. Paris 1540 in Soc. Du Verdier, pag. 723 of his Bibliothèque Française, quotes these verses, but not according to the Orthography of the original.

*I've seen a fryar young that had
Both sexes blended so, that he
Begot, conceiv'd, was brought to bed,
All by himself: not as you see
The course of other women is,
Who needs before they come to this
Must borrow'd tools employ ---*

They are taken from a Poem of John Molinet, intitled, *Recolletion des merveilles advenues en nostre temps*. Here is an Hermaphrodite more extraordinary than that mentioned by Mr de Beauval, in his *Histoire des Ouvrages des Savans* (6). The words applied to the Porcupine, 'Seque jaculo, sese pharetra, sese utitur arcu, --- he himself was his own bow, arrows, and quiver,' might have been applied to it. Isaac Vossius's hypothesis, does not reach so far. 'Hermaphroditus ut plurimum verè sunt mulieres non discrepantes à ceteris nisi excessu membri quo viros imitantur, quoque omnia ea quæ viri peragunt non in suum tantum, sed & virilem quoque sexum prodigiosam frangendo venerem, ut merito Seneca epist. 95. de illis dixerit, Dii illas deaque mali perdam, adeo perversum commentæ genus impudicitia, viros in eunt (7). --- Hermaphrodites for the most part are true women, in nothing different from the rest, but in that prominent member with which they imitate men, and perform all their actions, exercising their prodigious lust, not only upon their own, but likewise upon the male sex: of whom Seneca justly says, May the gods and goddesses utterly destroy them, for having invented such a monstrous kind of uncleanness, as even to abuse the bodies of men contrary to nature.'

(6) For November 1692, p. 125.

(7) Isaac Vossius, Comment. in Catal. p. 287.

But this story of Molinet ought not wholly to be credited. That Monk did not get himself with child: he himself was not both agent and patient at the same time. I do not know whether he was punished; I have only read that he was put into the hands of justice, and confined till he was delivered. Read this passage of the *Chronique Scandaleuse de Louis XI.* 'In the said year 1478, it happened in Auvergne, that there was one of the Fryars in a convent of black Monks belonging to Cardinal de Bourbon, who had both sexes, and made use of them in such a manner that he proved with child: whereupon he was seized, prosecuted, and confined till he should be delivered, that he might be dealt with afterwards as the Judges should think fit.' Is it not strange negligence to give no account of the consequences of this imprisonment (8).

(8) Chronique Scandaleuse de Louis XI, pag. m. 386. See also Robert Gaguin, in the tenth book of his History of France, fol. m. 284. verso. He says this happened in a convent of Jfsoire in Auvergne.

(9) Pag. 60.

(10) Pag. 93.

(11) Pag. 69.

[C] That these people are not descended from Adam. He ascribes many things to them, which suit only with the state of innocence; as that they are not ashamed of being naked, they all love one another with a sincere affection, they never quarrel, they know no distinction of property, they have all things in common with an admirable fidelity and disinterestedness (9); they bring forth without any pain (10), they have no unchaste inclination, they are strong and vigorous, their health is never affected by any sickness, and they make no great account of life, in comparison of the eternal rest that follows it, which they ardently desire (11). It is true their notion of that eternal

rest is not very orthodox, for in their opinion it does not consist in the beatific vision, but in the privation of a particular and individual existence. They say that after death we exist only in general, in an universal genius, who communicates himself by parts to each particular Being, and has the power, when an animal dies, to preserve himself till he be communicated to another. So that this genius is extinguished by the death of that animal, without being destroyed, since he awaits only for new organs, and a new machine to be revived (12).

This is as great nonsense as the soul of the world of some ancient Philosophers. According to Sadeur's account the Australians are not over-religious. They are contented to worship the incomprehensible Being without ever speaking of him; they fancy nothing can be more offensive to him, than to make his divine perfections the subject of their discourse: so that it may be said that the main part of their religion is not to speak of religion (13).

This does not favour of the state of innocence: man ought to glorify his maker by his words as well as by his thoughts; and it is in vain to say, as the old Australian did to Sadeur, that whoever ventures to speak of God, is like to speak of him otherwise than he should do; for this would prove too much, and it would follow from it that one should never think of the incomprehensible Being. I shall set down what is found on this subject in the book of that pretended traveller. He had told the old man (14) that in Europe

God is the subject of the most agreeable and useful conversations; and being asked, whether people had the same notions concerning that incomprehensible Being, he sincerely confessed they differed very much in the conclusions which every one drew often from the same principles, and that this occasioned many sharp disputes, frequently attended with a violent hatred, and sometimes even with bloody wars, and other consequences no less dismal. The good old man, continues he, replied with great ingenuity, that if I had not answered him in that manner, he would not have said a word more, but would have had me in the utmost contempt, being, said he, very sure that men could not speak of an incomprehensible thing, without having very different and quite contrary opinions about it. A man, added he, must be blind, who can be ignorant that there is a first principle; but one must be infinite, as he is, to speak of him exactly: for since we acknowledge that he is incomprehensible, it follows that we can speak of him only by guess, and that whatever we can say of him may indeed satisfy the curious, but not rational persons. And we rather chuse to be wholly silent, than to run the hazard of venting many falsities concerning his nature. There is something so specious in these words, that a gentleman assured me, that having read them to his footman, he asked him, What do you say to it, La Fleur? And he received for answer, Zooks, Sir, that old man was no fool, I wish I was like him, I should be a very wise fellow.

[D] A Pre-adamitical system. Sadeur says (15) that the Australians reckon about twelve thousand revolutions of the solstices from the beginning of their republic, and give out that they derive their original from a Deity, who with one breath produced three men from whom all others are descended; that according to their account the Europeans began five thousand revolutions after them, and that they give them a very ridiculous original; for they say that an amphibious serpent of a prodigious bigness, falling upon a woman in her sleep, enjoyed her without doing her any harm; that the woman awaked about the end of the action, and was struck with such horror at it, that she threw herself into the sea. The serpent carried her to a neighbouring island, where she repented of her despair, and was delivered of two children, the one a male, and the other a female, who shewed for many signs of malice that their mother

See Buffon on souls of beasts

Hin 800

(13) Pag. 83.

(14) Pag. 88.

(15) Pag. 117.

VOL. V.

B

S A D E U R. S A

it that a Franciscan, who forsook his order, is Terra Australis [G]. I wonder that Mr C peculiar to him, has given us an extract of *Ja Journal des Savans* (*), knew nothing of the Paris edition printed by Barbin, 1692, wa

La reste vaut mieux, pensée que ditte,
Et se verroit plustoit peinte qu'escrite.
Chacun estoit de son corps tant aysé,
Qu'en se tournant il se trouvoit basé :
En attendant ses bras, on l'embrassoit :
Venant penser, on le contreprenoit :
En soy voyoit tout ce qu'il vouloit veoir,
En soy trouvoit ce qu'il falloit avoir.
Jamais en lieu ses pieds porté ne l'eussent,
Que quand & luy ses passetemps ne feussent.
Si de son bien luy plaist mal user,
Facile estoit envers soy s'excuser.
De luy n'estoit fait ne raport, ny compte,
Ne congnoissoit honnesteté, ny honte.
Si de son cœur sortoyent simples desirs,
Il y entroit tant de doubles plaisirs,
Qu'en y pensant chacun est incité
A maintenir, que la felicité
Fut de tel temps, & le siecle doré.

*In the first age, while mortals still were good,
And herbs and acorns were their only food,
Three sorts of men existed, two of which
In ev'ry point were altogether such
As they are now: the third a double kind
Had in it both the male and female join'd.*

*The piece, you may suppose, was very fine,
And worthy of the maker's skill divine.
Two heads, four arms, and just as many feet
Did in this rational quadruped meet.
The rest is better far conceiv'd than said,
Better in pictures than in words display'd.*

*Each in himself was so contriv'd and blest'd,
That if he turn'd he found that he was kiss'd.
If he but stretch'd his arms, he was embrac'd,
With ev'ry thought a counter-thought was plac'd.
In short all that he wish'd or wanted he
Did largely in himself provided see.
He carry'd his amusements still about him,
Nor could he move a single step without 'em.
If of his goods he made a sinful use,
With ease he could unto himself excuse
The fault: for he had no account to give
Of what he did to any man alive.
As for ought else, he did not know the name
Of what is constrain'd modesty or shame.
If his heart's wishes pure and simple were,
So many double pleasures enter'd there,
That when we think of these, we are inclin'd
To say that true felicity confin'd
Her short duration to that narrow stage,
That space of time yclep'd the golden age.*

[G] A memoir . . . whence it appears that a Franciscan, who forsook his order, is the author of that pretend voyage into Terra Australis.] Here follows what was written to me from Geneva, the 13th of March, 1697. ' You will not be displeased to know the

S A D D U C E E S, a sect, which arose thereabouts before the birth of the Messias [Antigonus Sochæus was the founder of it.] the same Antigonus, put a wrong sense on them: they concluded that there is neither rewards nor punishments after this life, from

[A] A sect which arose among the Jews two hundred years, or thereabouts, before the birth of the Messias.]

(a) Pirke Avoth, cap. i, num. iii, & Maimonides Commentar. in Pirke Avoth, fol. 25, cap. i, apud John Helvicum Willemerum, in Different. Philologica de Sadduceis, pag. 20, 22.

(b) Maimon. ibid.

(c) Joseph. Antiquit. Judaic. lib. xiii, cap. ix.

(d) Id. ibid. & lib. ii, de Bello Judaico, cap. xii, (alias cap. vii.)

(e) Id. Antiquit. lib. xiii, cap. xvi, sub. fin.

(f) He died about the year of Rome 649.

mercenaries, who act only in hopes of getting by it, but like those generous servants, who are faithful and obedient to their masters without expecting any reward. This fine maxim ill interpreted by those two disciples of Antigonus, set them up for heads of a party (a). They founded two pernicious sects [B], which utterly subverted religion; and foreseeing that they should be put to death, if they ventured to declare publicly all the consequences arising from their principles, they durst not reject the authority of the Scripture, they only rejected the traditions. Those who embraced the sect of Sadok, were called Sadducees (b). They made already a considerable figure in the time of Jonathan brother to Judas Maccabeus, that is, about the year of Rome 600; for Josephus informs us, that there were at that time three sects among the Jews, viz. That of the Pharisees, that of the Sadducees, and that of the Essenes (c). He adds (d) that the Sadducees rejected the doctrine of Predestination, and taught that man is the only cause of his own prosperity or adversity, according as he makes a good or an ill use of his free-will. He says in another place (e) that the Sadducees and Pharisees had many quarrels between them, and that the rich people sided with the Sadducees, but the vulgar stood for the Pharisees. The latter prescribed many rites as being transmitted and handed down to them from their ancestors, though they were not written in the law of Moses: on the contrary, the Sadducees rejected all doctrines and ceremonies not contained in the Scripture. We read in the same passage of Josephus that the high-priest Hircanus (f), who had been a disciple of the Pharisees, took and abused them, having declared for the sect of the Sadducees at the suggestion of his favourite Jonathan, who was one of them. We are told in another place by the same Historian (g); that the Sadducees did not believe the immortality of the soul (b), nor that God concerned himself with evil either

(g) Joseph. Antiquit. lib. xiii, cap. iii.

(h) Idem. de Bello Judaico, lib. ii, cap. xii. (alias cap. vii.)

(1) Hujus Simonis Justi discipulus ac in cathedra Synedrati successit fuit Antigonus Sechaeus. Job. Helvicus Willemerus in Different. Philologica de Sadduceis, pag. 23. Edit. Wittemb. 1680.

(2) Lightfoot, Hor. Hebraic. in Matth. iii. 7, pag. 236. Edit. Carpz. apud Joh. Helvic. Willemer, ubi supra. pag. 24.

(3) Idem. Hor. Hebr. in Actus Apost. pag. 123. apud eund. ibid. pag. 26.

(4) Joseph. Antiquit. lib. xiii, cap. ix.

(5) 'Εκ τούτων ου άρχεται τών παρρησιών. Jam inde a multis retro saeculis. Joseph. lib. lib. xiii, cap. ii, pag. 617.

(6) Josephus, ibid.

the Sadducees. Now this Antigonus succeeded Simon the Just in the chair of the Sanhedrim (1). This Simon died in the year of the world 3662, or, according to others, 3690. One may therefore believe that Sadok's innovation began to appear in the year of the world 3700, that is, 248 years before CHRIST. Thus Mr Willemer argues in a thesis maintained under his direction at Wittemberg the 28th of September, 1680. Some learned men are of opinion that the heresy of the Sadducees is more antient, and that it sprung from a wrong sense put upon the thirty-seventh chapter of Ezekiel, whilst the prophets Zachariah and Malachi were still living. Dr Lightfoot, who followed that opinion, in his commentary on St Matthew's Gospel (2), departed from it on the Acts of the Apostles, and maintained a very different opinion, viz. that the heresy of the Sadducees did not appear till a long time after Sadok's death (3). Observe that Josephus the first time he mentions that sect, does not represent it as new one, but as a party entirely formed (4). The time his discourse refers to is that of Jonathan, brother to Judas Maccabeus; and therefore it must be placed 153 years before CHRIST. He mentions that sect again about a hundred years after, and represents it as a very antient one (5). The Jews, says he (6), had long before divided their wisdom, or Philosophy into three sects, viz. the Essenes, the Sadducees, and the Pharisees. Lucas Brugenius has broached a very bold opinion. He says that the college of the Scribes, founded by Ezra, was very flourishing under the Maccabees, and that those Scribes began then to examine the question about future rewards and punishments, because they had learned what the Greeks said about it. That enquiry occasioned two sects, that of the Sadducees, and that of the Pharisees: the latter held the affirmative, and the former the negative. He pretends that the Jews believed only temporal rewards and punishments, which were the only ones proposed in the law of Moses, and that if the Patriarchs and Prophets saw farther, they did not however teach the doctrine of a future life as an article of faith. According to this hypothesis, the Jews must have learned of the Greeks the immortality of the soul, and future rewards and punishments, whereas it is commonly believed that the Pagans had those excellent doctrines from the Scripture. Here follow the words of Lucas Brugenius: Quum tempore Maccabeorum plures florent Scribe quorum collegium ab Esdra exordium sumerat, qui sapientiae studebant, & ut juxta Graecorum subjacebant, nonnunquam audirent Graecorum de his rebus (animae humanae immortalitate, corporis resurrectione, aeternis bonorum praemiis, & malorum suppliciis) fabulas, factum est ut ceperint quaestiones de his rebus in medium afferre, & inter se ventilare, atque a se mutuo dissidere, aliis ista adstruentibus, qui vocati fuerunt Pharisei, aliis negantibus qui Sadducei. Ante haec tempora non videtur populum Israel quidquam de his rebus doctum fuisse, aut

quidquam de istis publice praedicatum, id quod lex harum rerum disertam mentionem non faceret, terrenas duntaxat spes minasque bonis malisque ob oculos ponens. Fuit quidem Patriarcharum & Prophetarum non dubia hic fides, quod vel undecimum Caput Epistolae ad Hebraeos testatur, sed multa à Patriarchis & Prophetis credita praedictaque fuerunt ut non proposita atque enarrata, ita nec credenda necessario populo fuerunt, ut virginitas matris Messiae, paupertas, passio, mors, resurrectio Messiae. Videtur clara publicaque hujusmodi rerum aeternarum doctrina Messiae reservata fuisse, interim dum Messias expectaretur quo paratores forent animi ad accipiendam fidem de rebus hujusmodi invisibilibus, futuris & aeternis, permiserat DEUS varias de his opinionibus oriri & sapientum synagogas inter se altercationibus discuti (7). Mr Willemer very much dislikes this opinion, and refers the reader to the Orthodox Divines, who have confuted the Socinians, &c. concerning the belief of the Jews. 'Hactenus Brugenius mirum in modum cumulat oporitur a homo Theologo indigna contra fidem fidelium V. & N. Test. essentialiter eandem (8). - - - (8) Willemer, ibid. Thus far Lucas Brugenius, who at a strange rate loads with invidious reflections, and such as are unworthy of a Divine, the faith of believers in the Old and New Testament, which is essentially the same.'

[B] They founded two pernicious sects.] Every body does not acknowledge that each of those two disciples of Antigonus founded a sect: some very learned men pretend that the sect of the Sadducees and that of the Baithusees, were but one and the same sect, which went indifferently sometimes by the name of Sadok, one of its two founders, and sometimes by the name of Baithus, the other founder; but because Sadok was more zealous than his colleague, in maintaining the party formed by him, his name was more frequently made use of than that of Baithus to denote their followers. These too rather chose to be called Sadducees than Baithusees, because Baithus being a bastard, they were afraid it would bring a blot upon them. This opinion is to be seen more at large in a book of Carpzovius (9). It is the more likely because some learned men confess they could never find out wherein the Sadducees differed from the Baithusees. 'Ignosce ignorantiae nostrae, they are Dr Lightfoot's words (10), si fateamur nescire nos penitus quid intererat inter Sadduceum, & Baithuseum, an convenirent in eodem, an dissentirent in aliquibus? de Baithuseis apud sacras paginas altum silentium, apud Judaicas mentio frequentissima, & videntur in quibusdam distingui à Sadduceis aut in quibus obscurius. - - - Excuse our ignorance, if we confess that we do not at all see what difference there was between the Sadducees and the Baithusees, whether they agreed in the same thing, or differed in some points. The Baithusees are nowhere mentioned in the Scriptures, but very frequently in the Jewish writings, and in some things they seem to be distinguished from the Sadducees, tho'

(7) Lucas Brugenius Annotat. in Matth. iii. 7, apud Willemerum, ubi supra, pag. 28.

(8) Willemer, ibid.

(9) Joh. Benedictus Carpzovius, Lipsiensis Professor Linguae Hebraicae, in Introductione ad Rationem mundi Martini Pagnonem Fidei, cap. iii.

(10) Lightfoot, in Horis Hebr. in Act. Apostol. pag. 128. apud Willemerum, ubi supra, pag. 2.

either to do it, or to take notice of it [C]. He observes (i) that the number of the Sadducees was not considerable, but that they were generally invested with the highest dignities; notwithstanding which they had no great interest; for few things were done according to their advice, and those among them who exercised the magistracy were obliged to comply, tho' against their will, with the decisions of the Pharisees, otherwise they would not have been tolerated by the populace. Josephus makes two observations, which, I think, will give a great light into the matter: one of them, is that the Pharisees were not severe in inflicting punishments (k); the other is, that the Sadducees shewed great severity in the functions of judicature (l). Lastly, he says (m) that there was no good understanding among them, that they lived like wild beasts, and that friends were not better used in their conversation than if they had been strangers. It is not easy to reconcile this with what he says in another place, that this sect was not beloved by the meaner sort of the people but by the rich; for the latter do not much agree with morose and peevish humours, but are for introducing the sweets and conveniences of life in all places where they have any intercourse. We ought perhaps to suppose, that what he says concerning the discord of the Sadducees, and their clownish conversation, signifies nothing more than that they accounted it a virtue to take the liberty of disputing with their masters (n). It was almost an unavoidable consequence from their principles, since they boldly rejected the authority of tradition, and did not care whether the several texts of the Scripture had been explained by the ancients in such a manner or not. This being laid down, a disciple had as much right to contradict his master, as the latter had to contradict his predecessor, and so on. The Sadducees are often mentioned in the Holy Scripture; but tho' it in forms us (o), that they denied the resurrection of the dead and the existence of angels and spirits, and that the Pharisees believed both, yet it gives us a worse character of the Pharisees than of the Sadducees. I shall examine what has been said of the immorality of the latter [D], and will make it appear that no good proofs can

(i) *Jof. Antiq. lib. xviii, cap. ii.*

(k) *Id. Antiq. lib. xiii, cap. xviii.*

(l) *Id. Antiq. lib. xx, cap. vii. See the remark [D].*

(m) *Id. de Bello Jud. ibid.*

(n) *Id. Antiq. lib. xviii, cap. vi.*

(o) *Mat. xxii. 23. Mark xii. 18. Luke xx. 27. Acts xxiii. 8.*

'tho' it does not appear in what.' The learned Maimonides plainly intimates that they were only two names for one and the same thing (11). Nevertheless some Rabbins have found a notable difference between them, for they say that the doctrine of the resurrection was never denied by the Baithusees (12), and that the Sadducees were much more wicked, and downright infidels (13). Nay, some will have it that the Baithusees were a branch of the Essenes (14); but that opinion has been fully confuted (15).

[C] This sect did not believe . . . that GOD concerned himself with evil, either to do it, or to take notice of it. Josephus charges them with this impious doctrine: these are his words; Σαδδουκαῖοι . . . τὴν μὲν ἐμμετρίαν ἀνθρώπων ἀναίρεσι, καὶ τὸν θεὸν ἐξω τῷ δρᾶν τι κακὸν ἢ ὀφρᾶν τίθεσθαι: Sadduceai . . . fatum omnino negant, & Deum extra omnem mali patrationem inspectionemque constitunt (16). Josephus does not seem to have either understood or truly reported their opinion; for we shall see hereafter, (17) that they believed that GOD rewards good men, and punishes the wicked in this world. They went to St John the Baptist, as well as the Pharisees, to be baptized by him, when they heard that he preached repentance in the deserts of Judea (18). The Scripture says, that they were desirous to avoid the evils they thought themselves threatened with (19). How then can it be denied that they believed that the baptism of repentance administered by St John would appease GOD's anger, or procure them some advantage? They did not therefore believe, as Josephus will have it, that GOD does not concern himself with punishing evil. Saldenus is in the wrong to find fault with Vossius, because he justifies them on that head. 'Ex philosophis gentium hanc Saducaeorum opinionem (animam non esse immortalem) amplexi sunt Epicurei; imo longe deteriorem. Nam Saducae agnoscebant Deum curare res humanas, quippe eum bonis bene facere in hac vita. Epicurei autem in totum tollebant providentiam divinam (20). - - - Among the heathen Philosophers the Epicureans embraced this opinion of the Sadducees, touching the immortality of the soul, or rather a much worse. For the Sadducees allowed that GOD concerned himself with human affairs, seeing that he rewarded good men in this life. But the Epicureans altogether denied the Divine Providence.' I cannot tell, says Saldenus (21), what could move the great Vossius to do that honour to such an infamous sect; for having consulted several authors, who have writ books concerning the sects of the Hebrews, I find every where that the Sadducees are plainly charged with rejecting the doctrine of Providence. Among several testimonies I shall only chuse

that of Josephus, and then he cites what is to be found in the ninth chapter of the thirteenth book of the Jewish Antiquities, concerning the opinion of the Sadducees about Predestination and Free-will. He had better have chosen the passage I have quoted in the beginning of this remark; for it does not by any means follow because a man rejects the fatality of Predestination, and teaches that men are entirely free to do good or evil, that he denies a Providence. The Pelagians, the Socinians, in a word, those who have writ with the greatest vehemency against the necessity of human actions, maintain at the same time that GOD governs the world, that he justifies vice, and rewards virtue. It is to be observed that Grotius thinks that the Greek text of Josephus, which I have quoted, is not correct.

[D] I shall examine what has been said of the immorality of the Sadducees. Mr Willemer charges them with cruelty (22), and to prove it he says, that they induced King John Hircanus (23) to persecute the Pharisees violently. He refers us to the eighteenth chapter of the thirteenth book of the Jewish Antiquities. I have consulted that passage, wherein I find only what follows. Hircanus, a disciple of the Pharisees, and very well beloved by them, entirely lost their friendship. They conceived a great hatred against him, and because, upon a certain occasion, they gave him great reason to be angry with them, he forsook their sect, and embraced that of the Sadducees at the instigation of Jonathan, his favourite. He abolished the ordinances of the Pharisees, and severely punished those who observed them. At last, he put an end to the sedition, which those two sects had raised, and spent the remaining part of his life in peace and felicity. Mr Willemer adds, that Alexander Janneus, being flattered and instigated by the Sadducees, was more cruel than his father Hircanus, and that having extricated himself out of a thousand difficulties in which he had been entangled by the Jews, he caused 800 of the chief men among the Pharisees to be crucified, and that before they expired, he ordered their wives and children to be murdered in their sight. During those executions he gave a grand entertainment to his concubines, and to the chief men among the Sadducees. This author refers us to the twenty-second chapter of the thirteenth book of the Jewish Antiquities, where I do not find that the Sadducees are mentioned in the least. As for the author of the *Cabbala Historica* quoted by him, I have not been able to consult him; but tho' he should say what Mr Willemer alleges out of his book, can we believe him? Can the testimony of a man, who lived at so great a distance from those times, be valid in opposition to the

(22) Willemer. ubi supra, p. 44.

(23) So he styles him, *Johanni Hyrcano Regi auctore fuerunt*. But Josephus, *Ant. lib. xiii. cap. xix.* says, that Aristobulus, the son of this Hircanus, was the first who assumed the title of king.

(11) Maimonides. Comment. in Pirke Avoth, cap. i, fol. 25. apud Willemer. *ibid.*

(12) R. Abarias Idumaeus, apud eund. pag. 7.

(13) R. Gedalias Ben Jechaja, apud eund. *ibid.*

(14) R. Abarias, R. Manasse Ben Israel, lib. i. de Refort. Mort. cap. vi. Fullerus, lib. ii. Mifcellan. Sacror. cap. iii. apud eund. *ibid.*

(15) See Waltherus, Centur. Mifcell. Theol. pag. 479.

(16) Joseph. de Bello Jud. lib. ii, cap. vii, sub fin. pag. m. 788.

(17) In the remark [E].

(18) Mat. iii. 7.

(19) *Ibid.*

(20) Vossius, de Orig. & Progr. Idolol. lib. i, cap. 2, pag. m. 72.

(21) Quid tanto apud Magnum virum favore propudium hoc hominum genus dignum fecerit, fautor me ignore. Saldenus, *Orig. Theol.* p. 559.

can be given of it. It would be less surprising that they should have been good men than

the silence of Josephus. The German author goes on thus. At last queen Alexandra, by her husband's advice, and with the assistance of the Pharisees, undertook to restrain the turbulent spirit of the Sadducees by severity, but could not reduce them to reason, nor prevent the new broils which they occasioned in the state between Hircanus and Aristobulus; and when Herod had rid himself of those two princes, the Sadducees made use of their interest with him to commit

(24) Redigere tamen in ordinem & impedire non poterat novas, quas excitabant in Republica turbas inter Hyrcanum & Aristobulum fratres. Quibus è medio sublati, favore Herodis M. quo potissimum nitebantur ad turpia quævis factiosa sunt abusi. Willemer, *ibid.*

(25) *Id. ibid.* pag. 45.

all manner of crimes (24). Josephus, in the seventeenth chapter of the sixteenth book of the Jewish Antiquities, is of opinion that Herod was moved by the counsels of the Sadducees, and their impious doctrine, concerning the fatal necessity of all things, to the barbarous cruelty he was guilty of in causing his sons to be strangled, and three hundred captains to be stoned to death. This is Mr Willemer's account, and thence he concludes, that it has been truly said that the Sadducees were very immoral men, that they were Epicurean swine, and very pernicious heretics. *Ex vero igitur dictum est, Sadduceos fuisse moribus pessimis, & Epicuri de grege porcos: ita quæ doctrinam perniciosos omnino hereticos* (25). But it is certain, he draws this consequence wrong; for, 1. The matters of fact on which he builds are not to be found in Josephus, the author he alleges to prove them: 2. Tho' they were true, it would not follow from thence that the Sadducees wallowed in sensual pleasures as those do who are called *Epicuri de grege porci*. All that could be proved from thence, is, that they made an ill use of their interest with princes to oppress the Pharisees, of whom they had great reason to be afraid, since that sect was animated with a superstitious zeal, and supported by the populace. I confess that such a conduct is unjust; but the like is to be seen in all parties, or in all factions of state or religion. Those who teach the doctrine of future rewards and punishments, have not been less careful to take hold of favourable opportunities in order to oppress their rivals. They are generally severe and cruel in their counsels; and therefore there would be nothing singular, nor any character of distinction in the proceedings of the Sadducees, tho' the matters of fact mentioned by the German writer were true. What will he say then, if I shew that they are false or uncertain? Which is not difficult to do.

It is certain that the Jewish Historian makes no more mention of the Sadducees than of the Great Mogul, in the chapter, where he tells us how Herod caused his sons and the three hundred captains to be put to death. He would have made himself extremely ridiculous, if he had said that the doctrine of those men, concerning the fatality of all things, moved Herod to such cruelty (26); for it was notorious that they entirely rejected the doctrine of Predestination, and whenever he mentions them, he observes, that, according to their principles, a man's fate depends wholly upon his free-will. I do not deny that Josephus says, that the Sadducees occasioned the insurrection of the Jews against Alexander Jannæus, and the cruelty of that prince towards that people, because they advised him to persecute the Pharisees and their adherents (27); but the testimony of such an author (28) is very inconsiderable, especially when we may oppose against it the silence of such an Historian as Josephus, who never shews the least partiality to the Sadducees. Rabbi Abraham of Salamanca is too modern a writer to give any weight to facts otherwise uncertain; and therefore we are not obliged to believe upon his word, what he says of the immorality of those heretics (29). Once more; if they had been in general disrepected for their debaucheries and wicked actions, it is scarcely possible that Josephus, who speaks of them so often, would have been wholly silent on that head, and that the only thing mentioned by him concerning their morals should strongly incline us to believe that they did not live a sensual life. He says that they were men of a clownish and rough conversation, who shewed no more civility to their friends than to strangers. *Σαδδουκαίων δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους τὸ ἄγχιον, αἰτεῖ ἐπιμειλίαι πρὸς τοὺς ὁμοίους ἀπενεχτοὺς ὡς πρὸς ἀλλοτρίους. Sadducei vero & inter se feris moribus disceptantes, & conversatio eorum circa externos inhumana* (30). This is not the character of voluptuous men; for, on the contrary, they

(26) Ipse Herodes M. ad immemorem severitatem pessimis Sadduceorum consiliis ac impia doctrina de necessitate omnium fatali impulsus creditur Josepho *lib. xvi. c. 7. cap. xvii. pag. 465. Id. ib. pag. 44.*

(27) See the marginal note of Genebrard upon the twenty-first chapter of the thirteenth book of Josephus, *fol. m. 464. verso.*

(28) See in Vossius de Histor. Græcia, *lib. ii. cap. viii. p. 197.* what a contemptible writer he is.

(29) Sadducei fuerunt improbi pessimique moribus præditi. R. Abraham Salamanticensis apud Willemer, *p. 44.*

(30) Joseph. de Belle Jud. *lib. ii. cap. vii. sub fin. p. m. 788, 789.*

are very complaisant one to another, their whole study is to multiply the sweets of their conversation, and they banish every thing that diminisheth the pleasures of it. Mr Willemer (31) lays a great stress upon St John the Baptist's calling the Sadducees a *generation of vipers* (32). He runs back to the first serpent, that seduced Eve. Let him say what he pleases: I need only answer him, that the Pharisees were called so as well as they; and therefore if any thing be concluded from it concerning the immoral lives of those, who denied the immortality of the soul, it will no less affect those who believed future rewards and punishments. The same may be said of the heaven, which our Saviour would have his disciples to beware of (33). The Pharisees are as much concerned in it as the Sadducees.

Observe, that it is the opinion of many authors, that the Sadducees called themselves so from a word, which signifies justice, or righteousness. *Ἐπονομαζέσθαι δὲ ἑτοίματον Σαδδουκαίων, διότι δὲ καὶ δικαιοσύνης τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ὀνομαζέσθαι. Σαδδὲ γὰρ ἱπποσύνην σημαίνει δικαιοσύνην. Sadduceos se à justitia nominant. Sadek enim justitiam significat* (34). Those who approve this etymology, observe that these Heretics were called Sadducees, because they were ambitious of being accounted just or upright men, and others bestowed that encomium upon them (35). Mr Willemer cites Bernard for this opinion Isidorus, Beatus Rhenanus, Bernard de Breitenbach, and Dr Richard Montague. He says it is disputed from what sort of justice those sectaries were denominated. It was according to St Jerom, inherent justice or righteousness; for they pretended to have acquired it perfectly by the observation of the law. Several approve this opinion of St Jerom. D.

*Hieronymus in Matthæum XXII. Tom. VI. Oper. allegat propriam inherentem justitiam, de cujus perfectione, ex lege à se observata, fuerint gloriati. Sequuntur cum multi Patrum, plurimique Scholasticorum ut & Mathias Flacius Part I. Clav. Script. pag. 1064. Georgius Fabricius Histor. Sacr. lib. X. num. 432. pag. 584. Atque Gregor. Lex. S. pag. 236 (37). Others will have it to be distributive justice, and they are again divided; for some say it is that which consists in rewarding; and others, that which consists in punishing. The former pretend, that, according to the Sadducees, justice is administered wholly in this world; good men are rewarded, and wicked men punished here, and nothing remains to be done after this life. The latter say, that those Heretics were very severe in the administration of justice, and that they were called Sadducees upon that account. *Non nemo ob remunerativam justitiam eos justos appellatos statuit, quod existimant in hac vita omnem compleri justitiam, h. e. justis bene fieri, malis evenire mala, mortuo autem homine nullam superesse judicii justitiæ. Punitivam vero justitiam eligit Nicolaus de Lyra Comment. in Act. V. ita inquit: Dicuntur Sadducei à Sadech, quod est justitia in Hebræo: nam Sadducei inter alios Judæos erant in judiciis & punitionibus acerrimi, ut dicitur in Scholastica Historia (38), propterea sibi nomen justitiæ usurpabant (39). If the facts on which this etymology is grounded, be true, there is no room to doubt but that the sect of the Sadducees valued themselves on all the outward appearances of good morality, and by consequence carefully avoided a loose life. Be it as it will, we have here many authors, who must needs believe that they were regular men. There are therefore at worst authorities against authorities: and after what has been said, it will be no difficult matter to judge which of them are best. Note, that one may easily suppose that the Sadducees were very strict administrators of justice; for since they did not believe that a malefactor would be punished after this life, it was natural for them to think that he was to be condemned to a very severe punishment in this world.**

I must take notice of some faults of Mr Lloyd. I think he is mistaken, when he says, 1. That what Josephus tells us of their austere humour, ought to be understood of the severe sentences which they pronounced in administering justice. 2. That, according to the same Historian, the Jews hated them by reason of that severity, and were more inclined to the Pharisees, who were naturally mild in inflicting punishments. *Erant enim in malefactoribus acerbiores; in judiciis, & paucorum multis exactiores rigidi, quemadmodum ex Hist.*

(31) Willemer, *pag. 17.*

(32) Mat. iii. 7.

(33) *Id. xvi. 6.*

(34) Epiphanius, *Harref. 14. pag. m. 31.*

(35) *Id. ibid.*

(36) *Idem. p. 6.*

(37) *Id. ibid.*

(38) Josephus should have been quoted. See below clat. (41).

(39) Willemer, *ubi supra, p. 6.*

and

- *It* (51) Willemet,
ves, *ibid.* p. 14, 15.

SADDUCEES.

12

(p) Marham, Chronic. Can. Egypt. §. ix, pag. m. 159.

(g) Matthew, Mark and Luke, ubi supra, citation (c).

and that they made but one body of religion with the rest of the Jews, as the Jansenists and Molinists do now with the other Christians of the Romish communion. The Sadducees do not appear under that name in the Talmud, but only under the notion of Heretics and Epicureans (p). It is said, but with very little reason, that they admitted only the five books of Moses [G], and that therefore CHRIST in disputing with them cited only the Pentateuch (q). Arnobius is the only author who informs us that according to

desire it should be so comprehensive as that of the Jews was at that time; they do not desire an ecclesiastical toleration for all sects, but are contented with a civil and political one. We have seen that Mr Wilmers attributes the toleration of the synagogue in favour of the Sadducees to the corruption of those times. He gives other reasons for it, and particularly the care those Heretics took to comply in all things with the public worship: 'Magnopere impendebat ejusmodi nem promeritam favor Magnatum plane singularis erga Sadduceos. Adjuvabat ingens Sadduceorum, quæ invaluerat, potentia, ac ingeniosa qua abominanda hæresim tegebant, astutia: crebra item sacrificia, atque reliqua Levitici cultus onera, quæ pro salute populi se fulcipere gloriabantur (52). . . . What chiefly prevented the deserved expulsion of the Sadducees was the extraordinary favour of the great men towards them. To which may be added, the great power the Sadducees had gained, and their subtilty in glossing over their abominable Heresy; as also their frequent sacrifices, and their complying with the other injunctions of the Levitical law, which they pretended to do for the good of the people.' It is certain that the most enormous diversity of opinions as to speculative doctrines of religion, is more tolerated than the least dispute about the public worship. Be careful to practise all the outward duties prescribed by the prevailing religion; and notwithstanding you may hold capital Heresies you will be less molested than if you should oppose the outward worship without being guilty of those Heresies.

(52) Id. ibid. pag. 15.

(53) Jurieu, Apologie pour la Réformation, Tom. ii, p. 254, Edit. in 4to.

I must observe that a Reformed Divine, who is now become a great opposer of Toleration (53), had before confuted those, who say that Heretics ought to be punished with death, among other reasons, by alledging our Saviour's conduct towards the Sadducees. He observed that JESUS CHRIST dealt with them with great clemency, and did not blame the magistrates who tolerated them. See the *Pensées diverses sur les Comètes* in the 185th article.

[G] It is said, but with very little reason, that they admitted only the five books of Moses. Tertullian says they followed the heresy of Dositheus, who rejected the prophets; and that besides, they were so impious as to deny the resurrection. *Taceo . . . Dositheum, qui primus ausus est prophetas quasi non in Spiritu Sancto locutos repudiare. Taceo Sadduceos qui ex hujus erroris radice surgentes, ausi sunt ad hanc hæresim etiam resurrectionem carnis negare* (54). Origen (55), St Jerom (56), and a vast number of other writers say the same; I mean, that the Sadducees acknowledged no other books to be canonical besides the Pentateuch. I have also advanced the same opinion in another work (57); but now I confess that it does not seem to me wellgrounded. There is a negative argument against it, which appears to me very good. The Holy Scripture, speaking of the Sadducees, and their errors, never says that they rejected the prophets. I confess this silence is not a convincing reason; but what shall we say of Josephus, who does not impute to them any such rejection? It is impossible to conceive that he would have omitted such a remarkable and important article, even when he observes that this sect rejected traditions. What makes the argument yet stronger is, that he not only says nothing of their rejecting any part of the Scripture, in a place where he could not have been silent about it; but positively affirms, that when they denied the authority of unwritten traditions, they gave this reason for it, *Nothing ought to be accounted lawful but what is written. Εξιστά δὲν ἡγούμενοι νόμιμα τὰ γεγραμμένα: τὰ δ' ἐν ἀκατάστατοις τῶν πατέρων μὴ τῆς εἰς. Oportere eas tantum servare quæ scripto continentur* (58). Can an Historian speak thus of a sect, that rejects the greatest part of the Scripture, without being a mad-man? I know that a caviller may say (59), that Josephus's words concern only the written laws, and consequently the Pentateuch; but I know also that this Historian could not have forbore mentioning in that place the contempt, which it is said

(58) Joseph Antiq. lib. xiii, cap. xxviii, pag. 454.

(59) Serarius and Petavius will have it so. See Petavius's Notes in Epiphani. ad Heret. 14. pag. 28.

those Heretics had for the other books of the Scripture. Mr Simon is positively against those, who affirm that they acknowledged no other books to be canonical besides the Pentateuch, and alledges the testimony of Josephus. *That sect, says he (60), retained the whole body of the Scripture, according to Josephus, who affirms that the Sadducees received πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα (61), all the Scripture, and only rejected the traditions; and therefore they are mistaken, who believe that the Sadducees retained only the five books of Moses in imitation of the Samaritans.* There are many passages in the Babylonian Talmud, and in the writings of the Rabbins (62), whereby it appears that the Sadducees acknowledged the Hagiographa, and the prophetic books of the Scripture to be divine, and only despised the explications of their Doctors. Some think that the Samaritans have been confounded with the Sadducees, and take that to be the reason why several writers fancied that the latter as well as the former rejected all the books of the Scripture besides the Pentateuch (63). But it is certain that these two sects ought to be distinguished; for the Jews had no communication with the Samaritans, and at the same time maintained Ecclesiastical communion with the Sadducees. Nay, sometimes a Sadducee was their High-priest (64), and it is not improbable that the High-priest Caiaphas was of that sect (65).

(60) Simon, Hist. Critique du Vieux Testament, book i, ch. xvi, p. m. 93.

(61) I think Mr Simon would have much ado to find those Greek words in Josephus.

(62) See the Diffinition of John Helvicus Willemmer, p. 33, 34.

(63) See the 6me Diffinition, pag. 10, 11.

(64) See Josephus Antiq. lib. xx, cap. viii.

(65) See the 5th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, ver. 17.

(66) Centur. Magdeburg. Cent. I, lib. i, cap. v.

(67) Mr Becker, a minister of Amsterdam maintained this doctrine with great heat in some books written in the vulgar tongue. He was deposed upon that account. He pretended to say nothing contrary to the Scripture.

(68) Manasseh Ben Israel, lib. i. de Resurrect. mortuor. cap. vi, pag. 43. apud Willemmer, ubi supra, p. 32.

(69) Willem. cantur (Acts xxiii. 8.) negasse spiritus, non disputo. Pag. 38, 39.

(70) Grotius in Matth. cap. xxiii, ver. 23.

(71) Vossius, de orig. & prog. Idol. lib. i, cap. vi.

(72) Willemmer. pag. 41.

(73) Ye have said, it is vain to serve God: and what profit is it, that we have kept his ordinance, and that we have walked mournfully before the Lord of Hosts? Malachi chap. iii. ver. 14.

It would be a wrong way of reasoning to urge, that the Sadducees chose such books of the Scripture as did not formally contradict their errors; that they acknowledged these to be canonical, and rejected the rest, because they found there plainly asserted the immortality of the soul, and the doctrine of the resurrection, and that their idleness made them pitch upon this short way of disputing. *Sadducei compendio studentes & otio, immo etiam ut effugerent plurimum confutationes abjectis & abolitis omnibus prophetarum libris solas quinque Moses receperunt* (66). I say that such an argument is fallacious: matters of fact ought to be proved by arguments grounded upon facts, and not by probabilities supported by speculative reasons. Besides, we do not want such reasons; for men may so easily invent subtleties, glosses, and distinctions, that they need not reject the authenticity of a book, to answer the arguments alledged against them out of it. Do not the Socinians profess to acknowledge all the New Testament, and yet it contains more passages against their errors than the Old Testament against those of the Sadducees? Nay, what is more surprising, many Christians, who still acknowledge the truth of the holy Scripture, laugh at Magic, and maintain that the Devils have no power (67). I must observe that a modern Rabbi questions the truth of what is said in the Scripture, that the Sadducees did not believe any spirits. It would follow from thence, says he, that they rejected the Pentateuch, which makes mention of angels in several places. *De eo quod Sadducei dicuntur (Acts xxiii. 8.) negasse spiritus, non disputo. Sane ut multi putant sic sequeretur eos negasse legem Moysa quam variis in locis angelorum mentionem facit* (68). He argues wrong: The Sadducees made use of distinctions in order to elude the force of those passages. See Willemmer (69), and the writers quoted by him, and particularly Grotius (70). Consult also Vossius (71), whom he does not quote. What is certain is, that they practised the rites of the Jews, and professed to hope that therefore God would bestow upon them, the favours he has promised to those who observe his law, and that they should avoid the curses wherewith the transgressors were threatened. *Promissionibus legis inhiabant, eoque nomine DEUM sibi sacrificiis, precibus, jejuniis, aliisque cultus Levitici ceremoniis placare conabantur, ne iratum Numen promissiones amplissimas à populo tolleret* (72). The author of these Latin words shews against Dr Lightfoot, that the passage of Malachi (73) cannot be applied to that sect, since they never believed that the law was to be despised, nor that the observation of it was insignificant. 'Neque Sadduceorum doctrinæ & moribus convenit locus

(74) W. pag. 25

(75) W. pag. 26

to some they ascribed an organized body to God. He relates this in a manner that is somewhat liable to censure [H].

* Malach. III. v. 14. nunquam enim professi sunt Sadducei, legem Dei non esse observandam, aut observantiam legis esse frustraneam. Contrarium docet ipse Lightfoot *Hor. Hebr. in AA. Apost. p. 122. quænam, inquit, religio Sadducei? Orat, jejunit, sacrificat, observat legem, & tamen non expectat resurrectionem aut vitam æternam. Quorum hæc religio? Ut obtineat scilicet bona temporalia quorum solum promissionem observat illi factam in lege nihil rimari ultra literam (74). - - - Neither can this passage of Malachi be applied to the doctrine and manners of the Sadducees; for they never professed that the law of God was not to be observed, or that the observation thereof was insignificant; Dr Lightfoot himself teaches the contrary, when he says, What kind of a religion is that of a Sadducee? He prays, fasts, sacrifices, observes the law, at the same time that he does not look for a resurrection, nor eternal life. Why all this religion? To the end, forsooth, that he may obtain temporal blessings, which alone he observes to be promised in the law; and he seeks no farther than the literal signification.' Note, That the passage of Malachi might be admirably well applied to some Sadducees, who, had they been guided by experience, would have detected the falsity of the maxims which their Doctors taught them.*

[H] According to some they ascribed an organized body to God. Arnobius relates this in a manner that is somewhat liable to censure. Consider well his words.

* Neque quicumque Judaicas in hoc loco nobis opponat & Sadducei generis fabulas tanquam formas tribuant atque os Deo. Hoc enim putatur in eorum literis dici, & ut vel re certa, atque auctoritate firmari: quæ aut nihil ad nos attinent, nec ex aliqua portione quicumque habent commune nobiscum: aut si sunt, ut creditur, sociæ, querendi sunt vobis altioris intelligentiæ doctores, per quos possitis addiscere, quibus modis conveniat literarum illarum nubes, atque involucri relaxare (75). - - - Let no man oppose to us here the fables of the Jews and Sadducees, as if they ascribed a form and mouth to God. For this is thought to be said in their writings, and to be confirmed as a thing certain by authority. But these fables are either nothing at all to us, and are in no respect common to us with them; or if they likewise affect us, as they are supposed to do, you must consult Doctors of a deeper penetration, from whom you may learn in what manner it is necessary to explain the figurative expressions in the Scriptures. One of those who have commented upon him, censures him in the following manner. Nimis confuse Arnobius, saith he (76), atque etiam periculose. Nam de libris Veteris Testamenti tanta temeritate loqui impium plane & horrendum. Hoc igitur ait quia Rabbinorum scripta infinitis fabulis jam scatebant . . .

* Summam imperitiam prodit hoc loco Arnobius. Atqui melius Numenius Pythagoreus qui libro de summo bono primo Judæos in iis nationibus numeravit quæ Deum incorporeum existimabant, citatis etiam prophetarum testimoniis atque troporum enodatione, si quando contraria sententia videbatur effici posse adhibita. - - - Arnobius's reasoning is too confused, and even dangerous. For it is both impious and horrible to speak of the books of the Old Testament so rashly. He says this, because the books of the Rabbin are already stuffed with an infinite number of fables. - - - Arnobius betrays great want of judgment here. Numenius Pythagoreus did much better, who, in his first book de Summo Bono, reckoned the Jews first among those nations which believed God to be an incorporeal being, alledging even the testimonies of the Prophets, and explaining those figurative expressions which seemed to warrant the contrary opinion. This censure is not altogether groundless, but it should have been less severe; for Arnobius means this. We are not answerable for the idle fancies of the Jews; but there is no harm in the things that are common to us with them, if the mystical sense be understood. He could not deny that, according to the literal sense of the Scripture, God has hands and feet, a mouth and eyes. Therefore it was necessary for him to inform the heathens that the truth lies concealed under those figurative expressions. He shewed himself to be a dextrous and able Rhetorician by not insisting on that objection, and by only telling his adversaries, in four or five lines, that the Christians do not ascribe to God any figure or organical composition. Had he attempted to enter upon a more exact discussion of the matter, as Numenius did, he would have enervated his work; for since he was writing an invective against the Pagans, it was not his business to lose any time in answering them. It was better for him to act all along the part of an assailant; an author ought to be upon the defensive as little as he can, when he writes books of this nature. For the rest, we find in Origen what Numenius did in favour of the Jews (77); which shews that the Pagans did not neglect the pretended advantages they hoped to draw from some passages of the Scripture, that seem to ascribe some imperfection to God. The Christians had recourse to the figurative sense, and alledged against such passages those, wherein the perfection of God is clearly expressed. But Arnobius's work could hardly allow of such a digression, which afforded a pretence to answer that the passages of the Poets ought also to be explained one by another, and that some of them were to be understood in a figurative sense. It had been improper for Arnobius to revive such a notion: the commentator, who censures him, was not aware of this.

(74) Willem. pag. 25.

(75) Arnob. lib. iii, pag. m. 106, 107.

Arnobius
rash

(76) Desid. Heroldus, in Arnobium, pag. m. 134.

(77) Origen. contra Celsum, lib. i. Hæc duo quoties the passage in Greek.

SAINT-CYRAN (JOHN DU VERGER DE HAURANNE, ABBOT OF) one of the patriarchs of Janenism, was a native of Bayonne. Moreri speaks of him (a). I might add many things to what he says of him, but I defer them till another time. He was a very learned man, as appears from his work against the *Somme Theologique* of Father Garasse (b), and from the books that he published against the Jesuits, on which the clergy of France caused an encomium to be made in the year 1646 (c). The author did not put his name to the former; he appeared in the latter under the disguise of Petrus Aurelius for reasons mentioned by his friends (d). Few people know that he is the author of an apology for the bishops, who take up arms [A]. This paradox is less surprizing, than that which he maintained in his *Casus*

(a) Under the word *Verger*.

(b) See the article GARASSE, remarks [C] and [D].

(c) By Mr Goddeu. See a piece of the Jesuit Varouffeur intitled *Antiquus Gellius Episcopus Grauffensis an Elogii Aureliani Scriptor idoneus*.

(d) In the dialogue of two parishioners of St Hilary du Mont, pag. m. 45.

[A] Few people know that he is the author of an apology for the bishops, who take up arms. Consider these words of Mr Joly. The canons of Munster are obliged to prove their nobility by sixteen descents, as they say, and they are so fond of it, and of their military performances, that I have seen an epitaph upon the tomb of a canon, which imports that he was a captain, and died in the war. Hence it is that they use to get their pedigrees and coats of arms painted in a cloyster adjoining to the church, or in some public place. This example, in my opinion, does not deserve to be imitated, any more than those that were collected and inserted in the book, intituled, *L'Apologie de l'Evesque de Poitiers, in the year 1615, which*

a learned man of that time called, in a pleasant manner, and not without reason, The Alcoran of the Bishop of Poitiers; tho' the author of that book, who did not put his name to it, has been since much talked of on account of some other works concerning Ecclesiastical matters and piety, which are much better (1). Mr Joly would say no more, tho' he meant our John du Verger. That Bishop of Poitiers, was the patron of this learned native of Bayonne, and resigned to him the abbey of Saint-Cyran in 1620 (2). I have read in some compiler, that John du Verger being principal of a college in his own country, and hearing that this bishop wanted a Reader, or a Library-keeper, offered his service to him.

(1) Joly, Voies de Munster, pag. 80, 81. See also the *Mélanges* of Vigneul Marville, Tom. ii, pag. 27. Dutch Edit.

(2) See Moreri.

VOL. V.

D

Regius [8]. He died of an Apoplexy (e) at Paris, the second of October 1643 (f) The assembly of the clergy was so much displeased with the encomium bestowed upon him, in the *Gallia Christiana* of the brothers Sammarthani, that they ordered it to be struck out [C].

Those, who say that he died a prisoner at Bois de Vincennes, are mistaken, and might have avoided that mistake if they had taken notice that among his letters [D], there are some that are dated at Paris after he had recovered his liberty (g). His friends pretend that he was imprisoned in 1637, for no other reason, but because Cardinal de Richelieu had a mind to revenge himself on the abbot, for having refused to give his vote for the dissolution of the marriage of the Duke of Orleans and the Princess of Lorraine (h). If this was the true reason of his confinement, yet other causes were alledged for it, and they endeavoured to ruin him as a teacher of errors: his trial began upon that foot (i). But some say that Cardinal de Richelieu looking upon him as a man very well qualified to write

(e) St Romuald, Abr. du Threfor. Chronol. Tom. iii, pag. 452.

(f) Labbe, Chronol. Tom. v, pag. 877.

(g) See Leydecker, Hist. Janfenismi, pag. 497 & Epistolam Christiani Philireni ad Janum Palaeologum, pag. 29.

(h) See the eighth volume of la Morale pratique, pag. 383. See also pag. 415.

(i) See l'Esprit de Mr Arnaud, Tom. i, pag. 228 & seq.

(3) Scholarcha Bionensis . . . qui ausiens quod Episcopus Pictaviensis Leclerc vcl Bibliothecario opus habere adit eum, & ejus servitio prorsus se tradidit, à quo paulo post parvam Abbatiam S. Cyran accepit. Petrus à St. Romualdo in continuatione Chronici Admari, p. 453. ad ann. 1638.

(4) Giffertus Voëtius, in Defensata causa Patris, lib. iii, §. ii, pag. 689.

(5) Petrus à St. Romualdo, ubi supra, pag. 472. ad ann. 1643.

(6) Vie du Pere Paul, pag. 194, 195. Leyden 1661, in 12mo.

(7) Responses aux Lettres Provinciales, pag. 170, 171. Liege 1658.

him, which the bishop accepted (3). Voëtius did not forget this warlike adventure of the Bishop of Poitiers, in his list of some Ecclesiastics who took up arms. That prelate appears at the end of that catalogue. 'Henricus Ludovicus Rupipofus Episcopus Pictaviensis non solum arma tractavit, & armato populo armatus praeivit, ut Pictavio nonnullos ex Patriis quibus diffidebat ejiceret: sed etiam Apologiam edidit anno 1615, adversus eos qui dicebant, non licere Ecclesiasticis in casu necessitatis ad arma recurrere: sub cujus finem Catalogum bene longum texuit Cardinalium & Episcoporum qui tempore necessitatis arma tractarunt, Joannis Columnae Legati Gregorii IX contra Fridericum, Arnoldi Pelgrue Vaconis contra Venetos, Aegidii Albornos Cardinalis Toletani, cum Rege Castiliae contra Mauros, & contra Ludovicum Bavarum & aliorum complurium, quorum nemina ibidem legi possunt, simulque videri nullam coegisse necessitatem ut viri Ecclesiastici ad id negotium admoveantur; quando laicorum ducum satis larga copia suppeteret (4). - - Henry Lewis de la Roche-fozay, bishop of Poitiers, did not only take up arms, and put himself at the head of the armed populace, in order to drive out of Poitiers certain noblemen, whom he distrusted, but likewise published an apology, in the year 1615, against those who said that it was not lawful for Ecclesiastics to take up arms in any case; near the end of which he has inserted a long catalogue of cardinals and bishops, who took up arms in a case of necessity, as did John Columna, the Legate of Gregory IX against Frederic, Arnoldus Pelgrue of Gascony against the Venetians, Aegidius Albornos, cardinal of Toledo with the king of Castile against the Moors, and against Lewis of Bavarica; besides several others, whose names may likewise be seen there. At the same time it plainly appears, that it was not a case of necessity which had required Ecclesiastics to be employed in such affairs, there being no want of Lay-generals.'

[B] The paradox which he maintained in his *Casus Regius* I have not read that book, but it is said that he maintained in it that there are thirty-four cases, wherein a man may kill himself innocently. Paulo ante (obitum) composuerat librum inscriptum *Casus Regius*, ubi attulerat 34 casus in quibus quislibet poterat libere se ipsum interficere. Unde unus ex discipulis ejus nomine Meister arripuit nuper occasionem se ipsum interficiendi, cum Meis esset (5). See below, the remark [I]. Father Paul approved the principles of the Stoics in this respect; for when he was told that the Pope designed to have him carried away, he answered, among other things, 'That in case he was taken alive, in order to be carried to Rome, the Pope could not but know, that after he had done all he could, a man had a greater power over his own life than all other men put together, and that consequently he might deprive himself of life, before the Pope could have the satisfaction to take it from him in public (6).' I do not know whether many people have taken notice of this maxim of Fra-Paolo.

This doctrine of our Abbot was sometimes taken notice of in the first answers to the *Lettres Provinciales*, written by Mr Pascal. '(7) You should rather think of correcting the mischievous doctrine of Saint-Cyran, who was so bold as to say that we may kill our neighbours when we are moved to it by inward inspiration, tho' it be forbidden by the outward law. You may see the proof and the practice of it in

the second page of the information, drawn up against him by order of the late king, in the year 1638. The original is in Clermont-college at Paris (8). There are some opinions in it concerning this matter (9), which are plainly contrary to the Christian faith. . . . (10) Some are repugnant to morality, which we call scandalous, as those of the Abbot of Saint-Cyran*, who said that we are bound to kill a man, when moved to it by inspiration, tho' it be contrary to the outward law, which forbids it. Some are against common sense, which we call extravagant and rash, as that of the same Abbot, who goes about to prove in his *Casus Regius*, which you acknowledge to be his principal work, that men are often bound to kill themselves; and that this obligation being one of the most difficult and important, the performance of it requires an extraordinary courage and firmness. . . . (11) Can those, who teach, that it is lawful to kill one's self, and that a man is often bound to do it, have a right to determine when it is lawful to kill one's neighbour? And can those, who say, that one ought to obey the inward motion, which prompts us to kill a man, tho' it be forbidden by the outward law, declare at what time the outward law allows of it, and gives us a full power to do it? I do not think that Mr Pascal made any answer to this point, tho' he was in a manner forced to it by such frequent repetitions, nor do I know whether his silence was ever objected to him.

[C] The assembly of the Clergy . . . ordered the encomium on him to be struck out. St Romuald relates it thus; 'The son of one of the twin-brothers of Scævola Sammarthanus, who is lately dead, published in their name four great volumes in folio, intitled, *Gallia Christiana*, and mentioning that Abbot, bestowed on him a great encomium, as if he had been the most orthodox, and the most holy man, that lived in our days; but the general assembly of the Clergy of France ordered it to be struck out by a formal decree (12).' See the remark [K].

It is to be observed, that the prelates, who, in their assembly, caused that encomium to be suppressed, would not buy any copy of the *Gallia Christiana* which had it not (13).

[D] His letters. It is a work very much cried up by the Janfenists. Mr Arnaud d'Andilly published it in 1648, and dedicated it to the Clergy of France. The letters are full of devotion and maxims of piety, as we are told; I speak thus because I have not seen them. Mr Leydecker has given us some extracts of them, whereby the reader may have a good opinion of these letters (14). On the contrary, Father Bouhours quotes some fragments of them, written in a in Hist. Janfenismi, p. 470, & seq. He makes use of the edition of the Sieur de Preville, 1655. It is said, in Morel's Dictionary, that the Lyons edition is one of the finest; I do not know whether he means that of 1679. Note, that we are told in the book, intitled, *la Morale pratique des Jesuites*, pag. 413 of the 8th volume, that Father Pinterau, a Jesuit, has only printed some scraps for the answers to under the name of a chimerical gentleman, whom he calls the Sieur de Preville. You may see in the following pages how the original letters of Janfenius and the Abbot of Saint-Cyran came into the hands of the Jesuits.

(8) Ibid. p. 347.

(9) That is concerning Homicide.

(10) Responses aux Lettres Provinciales, p. 342.

(11) Ibid. p. 360.

(12) The Abbot of St Cyran in his *Casus Regius*.

(13) A maxim of the Abbot of St Cyran according to the deposition of the witnesses in his process kept in Clermont-College.

(14) St Romuald Abregé du Threfor. Chronol. Tom. iii, pag. 452, 453. ad ann. 1643.

(15) Vigneul Marville, Mémoires, Tom. ii, pag. 23. Dutch Edit.

(16) Bouhours, Maniere de bien penser, pag. 345, & seq. Dutch Edition.

(17) Leydecker, Hist. Janfenismi, p. 470, & seq.

(18) Leydecker, Hist. Janfenismi, p. 470, & seq.

(19) Leydecker, Hist. Janfenismi, p. 470, & seq.

(20) Leydecker, Hist. Janfenismi, p. 470, & seq.

(21) Leydecker, Hist. Janfenismi, p. 470, & seq.

(22) Leydecker, Hist. Janfenismi, p. 470, & seq.

(23) Leydecker, Hist. Janfenismi, p. 470, & seq.

(24) Leydecker, Hist. Janfenismi, p. 470, & seq.

(25) Leydecker, Hist. Janfenismi, p. 470, & seq.

[E] Car-

write against the Protestants [E], exhorted him to go about it in prison, and offered to supply him with books and all necessary helps. We shall see below (k) the Abbot de Saint-Cyran's answer to that proposal. He was not much esteemed by the famous Grotius [F], which is not very surprising; for Grotius, following the doctrine of the Arminians, was not very well disposed to admire such a rigid follower of St Augustin. I have said in another place (h) that the opinion of this abbot concerning the council of Trent was discovered to the public by Mr Abelly in the Life of Vincent de Paul, and that the discovery of this secret was acceptable to many people. This must not be to understood as if the public had not known before that such a thought was ascribed to that abbot. I only meant that many were glad to know that the testimony of Vincent de Paul appeared in print; but before that work of Mr Abelly came out, it might have been found in some other books that the Abbot of Saint Cyran did not very well approve the council of Trent [G]. He was very ill treated in a book of Mr de Raconis, Bishop of Lavaur. His friends accuse that prelate of having done that out of complaisance to Father Joseph (m). He accuses them in his turn, for already canonizing that abbot, as if they were Popes, and as if he had already done a great many miracles as true, as the forged ones they had published were ridiculous (n).

(k) In the remark [E].

(l) In the remark [G], of the article ABELLY.

(m) Raconis, de la Primaute de Saint Pierre, pag. 10, Paris edition 1645, in 4^{to}.

(n) Id. ibid.

Here follow some more additions. The praises bestowed on him by Mr de Balzac are doubtless hyperbolic; nevertheless, we find there one of the talents of the man whom he is commending, viz. that he understood how to support his opinions in the best manner [H]. I have received a very curious memoir concerning the paradox in the remark B [I]. I shall give the very words of that memoir, in which there is also something

[E] Cardinal de Richelieu looking upon him as a man very well qualified to write against the Protestants. It is said that this Abbot was resolved to answer the Ministers, who had writ against Cardinal du Perron about the Pope's supremacy, and the Real Presence. His confinement put a stop to his design: Cardinal de Richelieu encouraged him to go on with it; but the Abbot would answer, that it was not becoming the dignity of the Church, that her head and her greatest mystery should be defended by a prisoner. *Communis opinio est Abbatem Sancyrannum, antequam in arce Vincennæ detineretur, medium, et aggressum etiam utriusque Cardinalis Perronii adversus heterodoxorum plures, qui in vitam jam mortuam infirmitatem, illi utique quasi sibi plagas inflixerat, et suscepisse defendenda que Cardinalis inhumilitate dignis scripserat de Eucharistia, et de primatu Petri ab hereticis nunquam lacerata. Id cum obaudisset Cardinalis Richelieu, fecit ut ad id opus, quem eorum intererat parabat, incitasset, et pollicitus si inchoatum apologiam vellent proficisci, curaretur, ne quidquam librorum, et subsidiorum deficeret, que ad absolvendam vellet, aut forent necessaria; sed excessu animo respondens à Sancyrano non convenire Ecclesiæ dignitati, illius caput, et mysterium maximum ab homine atque, qui sui juris non esset, defendi (16). Mr Arnauld says only, it is well known that his confinement was the only thing that prevented his answering the ministers, who had writ against the doctrine of the Catholic church concerning the Eucharist (17).*

(16) Vincentius, Baronius Apolog. Ordinis Prædicatorum, Tom. i, pag. 163.

(17) Morale pratique des Jésuites, Tom. viii, pag. 376, 377.

[F] He was not much esteemed by the famous Grotius. In order to prove this, I shall only set down a passage out of a letter of Balzac to the Jesuit Leonard Allemai. "Quam æquo animo Grotio etiam alieni videre poteris ex his que subjungo verbis Epistolæ, non ita pridem ab eo scriptæ, ad optimum & humanissimum virum Joannem Cordesium. "Et mihi Aurelius interdum suffraginis egere videtur. Nam quorum tantus Suarezii contemptus; hominis, si quid recte judico, in Philosophiâ, cui hoc tempore conexa est Scholastica Theologia, tantæ subtilitatis, ut vix quæquam habeat parem? Quid attinet Molinitarum nomen Societati toties obijcere, cum si quid Molinæ exciderit periculosius, id posterioribus Jesuitarum, præcipue Lessii, scriptis sit castigatum. Neque verò non nihil etiam ab illâ sententia periculi est, quæ cum concilio Valentino, laudante Aurelio, statuit quorundam salutem Deum nolle, si illi quidem nudi à hominibus spectentur (18). . . . How equitable Grotius is, even to people that differ from him in their principles, will appear to you from the following words, which I take out of a letter written by him not long ago, to that worthy and good natured man John Cordesius. "Aurelius seems to me to want a check now and then. For why should he discover so great contempt for Suarez, a man who, if I judge aright, has such refined notions in Philosophy, with which at this time scholastic Divinity is strongly connected, that he has scarce any equal? To what purpose does he so often upbraid the Jesuits with the name of

(18) Balzac, Epistolar. Select. pag. m. 172.

"Molinist, since if there was any thing dangerous in Molina's doctrine, it has been since mended in the writings of the Jesuits, and particularly in those of Lessius. For neither is that opinion entirely free from danger which, established by the council of Valencia, and approved by Aurelius, declares, that God wills not the salvation of some, if we consider them barely as men."

[G] It might have been found in some other books, that he did not very well approve the council of Trent. It will be sufficient for me to quote one of them, that is, the Triumpbus Catholicæ veritatis adversus Novatores, printed in 1651. Father Labbe, who is justly accounted the author of it, inserted a memorial in it containing the dying words of Octavius de Bellegarde, Archbishop of Sens. It is said that this archbishop sent to the Pope's Nuncio by the Baron de Renti this last declaration of his opinions, that the Pope might be informed of it. One article of that piece runs thus: "That the Archbishop of Sens . . . is bound to believe that this whole party is rightly suspected by the Church, knowing that it began with an illusion, which produced, among other effects, a false devotion called, le Chapelet secret du S. Sacrement (19), condemned as such by eight Doctors of the Sorbonne; and being informed by credible persons, that the Abbot of Saint-Cyran spoke of the council of Trent as of a political assembly, which was not; & in the least a true council (20)."

(19) Concerning which, see Melnier, Port-Royal d'intelligence avec Genève, pag. 5.

[H] The praises bestowed on him by Balzac . . . we find there one of the talents . . . that of supporting his opinions in the best manner. It must be owned, Sir, that you are the greatest tyrant alive, and that your authority begins to be terrible to every body; when you speak, there is no possibility of retaining one's opinion, if it be not agreeable to your's. You have often reduced me to that extremity, that parting from you without knowing how to answer you, I could scarce refrain from crying out in an extasy, Restore me my opinion, which you have taken from me by force, and do not take away that liberty of conscience which the king has allowed us (21). This is what Mr Balzac wrote to him on the 12th of January, 1626. See also the thirty-first Letter of the Supplement to his works at pag. 186 of the 10th edition.

* See upon this point, and several others, what is observed in the book intitled: Les Reliques de l'Abbé de St. Cyran.

(20) Triumpbus Catholicæ veritatis, pag. 159, 160.

(21) Balzac, Lettre à l'Abbé de St. Cyran. It is the ninth in the second part of his works in the Paris edition 1638.

[I] I have received a very curious memoir concerning the paradox mentioned in the remark B. We have seen in the remark [B] what Peter de St Romuald says on that subject: but what follows was communicated to me by a person much better informed than that monk. The Abbot de St Cyran did not write any such book as the *Casus Regius* in the latter part of his life. The book which occasioned this mistake of the good Father was printed in the year 1609: and as there is no reason against ascribing it to the Abbot de St Cyran, the apology for the Bishop of Poitiers must not be counted his first, but his second work. The book in question is intitled, *Question Royale*, & sa Decision, at Paris, by Toussaint de Bray, in 1609.

SAINT-CYRAN. SAINT-CYRE.

something touching the suppression which the Sammarthani were obliged to make [K]. They ascribed to our John de Verger a piece which was censured by the Sorbonne, and which was written by a sister of Mr Arnauld. It is intituled *Le Chapelet secret du Saint Sacrement de l'Autel*. I shall speak of it below [L].

in 8vo. This is the title, and it is no otherwise expressed in the privilege, but in the first page we find a more circumstantial one: *Question Royale*, &c. The royal question, wherein is shown in what extremity, especially in times of peace, a subject may be obliged to preserve the life of his prince at the expense of his own. This book contains fifty-six leaves, or 112 pages. It is true, the author in several places, particularly fol. 46, & seq. mentions several particular occasions in which a man may kill himself without being guilty of self-murder. He alleges them to prove, that much more a subject ought to preserve the life of his prince at the expense of his own. What occasioned that piece is curious enough to be related. It is to be found in the book, intituled, *L'Innocence*, &c. *Innocence and Truth defended*, part 2. art. 8. p. 155, and 156. and is this. King Henry the Great having asked some Lords what he should have done, if, at the battle of Arques, instead of gaining the victory, he had been forced to fly, and had embarked in the neighbouring sea without any provisions, and had been driven by a storm into some remote desert or island; and one of the lords answering, that he would sooner have given himself for food to him by taking away his own life, which he must quickly have lost however, than have suffered his king to die with hunger. The king questioned whether that might be done. The tale Count de Cramail, who was present at this discourse, paying a visit soon after to Mr de St Cyrano, his particular friend, proposed this question to him, and desired his answer in writing. Mr de St Cyrano, who was then in the vigour of his youth, and might possibly be affected with that generous resolution, exercised himself upon that question purely Metaphysical, in the same manner as he would have done upon the clemency of Phalaris, the most cruel tyrant that ever was; and having delivered his solution of it in two shapes to the Count de Cramail, that lord suppressed of the two pieces that which was the better grounded in reason and authority, and caused the other to be printed without the author's name, and even without his knowledge, under the title of *Question Royale*, because the king had proposed it, and because it only concerned that Metaphysical case relating to the king's person and life, as appears from the very title. But the Abbot of St Cyrano has ever since declared to his friends, that the said little piece did not contain his true sentiments, but a paradox which that

lord had engaged him to maintain in his youth, just as we see Socrates did formerly write an encomium upon Helena, and another upon Euripides, &c (22).

[K] The suppression which the Sammarthani were obliged to make. The Clergy obliged them to suppress the encomium which they had made upon John du Verger de Hauranne in the 4th volume of their *Gallia Christiana*, p. 830, speaking of the Abbots of Saint-Cyran (23). They caused to be substituted there the encomium upon Mr de la Rochepeyrou, Bishop of Poitiers, such as it had been published before in the third volume, pag. 903. They likewise caused to be added in the margin of the substituted leaf, the following words over-against the Abbot de Hauranne's name. 'Cautum est decreto Cleri Gallicani quod in quibusdam exemplaribus elogium huic diversum reperitur, id censetur insertum in ejus cognitione & approbatione; illud tamen fama Sammarthanorum & Historicis fide qui suis operibus de Ecclesia Gallicana bene meriti sunt (24). - - - It is provided by a decree of the Clergy of the Gallican Church, that in case any of the copies should contain an encomium different from this, it ought to be looked upon as inserted without their knowledge and approbation; without any prejudice however to the fame and fidelity of the Sammarthani, who have done great service to the Gallican Church by their works.'

[L] It is intituled, *le Chapelet secret*, &c. . . . I shall speak of it below. It is one of the pieces by which Father Meynier endeavours to prove upon the Messieurs de Port-Royal that they have a secret intelligence with Geneva, he takes some propositions out of it, and compares them with those of the ministers; but before he comes that length, he makes the following preamble; 'Notwithstanding that he who wrote the Apology for Saint-Cyran, and that the other

Janfenists' (25) il est vray que je exclusivement. Father Meynier observes (26), that the Port-Royal condemn the Sorbonne for having censured this *Chapelet*; but he says it was not without reason that the Sorbonne affirmed that besides the extravagances, impertinences, errors, blasphemies, and impieties, which this *Chapelet* contains, it introduces besides opinions . . .

(22) A manuscript Memoir communicated by Mr Lancelot.

(23) See above remark [C].

(24) Taken from a manuscript Memoir of Mr Lancelot.

(25) Meynier, le Port-Royal, & Geneve d'intelligence contre le très Saint Sacrement de l'Autel, pag. 5, 6.

(26) Ibid. p. 6.

(27) Ibid. p. 14.

SAINT-CYRE was one of the brave men of the Protestant party under the reign of Charles IX. His name was Tanneguy Bouchet de Puy-Greffier [A]. He was one of the heads of what is called the conspiracy of Amboise (a); and after the battle of Dreux he was appointed governor of Orleans, upon advice that the royal army designed to besiege it (b). He brought the troops of Guienne to the Prince of Condé after the battle of St Denys (c), and was killed in that of Moncontour, being one of the oldest and bravest soldiers in France (d). We find a more particular account of his valour in d'Aubigné's History. 'The consecration of the Reformed, says he (e), was not so great, but that they rallied in large bodies and often charged those who pressed them hard, tho' they were closely pursued by the companies of the Marshals de Camp, which had not fought. The chief glory of that running fight ought to be ascribed to the Reisters; but Saint-Cyre Puy-Greffier ought to have a share in it. That old man having rallied three troops of horse in the wood of Mairé, and perceiving that by one charge he might

[A] Tanneguy Bouchet de Puy-Greffier. 'He was descended from John Bouchet, counsellor in the parliament of Paris in the year 1372, and afterwards admitted president into the grand chamber the 29th of April, 1389, originally of Auvergne, who was the father of John Sieur de Puy-Greffier in Poitou, paternal ancestor of the Sieurs du Puy-Greffier de Sainte Gemme, and de Villiers-Charlemagne, and of this Tanneguy Bouchet (1), whom la Popeliniere by mistake calls Du Bouchet (2). The eldest branch of the family ended in Frances Bouchet, lady de Puy-Greffier, who married Artus de Cossé Seigneur de Comon, Marshal of France, and in another Frances Bouchet, sister of the former, who married first Andrew de Laix and d'Alaroth, and then Francis de la Trappe, Count de Benzon (3). I shall mention, by

the by, a small adventure of Frances de Bouchet the wife of Artus de Cossé. Her husband was deprived, on her account of the office of Superintendent of the Finances, whereby he got the first year enough to pay all his debts, and as much money again as he owed (4) (§). He carried his wife to court to wait upon Catherine de Medicis. She was a country lady, who had never seen the court, and who was so simple as to thank her majesty for the superintendancy, as a favour whereby they had been enabled to pay their debts, and to get wealthy. The marshal, who heard this compliment, was provoked at his wife's folly; but the queen was wonderfully pleased with so ingenuous a confession, and that the lady had revealed enough to ruin her husband (§), if he should fall under the displeasure of that prince.

(4) Varillas, Charles IX, lib. vii, ad ann. 1567.

[(§) a] Brantome does not say that, for it was from him that Varillas borrowed the main of the story. See his *Homm. III. Fr. Tom. II.* in the Life of the Marshal de Brissac. R. E. M. C. 17.]

(5) Varillas, *ibid. supra.*

[B] He

(a) D' Aubigné, Tom. i, pag. 125.

(b) Idem. p. 238.

(c) Castelnau, Memoir, liv. vi, chap. viii.

(d) They are la Popeliniere's words.

(e) Histoire, liv. vi, chap. xvii, pag. 437. ad ann. 1569.

(1) Le Laboureur, Addit. aux Mem. de Castelnau, Tom. II, p. 793.

(2) *Id.* p. 794.

(3) *Id.* p. 794.

‘ might save the lives of a thousand men, his mi
‘ of his, advised him to harangue his soldiers. T
‘ brethren and friends it is thus you must do : with
‘ manner in armour, silvered over from head to
‘ as snow, and aged eighty-five years, he advan
‘ all the Marshals de Camp before him, and sa
not less virtuous than valiant [B], as he shewed

[B] He was not less virtuous as he shewed by his punishing adultery.] The story is very remarkable, Beza relates it in the following manner. On the 26th of March 1563, the Sieur de Saint-Cy, otherwise called Puy-Greffier, who had been appointed governor of Orleans from the time that the Prince left that town, a good man and a great enemy to vice, caused a new and remarkable execution to be made in the persons of Deslandes Sieur du Moulin, formerly secretary to the king, and of Godard (§β) the wife of John Godin, lieutenant to the Provost-marshal of Blois. Whilst this Godin was in the army, du Moulin debauched his wife at Orleans, for which crime he was hanged with her in the square du Martroy : which being told at court appeared so strange, that many were not ashamed to say, that if there was nothing else in the Reformed Religion, they would be sure not to embrace it (6). The reflexion is very ingenious : and indeed how can a man be safe in a religion, which does not refer to God the punisher of adulterers, but delivers them up to the secular power to be punished with death ? This is sufficient to put a great many people out of conceit with a religion ; it is worse than the condemnation of Polygamy, which kept some infidels from embracing Christianity. Left any one should suspect the author I have quoted, I shall cite another, who was not a Protestant, and who relates the thing in a very pompous manner. ‘ Pridie judicium non hujus sæculi nec tunc ‘ secundum Franciæ mores, ubi adulterium non puniri ‘ magni nominis Jurisconsultus Joan. Faber olim dixit, ‘ Aureliani latum est contra Landam Molinum, qui ‘ Godardam Jo. Godini uxorem dum vir in castris ‘ esset corrupisse convictus, ad mortem damnatus est, ‘ amboque Landa & Godarda in publica platea laqueo ‘ suspensi sunt, Pigreferio prisca moris ac severitatis ‘ viro qui à Condæo urbi præpositus fuerat judicium ‘ urgente, & grassantibus vitii exemplo opus esse ‘ dictitante ; quod tamen in aula adeo male acceptum ‘ est, ut plerique summa impudentia palam testarentur ‘ se à Protestantibus semper alienos futuros, & vel ob ‘ eam causam nunquam in eorum verba juraturos esse, ‘ qui adulterii hucusque impunitis nova & apud nos ‘ inaudita severitate poenam capitis statuerent (7). . . .

[(§β) Mr Bayle has not observed that Godard being a Masculine name, we ought to read here Godard, agreeable to the Latin Godardam, of Thuanus who had consulted the Errata of Beza's Ecclesiastical History. R. E. M. C. R. I. T.]

(6) Beza, Histoire Ecclef. liv. vi, towards the end, pag. 336.

(7) Thuanus, lib. xxxv. init ad ann 1563.

(8) In § ex non Kripto Inst. de jur. nat.

(9) See the advertisement prefixed to the Catechism of the Jesuits (§γ).

[(§γ) It must be the second edition of this Catechism, in 16mo, printed in Holland in the year 1678. For the first edition in 8vo, said to be printed at Villefranche 1602, does not contain this Advertisement. As to what concerns the saying mentioned in remark [B], it is in the Confession of Sancti, lib. i, ch. viii, where d'Aubigné puts it in the mouth of a Superior of St Anthony. R. E. M. C. R. I. T.]

(10) See the Critique generale de l'histoire du Calvinisme, against Maimbourg, Letter ix.

‘ On the day before, a sentence not suitable to the customs ‘ of the present age, nor at that time to those of ‘ France, where, according to the great Civilian Faber, ‘ adultery is not punished, was passed at Orleans upon du ‘ Moulin ; who being convicted of having debauched Godard the wife of John Godin, during her husband's absence in the army, was condemned to death ; and both ‘ he and she were publicly hanged ; Puy-Greffier, a man ‘ of primitive manners and severity, who had been ‘ appointed governor of the city by the Prince of Condé, ‘ insisting upon it, and affirming that the raging vices of ‘ the time required such an example to be made. It was ‘ nevertheless so ill taken at court, that most people openly ‘ declared with the biggest impudence, that they would ‘ always hate the Protestants, and never would embrace ‘ their religion, if it were for no other reason but this ‘ that they made a capital crime of adultery, which before that time had not been so much as punished. Those ‘ courtiers were in the right to say that Puy-Greffier's severity was out of fashion ; nay, the Civilian Faber, quoted by Thuanus, expressly says (8), that it was never heard that any body had been punished for adultery in France. Few people were able to refrain ‘ saying in that respect, let us beware of innovations ‘ (9). It must also be granted that this severity was not of long continuance among the Protestants, according to the maxim, nullum violentum durabile. It lasted longer at Geneva (10) ; but at last it vanished away : and it may be said in general to the shame of Christians, that they have suffered the penal laws, which many Pagan nations had enacted against adultery, to be abolished time out of mind. There is hardly any crime which oftner escapes with impunity than that : whoever prosecutes any person for it, must rather expect to be the talk of the town, and to be laughed at

bourg prevailed about thirty years before with the magistrates, to inflict a capital punishment on adulterers; and he wishes the Reformed Divines of the Low-Countries would not express so much zeal against dancing, as against the too great indulgence for adultery. He fancies that if they had thundered to purpose against that abuse, they would, with God's blessing upon their endeavours, have engaged the magistrates to inflict a more severe punishment than a fine. (16) *Qui* (Theologi) *si aequè fervide à pluribus jam annis*

(16) Mart. Schoockius Exercit. xvi. pag. 327.

demonstrassent in adulterium, (quod, pro dolor! per totum Belgium pecuniaria duntaxat multa expiatur) ex Dei benedictione, dubio procul, jam diu à suis Superioribus consecuti fuissent, quod ex voto obligit, ante annos ferme triginta, Theologis Augustanae Confessionis, Argentinae Evangelicam doctrinam annunciantibus: qui, licet non subdlexerunt Auditoribus suis temperatis in nuptiis choreas, à Magistratu tamen impetrarunt gladium adulterii vindicem. Had he been a minister, he would have found the difficulty of that advice.

SAINTE-ALDEGONDE (PHILIP DE MARNIX LORD DU MONT) born at Brussels [A], in the year 1538, made himself famous by his employments and writings. He fled into Germany when liberty of conscience was suppressed by the Spaniards in the Netherlands, and at Heidelberg he had the office of counsellor in the Ecclesiastical council conferred upon him. He returned into his own country in the year 1572 to employ his talents for the support of liberty and the interest of the Reformed Religion [B]. He was very much esteemed by the Prince of Orange, to whom he did several important services, not so much by his sword as by his words [C]. He was one of the deputies, sent by the States into England in 1575, to desire Queen Elizabeth's protection. Three years after he was sent by the Arch-duke Matthias to the diet of Worms, where he made

a very

[A] Born at Brussels.] I would not affirm it, if Melchior Adam was the only author that says so; for I find he adds to it a falsity, whereby one might be apt to think that he was not rightly informed. He says that the father and mother of Philip de Marnix were natives of Burgundy, and retired to Brussels.

(1) Bruxellis . . . è parentibus Burgundicis qui eo concesserant. Melch. Adam, in Vitis Jurisf. pag. 333.

(1) This is not true: Sainte-Aldegonde answering a writer, who called him a foreigner of Burgundy, says, *Not one of my ancestors was a native of Burgundy, that I know of; and it is notorious that I was born, educated, and allied, in this country. And likewise my father was born, brought up, and allied in it; so that except my grand-father and his predecessors, who were natives of Savoy, all my paternal and maternal ancestors were born in the Low-Countries* (2). The reason therefore why I affirm that he was born at Brussels, is because Verheiden says so (3), without adding any of the falsities that are found in Melchior Adam. Note, that Moreri in copying these falsities has rather increased them, for he is more particular, and says that the parents of our Philip were natives of the county of Burgundy. It seems that Swertius and Valerius Andreas knew not that Philip de Marnix was born in the Netherlands: their ignorance of this is surprising, since they knew this author by his controversial books (4). Had they known his native country, they would have placed him in the catalogue of the writers of the Netherlands: they do not use to leave out the Protestant authors.

(2) Sainte-Aldegonde, *Response apologétique au Libelle intitulé Antidote*, fol. A. 5. verso.

(3) Verheiden, in *Elog. prestantium aliquot Theolog. pag. 141*.

(4) They mention them speaking of Michael Baius, and the Jesuit John David, who wrote against Sainte-Aldegonde.

[B] He returned into his country in the year 1572, to employ his talents . . . for the interest of the Reformed Religion.] Since Verheiden and Melchior Adam knew nothing of the circumstances of his return, it will not be improper for me to supply what they have omitted. Sainte-Aldegonde soon after he left the Low-Countries on account of religion, was admitted into the service of the Elector Palatine; but William Prince of Orange, who looked upon him as a man well qualified for his designs, desired him of the Elector: *whicb was granted him first for two months, and then for two more, and at last for so long as he should want him; only the said Elector reserved to himself the liberty of recalling him, when he should think fit* (5). Sainte-Aldegonde gives this account to shew that he followed the Prince of Orange only as his private minister and servant, and not as a member of the States, or to intrude into the administration of public affairs. And therefore, says he, *if I have been employed in public affairs, either in the name, and by order of the States, or otherwise, it was always at his desire, and to pay him a due obedience as I was ordered by my first master. I will also mention what has been omitted concerning the persecutions he went through, before he fled into Germany. I was, says he (6), outlawed, banished, deprived of my estate, and exposed to the hatred and abuses of my friends and relations; and at last I lay in prison a year under the Duke of Alva and the commander Requesenes; and during that confinement I prayed to GOD every night at least for the space of three months, as if it had been the last night of my life, knowing that the said Duke of Alva had twice ordered that I should be put to death in prison. Observe that it had been objected to him, that he had been in*

(5) Sainte-Aldegonde, *Response apologétique*, fol. D. 3.

(6) Id. *ibid.* in the next leaf to B. 5.

the service of the Dukes of Parma: but he answered (7) that he never had any thoughts of going into the service of that lady, nor ever frequented her court, *seeing that during the space of six years, since his return from Geneva till the beginning of the troubles, he had concealed himself, as it were, under the cross of the persecutions, which were at that time very violent.*

(7) Id. *ibid.* fol. D. 5.

[C] . . . Not so much by his sword as by his words.] Melchior Adam, from whom I have taken the greatest part of the text of this article, is my author for this. *Quo in loco*, saith he (8), *non tam fortiter gerendum patriæ libertatis propugnatores se declaravit.* He could write and speak well, and was a scholar and a man of parts: his services were particularly memorable on account of those qualifications. It was he who drew up the formulary of the famous confederacy in the year 1566, by which several great men of the Low-Countries engaged to oppose the Inquisition (9). Brederode, who was the head of that league, made him treasurer of it (10). Sainte-Aldegonde spoke in the name of the Prince of Orange in the assembly of Dort, composed of the deputies of all the towns, in the year 1572. He made a lively description of the calamities of the country, and prevailed with that assembly to come to a resolution of opposing the tyrants. *Ibidem ejus orator Dominus de Sancta Aldegonde effusam de principis pio affectu, patriæ necessitate, Hispanorum tyrannide declamationem pronunciat, ac civitates novo bello contra Regem, regis tamen nomine usurpato illaqueat* (11). The Spaniards dreaded that Orator and Negotiator so much, that the Duke of Parma gave express orders to observe him narrowly in the conferences held at Cologne in the year 1579. *Monens interim ut Coloniam adventantem Philippum Marnixium . . . sedulo observaret, ab eoque uti ab homine impie callido sibi præcaveret* (12). The Protestant readers knowing the character of the man, who abuses Sainte-Aldegonde in this last passage, will never have a worse opinion of him. He assisted at the pacification of Ghent, in the name of the Prince of Orange and of the nobility of Holland and Zealand in the year 1576 (13). He was sent to Brussels the year following; but we ought not to credit what is said by the Historians of the contrary party, that it was to attempt upon the liberty of Don Juan of Austria (14). He was taken by the Spaniards, at the Hague in the year 1573 (15), and it being feared that such a prisoner, who was very prejudicial to them, would meet with very ill usage, the Prince of Orange sent them word that he would in the strictest manner use reprisals against the Count de Boffu (16). The year following Mondragon being forced to capitulate at Middelburg, offered to set Sainte-Aldegonde and three other prisoners at liberty, provided the capitulation he demanded, should be granted him. *Se apud Requesenium effecturum ut captivus Aldegundius (quod aerebat Orangius) tresque insuper alii Aldegundii arbitrari remitterentur in Zelandiam intra sex menses* (17). That agreement was accepted and executed: which I observe, to shew how much our Philip de Marnix was considered. He was to have the choice of three prisoners, who were to be set

(8) Melch. Adam, in *Vitis Jurisf.* pag. 333.

(9) Strada de Bello Belgico, Decad. I, lib. v, pag. m. 205.

(10) Brederodius coactores nominat & Philippum Marnixium . . . serarium Questionem creat. Id. *ib.* pag. 291, ad ann. 1566.

(11) De ortu & progressu Calvin. Reformat. lib. ii, §. iv, pag. 47.

(12) Strada, ubi supra, Dec. II, lib. ii, pag. 127.

(13) Thuan. lib. lxxii, pag. m. 163.

(14) Strada, ubi supra, lib. ix, pag. 527, 530. ad ann. 1577.

(15) Id. *ibid.* lib. vii, pag. 451.

(16) Id. *ibid.* pag. 452.

(17) Id. *ibid.* lib. viii, pag. 460, ad ann. 1574.

set

a very fine speech, and boldly described the Spanish tyranny [D]. He was one of the plenipotentiaries, whom the States sent into France in the year 1580, to offer the sovereignty of their provinces to the Duke of Alençon [E]. He was consul to Antwerp in 1584, when that town was besieged by the Duke of Parma. In the year 1593 he conducted into the Palatinate the Princess Louisa Juliana (a), who had been betrothed to the Elector Frederic IV (b). The books he published [F] were not the least service he did: some of them were on Politics, and others on Controversy; some were serious, and others comical: the latter proved most useful [G]: his very songs procured a great advantage

(a) Daughter to the Prince of Orange William the first of that name.

(b) Taken from Melchior Adam in Vitis Juris conf. pag. 333, & seq.

(18) Idem. Dec. II, lib. ix, pag. 627.

set at liberty with him. The States designed in 1587 to send him to the conferences about a peace with Spain (18); but having resolved to continue the war, his deputation proved a meer project.

[D] He made a very fine speech, and boldly described the Spanish tyranny. Thuanus says it was printed and answered. 'Eo à Matthia missus Phil. Marnixius Santaldegondanus orationem mire liberam ad VII viros & imperii principes, qui aderant, Nonis Maii habuit, qua deplorato miserabili Belgii statu, & Albani Austriacae tyrannide acerbis verbis exagitata Imperii opem imploravit; quippe commune Belgii cum Imperio periculum esse, prædixitque fore, ut belli incendium, nisi sistatur, se latius spargat, & Coloniam, Monasterium, Emdam, aliasque vicinas civitates, quas ex Albani consilio Hispani sub jugum mittere jampridem decreverint, olim complectatur, proinde rogat . . . ad eam orationem publicatam postea contraria oratione Calidii Chryfopolitani nomine Lucemburgi edita responsum est, quæ tota in exagitanda Belgum in Deum ac principem suum rebellionem occupatur (19). - Phil. Marnix of Sainte-Aldegonde, who was sent thither by Matthias on the 7th of May, made an exceeding bold speech to the Electors and the Princes of the empire, who were present, in which having deplored the miserable condition of the Netherlands, and inveighed against the tyranny of the Duke of Alva and the house of Austria, he implored their assistance, as the empire lay equally exposed with the Netherlands to the danger, and foretold that the fire of the war, unless it was stopped, would spread wider and include Cologne, Munster, Embden, and other neighbouring cities, which the Spaniards, by the advice of Alva, had long ago resolved to bring under subjection. He therefore asked . . . This speech being published, it was answered by one printed at Luxemburg under the name of Claudius Chryfopolitanus; which is entirely taken up in exposing the rebellion of the Netherlands against GOD and their sovereign.' Note that this speech was translated into Dutch verse by Baptist Horvart (20), and that Cornelius Loofe, a native of Ter-gow, was the person who answered it (21).

(19) Thuan. lib. lxxvi, pag. 239. ad ann. 1578.

(20) Melch. Adam. ubi supra, pag. 335.

(21) Placcius, de Pseudonymis, pag. 172.

(22) Wicquefort, Traité de l'Ambassadeur, book ii, pag. m. 228, 229. See also Strada, ubi supra, Dec. II, lib. iv, par. 248, ad ann. 1581.

[E] To offer the sovereignty of their provinces to the Duke of Alençon. Melchior Adam has forgot to tell us that Sainte-Aldegonde followed that prince into England in the year 1581, and wrote to the States the false news of his marriage with Queen Elizabeth. It is an example, which Mr de Wicquefort sets before the eyes of ambassadors, in order to shew how cautious they ought to be in writing news. 'Sometimes, says he (22), one cannot believe his own eyes. Vidi aut vidisse putat. - i. e. he saw or imagines that he saw.' The Sieur de Sainte-Aldegonde, who was agent for the states of the Low-Countries at the court of England in the year 1581, being one evening in the queen's chamber, saw her discoursing with the Duke of Alençon. The lords and ladies were at so great a distance from them that they could have no share in their conversation; but every body was witness to a thing, from which one might draw a very great consequence. The queen taking a ring from her finger, put it on the duke's, who quickly went out with great cheerfulness and satisfaction, as having obtained an earnest and a pledge of his marriage. Sainte-Aldegonde, who looked upon this action as a thing of the greatest importance to his masters, gave them notice of it by an express he dispatched that very same night. All the towns of the Low-Countries expressed their joy for a piece of news, that proved false, by the ringing of bells, the firing of guns, and the lighting of bonfires. The queen blamed Sainte-Aldegonde for being so hasty in giving notice of a thing, the truth of which he might have known in a few hours.

[F] The books he published. Meursius gives a catalogue of them: it contains *Theses aliquæ de Ecclesiæ*

atque Ecclesiasticarum traditionum xetnptio seu certa norma. Item de sacramento carnis dominicæ. Responso ad Michaelis Baii regii Professoris Lovaniensis apologiam. Epistola consolatoria ad fratres exules Brabantos, Flandros, Hannones, Artesios, aliosque Belgas peregrinos in regionibus ob puram Evangelii doctrinam dispersos. Tractatus de cæna Domini ad Galliarum Regis sororem Lotbaringie Duci nuptam. Contra libertinos. Apologetica responso contra anonymum quendam libertinum (23). To these may be added, says Meursius, several pieces published at different times, admonitions, declarations, tractatus, consilia, disputationes, consolationes, interpretationes, and several anonymous writings. His design was to refute the Romish controversies, and to raise enemies to the King of Spain. I leave you to judge whether having the talent of writing with great facility, he did not disperse many pamphlets about the transactions of the time. He did then what Baron Lifola has done since. Note that it has been said he was lucky in guessing the designs of the Spaniards, and that therefore the alarms he raised against their ambitious projects were not without ground. 'Prudentiæ & historiæ cognitio quanta in eo fuerit, scriptum illud declarat, in quo agit de Hispanorum scopo, ad quem sua ipsi tela dirigunt; qui Monarchiam sibi præfigentes, nihil non ausint. In eodem tanquam vates prognosticis politicis multa prædixit: quæ evenisse Britannia, Polonia, Gallia, alique regiones testantur (24). - His great knowledge in Politics and History appears from that treatise, wherein he considers the chief aim which the Spaniards have in view: who in order to bring about their scheme of universal monarchy leave nothing unattempted. In the same treatise, like a prophet or political prognosticator, he foretold many things which have actually come to pass, as Great Britain, Poland, France, and other countries can testify.'

(23) Meursius, Athenæ Batavæ, pag. 180.

(24) Melch. Adam. ubi supra, pag. 335.

[G] . . . His comical books were most useful. He published in Dutch the Romish Hive, *Abeverium Romanum*, in the year 1571, and dedicated it to Francis Sonnius Bishop of Boilleduc, one of the chief Inquisitors of the Low-Countries (25). That book, full of comical stories, was wonderfully applauded by the people, and proved more prejudicial to the church of Rome, than a serious and learned work would have been. Nay, it is said to have put many people upon examining more strictly the controverted points of religion, and detecting the errors of the church of Rome: Erasmus's colloquies had produced the same effect: 'Hoc scriptum . . . est varietate historiarum, & acumine sententiarum refertissimum: joci facetiisque in Papiarum theatrales nugæ & fabulas mire conditum: adeo ut lectoribus istorum temporum præcipue, singularem attulerit voluptatem: & occasionem multis præbuerit, de religione Christiana serio cogitandi. Et hic liber ut populari applausu acceptus, sic non sine fructu plurimorum lectus, plus rei Belgicæ illa tempestate in religionis negotio profuit; quam eruditi aliquot commentarii (26). - This book . . . is full of stories and witty sayings: it is wonderfully seasoned with jokes and facetious remarks upon the theatrical tales and trifles of the Roman Catholics: so that to the readers of those times especially, it gave an extraordinary pleasure, and put many upon thinking seriously of the Christian Religion. As this book was received with general applause, so the reading of it produced good effect, and it did more service to the Low-Countries in the business of religion than some learned commentaries.' He wrote a book of the same nature in French, which was printed soon after he died, with this title, 'Tableau des differens de la religion. - - - A picture of religious differences.' He is very merry in it, and brings in a posse of jokes and quibbles; and yet alleges very pertinent reasons. This work proved as successful as the *Abeverium*. The greatest part of

(25) Id. ibid. pag. 336.

(26) Id. ibid.

SAINTE-ALDEGONDE.

(c) Melch. Adam.
ibid. pag. 334.

(d) See his Apo-
logetical answer
to the German
gentleman. *init.*

advantage to the new republic [H]. He translated the Psalms of David out of Hebrew into Dutch verse; but that translation was not made use of in churches [I]. He was employed about a Dutch translation of the Scripture, when he died at Leyden the fifteenth of December 1598 (c). He had a little before made a journey into France about the prince's affairs (d). He did not escape slander [K], and it is said that his retreat was the life

(27) Thuanus,
pag. m. 39.

(28) I think
Thuanus is mis-
taken in this.

(29) *Librum pe-
nitentissimum.*
Valer. Andr. Bi-
blioth. Belg. pag.
490.

(30) Verheiden,
in *Elogiis* ali-
quot Theologor.
pag. 145.

of the stories are the same in both. Vast numbers of people diverted themselves with examining this picture, and were more confirmed in their belief thereby than if they had read the best work of Calvin. Thuanus did not approve this way of handling controversy. I have seen, said he (27), Philip de Marnix de Sainte-Aldegonde at the siege of Paris, and I lodged three months in the same house with him . . . he was a polite man, but there was no great matter in him. He was chancellor of Gelderland (28). He treats of religion in the style of Rabelais, which is very ill done. John David a Jesuit published another *Alvearium* in Dutch to confute that of Sainte-Aldegonde, which he called a most pernicious book (29). He knew well enough that the most dangerous way of writing against a doctrine is to turn it into ridicule.

[H] His very songs procured a great advantage to the new Republic. I might have cited, above, Verheiden instead of Melchior Adam, who only transcribes him; but I thought it an indifferent thing, provided I should once point out the original. I take another way here, and set down the words of Verheiden. 'Ab hoc Viro, fatisse (30), etiam profecta dicitur decantata illa CANTILENA composita in laudem PRINCIPIS GUILLIELMI Nassavii, Ad Belgas Tyrannide Albani oppressos edita. Quæ quidem Cantilena ita scite facta, ita concinnis rhythmis modulique suis est attemperata, ut plebis animos mire ad Principis, Libertatisque Patriæ amorem excitaverit. In hoc igitur SANCT-ALDEGONDII se alterum quasi TYRTÆUM, toties à Platone laudatum, ostendit. Nam cum PRINCIPIS Fortissimi laudes, hortamenta virtutis, damnorum solatia, salutariæque consilia continet; magnum ardorem defendendi PRINCIPIS PATRIÆQUE LIBERTATIS populo injectit: adeo ut nihil illis temporibus convenientius prodiret iudicare liceat. . . . To the same author is ascribed that famous ballad, which contains a panegyric upon William Prince of Orange, and was published in Holland while that country was oppressed by the tyranny of the Duke of Alva. That song was so artfully contrived, and so well composed in its rhymes and notes, that it stirred up in the minds of the people a wonderful affection for the prince and the liberty of their native country. By this therefore Sainte-Aldegonde proved himself to be, as it were, another Tyrtæus, whom Plato so often commends. For by celebrating the praises of so heroic a prince, by exhorting the people to behave valiantly, by comforting them for the losses they had sustained, and by intermixing some advice, he inspired them with a great zeal for the defence of the Prince and the liberty of their country. So that we may justly affirm that nothing could be published more suitable to the circumstances of those times.' He is in the right to say, that nothing could better fit the circumstances of the time, than a pretty song full of invectives against the Duke of Alva, and of encomiums on the Prince of Orange. The design of erecting some provinces of the King of Spain into a common-wealth required many things, and particularly a continual application to prevent the suggestions of those, who might have represented that it was almost impossible to hold out against so potent a monarch, that the charges necessary to carry on the war against him would very much exceed what he exacted from them, and that therefore it was a great piece of folly to spend one's All rather than bear an impost (31). This might have been confuted by a thousand good reasons, and it was of great moment to make the people sensible of it both from the pulpit and in books: but nothing was more proper for such a design than a song; for it is a thing that remains imprinted in the mind, and every body, even the peasants and servant-maids, daily repeat it with great joy and satisfaction. We have here therefore one of the most important services of Philip de Marnix. This puts me in mind of the song about the Scalado, which the Genevois sing in their houses on the anniversary day, as a thing almost essential to that ceremony. I am sure that at first the impressions made by this song in the minds

(31) Omnia da-
bant ne deciman
arent.

of the people, surpassed all others (§ a). [(§ a) Mr Bayle does not tell us that it was Theodore Beza who, in his very old age, made the song upon the Scalado of Geneva. REM. CRIT.]

[I] That translation of the Psalms was not made use of in churches. He affected to use none but Dutch words, and acted quite contrary to the other Poets of his nation, who inserted in their pieces a vast many words taken from the French. His translation was better than that which was sung in churches; nevertheless it was not admitted. Thus in France the old version of Marot and Beza was preferred to that of Mr Conrart, which some had a mind to introduce. I shall set down a passage of Melchior Adam (32): (32) Melch. A. Id opus hæcenus aliquoties typis publicatum, sed nunquam communi concionatorum consensu est receptum: cum contra versio alterius à tot millibus edificatur. Nimirum

Pro captu lectoris habent sua fata libelli.

'That work has been printed several times, but was never yet received by the common approbation of the ministers: whereas the other translation is commended over by so many thousands. The reason is because,

Books have their fate, succeeding well or ill
Just in proportion to the reader's skill.

Here follows another passage, whereby it appears that Philip de Marnix, the better to introduce his version, made it, as much as ever he could, like that which was already used. Mr Conrart had the same precaution, but to no purpose (33): people were too much used to the common translations. 'Ante complures annos displicuit nonnullis apud Belgas nimis ille à textu Scripturæ per laxiores paraphrases metricas recessus: præsertim Psalmorum Datheni, qui ex Psalmis Gallicis Maroti & Beza expressi erant. Veriavit hæc cura inter alios nobiliss. Marnixium montis Sancti-Aldegondis Dominum; qui propterea novam paraphrasin rhythmo-metricam composuit, strophis, lineis, syllabis, cum Datheni Psalmis, parâ passim eundem, ut cum illis in templis cantari, aut facile iis substitui posset. Sed cum Datheni Psalmi jam memoriâ à plerisque tenerentur, non viderunt Ecclesiæ, quomodo commodè & absque aliquâ commotione plebis ecclesiasticæ in publicis sacris hic quicquam loco moveri posset (34). . . . A good many years ago some people in Holland were displeased with these loose poetical paraphrases, which varied too much from the text of Scripture; especially with respect to the Psalms of Dathenus, which had been formed upon the French Psalms of Marot and Beza. Among others Philip de Marnix lord of Mount Sainte-Aldegonde employed himself this way, and composed a new paraphrase in metre, exactly agreeing with the Psalms of Dathenus in the stanza's, lines, and syllables; for this reason that it might be sung along with them in the churches, or easily substituted in their room. But whereas most people had already got the Psalms of Dathenus by heart, the churches did not see how they could conveniently and without giving some offence to the common people introduce any alteration in the public worship.'

[K] He did not escape slander. Some instances of it may be seen in the words I have quoted out of Strada. But here is a more cutting stroke: that Jesuit having said that Sainte-Aldegonde was one of those, who had been ordered to seize upon Don Juan of Austria by stratagem or by main force, adds: 'Quod sanè facinus et si non abhorrebat à reliqua vita aut Aldegundii hominis ignominiosissime nequam, qui Calvinum puer docentem audierat, fenex jam alios ipse docebat: aut Hefi . . . tamen an illi re ipsa moliti hoc sint, ut Austriacus multis authoribus exultimavit . . . affirmare non auiam (35). . . . Which wicked attempt, although it was no ways inconsistent with the rest of the life either of Sainte-Aldegonde, a man of an infamous character, who in his youth had been Calvin's disciple, and taught others in

(33) Note, that the church of Geneva and several others have at last laid aside the old version of the Psalms; but the Walloons churches have resolved to keep it. See the remark [P], of the article M A R O T.

(34) Gislebertus Voëtius de Politia Ecclesiast.

(35) Strada de Bello Belg. Dec. I, lib. ix, pag. m. 527, 528, ad ann. 1577.

life of a man in disgrace. He was strangely perplexed when complaints were made that he exhorted

his old age; or of Hefus . . . yet whether or no they did actually attempt such a thing, as Don Juan of Austria, relying upon the authorities of many, believed, . . . I dare not positively affirm. I have a book printed at Cologne in 1673, with this title, *De ortu & processu Calvinianæ reformationis in Belgio: in quo exhibentur patia & fœdera ibidem inita, & demonstratur nullam eorum à Reformatibus habitam esse rationem, Autore C. L. S. V. V.* Sainte-Aldegonde is very ill used in it, and the author says, among other things, that whilst he was endeavouring to undo the Catholics of the Netherlands in the diet of Worms, he made it his business to persuade the ambassadors of the Emperor and of the Electors, that the Arch-duke Matthias had been invited by the inhabitants of that country to be the protector of the Romish religion, which was very much endangered by the Civil war. *Belgas Archiducem Matthiam pro tuenda Catholica Romana religione ad Provinciarum regimen evocasse, præsertim cum illa inter civiles hostes tumultus magnis motibus percelleretur* (36). I shall observe by the by, that the author of that book was discovered, though he had taken all possible care to conceal himself. He was banished upon that account, and his estate was confiscated. He lived at Cologne under the protection of the Pope's Nuncio in 1678. I only say this upon the credit of the Italian Journalist (37). If what is said of Sainte-Aldegonde in that book were true, it would be a trick of an ambassador, which he did not invent, and which is common enough (38). I have another book intitled, *Antidote ou contrepoison contre les conseils sanguinaires & envenimez de Philippe de Marnix Sr. de Ste. Aldegonde, &c.* . . . *An antidote or counterpoison against the bloody and pernicious counsels of Philip de Marnix Sieur de Sainte-Aldegonde, contained in a book published by him against the spiritual zealots, whom he calls in his language Geesdijvers. Written in the form of a responfory letter by a German gentleman, a lover of peace and of the Belgic liberty.* The time and place of the impression and the Printer's name do not appear in it; but one may know that it came out about the year 1598. The author of that book abuses Sainte-Aldegonde in the following manner. (39) That

(36) *De ortu & processu Calvin. Reform. in Belgio, lib. ii, §. 12, p. 78. He quotes Uytendagartius Histor. Eccles. Part. iii.*

(37) See the VI Journal de Lettrés 1678. in the extract of the book intitled, *De ortu & processu, &c.*

(38) See the remark [B], in the article BEL-LAI (WIL-LIAM DU)

(39) *Antidote, pag. 13, 14.*

(40) *Ibid. p. 15.*

advice puts me upon scanning your former actions, when I call to mind that it was not without cause that the States of Holland and Zealand would not permit you to come into their territories. You was then in despair by reason of the unfortunate murder of the late Prince of Orange of Glorious Memory, and because the design at the dike of Cauwestein miscarried. Your conscience was very much troubled, as mistrusting God's power, till such time as you had contrived that pretty surrender of Antwerp, and the pacification then concluded in the year 1584, and not contented with that great piece of service done to the Duke of Parma, you made it your business in common discourse to praise that prince, advising some to make a general peace, the better to conceal your own fault by the ruin and desolation of a hundred thousand poor afflicted people; for you presumed so much upon your ability as to pretend that you knew a way to make the said duke revolt against his master, and by that means to procure a re-union of the seventeen Provinces. You boasted that you had opened the matter to him in the time of the parliament of Beveren, when you had so many private discourses with him in the presence of all your colleagues, who are venerable men and some of the most illustrious in the said town: which was too great an undertaking for such a man as you are. I shall say nothing of your ill conduct in the government of that town, since you might have supplied it with sufficient provisions and ammunition for a siege of some years, considering the absolute power you usurped in it, and upon this not only the preservation of that town, but, in a manner, that of the whole State, depended, witness the confusion the Provinces were in when . . . (40) This wife Prince of Orange, of Glorious Memory, was sensible, some years before he died, of your turbulent spirit, when he removed you by degrees from his council and person, lest he should some time or other find himself in a plunge, from the effects of this detestable advice of your's.

VOL. V.

Equity requires that we should hear what Philip de Marnix answered to that German gentleman. 'Since the States-General, says he (41), who would not permit me to come into their territories, have not continued in their resolution, but, on the contrary, have been willing that I should be nearer them, have conferred with me above twelve years, and imparted to me many designs and secrets, and even conferred upon me honourable employments, ordering that I should be well used, to give me thereby some marks of their affection; do not you see that they have by that means cleared me of the calumnies, which slanderers men, like you, had invented against me, though they durst not open their mouths in my presence? . . . How dare you put a construction upon what the States have done, quite contrary to their intention? How dare you blame me, because, in such a critical time, they thought fit, for some particular reasons, that I should be absent for some time, by reason of the ill reports that were spread against me; it being impossible that a man in such a post as I had, should please every body. Especially if it be considered, that, as they very well know, a false report went about, that I had prevented the reading of the Queen of England's letters at Antwerp; at which some English soldiers were so exasperated, that they swore they would kill me: but afterwards being informed of the truth of the matter, and even that I was going to the queen in order to clear my self, they changed their mind. If therefore the States, for this, or some other consideration, thought fit that I should be absent for some time, (for the letters of the States of Zealand alleged no other reason but the reports that went about me) how can you be so impudent as to defame me for a thing which redounds to my glory and honour?' Afterwards he gives a long list of the courageous actions performed by his order or counsels since the death of Prince William; which shews that this assassination, which made him very uneasy, did not throw him into despair, and deprive him of the use of his reason. He gives a particular account of his conduct during the siege of Antwerp; he protests that he opposed, as long as he could, those who were for capitulating, and that he and his twenty-one colleagues had all their instructions in writing (42), when they went out of the town to settle the conditions upon which it should be surrendered. He says, that he made the enemies believe, that they had still provisions enough for seven or eight months, so that Mr Richardot, the second day after he entered into the town, said, when he saw what a condition it was in, that he had never been so much imposed upon (43). He is very long in justifying himself as to the praises he had bestowed upon the Duke of Parma. He says (44), that making a report to the great council of what had passed during the capitulation, he was obliged to set forth the reasons alleged by the deputies of the Duke of Parma, to remove the mistrust that prevailed among the people. They had enlarged upon the virtues of that duke, and made an abridgment of his life, to shew that on all occasions he had faithfully kept his treaties. Sainte-Aldegonde related what they had said. Here follows an instance of popular injustice, and of the wrong construction that is put upon things. 'This discourse made in such an assembly, and spread all over the town, was construed by many, as if what I had related to have been spoken by the deputies of the Duke of Parma, had been my own opinion; so that every body was saying that I had extolled the said duke to the sky: whereupon some ministers (even some of those, whom I took care to consult before I did any thing) made me a sharp remonstrance, as if I had renounced my religion and my party. I confess that by an effect of human infirmity, I was more nettled at it than I should have been; so that my answer was attended with some marks of indignation. . . . And because I perceived, that, tho' I had satisfied them, the same report prevailed still all over the town, and that many of those, who envied and hated me, and who retired into Holland in crowds, triumphed over me upon that account, to the prejudice of my reputation; I confess I was so moved with it, that, in my Apology, without remembering that I had related those

(41) Sainte Aldegonde, *Reponse apologique à un Libelle fameux qui a été publié par un certain libertain s'attirant Gentilhomme Allemand, &c. fol. B 3.*

(42) *Ibid. fol. C 2, verso.*

(43) *Ibid. fol. C 3, verso.*

(44) *Ibid. fol. C 4.*

SAINTE-ALDEGONDE.

exhorted the States to persecute the sects [L]. I have read a book, wherein it is observed that

things, as they were spoken by our enemies, (as I have said already), I plainly and absolutely maintained that there was no harm in praising our enemies, for such things as are really commendable, and I mentioned several good qualities of the Duke of Parma. To which I was induced, not only by reason of the said calumnies, but also by the necessity of the time, and because I was in his power, together with the whole town; tho' I may truly say that I had still other views (45). I shall mention this new reason, because it discovers to us a weakness, an artifice, and a corruption, which prevail in all places, and in all ages. 'I have always been of opinion, says Sainte-Aldegonde (46), that nothing can be more dangerous for the preservation of a state in hard and difficult times, than to despise one's enemy. For as Orators tell their scholars, that they ought never to fancy that their adversaries want wit; so in point of war, it is very dangerous to think that our enemies are foolish and careless people. And yet many were apt to entertain such thoughts, endeavouring to make every body believe that the Duke of Parma was a man of no prudence and ability in military affairs. An opinion, gentlemen, which might have proved very prejudicial to your state, if your prudence had not prevented the ill effects of it, by looking for assistance every where. Since my return into Zeeland, I have seldom said any thing of the Duke of Parma, either to his advantage or disadvantage, except when I was required to do it, by those who had the power to command me; and then I told them what I truly thought of him. Thus much for the praises bestowed on the duke, which have been laid to my charge by so many people. Wherein I believe I have done nothing but what I was obliged to do by the necessity of the times, and by my concern for the preservation of the town, and of the churches that were in it.'

Here you see a great difference between those, who are altogether for countenancing popular prejudices, and those who reason equitably and solidly. The latter think themselves obliged in justice and good policy not to give a wrong account of the forces, valour, and good conduct, of the enemy: the former are for telling impudent lies about those things. Not but that they are sensible that such lies may be prejudicial in some respects; but they rather chuse to indulge by such means their own passions and those of the people; and because they take them to be more advantageous than detrimental, considering the humour of the populace, they do not approve of sincerity, and if any one practices it, they impudently charge him with treason.

I omit the apology relating to the letter written by Sainte-Aldegonde to the Lord de Meetkercke, concerning a general peace. He vindicates himself by laying the fact open, and shewing the drift of his design, and he confesses that some false and foolish reports went about it. I likewise omit what concerns his being accused of neglecting to supply Antwerp with provisions, &c. I think he fully justifies himself as to these articles. Let us see what concerns his being told in a reproachful manner that he had been excluded from affairs, and had made himself suspected by Prince William. We shall see in his answer several particulars belonging to his history (47). 'After the death of the said elector, and even after the departure of the king's brother (48), having earnestly desired to be dismissed, in order to live a private life, his excellency (49) was pleased to grant my request, but on condition, that whenever he should send for me, I should be ready to serve him in what place he should order, which I promised to do. Upon this promise he had a mind to dispatch me to Bruges, giving me the government of that town, and what depended upon it (which was prevented by my sickness, and the secret practices of those, who invited thither the present Duke of Arschot). Afterwards he sent me to Antwerp, having little hopes of preserving that town, by reason of the different inclinations of the people, and the animosity they expressed against him, under pretence that he favoured the French. He got me admitted there into the council of Brabant, and soon after I was by his means appointed the head of the town, under the title of the first burgomaster, seeing that I had absolutely

refused that of Margrave.' He says afterwards, that this prince, a month or six weeks before he died (50), sent for him to Antwerp, on account of the resolution that was taken to send into France for succours. ' (51) Ever since God was pleased to call him to himself, after the siege of Antwerp, which lasted thirteen months, during which time I used my utmost endeavours to keep it for the States and the United Provinces, tho' God was not pleased to prosper my labours, I willingly laid aside the administration of affairs, and no body can say I sued for any other employment directly or indirectly. Much less can it be said that I was turned out, since I always loved to live a retired and frugal life in the country, till the said States were pleased to call me to Leyden, in order to spend my time in a sacred study, on which all my friends knew that my mind was altogether bent. Which is so true that this man, through a kind of contradiction, sends me into Zeeland to cultivate my garden and improve my lands, as I had formerly done for a considerable time.'

I shall add something out of Strada. That Jesuit acknowledges that Sainte-Aldegonde used his utmost efforts for the defence of Antwerp. He represents him as a man well stocked with methods of leading the mob (52). His adherents, said he, gave out that they knew the Duke of Parma would offer very reasonable terms, but that he had privately promised the soldiers that they should have the plunder of the town. *Addebant aliqui civium, nempe ex Aldegundii cohorte, sibi exploratum esse, Parmensem Principem oblatum quidem conditiones baud spernendas, clam tamen stipendiorum loco cum Hispanis pactum esse populationem urbis* (53). The magistrates sent out emissaries, who declared all over the town, that some letters had been received from France, importing that the troops designed for their relief were at last upon their march (54). That Historian observes that the greatest part of the citizens suspected those letters to have been forged in Sainte-Aldegonde's closet (55). Is not this to represent him as a man, who used his best endeavours to preserve that place? He adds, that Sainte-Aldegonde having lost all hopes, and being willing to take care of his own particular interest, forwarded the sending of some deputies to the Duke of Parma (56). He mentions the discourse he made to the duke; he says (57), that he had a conference of four hours with that prince, at which the other deputies were not present, and that he particularly insisted on the article of liberty of conscience, giving hopes that upon such a condition Holland, Zeeland, and the rest of the Low-Countries, might submit again to the King of Spain, and that he took it upon himself. He pretends that the Duke of Parma, who rejected that condition, made use of such a wonderful eloquence, that Marnix owned he had never seen a prince, who spoke better. Lastly, Strada says, that he seemed to have altered his mind since that conference, and to be more inclined to conclude a capitulation, and that he published a book, wherein he not only bestowed great encomiums upon that duke, but also declared that one could not bear arms against Philip II with a good conscience. This confession, continues Strada, of a man, who had so great an interest in his party, was prejudicial to the confederates, and they began to suspect Sainte-Aldegonde to such a degree that he was laid aside. Let us see this as it is told in elegant Latin. *Quinetiam edito postea libello, quum res ab Alexandro patratas, clementiam ejus in victos, in servanda fide sanctimoniam, ceterasque Imperatorias virtutes, liberali praeconio celebrasset; adiecit inter alia, Sumi adversus Philippum Regem arma à subditis populis, integra conscientia, nequaquam posse. Quae sane confessio non temere inter loquendum prompta, sed literis ad memoriam confectata, ut erat hominis auctoritate inter suos, & Calvinianâ sapientiâ longe clarissimâ, Federatorum causae momentâ plurimum abrogavit, ipse suis offensus invisusque, regendam ad Rempublicam postea non accessit* (58).

[L] Complaints were made, that he exhorted the States to persecute the sects. I have said more than once, when there was occasion for it, that it was a hard case for the Protestant writers of the XVIIth century, to think themselves obliged to exhort the magistrates

(45) Id. ibid. verso & seq.

(46) Id. ibid. C 5. verso.

(47) Sainte-Aldegonde, ubi supra, fol. D 3. verso.

(48) That is, the Duke of Arschot.

(49) That is, William, Prince of Orange.

(50) Sainte-Aldegonde, ubi supra, fol. D 4.

(51) Id. ibid. verso.

(52) Aldegundius non consumptis adhuc quas apud prime callebant artibus tractandae multitudinis, spargit in vulgus scripturam se Parmensi principi. Strada, lib. vii, Dec. II, p. 423.

(53) Id. ibid. pag. 424.

(54) Id. ibid.

(55) Plerique Gallicas literas Antwerpiae natus in Aldegundiano conclavi suspcebant. Id. ibid. pag. 425.

(56) Consul Aldegundius ubi rem desperatam publicam vidit, sibi privatim consiliarius legationem . . . festinavit. Id. ibid. pag. 427.

(57) Id. ibid. pag. 432.

(58) Id. ibid. pag. 433.

that he loved dancing, and that this is sufficient to answer the scruples of the Precifists [M].

It

protest
persecut

to punish Heretics, whilst they thought it strange that the Catholic princes should persecute the Protestants. Indeed their own arguments were retorted against them, and they could hardly come off but by supposing, as all parties do, that their doctrine was true. Sainte-Aldegonde must needs have been more perplexed than many others, since he had taken so many journeys, made so many discourses, and writ so many books, for a state, which had taken up arms against the Spaniards, to free themselves from the yoke of the Inquisition. How many things might have been said against him, when he exhorted the sovereigns of that same state to exterminate some sects? Here is an instance of the perplexity he was in. He supposes, 1. That these words were only objected to him (59). *It is high time, noble and venerable lords, that you should go about to maintain the honour of GOD in this world, if you desire that he should protect and defend your country.*

(59) Sainte-Aldegonde, Responsio apologetica, fol. A 4.

2. That the antidote which was opposed to that exhortation, consists in this: *Men ought to live quietly one with another, and every body ought to have the liberty of believing what he thinks to be right, and we should not concern our selves with it.* Permette Divis cætera, ----- *With all things else, trust the gods.* He quotes the ninth and forty-first pages of the Antidote; but there is in the ninth page a clause omitted by him. He is blamed for using these words, *to suppress and entirely annihilate that mortal poison.* It is further said (60), that he thinks it very strange, *that there should be still some men so tender-hearted, as to question whether the magistrates ought to inflict corporal punishments, and lay a fine upon those who are guilty of insolence in the service of GOD and religion.* What he leaves out, pretending to know nothing of it, alters the state of the question, and removes the difficult part of it. Can such a proceeding be consistent with sincerity? Is it not an unfair thing to reduce the Antidote to a single proposition of the forty-first page, without considering several solid arguments that go before it?

(60) Antidote, pag. 10.

It is true, that in another place of his answer (61), he examines what he had left out in the beginning. That examination shews the perplexity he was in. Note, That he bore an ill-will to the Enthusiasts long before. See his letter to Beza written the tenth of January 1566 (62).

(61) Aldeg. Responsio apolog. fol. G 5, & seq.

[M] *It is observed that he loved dancing, and that this is sufficient to answer the scruples of the Precifists.* See Schoockius (63), who has inserted in one of his books, a letter written by Sainte-Aldegonde, in 1577, to Caspar Verheiden, a famous Dutch minister (64). That letter seems to me very judicious. I shall take two or three curious things out of it. The author affirms, that many people were so offended, because dancing was forbidden in the Reformed churches, that it made them unwilling to join with them, and that several laid aside their aversion to the church of Rome, when they came to know the practice and opinion of the Protestants about it. From thence he infers, that too rigid a morality; touching this bodily exercise, was so far from being edifying, that it was scandalous (65). He says that the prince (66) himself was very much offended when he heard that one could not dance at a wedding, without incurring the censure of the church. He thinks that dancing is a good and commendable thing in the Netherlands, because it keeps people from drinking or gaming after meals (67). He is not much concerned because the zealots have not the same esteem for him as they had before; for, says he, I take reputation to consist in the real nature, and not in the superficial outside of things. *Existimationis certe (quam tu mihi apud pios omnes amissam hoc facto esse autumas) rationem, ego nunquam in rerum externarum umbris, sed in ipsiis rebus positam esse statui* (68). However he approves the conduct of the church of Geneva, which, by forbidding dancing, had suppressed many unbecoming things that were practised every day. It was an usual thing in those parts to carry young maids to balls up and down in the night-time, and to vex them with lewd postures. He does not think that one can be present at such a spectacle without a sin, and much less an actor in it. His expressions being much stronger and more expressive than mine, I shall set them down here, in favour of those who understand Latin. This I do in a thousand other places for the same reason.

(62) It is the sixth letter among those of Beza.
(63) Schoockius, Exercit. xxiii, pag. 317, Edit. in 4to.
(64) It is the Lib. of the Ill. Tome of the Epistole illustrium Belgarum.
(65) Plane censo non modo nullam esse in hac importuna morositate, & revocata ad humane opinionis placitum censura, sed incedibile etiam scandalum. Schoock. pag. 318.
(66) I think he means the Prince of Orange.
(67) Imo vero his locis sanctas duxerim choreas que post epulas ad sistenda ebriorum pocula inhibendive aleatorum ludos, agitantur cum fructu. Schoock. ibid.
(68) Ibid. pag. 319.

Ut ego Genevates merito laudandos censeam, qui turpissima dedecora, quæ quotidie sine fronte committebantur, hoc uno interdicto, quasi Tenedia bipenni, refecerunt. Sed illis erat usitatum, quod & bodie est multo frequentissimum, apud Burgundos, Sabaudos, atque omnes Allobroges, & multos etiam Gallos, puellas virgines in tempestiva nocte, sine ullo custode, ad choreas, quocunque vellet abducere, & quamdiu vellet in sœdissimis atque obscenissimis gestulationibus, quovis anni tempore, sine ulla prope intermissione, prætextu chorearum, usque ad nauseam fatigare. Quos ego mores vel inspicere, nedum exemplo comprobare, nefas esti duxerim (69).

The Reformed churches, which forbid dancing, cannot be sufficiently praised for it; and it were an absurd thing to fancy that the ministers blamed it, only as it is an art of moving according to the time and cadence of Music. It is a very lawful exercise under that notion, it is neither good nor bad, morally speaking. But the manner of it occasioned a thousand disorders, and in the very room wherein the ball was kept, it made dangerous impressions upon a woman's chastity. The proverb concerning convents, *As dangerous as the return from matins* (70), might have produced another, with a small alteration, *As dangerous as the return from a ball.*

To confirm what I have said, that the Protestant churches of France did very wisely forbid dancing, I shall quote a passage out of a book written by Lambert Daneau, if I am not mistaken. The author maintains (71), that *the Devil never invented a more effectual way than dancing to fill the world with subreedom*:

For if the bare meeting of a man and a woman can have this effect, if lewd words, or wanton songs alone, if bare touches are sufficient to kindle lust, as we have but too many instances of it every day; one may judge of the great inconveniences that will arise from the concourse of all those things in one and the same place, and in the same persons, who besides meet there only for the sake of pleasure. But all those things are to be found in dancing; so that it may be said that dancing is a composition of all sorts of poisons invented by the Devil, to strike the heart more powerfully, to stifle the fear of God, and to kindle all manner of filthy lusts; that it is a bait for the eyes and ears, and, in general, for all the senses to seduce them, and convey the poison into the soul through their channel. There, more than in any other place, the heart gives an unbounded loose to its desires and wanton inclinations.

(72) Upon such an occasion every body may chuse, even in the arms of husbands and mothers, such women as they like, that is to say, such as their lusts direct them to; and then they take them by the hand, and as if they were already enjoying their desires, they kiss, embrace, and carry them up and down: young men making it their business to appear nimble and merry, and to please women with a thousand motions; and women, on their part, using their endeavours to do the like. The men know how to make them frisk and cut such high capers, that the company may see their legs up to their very thighs, without shame. A ball will have its cross motions, settings, and nearer approaches; and when the parties meet, there will be glances, capers, and redoubled frolics, on purpose to shew that the heart, in a manner, flies with joy upon seeing itself so near the object of its desires; each sort of dance affords new ways of pleasing, seeing, and touching more familiarly: all those things are performed with great shoutings, with smiling countenances, that seem transported with joy, and with all the symptoms of hearts that are intoxicating with full draughts of pleasure (73).

The dancers are not the only persons liable to those inconveniences, but also those who are mere spectators, since women have a full sight of young men, whilst they play their nimble and merry tricks; and likewise the men a full sight of the women and maids, whilst they shew their wantonness. How great a power have the eyes and ears (or rather the Devil, who makes use of those organs) upon idle people, well fed, and greedy of pleasures? But let us suppose that some will dance without having any ill desires; can it be said that they will not excite them in others? For they

(69) Ibid. pag. 320.

(70) See Paquier, Recherch. de la France, book viii, ch. xxxiii, pag. m. 729.

A DESCRIPTION of the ill consequences of dancing.

(71) Traité des Danfes, ch. x, pag. 37, of the third edition which is that of 1583.

(72) Ibid. p. 38.

(73) Ibid. p. 41.

It cannot be denied, without doing him injustice, that he was one of the illustrious men of

they do every thing that may kindle lust, and, as St Jerom says in a like case, they present the poison to any that will take and swallow it. Now there will be but too many in these excessive fits of pleasure, and after the provocatives of a full repast, that will be disposed to drink it. A maid is pitched upon to dance; which is sufficient to make her fear that she has excited a foolish desire in the person, who pitches upon her. But when he kisses her very tenderly, and caresses her, and whilst she is dancing, redoubles his efforts; what can she think but that he does it upon her account, and that the fire of love, which kindles his lust, makes him so nimble? Besides, that maid goes up and down with a bold and merry countenance, and without any veil or mark of shame, as it were, to shew herself to every body. But how can she be sure, that none of those, who look upon her, will feel an unlawful desire? And if you suspect that you have occasioned an ill thought in a man, what is become of your conscience, if you are not sorry for it, and do not avoid such meetings? The same may be said of young men with respect to women (74). I should transcribe the greatest part of that book, if I was willing to mention all the reasons alledged in it as strong as these. That treatise was dedicated to the King of Navarre, by the ministers of the Holy Gospel of the French Reformed churches. His court wanted very much to be reformed in that respect, for it was not like that of the virtuous Joan d'Albret. Her example was alledged to that prince (75): 'Thanks be to G O D, there is no body who does not assure himself, that your majesty, besides the great parts and excellent judgment which G O D has bestowed upon you, having so good and so bold an education from your infancy by such an excellent queen and mother, that she was deservedly called the wonder of her age, and remembering the good example she gave you, (for she always kept her house free from such filthy things, ever since she was called to the knowledge of the Gospel, and had the command of herself) it is impossible that the corruption of this age should prevail upon you more than holy precepts, the ill examples of other courts, more than the remembrance of that wherein you have been bred up, and the allurements of the world more than the piety, which you have sucked in with your mother's milk.'

(74) *Ibid.* p. 43.

(75) *Ibid.* in the Epistle Dedicatory, fol. A 3.

Ludovicus Vives, a Roman Catholic, had followed the same maxims which Lambert Daneau has set forth. I shall quote him according to the French translation of Peter de Changy. 'In the cities of Christendom we have dancing-schools permitted as fests for wantonness: a thing which the Infidels themselves would by no means suffer, on account of the leud touches and immoderate kisses that are customary there. To what purpose is so much kissing, unless it be to imitate the amorous doves? In old times virgins were not allowed to be kissed by any but their near relations; now every body assumes that privilege. We are brothers and sisters by baptism, but friendship and charity may very well subsist among us without such familiarities. What pleasure or advantage can there be in leaping higher than a girl's strength can bear her, in being raised between two men and hoisted up by the arms, or in dancing a whole night without being tired of it (76). . . . From such nocturnal meetings proceed (as is said before) leud kisses, afterwards unchaste looks and touches, together with obscene discourse. They disfigure themselves at a strange rate. One has her coif pulled off, another is seen bare-headed, joined between two doors, or follicited by squeezing of the hand and other signs; for so treacherous a business it is that there is no way of escaping unhurt. The body is heated; desire inflamed; the heart beats; the will wavers; and then, if a convenient place presents, it is odds but they carry the point still farther. In short it can never bear a good construction among women and girls that have a tender regard to their honour, and therefore it is prudent to avoid the danger, for fear they should not be able to resist it (77).'

(76) Vives, on the education of a Christian woman, chap. xiii, fol. 33. Edit. of Paris 1543.

(77) *Ibid.* fol. 34.

(78) Plantin affirms in his preface that the first translator had followed the Latin no further than he thought fit, and that the said book, in the form he had put it, was rather an abridgement, collection, or alteration; than a translation of the said Latin of Ludovicus Vives.

The translation of Antony Tiron printed for Plantin at Antwerp in the year 1579 doth not entirely agree with the other (78). His words are as follows: 'Dancing is the last companion which makes extravagant entertainments the scene of mirth and high diversion; so that we may justly say that dancing is in a

manner the height of all vices. Notwithstanding this we have dancing-schools in Christendom; upon which account the Heathens out-do us in point of modesty: for they are utter strangers to that new way of dancing which prevails among us, and which is a bait to uncleanness, as being full of unchaste touches and kisses. What means so much kissing? Formerly men were allowed to kiss no women but such as were their relations; but now it is the custom all over Burgundy and England to kiss whomsoever one pleases. Baptism, it is true, gives occasion to this, to the end forsooth it may appear that we are all brethren. For my part I would gladly know what is the use of so much kissing, as if we could not keep up our love and friendship with the women by any other means: but it is the beginning of an uncleanness which I will not name. To speak my mind freely, I am of opinion that it is a most shameful and barbarous custom. But to pursue my discourse upon dancing; what is the good of so many leaps which the girls take, supported under the arms by their partners, to the end that they may be able to kick up their heels higher? What pleasure do these locusts take in tormenting themselves thus, and in spending the greatest part of the nights in dancing without being either weary or satisfied (79)? All the rest of the chapter is full of moral reflexions, and lashes maquerades at a terrible rate.

It is plain that when dancing is attended with so many irregularities, it deserves to be blamed by all those, who write moral books. Sainte-Aldegonde would not have approved of it. The Count de Buffi Rabutin condemned the use of balls as a very dangerous thing: reason and his own experience convinced him of it (80). All the Casuists ought to be Precisists or Rigorists upon this head. The Philosopher, who wrote against the Precisists, declared (81) that he blamed dancing under this notion; but he said he did not believe it was of the same nature among the Protestants of Germany; and that the Precisists, who are offended at a custom, that prevails in that country, where both sexes dance together, should consider that they do not disapprove certain customs, at which the Germans have more reason to be offended. 'Si mixti saltantium chori, nos ratione Germanorum offendant, nec eos multo magis offenderint promiscui juvenum & virginum accubitus in nuptiis, maxime oscula ex more gentis Belgicae, praeter ceteris Hollandicae, frequentari solita. Obtestor eos, quorum zelus contra choreas forte improbari non posset, si a scientia convenienter dirigeretur, an non multo majus scandalum promiscua & quotidiana haec oscula (ita loquitur Sueton. lib. iii. cap. 34.) praebant Sarmatis, Cimbris, & Germanis, quam nobis (si gentilitios mores distinguere noluimus) praebere possint a nuptialibus eorum tripudiis (82)? . . . If we are scandalized at the promiscuous dancing which is in fashion among the Germans, truly they have more reason to be offended at the promiscuous lying of young men and girls at a wedding, and more especially at the kisses which are so customary in the Low-Countries, and particularly in Holland. I appeal to them, whose zeal against balls would perhaps not deserve to be censured, if it was guided by knowledge as it ought to be, whether these promiscuous and daily kisses (to make use of Suetonius's words) do not give much greater offence to the Poles, Holfteiners, and Germans, than we (if so be that we will not distinguish between the customs that are peculiar to different nations) can possibly take at their nuptial dances.'

(79) *Ibid.*, as translated by Antony Tiron, pag. 128, 129.

(80) See in the second part of the *Retour des Pieces chastes*, his letter to the Bishop of Autun, concerning balls and dancing.

(81) Nulla ratione tamen patrocinaris volo tripudiis modernis, à Bathylli modis non abhorrentibus, atque convenientibus magis Pathico, five cinædo, quam hominini Christiano. Mart. Schoockius, ubi supra, p. 327.

(82) *Ibid.*

He draws up a parallel between the custom of kissing and that of dancing, and maintains that foreigners will be more offended at the first, than the Precisists are at the last. 'Quam pro suis Batavis excogitaverit hic rigidus Theologus, idemque juratus adversarius non minus omnigenarum chorearum, quam votorum innoxiorum propinato poculo additorum? Maxime, si Cimber, aut Sarmata viderit uxorem illius, convivas suos ad ostium osculo excipientem & dimittentem. Næ, peregrinus hic conviva, cum Clemente Alexand. lib. 3. Pædag. ejusmodi osculum, à gravissimi licet Patris uxore ex usu gentis frequentatum, vocaverit osculum incestum, veneno plenum, sanctitatem simulantem, & osculum impudicitiae: ex Ambrosio vero in cap. ult. 2. ad Corinth. affectus libidinosi indicium. Nec est, quod adversarius dicat hoc judicium, seu Cimbris, seu Sarmatae, charitatis expers esse, quum ipse longe inclementius

of the XVIth century; for he was very zealous for his religion, and had a great deal of wit and learning: besides he was well skilled in the Civil Law, Politics, Negotiations, Divinity, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, and several living languages (e).

(e) See Verheiden, in Elog. ali-quot Theolog. p. 141, & seq.

(83) Mart. Schoockius, Ex-erit. xxiii, pag. 328.

inclementius iudicet de saltationibus, quas proclamat esse proxima incentiva libidinis, interim non cogitando, per oscula multo expeditius ingredi libidinem; atque Cimbri, seu Sarmatæ, videri prostituta famæ, & pudicitia, feminas esse, quæ præsumpserint hospites osculo excipere (83). - - - *What excuse could this rigid Divine, this sworn enemy to all kind of dancing, as well as to the innocent custom of drinking healths, find out for his countrymen the Dutch: especially if an Holsteiner or Pole should see his wife receiving and dismissing her guests at the door with a kiss. Truly that foreign guest would with Clemens Alexandrinus call a kiss of that nature, though given by a grave Person's wife, and warranted by the custom of the country, an impure kiss, full of venom, and which under the pretence of being holy was in truth the kiss of unchastity; or with St Ambrose he would construe it for the mark of a libidinous inclination. Nor could his adversary say that this custom of the Holsteiners or Poles was void of charity, since he himself passes a far more unmerciful judgment upon dancing, which he avers to be the biggest incentive to lust, not considering that lust is much sooner raised by kisses; and that the Holsteiner, Cimbrian, or Pole, believes all these to be loose and abandoned women who presume to welcome their guests with a kiss.* He concludes that nations ought to excuse one another, and to consider, above all things, that an ancient and long custom may make a thing innocent in one country, that is indecent in another. He instances upon English women walking with other men than their husbands. (84) Quæ ratione oculi dicta sunt, applicari possunt deambulationibus, quas uxores Anglorum, cum alienis viris intrare solent (85), quæ & inter primaria dignitatis Belgas hoc tempore frequentari incipiunt. Certe offenderint hæ matronas Christianas ad Septentrionem degentes; quæ mirabuntur admodum, hæc & similia citra censuram tolerari posse ab illis Theologis, quorum zelus quo-

(84) Id. ibid. pag. 329.

(85) Henry Stephens mentions that custom in his Latin Apology for Herodotus.

tidie occupari solet circa saltationes & pocula votiva. Nos vero, citra pulveris jactum, ex omnibus hiis difficultatibus expedire constanter possumus, quando docemus, in talibus gentium mores & consuetudines ante omnia inspicere debere quorum ratione, ut rigiores quoque Præcisissæ Hollando sua concedunt suavia, Anglicanis matronis prodeambulationes cum maritis non suis; ita aliis gentibus mox invadere non deberent suas saltationes, modo ab iis absit mollities, & illud τῆς γυναικὸς, ad accendendum libidinem ab otiosis nepotibus excogitatum. - - - *What has been said with respect to kisses may be applied to the custom that English women have of walking with other men than their own husbands, which likewise begins to be the fashion among Dutch ladies of the first quality. This must certainly give offence to the Christian women that live farther North, and they will wonder very much how these and the like things can escape the censure of those Divines, whose zeal is daily employed against the custom of dancing and that of drinking healths. But as for us, we can easily extricate ourselves out of all these difficulties, by saying that in such things the manners and customs of nations ought chiefly to be considered, and that since out of regard to those, the rigid Precisists allow the Dutchman his kisses, and the English women their walks with husbands not their own, they ought as little to envy other nations their dances, provided they be free from effeminacy, and have none of those artificial gestures which profligate men have contrived as incentives to lust.*

It may be observed that this Philosopher had not the same reasons that Sainte-Aldegonde had, to write an apology for dancing. He protests that he never had a mind to dance; and that if the magistrates should forbid dancing, it would not make him uneasy in the least (86). Sainte-Aldegonde could not have said so with any sincerity.

(86) Protestationi hoc unum amplius adjicio, mihi, circa choreas, ne quicquam fieri five meti; quum de earum exercitio ne per somnium quidem cogitarem tota vita, quam exemplo agni illius Eurymeni apud Plautum, ex Dei meli voluntate, in qua libenter acquiesco, tranfigo inter catenatas molestias & curas: unde & ferre possum Magistratum E-dicta, chorearum abolitionem perpetuam urgentia. Id. ibid. p. 321.

SANCTA-CLARA (FRANCIS OF) an Englishman, and a Franciscan Monk, lived in the XVII century. He was chief lecturer in Divinity at Douay, in the convent of St Bonaventure, and provincial minister of the province of England, and Almoner to the Queen of Great Britain, wife to Charles I. He published some books [A], where he shewed himself favourable to those of the Episcopal persuasion in England; for he endeavoured to prove that the XXXIX articles of their church might be more easily reconciled with the council of Trent, than is commonly imagined. He was besides very favourable to those who err with a good intention. We need only see his problem upon invincible ignorance (a). He does not appear to have any other learning or eloquence besides what may be got by a diligent reading of the School-men and Canonists.

(a) It is the xvth of his book, intitled *Deus, Natura, Gratia*. Mr Allix has quoted it twice, (pag. 117, 203) in his *Reflexions Critiques & Theologiques sur la Controverse de l'Eglise*, printed in the year 1686.

It has likewise been quoted in the *Commentaire Philosoph. sur les contrain-les d'entrer*, pag. 524, of Part. II.

[A] He published some books. I shall give the entire title of that which he dedicated to Charles I, king of England, and which was printed at Lyons in the year 1635 in 8vo. 'Deus, Natura, Gratia, five Tractatus de Prædestinatione, de Meritis & peccatorum remissione, seu de Justificatione, & denique de Sanctorum Invocatione, Reliquiarum & Imaginum veneratione, de Indulgentiis, & Purgatorio, & sub finem, de Excommunicatione. Ubi ad trutinam Fidei Catholicæ examinatur Confessio Anglicana, & ad singula puncta, quid teneat, qualiter differat, excutitur. Doctrina etiam Doctoris Subtilis, D. Augustini sequacis acutissimi, olim Oxoniæ & Cantabrigiæ, & solemniter approbata, & honorifice prælecta, exponitur & propugnatur. Accessit paraphrastica Expositio reliquorum Articulorum Confessionis Anglicanæ. Tertia editio multo auctior, pluribus materiis Theologicis illustrior, & in articulorum discussione clarior, & fusior. Præmittitur Epistolium Apologeticum lectori Catholico, in quo ratio totius operis exhibetur. - - - *God, Nature, Grace; or a treatise*

*on Predestination, on Merits and the forgiveness of sins, or on Justification; as also on the invocation of saints, the worship of relics and images, on indulgences, and purgatory, and lastly on excommunication. Wherein the confession of the Church of England is examined by the scale of the Catholic Faith, and discussed in every point, both as to what it contains, and in what manner it differs from the said faith. The doctrine also of Duns Scotus, the subtle follower of St Augustin, which formerly was solemnly approved of and honourably taught at Oxford and Cambridge, is explained and defended. To this is added, a paraphrastic exposition of the other articles of the English confession. The third edition considerably enlarged, improved by the addition of several points of Divinity, and more distinct and copious in the discussion of the articles: to which is prefixed, a short apologetic epistle to the Catholic reader, giving an account of the whole work.' His *Apologia Episcoporum, seu sacri Magistratus Propugnatio: Præmittuntur Anarcharum politicissimi*, was printed at Cologne in the year 1640 in 8vo.*

SANTA-CROCE (PROSPER) in French *Sainte-Croix*, made a cardinal by Pius IV, had been advocate-consistorial and auditor of the Rota. He was Nuncio in Germany, Portugal, Spain, and France. Catherine de Medicis procured him the archbishopric of Arles, where he prevented with an extreme severity the establishment of the Protestant religion. He died at Rome the fourth of October 1589, being seventy-six years old. I

VOL. V.

G

shall

SANTA-CROCE. SANCTA-MAURA.

shall speak of his books [A]. At his return from his nunciature in Portugal, he made Tobacco known in Italy [B]; which is the reason why that herb was called Santa-Croce (a).

(a) Ex Prospero Mandosio, Bibliotheca Romana; & Oidoino Athen. Roman.

[A] I shall speak of his books. His books are, *De-
cisiones Rotæ Romanæ. Gallicarum rerum Commentaria.
Epistole ad Federicum Naufragum aliosque. Several Ora-
tions. Constitutiones lætæ artis à Sixto V. in Urbe
erectæ.* The Jesuits of the Roman college have his
treatise, *De Officio Legati*, and one volume of his let-
ters in manuscript (1).

(1) Ex Prospero
Mandosio, Bibl.
Romana; & Ol-
doino Athen.
Roman.

[B] He made Tobacco known in Italy. This appears
from some verses of Caſtor Duranti, quoted by Man-
dosio, wherein that herb is celebrated, as if forsooth it
was an universal remedy.

Nomine quæ Sanctæ Crucis herba vocatur, ocellis
Subvenit, & sanat plagas, & vulnera jungit,
Discutit & strumas, cancrum, cancroſaque ſanat
Ulcera, & ambuſtis prodeſt, ſcabiemque repellit;
Discutit & morbum cui ceſſit ab impete nomen,
Calefacit & ficcat, ſtringit, mundatque, reſolvit,
Et dentum & ventris mulcet capitique dolores;
Subvenit antiquæ tuſſi, ſtomacoque rigenti
Renibus & ſpleni conſert, ultroque, venena
Dira ſagittarum domat, iſcibus omnibus atria
Hæc eadem prodeſt: gingivis proficit atque
Conciliat ſomnum: nuda oſſaque carne reveſtit:
Thoracis vitis prodeſt, pulmonis itemque,
Quæ duo ſic præſtat non ulla potentior herba.
Hanc Sanctæ Crucis Proſper quum Nuncius eſſet
Sedis Apoſtolice Luſitanas miſſus in oras
Huc adportavit Romanæ ad comoda gentis,
Ut proavi Sanctæ lignum Crucis ante tulere
Omnis Chriſtiadum quo nunc reſpublica gaudet,
Et Sanctæ Crucis illuſtris Domus ipſa vocatur
Corporis atque animæ noſtræ ſtudioſa ſalutis.

The herb which borrowes Santa Croce's name;
Sore eyes relieves, and bealeth wounds. The ſame
Diſcuſſes the King's Evil, and removes
Cancers and Boils: a remedy it proves
For burns and ſcalds, repels the nauſeous itch,
And ſtrait recovers from Convulſion fits.
It cleaſes, dries, binds up, and maketh warm:
The Head-ach, Tooth-ach, Cholick, like a charm,
It eaſes ſoon; an antient cough relieves,
And to the reins, the mill, and ſtomach gives
Quick riddance from the pain that each endures;
Next the dire wounds of poiſon'd arrows cures,
All bruifes heals, and when the gums are ſore,
It makes them ſound and healthy as before.
Sleep it procures, our anxious ſorrow lays,
And with new fleſh the naked bone arrays.
No herb has greater power to reſtify
All the diſorders in the breaſt that lie
Or in the lungs. Herb of immortal fame!
Which hither firſt with Santa Croce came,
When he, his time of nunciature expir'd,
Back from the court of Portugal retir'd;
Even as his predeceſſors great and good
Brought home the Croſs, whoſe conſecrated wood
All Chriſtendom now with its preſence bleſſes:
And ſtill th' illuſtrious family poſſeſſes
The name of Santa Croce, rightly given,
Since they, in all reſpects reſembling Heaven,
Procure, as much as mortal men can do
The welfare of our ſouls and bodies too.

A parallel between Tobacco and the wood of the true
Croſs, is a very high ſtrained panegyric.

(a) See the arti-
cle LEUCAS.

(b) Coronelli,
Memoires Hiſt.
& Geogr. Print-
ed at Amſterdam
1686.

(c) Spon, Voieg.
Tom. I, p. 104.
Dutch Edit.

(d) Coronelli,
ubi ſupra.

(e) Spon, ubi
ſupra, p. 104.

SANCTA-MAURA, an iſland formerly called Leucas (a), nine miles from that
of Cephalonia (b). The Greeks call it ſtill Leucada (c), for properly ſpeaking they call
Sancta-Maura the fortrefs, where there was formerly a monaſtery of that name. That
fortrefs is three miles diſtant from the ruins of the town of Leucas [A], in a place where
the canal between the iſle and the continent is one league broad. Nevertheless it has
conſtant communication with the continent by the bridge, and by means of ſeveral little
iſlands joined together by bridges (d). It has alſo an aqueduct [B] a mile long, which
ſerves for a bridge to thoſe, who go on foot (e). There are about thirty villages in the
iſland: the Greeks have a biſhop in it. It abounds with corn, wine, oil, and ſeveral
forts of fruit, and is about twelve or fifteen leagues round (f). The Turks made them-
ſelves maſters of it in 1479 [C]. The Venetians took it from them under the conduct of
the Captain-general Peſaro in 1502, and reſtored it to them ſoon after by a treaty of peace.
They retook it under the General Morofini the twenty-third of July 1684. The Pirates
of

(f) Father Co-
ronelli ſays it is
ſeventy miles in
circumference.

(1) Spon, Voieg.
Tom. I, p. 103.

[A] Three miles diſtant from the ruins of the
town of Leucas. Spon (1) cenſures Ortelius and
Ferrarius for believing as other Geographers do, that
Sancta-Maura is ſtill in the ſame place with the
town of Leucas, the ruins of which are to be ſeen
three miles from Sancta-Maura. I do not find in Or-
telius's *Theſaurus Geographicus* that the town of Sancta-
Maura, and that of Leucas are in the ſame ſituation;
but only that the iſle of Leucas is now called Sancta-
Maura. Now is there any thing in this that de-
ſerves to be cenſured? Spon adds, that the town of
Leucas was built upon a riſing ground a mile from the
ſea, at the narroweſt part of the canal that was made
when the iſthmus was cut, and that this part is not
above fifty paces broad. I confeſs I cannot apprehend
that a town ſhould be built upon a canal fifty paces
broad, and yet be a mile diſtant from the ſea; for is
not that canal in the ſame place where the iſthmus
was? Now can a town built upon an iſthmus fifty
paces broad be above fifty paces diſtant from the ſea?
Suppoſing the Engliſh channel to be only thirty toifes

broad, will it follow from thence that Dover and Ca-
lais are not upon the ſea-ſhore.

[B] It has alſo an aqueduct. Spon (2) who ſaw (2) Spon, ubi ſu-
pra, pag. 104.
who go on foot, though it be hardly above three foot
broad, and has no breaſt-height. He adds, though a
man be never ſo fearful, he trembles when he goes over
it, eſpecially if he meets any body that comes from the
place he goes to; for two men have much ado to go over
it a-breaſt. But Father Coronelli ſays (3) it is a ſtately
aqueduct, built with ſtone, and ſupported by three hun-
dred and ſixty arches. The ſupplement of Moreri's
Dictionary calls it a magnificent aqueduct of ſtone . . .
ſupported by three hundred and ſixty arches which croſs
the great pond.

(3) Coronelli,
Memoires Hiſt.
& Geographi-
ques.

[C] The Turks made themſelves maſters of it in the
year 1479. It was under Mahomet II. See the par-
ticulars of it in that Sultan's life written by Mr Guil-
let (4); they are curious enough. Leonard Tocco, (4) In Tom. ii,
Deſpotes or Dynaſta of Acarnania, was then poſſeſſed pag. 329.
of Sancta-Maura.

of Sancta Maura have been much talked of: They were the first that made use of galliots. The Bashaw of the Morea went on purpose into that island in 1675, to burn their small vessels (g). Durag Bey, a famous corsair of Lepanto, had seven or eight corsairs of Sancta-Maura under his command. (2) Spon, *ibid.*

SANCTESIUS (a) (CLAUDIUS), in French *de Saintes*, one of the chief controversialists of the XVIth century, was a native of Perche [A]. He took the habit of canon regular in the year 1540 (b), in the monastery of St Cheron near Chartres (c), and was sent to Paris some time after, where he studied classical learning, Philosophy and Divinity in the college of Navarre (d). He took his degree of Doctor of Divinity in 1555, and then applied himself very much to controversy, and was admitted into the house of the Cardinal de Lorraine (e). In the year 1561, he was one of the disputants for the Romish party in the conference of Poissy, and afterwards one of the twelve Divines, whom Charles IX sent to the council of Trent. He and Simon Vigor disputed with two ministers in the house of the Duke of Nevers in 1566 (f). I speak of this in another place (g). He preached a considerable time in Paris, and was made Bishop of Evreux in the year 1575. He was so incensed against the Protestants, that he maintained that those, whom they had baptized, were to be baptized again [B]. He left nothing unattempted to turn them out of his diocese, and to get all the canons of the council of Trent admitted into the kingdom without any restriction [C]. He did not scruple to say that Calvin and Beza taught Atheistical doctrines (b). He joined in the League with such a fury, that he maintained that Henry III had been justly assassinated, and that Henry IV deserved the same punishment [D]. The manuscript, wherein he asserted that doctrine, was found in his closet, when Biron made himself master of Louviers, and seized upon that unhappy prelate. He was not treated like a prisoner of war, but he was sent to Caen (i) to be tried; and because he obstinately continued to maintain that pernicious doctrine, he would have been put to death, had not the Cardinal de Bourbon, and some other Ecclesiastics who were with the king, prevailed with him to remit that punishment, which they thought he justly deserved, and to condemn him to a perpetual imprisonment. He died soon after in his confinement (k): it was in the year 1591. It is to be observed that long before, out of spite to the Protestants, he had said in a book, that subjects ought never to oppose the ordinances

(a) Thuanus calls him Sanctus.

(b) Moreri at the word *Claude de Saintes*, letter C.

(c) In Cœnobio Sancti Carauli ad Carnutum. Jo. Launois Hyl. Gymnasti Navarr. p. 769.

(d) *Id. ibid.*

(e) *Id. ibid.*

(f) And not 1566, as Launois will have it. *ibid.*

(g) See the article ROSIER.

(h) See the book which he intitled, *Declaration d'auteurs Athéistes de la Doctrine de Calvin & de Beze*.

(i) The parliament of Normandy had been removed thither.

(k) Taken from Thuanus. See his words in the remark [D].

[A] He was a native of Perche. I know that according to La Croix du Maine and Moreri, he was a native of Chartres: but I rather believe John de Launois, who has these words: *Claudius Sanctus ortum habuit in ea Gallie regione cujus populi nunc Pertenses, Gregorio Turonensi Pertenses; antiquioribus Auterici Diablintes dicti fuere* (1).

(1) Jo. Launois, in Hist. Gymnasti Navar. pag. 769.

[B] He maintained, that those whom the Protestants had baptized, were to be baptized again. He himself tells us that Pius V having decided, that those who had been baptized by the innovators, ought neither simply, nor yet with any addition, to be baptized again, ordered his Nuncio to command him, and the other preachers of Paris, to teach no longer the contrary. That brief of Pius V is very scarce. I shall set down the words of Dr de Launois. *Ad annum MDLXXII Lutetia concionabatur, cum Pius V Pontifex statuit, neque simpliciter, neque cum adjectione repetendum esse baptismum, quem Novatores dedissent. Id testatur in Synodo, quam cum Episcopus fuit, anno MDLXXVII habuit. Quam, inquit, definitionem Pius Pontifex ante quinque vel sex annos per Breve, ac per Internuntium Apostolicum dignatus fuit nobis atque aliis, qui tum Lutetia Parisiorum fungebantur concionatorum officio, significare atque inhibere, ne aliter doceremus. Breve illud vix invenitur* (2).

(2) Launois, *ibid.* pag. 770.

[C] He left nothing unattempted . . . to get all the canons of the council of Trent admitted into the kingdom, without any restriction. This I shall prove by the words of the said doctor. Porro autem, says he (3), in Episcopali munere nulli non peperit labori ac diligentia, sive ut hæresim à finibus suis exterminaret, sive ut Tridentini Concilii decreta penitus admitterentur ac servarentur.

[D] He maintained that Henry III had been justly assassinated, and that Henry IV deserved the same punishment. Let us transcribe the whole account Thuanus gives of this. Captus in oppido (4) Claudius Sanctus Ebriocensium Episcopus famosus Theologus regis paribus infestissimus cum libris & chartis, inter quas scriptum reperit, cum quo parricidium Regis tantum iuste factum tuebatur, & idem licere in Regem hodiernum defendebat. Itaque non lege belli cum eo actum, sed Cadomum sub custodia missus, ut in cum Senatus inquireret, & tanquam de perduelli sup-

plcium fameretur. Nec enim sacri ordinis prærogativæ in crimine læsæ Majestatis apud nos ratio habetur, sed in convictos, sive sacerdotes sive episcopi sint, tanquam solutos ac profanos legum severitas exercetur, parumque res ab executione absumit: Sanctio jam peracta reo, ut erat perversi ingenio errorem præfæcte propugnante. Sed intercesserunt postea Cardinalis Borbonius alique è sacro ordine, qui cum Rege erant, tenueruntque, ut pro mortis poena, quam legibus nostris, ut ipsi fæcebantur, meruerat, carceri perpetuo manciparetur, in quo paulo post decessit (5). - - Claudius Sanctus, Bishop of Evreux, a famous Divine, and a bitter enemy to the king's party, was taken in the town, with his books and papers, among which was found a piece, wherein he justified the murder of the late king, and maintained that the same thing might lawfully be done to his present majesty. For this reason he was not treated like a prisoner of war, but was sent under a guard to Caen, that he might be tried before the parliament, and punished as a traitor. For with us no regard is had to the privileges of the holy order in crimes of high treason; but the rigour of the law takes place upon all such as are convicted, upon priests and bishops, as well as lay men; and it was very near being executed here; Sanctus, even after he was found guilty, continuing obstinately to defend this error. But afterwards, the Cardinal de Bourbon, and some other Ecclesiastics that were with the king, interceded for him, and obtained that instead of being punished with death, which they confessed he deserved by our laws, he should be condemned to a perpetual imprisonment, in which he died soon after. Henry IV acted, without doubt, upon this occasion according to the clemency and generosity that were natural to him; but there was likewise some small mixture of that timorous prudence, which frequently shook his great courage, when he came to observe that the monster of the league he was to overcome, more fierce and dangerous than Hercules's Hydra, would grow more furious and terrible by the effusion of his blood. Wherefore that prince thought himself obliged to use mildness in order to tame and pacify that wild beast. Clemency, on the one hand, and policy on the other, spared Sanctus the shame of losing his life upon a scaffold, as he deserved. [E] He

ordinances of their sovereigns [E]. He published a small piece in 1561, to shew that Heretics ought not to be tolerated [F]. It is a very ancient opinion, and very common to

(6) It was the doctrine of the Roman Catholics before the League; but they sung to another tune soon after, as one of them told the Leaguers in a reproachful manner in a book printed at Caen, 1590, and intitled, *Deploration de la mort du Roy Henry III, & du scandale qu'en a l'Eglise*. They themselves, says he, pag. 54, in the beginning of the troubles made use of this argument against the Huguenots, 'They are Heretics, for they take up arms against the magistrates, they will not obey them, but are for planting their religion with the sword, which is only given to the magistrates.'

(*) Confession of Geneva, Art. xl.

(8) Frater Claudius de Sainctes, in *Methodi quam sequuti sunt Principes*, cap. xiii, fol. 112. verso.

(9) Printed at Amsterdam, 1687, in 12mo.

[E] He had said in a book, that subjects ought never to oppose the ordinances of their sovereigns (6). The book, wherein he advances this opinion, was printed at Paris, in 1561, with this title, *Confession de Foi Catholique, contenant en bref la Reformation de celle que les Ministres de Calvin presenterent au Roi en l'Assemblée de Poissy*. The fifty-seventh article of that Confession contains these words: 'We hold that subjects ought to obey their laws and ordinances, to pay tributes, imposts, and other duties, and bear the yoke of subjection with a ready will, tho' princes were infidels, and the empire of GOD should not be preserved entire.' And therefore we detest those, who would reject superior powers, set up communities at their pleasure, introduce a confusion of goods, and overthrow the order of justice. We also reject all murderers and assassins, hired and sworn to follow and support sects, and those who declare all those to be worthy of death, without form of trial, who displease or resist them, and who get kings, lords, churches, and towns, attacked under pretence of the word of GOD.' The author undertook to shew that the Catholics went farther than the Protestants; for the latter added a clause to the article, wherein they declared their opinion about the obedience of subjects; provided, say they, the empire of GOD be preserved entire (7). Tho' this clause has been often reflected upon, as being too general and captious, it is very just and orthodox, if it be rightly understood, tho' it may be wrested to a pernicious sense against the intention of the authors. But it is certain that Sanctesius left it out of his Confession from a motive of mere ostentation, and out of hatred to Geneva; and no man did ever contradict himself more impudently than he did: which is the usual fate of those who argue without principles, and embrace an opinion only to differ from their enemies, that they may have a pretence to insult them, and render them suspected. When that passion is over, or when the interest and exigencies of their party require another thing, they renounce their first opinions, and espouse quite contrary ones. We have some late instances of it.

[F] He published a small piece . . . to shew that Heretics ought not to be tolerated. His book is intitled, *Ad edicta veterum Principum de licentia sectarum in Christiana religione*. Item *methodus contra sectas quam sequuti sunt primi Catholici Imperatores*. He approves that Heretics should be put to death, and declares that if the fires, which had been lighted in France to destroy Calvinism, had not been extinguished, that sect would have made no progress. 'Audiui Severum Sulpitium de Priscillianii historia, quasi tabulam absolutionis per domos judicum aliquorum circumlatum, cum adhuc in Gallia exercerentur judicia de capite pro religione ex Christianissimorum regum edictis, atque ex ea historia plus damni nostrae fidei, quam à Calvino libris & emissariis illatum. Non enim ultro citroque intrepide commeaissent, & ad factionem tot homines sollicitassent, si conflagratio non fuisset temere restincta, & à nonnullis quasi fides publica data Religionis & Reipub. perturbatoribus (8). -- I have heard that Sulpitius Severus's history of Priscillianus, was carried round to the houses of some of the Judges, as if it had been a decree of absolution, during the time that capital punishments were still inflicted on a religious account in France, according to the edicts of the most Christian kings; and that this history did more damage to our faith than the books and emissaries of Calvin. For they could not have gone up and down so without any fear, and stirred up such a number of men to sedition, if the fires had not been imprudently extinguished, and if some few had not presumed to give a kind of public security to these enemies of religion and the state.' The whole strength of this book is grounded upon custom and practice; for he alleges few reasons, and those he offers are not good. Whoever impartially compares the arguments for or against Toleration, must needs confess that he could not have alleged any good reason for persecution, tho' he had been a man of much greater abilities than he was. The reasons for a Toleration have been set forth with the utmost evidence by some late writers. See the prefaces to the History of the Edict of Nantes; the book (9) intitled, *Traité de la Liberté de Conscience, ou de l'Autorité des*

Souverains sur la Religion des Peuples, opposée aux Maximes de Hobbes & de Spinoza, adoptées par le Sieur Jurieu dans son Histoire du Papisme, & dans son Systeme de l'Eglise; the Philosophical Commentary upon these words, *Compel them to come in*; and the Latin letter printed at Tergow, in 1689, Mr de Beauval (10) ascribed it to Mr Bernard, a French minister, very well known by his works, and very well qualified to write a book that contains such close reasoning; but it is certain he is not the author of it, and it is thought to be written by an English gentleman (11), whose books on Metaphysics, Morality, &c. appear frequently in the Journals. But without undertaking to read a long-winded work, one needs only read a small piece written at London, in 1685, by an illiterate magistrate of a town in Holland (12). It is intitled, *H. V. P. ad B. . . . de nuperis Angliæ motibus Epistola, in qua de diversorum à publica religione, circa divina sentimentum differitur tolerantia*. That letter was printed at Rotterdam, in 1685, in Latin, French, and Dutch.

The reasons alleged for Toleration must needs be very cogent, since all those, who have done their utmost endeavours to answer them, have been obliged to have recourse to unfair means, and to acknowledge that Heretics ought not however to be punished with death (13). Their malice and unfairness appear by their endeavouring to create a belief, that those who are for Toleration favour the Socinians; that they are ill affected towards the government, and deprive the supreme powers of one of the most considerable rights that GOD has given them. This is a base and unjust proceeding: at this rate one must not find fault with the cruel decrees, by virtue of which so many Protestants have been burnt in France, the Netherlands, Spain, and Italy; for the Socinians do mightily exclaim against those cruelties. They inveigh no less against the Papists, who have put to death those, that are mentioned in the Protestant Martyrology, and against those, who put to death Servetus, Gentilis, &c. In a word, one must not write against the Pope, the Jews and the Turks; for it is manifest, that Socinus and his followers do not spare them, but confuse them with all their might. If they who shew that no penal laws ought to be established against those who err in matters of faith, are wanting in the respect due to sovereigns; if they divest the supreme powers of one of their most considerable prerogatives; our late apologists for persecution will be found guilty of that crime, since they maintain that no blood ought to be shed upon account of religion. Does not this take away from sovereigns the brightest gem in their crown? Have they not the power of life and death over malefactors? Besides, can it be said that GOD has put the sword into the hands of the magistrates of Holland, to punish those who transgress against the first table of the Law, as well as those who transgress against the second, without reflecting upon them, and exposing them to the hatred of their subjects? If this be true, is not their toleration of idolatry as great a crime, as if they tolerated murderers and highway-men? Further, could there be any thing more ridiculous than to inflict no other punishment than banishment upon notorious assassins and poisoners, without distinction of age or sex (14). See the dispute of Messieurs de Wallemburgh (15) about this question, Whether supposing that the magistrates have a right to punish Heretics, they may put them to death. They reduce their dispute with the Lutherans to this point; for they allege the famous Gherard, who was for enacting penal laws against sectaries, but did not approve that they should be punished with death. They clearly shew him that it is a frivolous exception. But in order to see the confusion of those, who are against Toleration, we need only observe that they unwarily say, that the sovereigns, who oppose the introduction of a true doctrine, are very commendable. 'I cannot blame the Swifs, says one of them (16) who will not permit by any means the growth of any new sect amongst them. Holland abounds with different religions. It were to be wished that those disorders had been prevented from the beginning.' The author of these words being a minister, two absurdities contained in them were objected to him.

(10) Histoire des Savans, for September 1689, Art. ii.

(11) Mr Locke.

(12) Mr PArts. See a short encomium upon him in the *Novellæ de la République des Lettres*, for October 1685, Art. ii, p. 1093, 1094, of the second edition. That great man died the eighth of October 1686.

(13) See the eighth letter of the *Tableau du Socinianisme*.

(14) Note, that this may serve to confuse that author of the eighth letter of the *Tableau du Socinianisme*, by his own assertions. See them above in dist. (105), of the article LOYOLA.

(15) See their book *De unitate Ecclesiae, lib. vi, Part. i, cap. ii, & sequent. pag. 222, & sequent. Edit. Colon. 1656, in 4to.*

(16) *Esprit de Mr Arnaud, Tom. ii, pag. 335.*

to this very day, tho' no doctrine was ever confuted with more solid arguments (1). The titles of his other books may be seen in the history of the college of Navarre. Moreri and du Sauffai have committed unpardonable mistakes [G]. It is to be observed likewise that Sanctefius confessed he was suspected for some time of being inclined to Calvinism [H], and that he represented Cardinal de Lorrain as a faint under persecution [I].

He

(17) Lettre à Monsieur J. . . . sur son Livre intitulé l'Esprit de Monsieur Arnaud, pag. 11. That letter, according to the title, was printed at Deventer by the heirs of John Comenius in the year 1684.

(18) Ibid. p. 8, 9.

(19) In the remark [A].

(20) Ante omnia me ut fugitivum servum increpavit, quem non ignoraret CAPTASSE remotiores Episcopatus, ut me in libertatem à servitute auferret, atque ejus comitatu affere-rem. Claud. Sanctefius, Epist. Dedicat. Libri de Eucharistia, ad Gregorium XIII.

(21) That is the Cardinal de Lorrain.

(22) The Cardinal de Lorrain died at Avignon, the 26th of December 1574.

(23) Sanctefius, Epist. Dedicat. Libri de Eucharistia.

him. Neither the Catholic nor the Reformed Cantons, was he told (17), 'will tolerate new sects: Is it then upon this account that you cannot blame them? How little is your zeal for the propagation of your religion! Is it not your duty to wish earnestly that the Catholic Cantons would tolerate the Reformed amongst them, and ought you not to blame them exceedingly for refusing to hear Jesus and his prophets? Truly you are no good Apostle of Christ.' He had been told before: (18) If your opinion had been followed in these happy provinces . . . the Protestant religion had never prevailed in them . . . And if Spain had been always uppermost, and had prevented those disorders from the beginning, you would not live so comfortably in the habit you wear; for the Protestant religion would be so far from prevailing in this country, that one would hardly have a notion of it. Truly the Reformed are very much beholden to you.

[G] Moreri and du Sauffai have committed unpardonable faults.] I only say this of some of them: I. I have already observed (19) Moreri's mistake about Sanctefius's country. II. He could not be at the conference of Poissy after his return from the council, since he did not go to that council till after that conference was held. III. How could Charles IX, who died the 30th of May 1574, name him to the bishopric of Evreux, in the year 1575? I do not question that our doctor sued for that dignity before that prince died, and had a promise of it; but it is certain he did not obtain it till the reign of Henry III. He himself says so; nor does he dissemble that his patron (20) told him, in a reproachful manner (21), that he sued for bishoprics in remote provinces, to free himself from the slavery of the court. 'Quoniam Christianissimi Regis Caroli mors intercessit, ne qua factione vel gratia mutaretur, quod semel Principi placuerat. Quibus potuit precibus apud Reginam matrem, novum Regem, Regisque fratrem, optimos maximos Principes, & Sanctitatem vestram, ac fratrum Cardinalium classem egit, ut is mihi maneret Episcopatus; nec prius quievit, quam accepit promotionis mee diploma ad te perferri. Quod accidit illis diebus, quibus Avenione, non annis, sed curis Ecclesiarum ac reipublice confectus, agebat animam (22): quasi moriens hanc mihi cum Episcopatu tradidit & commendavit (23). . . . Because the death of the most Christian King Charles fell out in the mean time; left what had been the will and pleasure of that prince should be rendered of no effect by any faction or favour, he employed his utmost interest with the queen-mother, the new king, and the king's brother, these great and good princes, as likewise with your Holiness, and the college of cardinals, to get me confirmed in that bishopric: nor did he rest until he had procured my nomination to be sent to you. This happened during the time that he lived at Avignon, worn out not with years, but with the cares of the church and state; so that dying, he, in a manner, gave up, and recommended his soul to me at the same time with the bishopric.' This shews that his nomination was drawn up at the court of France, and sent to the court of Rome in December 1574; but because he did not receive his bulls before the year 1575, Dr de Launoi was in the right to say that he was preferred to a bishopric in 1575. Here follow the gross mistakes. IV. The innovators mentioned by Moreri had so little interest at the court of France, before Sanctefius turned rebel, that if they had undertaken to vent any calumny against him, they would rather have done him good than harm. Perhaps they represented to Henry III, who was no less persecuted by the league than they, the excesses of that factious bishop; but this was no calumny. V. What an absurdity, to pretend that they poisoned him? He was no longer in a capacity to do them any prejudice; for tho', by the king's favour, he had escaped capital punishment, he was to be confined in a prison the remaining part of his life. VI. To say nothing of his trial, and of the reason why he was thought to deserve death, is an unpardonable omission. Spondanus,

VOL. V.

before him, was guilty of the same omission: the Muse, who presides over History, must needs look upon such writers as great prevaricators. Dr de Launoi has not committed the same fault; for he names the author who mentions the punishment of that bishop, and he thinks he deserved it. 'Anno MDXCI decessit perpetuo mancipatus carceri propter ea, quae Jacobus Augustus Thuanus memorie tradidit in Historiarum libro CI. Sic virum tantum, & de Ecclesia olim tam bene meritum periisse valde dolendum, nisi pereundi causa id iuste postulasset (24). . . . He died (24) Launoius, in the year 1591, being condemned to perpetual imprisonment, for the reasons which Thuanus has related in 773 the 101st book of his history. The loss of so great a man, who had formerly done such good service to the church, would have been very much to have been lamented, if he had not given just cause for his own destruction.' I wonder that the ministers of state, in France, should suffer so many writers to suppress the infamy of rebel bishops. It is giving such as shall think fit to imitate their example, strong reason to hope that Historians will take no notice of it.

Here follow the mistakes of Andrew du Sauffai.

I. He says that Sanctefius was Professor in the year 1533, in a monastery of regular canons (25). II. He tells us that Sanctefius went to the council of Trent before the conference of Poissy was held. III. That he assisted at a provincial council of Rouen in the year 1576; but that council was not held before the year 1581, as Dr de Launoi informs us (26), who adds that Sanctefius published the year following a French translation of the acts of that assembly, which he had promoted and directed (27). IV. That invincible hero of the Gallican church did not confine himself within those bounds, if we believe du Sauffai: he and Simon Vigor disputed with Spina and du Rosier, two of the chief ministers, and got a complete victory. That is, the bishop of Evreux was not contented to assist at a provincial synod in the year 1576 (28), and to put in order and publish the synodal decrees of his diocese, but engaged also in a regular disputation with those two ministers. What an anachronism is here! that conference was held eight or nine years before Sanctefius came to be a bishop. V. He died in 1591, and not in the foregoing year. VI. It is an inexcusable prevarication in mentioning the death of that Prelate, to call him *extimius*, - - - excellent, without saying any thing of his rebellion, and abominable doctrine, and of the infamous punishment he had like to have undergone. What du Sauffai says of him is contained in fifteen lines. How many faults would he have committed, if he had made an encomium of fifteen pages?

[H] He confessed that he was suspected of being inclined to Calvinism.] He says those suspicions were grounded on his appearing much more moderate, when he engaged in a dispute in the Hôtel de Nevers, than he had been at the conference of Poissy. 'Ego qui Pissiaci habebam acrior, & tantum non seditiosus, antequam superiore in collatione facta cum Spina & Rosio Ministris, credebam mutatus, ac paulo momento ad Calvinismum posse impelli, quoniam de pristina vehementia tantum remiseram, quantum in domino Vigoreo Calvinistis infestissimo Doctore magis ac magis cernebam inflammari & exardescere (29). . . . I (29) Sanctefius, who at Poissy was esteemed too fiery, and not far distant from sedition, in the conference held the year before with the ministers Spina and Rosier; was now thought to be changed and very much inclined to Calvinism; because I had abated of my former violence, in proportion as I saw it flame out with more and more heat in that bitter enemy to the Calvinists, Simon Vigor.'

[I] He represented the Cardinal de Lorrain as a saint under persecution.] If we may believe Sanctefius, that cardinal was very sick of the bruise of Joseph; he daily afflicted his righteous soul, like another Lot, seeing the evils of the church. He was a-dying every day in the midst of the tribulations and anguishes he endured for the cause of God, and was continually preparing himself for martyrdom, being told every day that there was a design upon his life; and he would say sometimes,

H

(1) See the remark [F].

(25) Ordinis Sancti Augustini Canoniarum Regularium . . . anno 1533 Presens. Andr. du Sauffai, de Scriptis Ecclesiasticis Continuat. pag. 38. Edit. Colon. 1684, in 4to.

(26) Launoius, ubi supra, pag. 772.

(27) Synodum provincialem . . . promovit, rexit, composuit. Id. ibid.

(28) According to du Sauffai's computation.

(29) Sanctefius, in Responsione ad Apolog. Berzæ apud Launoius, ubi supra, pag. 769, 770.

He was one of those Divines, who found it a difficult thing to answer the passages of St Augustin alledged by the Protestants against Free-will. Wherefore he lessened the authority of that holy doctor as much as he could in his controversial writings about the doctrine of Grace [K].

times, Let us go and die with him. * Per annos fere sexdecim à comitatu illuftriffimi Principis, ac maximi Cardinalis Caroli Lotharingi, nili alicuius officii publici caufa, non recessi, nec ille me ftudiorum tantum, fed ad externos omnium profectum, colloquiorum & negotiorum multorum, quæ difficillimis Gallie temporibus ipfi contra hæreticos & paffionum, qui participem fecit, ut tentationum & paffionum, quibus per tot annos quotidie moriebatur, & omni hora de vita periclitabatur, qui quoties nunciabatur, paratas effe infidias, tam parum timidus, quam nimium effe putabatur, folebat ad me conuerfus dicere : Sequeris Sacerdotem Levita ; aliquando vero : Eamus, & moriamur cum illo. Cum defereretur ab intimis, addebatur : Socii paffionum erunt & confo-
lationis (30). - - - For almost sixteen years I clofely attended that illuftrious Prince and great Cardinal Charles de Lorrain, unlesſe when ſome public buſineſs required my aſſiſtance. He not only made me a partaker in his ſtudies, but likewiſe in all his travels, conferences, and the many weighty affairs which he tranſacted againſt the Heretics during the troubles of France. I was be-

(30) Sanctefius,
Epist. Dedicat.
Librorum de Eu-
charistia, ad Gre-
gorium XIII,
apud Launoium,
ubi supra. pag.
771.

(31) See his article, and particularly the passage quoted out of Brantome.

(32) Beza, ad
Claud. de Xain-
tes, Apolog. I,
init. Oper. Tom.
II, pag. 288.

mes, Let us go and die with him. ' Per annos fere
fexdecim à comitatu illuftriffimi Principis, ac maximi
Cardinalis Caroli Lotheringii, nifi alicuius officii
publici caufa, non receffi, nec ille me ftudiorum tan-
tum, fed ad exteros omnium profectuum, colloqui-
orum & negotiorum multorum, quæ difficillimis Gal-
lie temporibus ipfi contra hæreticos incidenter, me
participem fecit, ut tentationum & paffionum, qui-
bus per tot annos quotidie moriebatur, & omni hora
de vita periclitabatur, qui quoties nunciabatur, pa-
ratas effe infidias, tam parum timidus, quam nimi-
um effe putabatur, folebat ad me converfus dicere :
Sequeris Sacerdotem Levita ; aliquando vero : Eas-
mus, & moriamur cum illo. Cum defereretur ab
intimis, addebatur : Socii paffionum erunt & confola-
tionis (30). . . . For almoft sixteen years I clofly at-
tended that illuftrious Prince and great Cardinal Charles
de Lorrain, unlefs when fome public bufinefs required
my abfence. He not only made me a partaker in his
ftudies, but likewise in all his travels, conferences, and
the many weighty affairs which he tranfacted againft
the Heretics during the troubles of France. I was be-
fides a witnefs to the temptations and fufferings in which
for fo many years he was dying daily, and was every
hour in danger of his life. As often as he was told
that there was a plot againft him, being at little fear-
ful as he was thought to be much fo, he ufed to fay,
Turning towards me : You follow a Prieft being your-
felf a Levite ; and fometimes, Let us go and die with
him. When he was deferted by his intimate friends,
he added : They fhall be the companions of my fufferings
& confolation.' Thofe, who have read in Mezerai
and other Catholic writers, that this cardinal was a
worldly, proud, and voluptuous, man, that he had a
great power and intereft (31), and violently pro-
fected the Proteftants, will not read this defcription of
his pious fufferings without laughing. In another
book Sanctifius begs of God that he would ftrenghen
the cardinal his fervant, persecuted for a good caufe.
Beza ridiculed him upon this head. ' Omittam vero
' libens tum pleraque illius libelli ineptias, veluti
' quod invitum efiam à fuïs fodalibus huc pertractum
' dicit, ac tandem etiam fuo Cardinali virtutem &
' confidentiam in perfectionibus precatur, quod quidem
' non fine rifu legi poffunt (32). . . . I will gladly
' pafs over moft of the foolifh things in that book, as for
' example, his faying that he was drawn thru a length
' by his friends contrary to his own inclination, and his
' praying for refolution and confancy to the cardinal
' under his perfecutions : all which it is impoffible to
' read without laughing.' I have long thought of a
thing, that would very much perplex the Aftatics, if
they had a mind to take notice of that part of our
Hiftories of the XVIth and XVIIth centuries, relating
to the troubles of religion. Each church complains
that the is under fufferings, and looks upon her victo-
ries as a means, in God's hands, to free her from the
flavery and flaughter the was threatened with. I need
not then that the Proteftants exprefs themfelves in
that manner with refpect to the conquefts of Guftavus

Adolphus; but I shall make it appear that the Jesuits did the same when they considered the great success of the emperor. In order to it I shall set down an extract of a letter written to James Count de Tilly, a Jesuit, who was chaplain to the famous Count de Tilly. 'Rem noſtram, id eſt Catholicorum . . . bene ſe habere hoc doceret bellum, in quo jam quarto anno verſor cum Illuſtriſſimo Comite de Tilly, &c. Erant mira Conſilia noſtrorum Adverſariorum: ſed quam mirabilem in altis Dominus ! moliebantur nobis interneſſionem, inciderunt in ſoveam, quam fecerunt: & ut liberent noſtri hoſtes conſentitur, nunquam dediffent, quod acceptuerunt, beneficium Vitæ. Ut vel inde pateat, quæ pars furorem, quæ ſequatur æquitateſ (33). - - - Our affairs, that is of the Catholics, . . . would ſeem to be in a ſhriving way by this war, in which it is now the fourth year that I am preſent with the moſt illuſtrious Count de Tilly, &c. The deſigns of our adverſaries were amazing: but how wonderful is GOD in the beſiſt? They were meditating our utter deſtruction, but they have fallen into the pit which they themſelves have digged: and, our enemies make no ſcruple of confeſſing, they would never have given the quarter which they received: ſo that from this very thing it may appear which ſide is diſtreſſed by fury and which by equity.'

[K]e *He lessened the authority of St Augustin as much as he could . . .* The Janfenist, who published in 1689, some Letters written by the Prince of Conti to Father de Champs, added to them among other things a dissertation intitled, ' S. Augustin justifié du soupçon ou des apparences de Calvinisme.' - - - *St Augustin justified from the suspicion or the appearance of Calvinism.* I find the following passage in it concerning Sanctisim. ' He was one of those, who thought it necessary always to take the opposite side of the question with the Heretics, in order to get the more advantage over them, and who, considering the frightful part of St Augustin's doctrine concerning Predestination, more than the solid foundation of the Scripture and tradition, on which it is grounded, were too easily frightened at that doctrine. That author made bold to say, *That St Augustin writing against the Pelagians with too much heat, did too basely despise the unanimous opinion of all those, who lived before him.* A man who speaks of St Augustin in this manner, and charges him with having changed his opinion three times, does certainly deserve to be delivered up to Father de Champs, that he may deal with him, as he thinks fit. Father John Martinon, likewise a Jesuit, who wrote under the disguise of Antonius Moraines, was ashamed of it. *That author, says he, will give me leave to observe that he would have acted a much better part, and more becoming the respect that is due to so great a Doctor, if he had constantly followed him, giving sometimes a favourable sense to his words, instead of imputing to him such an inconsistency in his opinions* (34). We may compare the opinion of this bishop of Evreux, with that of the Jesuit John Adam (35).

(33) Johan. Agricola, in Epist. ad Jacobum Reihingum, apud Henning. Witte, Memoriz Theologor. in Orat. funebri Reihingi, pag. 912, 913.

(34) Lettres du Prince de Conti, ou l'Accord du Libre arbitre avec la Grace de J. Chrif. pag. 190, 191.

(35) See above
the remark [D]
of the article
A D A M.
(J O H N).

SALISBERI (**JOHN OF**) Bishop of Chartres in the XIIth century. See **SARISBERI**.

SALMACIS, a fountain at Halicarnassus, which was said to effeminate those who drank of it, or went into it [A]. The Poets being willing to account for this ill quality, supposed

[A] *A fountain . . . which was said to effeminate those who drank of it, or went into it.* Strabo having said that the fountain Salmacis was in Halicarnassus, adds that it had an ill name, as having the power of making those, who drank of it, voluptuous and effeminate. Διὰ βεβηλημένην ἐκ αὐτῆς ἐπὶ δόξαν, ὡς μαλακίζουσα τὸν πίνοντας ἀπ' αὐτῆς. *neſcit quæ de cauſa infamiam quæ ex eo bibentes molliciem contraherent* (1). But, according to Ovid, none could experience this unhappy change without going into it.

(1) Strabo, *lib. xiv.*, pag. 451.

(1) Strabo, *lib.*
xiv, *pag.* 451.

Unde sit infamis, quare male fortibus undis
Salmacis enervet, tactosque remolliat artus,
Discite (2).

Quisquis in hos fontes vir venerit, exeat inde
Semivir, & tactis subito mollescat in undis (3).

*How Salmacis, with weak infeebling streams
Softens the body and unnerves the limbs.*

(2) Ovid. *Metam. lib. iv, fab. ix, ver. 285.*

(3) *Ibid.* ver.
385. He says in
book xv, ver.
319.

319.
Cui non audita
est obscenæ Sal-
mæcis undæ?
*Who has not
heard of Salmæcis
And obscene.*

supposed that a nymph, who was passionately in love with Hermaphroditus, the son of Venus and Mercury, threw herself into that fountain, whilst he was bathing himself; and closely embraced him; and that her caresses and entreaties not being able to move the heart of that insensible youth [B], she begged of the gods that she might remain for ever

And what the secret cause, shall here be shown.

*Ob grant, that whome'er these streams contain,
If man be enter'd, he may rise again
Supple, unfinew'd, and but half a man!*

ADDISON.

Strabo makes a judicious reflexion upon this. Voluptuous men, says he, in order to clear themselves ascribe to the elements what proceeds only from the ill use they make of their wealth. Good cheer makes them leud, and they find fault with the air and water; which is a great illusion. *Ἔοικε δ' ἡ τρυφή τῶν ἀνδρῶν αἰτία εἶναι τῆς ἀεγρῆς ἢ τῶν ὕδατος. τρυφῆς δ' αἰτία ἢ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ πλεονεξίας καὶ ἡ περὶ τὰς διαίτας ἀκολασία.* Enimvero luxuria hominum videtur in aëris & aquæ temperiem culpam referre: atqui non hæc causam luxuriæ præbent, sed divitiæ & vitius intemperans ratio (4). According to Vitruvius the fountain Salmacis was reported to have that ill quality, not because those, who drank of it, became leud and voluptuous, but because it afforded the Barbarians an opportunity of growing civil and tractable, and leaving off their fierceness: for being expelled by the colony, which the Argivi settled in Halicarnassus, they were obliged to return to that fountain for want of water, and so they conversed with the Grecians, and grew polite. *Descendebant æquatam ad notum sibi fontem, atque ibi in Græcorum consuetudinem & suavitatem sua voluntate reducebantur. Hinc aqua illa, non impudico morbi vitio, sed humanitatis dulcedine molliis animis barbarorum eam famam est adeptæ (5).*

(4) Strabo, ubi supra.

(5) Vitruvius, lib. ii, cap. viii.

[B] Her intreaties not being able to move the heart of that insensible youth.] Hermaphroditus began to travel through the world at fifteen years of age. He was a very handsome boy; the nymph Salmacis did no sooner perceive him on the banks of her fountain but she fell in love with him. Though her amorous passion made her very impatient, she nevertheless put on her best apparel and painted her face before she went to him.

*Nec tamen ante adiit, etfi properabat adire,
Quam se composuit, quam circumspexit amictus,
Et finxit vultum, & meruit formosa videri (6).*

(6) Ovid. Met. lib. iv, ver. 317.

*Fain would she meet the youth with basty feet,
She fain would meet him, but refus'd to meet;
Before her looks were set with nicest care,
And well deserv'd to be reputed fair.*

ADDISON.

Her compliment contained few needless things: If you are not a god, said she to him, you look like one: happy is your father, happy are your mother, your sister and your nurse, but happier still she, who is, or shall have the honour to be your wife. If you are a married man, be unfaithful to your wife for my sake; and if you are not married, I desire to become your wife immediately.

*Sed longè cunctis longæque beator illa est,
Si qua tibi sponfa est, si quam dignabere tædâ.
Nunc tibi five aliqua est, mea sit furtiva voluptas:
Seu nulla est, ego fim, thalamumque ineamus eundem (7).*

(7) Id. ibid. ver. 325.

*But oh how blest! how more than blest thy bride,
Ally'd in bliss, if any yet ally'd.
If so, let mine the stolen enjoyments be;
If not, behold a willing bride in me.*

ADDISON.

These words made the young man blush; but his modesty and his silence did not put a stop to her violent passion: she asked him many kisses, at least such as

are given to a sifter: and at last she was ready to take him about the neck, when he plainly told her that he would run away, if she would not be quiet.

*Poscenti Nymphæ sine fine fororia saltem
Oscula, jamque manus ad eburnea colla ferenti,
Definis? aut fugio, tecumque ait, ista relinquo (8).* (8) Ovid. ibid. ver. 334.

*The nymph still begs, if not a nobler bliss,
A cold salute at least, a sister's kiss:
And now prepares to take the lovely boy
Betwixt her arms. He innocently coy,
Replies, or leave me to myself alone,
You rude uncivil nymph, or I'll be gone.*

ADDISON.

Being thunder-struck with this speech, she withdrew, but did not lose all hopes: she hid herself in a thicket, and perceiving Hermaphroditus in the water, she was so inflamed with love that she threw herself into it stark naked. She took hold of him, kissed him in spite of all that he could do, pawed him, and hugged him so closely that he was not able to extricate himself: but that was all she could get of him; he persisted in his indifference.

*Veste procul jacta, mediis immittitur undis,
Pugnantemque tenet, luctantiaque oscula carpit;
Subiectatque manus, invitatque pectora tangit:
Et nunc hac juveni, nunc circumfunditur illac.
Denique nitentem contrâ, elabique volentem
Implicat ut serpens, quam regia sustinet ales.*

*Perstat Atlantides, sperataque gaudia Nymphæ
Denegat: illa premit, demissaque corpore toto
Sicut inhærebat, Pugnes licet, improbe, dixit,
Non tamen effugies. Ita dii jubeatis, & istum
Nulla dies à me, nec me deducat ab isto!
Vota suos habuere deos (9).*

(9) Id. ibid. ver. 337.

*He's mine, he's all my own, she Naïd cries,
And flings off all and after him she flies.
And now she fastens on him as he swims,
And holds him close, and wraps about his limbs.
The more the boy resisted, and was coy,
The more she clapt and kiss the struggling boy.
So when the wrigling snake is snatch'd on high
In eagles claws*

*The restless boy still obstinately strove
To free himself, and still refus'd her love.
Amidst his limbs she kept her limbs intwin'd,
And why, coy youth, she cries, why thus unkind!
Ob may the gods thus keep us ever join'd!
Ob may we never, never part again!
So pray'd the nymph, nor did she pray in vain.*

ADDISON.

It was then that the nymph begged of the gods that she might never be parted from the beloved object she held between her arms. What she asked was granted her; and this was the origin of Hermaphroditus.

Every body knows the moral reflexions groundd upon that fable; but every body does not know the mystery that some have found in it. They pretend that the Antients did thereby insinuate, that the fair sex ought not to begin the attack, but leave it to men, and stand upon the defensive. If the parts were changed, say they, there would be a great decay in the empire of love. It is true that women would make vigorous and furious attacks; but men would make a better defence still, and all this would end in nothing but monsters and prodigies. See Mr de Fontenelle in his dialogue between Sappho and Laura; the

(a) See the remark [A].

ever in the posture she was in. Her request was granted: her body and that of Hermaphroditus made but one person with the distinguishing marks of both sexes. Hermaphroditus perceiving that change, obtained from Venus and Mercury by his entreaties that the water of that fountain should have the virtue of making people effeminate. Strabo and Vitruvius deny that it had that virtue, and alledge some other reasons for the ill report that was made of it (a). It is a mistake to say that this son of Venus and Mercury was born with the parts of both sexes, and that, according to Peter Gregory, it was Mercury who shewed so much indifference for the nymph Salmacis [C].

(10) Fontenelle, *Dialogues des Morts anciens avec les modernes*, pag. 47. Dutch Edit.

the result of which is as follows. 'Men would defend themselves too well. When it is required that a sex should resist, it is required that it should carry this resistance just so far as is necessary to make the other sex relish the victory, but not far enough to obtain the victory itself. A sex ought not to be so weak as to surrender immediately, nor so strong as never to surrender. This is our character, and perhaps it would not be that of the men. Believe me, after many reasonings about love or any other matter whatsoever, it will be found at last that things are very well as they are, and that a reformation would spoil all (10).' It were a difficult thing to foresee what would happen, if the sex that resists should become the aggressor, and if the sex which attacks should stand upon the defensive. The conjectures, that may be made upon some few hasty advances of the fair sex, which have proved unsuccessful, cannot be depended upon. It is likely that such advances have often succeeded. What is certain is that men upon a thousand occasions wherein they stand upon the defensive, betray a great weakness, make but little resistance, and are easily overcome. Though they are convinced that they have been deceived and betrayed, though they are resolved to revenge themselves, though they threaten, and swear they will never see that unfaithful woman; yet some flattering words, some sighs, and one or two tears will quickly pacify them.

Et quod nunc tute tecum iratus cogitas:

Egone illam? quæ illum? quæ me? quæ non? sine modo?

Mori me malim: sentiet qui vir sum.

*Hæc verba me hercule una falsa lacrimula,
Quam oculos terendo misere vix vi expresserit,
Resinguet: & te ultro accusabis, & ei dabis
Ultro supplicium (11).*

(11) Terent. Eunuch. Act. I, Scena I.

Being sensible that what is required of them is unjust and shameful, they are resolved not to grant it; but can they refuse it, if it be begged of them with great importunity, and if they mind the craftiness and fawning of a coquet? It is a great mistake to depend upon their resistance: if nature had put them upon the defensive, they would be quickly overcome. It is better that the resisting part should be allotted to women. Let us remember Moliere's weakness (12).

(12) See the article POQUELIN, remark [C].

As for those, who in order to prove that resistance has not been rightly allotted to women, maintain that they defend themselves only by an ill principle; they ought to be rejected as morose, capricious, and unjust censurers: and though they should repeat a hundred times over and over that women make a resistance only to kindle a greater fire, and set a higher price upon themselves, without pretending to a final perseverance; though they should say as many times that the reason why they dispute the ground, is because they are afraid of giving a quick disgust, and that therefore their long delay is not very meritorious, they would not deserve to be heard. Neither they, nor their verses ought to be minded (13). Grant them only that nice men are willing to meet with some difficulties, and do not congratulate themselves upon their meeting with none, as did the person upon whom the following epigram was made.

(13) See Chevreau's *Oeuvres diverses*, p. 531.

Hoc te nomine prædicas beatum,
Gilli, quod quodam fruarer amica
Et benigna adeo, ut rogata nondum,
Mox supina cadat, pedesque tollat.
Sed erras nimium, miselle Gilli:
Nam quæ nil penitus negare nescit,
Opus, non homines, amat puella:

1

*Et quæcunque nimis cadit libenter,
Surgit ista nimis quoque illibenter (14).*

(14) Bess, in *Juvenilibus*, fol. m. 56.

*You glory, Gillius, in this
That you an easy mistress kiss,
So kind, so coming, and so free
That, long before you ask her, she
Will prostrate fall, submissive lie,
And to her wanton leg on high.
Alas, poor man, how ill you chuse!
Since one that nothing can refuse,
Does not the man but work affect:
And as you'll find, if you reflect,
She who so readily doth fall
Is loth to rise again at all.*

I repeat the words of Mr de Fontenelle, *Things are very well as they are*. If the question was about bodily strength, they should want to be reformed; the resisting part had not been rightly allotted: but since the question is about attacks upon the heart, it belongs in justice to the sex, which exceeds the other in beauty, good air, and address.

[C] *It is a mistake to say, that he was born with the parts of both sexes, and that . . . it was Mercury, who shewed so much indifference for Salmacis.* A modern author says, that Venus being got with child by Mercury, was delivered of an infant, which had both sexes. 'Venerem à Mercurio compressam autumant' (poète) *talem prolem genuisse, quæ sexum utrumque participaret, sicuti apud Ovidium, lib. iv. Metamorph. videre est, dum scribit.*

Mercurio puerum & divâ Cithereide natum
Naiades Ideis enutrivere sub antris,
Cujus erat species, in quâ materque paterque
Cognosci possent, nomenque traxit ab illis.

Item;

Nec duo sunt, sed forma duplex, nec femina dici,
Nec puer ut possit, neutrumque & utrumque videtur.

'Tamest eundem ex Mercurio & Salmacide, unâ
Nympharum Naiadum genitum dicat Petrus Gregorius in *Syntagm. Jur. univ. lib. vii. cap. 2. num. 8.*
(15). --- *The Poets affirm that Venus, being impregnated by Mercury, was delivered of a child, which had both sexes; as we find in the 4th book of Ovid's Metamorphosis, where he says,*

(15) Jacob. Malerius, *Camære Elector. Brandeb. & Regimini Neo-Marchici Advocatus, patriæque Franco-Viadine Juris Prædictus*, in *Discurfu Juridico-Pædagogico de Hermaphroditi, eorumque jure*, cap. i, pag. 145. That book was printed in 1692.

*The Naid's nur'd an infant heretofore,
That Cytherea once to Hermes bore:
From both th' illustrious authors of his race
The child was nam'd: nor was it hard to trace
Both the bright parents thro' the infant's face.*

Likewise;

*Both bodies in a single body mix,
A single body with a double sex.*

ADDISON.

'Altho' Gregorius Tolofanus says that this same child was begotten of Mercury and Salmacis, one of the Naid's.

There are two things in these words which want to be rectified. The two last verses do not concern the state that the son of Venus was in, before Salmacis embraced him; for he had then only the masculine sex: they concern the state he found himself in, when the prayers of Salmacis were heard. There is a vast number of such proofs in authors. Here are the

SAMBLANÇAI.

(16) The number 4 should have been inserted here.

(17) It is the eleventh in the good editions.

the words of Gregorius Tolofanus. *Non fecit quam & illingantur qui cum fabula Ovidii*, lib. (16). *Metamorph. fab. 10* (17). *narrant Androgynem factum ex Salmacide una Nympharum Naiadum, & filio Mercurii*. No otherwise than those authors fancy, who, according to the 10th fable in the 1st book of Ovid's *Metamorphosis*, tell us, that an Androgyn, or Hermaphrodite, was made out of Salmacis, one of the Naiads, and the son of Mercury. That Civilian had been saying, that, according to Plato, all men were at first Androgynes, but being divided into two, nothing remained of them but the name, which even became a shameful one. This is partly true, and partly false. Plato does not say that

all men were Androgynes (18), but he observes that this name was opprobrious (19). He is in the right to say so, for besides that it is questioned whether Hermaphrodites are not monsters, that name is bestowed upon the most infamous debauchees. *Licet etiam Hermaphroditus is dicatur, qui turpiter & facit & patitur adversus & averfus impudicus, ut docet Suidas in voce ἑρμαφρόδιτος* (20). There is a book intitled, *L'Isle des Hermaphrodites nouvellement decouverte, avec les mœurs, loix, coutumes, & ordonnances des habitans d'icelle*. It is an ingenious satire upon the court of Henry III.

in *Convivio*, pag. m. 1185. (20) Jacob Mollerus, ubi supra, f.

SAMBLANÇAI (JAMES DE BEAUNE, BARON DE) superintendent of the finances in the reign of Francis I, was condemned to be hanged for imbezzling the king's treasure. That sentence, which happened to be too severe, was executed the twelfth of August 1527 (a); but he was declared innocent some time after his death (b). He was a native of Touraine (c). I shall set down somewhat at large the circumstances of his trial, as they are to be found in a book of Varillas [A].

(a) Bouchet, *Annales d'Aquitaine*, fol. 232, where you will find the sentence.

(b) Varillas, *Hist. de François I, livr. iii, pag. m. 216*.

(c) Bouchet, ubi supra, fol. 232, verso.

[A] I shall set down . . . the circumstances of his trial, as they are to be found in . . . Varillas (1). The king being informed that Lautrec had not received the money designed for him, sent for Samblançai: And instead of calling him his father, as he used to do, looked upon him with an ill eye, and asked him why he had not remitted to Lautrec the three hundred thousand crowns, which had been promised so positively. Samblançai not being yet sensible of the danger he was in, answered, with his usual ingenuity, that upon the same day that assignments for the Milanese had been drawn up, his majesty's mother came to the treasury, and demanded the whole payment of what was due to her, as well in pensions and gratifications, as for the duchies of Valois, Touraine, and Anjou, that were settled upon her: that he represented to her, that if he should give her such a great sum all at once, the king's treasure would be drained, and the fund designed for the duchy of Milan diverted contrary to what had been ordered by the king that morning in her presence, and which she had agreed to: but that this princefs persisted in her demand, and threatened to undo him, if he refused to give her all that she asked: and upon his representing to her that his life would be in danger, if Lautrec found no money upon his arrival at Milan, she replied, that her interest with the king was sufficient to prevent his being prosecuted, and that if he should be called to an account for misapplying the money designed for Italy, it was * but saying he had done it by her order. The king, to be better informed of the matter, sent for his mother, and Samblançai repeated the whole story in her presence; upon which she fell into such a passion, that, notwithstanding the respect she owed to her son, she gave the lie to Samblançai, and desired to be revenged of that rash man, who pretended that she was guilty of high-treason. But because it would have appeared by the dates of the receipts, she had left in the king's treasure, that she had received the money designed for Lautrec, she confessed that she had demanded the payment of her pensions; but she maintained that Samblançai had paid her the money, without telling her that it was the same which was to have been sent to Milan. She denied what Samblançai had further said, and so earnestly desired he should be imprisoned, protesting, however, that it was only the better to clear herself of the crime laid to her charge, that the king was obliged to give orders for his being arrested in the anti-chamber. . . . (2) Samblançai was no sooner a prisoner, but commissioners were appointed for his trial (3). . . . The imbezzling of the king's treasure was the only crime he was tried for; and he was condemned to death, whether because the judges were afraid of exasperating the king's mother if they should vote for a lesser punishment; or because they were prepossessed with an opinion, that a man cannot have for a long time the management of the king's money with clean hands. The execution was public. . . . All authors do not agree about the circumstances I have mentioned, and some will have it that Samblançai was undone by another court-intrigue. They say † that the

* In the trial of James de Beaune, Seigneur de Samblançay, Treasurer of the king's exchequer.

(2) Varillas, *ibid.* pag. 215.

(3) Viz. Chancellor du Prat, who was beholden for his fortune to the king's mother, President Gentil, and some other counsellors who were the chancellor's friends. Varillas, *ibid.* pag. 216. Belcarus seems to me more worthy of credit, who does not say that Chancellor du Prat, *bipedum omnium nequissimus*. . . . The greatness of all villains, was one of the commissioners but that he chose them. Belcarus, *lib. xviii, numb. 12*.

† Towards the latter end of the old chronicle of Angers.

king's mother gave him her receipts written and signed with her own hand for the money she took of him; but that the chief deputy † of that treasurer fell passionately in love with a lady belonging to the king's mother, who persuaded him to steal the receipts of that princefs; which was done; that the king's mother being thereby enabled to undo Samblançai, when she pleased, without any risk to her self, denied that she had received any money of him, and that Samblançai not finding the receipts to convict her, was apprehended and condemned; that he was publicly executed; but that the truth did not come out till the king's mother, being adying, revealed it to the king, and begged his pardon for it. Lastly, some manuscripts affirm, that the way they took to ruin Samblançai was, by demanding a vast sum of him for the pressing necessities of the state; that he excused himself not only because the king's treasure was empty, but also because the king owed him above three hundred thousand livres; and that this afforded a pretence to make him give an exact account of his administration; that he gave it in form, and because his papers were in good order, he made it appear that his majesty owed him the sum mentioned by him; that the thing had gone no farther, if he had been as great a Politician as he was a great Financier; but that he unreasonably gave way to the itch of prosecuting those who had unjustly accused him, being not contented with his glorious defence, and that besides he persisted in requiring immediate payment of the money the king owed him, tho' no body knew better than he that his majesty was not able to pay him; that Samblançai came ill off in the affair, because the ministers not knowing any other way to get rid of his importunity, bribed a man of Tours, called Prevost, his deputy, who stole from him the private receipts; that when they had in their hands what had been hitherto wanting in order to his being convicted of imbezzling the king's money, he was arrested, and commissioners out of the parliaments of Paris and Bourdeaux were appointed to try him; that he desired to be tried by his ordinary, who was the Archbishop of Tours, by virtue of his letters of Tonsure, which he shewed; but that the archbishop, who was his son, happened to die at that time; that Samblançai was † condemned to be hanged; and was executed on the 14th of August, 1523, being sixty-two years of age; that he was carried to the gallows at Monfaucon at one of the clock in the afternoon, and that he got his execution put off till seven a-clock in the evening, in hopes that the king would send him his pardon upon the ladder, as he had sent it to Saint Vallier upon the scaffold; but that the person who attended on him, having at last told him that there was no pardon to be hoped for *, he put himself into the hands of the executioner, saying, that he knew too late that it was better to serve the King of Heaven than the kings of the earth, and that if he had done for God what he had done for the king, he had been better rewarded. Nevertheless it appears by the epigrams of the famous Poet Clement Marot, which contains several particulars of the life of Francis

I

(4) Eam (curam) ad matrem Lautrecio infestam, quod de ejus impudicitia liberius loquutus fuisset, rejecerit. Belcarius, Comment. Rerum Gallicar. lib. xvii, num. xii, pag. 509.

' Francis I, not to be found any where else, that Samblançai died bravely, and that the timoroufness of the person, who conducted him to the place of execution, gave a greater lustre to his courage.' The first account of this author is a paraphrase upon Belcarius, who observes that Lautrec fell under the indignation of the king's mother, because he spoke too freely of her amorous intrigues (4). Note, that

Gentil, who, according to Varillas, had been one of Samblançai's Judges, was hanged (5) some years after (6). (5) See his epitaph in Bea's *Juvenilia*, fol. m. 30. verso.

(6) Bouchet, *Annales d'Aquitaine*, pag. 281, says it was about the year 1538, and that he was president in the court of Inquests in the Parliament of Paris, and a native of Italy, and that he was guilty of stealing the receipts of Treasurer Poncher, who had been hanged at Paris for want of them.

S A M B L A N Ç A I (WILLIAM DE BEAUNE, BARON DE) the son of the foregoing, was the father of four sons and one daughter, who made a great figure in the court of France. I. JAMES DE BEAUNE, Baron de SAMBLANÇAI, viscount of Tours, &c. was the eldest. He was knight of the order of St Michael, and gentleman of the king's bed-chamber in ordinary; and left behind him but one daughter, who was very much talked of by reason of her beauty and galantry under the name of Madam de Sauve (a). The third son of William de Beaune was known by the name of Monsieur la Tour d'Argi, and was the Father of MARY DE BEAUNE, the wife of Annæus de Montmorency Marquis de Turi. The fourth was Chancellor to Catherine de Medicis, Bishop of Puy (b), and Abbot of Royaumont (c). He died in the year 1565. I have passed over the second because I have so many things to say of him that I design to bestow a paragraph upon him. The daughter was married first to Lewis Burgensis, first Physician to the King, and Sieur de Montgauguier (d), and then she was the fourth wife of Claudius Gouffier, Marquis de Boissi, Duke of Rouanez, and master of horse to the king. She died without issue. Brantome (e) says, that before she was called Madam de Rouanez, she went by the name of Madam de Chateaubrion. He adds, that she was a great favourite of Queen Catherine de Medicis, her mistress. He is in the right to say so; Thuanus says the same [A].

RENAUD DE BEAUNE, the second son of William, was Archbishop of Bourges and then of Sens in the reign of Henry IV, and one of the most eloquent and learned prelates of that time. But what makes him more illustrious, is, that he did not depart, as so many other Ecclesiastics did, from the laws of the kingdom concerning the succession to the crown. He maintained to the last that though the King of Navarre was a heretic, the crown of France did lawfully belong to him after the decease of Henry III. In order to maintain this assertion he set forth in the conferences of Surene (f) the most specious reasons that the Law and the Scripture can afford: but his wit, eloquence, and learning, did not persuade the deputies of the League; for besides their being resolved not to yield, whether they could answer the reasons of the royalists or not, they were headed by Peter d'Epinac Archbishop of Lyons, who was not inferior to Renaud de Beaune in wit, eloquence, and learning, and who alledged, as well as he, divine and human laws [B]; so that after several fine discourses they were obliged to think

(1) Thuan. de Vita sua, lib. iii, pag. m. 1194.

(2) Mr le Laboureur, Addit. to Castelnau, Tom. i, pag. 322. and Father Anselme, Hist. des grands Officiers de la Couronne, pag. 469, call him Claudius.

(3) Thuan. *ibid.*

[A] Thuanus says the same. He says (1) that Margaret (2) de Beaune, the wife of Claudius Gouffier, Marquis de Boissi, sister to Renaud de Beaune, Archbishop of Bourges, procured very noble employments to her brother, because she had a great interest at court; so far that Rouanez was erected into a duchy in consideration of her marriage with the Marquis de Boissi. *Commendatione sororis Margaritæ gratiosæ in aula femine, quæ sub id Claudio Guforio Boissi marchioni & Rodamno ob id creato duci magno Franciæ scutifero nupti, maximis jam tum negotiis adhibitis, etiam Francis Alenconii Ducis Cancellarius fuit* (3). This is one of the things daughters are good for in a family: they are sometimes the only cause of the fortune of their brothers and relations. Perhaps Renaud de Beaune, notwithstanding all his fine qualities, would have remained all his life-time in a mean condition, had not his sister's interest put him in the way of raising himself, and given him the opportunities of discovering his merit, and of being rewarded for his first services by more considerable employments. That Historian adds, that the family of Beaune, and that of Thou, had contracted a very strict friendship long before; and that after the sad death of James de Beaune superintendent of the finances, his children, forsaken by every body at court, and in the city, as it happens on like occasions, found a sanctuary among the de Thous; that Renaud de Beaune lodged for some time in the house of Augustin de Thou, grandfather to the Historian Thuanus, and that from that very time there was a talk of marrying Christopher de Thou, Augustin's son, to Margaret de Beaune, Renaud's sister; that tho' this project had no effect, that lady had always been a hearty friend to Christopher de Thou, and used her interest for him, when she was in favour, more than for any body else, except her brothers; that

she intrusted him, as being her particular friend, with her last will, many years before she died. Besides she made him executor of her will (4).

[B] Who alledged, as well as he, divine and human laws. Thuanus has inserted, in the 106th book of his history what was alledged on both sides. Cayet (5) relates it more at large, and says, (6) among other things, that the Archbishop of Bourges, who could not deny that each party alledged several examples, and made use of the authority of the Scripture to prove their opinions, and resorted it in a different sense, confined himself to this maxim, that one might have the right understanding of the Scripture, 'by invoking the holy Spirit of God, who gives it to those that ask for it, and imparts the knowledge of truth in their minds, intellectualum bonum dat petentibus eum.' He added, 'that the voice of CHRIST and his Apostles was evident, and that Christians were continually told that they ought to fear God, honour the king, and render to God what is due to him, and to Cæsar what belongs to him; that every soul was to obey the powers ordained by God... but that he would no longer spend time in confuting the passages, and examples, that had been alledged, which could not hinder our submitting to what is expressly commanded in the word of God.' This seems to be his meaning: when the Scripture is made use of to maintain contrary opinions, the best way to extricate one's self from the difficulties that confound our reason, is humbly to implore the direction of the holy Spirit. By the help of this direction we may be able to see what side we ought to chuse, as knowing that the express orders of God ought to be our rule, and not some particular examples, which seem to be exceptions to those orders. This maxim seems to be reasonable; but I do not see how it can compose differences; for

(4) Ante mortem diu condito testamento illud apud singularem amicum, sic eum vocabat, deposuit, ejusque executorem ipsum nominavit. *Id. ibid.*

(5) In the fifth book of the *Chronologie Novenaire*.

(6) *Ibid.* fol. 170, verso.

think of another expedient [C], viz. that the King of Navarre should change his religion. This was the only thing which cut the Gordian knot. The pleadings of Renaud de Beaune do at this day more honour to the Clergy of France [D], than they did good at that time to Henry IV. Thuanus says a pretty remarkable thing of this prelate, which is, that he was a prodigious eater [E]. I add that he was at first counsellor in the parliament of Paris, afterwards president of the court of Inquests, and then master of the Requests; after that Bishop of Mande, and Chancellor to the Duke of Alençon, son of Henry II (g). He had an admirable memory; for forty years after he had studied the Classics under James Tufanus and James Stracel, he remembered the fine passages which they had taught him in good Greek and Latin authors, and applied them with a good grace, and very judiciously, though the great affairs that passed thro' his hands might have blotted out of his memory those old ideas which he had no leisure to refresh (b).

(g) Thuan. de Vita propria, lib. iii, pag. m. 1194.

The (b) Id. ibid.

for each party will boast that they have implored the direction of the holy Spirit, and will maintain, if the interest of their cause requires it, that commands ought to be explained by examples, that is, that their cause requires that the example of the Maccabees, &c. should be imitated, instead of conforming to St Paul's precept, *Let every soul be subject to the higher powers*. We must therefore allow, that whilst sovereigns have no better support than the doctrines of Divines, they rely upon weather-cocks, that turn with every wind, and use the word of God as a nose of wax, to the great scandal of good and pious souls, and the great satisfaction of profane men, and free-thinkers, who are charmed with having an opportunity to say of the Spirit that inspired the Prophets and Apostles, the same thing which the Protestants say of the Spirit that makes the Pope speak *ex Cathedra*, and the councils; viz. that he believes like a common father between the Thomists and the Scotists (7), that he qualifies his expressions in such a manner as to favour both parties alike, that he will neither disarm those who revolt, nor shelter them from the attacks of those who persist in their obedience; in a word, that he follows the example of neutral cities, where they sell arms to both sides.

(7) See the Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, Feb. 1686, pag. 127.

[C] They were forced to think of another expedient. Maimbourg does agreeably and neatly relate what he took out of Victor Cajet. 'The two heads of the' deputation on both sides, says he (8), two of the most dexterous and eloquent men of their age, were men of too great abilities, and maintained their opinions with too much wit and strength, to come to an agreement in their dispute. The Archbishop of Bourges, in the three speeches he made to prove his assertion, and to confirm it by confuting the answer made to it, alleged the strongest arguments to persuade the Leaguers of these three things, which he constantly maintained to the last as so many undeniable truths. 1. That men are obliged to acknowledge and honour as their king the person, to whom the kingdom belongs, by the inviolable right of a lawful succession, without any regard to the religion he professes, or to his morals.' 2. That King Henry IV was neither a Heathen nor an Arian, nor a persecutor of the Catholic Church, and was resolved to renounce his errors, as soon as he should be instructed in the truth. 3. That all the French ought to acknowledge him, and then unanimously endeavour to instruct him. The Archbishop of Lyons answered (9), those three points one after another, and declared that so long as the King of Navarre remained an Heretic they would have no commerce with him. The Archbishop of Bourges replied with great force; but seeing the Leaguers were not to be shaken, he told them the king was thoroughly resolved to be converted (10). Here is a sovereign prince indeed: he cannot so much as prevail upon his subjects, that they would be so good as to let him serve God according to the light of his conscience. It is a shame to Christianity to have introduced into the world so great a disorder. It is the part of subjects to beg liberty of conscience of their sovereign; but here are subjects who refuse it to him.

(8) Maimbourg, Hist. de la Ligue, liv. iv, pag. 465.

(9) Ibid. p. 468.

(10) Ibid. p. 472.

[D] His pleadings do at this day more honour to the Clergy of France. The League has furnished the Protestants with abundance of unanswerable arguments against the seditious maxims of the court of Rome, adopted by an infinity of Laymen and Ecclesiastics. These objections would have been stronger, if all the Clergy of France had followed the rebel-

lion; but since one of the principal prelates, speaking for a considerable part of the Catholics, maintained so solemnly the doctrine of obedience, people fancy there is nothing to be feared for the future, and that the acts of the conference of Surene can afford both defensive and offensive arms.

[E] He was a prodigious eater. Scarce had he slept four hours, but hunger forced him to rise and eat his breakfast; which he did regularly at one of the clock in the morning, or rather sooner, he rested till four a'clock, and then he went to eat: he did the same at eight: he dined at the usual hours: he eat a collation four hours after: he supped plentifully at the usual hour, and took another collation before he went to bed. He did not eat after the French fashion; for in winter he was at least an hour at table, and an hour and a quarter in summer. For this reason he cared not to dine abroad, and when a great prince, who had often invited him, and found him always armed with excuses, asked him the reason of his refusal, he gave him this answer, *You do not eat like a man, but like a dog*; that is, you make too much haste. That prince promised to remedy this inconvenience, and was as good as his word, for he ordered his steward, that when this prelate should be there, he should put a pretty distance of time between each course (11). *Cibum autem ita per otium sumebat, ut sumendo boram integrum impenderet bieme, aestate, in qua tardior orexis, horæ etiam quadrante adderet, & ambulantiis, quales in aula nostra, cænis summoere offendeatur; adeo ut cum serpius à principe primario ad prandium invitaretur, & toties se excusaret, rogatus quid id faceret, facite responderit, illum non humano sed canino more prandium usurpare, festinatus nimis epulas intelligens. Quo intellecto ille cum se non solum laute quod semper faciebat, sed prolixè accepturum promissit, & eo invitato semper struendum monebat, ut missibus adponendis legitimum tempus interponeret* (12). Another thing in him was very singular; this prodigious quantity of meat did not make him heavy nor drowsy, nor full of vapours: he was always well disposed for the exercises of the mind (13); as for those of the body he took care to use none; he durst not walk for fear of exciting his appetite. 'In tanta ciborum, quibus alabatur copia, cum nec membrorum agitatione, nec deambulationibus, ne exuperantem appetitum proritare, corpus exerceret, naturam succo nimio turgentem medicamentis purgantibus crebro adjuvabat, quæ medicæ rei non ignarus domi per homines peritos sibi parabat. Itaque raro ægrotabat, & quamvis in summa corporis pigritia mens semper laboraret, nunquam fatigabatur' (14).

(11) Thuan. de Vita, præp. 3. lib. iii, circa init. pag. 1194.

(12) Id. ibid.

'After such quantities of victuals which he eat, as he used no sort of exercise, nor walking, for fear of exciting his voracious appetite; he said nature, overburdened with too much nourishment, by frequent purgatives; which, as he had some notion of Physic, he took care to have made up at home by skillful persons. Thus he was seldom sick, and, notwithstanding his great bodily indolence, his mind, tho' constantly at work, was never tired.' What Thuanus says of this method of eating at the court of France in haste, and as it were walking, which did not please our René de Beaune, puts me in mind of a story I have heard more than once. It is well known that Marshal de Turenne commanded armies where were several foreign officers. They praised the good cheer of his table, but could not endure that the meals should be so short, and especially when they observed that the French officers were scarce risen from table, but they began to ask one another, what shall we do? Alas! said the strangers,

(13) Nunquam commotior aut fermentior visus, nulla gravædine aut dolore capitis tenebatur, semper seque sui corpus & ad omnia paratus, extra negotia quietem & confabulationes sectabatur. Id. ibid.

(14) Id. ibid.

The fables he uttered out of the pulpit, I mean in the funeral oration of Catherine de Medicis, are so ridiculous [F] that they would scarce be pardonable in those writers of romances, who have published the History of the fair Maguelona and of Peter of Provence, of the four sons of Aimon, and of Palmerin of Oliva, &c. Henry IV acknowledged several ways his fidelity and services, but above all by the constancy with which he applied himself to surmount the long difficulties he met with at the court of Rome [G], about his translation from the archbishopric of Bourges to the archbishopric of Sens.

gers, we were so well at table; you seemed so impatient that one would have thought you had some great business to dispatch, and now you know not what to do. Why did not you keep where you were, and let others do so too, since you do not know how to spend the time?

[F] *The fables he uttered . . . in the funeral oration of Catherine de Medicis are so ridiculous.* Here is a specimen of them. At the time that the great Captain Brennus led his army through all Italy and Greece, there were with him two French gentlemen, the one called Felonius, and the other Bono, who seeing the ill design that Brennus conceived after his great conquests, to go and seize upon the temple of Delphos, to pollute himself and his army with the sacrilege of that temple, they both retired and went into Asia, with their ships and men, where they penetrated so far that they came into the country of the Medes, which is near Lydia and Persia, where having made several conquests, and obtained great victories, they retreated, passing through Italy, hoping to come back again to France. Felonius stopped at a place where Florence is now situated along the river Arno: the situation seemed very pleasant and delightful to him, it being like one that before had pleased him in the country of the Medes, and he built there a city which is now called Florence. His companion Bono built the city of Bononia, not far from it: and from that time, by reason of the conquests and victories that Felonius had got in the country of the Medes, he was called Medicus among his people, the surname remaining in his family; as we read of Paulus who was called Macedonicus, because he had conquered Macedonia, and taken prisoner King Perseus; and of Scipio, who was called Africanus, for having done the same thing to Africa (15). Brantome, from whom I have this passage, adds; *I do not know from whence Mr de Beaune had this story; but it is very probable that before the king, and so great an assembly as was there at the queen's funeral, he would not have alledged it without some good authority* (16). He had observed before he mentioned this fabulous genealogy, that this Archbishop of Bourges was as learned and as worthy a prelate as any in Christendom, but that some said of him that he was too credulous, and not fit to be weighed in the scales of St Michael, who weighs all good Christians at the day of judgment, as they say (17). The Leaguers gave out that he was an Atheist (18).

(15) Brantome, Mémoires des Dames illustres, pag. 32, & seq.

(16) Id. ib. p. 34.

(17) Id. ib. p. 32.

(18) See the notes upon the Confession Catholique de Sanci, p. 87, & seq. Edit. 1699.

(19) Journal d'Henry III, ad 26 Junii 1584, pag. m. 80.

(20) See Martialis, Epigramm. lxxxix. lib. ii.

Quod timet & patulo promissam pectore barbam
Demulcet Biturix, hoc Ciceronis habet (20).

*In that he pants, and strokes, and strokes again
His long large beard, this native of Touraine
Resembles Cicero . . .*

[G] *The constancy with which he applied himself, to surmount the long difficulties he met with at the court of Rome.* I do not pretend to say that he withstood

those difficulties without ever yielding: I only mean that having expected a more favourable time, he renewed his application till such time as the thing was done. You will find the particulars of all this in the following account of Mr Amelot de la Houfflaie (21). In 1596, says he, the king had writ to the Pope in favour of Renaud de Beaune, Archbishop of Bourges, to have him translated to the Bishopric of Sens, and to obtain it for him gratis*. But the abbot, which this prelate had given the king in the abbey-church of St Dennis, and the motion he had made to the clergy in the assembly of Mantes, for creating a patriarch in France, had made him so odious to the court of Rome, that the Pope would not hear of him. Our cardinal (only then Bishop of Rennes) in vain represented to the Pope and Cardinal Aldobrandino, that such a refusal or delay might, at the long run, be interpreted as done, because this archbishop had taken the king's part, which would not only give offence to the king, but also to all the princes, prelates, lords, and gentlemen, who had followed him; and it would be thought that there remained in the soul of his Holiness some memory of the past offences and rancours: that the ill reports that were made of him to his Holiness, were only grounded upon this, viz. That this prelate had found out a shorter way to serve the Catholic religion, and the authority of the holy See, than those had done, who thinking to preserve them, would have ruined them both, if their advice had been taken. All this did not move them, and the Pope excused his rigour, by saying that this affair would never pass in the consistory, and that the cardinals would oppose it, and from thence take occasion to think ill of the king himself†. The affair remained thus till the promotion of Mr d'Osflat, who in obedience to the king's orders, in the first days of his cardinalship began afresh to solicit for this prelate's translation. † But the Pope answered him again in the same strain, and said, *That if he proposed the affair to the consistory he would receive an affront, being certainly informed that there were some cardinals who would oppose it.* And the Cardinal Nephew added, *That it was not even for that prelate's interest, that his affair should be proposed in the consistory*‡: by which he gave to understand, that there would be some things ript up there which would be to his confusion. . . . The king seeing the extremerepugnancy the Pope had to the matter, and perceiving that his Holiness would make him pay dearer for the favour than the thing was worth, resolved at last to follow the prudent counsel of the Cardinal of Florence . . . (22) and he ordered our new cardinal (23) to tell the Pope, that tho' he had many reasons to desire the expedition of the Archbishopric of Sens in the person of the Archbishop of Bourges; nevertheless, to comply with the will of his Holiness, he would cease to importune him any more. ** And so the Pope was delivered from this pursuit, which infinitely displeased him, for the reasons I have given; till the beginning of the embassy of the Count de Bethune, who had orders to renew it three years after. And Cardinal d'Osflat laboured so hard with him about it, that they obtained at last the translation of the Archbishop of Bourges to the Archbishopric of Sens, which was expedited in the consistory of the 29th of April, 1602 ††.

(21) Amelot de la Houfflaie, Vie du Cardinal d'Osflat, pag. 25, 26.

Letter 76, 95.

† Letter 95.

‡ In his audience the nineteenth of March.

†† Letter 178.

(22) Amelot, ib. pag. 27.

(23) That is, d'Osflat.

** Letter 183.

†† Letters 310, 312.

SAMSON, a judge of God's people. I shall not relate his History, it is known to every body; you may read it in Moreri, and more at large in the Dictionary of the Bible (a). I will only observe one thing, which seems to me very singular. Some would have it, that by the words of the Scripture which tell us that the Philistines made him grind, is to be understood that they made him lye with their wives [A], that they might have a race from so brave a man. The allegory which La Mothe le Vayer found in the actions of this hero is more ingenious than true. He says they represent the Sceptic Philosopher (b).

(a) Composed by Mr. Simon, Doctor of Divinity, and printed at Lyons, 1693.

(b) See his Sceptic Treatise on the saying, *n'avoir pas le sens commun*, in the ninth volume of his works, pag. 236, & seq.

[A] That they made him lie with their wives. According to this we might find a new conformity between his history and that of Hercules. Be it as it will, it is certain that the Hebrew word, which signifies to grind, is sometimes taken in an obscene sense. What is translated in the book of Job, *Let my wife grind unto another* (1), signifies according to the vulgar, *May my wife become the concubine of another, scilicet alterius sit uxor mea*. But some would ask, would Job say the same thing twice together? For it is clear that the following words, *let others bow down upon her, super illam incurventur alii*, signify prostitution. It is clear that *incurvari* signifies the same thing here as *inclinare se* in Plautus (2). This difficulty is nothing; for all antient writers, both sacred and profane, afford us a thousand examples of such repetitions. These words of the Lamentations of Jeremiah (3), *They took the young men to grind*, signify, according to the vulgar translation, *they have leudly abused the youth, adolescentibus impudice uti sunt*. But here is a passage of St. Jerom, quoted by Brusius, which will afford me the proof I want. 'In tertio decimo commentario rum super Iesaiam, cap. 47. ad locum, *Tolle molam, mole farinam*, ita scribit, (*Hieronymus*) quia sequitur *tur denuda turpitudinem tuam, etiam mola ab Ebraeis figuratiter intelligitur: quod scilicet in morem sortis uisitorum libidini pateat. Illudque quod in Iudicum libro de Samson scribitur, ad molam eum a Philistin esse damnatum, hoc significare volunt, quod pro sobole robustissimorum virorum hoc in Allophyliis mulieres facere sit compulsum* (4). - - In the 13th book of commen-

(1) Job xxxi, 10.

(2) Pol istuc quidem omne jam ego usurpabo domi; Nam jam inclinabo me cum liberta tua, Plaut. in Persa, Act. IV, Scene. viii.

(3) Chap v. ver. 13.

(4) Drusius, Quæst. Ebraicar. lib. ii, num. 38. pag. m. 97. See Petri Petiti Miscellan. Observationes, lib. iii, cap. ii, pag. 152, & seq.

aries upon the Prophet Iesaiab, chap. xlvii, at the words, *Take the mill and grind meal*, St. Jerom writes thus: The word *mill* being followed by these words, *uncover thy nakedness*, is also understood in a figurative sense, by the Hebrews, viz. because like a harlot it lies open to the lust of the conqueror. In the same manner, what we read in the book of Judges, of Samson's being condemned by the Philistines, to grind in a mill, is thought to signify that he was compelled to lie with foreign women, in order to beget a race of very strong men. Drusius observes (5), that *molere*, to grind, in this obscene sense, signifies the action of the male; for which reason he makes a gloss upon the words of Job. *Molere in hoc sensu viris tribui solet. De lingua Latina loquar, in qua notissimum illud, alienas permolere uxores* (6). Forjan apud Jobum passivè sumendum, molatur alteri, ab altero, hoc est, ut sensus sit, molat alter uxorem meam. I think they are in the right who can scarce persuade themselves that the Philistines, who were his great enemies, would have condemned him to a punishment so agreeable; for Samson loved women, and he would have been well kept to perform the office of a stallion, there had been nothing to fear but compulsion.

Nulla est tam facilis res, quin difficilis fiet, Quam invitatus facias (7).

There is nothing so easy, but becomes hard, when done by compulsion.

(5) Ubi supra.

(6) They are Horace's words, *Sat. II, lib. i, ver. 33*.

(7) Terent. Heautontim. Act. IV, Scene vi, init.

SANCHEZ (FRANCIS) professor of Physic at Toulouse, born at Braga in Portugal, was carried over in his infancy to Bourdeaux by his father, who was a very skillful Physician. He travelled into Italy, and staid some time at Rome, from whence he returned into France, and studied at Montpellier, where he took his degree of Doctor of Physic at the age of twenty-four. The wars about religion having forced him to leave that city, he went to Toulouse, where he taught Philosophy twenty-five years, and Physic eleven. He died aged something more than seventy years. His life is prefixed to his works (a) [A]. He was a great Sceptic, as I take notice in the remark. He is very much praised in the Patiniana (b), where we read that he was *born of Jewish parents*, and that he died at Toulouse, *being threescore and ten years old, in the year 1632*.

(a) Taken from Don Nicolas Antonio, Biblioth. Scriptor. Hispan. Tom. i, p. 362, 363.

(b) Pag. 72, 73. Edit. of Paris 1701.

[A] His life is prefixed to his works. The author of this life, called Raimond Delassus, had been his scholar. The greatest part of the writings of Sanchez are about Physic; they were printed at Toulouse, in 4to, 1636. There were added to them four treatises of Philosophy, which were re-printed in 12mo, at Rotterdam, in the year 1649. Here are the titles of them: *Quod nihil scitur. De divinatione per somnum ad Aristotelem. In librum Aristotelis Physicognomicum Commentarius. De longitudine & brevitate vitæ*. The treatise *quod nihil scitur*, - - that we know nothing (1), represents inge-

(1) John Uldric Wildius confused it in some letters, intituled, *Quod aliquid scitur*, maintained at Leipzig in 1664.

niously and subtilly the vanity of what we call science, study, composition of books, &c. It was published before the edition of all the works of the author; for I find in Barthius that two dissertations were re-printed in Germany, in the year 1618; one of Maturinus Simonius, an Italian doctor, *de Literis pereuntibus*; the other of Francis Sanchez, a Spanish doctor, *Quod nihil scitur* (2). Sanchez understood Geometry, and made some objections against Clavius, which he pretended that Jesuit had not well answered (3).

(2) Barthius in Statium, Tom. i, pag. 447.

(3) Delassus in ejus Vita, apud Nicol. Antonium, Biblioth. Scriptor. Hispan. Tom. i, pag. 363.

SANCHEZ (THOMAS) a Spanish Jesuit, born at Corduba in the year 1551, entered into the society in the year 1567. The austerity of his life, his sobriety, his mortifications, his application to study, his chastity, are prodigies, if what Alegambe (a) and Southwell (b) say of him be true. He died at Granada, the nineteenth of May, 1610, and was buried there (c) magnificently (d). He was certainly a learned man; he has given public proofs of it in the great volume that was printed at Genoa, in the year 1592 [A], and in the four volumes in folio that were printed after his death. It were

(a) In Biblioth. Scriptor. Societ. Jesu, pag. 436.

(b) In ead. Bibl. pag. 767.

(c) See the remark [C], citation (11).

(d) Alegambe & Sotuel, Biblioth. Scriptor. Societ. Jesu, pag. 436, 767.

[A] In the great volume printed at Genoa, in the year 1592. It treats fully of what concerns marriage. It is pretended that Clement VIII declared that no man had examined with more diligence, nor cleared with more exactness the controversies that concern this subject.

crament. 'Vehementer admiratus est subtile hominis acumen, peracre judicium, raram perspicuitatem, singularem & exquisitam in rebus indagandis solertiam, in tradendis facillimam methodum, in evolvendis citandisque Auctoribus exactissimum & planè indefessum

K

were to be wished that the work printed at Genoa, and afterwards in several other towns, had given as great proofs of his judgment (e) as of his wit and learning; for the temerity he had to explain an incredible number of filthy and horrible questions in that work may produce great disorders. Bitter complaints are made of it [B], and

(1) Nat. Sotuel,
Biblioth. Scrip-
tor. Societar.
pag. 767.

(2) Nicol. Antonius, Biblioth. Scriptor. Hispan. Tom. ii, p. 252.

(3) I have an abridgment of it in an alphabetical order made by Emanuel Lawrence Soares, a priest of Lisbon, in the year 1621. in 12mo.

(4) Petrus Aurelius, in Vindiciis Censuræ.

• Petrus Aurel.
Vindic. Censuræ
Facult.

(5) Jurieu, Apologie pour les Réformateurs, *ib.* ix, pag. 150.
Edit. in 4to.

does in the following words, (6) ' Volo per hanc occasionem non filere, quàm iniquè ac malignè . . . Thomas Sanches, laceratus fit à quibusdam fori rabulis (7) quorum vitæ spurcitas, & fidem heterocli-

tam, alijam pridem prouiderunt. Sed & hæretici . . .
 magno hie zelo concitatur, quod recens admodum
 petulanter fecit Ludimagister Bernensis Christopho-
 rus Luthardus, ad parallelum Calvini cum præfati
 hæretici Simonianis : spurilocoquia sua in Sanchez
 MENDACITER affingens Academiæ Parisienf. . .
 I will not omit this opportunity of taking notice how un-
 justly and maliciously Thomas Sanchez has been
 abused by certain petty-jugglers, whose lives and souls
 found faith have been long ago detested by others. The
 Heretics also shew great zeal upon this be-
 as Christopher Luthardus, a School-master of Bern
 has done lately in a very insolent manner, upon occasi-
 of the parallel drawn between Calvin and the old Simo-
 niac Heretics ; falsely ascribing his own dirty invectives
 against Sanchez, to the Faculty of the Sorbonne. I
 it as will, let us cite the minister who is not verily
 exact (8) . . . Hic omittitur non debet & lectori meo
 videre, laude dignissimum Sorbonæ Parisienfæ
 facundia in Liberu Thomæ Sanchez. prout ea habet

tur in invidiis *Censuræ* à doctõribus Sorbonicis approbati, & à Petro Aurelio editis, pag. 517. & *De illo opere Matrimonialis*, inquit, *dicere speciem* tim possumus, esse opus non gloriandum, sed pudendum tam immam curiositate, tam invidia in rebus spurcis simis & infandis fœcitate horrendum, ut mirum pudoris alicujus hominem, esse fme rubore ferat, si fuisse, que quavis modestioris ingenii vix sine rubore legat. Portenta ista sunt, non scripta; animorum infestis, non mentium subsidia, incitativa libidinis, scõla flagitiorum, non bonestæ disciplinæ, non scientiæ Christianæ instrumenta. Infelix scientia, que omni perdere, paucos juvare nata est. Quæ circa foras sterquilinita volubunda & revolvenda volutatur, ut doctorem jure cum scarabeo conferas, vel cum iis latrinariis fœdiantis (§4). --- I ought not here to omit non conceal from the reader that praise-worthy censor rubric the Sorbonne passed upon the book of Thob Sambeze, as it is to be found in the Vindication of Censure, approved of by the Sorbonnists, and published by Petrus Aurlaus. As to that book de Matrimonio, say they, we can particularly affirm, that it work of which one has more reason to be ashamed than proud : for such a monstrous curiosity does this horrid piece discover, and such an odious exactness in dwelling upon filthy subjects, that it is not every where to be mentioned, that it may be justly wondered at a man of any thame could write without blushing such things, as a person of a modest disposition scarcely read without blushing. These are monstrous and not writings, fœres for the mind, not helps, centives to lust, and a school for wickedness, the instruments of honest instruction, or Christian knowledge. An unhappy science it is, contrived to ruin all, and to do good to few. It wallows in filth, and is constantly employed in turning dungheils; so that the teacher of it may rightly be compared to a black beetle, or to such persons who busyness lies in raking filth and natifness.

[5(x) Before the Abbot of St Cyran others complained of the book of Sanchez. Here follows upon this head a very curious passage of an author much known. 'He that would know the matter' and degree to which whoredom is arrived, let him read Sanchez in his treatise de *Matrimonio*; where he has endeavoured not so much to comment upon to perjuris, not so much to reprove as to shew the lecherous stupidity of Aretin, notwithstanding that he was one of the most experienced, and, in a manner, the senior wit of this Faculty. But he has gone so far, nor entered into so many dialogues the strange and prodigious things that are revealed in confession, as Sanchez, who, in this respect, surpasses all others. He teaches all the postures fit for lions to use in the haunt of iniquity; which is terrible to think of. The ladies often quit the school of Ronfard, and Amadis, for the *Summa* of B.

(6) Theophil.
Raynaudus, de
malis & bonis li-
bris, num. 85,
pag. 53.

(7) In his *Bipolar* theca, p. 362, he speaks thus: Thomas Sanchez a plerique fori rabulibus spurcus audit, quod inter Opere de Matrimonio, librum nonum qui est de debito conjugali insecrēt spurci- et multa chartis commisit quae abique fœdo sensu et recundie condicione, vix q. pofint. . . . Thomas Sanchez has been called a filthy writer & several petty fops, because of his work on the marriage book, which is filled with mis- took, which in- stead of conjugal duty, with much filth, and several fœdral things which can hardly be read with- out a lead in mouth, and ruin of modesty.

(8) Andr. R. tus, Explicat Decalogi, Op Tom. i, p. 1 col. 2.

and all that has been said for his justification is weak [C]; and yet there are some Casuists, who

† See the last quotation of the text of this article.

the Franciscan †: and indeed we find the extravagances of leachery better described in such authors than in Rabelais, or any where else. What an odd appearance it has, that these men, who would have it believed that they are mines of chastity and inexhaustible springs of continence, should nevertheless cast up such ill humours, and publish an iliad of so many impurities? But to speak truly, what have priests to do to thrust their noses within the curtains of wedlock, or to set up for secretaries to the stewards? They bend their utmost thought upon these things, with such an unbounded extravagance of imagination that nothing can be more subtle: they feign cases that have rather a metaphysical than a moral possibility. The most insatiable and burning lust cannot by any means rise so high. You will find there such lecherous inventions as all the pillars of the stewards could never have hit upon. Those who have a mind to set up shop with them, will find enough there both to gain a livelihood, and to ruin their souls. Pagan authors never penetrated so licentiously into this abomination as these fine architects and chief ministers of luxury: they have enlarged the dimensions of it at a furious rate, and acquired a great many novices to study under them. They have sweetened the practice of it, chalked out new postures, and enriched the whole with descriptions cynically invented, and most fully published. In short, Venus never received more homage from any than from their science. The treatise of Sanchez is a true library of Venus: such books have made, and will make, more profelytes to fornication, than all the Penitentiary of Rome has made, or ever will make, to chastity. They are much more proper to teach than to dissuade sin: and tho' all the other books upon whoredom were destroyed and sunk, they would be more than sufficient to revive it. They contain forms, formalities, materialities, categories, and transcendencies, that are spick and span new. Carnality and unnatural lust are described there in their full extent. If Horace or Martial were to return, they would make fine odes and epigrams upon those operators that wanted to castrate them. In five hundred Martial's or Horace's there is not so much room for clipping off, and castrating as in one page of this last author †.

† Franc Archer de la vraie Eglise, pag. 266, 267, 268.

As for the rest, if such a dangerous book was neither censured by the assembly of the French Clergy, as Mr Jurieu says, nor by the Faculty of Divines at Paris, as Mr Rivet pretends; it has at least been prohibited by a famous magistrate; a thing which redounds very much to his honour. This appears by the following words: *Thomas Sanchez has not been wanting in this*, (viz. in replenishing the cases of conscience with an infinite number of vile impurities); *for he has so stuffed his book de Matrimonio with these, that he is remarkable upon such a carnal subject, beyond all that ever handled the same before*. . . . One of the worthy actions of *Président le Jay*, when he was lieutenant of the Policy at Paris, was, to have made strict search after this book, and to have forbid the Booksellers of Paris to sell it under pain of death ††. These words, as well as the long passage that precedes them, are taken from a very scarce book, intitled, *Le Franc-Archer de la vraie Eglise contre les Abus & Enormitez de la fausse*, written by Antony Fusi, and printed in the year 1619, in 8vo. REM. CRIT.]

†† Ibid. pag. 867, 868.

[C] What has been said for his justification is weak.] The censurers of this author may pretend two things: the first is, that he could not possibly write so many particular impurities, without being unchaste himself: Extant inter alia nonnullorum Jesuitarum de his argumentis scripta, in quibus explicantur talia, quæ vix diabolus ipse, studium omne adhibendo, suggerere posset: ubi non solum genera, species, sed & modos omnes, objecta, subiecta, circumstantias, ita minutatim examinant, ut nemo sanus ea profecta fuisse judicet à mente purâ & castâ. Inter quos eminet Thomas Sanchez Hispanus Jesuita, in prolixo tractatu de Matrimonio (9). . . . There are extant, among others, the writings of some Jesuits upon these subjects; where such things are explained, as the Devil himself, with his utmost thought, could hardly suggest: where not only the kinds, species, but likewise all the different ways, objects, subjects, circumstances, are so minutely considered, that no man in his senses can suppose this to pro-

(9) Rivetus, ubi supra.

ceed from a pure and chaste mind. Among these authors the most remarkable is, Thomas Sanchez, a Spanish Jesuit, in his large book de Matrimonio. The second is, That he could not communicate to the public the knowledge of so many monstrous irregularities, without doing a prejudice to good morals. It being certain that several persons are inclined to commit these abominations when they know they are practised. Therefore a man that is wise and zealous for the salvation of his neighbours, ought carefully to avoid letting them know the impurities that are discovered to him in the tribunal of confession; for we may be assured that those who know nothing of the matter, will more easily abstain from it, than those who know the enormity and filthiness thereof.

As to the first of these two accusations, the friends of Sanchez answer, That he was a man of an admirable virtue and perfect chastity. His immaculate virginity accompanied him to his grave, say they, and the day he was buried all people thronged in, either to kiss, or to touch with their beads his body covered with flowers, and shining with a virginal beauty

(10). *Ad communis parentis funus (sic eum vocabant) advenit Illustrissimus Archiepiscopus, gravissimique Senatus Regius: confuxere sacrorum Ordinum viri Religiosi; urbis universa Nobilitas, & promiscue plebis innumera multitudo, qui defuncti corpus floribus conspersum, & eximia quadam specie ac virginali nitore micans certatim conabantur vel resariis contingere, vel oculis suppliciter venerari* (11). They refer us to some authors, who have praised the purity of his life. *Ejus innocentiam & vitam purissimam exhibent Crombetius l. 2. de studio perfecti. cap. 12. & Joannes Bourghesius l. cui titulus est Societas Jesu, Deiparæ sacra cap. 20* (12). This implies, that his mind and imagination were filled with those filthy matters, but his heart and body were free from that contagion. Many people think this as hard, as to be like the Hebrew children in the Babylonian furnace without being burnt. But after all, it is not impossible but that the horror that might be conceived for those execrable abuses of matrimony, and the desire of correcting them, might preserve the innocence of an author who should wallow in those ordures; of an author, I say, whose age, temper, and education, might be powerful preservatives against the pollutions of the flesh. There is some reason to think that authors who dwell too much upon the explication of the Pri-

(10) Homo vitæ purissime innocentissimeque actus, & nulla unquam graviore labe contaminatus. . . . Castimonie tantum decus, ut virginitatis florem in tumultum intulerit. Soruel, ubi supra. Sanchez, hominem sanctissime vitæ & perpetuo virginitatis candore nitentem, ut graves scriptores prodiderunt. Tb. Raynaud, ubi supra.

(11) Soruel. ibid.

(12) Theoph. Raynaud. Hoplethea, §. ii. Serie III, cap. x. pag. 362.

apeia, and the obscene passages of Catullus and Martial, are not very chaste; and it is but too certain that there have been some commentators who dwell upon those matters too long, and made a deep scrutiny into them, only because they were unchaste. But that is not to be taken for a general rule; for the sole desire of shewing a great deal of reading, and an uncommon learning, is very capable of engaging an humanist to comment largely upon the Poets I have mentioned. The first reading of those poems does strongly attack virtue, especially that of young men: by degrees one grows harder; and there are Critics, who, after having read several times Catullus and Martial, either to clear up some old custom, or to comment on them, are no more moved with their impure expressions, than if they read an aphorism of Hippocrates. It happens to those Critics as it happens to Physicians and Chirurgeons, who being used to handle filthy ulcers, after some time, find no offence from the stink. I pray God it may happen so to Confessors, and Casuists, whose ears are the common-shores of all the filth of human life. There are but too many of them, doubtless, who never rise to such a pitch, and whose virtue is overcome, when they hear the impurities of their penitent: no consequence can be drawn from hence against this or that man in particular; so that we should be very rash, should we assert that Sanchez was not possessed of this insensibility, and that he was infected with the stinking ordures he stirred with so much application: and after all, he has an excuse, which the most chaste commentators upon the *Catalesta* cannot have; for he may say he only put his hand to this filth with a design to purge the world of it. It is by this, that they endeavour to answer the second accusation, which is a great deal more perplexing than the first.

I have said elsewhere (13) what is alleged to justify Albertus Magnus in the same case. His friends pre-

(13) See the article ALBERTUS, remark [D].

who continue every day to publish such like impurities (f). They have done so a long time,

(f) See the censure upon a book of *Amadus Guimenius* made by the Faculty of Divinity at Paris, the third of February 1665. They condemn several propositions, that are only denoted by the first words, and cannot be modestly translated into French.

tend that there ought to be books, wherein Confessors may meet with necessary instructions against the disorders imparted to them; and therefore that a great doctor like him ought to write upon that subject. The same answer is also given for Sanchez. The filthy questions, say they, and the enormous obscenities which he examines so exactly, are very servicable to the directors of conscience. We have therefore no reason to be scandalized at them. Do we blame a Physician for stirring filthy excrements, in order to procure his patient's health? This consideration hindered the Jesuits from curtailing Sanchez. One of them says, among other things, that being to judge of one of the most impure matters that are contained in it, he could never have resolved the insurmountable difficulties which offered themselves, without the solutions of this author. *Fuisse autem eam de Matrimonio scriptio- nem necessariam, audire memini ex homine & probato- rum morum severitate, & eruditione clarissimo, P. Val- rio Reginaldo. Li cum in quadam Provinciali Congrega- tione, à nonnullis maticulosis propositum esset ut opus Pa- tris Thomæ Sanchez de Matrimonio truncaretur ea tra- ctatione ejus scilicet toties pro tribunali à malevolis Casuistis extra causam ingessus erat; graviter contesta- tus est, nihil esse in eo opere conscientiarum duntaxat ar- bitris scripto, quod offensum merito moveret. Cum non modo apud Jurisperitos, (Tiraquellum præsertim in legibus Connubialibus,) tetiora absque necessitate ad me- ram curiositatis pabulum legantur, sed etiam apud alios de Matrimonio Scriptores, nec non apud Summos eadem occurrant; quæ omnia Lybitinæ addicere, & impossibile & damnosum foret. Apud Sanchez certe, quod maxime spurcum ac vel lectu scdum videri poterat, sibi aliquando ad didicandum fuisse propositum; & nisi ex eo Autore enodationem habuisset, salubres sibi inexpedibiles fuisse futuras. Itaque non plus offendi quemquam debere, ea fa- tidiorum dubiorum tractatione ad directionem penitentium necessaria, quam succenseamus, cum Medici olida ejecta- menta in ægri bonum & curationem emoverent (14).* The Abbot of St Cyran, under the name of Petrus Aurelius, had refuted beforehand this bad reason. He maintained that this work might do a great deal of harm, but little good. By setting before the eyes of the public an infinity of infamous impurities that are committed in the nuptial-bed, good souls are scandalized, the curio- sity of some is excited, and the lasciviousness of others, &c. But if the directors of consciences are to pass their verdict in such cases, it is much better that they should have recourse to the living voice of doctors, than to a public work, where it is hard to find the case in question with all its circumstances. It must be granted, this remark is very solid: the Ro- man Catholics are in the wrong not to imitate sects of the ancient Philosophy, where the whole system was never put in writing: a part being reserved to be taught by word of mouth to the favourite disciples: this was only preserved by tradition. The Pope should have forbid the Casuists to print any thing about the cases of luxury; he should have ordered the matter so, that the instruction of the confessors, either with respect to the questions, or to the penances upon this head, might be communicated from the one to the other in private, or at most in manuscript under the seal of secrecy. Let us quote Petrus Aurelius. *Modestiores fuerunt semper Ecclesiastici tractatores. . . Nec tanti fecerunt an- ticipem istam & periculosam conjugum arcanorum, fla- gitiorum, piaculorumque scientiam. Maluerunt ista nesciri à paucis, quorum forte interesset, quam sciri à plurimis à pestilentissima curiositatis illecebram, ad cupidita- tum fomitem, ad publicum dedecus, dum promiscue, ma- ximis voluminibus, ante ora omnium propositis, explicantur. Nam & raro usu venit ut talium usandarum cognitione sit opus; & cum usu venit, tutius viri probi, Ecclesia- sticarum rerum peritiores consulunt, qui ista ex æquo & bono, & ex Ecclesiastica disciplinæ comparatione di- judicent, quam ex libro quopiam publicè noxio aut pericu- loso, ubi aliquid generatim tantum, aut obscure, aut à præsentis negotio remotè, ut ferè accidit, scriptum sit, questionis fortasse diversissimæ expositio privato cujusque judicio repetatur. Atque ita hætenus observavit Ecclesia, donec Thomas Sanchez superiorum seculorum castiorem mo-*

destioremque consuetudinem spernens, prodigio volumine, ve- lus CLOACA ingenti, fanda infandaque convolvit (15).

The other reasons of Theophilus Raynaud are not better. He cites (16) long passages out of St Chry- sostom, which prove that this Father of the Church has represented to the life, and, in plain terms, the in- famous impurities of his time. He shews (17) that St Epiphanius has described in the same manner the impurities of the Gnostics, and that St Cyril made use of the same liberty to describe those of the Mani- chees. He maintains that Hincmarus, in his book about the divorce of Lotharius and Telberga, spoke more obscenely than Sanchez (18). He says that the excuses which St Chrysofom, St Epiphanius, St Cyril, and Hincmarus, made to their auditors or readers, may serve as an apology for his fellow-Jesuit. He mentions what Radulphus Flavienus observed, against the false niceness of those who blamed the obscene terms which Moses made use of in Leviticus (19). But it is so easy to perceive the difference between those examples and the conduct of the Spanish writer, that I shall not stand upon the proofs of the weak- ness or insignificance of that parallel. Every body easily perceives, that the same things which are permitted to those who know a fact, which the enquiries of Hito- rians, or juridical proceedings have manifested, ought not to be allowed to those who only knew it by way of auricular confession. The ancient Fathers had a right to make known the execrable deportments of the Heretics. Hincmarus might compose a relation upon the most impure conduct of a divorced queen; and when once vice is attested either by history, or by a verbal process, authors have a right to mention it, if it be to the purpose: but as to vices that are only re- vealed to the confessors, another method ought to be taken with them. I pass by what a great many peo- ple would not have omitted; that now a-days no famous preacher would be so bold as to take the same liberty in this respect that St Chrysofom and St Cyril took, and that if any writer of the ancient Church is to be imitated on that score, it is Salvian, of whom Theo- philus Raynaud cites these fine words. *Quæ quidem omnia tam flagitiosa sunt, ut etiam explicare ea quispiam atque eloqui salvo pudore non valeat. Quis enim integro verecundiæ statu, dicere queat illas vo- cum ac verborum obscenitates, illas mortuum tur- pitudines, illas gestuum scditates? quæ quanti sint criminis, vel hinc intelligi potest, quod & rela- tionem sui interdicunt. Nonnulla quippe etiam ma- xima scelera, incolumi honestate referentis, & no- minari & argui possunt, ut homicidium, latroci- nium, adulterium, sacrilegium, ceteraque in hunc modum; solæ theatrorum impuritates sunt, quæ honestè non possunt vel accusari: ita nova in coar- guenda earum turpitudinum probrofitate res evenit arguenti: ut cum absque dubio honestus sit qui accu- sare ea velit, honestate tamen integra, ea loqui & ac- cufare non possit (20).* . . . All which things are so

(15) Petrus Au- relius, in Va- diciis Censa- re, apud Andr. Rivetum Oper. Tom. iii, p. 1400. col. i.

(16) Theophil. Raynaud. Hipo- theca, ubi supra, pag. 362, 363.

(17) Ibid. pag. 364.

(18) Coæstus est stylum demittere in spurcitas longe scdiores quam uf- piam apud San- chem legantur. Theophil. Ray- naud, de malis & bonis Libris, pag. 53. See also his Hypotheca, pag. 363.

(19) Idem, Ho- plothea, p. 364. & de malis Libris, pag. 56.

(20) Salvianus de Providentia, lib. vi, pag. m. 199, 200.

(21) The words of Cicero, Philip. II, against Marc Antony may be applied to this subject. Tu eo liberior quod ea in te admittis quæ à verecunde inimico audire non posses. . . . You are the more free upon this ac- count, because you have committed such crimes as your modest adver- sary cannot men- tion. See the use that has been made of these words in the Cabale Chiméri- que, pag. 194, of the second Edition.

(22) Ita factum videmus ante Sanchez, ac post eum à quamplu- rimis, ut mirum sit hunc æstum efferverisse in u- num Sanchez. Raynaud. Hypo- theca, pag 364. See

(14) Theoph. Raynaud. Ho- plothea, pag. 362.

time, and it is a deplorable thing to see that with all manner of such filthy accounts, did 'Benedicti, who is a Franciscan Doctor, fins, and shews that he has both seen and of Benedictus is translated into French: It in 1584 (b), and at Paris in the year alone.

courtiers, who had their memories stuffed cite as a common-place-book the 'Summa' who has written very well of all sorts of and read a great deal (g). This book was published in that language at Lyons 1602, which might well have been let

(g) Brantome, Dames Galantes, Tom. i, pag. m. 51. See also pag. 185.

(b) Du Verdier, Bibl. pag. 651.

See Mr Jurieu in the Apology for the Reformers in the chapter I have cited. Let us conclude, that it is a thing very blameable and deplorable that there should be so many books of that nature; but it is infinitely more deplorable that the impurities they contain should be so many real crimes. The school-men spin things so fine, that, even in matters of morality, they have debated very needless questions and things that never happen; and you see continually the Casuists distinguish between the practice and the theory, and propose Metaphysical and imaginary cases. This, probably, was one of the reasons which made Mr Rivet judge that the infamies that are read in Sanchez had been invented by that author; and therefore being at Aix-la-Chapelle with a Jesuit, he told him he could not sufficiently wonder that a man who had made a vow of chastity, should suppose such abominations as were not practised. I see, replied the Jesuit, you have never been a confessor. We hear often more impure cases than those; so that it is necessary that confessors should be provided with directions, according to which they may be enabled to impose due penances. Mr Rivet replied, smiling, It is strange that you should boast so much of the holiness of your church, since, according to your confession, such things are practised in it, of which the very Heathens knew not the name. *Hæc ego cum ante aliquot annos obijcerem Jesuitæ cuidam Aquigrani, addideremque me non existimare reperiri exempla talium abominatum, meque valde mirari ab homine castitatem professio fuisse excogitatas:*

Regerebat, me nunquam fuisse admotum audiendis confessionibus, atrociora multis & spurciora sepius audiri ab ore confitentium, ut necessario opus sit confessorio institui super istis, ni velint hæere talibus occurrentibus peccatis, juxta quæ est injungenda penitentia. Subridens dicebam, mirum igitur esse quod tantopere gloriarentur de sanctitate Ecclesie sue, in qua, & sepe, ut ille fatebatur, ea perpetrarentur, quæ apud Ethnicos ne nominata quidem fuerant (23). We do not know the domestic privacy of the antient Pagans, as we know those of the countries where auricular confession is practised; and therefore we cannot tell whether marriage was so brutally dishonoured among the Pagans as it is among the Christians: but at least it is probable that the Infidels did not surpass, in this respect, many persons who believe all the doctrines of the Gospel. Those for whom the book of Sanchez is writ, are such as go to confession, and submit to the penances enjoined them by their confessors. They therefore believe what the Scripture teaches us of Heaven and Hell, they believe purgatory, and the other doctrines of the Romish communion; and yet, in the midst of this persuasion, you see them plunged into abominable impurities, which are not fit to be named, and which draw down severe reproaches upon the head of such authors as dare to mention them. I observe this against those who persuade themselves that the corruption of manners proceeds from mens doubting, or being ignorant that there is another life after this.

(23) Rivet, in Decalog. ad c. 7. 13. Oper. Tom. i. pag. 1400, col. 2.

SANDERS or SAUNDERS (NICHOLAS) an English Priest, but not a Jesuit as some have said [A], shewed great zeal for the Pope's interest, and miserably ended his days in a kind of military mission in Ireland, where he was gone to encourage the Roman Catholics who had taken up arms against Queen Elizabeth [B]. I forbear to give his article, because it is to be found, not only in Moreri's Dictionary, but also in other Books which are every where to be met with (a). I shall only say something of his History of the English Schism [C]. It is a book where there is a great deal of passion and very little exactness, two qualities which generally go together. In the

(a) In the Histoire du Divorce de Henri VIII, par Mr le Grand, Tom. ii, pag. 7, & seq. and in the Anti of Mr Boulton, article 159.

[A] He was a . . . Priest, but not a Jesuit, as some have said.] Of this number was the author of the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* (1); but that error, into which he had been drawn by guides whom he had reason to think creditable, was corrected soon after (2). That author had observed that du Moulin gives Sanders the title of Jesuit (3), and had read the following words in a book of Mr Daillé: Richard Crackenthorp, one of the learned English writers, says that Sanders the Jesuit was not ashamed to be the first who published this story (4); that is to say that Queen Elizabeth was created head of the Church. He had seen that Schoockius, for an instance of the Jesuitical impostures, alleges what Sanders the Jesuit wrote upon the birth of Queen Elizabeth (5).

[B] He miserably ended his days in a kind of military mission in Ireland, where he was gone to encourage the Roman Catholics . . . against Queen Elizabeth.] His countryman Edward Rihston, when he published the History of the English Schism, prefixed to it a short preface wherein he says what follows: *As the said Sanders, being very zealous for the salvation of his countrymen the English, had retired from Spain into Ireland, to comfort the distressed Catholics who had taken up arms in defence of Religion (in which body work he soon after gave up his blessed soul to his Creator; his continual labours and sufferings, the indisposition of the air and place, the want of necessities, and other difficulties and miseries having occasioned his death) he left this work of the English Schism.* They put in the margin that he died in the year 1581. I have made use of the old French translation, and not that of Mr Maucroix. We find in Camden, that the ill success of the rebellion made Sanders lose his senses, and that seeing himself for-

gaken by all, he wandered up and down in the woods and mountains, and died of hunger in the year 1583. Upon this Camden makes the following reflexion; that the Divine Justice, if we may be allowed to judge of it, made use of hunger to stop a mouth which had been always ready to preach, revolt, and publish calumnies. *Inter quos (Sacerdotes) facile primus erat Nicholas Sanderus Anglus, qui fæpe eodem fere momento miserimè periit, cum derelictus, & ex adverso rebellionis successu mente motus, per sylvas, saltus, & montes errabundus nullum reperiret solatium. In ejus pera deprehensæ erant Orationes quædam & Epistolæ ad rebelles confirmandas conscriptæ, amplius à Pontifice Rom. & Hispano promissis refertæ. Ita divina Justitia, (si fas sit judicare) os illud ad rebellionem concitandas, & calumnias cum mendaciis eructandas semper apertum, fæpe obstruxit. Ille enim primus omnium horrendum illud (ut alia taceam) contra matris Elizabethæ natales mendacium constavit, quod nemo temporibus illis, recenti in eam Pontificiorum odio novit, Anglia totis XL postea annis non audivit, temporum ratio falsitatis & vanitatis liquidissime convincit, & ipse sui immemor quod mendacem non oportuit, plane coarguit (6).* Consult Mr Burnet (7), who will tell you the different accounts that were given of this person's death.

[C] I shall say something of his History of the English Schism.] He completed it in Spain; but he had not as yet put the last hand to it, being almost continually hindered by other affairs, and likewise by other compositions (8). Nevertheless there were some copies of it in Spain and Italy, and it was no difficult matter for Rihston to get one of them, when, being prevailed upon by the importunity of one of his friends (9), he resolved to publish this History (10). I have read

(6) Camdenus, Hist. Regine Elizabethæ, Part. iii, pag. m. 372.

(7) Burnet, his Criticism on the ninth book of Varillas, pag. 35. & 131.

(8) Edward Rihston, preface to the History of the English Schism.

(9) He was at Cologne, and was called Jodocus Skarnbert.

(10) Rihston, ibid.

(1) For the month of Nov. 1685, Art. VI, pag. 1238, of the first edition.

(2) In the second edition, p. 1250.

(3) Du Moulin, Défense du Roi de la Grand' Bretagne, pag. 45, Edit. of Geneva 1631.

(4) Daillé, Réplique à Adam & à Cottribi, Part. ii, pag. 78.

(5) Schoock, de Fabula Hamel, pag. m. 222.

(b) This confutation is intitled *Fidelis servus infidelis subdito Reipublico*, and was printed in the year 1573.

(c) Le Grand, *Hist. du Divorce de Henri VIII.*, pag. 9, 10.

the confutation (b) of the seventh book of his visible monarchy of the Church, that author is upbraided not with having invented what he wrote but with trusting somewhat too rashly to common reports in matters of importance (c). It is the general fault of those who suffer persecution for their religion. This was the case of Sanders. He embraced the sentiments of the Spaniards and Italians touching the Pope's authority, and strongly defended them in his book *de visibili Monarchia Ecclesiæ*, printed for the first time in the year 1571 (d) at Louvain in folio (e), and in another work intitled *de Clave David*, which was one of his last productions (f).

(d) Ibid. pag. 3.

(e) Epit. Biblioth. Gefneri. (f) Nicolaus Sanders cygnæ sua cantione in Libris de Clave David egregie fecit hujus (pontificis) dignitatem extulit. Schultingius, Epist. Dedic. Tom. I. *Bibliothecæ Catholicæ*.

over, said he, from beginning to end the said work, and have corrected some passages, which had been either corrupted by the fault of the transcribers, or not sufficiently explained by the author; through the haste he was in: and to the end that the thread and order of the History might be the better kept up, I have curtailed some things, which seemed to be intangled with too long disputes. I have likewise added many that were wanting, particularly such as happened after the death of Mr Sanders: and whereas the bulk and size of the work did not appear to be very large, I have comprehended the whole under the title of one single book. Last of all I have delivered it, thus corrected, to my said friend M. Joffe, together with this epistle, to the end that he might send it to his Printer, who desired it so earnestly (11). In this manner did they publish the first edition, which was that of Cologne 1585. Rihthon had no hand in the following editions where many things were added (12); for he died the same year at St Menchou (13). This book of Sanders had such a prodigious sale, that being reprinted at Rome in the year 1586, a Bookseller of Ingolstadt (14) immediately counterfeited that edition. He dates his Epistle Dedicatory to the Archbishop of Salzburg on the 5th of November 1586: which makes me conclude that his edition came out that year, and that the copy which I make use of, and which has the year 1588 marked in the title, is of a second edition at Ingolstadt. Note, that in the edition of Rome the work contains three books, according to the division of Sanders with the passages which Rihthon had curtailed. Mr le Grand observes (15) that the editions of Rome and Ingolstadt are so different from the first that one may say it is a new work; and he pretends (16) that no edition has yet appeared which is better than the first. Others were published at Cologne in the year 1610, and the year 1628. The latter is the fullest of all; for it contains several additions taken from a book of Ribadeneira upon the same subject.

(11) Ibid.

(12) Le Grand, *Hist. du Divorce de Henri VIII.*, Tom. II, pag. 6.

(13) A French town in Champagne.

(14) Named Wolfgangus Ederus.

(15) Ibid.

(16) Ibid. p. 7.

A man who marked his name only by the initial letters J. T. A. C. translated this book of Sanders into French the same year that it was published at Cologne, I mean in 1585; but afterwards, adds he, this History having been augmented at Rome with licences in the year 1586, and sent to me some months ago, I have revised and translated it into our French tongue. The advertisement where he speaks in this manner is dated the 9th of July 1587. This translation was printed in the year 1587 in 8vo. We are not told in what place; but the title informs us that it was printed by the command of the most illustrious and reverend Cardinal de Vaudemont, at the request of certain English gentlemen who had been obliged to fly their country for the Catholic Faith. I have seen another French translation printed in the year 1587 in 8vo. It is very different from the former: I do not pass this judgment upon it, because the words that are in the title of the one are not in the title of the other, or because the Preface signed J. T. A. C. and dated the 9th of July 1587, is in the one and not in the other. There are not proofs of a different edition. The Booksellers sometimes change all the first pages without reprinting the body of the book. But here are my proofs: it is impossible to give more convincing ones. The translation printed by the command of the Cardinal de Vaudemont, contains 281 leaves, the other contains 296, although it be printed in smaller characters. I have found in the latter several passages otherwise translated than they are in the former. I shall give an example of it. We read in the 187th leaf of that translation which wants the Preface signed J. T. A. C. that Millon Coverdale being gone to Oxford, got up into the pulpit to discourse upon the Eucharist, and because people rallied him on account of his bringing with him 'Sororem quamdam suam, --- a certain

'sister of his,' he sharply replied 'qui in eum flo-machati fuissent quod vas commoditatis haberet (ita enim suam meretriculam appellabat) --- those who had rallied him for his having always with him his vessel of convenience (for so he called his whore).' Here follow the terms of the other translation in the 166th leaf (17). 'Milon Coverdale... having heard that the University of Oxford was wonderfully addicted to the Catholic Faith, and for no consideration in the world could be prevailed upon to abandon it, in order to embrace Herefy; and that, besides this, there were some who girded at him on account of his carrying every where along with him a certain sister of his, imagining that he should find a great many copies of himself, and being persuaded that he should be able to seduce a vast number of people, he came to Oxford, got up into the pulpit, every body was very attentive. For this reason after he had first of all sharply reproved those who were offended at his having the Vessel of Con-venience (for so he called his little whore) he added, that, &c.'

(17) Note that I have not cited word for word the whole passage of the other translation, as I do of this. It is sufficient that in some words we see the difference.

The title of these two translations is extremely barbarous and unpolished, even for that time: the author who marks his name by the initial letters J. T. A. C. does justice to himself when he owns that he has had more regard to the sense and meaning, or corruption of Sanders, than to a show and orderly placing of quaint words, contenting himself with being understood by those who consider rather the marrow and truth of History, than the ornaments and figures of Rhetoric. We must nevertheless own that his translation is not so barbarous as the others, and contains fewer passages misunderstood, for example, he has not blundered in this, as the other has done. 'The river Thames which waters the city of London, on the 17th of December 1550, in less than nine hours, ebbed and flowed three times contrary to custom. The same year a certain sweating disease, pestilential and mortal, and before that time unknown to Physicians, spread all over England, and killed an almost infinite number of people, so that in less than seven days there died in the city of London alone eight hundred persons: several thousands more being infected with the same distemper in other places: it had nevertheless nothing of the nature and quality of the Plague: but it was a kind of miracle and prodigy, by which the almighty and merciful God thought fit to warn the English of the enormous sin which they had committed against him: it has done no service however to a wicked and reprobate generation (18).' In the other translation the Latin

words *Sudatorius quidam pestifer morbus nunquam antea Medicis cognitus* (19), have been rendered a certain disease called the Pox formerly unknown to Physicians. Here are two errors fit for a school-boy: the Pox, which was not the thing in question, had already been the subject of several printed volumes. My reason for quoting this passage of the Historian somewhat at length, is to shew the turn of his mind, and because he has published a gross falsity not to be excused in an Englishman. He says that the English sweating disease which was felt at London in the year 1550 had never before that time been known to the Physicians (20). He was then ignorant it seems that it began to be known in the year 1486 (21), and that afterwards it frequently made great havoc. Do not fancy that the least bad translation of the two was written by a man that understood the Latin well. You are going to see a mistake which will be pretty sufficient to convince you that he sometimes misunderstood the sense of the original. 'The Printers made every where strict search after the works of Mr Nicholas Sanders and especially those which had not yet been printed, but which he had either deposited with his

(18) Sanders, du Schisme d'Angleterre, II, fol 168 of an old French translation.

(19) Sanders, de Schismate Anglicano, lib. II, pag. 233, Edition of Ingolstadt, 1588.

(20) Nunquam antea Medicis cognitus, id. ibid.

(21) See the remark [D], of the article AMMONIUS (ANDREW) & Sebastianus Calverius, ad ann. 1486, who observes that the Scoury likewise began this year in Lower Germany.

' particular friends, before his death, or left to his 'adversaries.' It is in this manner that he translates these Latin words of Rihston: *D. Nicolai Sanderi . . . Opera . . . à Typographis undique conquiri ad præzium, maxime verò ea quæ nondum impressa, sed ab illo . . . vel apud amicos deposita, vel in adversariis relictæ.* You see how by a gross ignorance he imagined that in *adversariis*, that is to say, among his papers, signified to his enemies. Mr Maucroix gave a new French translation of this book of Sanders in the year 1677. It is very polite: we have three editions of it (22). To know whether this History of the Schism be impartial and of any weight, we must consult the criticism which Bishop Burnet has given of it (23), and what Mr le Grand has answered in behalf of Sanders (24). How passionate this author is has been said in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* at the sixth article for the month of November 1685. An anonymous writer had already criticized upon that Historian in the year 1593. His book was printed at Cambridge, and is intituled, *Anti-Sanderus, duabus Dialogis Venetiis habitis in quibus Sanderi & aliorum calumniæ in Elizabetham Reginam refelluntur.* See likewise Schoockius in the fifth chapter of the third part of the *Fabula Hamelenfis* (25).

(22) Two of Paris, and one in Holland: this last was printed in the year 1683.

(23) In the second volume of his History of the English Schism. Some pieces have been written *pro* and *con* since the first. These too may be consulted.

(24) Pag. 222. Edit. secunda.

(25) He has observed at the end of the first part of the History of the Reformation of the Church of England, 127 errors in Sanders, and at the end of the second part 87 errors in the same, and 12 in the continuation. The edition he goes by is that of Cologn 1628.

S A N S O N (JAMES) a bare-footed Carmelite, known in his order by the name of Ignatius-Joseph de Jesus Maria, was born at Abbeville on the tenth of February 1595. He took the habit of this order at Paris on the thirtieth of November 1618, and was sent to the convent where the Noviciate of the province was, and where Father Clement de Sainte Marie, a native of Geneva, and nephew to Calvin (a), was Prior, and Father Alexander, nephew to Pope Leo XI, minister of the Novices A year after his profession he was sent to study Divinity, at which time he continued the exercises of the Noviciate 'He took holy orders, and about three months after his ordination, he was employed by his superiors in hearing confessions and preaching; afterwards he was sent to Limoges to begin that foundation, where he had the happiness to converse familiarly with the venerable mother *Isabelle des Anges*, one of the first six Carmelite Nuns that came from Spain, to establish the order in France. At his return from Limoges he was chosen sub-prior of the convent at Paris, then master of the Novices at Charenton He was afterwards appointed master of the Novices in the convent of Toulouse.' He was chosen some time after that to be confessor to the Dukes of Savoy, and to govern the Carmelites newly established at Turin. It was he that persuaded Madame la Peftrie to found a convent of Ursuline-Nuns in Canada, by giving a hundred thousand livres for so good a work. This happened at his return from Turin, while he was at Paris; he applied himself at the same time to found a convent of bare-footed Carmelites in Abbeville, and succeeded therein beyond his expectation [A]. He died in the convent of Charenton on the nineteenth of August 1664 (b). Strange things are said of his devotion [B]. He has written some books [C]. He had two brothers, the one a Capuchin and the other a Carthusian Fryar [D]. He was of the same family with the

(a) See the remark [DD], of the article CALVIN.

(b) Taken from a book intituled, *Les Fleurs du Carmel* cueillies du Parterre des Carmes Dechauffés de France, par le R. P. Pierre de la Mere de Dieu Carme Dechauffé, pag. 292. 2^e fig. Edit. of Amsterdam 1670. in 4to.

[A] He applied himself . . . to found a Convent of barefooted Carmelites in Abbeville, and succeeded therein beyond his expectation.] I shall quote what one of his brethren says: 'He obtained more than he had asked, since he not only saw the foundation of our Fathers in Abbeville, but likewise in the city of Amiens, where I had the happiness to accompany him: and I am obliged to declare this truth, that the people held him in such veneration that they did not call him otherwise than the Holy Father: notwithstanding that some Fryars turned this into ridicule, it did not hinder his reputation from increasing daily, nor parents from presenting their sick children to him, in order to receive his blessing, as being persuaded that this would contribute towards their recovery (1).' To know what hand he had in establishing the Monks of his order at Abbeville, we must consult the *Annals of the barefooted Carmelites* (2) written by Father Lewis de Saint Theresia.

(1) Les Fleurs du Carmel, p. 299.

(2) Ad ann. 1640: I have been informed of this by Mr Lancelot, one of those who take care of the books in the Mazarin library.

(3) Fleurs du Carmel, p. 297.

[B] Strange things are said of his devotion.] During the exercises of the Noviciate, 'He was sometimes so powerfully drawn and transported out of himself that he rather suffered than acted, and the sweetness of Heaven was such, that, as he himself writes, it was difficult for him to bear it. These infused lights and inward riches of virtue made him sensible that supernatural prayer cannot be acquired by any human means: how a soul ought to behave when, according to St Dionysius the Areopagite, it suffers divine things passively (3): . . . Several believed that he conversed familiarly with, and that he even saw, his good angel, to whom he paid a singular devotion: as he was one day with the reverend Father Eulaise de S. Marie upon the moving sand, hastening towards the little town of Crottoy, the sea had like to have buried them in its waves, had not a child, as beautiful as an angel, appeared to shew them the way, and obliged them to double their pace, who after having conducted them into a place of safety, disappeared. His companion was firmly persuaded that this child was an angel who had taken that visible

form in order to rescue them both from the manifest danger of losing their lives. Our venerable Father confesses that he never was in such an extremity; and indeed he was very thankful upon that account, since he prepared himself for a happy death with more application than before. He gave directions in writing how he would have every thing done at this last hour; among other things he desired to have a halter about his neck; to die upon the flat ground; to do *amande honorable* to the whole society for the ill example which he fancied he had given from the time that he had the happiness to wear the holy habit of the Holy Virgin, and to be received into our holy order. I confess that having read all that he writes upon this head, the ardent ejaculations he makes to his God, and the heroic acts he brings forth from the bottom of his heart, I have been very much edified, especially by his profound humility (4).'

(4) Ibid. pag. 299, 300.

[C] He has written some books.] In the year 1646 he caused his Ecclesiastical History of the city of Abbeville, and of the Archdeaconry of Ponthieu, to be printed at Paris in 4to. Eleven years after he published at the same place in folio the History of the Earls of Ponthieu, which I have cited in the article of Abbeville. In this last book (5) he frequently refers to the former. For the rest, Mr de la Roque, in the 153d page of his *Traité de la Noblesse*, should not have called him Ignatius Sanfon, but James Sanfon (6). This was joining his family name and his religious name together. After this Carmelite's death there was found written with his own hand a piece, intituled, *Preparation for Death, wherein he speaks of himself without mentioning his name.* He dedicated it to his good guardian angel. That Epistle Dedicatory is singular: you will find it in the 290th and 291st pages of the *Fleurs du Carmel de France*.

(5) See particularly pag. 825.

[D] He had two brothers, the one a Capuchin, and the other a Carthusian Fryar.] I am going to cite a passage which contains something that ought not to be believed. 'When he was about fourteen years of age

(6) He tells us in pag. 830, of his *Histoire des Comtes de Ponthieu*, that in the world he was called James Sanfon. Mr Lancelot communicated these remarks to me.

the famous Geographer Nicholas Sanfon (c).

(c) He was second cousin to that Geographers father. I was informed of it by Mr Lancelot.

'he made a trip to Paris, where he had the happiness to see his eldest brother, the Capuchin named Peter Matthew d'Abbeville, who died in the convent of St Honoré, having been poisoned by the Heretics who could not endure the great conversions which God wrought by him, in the city of Alençon where he was the guardian. The poison having not immediately killed him made him suffer a long martyrdom and pains for several years. He led such an exemplary life, and died such a holy death, that his name has deserved to be inserted in the Gallican Martyrology. He saw him but once lying upon a

'poor bed in his cloaths, and overwhelmed with sickness: he was so sensibly touched with the example of this good brother's humility, and with the words he said to him, that the tears gushed from his eyes for joy and grief: for joy to see him, and for grief to find him so emaciated. He had another brother, a Carthusian, named Dom John Sanfon, who did not live long in his order: his life however was so exemplary that it deserved to be written, that it might serve posterity by way of an incentive to virtue (7).'

(7) Fleurs de Carmel, p. 294.

SAPORTA (ANTONY) royal professor of Physic in the university of Montpellier, and chancellor of the same university, lived in the XVth century. His treatise *de Tumoribus præter naturam* was published at Lyons in the year 1624 in 12mo by the care of Henry Gras (a), Physician of the faculty of Montpellier, and fellow of the college of Physicians at Lyons. It had been for a considerable time deposited among the papers of Francis Ranchin to whom it was dedicated. I cannot tell whether or not our Saporta was the son of LEWIS SAPORTA a famous Physician [A]; but I know that he was father to JOHN SAPORTA author of a treatise *de Lue venerea*, which was printed with that *de Tumoribus præter naturam*.

(a) And not by the care of the author himself, as Mr König affirms.

[A] LEWIS SAPORTA a famous Physician. He was Doctor and Professor in the University of Lerida, where he had taught Physic for the space of nine years (1). After this he retired to Avignon; but before he could settle there, he was obliged to go through all the necessary forms in order to be made a

Doctor of that University. From thence having an inclination to retire to Montpellier, he was obliged to go through the same degrees again, in order to be made a Doctor of the University there, as Laurence Joubert informs us; so that he was thrice created Doctor (2).

(2) Id. ibid. pag. 166.

(a) Strabo, lib. xiii, pag. 425. Suidas, in Σαπφώ.

(b) Suidas, ibid. (c) Servius in Virgil. Dionys. Halicarn.

SAPPHO was one of the most famous women of all antiquity for her verses and her amours: she was a native of Mitylene in the isle of Lesbos (a), and lived in the time of Alcæus her countryman, and in the time of Stephichorus, that is to say, in the XLIIId Olympiad, six hundred and ten years before JESUS CHRIST. She composed a great number of odes, epigrams, elegies (b), epithalamiums, &c (c). All her verses run upon love [B], and had such natural and moving charms that one ought not to be surprized if she

(1) Preface to Anacreon.

[A] She lived . . . in the XLIIId Olympiad. This fully confutes the story of the amours of Anacreon and Sappho; for though we ought not to place between them an interval of 100 or 120 years, as Mrs le Fevre does (1), yet it is true, that their ages do not well enough agree for a commerce of gallantry. We may very well suppose that in the LIId Olympiad Anacreon was capable of love; but since the Chronologers place Sappho in the XLIIId Olympiad, we must conclude that she was then in her greatest reputation, and that she might be about thirty years old. Now when she threw herself headlong from the rock, she was in love with a young man she had hoped to regain: therefore there is no probability that she lived till the time when Anacreon was born, and we may be well assured he never saw her, nor ever was in love with her. It was only to give his fancy a full scope that Hermesianax supposed she was beloved by Anacreon. 'Εν τούτοις ὁ Ἑρμηνιάναξ σφάλλεται συγχρονεῖν οἷον Σαπφῶ καὶ Ἀνακρέοντα, τὸν μὲν κατὰ Κύρον καὶ Πολυκράτην γενόμενον, τὴν δὲ κατ' Ἀλυττὴν τὸν Κροῖον πατέρα. . . . Ἡ γὰρ καὶ παλαιὸν τὸν Ἑρμηνιάνακτα περὶ ταῦτα τὴν ἔρωτα. In his fallitur Hermesianax qui Sappho cœvram Anacreonti fuisse putat, cum ea sub Alyatte Croci patre vixerit, Anacreon verò sub Cyro & Polycrate. . . . Hermesianactem per lulum de Anacreontis amore id scripsisse arbitror (2). . . . In this Hermesianax is mistaken, who fancies that Sappho and Anacreon were contemporaries; whereas she lived in the time of Alyattes, the father of Croesus, and he in the time of Cyrus and Polycrates. . . . For my part I imagine that Hermesianax only writ of this intrigue to give his fancy a full scope. Others (3) by the same poetical liberty handed about some verses, wherein Anacreon played the gallant to Sappho, and she answered him. Diphilus (4) a comic Poet introduced Archilochus and Hipponax courting Sappho in one of his Plays. This is a witty conceit of the same kind. Madam Scuderi has not therefore made use of this anachronism without ex-

amples, when she supposes (5) that Anacreon courted Sappho. If Sappho had been such an one as she is characterized in the Grand Cyrus, she had been the most accomplished person of her age. The lady, who made her so great a model of perfection, went a long time by the name of Sappho in the ingenious writings wherein she was spoken of. This was to do a great deal of honour to the antient Sappho, since they gave her name to a lady who writ perfectly well in verse and in prose, and whose virtue was admired. Of whom one might have said,

Castior hæc & non doctior illa fuit (6).

In learning equal, she surpass'd
The other by her manners chaste.

For the rest, there is reason to think that if Anacreon and Sappho had seen one another in their youth, they would have made love to one another, and that we should have had a more certain account of the gallant's good success than we have of that of Alcæus (7). Nay perhaps they would have married together, but I do not know whether they would have long agreed; each of them loved too much his like. I do not know where Tanaquillus Faber (8) found that Diphilus made mention of their amours; it should be in Athæneus, but he says nothing of it. I have already said that Mrs le Fevre puts between them the space of a hundred or sixscore years; but I add that this does not agree with what she asserts, that Anacreon was cotemporary with Solon, Æsop, Cyrus, Croesus, and Pisistratus. These two last remarks are equally against the father (9) and the daughter.

[B] All her verses run upon love. Pausanias observes that Anacreon was the first, who, after Sappho, writ scarce any thing but love verses (10), and that Sappho writ a great many things upon this subject which did not agree well together (11). The meaning of it is that she turned this subject so many ways,

(c) In the Grand Cyrus.

(6) Martial. Epigr. lxxviii, lib. vii.

(7) See the article ALCÆUS.

(8) Vie des Poëtes Grecs, pag. m. 49. Mrs le Fevre says so too in the Life of Anacreon.

(9) Mr le Fevre, Vie des Poëtes Grecs, places Anacreon in the LXXIIId Olympiad; and in his Latin notes upon Anacreon he makes him cotemporary with Solon, Æsop, Croesus, and Pisistratus, &c.

(10) Pausanias, lib. i. pag. 239

(11) Pausanias, lib. ix, 302.

she was called the tenth Muse (*d*). Strabo looked upon her as a wonder (*e*), and said that never any woman could come near her in Poetry. There remains nothing of so many Poems she made but some small fragments which the ancient Scholiasts have cited, and a Hymn to Venus, and an Ode to one of her mistresses [*G*]; for you must know that her amorous passion extended even to the persons of her own sex [*D*], and this is that for which she was most cried down. Suidas has preserved the names of three of her mistresses (*f*), who ruined her reputation and disgraced themselves by a strange singularity which was imputed to their commerce. He has also preserved the names of three of her female disciples whom she did, in all probability, initiate into her mysteries. Since Lucian (*g*) does not observe that the women of the isle of Lesbos, who he says were very subject to this passion, learned it of Sappho, it is better to believe that she found it already established in her country than to ascribe to her the invention of

(*d*) Antholog. lib. i, cap. lxxvii. Aulonius, Epig. xxiii.

(*e*) Θυμασθόντι χρῆμα, ad mirandum quid. Strabo, lib. xiii, pag. 424.

(*f*) Ovid names two more, Epist. Sapph. ad Phaon. See the remark [*D*].

(*g*) Dialog. Metretic. Tom. ii, it. pag. 714.

that she spoke of it sometimes in one manner and sometimes in another. The sport pleased her. Among other things she had made a calculation of the signs by which one might know an amorous person; and she had so good success in it that the Physician Erasistratus knew by those signs the distemper of Antiochus (12). Every body knows that this young prince was desperately in love with Stratonice, his mother-in-law, and that not daring to discover it he pretended to be sick, and the cause of his illness being known, his father parted with her to him: but as often as this adventure is spoken of, people do not think, as it is fit they should, of Sappho who afforded the Physician the necessary expedients. Those, who intended to denote the Poems of this woman by their true character, called them her fires and her amours.

(12) Plutarch. in Demetrio, pag. 907.

Spirat adhuc amor
Vivuntque commissi calores
Æoliæ fidibus puellæ (13).

(13) Horat. Od. IX, lib. iv.

And Sappho's charming lyre
Preserves her soft desire,
And tunes our ravish'd souls to love.

CREECH.

Plutarch compares her to Cacus the son of Vulcan, of whom the Romans write that he cast out of his mouth fire and flame: *what she sings is a composition of fire*, says he, *her verses are the expulsion of the flame she has in her heart*. Αὐτὴ δὲ ἀληθῶς μεμιγμένα πυρὶ φέρεται καὶ διὰ τῶν μελῶν ἀναφέρει τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας θερμότητα. *Ipsa autem vere igni mixta loquitur, & per carmina calorem corde conceptum emittit* (14).

(14) Plutarchus de Amore, p. 762.

[*C*] There remains nothing . . . but some small fragments . . . a Hymn to Venus, and an Ode to one of her mistresses.] The Hymn to Venus was preserved by Dionysius Halicarnassensis (15), who inserted it in his works as an example of a perfection he had a mind to characterize. With the same view Longinus (16) has preserved to us the Ode to her mistress. Catullus has translated part of this Ode (17): all these circumstances are a proof of the singular esteem the ancients had for her verses.

(15) De colloc. verborum, cap. 81.

(16) Περὶ ὕψους, cap. ix.

(17) See in Isaac Vossius's Commentary upon Catullus, pag. 113, those two pieces of Sappho corrected.

Tanaquillus Faber was resolved to publish some observations upon that ode; but he abstained from it because he was brought into trouble for some things he had put in his edition of Anacreon (18). 'Ut ne tandem bona fide ætos . . . fiam, scitabbe (19), quod sane haud necesse est, decrevi nil quidquam ad hoc admirabile odarium dicere. Fuit olim, fateor, cum Sapphonem amabam; sed ex quo illa me perditissima femina pene miserum perdidit cum scelertissimo suo congerone, (Anacreontem dico, si necis, Leclor,) noli sperare quidquam à me dictum iri, unde aut ipsa, aut ipsius opera, (queis tamen olim in Græcia nil elegantius, nil magis tersum aut venustum quidquam extitit,) probari videantur. Itaque quando mihi imposita fubula est, hic lacuna esto. . . . *Left I should be excommunicated in good earnest, which is a thing that I am by no means fond of, I have taken a resolution to say nothing at all upon this admirable ode. I confess that I formerly looked upon it as such; but having been ruined by that lewd woman, and by her most wicked and tattling companion, (if you are at a loss, reader, to know who that is, I mean Anacreon), do not expect that I should say any thing by which I might seem to approve either her or his work, (ibo', in Greece, no productions were esteemed*

(18) See above remark [*D*] of the article of the first BATHYLUS.

(19) Tanaq. Faber, Not. in Longinus, pag. 292.

'more elegant, polite, and beautiful). Since therefore silence is imposed upon me, here let there be a gap.' The fragment which he cites (20) out of his notes on Anacreon, shews us that he was persuaded that Sappho writ this ode for a woman she was in love with. We shall see in the following remark that his daughter was not of this opinion; and that nevertheless it is a very probable one. For the rest, if there is no better proof than the above quoted Latin passage of this author (21), to pretend that he ceased to esteem Sappho (22), it is to rely upon an ill foundation.

(20) Id. ibid. pag. 293.

(21) Above citat (19).

[*D*] Her amorous passion extended even to the persons of her own sex.] I cannot blame the charity of Mrs le Fevre (23), who has endeavoured, for the honour of notes upon the Sappho, to render the fact uncertain; but I think her too reasonable to be angry with us for believing our own eyes. The ode which Longinus has mentioned, is not in the file of one female friend writing to another: it favours of love all over, and not of friendship: otherwise, Longinus, who was so good a judge, would not have brought it as a model of the art with which great masters represent things: he would not, I say, have given us as an example of that art, the manner wherewith the symptoms of an amorous fury are collected in that ode, τὰ συγκαίνοντα ταῖς ἐρωτικαῖς μανίαις παθήματα; and Plutarch would not have cited this same ode to prove that love is a divine fury, which causes more violent enthusiasms than those of the priests of Delphos, or the Bacchantes, and of the priests of Cybele. Τὴ τοσούτου ἡ Πυθία ἀπέκρινεν ἀλαμίνην τῷ τρίποδι; τίνα τῶν ἐνθεασσομένων ἔπος ὁ αὐλὸς καὶ τὰ μνηστῆρα καὶ τὸ τυμπανον ἐξισῶσιν (24). The poetical translation of this is to be found in these verses of Horace, if instead of *ira*, anger, you put *amor*, love:

(22) See the Greek Poets by Mr le Fevre.

(23) In the Life of Sappho.

(24) Plut. de Amore, pag. 763. Here is Xylander's version, Quid tale aut tantum accidit Pithiæ cum tripodem attigit? Quemnam orgia agentium tibia & Magnæ matris carmina atque tympanum sic animo abalienaverunt.

(25) Horat. Ode XVI, lib. i.

Non Dindymene, non adytis quatit
Mentem sacerdotum incola Pythius,
Non Liber æque, non acuta
Sic geminant Corybantes æra,
Tristes ut ira (25).

Not Cybele such heat inspires
Nor Phæbus with such raging fires
His prophet's soul possess'd,
Nor Bacchus self can raise a man
Half so much as anger can,
When once it burns the breast.

CREECH.

People were so persuaded in Ovid's time, that Sappho loved women as men do; that he makes no difficulty of introducing her making a sacrifice to Phaon of the female companions of her debauchery.

Nec me Pyrrhiades Methymniadesve puellæ,
Nec me Lesbium cetera turba juvant,
Vilis Anactone, vilis mihi candida Cydno:
Non oculis gratia est Atthis, ut ante meis.
Atque alie centum quas non sine crimine amavi
Improbe, multarum quod fuit, unus habes.

Lesbides infamem quæ me fecistis amatæ,
Definite ad citharas turba venire meas (26).

(26) Ovidius, Epist. Sapph. ad Phaon.

No more the Lesbian dames my passion move,
Once the dear objects of my guilty love;

M

All

VOL. V.

(5) *Mascula Sappho*. Hor. Epist. XIX, ver. 28, lib. i, Aufonius, Cupid. Crucif.

it. Be it as it will, Sappho passed for a famous *Tribas*, and some are of opinion that this was the reason why she was surnamed *Masculine* (b) [E]. If her design was to dispense with the other half of mankind, she was frustrated of her expectation; for she fell desperately in love with Phaon, and did in vain all that she could to make him love her: but he despised her and forced her by his coldness to throw herself headlong from a rock [F], to extinguish her devouring flame. How cruel he was

*All other loves are left in only thine,
Ah, youth ungrateful to a flame like mine!*

*Ye Lesbian virgins, and ye Lesbian dames,
Themes of my verse, and objects of my flames;
No more your groves with my glad songs shall ring,
No more these hands shall touch the trembling string.* P O P P.

Horace is another evidence against her in the complaints he supposes she made of the maids of Lesbos;

*Et Aëolis fidibus querentem
Sappho puellis de popularibus* (27.)

(27) Horat. Ode XIII, lib. ii, & ibid. Lambinus, Cruquius, Mr Dacier, &c.

*And Sappho, in Æolian strains,
Who of the Lesbian maids complains.*

for if she had reason to complain that the ladies of her country envied her merit, she would not have chosen the young ones for the subject of her complaint: but because she had spoke to them of love, and the greatest part of them were either too simple, or, to speak better, too crafty to be caught, and those who had complied, had made her infamous; for this reason she complained of the young maids. This verse of Ovid, *Definite ad citbaras turba venire meas*, shews, that the women of Lesbos had done justice to her fine verses. For the rest, I leave it to a new Father Sanchez to decide, whether a married woman, who had complied with the passion of Sappho, would have committed adultery, and made her husband a cuckold, properly speaking? I do not know whether this question has escaped the inexhaustible curiosity of the Casuists about matrimonial causes.

Let us confirm this by the testimony of a great wit, who did not believe that his complaisance for Mrs le Fevre should go so far as to approve the pains she has taken in favour of Sappho. After the death of her husband, says he (28), *Sappho, tho' young, renounced marriage, but not the pleasure of loving. She had a soul too amorous to be without it; which may be easily judged by the tenderness which runs through her poems, and which undoubtedly sets her above all the Poets as to that point. Thus finding herself too weak to vanquish so violent an inclination as that, she wholly gave herself up to it, and loved all manner of ways, going even far beyond the bounds which modesty naturally prescribes to her sex. It is in vain to justify her on that head; it cannot be done but at the expence of truth: and neither her aversion for the shameful love of Charaxus, nor all the honours she received from the Lesbians, can wash off a stain, which all those who have spoke of her could not disguise, notwithstanding the encomiums they have given her, and which her own works evidence more clearly still. Several beautiful women are put in the number of her mistresses.*

(28) In Horat. Epist. XIX, lib. i.

(30) Chabot quotes in Epigr. ad Philenim. lib. vii.

[E] She was surnamed *Masculine*.] It is not so easy as it is thought to know truly what Horace means by *Mascula Sappho*; but if he pretended to reproach her with her love against nature, it is easy to know he took the wrong time. The epithet would be very cold, and too far fetched without any necessity. There are, notwithstanding, learned men who understand it so. Chabot (29) places among them the interpreter of Juvenal and Porphyrio, an ancient scholiast upon Horace; and gives us Domitius for his author as to the latter. Without doubt he means Domitius Calderinus, whose commentary upon Martial I have not (30), but, according to Chabot, we find there, that Porphyrio has interpreted the word *mascula* both in a proper and figurative sense, 'Vel quia Sappho in poetico studio versata est, in quo sapius enituit, vel quia tribas diffamata fuit. . . . Either because she made Poetry her study, in which she frequently excelled, or because she was an infamous

tribas Cruquius, who has published the old scholiasts upon Horace, has not published these words of Porphyrio. As for the interpreter of Juvenal, cited by Chabot, it is reasonable that we should take him for the scholiast of that Poet; but I do not find that he says what is imputed to him: It is Britannicus who says it upon the forty-seventh verse of the second satire (31). However it be with the ancient commentators, it is certain that the moderns do commonly mention three opinions about the sense of *mascula Sappho*. 1. That this word means that she was a tribas. 2. That it denotes the inclination she had for the sciences, instead of handling the spindle and distaff. 3. The courage she had to precipitate herself at Leucas. This last opinion is Scaliger's (32), and Turnebus's (33), which is strongly confirmed by the following verses of Aufonius (34).

*Et de nimbo saltum Leucate minatur,
Mascula Lesbias Sappho peritura sagittis.*

*And manly Sappho, with the Lesbian dart
Sore wounded, to relieve the cruel smart
From steep Leucate's formidable height
Threatens a furious leap. . . .*

See the article LEUCAS, and the following remark.

Thevet rejects the first sense of *mascula Sappho*, and follows the second and third, but not without confounding himself childishly. Horace and Aufonius, says he (35), when they called this Lesbian woman *mascula*, meant nothing else but that she did what was proper for men, in composing so excellent verses, or that she had undertaken to get into those beautiful places of Leucas, near which the men durst not come. What an absurdity to give the name of beautiful places to a dreadful precipice, whither none went but out of despair? This therefore, continues he (36), is to wrong our Sappho, and to calumniate her without a just reason, since the divine Philosopher Plato admired her for her dexterity and vivacity of wit, and for her profound wisdom, which set her, not only above the rest of her sex, but also above the most able men. I make no manner of doubt but Thevet is a false witness here: I do not believe that ever Plato spoke of her profound wisdom, and if he had given her that elogy, it should not be understood in the sense of Thevet, but in the sense wherein it is taken at this very day among the Walloons, and was formerly taken in France. The midwives were called *sages*, *wise*, not because of their virtue, but because they knew many things that other women knew not. They are called at this day *femmes sages* in Guienne and Languedoc, but in other provinces, where they speak more exactly the French, to avoid the equivocation, they make use of a transposition, and call them *sages-femmes*. Tell at this day a Walloon, that he is happy in his children, that his daughters are sages, he will think you laugh at them, and he will tell you they are not, that it is not proper for their sex, and that it is enough for a maid to fear God, and understand housewifery. This shews that he understands, by being sage, to be learned, to know Latin, &c. The Greek word σοφός signified sometimes a knowing man, and in this sense Plato takes it sometimes, and particularly when he speaks of Anacreon. This is what a very good Critic has observed (37). In the same manner this word ought to be understood, if Plato had made use of it in praising Sappho. Let us conclude with these words of a commentator upon Tanaquillus Faber (38): 'It is very well known why Horace and Aufonius called her *mascula*, not for her courage, but in the same sense as γυνή ἀνδρική in Lucian, where an impudent woman explains herself, saying, ἡ ἐπιθυμία ἀνδρῶν ἐστὶ μοι, and τὸ αὐτὸ ἀνὴρ εἰμι. . . . I have the inclinations of a man, and am thoroughly masculine.'

[F] Phaon forced her, by his coldness, to throw herself headlong from a rock.] Mrs le Fevre says that Sappho could not forbear following Phaon into Sicily, whither

(31) Tale monstrum libidinis &c. Sappho cruciata, unde mascula est appellata ab Horatio in Epistola. . . . Sappho is said to have invented such a prodigy of love, from whence she was called Mascula by Horace in his Epistles. See Vianus upon Aufonius Cupid. crucif. ver. 25.

(32) In Aufon. Cupid. crucif. & in Virgil. Cirin.

(33) Advert. lib. x, cap. ii. Cupid. crucif.

(35) Thevet, Eloges des Savans Hommes, Tom. i, pag. 226.

(36) Id. ibid. pag. 227.

(37) See Mr le Clerc in the first volume of his Arts Critica, pag. 194, 195.

(38) Reland, Remarques sur les Vies des Poëtes Grecs, folio G 4.

(7) Soidas, in
Σαπφά.

was [G]! She had been long before the widow of one of the richest men of the isle of Andros, called Cercala, by whom she had a daughter called Cleïs (i). So the mother of Sappho was called. I do not know her father's name, for we have eight to chose upon (k), there being just so many different fathers assigned to her by authors (l). She had three brothers, one of whom, called Charaxus, sold Lesbian wine in Egypt (m), and fell in love there with a famous courtesan, by some, called Rhodope; but Sappho calls her Doricha. She was very angry with her brother for this shameful engagement

(8) Id. ibid.

(l) See the remark [K], in the article ANA- CREON.

(m) Strabo, lib. xvi, pag. 556. Athen. lib. xiii, pag. 596.

whither he retired that he might not see her; and that during her stay in that island, she made the finest verses in the world; and that it is very probable she made there the hymn to Venus, that is still extant, in which she begs so ardently the assistance of that goddess. Her prayers proved ineffectual; the sweet and tender verses she composed so often on this subject (39) were to no purpose: Phaon was cruel to the last degree. The unfortunate Sappho was forced to take a dangerous leap; for so I may justly call the remedy to which she had recourse, which was to go upon the promontory Leucas, and throw herself into the sea. It was looked on in those days as the true means to cure the pains of love, and for this reason that place was called the *Lovers' Leap*. Some say (40) that Sappho was the first that made a trial of this way of curing love: others say, she was the first woman that did it; but that, before her time, some men had done it (41). Several Poets have spoke of this despair of Sappho: one of them (42) having exhausted all the counsels he could give to an unfortunate lover, and at last referring him to the great remedy of all evils, makes use of this expression.

Quod tibi fuaserunt Phædra & Elissa dabant,
Quod Canace, Phyllis, & fœdita Phaoni.

What Phædra and the Tyrian queen advis'd,
And she whom Phaon cruelly deserv'd;
What Canace and Phyllis did approve
As the best remedy for hopeless love,
That may you chuse, by their example taught.

See here what Statius says;

Stefichorusque ferox, saltusque ingressa viriles
Non formidata temeraria Leucade Sappho (43).

And fierce Stefichorus with Sappho join'd,
Who, when she took her manly leap of old,
With rash, unshrinking courage did behold
Leucade's dreadful precipice. . . .

Pliny tells us a story about the cause of Sappho's love for Phaon. It was said that the occult qualities of a certain herb had excited that passion. Here are the words of Pliny, *Ex his*: he speaks of the different sorts of *eryngo*, or hundred-headed thistle, *candidam nostri centum capita vocant Portentosum est, quod de ea traditur: Radicem ejus alterutrinus fixus similitudinem referre, raram inventu: sed si viris contigerit mas, amabiles fieri. Ob hoc & Phaemon Lesbium dilectum à Sappho. Multa circa hoc non Mago- rum solum vanitates, sed etiam Pythagoricorum (44). That is to say, according to the version of du Pinet, the Latins call the white *eryngo* Centum capita . . . and certainly it is a wonderful thing, if what they say of this root be true. For there are some that say, that the root of white *eryngo* (which is very rare) resembles the parts of a man or a woman: and it is held, that if a man meets with one that represents the parts of man, he shall be beloved by women: and it is thought, this made Sappho in love with Phaon. And indeed, not only the Magicians, but also the Pythagoreans, tell strange wonders of this root. These are idle stories. Sappho was so well tempered for love that she needed no occult qualities of roots to enflame her.*

[G] How cruel he was! The cruelty of Phaon will not surprise us so much, if we reflect that Sappho was only a widow upon the decline, who had never been handsome, who was ill spoken of in her widowhood, and who kept no measure in shewing the violence of her passion. A man that is never so little nice, does not care for such unbecoming addresses, and draws ill conjectures from them. Add to this, that

Sappho had not the endearment of novelty, which often, even with nice people, makes amends for the defect of beauty and the flower of youth. Phaon knew all she was capable of; the trees and the grass had been her confidants; and perhaps his flight proceeded more from being spent than from indifference. Consider what she herself writes to him by the pen of Ovid.

Hæc quoque laudabas, omnique à parte placebam,
Sed tum præcipue cum sit amoris opus,
Tunc te plus solito lascivia nostra juvabat,
Crebraque mobilitas, aptaque verba joco:
Quique, ubi jam amborum fuerat confusa voluptas,
Plurimus in lassio corpore languor erat.

Invenio silvam quæ sæpe cubilia nobis
Præbuit, & multa texit opaca coma.
Agnovi pressas noti mihi cespitis herbas;
De nostro curvum pondere gramen erat.
Incubui tetigique locum qua parte fuisti.

In all I pleas'd, but most in what was best;
And the last joy was dearer than the rest.
Then with each word, each glance, each motion fir'd,
You still enjoy'd, and yet you still desir'd,
Till all dissolving in the trance we lay,
And in tumultuous raptures dy'd away.

I find the shades that did our joys conceal,
Not him that made me love those shades so well.
Here the press'd herbs with bending tops betray,
Where oft entwinn'd in am'rous folds we lay;
I kiss that earth which oft was press'd by you.

POPE.

She was not then so capable of hearkening to reason, as when she represented to a young man, who courted her for marriage, that being older than him, she would not marry him (45). The younger Phaon had been, the more she would have found her account in him. If I have said that she was not handsome, it was because I thought we should prefer to the authority of Plato, who calls her the beautiful Sappho (46), the authority of Ovid, who makes her speak thus:

Si mihi difficilis formam natura negavit,
Ingenio formæ damna rependo mez.
Sed brevis. At nomen quod terras impleat omnes
Est mihi: mensuram nominis ipsa fero.
Candida si non sum: placuit Cepheia Perseo.

To me what nature has in charms deny'd,
I well by wit's more lasting charms supply'd.
Tho' short by stature, yet my name extends
To Heav'n itself, and Earth's remotest ends.
Brown as I am, an Ethiopian dame
Inspir'd young Perseus with a gen'rous flame.

POPE.

Mrs le Fevre had set me an example for not giving credit to Plato or Athæneus; for she says that Sappho was not beautiful, that she was neither tall, nor little, that she had a very brown complexion, and very lively and sparkling eyes. What shall I say of Maximus Tyrius (47), who pretends that as she was black and little, Socrates (48) called her beautiful, only by reason of the beauty of her verses.

[H] She

(45) In a fragment of a letter quoted by Mrs le Fevre.

(46) In Phædra, pag. m. 1214. Athenæus calls her also the beautiful Sappho, lib. xiii, p. 196, and so does Plutarch de Amore, pag. 763, and Julian the Apostate, Epist. ad Alypium Cæsar.

(47) Orat. VIII, pag. m. 36.

(48) Id est Plato, ubi supra.

ment [H]. It is said that the Mitylenians did her the honour after her death to stamp their money with her image [I]. Some authors make mention of another Sappho [K].

(*) See the remark [K] towards the end.

Mr Moreri found one in Martial, only through an extreme inadvertency (n). We read in Aristotle the proof Sappho made use of to shew that death is an evil. The gods, said she (o), have judged it so, for otherwise they would die. There was in the Prytaneum of Syracuse, a most beautiful statue of Sappho: see what Cicero says of it, when he reproaches Verres with stealing it (p). It was the work of Silanion, and probably the same that Tatian speaks of in reproaching the Gentiles with the honour they paid to dishonest women. See citation (59).

(o) Ἡ ὡς περ Σαπφὸς ἔειπε τὸ ἀποθνήσκειν κακόν· οἱ θεοὶ γὰρ οὕτω νεκροῦσθαι ἀπὸ θανάτου γὰρ ἄν. Aut quemadmodum Sappho, mori malum esse, Dii enim sic judicaverunt: alioqui mortui essent. *Aristot. Rhetor. lib. ii, cap. xiii, pag. m. 445. B.*

[H] She was very angry with her brother for this shameful engagement. See how Ovid tells us this particular.

Arist inops frater victus meretricis amore,
Mistaque cum turpi damna pudore tulit.
Factus inops agili peragit freta cerula remo,
Quasque male amisti, nunc male querit opes.
Me quoque, quod monui bene multa fideliter, odit;
Hoc mihi libertas, hoc pia lingua dedit.

My brother next, neglecting wealth and fame,
Ignobly burn'd in a destructive flame.

P O E T.

I leave you to judge what reprisals he might have made, and what weight the remonstrances of such a sister could have. Athenæus observes that the invectives against the courtesan of Naucratis, were grounded upon the excessive fums she extorted from her lovers. Ἦν ἡ καλὴ Σαπφὸς ἐρωμένην Χαράξην τὴν ἀπαιεμένην, διὰ τῆς ποιήσεως διαβάλλει ὡς πολλὰ τὴν Χαράξην νοσοῖσάμεν. *Quam pulchra Sappho Charaxi fratri suo mercaturæ gratia Naucratis profecto nave dilectam versibus suis profecit, quod multa illam pecunia emunxisset* (49). Herodotus calls that courtesan Rhodopis, and says that Charaxus, who had spent a great sum to redeem her, was ill treated by the invectives of his sister Sappho (50).

(49) Athen. lib. xiii, cap. viii, pag. 596.

(50) Herodot. lib. ii, cap. cxxxv.

(51) Ex lib. i, pag. 23.

(52) Lambin. in Horat. Od. XVII, lib. i.

[I] They say that the Mitylenians stamped their money with her image. I shall observe on this occasion, that Lambinus, for want of understanding a passage of Pausanias (51), says falsely, That there was in the citadel of Athens a statue of Sappho. *Anacreontis Teii, statua in arce Atheniensium prima post Sapphonem locata est.* Here is the Greek. Τὸ δὲ τὸ Σανδρίππυ ἀνακρεὼν ἐκπνεύει Ἀνακρεὼν ὁ Τῆος, πρῶτος μετὰ Σαπφὸν τὴν Λεσβίαν τὰ πολλὰ ἂν ἐγχεύεν ἐρωτικὰ ποιήσας. It is evident that these Greek words mean nothing else, but that the statue of Anacreon was put near that of Xanthippus; the statue, I say, of Anacreon, who is the first after Sappho, who consecrated to matters of love the greatest part of the things he writ.

(53) Thevet, Elog. des savans Hommes, Tom. i, pag. 223, Edit. 1671, in 12mo.

(54) Le Fevre, Vie des Poët. Græcs, p. m. 23.

(55) See the Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres. Od. 1700, pag. 461.

(56) Thevet, ubi supra, p. 224.

(57) Aristot. Rhetor. lib. ii, cap. xiii, pag. 445. Mr Reland in his remarks upon Mr Le Fevre, quotes the words of Aristotle.

I should be glad to know whether Thevet is mistaken or not, when he assures us, That the Romans erected in memory of Sappho a statue of Porphyry richly wrought (53). It is Tanaquillus Faber, who has observed, that the Mitylenians stamped their money with the image of this heroine, and by this treated her like a queen when she was dead (54). He cites no body for it; but Mr Reland, who has made notes upon this work of Tanaquillus Faber (55), quotes this passage of Julius Pollux, οἱ μυτιληναῖοι μὲν Σαπφὸν τῷ νομισματι ἐνεχέοντο, and observes that there are still in being some medals of Sappho, which bear the name of the Mitylenians, ΜΤΙΛΙΝΑΙΩΝ. Thevet says, that he has taken the picture of Sappho from an ancient medal, which he brought from the isle of Lesbos, and that one like that, was given with several others, to the Baron de la Garde, then the French ambassador at Constantinople, by the first Physician of Sultan Soliman (56). Aristotle observes that the Mitylenians had paid honours to Sappho, but he does not tell us in what those honours consisted (57). Tatian reproaches the Greeks with the statue of the courtesan Sappho, made by Silanion; of that courtesan, says he,

who sung her own incontinency, and was amorous, even to madness (58). Καὶ ἡ μὲν Σαπφὸς γυναικὸν πορνικὸν ἐρωτομανὲς καὶ τὴν αὐτῆς ἀσελγείαν ἔδειξε. Et quidem Sappho meretricia muliercula infans amoris capta suam ipsa lasciviam cantat (59). Pliny speaks of a Painter called Leo, who had drawn the picture of Sappho (60).

[K] Some authors make mention of another Sappho. Mr Moreri says there are some, who mention a second maid of this name of Erythræ, who made verses, and that this is the opinion of Athenæus, lib. 13. Athenæus does not say that this other Sappho was a Poetess, or that she was born at Erythræ: he says that she was of Erethus (61), by profession a courtesan, and that she fell in love with Phaon. According to this opinion the great Sappho, the Sappho of Mitylene, who made such excellent Poems, might, without much trouble, be restored to a good reputation; there would be nothing else to do but to transport her bad fame upon the other Sappho. The worst is, that a lame passage of Athenæus, seconded as much as you please by the evidence of Ælian (62), is not to serve us for a guide preferably to a thousand authorities that are against it. Mr Lloyd, and Mr Hoffman advise us to distinguish well between the two Sappho's, the one of Eretria, and the other beloved by Phaon, as we see, say they, in Athenæus lib. 13. This is copied out of Vossius (63), and is not the more true for all that; for Athenæus only speaks there of one Sappho a native of Erethus, who was desperately in love with Phaon: whether their love was mutual or no, he does not say. Suidas might occasion a doubt, were it not probable that he has divided what ought to remain united. He speaks of two Sappho's: what he says of the first, beyond all doubt belongs to her that excelled in Lyric poetry: what he says of the second, viz. that she was of Mitylene in the isle of Lesbos, that she threw herself from Leucate into the sea for the love of Phaon, that she played on instruments, and was famous for Lyric Poetry, certainly agrees no less with the first. I therefore see no reason of any weight for admitting two women of that name, especially if we must distinguish the one from the other, by the qualities which Suidas and Charles Stephens attribute to them.

Here is a very absurd fault. (64) Canius, a Latin Poet, a native of Cadix (65), and a friend of Martial . . . married two wives, Theophila a learned woman, but a little too free, and Sappho, not so well learned, but more reserved. . . . Martial mentions what I write, lib. 3. epig. 63. & lib. 7. epist. 68.

Castior hæc & non doctior illa fuit, &c.

This is what we read in Moreri's Dictionary. But if we consult Martial, we find (66) that he only mentions one wife of Canius, and says she was called Theophila; that she was learned and made verses which Sappho might praise; that the latter was not more learned than Theophila, but that Theophila was more chaste than Sappho. The verse which Moreri quotes is the last of the epigram. He should not therefore have added an *Elcatera*. This is but a trifle in comparison of his blunder in giving to Canius a wife called Sappho, less learned, but more modest than Theophila. I say nothing of two other faults which are in the article Canius of Moreri's Dictionary. He quotes the 19th epig. of the third book of Martial, instead of the 20th, and *emulator* is put instead of *emulatur*.

(p) Cicero in Verrem, Orat. VI, fol. m. 78.

(58) Tatian. Orat. contra Græcos, pag. m. 168, B.

(59) Id. ibid.

(60) Plin. lib. xxxv, cap. xi, pag. m. 235.

(61) A town in the isle of Lesbos.

(62) Ælian. lib. xii, cap. xix. Var. Hist.

(63) Vossius, de Poët. Græc. pag. 17.

(64) Moreri, at the word Canius.

(65) This appears from the LXIII epigram of the first book of Martial, not quoted by Moreri.

(66) Mart. Epigramm. LXVIII, lib. vii.

S A R A H, sister and wife of Abraham [A], was his faithful companion in all his travels. She was already married to him, when they retired from Ur of the Chaldees to go to Haran (a). The barrenness, with which she was afflicted in her own country, did not leave her in foreign countries; and this made her take the resolution of giving her husband a substitute, that she might become a mother in the person of that substitute, since she could not be one in her own person. Hagar, her servant, whom she chose for this employ, was quickly with child and paid her with ingratitude (b). She despised Sarah; but Sarah not being able to bear this insolence, made such use of the full power her husband gave her over Hagar, that she forced her in a little time to fly out of the house. One may see in another place (c) the return of this ungrateful servant and the extremities she was reduced to, when she was turned out a second time. We shall not repeat it. It is better to say that at last by a particular blessing of God, Sarah proved with

(a) Genesis xi. 29, 31.

(b) Genesis xvi.

(c) In the article of AGAR.

[A] *Sister and wife of Abraham.* That is to clear from the XXth chapter of Genesis, that were it not for the ill habit contracted by some, of sacrificing the natural sense of the words of Scripture to the least difficulties that arise, there could not be two different opinions about the matter. Let us take right the circumstances of the fact. Abraham being come into the country of the Philistines, made Sarah pass there for his sister. Whereupon Abimelech taking her to be a maid, or a widow, so that nothing could hinder him from making her one of his wives, caused her to be brought to him. But knowing by revelation that she was Abraham's wife, he restored her, complaining of their lies, which had exposed him to great mischief. I say, *their lies*; for, on the one side, Abraham had said of his wife, *she is my sister*; and Sarah had said of her husband, *he is my brother*. Abraham excused himself, in the first place, on account of the fear he was in for his life, if he had said she is my wife; in the second place, because she was *truly* his sister, *the daughter of my father*, said he (1), *though she is not the daughter of my mother*. After this, he endeavoured to justify his wife by saying, that he had asked of her as a favour, that wheresoever they came she should declare that he was her brother. I admire that they do not see in this discourse, that Sarah was Abraham's sister, not by the mother's side, but by the father's side. These are my reasons.

(1) Genesis xx. 12.

I. In the first place, if Sarah had not been the sister of Abraham in this manner, the apology of her husband would only have still more deceived the good prince, who upbraided him with his former dissimulation; for if the Patriarch's excuses found credit, it was impossible to take Sarah for any other than the true and real sister of Abraham by the father's side, nor could any man living gather from such discourse that she was only his niece. I leave all knowing people to judge whether Abimelech could form any other ideas from Abraham's apology. But then I require that they be capable of placing themselves in the exact situation, and in all the circumstances of this adventure. It is to no purpose to suppose that Sarah was the daughter of Haran, and consequently the grand-child of the father of Abraham; and to add, that a nephew is sometimes called brother (2), and that a grand-son is sometimes called son; that, I say, is to no purpose in this affair, for the circumstances required that Abraham should use the words in the most proper signification; for if he had not, he must have passed for a man who designed to impose upon Abimelech.

(2) Lot, Abraham's nephew, is called his brother, Genesis xiv. 16: but this example is of no use to those who suppose that Sarah was Lot's sister; for upon this supposition Lot would be called brother, as being a brother-in-law, rather than as being a nephew.

II. Besides to what purpose should he make use of this distinction, *Daughter of my father, daughter of my mother*, if he meant only that he was the uncle of Sarah? put the case that he might have called sister, her that was only his niece; to what purpose should he say that his mother was not the grand-mother of this niece? It is, will some say, to represent ingeniously the degree of his kindred in respect of Sarah. But why did he use the word *daughter* in an ambiguous signification? Why does he not use it in its right sense, as I suppose he did. Besides, the ingenuity spoken of would have been very unreasonable; it would have weakened the apology of the Patriarch; for it would make the bonds of kindred appear less strong. If it be objected, that in my supposition that same ingenuity weakens the apology more then it strengthens it; I will give a reason why Abraham declared that Sarah was not his sister by the mother's side. They made a difference between the marriage of a man with his sister both by the father's and mother's

side, and the marriage of a man with his half sister. The Athenians who permitted the marrying of the sister by the father's side, forbade the marrying of the sister by the mother's (3). Solon decided it so. On the contrary, Lycurgus permitted the Lacedemonians to marry the sister by the mother, and not by the father (4). Some have said, that as the community of blood is more certain between a brother and a sister by the mother, than between a brother and a sister by the father; the permission of Solon was, generally speaking, less odious (5) than the permission of Lycurgus. Will any one pretend, after this, that, on my supposition, Abraham would have said without any necessity, that his wife was not his sister by the mother's side; as by the contrary supposition it would have been to no purpose to say, that his mother was not the grand-mother of Sarah?

(3) See the proof of it aoud Murtum, lib. xvi. c. w, Variar. Lect. & apud Gebhardum in Corn. Nepotem Vit. Cimonis. Consult the article C1-MON remark [D].

(4) See the same authors.

(5) Filia patris (foror, non uterina) jure continentur Noachidi, quoniam inter gentes ratio consanguinitatis paternæ non habebatur. Tarchius, apud Hieronymum, Hyst. Patriarch. Tom. ii, pag. 78.

III. Add to this, that if Abraham meant nothing else but that his father Terah was the grand-father of Sarah, he took the terms of father and sister in a large and less proper signification. Why therefore did he declare that his mother was not the mother of Sarah. Was she not so, in the sense that he took the word *father* in relation to Terah; that is to say, was she not the grand-mother of Sarah, just as Terah was her grand-father? Some think to clear the difficulty by supposing that Haran was the father of Sarah, and that he was not the brother of Abraham by the mother: they assign therefore two wives to Terah, and they suppose he had Haran by the one and Abraham by the other. Consequently if Sarah was the daughter of Haran, her grand-father was the father of Abraham; but her grand-mother was different from the mother of Abraham. I answer, all this falls to the ground as soon as it is supposed that this Patriarch made use of the words *sister* and *daughter* in a large signification; for upon this foot it is certain, that the mother of Abraham is grand-mother to the children of Haran, whether she bore Haran, or whether she was only the wife of him who begat him. As soon as you leave the proper and strict signification of the words which denote the kindred, and follow the custom observed in families, the word *mother* agrees to the wives in relation to all the children of their husbands, and by consequence that of grand-mother, with respect to all the children of all the children of their husbands: so that if Abraham had taken the terms in the large signification, which the title of friendship or civility has introduced into families, he could not have denied, as he did, that his mother was the grand-mother of Sarah. Some with they could say that he took the same words sometimes in a proper, and sometimes in an improper signification. But would not this be to suppose that he acted the Sophist, and imposed upon the honesty of Abimelech?

IV. My fourth reason is taken from thence, *viz.* that it cannot be supposed upon any good grounds that Sarah was adopted by Terah. If it were so, Abraham might have made use of his distinction without departing from exactness of speaking; for in that case his father might have been called the father of Sarah in a signification proper enough. But see here what ruins this evasion: they have recourse to it only to avoid the imputation of incest, and they do not avoid it by that; for a fraternity or brotherhood, founded upon adoption, properly so called, was no less an obstacle to marriage than a natural fraternity. According to the laws, a brother who should marry, his adopted sister, committed incest, properly so called. Inter fratrem fororemque nuptias esse prohibitas.

N

(d) Moret says
fully 137.

with child being ninety years old, and was brought to bed of a son called Isaac. She lived 127 years (d). We ought not to forget that she was very beautiful, and that her beauty and the complaisance she had for her husband, not to call herself his wife but his sister, exposed her to the danger of two rapes [B], whereby her chastity had suffered shipwreck,

(6) Justinian.
lib. i. Instit.
See the text of
the article
OCTAVIA.

bitas five eodem utroque parente, five altero tantum nati sunt: verum si per adoptionem foror facta sit: quandiu manet adoptio, etiam nuptias prohiberi: at si per emancipationem adoptio dissoluta sit, posse inter eos ritè iniri connubium (6). --- Marriage is prohibited between a sister and brother, whether they have both parents or only one in common: if the woman be a sister by adoption, so long as that adoption continues, marriage is likewise prohibited: but if the adoption should happen to be dissolved, then they may lawfully marry.

V. From hence I draw one of my chief reasons. If any thing should determine us not to take in a literal sense the precise declaration of Abraham, that Sarah is truly his sister, daughter of his father, but not of his mother, it would be the incestuous marriage that results from this fraternity. But does not that very thing refute those, who say that Sarah was Abraham's niece (7)? Is it not agreed upon that this degree of kindred renders marriages incestuous? Our adversaries therefore must seek out excuses for the incest of Abraham. If they can find any, it will be as well for us, as for them; the differences being only less or more, it will not be hard for us to give their reasons the extent that will be needful for us; especially considering that Jacob made no scruple to be married at the same time to two sisters, which in other times would have been an abominable thing. Clemens Alexandrinus looks upon this to be so small a difficulty, that he tells us very coldly, that the words of the Patriarch teach us, that men must not marry a sister by the mother's side. Τὰς ἑπομένους μὴ δὲ τὴν ἀγνοῦσαι πρὸς γάμον δὲ δὲ ἀκούειν. Docens eas quæ ex eadem matre nate sunt non esse ducendas uxores (8). It is certain that head; I shall not mention them; you may easily find them in other books. I shall only tell those, who would accuse me of undervaluing the conscience of Abraham with respect to the crime of incest; that before they come at me, they must overthrow and defeat a great many ancient and modern Divines, both Catholics and Protestants (9). I set no great value upon what is found in the Annals of Eutychius (10), that the first wife of Terah, mother of Abraham, was called Jona, and that his second wife, mother of Sarah, was called Teheviha; however it is a sign, that there is an ancient tradition for the opinion I have followed.

(8) Clem. Alexandr. Stromat. lib. ii, pag. 421.

(9) Clemens Alexandrinus, St. Jerom, Lipomannus, Olearius, Cajetanus, Sotus, Petavius, Codmannus, Father Abram, Musculus, Piffator, Heidegger, &c.

(10) Pag. 66, apud Heidegger, pag. 78.

(11) Chap. xi, var. 29.

VI. Here is another reason. If Sarah was not the daughter of Terah, but his grand-daughter, she must be the daughter of Haran, or of Nachor. But she was married. I prove it thus. We find in Genesis (11), that the wife of Nachor was called Milca, and that she was the daughter of Haran, father of Milca and Jisca. Since the latter is named without there being the same reason for doing it as there was for naming the other, (for no husband is assigned to her as to the other) it is probable that if Haran had had other daughters, they would have been named at the same time, and above all, Sarah would not have been forgotten, since mention had been made just before of her marriage with Abraham. We may then safely conclude that Haran had only two daughters, Milca and Jisca. This reason is so convincing, that it obliges several of our adversaries to suppose that Sarah and Jisca are the same person. They do no great honour to the sacred Historian. What an admirable writer would he be, if in three lines he should give two different names to a woman, without telling us that they are only two names of the self-same person? See in the XXIIId chapter of Genesis, the list of the children of Nachor: you will not find Sarah there, and you will see that his first-born came into the world after Abraham went out of his country; for it was at his return from mount Morija; where Abraham would have sacrificed his son Isaac, that he heard that Milca had brought forty eight children to her husband Nachor, viz. Huts, her first-born, &c. Besides, were it possible, that if Sarah had been the daughter of Haran, the

Scripture should never have mentioned Lot as her brother?

VII. It is easy to answer those who object the words of the Scripture (12), where Sarah is called the daughter-in-law of Terah; for a married woman is considered rather by the relations of her marriage, than by those of her birth.

[B] To the danger of two rapes.] They resemble one another as much as two drops of water. In both one another as much as two drops of water. In both of them Abraham concealed his being Sarah's husband; and bid her say he was her brother; and he did it because he was afraid they would kill him, if they knew he was her husband, and to the end that they might be kind to him for her sake, if they believed that she was not his wife. In both of them the ravishers were punished from above, before they could satisfy their lust, restored Sarah, gave large presents to her husband, and reproached him with his lies. The first rape happened in Egypt by king Pharaoh; the second in Guerar by Abimelech, king of the Philistines. Sarah was at least sixty-five years old when Pharaoh took her away, and ninety when she was ravished by Abimelech; for she was ten years younger than her husband (13), and their voyage into Egypt was after their going out of Charan, that is to say, after the seventy-fifth year of Abraham (14). As for the journey to Gerar, it was after the foretelling of the birth of Isaac, that is to say, when Abraham was a hundred years old. Say what you will, this history is a proof that Abraham feared death more than any conjugal dishonour, and that he was far from being a jealous husband. He leaves to the paternal care of Providence the honour and chastity of Sarah; but he is beforehand for the preservation of his life, and neglects no human means. Not to acknowledge therein the infirmity of corrupt nature is to be voluntarily blind. That patriarch might have said on this occasion, Homo sum, humani nihil à me alienum puto. (15) - - - I am a man, and therefore think myself liable to any thing which may happen to men.

Those who believe that the fear of danger made him reason ill, are mistaken; there is no fear of GOD in this country, said he (16), and they will kill me because of my wife. He believed therefore that those, who would make no scruple to kill a man, would make some to take away a married woman. Yes, he believed it, and not without reason. The good of society, without doubt, more than the love of virtue, made the rape of a married woman to be looked on as an enormous injustice, the ill consequences of which sovereigns themselves dreaded; but it was not looked upon as so great a matter, if a great lord took away a woman that was not married, in order to increase the number of his concubines. Therefore Abraham reasoning solidly, might be sure, that at least the fear of men would hinder the Egyptians and the Philistines from taking away his wife, suffering him to live at the same time, because he would be a perpetual witness of the violence done to a married woman. The reasonable conclusion of this was to be afraid, lest they should privately dispatch him, that they might keep Sarah, and yet not be reproached with taking away a married woman, for the public would have had no knowledge of that husband, if he had been quickly dispatched. This fear is not the worst passage of this history. Who does not know the underhand dealings of David, in order to destroy the husband of his mistress. The desire of being well treated, as being the brother of the beautiful Sarah, is more blameable than the fear of being killed. However we ought to abhor the brutality of Fauftus the Manichee (17), and content ourselves with what St Jerom says of the matter (18). St Chrysostom (19), and St Ambrose have found here matter for a Panegyric on the charity of Sarah, who was willing, in favour of her husband, to expose her chastity to the greatest dangers. 'Extrema adit, fororem se ejus asseruit, contenta, si ita esset necesse, periclitari pudore potius quam virum salute: ut tueretur maritum mentita est germanitatem, ne in-

(13) It is said
Genesis xvii. 17.
that she was
ninety years of
age when Abra-
ham was a hun-
dred years old.

(14) Genesis xi.
Heutont. A9.
I, Scene 1, pag.
m. 112.

(15) Terent in
Heutont. A9.
I, Scene 1, pag.
m. 112.

(16) Genesis xi.
Heutont. A9.
I, Scene 1, pag.
m. 112.

(17) He accused
Abraham, Quid
matrimonium suum
infamissimum
nundinator avaritiae
causa duobus regi-
bus Abimelech &
Pharaoni diversis
temporibus, Saram
conjugem forem
mentitus, quod
erat pulcherrima,
in concubitum
vendidit. ---
For that, like an
infamous vender
of his marriage
rights, he had at
different times, to
gratify his avarice,
and glutting
sold his wife Sa-
rah to the em-
braces of two
kings, Pharaoh
and Abimelch,
falsely putting her
off for his sister,
because she was
extremely hand-
some. Vide Au-
gustinum contra
Faustum, lib. xxii,
cap. xxxiii.

(18) He calls it
studium necessi-
tatem. - - - A just
dilectus necessi-
tatem.

(19) Homil.
xxxii, in Genes.
See the remark
[A] in the arti-
cle ABIME-
LECH.

(20) Homil.
xxxii, in Genes.
See the remark
[A] in the arti-
cle ABIME-
LECH.

(21) Homil.
xxxii, in Genes.
See the remark
[A] in the arti-
cle ABIME-
LECH.

(22) Homil.
xxxii, in Genes.
See the remark
[A] in the arti-
cle ABIME-
LECH.

(23) Homil.
xxxii, in Genes.
See the remark
[A] in the arti-
cle ABIME-
LECH.

(24) Homil.
xxxii, in Genes.
See the remark
[A] in the arti-
cle ABIME-
LECH.

(25) Homil.
xxxii, in Genes.
See the remark
[A] in the arti-
cle ABIME-
LECH.

(26) Homil.
xxxii, in Genes.
See the remark
[A] in the arti-
cle ABIME-
LECH.

(27) Homil.
xxxii, in Genes.
See the remark
[A] in the arti-
cle ABIME-
LECH.

(28) Homil.
xxxii, in Genes.
See the remark
[A] in the arti-
cle ABIME-
LECH.

(29) Homil.
xxxii, in Genes.
See the remark
[A] in the arti-
cle ABIME-
LECH.

(30) Homil.
xxxii, in Genes.
See the remark
[A] in the arti-
cle ABIME-
LECH.

(31) Homil.
xxxii, in Genes.
See the remark
[A] in the arti-
cle ABIME-
LECH.

(32) Homil.
xxxii, in Genes.
See the remark
[A] in the arti-
cle ABIME-
LECH.

(33) Homil.
xxxii, in Genes.
See the remark
[A] in the arti-
cle ABIME-
LECH.

(34) Homil.
xxxii, in Genes.
See the remark
[A] in the arti-
cle ABIME-
LECH.

(35) Homil.
xxxii, in Genes.
See the remark
[A] in the arti-
cle ABIME-
LECH.

shipwreck, if God had not prevented it [C]. A singular providence saved her in this danger, and restored her to her husband, with her honour safe and sound, besides the favours that were heaped upon him by the two princes who fell in love with her. This might sweeten the sad experience he had of the inconveniences which they find, who carry about with them a beautiful wife, which are sometimes greater, than if they travelled with an ugly one. One cannot easily clear Abraham [D] and Sarah in this matter, nor about the business of Hagar; therefore they are in the wrong who are so angry with Calvin, for reproving them on this subject (e). We ought to keep at an equal distance from the irreverence of Faustus the Manichee (f), and from the superstitious

(e) See Rivet, in Exercit. lxxvii, Tom. i, Oper. pag. 333. Heidegg. Hist. Patr. Rom. ii, pag. 151, and the remark [1] of this article.

(f) See remark [B], citat. (17).

(20) Abrof. de Abrah. cap. ii.

'fidiatores pudoris ejus tanquam æmulum & vindicem uxoris necarent (20). - - She exposed herself to the greatest dangers, and affirmed that she was his sister, chusing rather to hazard her own chastity than the life of her husband: to save him, she falsely called herself his sister, for fear that her lovers should put him to death, as their rival, and his wife's defender.' Origen was of another opinion; he found such a scandal in the literal sense, that he had recourse to types and allegories. 'Alioquin, says he (21), quæ nobis edificatio erit legentibus Abraham tantum Patriarcham non solum mentitum esse Regi, sed pudicitiam conjugis prodidisse? Quid nos edificat tanti Patriarchæ uxor, si putetur contaminationibus exposita per convenientiam maritalem? Hæc Judæi putent & si qui sint amici literæ non spiritus. - - Otherwise what edification shall we have in reading that so great a Patriarch as Abraham was, not only told a lie to the king, but also betrayed the chastity of his wife? Or how shall the wife of so great a patriarch edify us, if we suppose that she was prostituted by the connivance of her husband? Let the Jews imagine these things, and such who are friends to the letter, and not to the spirit.' Others have recourse to inspiration, and pretend that Abraham was directed by a prophetic spirit (22). This is the way never to be silent. This remedy ought to be better managed, and never to be used but as extremum unctio. Some (23) apply it to Sarah as to her desiring her husband to lie with her servant maid. As for those who say (24), to excuse Abraham, that his life was so necessary for the accomplishment of the divine promise, that he was obliged to preserve it at any rate, even at the expence of his wife's honour, they confute themselves: they alledge for his justification, what is against him; for if his life was necessary for the fulfilling of the divine decrees, he might have been assured that no body could kill him.

(21) In cap. vii. Genesios. Heidegger. pag. 149, pretends that Origen insulted and censured Abraham, quod per convenientiam maritalem Saram contaminationibus exposuerit. But how could he reproach him with it, since he rejects the literal sense?

(22) Paulus Burgensis, apud Heidegger. pag. 149.

(23) Joseph. Antiq. lib. i, cap. x.

(24) Apud Heidegger. ubi supra.

The loose Casuists and protectors of equivocations, take a great advantage of this conduct of the Patriarch. See the last answer to the *Lettres Provinciales*, that is, the *Entretiens de Cleandre & d'Eudoxe* (25).

(25) Pag. 128, & seq. of the Dutch Edit. 1696.

(26) Genes. xii. 17.

(27) Genes. xx.

[C] Her chastity had suffered shipwreck, if God had not prevented it.] The Scripture does not tell us what distemper it was that hindered Pharaoh from lying with Sarah; it says only that God struck him with great plagues, and all his house (26). As to Abimelech, the Scripture says, that God threatened him, in a dream, to kill him with all his family (27); but at the end of the chapter, it says, that at Abraham's prayer God cured Abimelech, his wife, and his servant-maids, and that afterwards they had children; for, adds the Scripture, *The Lord had entirely shut up the wombs of the house of Abimelech, because of Sarah the wife of Abraham.* I believe one might sooner have killed the interpreters, than hindered them from making conjectures upon those plagues of Pharaoh: the field is more large, in this respect, than in relation to Abimelech; for the Scripture seems to denote a sort of distemper, with respect to the latter. But they, probably, have judged of the one by the other, and, as it is likely, that the personal chastisement of Abimelech fell upon the parts designed for generation, since his wife and maid-servants were afflicted in those parts, it is believed that it was so likewise with Pharaoh (28). The Rabbinists say (29), he was tormented with so violent a gonorrhœa, that he had no pleasure to think of women, so far was he from being able to lie with them. They add, that Sarah had a guardian angel, who struck in such a manner all those who would have him strike, that they had neither the desire nor the power to come near her; and that it was by means of that angel that the preserved herself from the lascivious pursuits of Pharaoh. Philo (30) says only, that this prince endured insupportable pain and vexation,

(28) See Pterorius in Genes. cap. xii, ver. 17.

(29) Apud Lyrannum, citante Salliano, pag. 413.

(30) In Libr. de Abrah.

and was so far from thinking of the pleasures of love, that he only thought of his distemper, and the means how to get rid of it. His whole court was visited with the same scourge, because they had assisted or applauded him in the rape of Sarah. Eupolemon (31) says, that the plague got into the house of Pharaoh, and that Sooth-sayers having answered, it was for the rape of a woman, he restored her without touching her. Josephus (32) adds seditions to the plague. A modern author (33), who bears him an ill will, criticises him pretty smartly on this head. The reason he goes upon is, That a popular sedition does not hinder a prince from diverting himself with a woman, and that neither it, nor the plague has any particular relation with the sin of Pharaoh. This author therefore would have it, that he was afflicted in those parts that should have been the instruments of his debauchery, and he confirms his thought by the maxim of the wise man (34), *Per quæ peccat quis per eadem & torquetur.* - - By what a man commits a sin, by the same is he punished. Be it as it will, it cannot be denied, but that Sarah stayed some time in the houses of her ravishers: this is certain, at least, as to the last rape, since they had leisure to find out, that it was upon her account that the wombs of all the women in the court of Abimelech were shut up. From thence arises this small difficulty. That prince restored Sarah, as soon as he understood by a dream, that she was the wife of Abraham; he therefore knew nothing of it till she had been some time in his house. What did he design to do with her, seeing he let her alone all that time? Was it for this that he took her into his house? Those who make this objection, know not the custom of the Eastern princes. They have many wives, and others are sent to them from time to time: but we must not fancy that they care for them one after another by turns; there are some, whose turn never comes, tho' they be most beautiful. Abimelech was contented to have Sarah in his house, knowing that he could lie with her when he pleased: but God prevented it, before he chose his time. We may say the same of Pharaoh. I do not take him to have been so great a monarch, as to observe the ceremonies that were practised in the court of Persia, where a woman that pleased the king, was ordered to wash and perfume herself a year before she was brought to him (35). I shall not therefore insist on the conjecture of St Jerom (36), who explains by this method, the reason why Sarah was sometime unemployed in the house of Pharaoh. But let us say of this last king, what we have just now said of the king of the Philistines; or we may say that they were struck with a dangerous distemper the very first day they took her. Josephus says Abimelech was so sick that his life was despaired of by the Physicians. Others specify the nature of his disease; they say he had such violent pains in his genital parts, that he could not perform the act of copulation (37). For the rest, St Chrysostom (38), and St Jerom do well agree; quidam cum in veretro sit esse divinitus percussus, ut nec coire cum muliere posset ne dum vellet, & magnis ea in parte cruciatibus affligeretur. Pterorius in Genes. cap. xx, sub. fin.

(31) Apud Eupolemon, Fræp. lib. i, cap. 10.

(32) Lib. i, cap. vii.

(33) Sallian. Tom. i, pag. 413.

(34) Cap. xi, ver. 17.

(35) Esther, cb. ii.

(36) In Tradit. Hebraicæ in Genes. Vide Pterorius, in cap. xii, ver. 19.

(37) Tradunt quidam cum in veretro sit esse divinitus percussus, ut nec coire cum muliere posset ne dum vellet, & magnis ea in parte cruciatibus affligeretur. Pterorius in Genes. cap. xx, sub. fin.

(38) Homil. XXXI, in Genes.

[D] One cannot easily clear Abraham.] For besides what we have said above, would it not be an authority for the pernicious doctrine of equivocations if it was once certain that neither he nor Sarah told a lie? Those who attack the ill morals of Lessius, and some other Jesuits, say

(39) Apud eundem Pterorius, in cap. xii, ver. 19.

stitious flattery of some others. The beauty of Sarah had something peculiar in it, which ought not to be forgotten; viz. that it continued, at least, till she was ninety years old [E]. Several reasons are given for it. Some say, that it was because she had no children, and because she had renounced all matrimonial commerce, after she saw herself barren [F]. In case these reasons do not satisfy, there is added to them a particular

say that those lie who make answers which have no relation to the intention of him who asks a question. Such answers, tho' they contain nothing but truth, do not cease for all that to be lying; for example, if a son of Cain had been juridically interrogated who he was, with a design to know who was his father, he was, with a design to know who was his father, and had answered that Cain was his uncle, he had said nothing but truth, for his mother was Cain's sister; yet his answer had not been exempt from deceit. The same may be said of Sarah. Abimelech asked her what relation she had to Abraham; he had all the right imaginable to ask her, for he was king of the country; his intention was to know whether she was married, or no; and upon this he was to regulate his conduct as to her. She answered, *I am Abraham's sister*; her husband who had suggested to her this answer, said on his part, *I am Sarah's brother*. Is it not the same thing, as if he had answered, the relation of brother and sister is the greatest relation that is between us, and would not this answer have been a formal lye? If one, that knows all the circumstances of a great conspiracy, should be asked, *what do you know of it*, and should answer, *I know such a thing of it*, which should not be the chief matter of the conspiracy, would not he be a deceiver, would he not be a liar? For his answer would be equivalent to this, *I only know this*. A commentator upon Genesis (40), designing to prove that marriage between brothers and sisters was not practised in Abraham's time, makes use of this remark. Sarah answering, says he, that she was Abraham's sister, was presently believed not to be his wife; therefore, at that time, these two relations were concluded to be incompatible. This reasoning is false; for suppose that these marriages took place in a country, the custom there would be, that the sister, after her marriage, would no longer be called the sister of her husband, but his wife; so that every sister, not called the wife of such a one, but only his sister, would be looked upon then not to be his wife; and for this reason, Abraham and Sarah necessarily, and visibly deceived the Egyptians and the Philistines, by suppressing the relation of marriage, and speaking only of that of brotherhood; though those nations were not ignorant of the compatibility of those relations. But it was enough to be deceived by Abraham, that they should know that the one swallowed up the other, much as the quality of father absorbed that of uncle in the person of Cain, with respect to his children. In a word, the suppression of a truth is a real lye, as often as it is designed to make the hearer form a false judgment, and when according to the use of the language spoken it cannot fail to produce that effect. Abraham and Sarah are in the case. Those who deny that marriages between brothers and sisters, were known among the Canaanites, ought to read the chapter of Leviticus, where marriages in such and such degrees are forbid to God's people. Let us not forget that Isaac made use of the dissimulation of his father upon a like principle; he said also, for fear of being killed, that Rebekah was his sister (41).

(41) Genesis xxvi, 9.

[E] The beauty of Sarah . . . continued . . . till she was ninety years old. This is proved by the twentieth chapter of Genesis, where it is said, that Abraham, being gone into the country of Gerar, would only pass for the brother of Sarah; which was the reason why Abimelech took her into his house with a design to marry her. The birth of Isaac had been already foretold to this patriarch: but his wife was ninety years old when this happened; therefore, &c. I know the Scripture does not say in this passage, that Sarah was beautiful, but it is no hard matter to collect it from the circumstances of that journey. We find in the twelfth chapter, that the reason which obliged Abraham to say, in Egypt, that Sarah was his sister, was, because he saw she was beautiful, and was afraid that they would kill him, that they might the more easily enjoy her. Sarah no sooner appeared, but they took and carried her to the king's house. There is no doubt but Abraham dissimulated his marriage in Gerar

upon the same motive. He himself declares (42) (43) Genesis. xz. that he was afraid of being killed because of his wife; 11. he knew therefore she was beautiful enough to inspire love. The event speaks it still more clearly; for as soon as she was seen by the king of Gerar, he took her to his house in order to make her his wife. It was without doubt for her beauty; for to say with Father Salian, that he took her as a venerable widow, who understood the management of a house, and as the sister of a man whose alliance he looked on to be very advantageous to him, is a meer illusion. It is probable, that Abraham went only into the country of the Philistines to avoid the famine that pursued him; it was therefore easy for the king of that country to gain Abraham without making himself a sacrifice to the marriage of a widow fourcore years old. He would have purchased, at a dear rate, the friendship of Abraham, if Sarah had been decayed as commonly women are at that age. Let us therefore acknowledge as a certain truth, that she was still a beautiful woman. An honest Capuchin of Paris (43) pleasantly imagined that Abimelech took Sarah only to talk with her about devotion: he was, says he, a prophet and a man who reckoned it a singular happiness to hold familiar conversation with Sarah upon the subject of a future state. He thought this reverend mother would teach him many things concerning the kingdom of God. But would he have been chastised for such good and spiritual intentions? What a strange fancy! Flesh and blood, without doubt, would have had a greater share in their discourses than devotion, if they had let him do what he pleased.

We ought not to mind the thought of Hugo de St Victor; the consequences of it are dangerous: let us not open a breach in the holy Scripture; prophane men would enter into it that way, like wolves into a sheep-fold, and commit a thousand disorders. This author pretends (44) that Moses has not put in its proper place the taking away of Sarah by Abimelech, but in a time distant from the true time above thirty years. Let us maintain that Sarah was really ninety years old, when Abimelech designed to marry her. Nor ought we to have recourse to the expedient of those who say (45), that it is no greater wonder that Sarah should have been handsome at ninety, than to see a handsome woman at forty now a-days; for, say they, women lived then to be 130 years, as now they live to be fourcore. By their leave, they calculate wrong: where would they find, according to their supputation, the deadness of Sarah's womb of which the Apostle speaks (46)? Why did it cease to be with Sarah after the manner of women (47)? What would become of Abraham's celebrated faith with respect to the birth of Isaac? Is it strange, at this day, that a woman at forty, should conceive? Let us adjust their calculation better: ninety years are to 130 much as fifty-six to eighty. It is therefore with our beauties of fifty-six years that we must compare Sarah. Now I confess that though it be very rare that a woman of fifty-six should be taken away for her beauty, much less be designed for the bed of a sovereign, as a dainty and royal bit, yet there are some for all that, that have beautiful remains at that age. See what I have related elsewhere out of Brantome concerning Joan of Arragon and the Dukes of Valentinois. We may therefore say, without having recourse to miracles, which ought to be kept as much as possible for a great necessity, that the good constitution of Sarah, and her being exempt from lying-in and nursing, might preserve her beauty even to the age of ninety. Procopius thinks that when she was made capable of conceiving, she recovered her lost beauty (48), and that God, by a special favour, made her those two presents at once. Procopius may say what he pleases.

[F] Some say . . . she renounced all matrimonial commerce after she saw herself barren. Let us cite Pererius: Deinde id accidit Saræ ob summam ejus castitatem & continentiam, quippe quæ statim ut sensit se sterilem & invalidam ad generandum abstinuit à copula carnali,

(40) Pererius in Caput xi. Disput. vii. Beltramin. Lib. de Matrimon. cap. xxviii. argues in the same manner.

(43) Bonducus de Ecclef. ante legem, lib. iii. cap. iv. apud Heidegger. pag. 157.

(44) Apud Pererium, l. Disput. in Genes. cap. xx.

(45) Id. ibid.

(46) Rom. iv.

(47) Genesis xviii. 11.

(48) Addit Procopius divinitus cum fecunditate Sara restaurata fuisse prætinam pulchritudinem. Cornel. à Lapide in Genes. p. 149.

particular providence of God, who, as they say, preserved from all the attacks of old age, the beauty of Sarah, amongst other motives, to try the faith of Abraham [G]. This was not attended to by those, who in the heat of their homilies exaggerated so much her decay [H], to make the greater wonder of the milk that filled her breasts. It is pretended (g) that she had so great a plenty of it, that she was forced to take several children to nurse; and that the day that Isaac was weaned, she gave all the children of those that came to the feast, her breast to suck. They add, that she herself would suckle her son, to remove all suspicions that might arise from her age of Isaac's being a supposititious child. St Chrysostom approves this thought (b). There is no probability that this holy woman died of grief, when she was told that Isaac was sacrificed by Abraham; and we may boldly place this among the fables of the Rabbins (i). Josephus says, that Sarah died a little after the return of her husband and son: But according to his own calculation, she lived twelve years longer; for he says with the Scripture, that she was 90 years old when she was brought to bed of Isaac, and 127 when she died; and, on the other hand, he assures us, that Isaac was twenty-five years old when his father would have sacrificed him.

It is here that I must shew, 1. That Calvin is wrongfully accused of having thrown the grossest reproaches upon Sarah [I], because she desired her husband to make use of their

carnali, ut supra ostendimus super illis verbis quæ sunt in capite 18. Postquam consensui & Dominus meus vetulus est, voluptati operam dabo (49)? It will not be improper to see on what he grounds his opinion. He makes use of these words of Sarah, Postquam consensui & Dominus meus vetulus est voluptati operam dabo (50)? That is, after I am waxed old, shall I have pleasure, my Lord being old also? There are two difficulties that Sarah started to her self when she heard the promise that was made to Abraham, that his wife should be brought to bed of a son the year following. Must I then, said she, notwithstanding my great age, receive the caresses of my husband? this is the first difficulty: but is not my husband too old for that? This is the second difficulty. So that according to Pererius the must have started almost the same objection which the virgin Mary did, how shall this be, seeing I know not a man (51)? I think we cannot reasonably deny to this author that the words of Sarah signify, that she and her husband observed then a perfect continence; but all the rest is nothing but mere conjecture, viz. That they had already above fourteen years agreed on a mutual abstinence; that is to say, from the time that Hagar became the concubine of Abraham. But let us suppose it to be so: we must infer from thence, that Sarah put an end to matrimonial comforts when she came to be seventy-five years of age. How then comes Pererius to draw from this one of his reasons, why the beauty of that lady was preserved to ninety years? Intemperantia Venere cito mulierem inveterat & vehementer deformat ac turpat (52). That is to say, the immoderate use of Venereal pleasures makes a woman soon grow old, and ugly. Be it so. I leave the discussion of it to Physicians; but does it follow from thence, that a total abstinence from that exercise has a quite contrary effect, upon women; I mean that it puts off old age, and preserves their beauty? No Logician will find any strength in such consequences, generally speaking, considering the great number of things, of which the two extremes are bad, and pernicious both for the body and soul. In particular, the consequence here in question, is strongly impugned by Physicians (53). But if we should be so complaisant, as to grant it to Pererius, what service would it do him in relation to Sarah, who, according to him, deprived her self of the matrimonial right, only at the age of seventy-five years.

[G] To try the faith of Abraham.] This seems at first sight to be very strange: for men can scarce conceive a greater temporal happiness, than the perpetual beauty of what they love. What vows or wishes are so favourable to new married persons, as to wish that they may never seem old one to another?

Diligat ipsa senem quondam, sed & illa marito
Tunc quoque cum fuerit non videatur anus (54).

May she love him, when he shall antient grow;
And when she's old, may he not think her so.

But if you consider it well, you will find that for a
VOL. IV.

man who is to travel with a family, a beautiful woman is no small burthen. However, Abraham found it so, and may serve for an example. What fears was he not under of being killed, and what mortifying expedients was he not thereby obliged to have recourse to? Be it as it will, a famous Divine of Zurich spoke in this manner: 'Puto pulcritudinis Saræ causam non fuisse aliam quam supernaturale Dei donum & specialem ejusdem providentiam, qui eam in extrema senectute voluit fieri matrem Isaac, atque simul cotem fidei & patientiæ Abrahami, quæ in hac ob formam uxoris immixta tentatione non parum explorata fuit (55). . . . I think that Sarah's beauty was owing to nothing else but a supernatural gift, and an especial providence of GOD, who designed that she should be the mother of Isaac in her extreme old age, and at the same time a whet-stone to the faith and patience of Abraham, which were not a little tried by the temptation, which was exposed to on account of his wife's beauty.'

[H] Those who . . . exaggerated so much her decay.] St Chrysostom says, that the rod of Moses, which made water spring out of the rock, wrought a less difficult miracle, than was done when milk sprung out of Sarah's breasts. Non sic admirabile fuit quod ex petra in deserto scaturierint fontes aquarum quando illam virga Moyses percussit, sicut de vulva jam emortua parum nati, & lactis fontes scaturire (56). Here are the words of another Father: Portabat uterum gravem talis mater quæ inanis ambulare vix poterat (57) August. Marcidæ mammae quas in vacuos folles subditi succi detrimenta laxaverant, lactis fontis ubertate tenduntur (57).

[I] Calvin is wrongfully accused of having thrown out the grossest reproaches upon Sarah.] Let us begin with the words of the accuser. 'Non est prætereundum impie loqui Calvinum qui Saram quasi lenam & Abraham quasi adulterum ancillæ suæ carpit (58). . . . It is not fit I should pass over the impiety of Calvin, who reflects upon Sarah as being little better than a barrow; and reflects on Abraham as if he had committed adultery with his own maid.' These

words, and several others that follow, are so like those of Cornelius à Lapide, that there is reason to think Merfennus transcribed them from him. His work was printed in 1623. And that of Cornelius à Lapide in 1616. Carpit hic Calvinus Saram quasi lenam, Abram quasi adulterum ancillæ suæ Agar (59).

This calumny against Calvin goes yet higher: I have, as much as I could, sought for the first author of it, but I dare not say, I have found him in the person of Feuudentius. What is certain is, that this Monk preceded the Minime (60), and the Jesuit (61) whom I have cited. His accusation was not well known to Leonard Coqueus, who certainly would have named Calvin, and cited the *Theomachia Calvinistica*, if he had known what is to be found there. He has done neither of them; his reproaches are indeterminate; they fall in general upon the Modern Heretics, de Civit. Dei. and he cites another work of Feuudentius. First he says that Pausanias, the Manichee, blamed the conduct of the Patriarch Abraham, as a thing that betrayed his incredulity, and ardent desire of having children (62), and

(49) Pererius in Genes. cap. xx, ver. 2. Torniellus & Cornelius à Lapide, are of the same opinion.

(50) Genesis, xviii. 12.

(51) St Luke i, 34. Zecharias, in ver. 18 of the same chapter, alleges a difficulty like that of Sarah.

(52) Perer. in Genes. cap. xx, Dissert. i.

(53) See Gaspar à Ries, Elysio jucund. Quest. Campo, XLVI. vivere be maintain, quod omnimoda coitus diffinitio magna damna parit præsertim in ætatis, in feminis frequentissime, in viris rarissime & cum minori noxa.

(54) Martial. lib. iii, Epigr. xiii.

(g) See Pererius in Genes. cap. xxi, Salian, pag. 473, 474.

(b) Homil. xlv. in Genes.

(i) Who say so apud Tofatum. See Salian, pag. 439.

(55) Heidegger, Hist. Patr. Tom. ii, pag. 148. Rivet had said the same before him, Oper. Tom. i, pag. 277, and Pererius in Genes. had said so before Rivetus.

(56) Chrysost. Homil. xlv.

(57) August. Serm. lxxviii, de Temp.

(58) Merfennus Observat. in Problemata Veneti, num. 119, pag. 165.

(59) Cornel. à Lapide in Genes. cap. xvi, ver. 2. pag. 170, Edit. 1623.

(60) Father Merfennus.

(61) Cornelius à Lapide.

(62) Crimen inurebat & quod habenda proliis infana flagrans cupiditate, & Deo, qui id jam sibi de Sara conjuge promiserat minime credens, cum pellice volutatus sit. Leonb. Coqueus, in August. lib. xvi, cap. xxv. He cites D. August. lib. xxii, contra Faust. in Genes. cap. xxi.

their maid-servant. 2. That St Augustin has not made a good apology for this conduct of Abraham [K].

and afterwards he adds: 'Refert etiam Feuardentius in appendice ad libros Alphonsi à Castro contra hereses lib. 1. verbo Abraham, quosdam hereticos modernos . . . non minus impios fuisse in sanctissimum Patriarcham Abrahamum, ut cui crimen adulterii impingant (63) . . . Feuardentius alio relatus in his appendix to the books of Alphonsus à Castro against Heresies lib. 1. at the word Abraham, that certain modern Heretics . . . did with no less impiety reflect upon the most holy Patriarch Abraham, whom they accused of adultery.' The particular accusations against Calvin are contained in the following quotation. 'Pissimam aviam Christi Saram multis vexat contumeliis, multis jactat injuriis: † Sarai rationem alienam à verbo Dei apud se querit. In ipso progressu non leviter peccavit, quod orbitatis impatiens, à verbo Dei discessit. Obreptit desperatio. Connubii legem pervertit, lectum conjugalem pollucendo. Nec culpa etiam vocat Abram, quod stulto ac præpostero uxoris consilio obsequutus est. Reprehensioe digna est Abrahamæ facilitas. Utriusque autem claudicat fides. Dei virtutem non debuit alligare ordini naturæ, vel restringere ad suum sensum. Et in sequentibus †. Admittit concubinam quæ instar pellicis futura erat. Ad eandem qua ipsa serviebat impatiens maritum sollicitat. Vacillat quidem Abrahamæ fides, cum à verbo Dei declinans, uxoris impulsu ad remedium prohibitum transferre se patitur. Memento uno tentationi succumbit. Deinde, dolosissimo schemate utens, id ipsum quod negare se de illa fingit, palam adfirmat †: Neque enim domui suæ voluit erigere lupanar, nec ancilla suæ productrix, vel mariti lena esse . . . O hominem in disputando vafum, veteratorem, & malitiosum! Ecquid enim aliud est Abrahamæ, uxorem prostituere, pudicitiam ejus nudare præsidio, pudicitiam proderet (quod Calvinus palam tribuit Abrahamæ) quam ei lenocinari? Aut quid, Conjugii legem pervertere, lectum conjugalem pollucere, pellicem viro querere & subministrare, alienam in thorum mariti inducere (quorum à Calvinio infimulatur Sara) quam domi suæ lupanar erigere, & mariti lenam esse, quod hic simulate Calvinus negat & damnat (64) . . . He throws out many gross reflexions and reproaches upon Sarah the pious progenitrix of Christ. Sarah seeks a contrivance of her own not warranted by the word of GOD. In the course of her proceedings she transgressed not a little, for not bearing the want of children with patience she swerved from the word of GOD. She gave way to despair. She perverted the laws of wedlock, by polluting the marriage-bed. Neither is Abraham blameless, since he complied with the foolish and preposterous counsel of his wife. The easiness of Abraham deserves to be censured. Both of them were deficient in their faith. They should not have tied down the power of GOD to the order of nature, nor have confined it to their own sense. Afterwards he says. She introduces a concubine who was to act the part of a harlot. She inspires her husband with the same impatience by which she herself was transported. Abraham's faith did stagger, when swerving from the word of GOD; he suffered himself to be prevailed upon by the instigation of his wife, to make use of the forbidden remedy. In a moment he yielded to the temptation. After this, carrying on his deceitful scheme he openly asserts what he pretends to deny concerning her. For neither would she convert her house into a brothel, nor do the office of a procuress in bringing her husband and maid together . . . O arch caviller and spiteful old fox! If Abraham prostituted his wife, and betrayed her chastity by leaving it exposed and defenceless (which Calvin plainly imputes to Abraham) what else did he do but . . . for her? Or what else was it but to pervert the laws of wedlock, to pollute the marriage-bed, to seek out and provide a harlot to her husband, and to lodge a stranger in his arms, of all which things Sarah is accused by Calvin, I say, what else was this but to convert her house into a brothel, and to be her husband's . . . which Calvin here artfully denies and 'blames?' We may observe two frauds in the proceeding of this Franciscan. He suppresses the expressions, wherein Calvin endeavours to extenuate the fault of Sarah and that of Abraham: this is the first foul play. He asserts impudently, that Calvin uses a shameful turn of sophistry, to accuse, in effect, under a false appearance of negation, this holy woman of having

been a . . . to her husband. This is, the second fraud, and it is of such a heinous nature that it may be called a dreadful calumny. The free manner with which Calvin judges of the conduct of the husband and the wife, clearly shews that he sought no artful evasions: he speaks his thoughts with the greatest liberty; and makes use of all the right, that reason and Scripture give us of passing our judgment upon the quality of an action. It is therefore manifest, that he speaks sincerely, when he denies that Sarah acted as . . . &c. This appears further by the words which follow, and which Feuardentius has suppressed. 'Improprie tamen vocatur uxor, quæ præter Dei legem in alienum thorum inducitur. Quare sciamus hunc concubitus hic illicitum fuisse ut inter fornicationem & conjugium quasi medius fuerit. Idem omnibus commentis accidit quæ Dei verbo assequuntur. Quamlibet enim honesto tegantur prætextu corruptela subest, quæ à verbi puritate degenerat, eamque vitiat (65) . . . Nevertheless a woman that is introduced into another's bed, in a manner not warranted by the law of GOD, is improperly called a wife. Let us therefore conclude, that as this commerce was unlawful, so it was a kind of middle state between fornication and matrimony. The same thing happens in all those inventions which are patched to the word of GOD. For however they may be disguised under a plausible pretence, there is a corruption in them which degenerates from the word of GOD, and taints the purity of it.' This is the language of a plain and sincere Calvinist; one may therefore be well assured that this is the worst that Calvin designed to say. Now he says plainly, that the commerce of Abraham and Hagar was a kind of middle state between fornication and marriage. Feuardentius has suppressed this remarkable passage of Calvin's commentary: 'Benedictionis (quam sciebat divinitus promissam esse) potiundæ voto, conjugalem thorum sponte alteri cedit . . . sic laudabile fuit votum Sarai quoad finem vel scopum in quem tendebat, ut tamen in ipso progressu non leviter peccavit . . . Utriusque autem claudicavit fides, non in substantia quidem, sed in medio ipso (ut loquuntur) vel agendi ratione (66) . . . It was from her desire to obtain the blessing (which they knew GOD had promised) that she voluntarily resigned the conjugial bed to another . . . Thus the desire of Sarah, as to the end and scope to which it tended, was laudable, yet not so but that she sinned greatly in the way she took to compass it . . . But the sin of both was defective, not indeed in the substance, but in the medium (as they say) or manner of acting.'

Observe, that copiers are very apt to magnify things. Cornelius à Lapide and Marinus Mericennus say plainly and absolutely, that Calvin accuses Sarah of . . . and Abraham of adultery. Feuardentius was contented to say, that the accusation was proposed indirectly, and under a deceitful shew of a justification.

[K] St Augustin has not made a good apology for this conduct of Abraham.] He made use of four reasons. The first is, That Abraham was not induced to this act by any motive of sensual love, but in order to have children: *Uxor est ea (concubina) quippe ad generandam prolem, non ad explendam libidinem* (67). The second is, That he did it, not to injure his wife, but rather out of complaisance to her, and to give her the consolation which her state of barrenness made her wish for. The third is, That this conduct was grounded upon the right, which St Paul speaks of in the seventh chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians: *Likewise the man has not power over his own body, but the woman. There is no fault here, either on the wife's, or on the husband's side; she gives her maid to her husband, in hopes of issue, and he takes the maid with the same view. Nulla est hic cupido lascivie, nulla nequitie turpitudine. Ab uxore causa proles ancilla marito traditur, à marito causa proles accipitur; ab utroque non culpa luxu sed nature fructus exquiritur* (68). The fourth reason is, That Abraham sent away Hagar as soon as his wife desired it. I have cited elsewhere (69) the words of St Augustin on this subject: Leonard Coqueus, a commentator on that Father, makes no scruple to refute him. He alledges against the first reason this axiom of St Paul, *It is not lawful to do evil*

(63) Id. ibid.

† In cap. xvi. Gen. v. 1.

† Ver. 2.

† Ver. 3.

(64) Feuardentius, Theom. Calvinisticæ, lib. ix, cap. 1, pag. m. 426.

(65) Calvin. in Genes. cap. xvi. ver. 3. pag. m. 83, 84.

(66) Calvin. ibid. ver. i, pag. 83.

(67) August. de Civit. Dei, lib. xxv, cap. xxv.

(68) Id. ibid.

(69) In remark [C] of the article AGAR.

(70) Rom. iii. 8. *that good may come* (70); and the common doctrine of the Moralists, That to make an action good, it is requisite not only that the motive be good, but also that it be about a lawful matter. *Ad hoc quod sit actio honesta, requiritur non modo bonus finis & reliquæ circumstantiæ, verum etiam quod sit circa debitam materiam* (71). This

(71) Leonh. Coqueus, ubi supra, pag. m. 351.

furnishes him with the refutation of the second reason; for if the commerce of the Patriarch with his maid was bad in itself, it did not become lawful by Abraham's compliance with the desire of Sarah: the counsels or suggestions of a wife do not excuse a husband in regard to unlawful things; which appears clearly by the fall of the first man, who, in vain alledged, that the wife whom God had given him had persuaded him to eat the forbidden fruit. The third reason is no better than the rest; for a wife cannot convey to another woman the right of which St Paul speaks, any more than a husband can yield to another man the right of which the same Apostle speaks. *Non potest uxor sui illud quod habet in corpore viri transferre in alteram mulierem, ut congressum viri sui cum alia muliere assensu suo possit facere licitum, ut nec vir potest transferre in alterum virum illud quod habet in uxorem* (72). Leonard Coqueus says nothing on

(72) Id. ibid.

the fourth reason, because he did not look upon it as part of the apology: but the most stupid reader may easily perceive, that it serves only to shew that the Patriarch was not moved to it by any impurity. It is a very good thing readily and easily to quit an unlawful intercourse, but that does not prove that the enjoyment was lawful. This commentator supposes, that St Augustin did not alledge these reasons as proofs of the purity of the commerce of Abraham and Hagar, but only as proofs sufficient to refute the assertion of the Manichees, who affirmed that this Patriarch was desperately in love with Hagar, and lay with her only to satisfy his passion. He supposes also, that the same Father knew very well the true reason that cleared Abraham, which was, that there was a real marriage between Hagar and her master. He examines afterwards the three reasons of St Ambrose. The first is taken from this, That Abraham lived before the law of God had forbidden adultery. 'Abraham ante legem Moysi & ante Evangelium fuit, cum nondum interdictum adulterium videretur, poena criminis ex tempore legis est, quæ crimen inhibuit, nec ante legem ulla rei damnatio est' (73). - - - 'Abraham lived before the law of Moses, and before the Gospel, when adultery does not appear to be forbid: the punishment of a crime, takes place from the time that the law forbids it; nor is there any condemnation of a thing before the law is in being.' The second is the same with the first and second of St Augustin. The third is taken from hence, That the conjunction of Abraham and Hagar was one of the types of the Old Testament. The commentator observes (74), that Sixtus Senensis (75) found in the first reason of St Ambrose, two principles widely different from the common opinion of Divines. First, That the action of Abraham was adultery. Secondly, That adultery was at that time lawful, seeing the law had not forbid it. He maintains that Hagar was the lawful wife of Abraham, and that adultery was a crime even before it was forbid by any positive law. It was enough that it was contrary to the law of nature: *Erat tamen, per se illicitum & prohibitum lege divina naturali* (76). As to the third reason of St Ambrose, he refutes it by this aphorism, that the quality of a type does not infuse any morality into things, nor consequently take from them what is bad. 'Plerumque, *says St Gregory* (77), res quælibet per historiam virtus est, per significationem culpa, & aliquando res gesta in facto causa damnationis est, in scripto autem prophetia virtutis. - - - *Frequently a thing is, as to the history, a virtue, but by signification, a fault; and sometimes the thing done, is, in fact, the cause of damnation, but in writing a prophecy of virtue.*' St Augustin follows the same principle. 'In peccatis, *faith be* (78), magnorum virorum aliquando rerum futurarum figuram animadverti & indagari posse - - - *In the sins of great men, sometimes we may observe and discover the figure of things to come.*'

(73) Ambros. lib. i. de Abrah. cap. iv. apud Leonh. Coqueum, ibid.

(74) Leonh. Coqueus, ibid. pag. 352.

(75) Sixt. Senensis, Bibl. Sanctæ lib. v. Annot. xciiv. apud Coqueum, ibid.

(76) Idem, Coqueus, ibid.

(77) Gregor. lib. iii. Moral. cap. xvi. apud Coqueum, ibid.

(78) August. lib. iii. de Doctr. Christ. cap. xxiii. apud eund. ibid.

Let us observe here four things. In the first place, Coqueus makes St Augustin take an injudicious and insincere course. He knew, says he, the true proof of the innocence of Abraham, and suppressed it; he con-

tented himself with clearing him as to the reproach of being in love with his servant-maid. But was this enough? Had not the Manichees scope enough to load him with reproaches, tho' they had granted that he was not in love with Hagar? It is therefore to reproaches of this kind that St Augustin ought to have answered, and he did certainly do it. He pretended, that supposing the circumstances, as he put them, a man was justifiable who lay with his wife's maid. But was there ever a looser morality than his? Would they not at this day run down the Bauni's, and the Escobar's, if they taught that provided a man thinks only of leaving successors behind him, his wife may prompt him to lie with her maid, and he may follow her counsel? Do not tell me that St Augustin considers only the age that Abraham lived in; for since he grounds his reasoning on the right which St Paul gives to a husband over his wife, and to a wife over her husband, he proposes, without doubt, to account for it at all times. We have seen, in another place (79) what he says of the action of Acindynus. My second remark is, That the doctrine of Calvin is much purer on this point, than that of the ancient Fathers. He condemns the conduct of Abraham and Sarah, plainly and directly. He seeks no excuse for them from the use of Polygamy already established among the nations. He says they had no right to oppose the law that ties married persons one to another. 'Nec valet excusatio quod concubinam uxoris loco esse voluerit, quia fixum illud manere debuerat, mulierem viro adjunctam esse, ut essent duo in carne una. Tam-
men istam quæ duo inter se mutuo obligantur convul-

(79) See the remarks in the article ACINDYNUS (SERI-MIUS).

tere nunquam fuit hominum arbitrio' (80). - - - 'Nor is it any excuse that be defined the concubine to be in the place of a wife: for this ought to remain for certain, that the wife is joined to the husband, so that they two should be one flesh. Notwithstanding that polygamy had prevailed among many, yet that law by which the two are bound one to the other, was never to be dispensed with at any man's pleasure.' Nay, he observes, that this fall of Abraham ought to let us upon our guard against the ambushes of Satan, who attacks us, not only by persons that are manifestly criminal, but also by good people. 'Porro cum Sarai tam sancta mulier instar flabelli, ad eandem quæ ipsa servebat impatientiam maritum sollicitet: hinc dicamus quam sedulo nobis agenda sint excubiæ ne qua occulta fraude nos circumveniat. Neque enim improbos tantum & sceleratos subornat qui ex professo fidem nostram oppugnent: sed ut incautos opprimat, clam interdum ac furtim per bonos & simplices nos adoritur' (81). - - - 'Now as Sarah, so holy a woman, sollicit her husband to the same impatience wherewith she herself was transported, hence let us learn how diligently we are to be on our guard, lest by any secret fraud Satan circumvents us. For he does not only suborn wicked and reprobate men openly to oppose our faith; but that he may catch us unawares, he sometimes attack us secretly, and by stealth, by means of the good and simple.' In the third place, I observe that the liberty Calvin took of censuring severely this action of Sarah and Abraham, is of much greater use to Christian morality than the pains the Fathers have taken to justify Abraham and his wife. They have sacrificed the general interests of morality to the reputation of a private person: I could almost find in my heart to apply to all those, who are animated with that spirit, this fine saying of Cicero: *Urbem philosophiæ proditi dum castella defenditis* (82). - - - 'You betray the town of Philosophy while you defend the outworks. Lastly, I observe, that Josephus supposes a thing, of which the Scripture says not a word; that God commanded Sarah to put Hagar in her husband's bed. *Σάρρα τὴν θεῶν κελεύσαντι ἐπικλίνει μίαν τῶν θεραπαινίδων. Sara Deo jubente in thalamum ejus adducit unam famulidarum* (83). Here is truly the *Deus ex machina*, - - - God in the plot, of the tragic Poets, and the *ancora sacra*, - - sheet-anchor, of the proverb. Several commentators upon Genesis alledge the authority of this Historian, and observe that St Augustin has insinuated the same thing. *Idem insinuat St Augustinus lib. 10. contra Faust. cap. 32* (84). There is no Gordian-knot but may be broke that way.

(80) Calvin. in Genes. xiii. 1.

(81) Id. ibid. ver. 2. See also what he says a little after.

(82) See the article FRANCIS I. remark [P].

(83) Joseph. lib. i. Antiq. cap. xi. pag. 19, C.

(84) Cornel. à Lapide, ubi supra. See also Mercianus, ubi supra.

polygamy

SARISBERI

(a) Or Sarisberien-
ensis, or Sarisber-
ienfis, &c.

SARISBERI (a) (JOHN OF) in Latin *Sarisberienfis*, an Englishman, Bishop of Chartres, was born about the year 1110. He went into France at the age of sixteen or seventeen. He afterwards had a commission from the king, his master, to reside near Pope Eugenius about the affairs of England. Some would have done him an ill office with that Pope, and falsely accused him; but at last the truth came to light, and he was continued near Eugenius, with all the favours he deserved. He was still more esteemed by the successor of that Pope, and being recalled into England, he received great marks of esteem from Thomas Becket who was then High-chancellor. This chancellor wholly governed his master, Henry II, and as he wanted assistance under so heavy a burthen . . . he made use of the counsel of Joannes Sarisberienfis, especially about the education of the king's eldest son, and of many young noble English lords, whom he had undertaken to educate in good manners and learning. He desired him also to take care of his house, whilst he was abroad in Guienne with the king, his master. Being returned from that voyage, he was made Archbishop of Canterbury, and left the court to reside in his diocese. Sarisberienfis accompanied him, and faithfully followed him, when this prelate was obliged to retire into France, and when about seven years after he was recalled into England. It is well known that he was murdered in his own archiepiscopal church. *Sarisberienfis* undertook to ward off a blow that one of the assassins aimed at the head of his master, but he received it on his arm: the wound was so great, that the Surgeons after they had attended him near a twelve month, despaired of his cure. It is pretended that he was cured by a miracle of Thomas Becket. He was made Bishop of Chartres at the earnest intreaty of the province some years after [A], and he lived in this Episcopal see with the same modesty, and the same virtue which he had always preached up and recommended in his writings. He died about the year 1180 (b). He composed, among other books, a treatise in Latin intituled *Polycraticus* [B]. He was one of the greatest wits of his age, and one of the most polite and most able men in good literature (c).

(b) Taken from the Life of Joannes Sarisberienfis, prefixed to the French translation of his book de *Nugis Curialium*.

(c) Du Pin. Bibl. Tom. ix, p. 167. Dutch. Edit.

[A] He was made Bishop of Chartres . . . some years after.] Here is again one of those writers of eulogies, who neglect the dates (1). He could not mark in a more uncertain manner the time of the promotion of Joannes Sarisberienfis to that bishopric, since he had not assigned the year of Thomas Becket's Death. Let us supply this defect, and say that this archbishop was killed about the end of the year 1170. This is certain, but it is not agreed in what year Joannes Sarisberienfis was made Bishop of Chartres. Vossius says it was in 1164 (2), but he is mistaken. Father Labbe, who reproves him for it, places the promotion of that bishop in 1172 (3), and adds, that he died in 1182, and was buried in the abbey of Notre Dame de Josphat. Father Oudin says the same (4). But Mr du Pin has not followed their chronology, except in the year of his death. *Joannes Sarisberienfis*, says he (5), was at last made Bishop of Chartres in 1179, and died three years after.

(1) See the remark [D] in the article RUF-FL.

(2) Vossius de Hist. Latins, pag. 421.

(3) Labbe, Differt. de Script. Eccles. Tom. 7, pag. 606.

(4) Oudin, in Supplem. de Script. Eccles. pag. 441.

(5) Du Pin, Bibl. des Auteurs Eccles. Tom. ix, pag. 167. Dutch. Edit.

(6) Labbe, ubi supra.

(7) Du Pin, ubi supra.

(8) Lipsius in Tacit. Ann. lib. xii.

[B] He composed, among other books, a treatise in Latin, intituled, *Polycraticus*.] This is a well known book, and there are several editions of it. It is intituled, *Polycraticus, seu de Nugis Curialium, & vestigiis Philosophorum*. Father Labbe tells us that the first edition is that of Paris 1513, and that Constantine Frandinus procured it (6). I make use of the Leyden edition, ex officina Plantiniana apud Franciscum Raphe-
lengium 1595, in 8vo. Mr du Pin looks upon it as an excellent book, 'relating to the employments, the duties, the virtues, and vices of great men, and especially of princes and great lords, which contains a great many moral thoughts, sentences, fine passages of authors, examples, apologues, pieces of history, and common topics (7)'. Lipsius says, it is a patch work, that contains several pieces of purple, and fragments of a better age. In quo centone multos pannos purpure agnoscit & fragmenta ævi melioris (8). Janus Douza uses this

author too severely; for he puts him in the class of compilers, who take on every hand, and are like Horace's crow. *Omnium disertissimè*, says he (9), quoting the testimonies of authors who have said, that a certain workman had found out the secret of making glass malleable, *Joannes Sarisberienfis, quamvis ab exemplis supra dictis in partem nonnihil distans, libro de Nugis Curialium iv. cap. v. qui Polycraticus inscribitur, non quidem de suis, ne quid erres, sed verò de alieno (id quod Corniculæ isti cum factoribus illis semiprecis, Solino puta, Macrobio, Isidoro, atque aliis ejusdem farinae man-
gonibus commune) solens utique, præsertim de Satura Ar-
bitri nostri*. See what James Thomafius has answered to this censure of Douza (10). Note, That this work of Joannes Sarisberienfis has been translated into French, and printed at Paris in 4to, 1640, with the title, *Les Vanitez de la Cour*. The author of the translation only puts for his name D. M. at the bottom of his Epistle Dedicatory to the Marquis d'Asserac.

His other books are *Metalogicus, seu Tractatus de Logica, Philosophia*, &c. printed at Paris 1610, and at Leyden 1639, in 8vo. *Vita atque passio Sancti Thomæ Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi & Martyris*. A book of letters published at Paris 1611, in 4to. *Ex Bibliotheca Pappii Massensis*. Seven other historical letters inserted by du Chelne, in the fourth volume of his Collection of the Historians of France. There are many other letters of our author among those of Thomas Becket, collected by Father Lupus, and printed at Brussels in 1682, in two volumes in 4to. Balesus says, that this bishop composed a comment upon the Brunellus (11) of Vigelli; but a learned Critic (12) denies it for this reason, because that poem was dedicated to William de Long-Champ, whom Richard, King of England, made Bishop of Ely, in 1189, and who died in exile in 1197, fifteen years after the Bishop of Chartres, who is the subject of this article.

(9) Janus Douza Prædian. in Pe-
tronium, lib. iii,
cap. ix. pag. m.
594, 595.

(10) Thomaf.
de Plagio Literar.
pag. 240.

(11) It is the
title of a Latin
poem, which is
also called *Specu-
lum futurorum*.

(12) Reinesius,
Epist. ad Dau-
manium, pag. 197.
He does not say
Vigellus but Ni-
gelius.

SARNANUS, or DE SARNANO (CONSTANTIUS) so called because he was a native of Sarno in the kingdom of Naples (a), lived in the XVIth century. He was a Monk of the order of St Francis, and was accounted a very subtle Philosopher and Divine. He taught Philosophy at Padua, and Divinity at Rome and Perugia (b). Pope Sixtus invited him from this last city to Rome where he honoured him with a cardinal's cap, and made him Bishop of Vercelli (c). We have several books written by this Monk [A]. He died at Rome in the year 1595, and was

(a) And not in Umbria as Quenstedt says, de Parr. Viror. il. lustr. pag. 346.

(b) Nomenclat. Cardinal. p. 170.

(c) Quenstedt, ubi supra.

[A] We have several books written by this Monk.] The epitome of Gesner's *Bibliotheca* mislacks him Constantinus Sarmanus, and only mentions his book upon the *Universalis* printed at Venice in 8vo in the year

1576 (1). He composed besides that, a book *De sanctis intentionibus juxta doctrinam Scotti: Summa Theologica: Directorium Theologicum: Conciliatio Aureoli & Capreoli: Conciliatio Thomæ Aquinatis & Scotti, &c.* This

(1) Epit. Gel-
sæ pag. 174.

was buried at Sarno in the church of St Francis which he had caused to be built in a magnificent manner (d). His family name was Buccafoco. You will find his article in Moreri under the word *Bucafoci*. (d) Nomenclat. Cardinal. p. 1711

(a) *Apocalypse de Meliton*, pag. 25. This book was printed in the year 1663. The author was called Mr Pitheois. He had been a Friar Minime, but afterwards turning Protestant, he was Professor of Philosophy at Sedan, where he died very old in the year 1676.

having said that the minister, who, in answer to the Franciscan Feu-ardent, author of a book intitled, *Entremangeries Ministralles*, --- *The dissensions among the Ministers*, had published, *Les Entremangeries Monachales*, --- *The dissensions among the Monks*; had taken great advantage of the continual disputes of the Jacobins and Franciscans.

SAVONAROLA (MICHAEL, or JOHN MICHAEL) a native of Padoua practised Physic with so much reputation that Nicholas D'Este sent for him to Ferrara (a), and took him into his service, giving him a very considerable salary (b). Leonel the son of Nicholas, and Borfa (c) brother to Leonel continued him in his employment (d). He obtained the freedom of the place, acquired an exceeding great character, and made a good deal of profit by his business (e). He was a man of piety, and took no fee from the poor (f). He died at Ferrara knight of the order of St John of Jerusalem in the year 1431. The books he wrote were well received by the public (g), and have been printed in divers places (h). They treat of Physic. He left two sons, the younger of whom was father to the famous Dominican (i) who is the subject of the following article.

(a) Joh. Franc. Picus, in Vita Hieron. Savonarolæ, pag. m. 108.

(b) Ghilini Teatro, Part. ii, pag. 197.

(c) He was the first that had the title of Duke of Ferrara and Modena. Jo. Fr. Picus, ubi supra.

(d) Ghilini, ubi supra. (e) Id. ibid. (f) Jo. Fr. Picus, ubi supra. (g) Ghilini, ubi supra. (h) See Lindenius renovatus, pag. 643. (i) Jo. Fr. Picus, ubi supra.

SAVONAROLA (JEROM) grandson to the foregoing was born at Ferrara on the twenty-first of September 1452, and, without the knowledge of his parents, took the habit of a Dominican Fryar at Bologna in the year 1474. His superiors employed him to teach Physics and Metaphysics; but after having followed that business for several years, he took a disgust at these vain subtleties, and applied himself wholly to the reading of pious books, particularly of the holy Scripture. He was employed to preach and confess, and did both with great assiduity, till such time as he quitted the latter, that he might have the more leisure for the former (a). He was sent for in the year 1492, to prepare Laurence de Medicis for death (b). It is certain, 1, that he distinguished himself in an extraordinary manner by the austerity of his life, and by the fervent eloquence with which he preached against immorality [A], without sparing the disorders of the clergy, nor even the court of Rome; 2, that he pretended to partake in divine revelations; 3, that by all these means he acquired a great authority in Florence and the veneration of the whole city [B]; 4, that he lost his credit, was excommunicated, degraded from his Ecclesiastical orders, hanged and burnt, in the year

(a) Taken from his Life, written by John Francis Picus, Count of Mirandola, in *Collectio one Batifiana*, pag. 108, & seq.

(b) Politianus, Epist. IV. ltr. ii, fol. m. 92. voss. See likewise John Francis Picus, in Vita Savonarolæ, pag. 115.

[A] He distinguished himself by the austerity of his life, and by the fervent eloquence with which he preached against immorality. To the end I may not cite partial evidences, I shall quote the words of Paul Jovius, who has observed a pretty exact neutrality. Hieronymus Savonarola, says he (i), . . . utque adeo austeritate vitæ disciplina, ac erudito subtilique ingenio & in sacris concionibus admirabili facundia valuit, ut &c. Savonarola distinguished himself in such a manner by the austerity of his life, his learning, his subtle genius, and his admirable eloquence in preaching, that &c. He expresses himself still more strongly in another book. Tanta rerum atque animorum commutatio, . . . Florentiæ consecuta est, ut Hieronymus, qui modo singulari sanctimonia, virtutisque nomine animis civium imperitaret & in numerum divorum ut vivens referretur, publico consensu meruerat, concursu populi, senatusque decreto damnatus sit, & in area curiæ fœdissimo supplicio concrematus. . . . Atque ita qui ab excellenti doctrina ac vitæ continentia, & honestate, facundiaque incredibili in admiratione hominum aliquandiu fuerat, omnibus contumeliis & cruciatibus affectus, miserabile, & fortasse indignum tanta virtute, incerto levique populo spectaculum præbuit (2). . . . There followed such a change of affairs and sentiments, . . . at Florence, that Savonarola, who, a little before, had obtained a great power over the citizens by his singular sanctity, and the reputation of his virtue, and had, in the opinion of all, deserved to be canonized alive, was now condemned by a decree of the senate, and with the approbation of the people, and was ignominiously burnt in the yard of the court. . . . Thus he who for some time had been universally admired on account of his excellent doctrine, temperate life, and incredible eloquence; was forced to undergo all manner of indignities and torments, and

afforded a miserable spectacle, and perhaps, unworthy of so much virtue, to a fickle and inconstant populace. If you have a mind to see what has been said touching the great success of his sermons, you need only consult the appendix to Dr Cave's book (3). It is pretended, that the Florentines were converted by his preaching, much more than the Ninevites were by that of Jonas; for the city of Florence was reformed, not for a day, but for a long time, and cast all the instruments of luxury into the fire. Quæ de Hieronymi Savonarolæ eloquentia Christiana narratur, mira essent & incredibilia, nisi fidem facerent ejus scripta, quæ incredibilem spirant pietatem & ardorem; & facile persuadent quod ferunt, efficacia verbi Civitatem Florentinam, deliciis abundantiam opum diffuentem, fere totam non solum ad meliorem frugem ac modestiam Christianam revocasse, sed & ad planctus Ninive vitam civium convertisse, unde illis nomen gementium adhæsit, omniaque lux instrumenta, appensa Pyramidi flammis absumperunt. Neque ad tempus & boram putes id genus vitæ arripuisse, aut servasse, superstitie Savonarola; non minus diuturna & perennis fuit quam mira & repentina conversio (4). I give you notice that it is from one of Savonarola's brethren, and an apologist for the Dominicans, that I borrow these words.

(3) Wharton, in Appendix ad Historiam Literariam Guil. Cave, pag. 162, 163. He quotes John Francis Picus, in Vita Savonarolæ. See also Spizelius in Infelice Literato, p. 642.

(4) Vincentius Baronius Apolog. Ordini. Prædicat. Tom. ii, pag. 220, 221.

[B] He acquired a great authority in Florence, and the veneration of the whole city. They considered him as a prophet sent by God for the reformation of manners, and did not think that any thing ought to be undertaken without his advice, neither in the senate, nor in the houses of private persons. Thus Jovius speaks of him. Hieronymus Savonarola . . . literis admirabilis præsertim eloquentia insignis, qui in sacris concionibus, & in privatis colloquiis ita multitudinis animos opinione virtutis ceperat, ut illum rerum omnium, quæ immincebant, verum vatem, divinumque depravatis moribus censorum

(1) Jovius, in Elogiis, cap. xlii, pag. m. 99.

(2) Idem, in Vita Leonis X. pag. m. 52.

fickle
mob

VOL. V.

P

who strive to justify the revelations of Savonarola, but as he mentions a prophecy which

(28) Comines.
ibid. p. 499.

continues he (28), 'was because he had always preached very much in the king's favour, and his words had kept the Florentines from turning against us: for never had a preacher so great an influence over a city: he had constantly foretold the king's coming, (notwithstanding all that was said or written to the contrary) affirming, that he was sent by God to drive the tyrants out of Italy, and that nothing could resist nor withstand him: he had likewise said that he would come to Pisa, and that he would enter the city, and that on the same day the Florentine state would come to an end: and so it happened; for that very day was Peter de Medicis expelled: and many other things had he foretold in his sermons before they came to pass, as the death of Laurence de Medicis: and he likewise said publicly that it was revealed to him. He had preached, that the state of the Church should be reformed by the sword. This is not yet accomplished, but it is very near the point: and he still maintains that it shall be.' Several persons blamed him for pretending to divine revelations, others believed him. For my part I think him a good man: and I asked him, whether the king could proceed in his journey without any danger to his person, considering the great preparations of the Venetians against him, of which he was able to give a better account than I could, who was just come from Venice. He answered, that the king would meet with some difficulties by the way, but he would overcome them all, and gain immortal honour by it, though he had not above a hundred men in his company; and that God, who had conducted him hither, would guard him in his return; but because he had not applied himself as he ought, to the reformation of the Church, and because he had suffered his soldiers to plunder and rob the people, as well those of his own party, and such as had opened their gates freely to him, as his enemies, that God had pronounced judgment against him; and that he should shortly feel a lash of the whip. However, he bid me tell him that if he would have compassion on the people, keep his army from doing mischief, and punish them when they did it, as his duty required, God would revoke or mitigate his sentence; and that it was not sufficient for him to plead, *I myself do no harm*. He added, that he would go himself to meet the king, and would tell him these words, and so he did, and spoke of the restitution of the Florentine places. When he mentioned that sentence of God, the death of the dauphin came very fresh into my mind; for I knew nothing else that the king could lay so much to heart: and this I likewise say, to the end it may the better be understood, how the whole of this expedition was a mystery conducted by God himself. It is thus that he speaks in the second chapter of the eighth book. Let us see what he says in the nineteenth chapter, where he relates the tragical end of this Dominican. Friar Jerom, who foretold many things before they came to pass, . . . had always maintained, that the king would pass the Alps, and he preached it publicly, saying, that God had revealed to him as well that, as other things which he spoke of. He said that the king was chosen by God to reform the Church by force, and to punish the tyrants; and because he gave out that he knew things by revelation, several people murmured against him, and he drew upon himself the hatred of the Pope, and of several in the city of Florence. His life was exceedingly virtuous, as it plainly appeared, and his sermons were levelled against vice, by which means he brought many of his fellow-citizens to live well, as I have said. . . . He has all along affirmed publicly in his sermons, that the king would return once more into Italy, to fulfil that commission which God had given him, to reform the Church by the sword, and to drive the tyrants out of Italy, and that in case he did not do it, God would punish him severely. He printed all his first sermons with those which he preached lately, and they are now to be sold. As for that severe punishment with which, as he said, God threatened the king, if he did not come back; Savonarola frequently wrote to him concerning it, not long before his death; and to

the same purpose were the words which he said to me, when I talked with him at the time of our return from Italy: for he told me that sentence was given out in heaven against the king, in case he did not execute the will of God, and if he did not keep his men from plundering (29). He says (30), that the crimes laid in Savonarola's charge, were only that he forced discord in the city, and that as to what he pretended to speak by prophecy, he had private information of it from his friends that were of the council. I will neither accuse nor excuse them, continues he; I do not know whether they did well or ill in putting him to death: but he said many true things which the Florentines could not possibly have told him: and as touching the king, and the evils that were to befall him according to Savonarola's prediction, you see what has happened to him; first his son's death, and then his own. I have seen some letters which he wrote to that prince. Note he observes (31), that there were some Florentines who still expected the king's return, and wished for it, on account of the hopes which Savonarola gave them, and that they wasted and exceedingly impoverished themselves by reason of the expense they were at, from an earnest desire to recover Pisa, and the other places which they had delivered to the king: among which, Pisa was then in the hands of the Venetians.

I. This may induce us to believe that Savonarola foretold the return of Charles VIII, in a precise and absolute manner; for if he had only foretold it as a thing probable, and grounded himself on this, viz. that God required and threatened to punish the king if it was not executed, he would not have inspired the Florentines with so much confidence. It is then very likely, that he promised to them absolutely as a certain fact, the second expedition of Charles VIII; but that in addressing himself to that prince, he did not hold the same language, but only gave him to understand, that it was the will of God he should return into Italy, and, in case of failure, denounced against him the indignation and the severe judgments of his Creator. He found no better way than this to verify the prophecies which he gave out at Florence. Philip de Comines, who was better acquainted with affairs of state, than with the intrigues of prediction-makers, did not distinguish these two springs, or this duplicity of language: he confounded the one with the other, and supposes that the Monk added an *if* in his sermons, as he did in his letters (32); which is contrary to all likelihood. It is proper to observe, that if this prophet had been very sure in the matter, he would not have denounced these terrible judgments of God to Charles VIII; for in so doing, he believed it possible for that monarch not to make the second expedition. How then durst he foretell it, and say that God had revealed it to him? When God reveals that such a thing will happen, is it in the power of man to hinder it from coming to pass? Can they chuse any measures that will prevent it? Is it necessary to threaten them with some misfortune, in case they should make it miscarry? Let us conclude, that the threatnings used with Charles VIII, and the certainty of the revelation touching his return into Italy, are things which can never be reconciled in any wise head. If you should answer, that these threatnings were to serve as the means to bring about the event, and that therefore they were no sign of Savonarola's uncertainty, I will deny the fact; for Charles VIII did not return into Italy, and consequently the threatnings of that Monk were not one of the means which God had fore-ordained to that end. Turn yourself which way you will, you can never disprove his being a false prophet in this point. He puts me in mind of the Drabicius's and Knotterus's of our days, people that began by wishing earnestly for the ruin of the emperor, and who proceeded by foretelling it, afterwards by looking every where round for a prince able to procure it; and last of all, by signifying to that prince that he was predestinated to that great work, and that if he did not set about it, God would punish him severely (33). There is sometimes more malice than enthusiasm in this proceeding, a war is only aimed at; for as a man very well skilled in these artifices said, it is certain that prophecies, whether supposed or true, have often inspired the persons for whom they were made, with the design of undertaking the things that were promised to them (34).

II. I

* That might relate to the future taking of Rome, and the ransom of Pope Clement VII, in the year 1527. This marginal note which I find in my edition, is not made by Philip de Comines, and I do not understand why he expresses himself in the present tense, and he still maintains it, since he wrote his Memoirs, after Savonarola's death.

from church by force

Va. Sale

REFLECTIONS upon this narrative of Philip de Comines.

(32) For example the king will return, or if he does not return, God will punish him.

prophecy

(33) See the remark [H] of the article KOTTERUS. See also the remark [C], of the same article near the end.

(34) See the remark [H] of the article KOTTERUS. See also the remark [C], of the same article near the end.

which proved false, I mean that which affirmed that Charles VIII would come a second time into Italy, he serves as a witness to those who censure the said prophet. This will appear from a passage that I quoted out of Gabriel Naudé [E], one of the authors who blame the conduct of our Monk. He does not do it with so much harshness as Volaterranus who has roundly affirmed that Savonarola was an arrant cheat, and that riling

II. I shall make another reflection upon the narrative of Philip de Comines. This author is too ready to help Savonarola out with the accomplishment of his predictions. He verifies the threatnings of that monk in the death of the Dauphin, and in that of Charles VIII. They were loose threatnings, and did not much expose him; for that prince might meet with vexations from a hundred quarters, and more easily than persons of a private condition; so that one risked nothing at all in threatening him with some misfortune. A prophet has nothing to fear when he keeps to such generalities. He may even save himself by a backdoor, in case the princes whom he threatens should fall into no affliction: he may say, that such long prosperity is a judgment from God, that it hinders them from minding their salvation, as they would have done in adversity. Comines is too charitable and good-natured; he might have very well excused himself from making the applications. This fault has produced others; there are writers who have very falsely alleged his authority, for saying that Savonarola prophesied, that the King of France would not long survive the Dauphin. *Neque inficias tamen ire Comineus potuit, Savonarolam multa verè prædixisse, de quibus nemo mortalium potuisset admonere, Nam & Regi, inquit, fore prædixit, ut extincto filio ipse quoque non diu superesset* (35).

(35) Spizelius, in Infel. Literato, pag. 666. He quotes p. 636. a passage of John Francis Picus contra capitulum 11, Samuelis Calfinensis vultus that error is to be found.

(36) Comineus, ex Verhione Latina Sleidan Edit. Amst. 1656, in 12mo. As I have not this translation at present by me, I quote it upon the authority of Mr Crenius, Pref. ad Christop. Helvici Elenchum Judicium, &c. Edit. Lugd. Batav. 1702.

(37) It is *scut* in the editions of Sleidan, but the whole series of the discourse shews that we ought to read *scut*, or *scut*.

(38) See Guicciardin and Jovius at the beginning of their Histories.

Sleidan is perhaps the cause of the error which I have just taken notice of; for thus he has translated the end of the passage of Philip de Comines: *Nam & Regi prædixit, fore, ut extincto filio, ipse quoque non diu superesset, atque bas illius ad regem literas, ipse legi* (36). Nothing could be more unfair than this translation; it does not at all answer to these words of the original: 'Et touchant le Roy, & les maux qu'il dit luy devoir advenir, luy est advenu ce que vous voyez, qui seut (37) premier la mort de sons fils, puis la sienne, & ay veu des lettres qu'il escrivoit audit Signeur.' The translation has so confounded things, that it directly and formally ascribes to the prophet what is no more than a pure comment of the historian. Besides, it affirms, that the historian had seen the letters which contained that pretended prediction; but Comines only says, that he had seen some letters from Savonarola to the king. To make a faithful translation, it should have been expressed thus: *Et quidem quoad Regem mala ipsi contigerunt quæ is eventura dixerat, quod ipsimet cernitis, nempe primo obitus filii, ac deinde ipsius Regis. Nonnullas vidi epistolas supradicto Principi ab eo scriptas.* This simplicity without elegance is much better than a fine Latin style which corrupts the sense of the original.

III. Here follows a third reflexion. The event has proved, that Charles VIII was not chosen by God to reform the Church by the sword, and to drive the tyrants out of Italy. He no ways reformed the Church: Historians (38) mark his expedition as one of the æra's of the greatest calamities of Italy; and it is certain that no advantage accrued from it to that part of the world. What else can we conclude from this, but that the Monk was deceived in his pretended revelations. He did not see farther than another into the decrees of God; but he had the confidence to boast that he knew them. Let it not be alleged that if Charles VIII had reformed the Church by his sword, and caused his soldiers to observe an exact discipline, Savonarola's predictions would have had their full accomplishment. These are idle evasions. When God predestinates to the end, he likewise predestinates to the means: so that if the means of reformatory to the Church her primitive form, and to Italy her liberty, had depended on the sword of Charles VIII, and on the good discipline of his troops, that prince would have been predestinated to these means, and if so, he would have put them in execution, for nothing can hinder the decrees of God. It is then false that providence had pitched upon him for this work; and consequently Savonarola, who affirmed it, ought to be looked upon as a false prophet in that respect.

I shall not repeat what has been said elsewhere (39) in answer to the evasions and subterfuges of those who, after not succeeding in their predictions, lay the fault on the sins of men. If these sins were to hinder the event, there was no decree in heaven concerning the existence of that thing: for which reason, every man who foretold that it would come to pass was mistaken; and if he had been truly inspired, he would have known the real obstacles that would happen, and not the pretended existence of what was not to happen.

I do not know what authority Varillas had for saying that when there was a dearth at Florence, it did no service to Savonarola that he had foretold it, that on the contrary, the Florentines were so much the more offended at his not having applied a proper remedy (40). They would not have been altogether in the wrong: for he governed the whole city; and if he was obliged as a prophet to foretell the barrenness of the earth; as director of the affairs of state he was obliged to provide supplies of corn: otherwise, his prediction was to no purpose.

I must not omit that his conversation with Philip de Comines has been ill related by Varillas, who has not only tacked to it extravagant additions and enlargements, but likewise an intolerable falsity, viz. that Savonarola affirmed that Charles VIII would not return into Italy (41).

[E] Philip de Comines serves as a witness to those who censure Savonarola. This will appear from a passage of . . . Gabriel Naudé. Since all the praises which have hitherto been bestowed upon that person, are to be ascribed either to the affection of his friends and followers, or to the artifice and subtlety of heretics, who would gladly make him more zealous than St Paul, more learned than St Augustine, and more eloquent than St Chrysostom, because they appropriate him to themselves; I reckon that in order to judge of him with more reason and equity, we may in the first place say of the predictions which brought him into such vogue and esteem, that so far were they from being occasioned by a divine enthusiasm, like those of the prophets, and of many other saints and favourites of God, that on the contrary, they have been almost every one false; as appears in his having affirmed that Charles VIII would come a second time into Italy, that the person who should grasp at the dominion of Florence would come to a miserable end, that John Picus would recover of the illness of which he died two days after, and in many more of his prophecies, still more vain, which are amply deduced and told in the book that John Poggius wrote upon the falsity of them: and that if any of them proved true, it must be owned, that this happened either by chance, or because he had private information given him of what was to be done by a great number of friends that he had in the council of the Florentines, and in that of the King of France. Lastly, As to what concerns the rest of his actions, we may truly judge by these, that he was a very great politician, dignified sometimes with the most honourable employments, and endowed with such a ready and persuasive eloquence, that he may justly be compared to those ancient orators, who had no less dominion and influence upon popular and democratical states, than the winds have upon the sea, keeping them at pleasure in the calm of peace, or in the storms of war, making them roll sometimes one way and sometimes another, turning them upside down, and, in short, managing them at pleasure, and to the tune of their discourses. Savonarola may boast of having done this for above the space of ten years at Florence, although he likewise made use of his revelations, and of his counterfeit and dissembled piety, to keep up his credit and reputation so long, knowing from the examples of Arius and Mahomet, that the respect of religion has an extreme influence upon our minds; and that when once a man has got the fame of living holily, he makes the people believe what he pleases, especially if he be endowed with a

(39) See remark [E] of the article St BER-NARD.

(40) Varillas, Anecdotes de Florence, p. 214.

(41) Varillas, Hist. de Charles VIII, book 10, pag. 345, 346. Dutch Edition.

+ Comines, lib. viii, cap. xix.

rising up in rebellion against the Church he endeavoured to found a new sect (c). What he adds, that Savonarola, when he went to church in order to preach, got armed men to accompany him (d), is no small proof of a factious spirit. It cannot be denied that he concerned himself too much with political affairs [F]. This is always blameable in persons who have dedicated themselves to the ministry of the word of God; but they are chiefly to be condemned when they meddle with the government, in a state which is divided into factions. Now this was precisely Savonarola's case. There were two factions in the republic of Florence: the one endeavoured to support the house of Medicis, or at least the Aristocracy; the other wanted to extirpate that house, and to set up a popular government. In these divisions he made himself the head of a party, and the soul or *primum mobile* of the Democratical faction (e); so that he may be well compared

(c) Volterrano, ubi infra.

(d) Non religiosus sed Militum gladius atque lictoribus stipatus ad templum divinumque verbum predicandum accedebat. Volterrano, lib. vi, pag. m. 181.

(e) See remark [G].

(42) Naudé, Apologie des grands Hommes accusés de Magie, chap. xvi, pag. m. 455, & seq.

(43) Id. ibid. pag. 460.

(44) That which I have observed in the remark [C], viz. that Charles VIII was determined to procure the reformation of the Church, and the deliverance of Italy.

(45) Excerpta ex Diario Johannis Burchardi, pag. 55. Edit. Hannoveranae 1696. See also pag. 46, and the Preuves & Observations sur les Mémoires de Comines, pag. 335, the Hague Edition 1683.

graceful delivery, and an uncommon eloquence (42). Naudé concludes, that it was easy for Savonarola to bear rule at Florence, quando, as Jovius, in speaking of him, has very well observed; 'Nihil validius esset ad persuadendum, specie ipsa pietatis, in qua etiam tuenda libertatis studium emineret' (43). - - - Since there it not a more powerful instrument of persuasion than a show of piety, in which also a great zeal for the support of liberty is conspicuous.

We shall see below some other strokes of his censure. Take notice, if you please, that he might have found in Philip de Comines another proof of Savonarola's illusions (44), and do not forget what he observes touching the information which that prophet could receive from the court of France, and the council of the Florentines. 'This was no bad method of foretelling. It has been said, that there were confessors who revealed to him the secrets of their penitents, and that he owned it in prison. Another good way of making it to be thought that he had revelations from above. Frater Hieronymus carceribus mancipatus postquam septies questionibus & tormentis expositus fuit, supplicavit pro misericordia, offerens dicturum & scripturum omnia quibus deliquisset. Dimissus est de tortura & ad carceres repositus, & assignata sibi carta & atramento scriptis crimina & delicta sua in foliis, ut afferbant, LXXX & ultra, scilicet quod non habuit unquam aliquam revelationem divinam, sed habuit intelligentiam cum pluribus ex Fratribus in civitate Florentia & extra eam per multa millia residentibus qui ei Confessiones Christi fidelium revelarent cum contentum nominibus & cognominibus, ex quibus sibi plura dicebantur, & contentes ipsos pro hujusmodi peccatis & criminibus privatim, aliquando in genere publice corripiebat, assersens sibi a Salvatore nostro Domino Jesu Christo esse revelata (45). Savonarola being committed to prison, after he was seven times put to the rack, begged for mercy, promising that he would make a full discovery of all his crimes in writing. He was released from the torture, and remanded back to prison, and having paper and ink given him, he wrote down his crimes and offences in eighty leaves and upwards, as it is affirmed, viz. confessing that he never had any divine revelation, but that he held a correspondence with several Friars residing in the city of Florence, and many miles out of it, who revealed to him the confessions of their penitents, together with their names and surnames, which gave him still farther information; and that he sometimes publicly reproved in general those who had confessed the like crimes in private, affirming that they had been revealed to him by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.' This is what we meet with in the journal of a master of the ceremonies under Pope Alexander VI. I have not the book where John Poggius gives the particulars of Savonarola's prophetic lies; but the following passage specifies some of them. A person named John Poggius wrote a treatise which was printed at Rome, containing thirteen chapters, in all which, addressing his speech to Savonarola himself, after having proved his predictions to be false, particularly, for that having sent his cap to Charles Strozza, when he was upon his death-bed, and foretold that he should be instantly and thoroughly cured by putting it on, the said Strozza had no sooner touched it, but he gave up the ghost; and in the like manner, having sent it to a Goldsmith called Cosmo, and to several other sick persons for the same purpose, viz. of a cure, foretold and promised, they all of them died in a very small time: and likewise for that he had publicly affirmed that John Picus of Mirandula, would recover of the illness of which he died two days after that prediction. I say, the said

John Poggius after having confuted the reasons of Savonarola, and exhorted him to return under the obedience of the Pope, proves him to be an infidel, an infamous apostate, a seditious man, a disturber of the public peace and happiness, a schismatic, a rebel to the supreme bishop, and therefore justly excommunicated (46). Read also this other passage: Quam ille multa de Ecclesie reformatione, de Turcarum & Maurorum conversione, de Florentinorum felicitate, quae max adimplenda & asstantium multi erant visuri antequam moreretur, praedixit? addens (in revelationum compendio) illas absolutas & immutabiles Prophecias esse? Attamen nihil horum ferè adhibere contigit, pleraque omnia intra tantum ferme annos contraria contigerunt (47). Martin del Rio reproaches him in these words, with having foretold absolutely, and without condition, three or four things as immutable and near events, the reverse of which had happened before the revolution of a century. He had foretold the conversion of the Moors and Turks, and the felicity of Florence, that is to say according to the principles of Democracy. But so far were the Florentines from recovering that government, that they fell under a monarchical one. He seemed to be so firmly persuaded of the certainty of his predictions, and had so rivetted that persuasion in the Monks of his convent, that he and they consented to verify by the test of fire (48), the following positions; I. The Church of God wants reformation: II. It shall be scourged; and III. It shall be renewed: IV. Florence shall be so too after having been scourged: V. There shall be hopes after that, and the infidels shall be converted to Jesus Christ: VI. All these things shall happen in our days: VII. The excommunication of Friar Jerom is void, those who pay no regard to it do not sin (48*). He affirmed, that he had such a distinct view of futurity, and was so thoroughly satisfied with the evidence of that object, that it would have been as difficult for him not to give his assent thereto, as to deny the first principles (49). It is in this strain that a person must speak, who desires that what he preaches up in a prophetic manner should make a deep impression upon peoples minds; but the return from this voyage is somewhat dangerous.

[F] It cannot be denied that he concerned himself too much with political affairs. He began by little and little to shew some marks of his secret ambition, when so soon as in the year 1484, as he himself says in the book he wrote on his prophecies, he mixed with Politicians, and procured himself to be called to the council, which at that time was held at Florence for establishing a popular government, where he excited all the citizens to embrace it with one consent; and proposed to them four or five points of great consequence, in order to support themselves in it, saying, that these were revealed to him by GOD Almighty, and that they ought punctually to observe them, if they were desirous of making their state the most flourishing in all Italy. Whereupon, tho' affairs had not taken the turn that he expected, he nevertheless did not fail to improve, day after day, his credit with the people, teaching in the sermons he preached in the year 1489 on St John's revelation, that the Church was threatened with a speedy reformation, after that of Francis Picus, in the petty kings and tyrants of Italy, who were shortly to feel the avenging scourge of all their iniquities. He proved this in such a manner by passages of the holy scripture, and by maintaining the certainty of his revelations, that after the expedition of Charles VIII into Italy, which he had foretold and proclaimed two years before, every body so confidently expected that he would return again, as Savonarola affirmed, that they did not lose hopes of it till the year 1498, in which King Charles, and

(46) Du Vésillet Vauvrière, Prosopographie, Tome iii, pag. 2333, 2334.

(47) Martin. Del Rio, Disquis. Magicar. lib. ix, cap. i. Quest. III, §. vi, pag. m. 197.

(48) See the remark [G].

(48*) Excerpta ex Diario Burchardi, pag. 46. Preuves sur Comines, pag. 331, but instead of fideles, we must read infidèles.

(49) Adeo clarescunt futura, sique praebent assensum; ut neque facile sint negaturi prima, & receptissima notissimaque Sententia, quod de Savonarola ille dicebat. (in Compendio Reveli) de de quodam suo familiari, quem non nominat, Picus affirmat, quem ego Hieronymum hunc fuisse opinor. Mart. Del Rio, Disquis. Magicar. lib. ix, cap. i. Quest. I, pag. 199. See John Picus, in the petty kings and tyrants of Italy, who were shortly to feel the avenging scourge of all their iniquities. He proved this in such a manner by passages of the holy scripture, and by maintaining the certainty of his revelations, that after the expedition of Charles VIII into Italy, which he had foretold and proclaimed two years before, every body so confidently expected that he would return again, as Savonarola affirmed, that they did not lose hopes of it till the year 1498, in which King Charles, and

(f) In Republics seditions are commonly the *Sacra Anchora*, the last resource, or the last reason of one of the parties. They are the same that great gusts are in kingdoms, *Ratio ultima Regum*. -- The last argument of kings. They are *Deus in Machina*, the God that unravels the incidents of the plot, and who decides the cause.

compared to the tribunes of the people, who favoured Marius against Sylla in the Roman republic, or rather to the Athenian Demagogues, who so frequently became the directors of the state. Can a Fryar, a minister of the altar, in a word, a clergyman, embark in this stormy sea? Is it not a kind of engagement to sin? Will not such a man be almost necessarily obliged to support himself by foul intrigues, and by plots that generally end in popular tumults (f), in plunderings, in massacres, in proscriptions, and in sentences of death hastily passed, and no less hastily executed, by the faction which hath prevailed. Savonarola's party redressed themselves odiously by such an execution upon several considerable persons (g), and he thereby sowed the seeds of his own ruin. He did no less contribute to it by his contempt for the thunders of the Vatican, and his declamations against the Pope; but what completed his destruction was, that having agreed that his doctrines should be verified by the trial of fire, he visibly fluffed, and his heart failed him, when the time came for executing his engagement [G]. By

(g) See Paul Jovius, in Vita Leonis X, pag. m. 51.

(50) Naudé, ubi supra, pag. 447, & seq.

and he that had favoured him so much in his sermons, were translated from this life into another (50). . . . He had incurred the hatred not only of Pope Alexander VI, and of the greatest part of the clergy, against whom he used to declaim in the pulpit; but likewise of all the principal citizens of Florence, by the execution which he advised to be made of seven or eight of the chief noblemen amongst them: so that having no friends left but the partisans of Paul Antony Soderini, who made use of him to support the popular government, in opposition to Guy Antony Vespucci, who wanted to establish an Aristocratical form, they were not able to resist those of the contrary party, who, during this commotion, broke open the gates of his convent, and dragged him to punishment. This they did in order that their city might have rest and quiet, by the death of that man who kept them at variance with the Pope, on account of his new doctrine, and nourished factions and divisions amongst them, which, if they had been suffered to go any further, could not have failed to end in the ruin of their state and authority (51).

(51) Id. ibid. pag. 449, & seq.

Had he meddled with the government, with no other view but to maintain concord, and had succeeded in his design, he could hardly be excused; for as laymen have no business with things appertaining to the altar, so Monks have as little to do with political affairs: every one should keep within the bounds of his own profession. What shall we say then of a man who immersed himself wholly in cabals of state and occasioned so many troubles and divisions? Paul Jovius is moderate enough in the censure which he passes upon him. 'Is Mediceo nomini maxime erat infestus, oppugnabatque eum Reipublicæ statum, quem paucorum potentium, uti prædicabat, vis & libido regere posset: ob id civitatem in partes jam plane diduxerat, ita ut à gravibus famisque civibus non inepte reprehenderetur, quod a religione divinarumque rerum contemplatione, ambitiosius quam sacrum virum deceret, ad munia regendæ Reipublicæ transivisset (52). . . . He was chiefly set against the family de Medicis, and opposed that form of a Republic, which, as he said, was liable to be governed by the violence and lust of a few great men. For this reason he had evidently divided the city into parties, and was very justly censured by grave and wise citizens; because, that laying aside his religious profession, and the contemplation of divine matters, he had concerned himself in the management of the state, with more ambition than became a man of his holy profession.' See in Guicciardin (53), how he declared it to be the will of God, that the government of the people should be set up, and nevertheless, he confessed that they should infringe the prerogatives of that form of government, in the point of executing four or five persons that were condemned for high treason. 'Their relations having appealed from the sentence to the great council of the people, by virtue of a law which had been made at the establishment of the Democracy; those who had been authors of the condemnation, fearing lest compassion for their age and quality, and the multitude of their relations, should mitigate in the minds of the people the severity of the sentence, bestirred themselves so much, that they procured it to be debated before a smaller number of citizens, whether they should be suffered to proceed in their appeal or not; where, as the advantage both in number and authority was on their side, who maintained, that it was a dangerous thing, and might very possibly end in sedition; and that the laws themselves allowed they might be dispensed with in the like case to prevent tumults; some of

(52) Paulus Jovius, in Vita Leonis X, pag. 48.

(53) Guicciardin, lib. ii. folio m. 45, verso.

the chief magistrates were impetuously, and in a manner by force and threatnings, forced to consent, that, notwithstanding the appeal lodged, the execution should be performed that very night; and in this the friends of Savonarola were more zealous than the rest, to the great scandal of him who did not dissuade, even his own followers, from violating a law which he himself had proposed a few years before, as very useful, and almost necessary for the preservation of liberty (54). We may discover in this conduct of Savonarola, some marks of the unregenerated man, and of the unchristian Politician. Note, That Varillas supposes that this Monk endeavoured to save the lives of these state-criminals (55). Had that been true, Guicciardin would not have laid just the reverse. I add, that Antony Maria Gratiana, Bishop of Amelia, observes, that the relations of the condemned persons in vain besought Valori and Savonarola upon their knees; they could not obtain for them that they should enjoy the privilege of an appeal to the people (56).

(54) Guicciardin, lib. iii. fol. 124.

(55) Varillas, Anecdotes de Florence, pag. 216.

(56) Gratiana, de Casibus Virorum illustrium, pag. 133.

[G] What completed his destruction was, that having agreed that his doctrines should be verified by the trial of fire, he wisely fluffed . . . when the time came for executing his engagement.] Guicciardin has discovered so great an inclination to justify Savonarola, that I cannot chuse a less suspected narrative than his. I shall quote it somewhat at length, that I may shew all the causes of this Monk's ruin. Savonarola . . . having been long before accused to the Pope of the following crimes, that he preached scandalously against the manners of the clergy, and of the court of Rome, that he nourished divisions in Florence, that his doctrine was not entirely Catholic, and having, for these reasons, been summoned to appear at Rome by several apostolical briefs, refused to go there, alledging divers excuses; and, on this account, he had at last in the preceding year been excommunicated by the Pope. By reason of this sentence he abstained some months from preaching, and if he had abstained longer, he might have obtained his absolution easily; because the Pope, who made no great account of Savonarola, had proceeded against him rather by the instigation and persuasion of his adversaries, than for any other cause. But he, concluding that it was owing to his silence that his reputation declined so fast, or that the end which he had in view was thereby interrupted, as he had chiefly raised himself by his vehemence in preaching, despised the Pope's orders, and returned as to the public discharge of that office; affirming that the censures published against him were unjust and void, as being contrary to the will of God, and prejudicial to the interest of society. He railed most severely at the Pope and the whole court: which occasioned a violent uproar. His adversaries (whose authority with the people increased daily) detested this disobedience, and laid to his charge that by his rash conduct the Pope's mind was altered, and that too at a time when he was treating with other confederates about the restitution of Pisa, and when it was proper to do every thing that might confirm him in that inclination. On the other hand, his followers defended him; saying, that people ought not, for the sake of worldly considerations, to disturb the works of God; nor consent that, under such pretexts, the Pope should begin to meddle with the affairs of their Republic. This dispute having lasted several days, and the Pope being strangely provoked, and thundering out new briefs and threatnings of excommunication against the whole city, he was at length commanded by the magistrates to desist from preaching. He obeyed their orders, but several of his brethren did in divers churches the same thing that

By this means he lost his reputation, and the very next day (b) a number of armed men hastened to his convent, and having dragged him from thence delivered him into the

(b) Two days after according to some authors.

he had done. As the clergy was no less divided than the laity, the monks of other orders did not cease to preach against him with great vehemence: and they were inflamed at length to such a degree, that one of the Friars who adhered to Savonarola, and one of the Friars minor, agreed to enter into the fire in the presence of the whole people, to the end, that, according as Savonarola's Friar should escape or be burnt, every one might plainly see whether he was a prophet or an impostor: because formerly he had several times affirmed in his sermons, that, as a sign of the truth of his predictions, he would obtain of GOD, when it should be necessary, the favour to pass unhurt through the middle of the fire. Being nevertheless vexed, that the proposal of coming to an immediate proof of it should have been made without his knowledge, he dexterously tried to divert it. But as the thing had already gone too far, and was pressed by some citizens, who desired to see their country rid of so much vexation, it was at last necessary to proceed. Wherefore the two Friars, accompanied by all their brethren, being come on the day appointed to the place which is before the public palace, where were assembled, not only all the people in Florence, but likewise several others from the neighbouring towns: The Friars minor were informed, that Savonarola had ordered his Monk to carry the sacrament in his hand when he entered into the fire. As they began to protest against this, and to allege, that by such means an attempt was made to endanger the authority of the Christian faith, which would decline very much in the minds of the ignorant, if the Host should burn; and as Savonarola, who was present, still persisted in his resolution, there arose such a discord between them, that they did not proceed to make the experiment. He left so much credit by this, that the next day his adversaries, encouraged by some accidental tumult (57), took arms, and joining to these the authority of the supreme magistrate, they entered by force into the convent of St Mark, where he resided, and carried him, together with two of his brethren, to the public goal (58).

(57) Bullart, *Académie des Sciences, Tom. ii.* pag. 6, says that Savonarola raised this tumult among the people.

(58) Guicciardin, book iii, near the end. fol. m. 127, ad ann. 1498.

(59) In the rem. [2], citat. (48).

(60) My author, who says this pag. 46, quotes pag. 51, some extracts from a discourse of Savonarola which intimate that the Franciscans were the first that proposed the test of fire. See below citat. (72).

(61) Bench' io credo ardere, ma per salute dell'anime son molto contento che lo ardi. *Excerpta in Diario Burchardi*, pag. 43.

(62) Ibid. p. 50.

not worth his while to enter into the fire with a single Franciscan; but that if his adversaries, and especially such of them as resided at Rome, and their adherents, would expose themselves to the fire, he was ready to accompany them; being well assured that he should come off in the same manner as the three Hebrews that were cast into the furnace at Babylon. *Si massimamente per che il mio entrare nel fuoco con un solo frate non farebbe quella utilità nella chiesa che richiede una tant' opera, quanto e questa ch'iddio ci ha posta nelle mani. Et però mi son offerto & mi offerirò de novo, di far io proprio l'esperienza, ogni volta che gl'averfarai di questa nostra dottrina & maxime que' de Roma e lor adherenti vogliano commettere la causa in questo padre & in altri, & mi confido nel nostro Salvatore Gesù Christo & non dubito punto ch'io andaro per il fuoco come fece Sidorac, Mesach & Abednago nella fornace ardente, non non per miei meriti & virtù, ma per virtù di Dio, il quale vorrà confirmare la sua verità & manifestare la sua gloria in questo mondo (63).* I pass by the other answers which he made to the objections: they are to be seen in this book which I quote (64).

(63) Ibidem.

(64) Ibid. & pagina sequenti.

The magistrates of Florence having well considered all these challenges, and the commotions which this thing bred in the city, gave orders that they should proceed to the execution of their engagements on Saturday the seventh of April 1498. The Friar minor, accompanied only with one of his brethren, went to the place of execution before the hour appointed; but Dominic de Pefcia let it pass, and came, a little after, in procession with the cross and the Host, and with Savonarola, and all his brethren, and a great multitude of people. The Friar minor declared to the magistrates that he did not at all doubt but that he should be burnt, and begged of them not to pass a judgment in Savonarola's favour, unless the Dominican should come out of the fire without receiving any harm. This was promised to him: and because there were people who suspected, that the one or other of the Friars, or perhaps both, had hid some charm under their gown, they were ordered to pull off their clothes, and to put on new ones, which had been just made for them. The Friar minor consented to it, and even offered to go naked into the flames. The Dominican on the other hand made use of subterfuges to keep his gown; and it was granted him at the request of the Friar minor himself, who represented, that since it was of cloth it would infallibly burn with the person that had it on. Afterwards, the Dominican protested that he would not enter into the fire without the crucifix. This was agreed to at the entreaty still of the Friar minor, who represented that the crucifix was of wood, and that consequently instead of being a preservative against the fire, it would be burnt with the Dominican. The latter asked, as a new favour, that he might be allowed to enter into the fire with the holy sacrament, and declared, that without that he would not expose himself to the trial. The magistrates refused to grant his petition, and thereupon the assembly broke up; every one returned to his own house; and this was the issue of an affair which had drawn the attention of the whole city (65). People murmured, chafed, and entertained suspicions against Savonarola; and on the Monday following, which was the ninth of April, they attacked the monastery of the Dominicans, and took that Friar out by force (66).

(65) *It might well have been laid upon that occasion, Spectatum admitti ritum tenebris amici? Would you not laugh to see this foolish show?* Horat. de Arte Poet. ver. 5, or Parturient montes nascetur ridiculus mus. *The lab'ring mountain breeds a silly mouse.* CREECH. Id. ibid. ver. 129.

I take this from the Journal of John Burchard, who was clerk of the chapel to Pope Alexander VI, and master of the ceremonies. He says, that these things were thus notified to the Pope by the Florentine ambassador. I confess, that the narrative of an apologist for Savonarola (67) does not agree in every circumstance with this, and that it contains a curious particular, which is not in the other, viz. that Savonarola offered to forfeit his life, in case the very silk that covered the holy sacrament should receive the least damage by the fire. The Apologist adds, 1. That Dominic de Pefcia would have entered into the flames without the consecrated Host, if one of his companions (68) had not been warned by Angels, that it was not fit he should enter otherwise: 2. That perhaps this angelical warning was designed to hinder people from imputing this miracle to some magic virtue, the

(66) Taken from the *Excerpta ex Diario Joh. Burchardi*, pag. 49, & seq.

(67) Joannes Franciscus Picus, in *Vita Savonarolæ*, pag. 128, & seq.

(68) He was called Sylvester of Florence.

the hands of justice. He was put to the rack; and it is said that he confessed his impoſture [H]. He was hanged and burnt with two other Jacobin Friars, Dominic of Peſcia and Sylveſter of Florence, of whom the one had reſuſed to enter into the fire

the effects of which are reſtrained by the preſence of the holy ſacrament. I obſerve, that Volaterranus has not related this adventure well; for he ſuppoſes (69) that Savonarola having boaſted that he had the gift of miracles, and that he could paſs unhurt thro' the middle of the fire, the magiſtrates ordered him to make the trial, and diſcovered the cheat, by ſeeing him reſolved not to do it without the Hoſt in his hand. This error of Volaterranus in ſuch an eſſential circumſtance of a fact, which he had almoſt ſeen with his own eyes is unpardonable.

REFLECTIONS
upon Savonarola's
conduct, with
regard to the
challenge of the
Franciscan.

For the reſt, we cannot accuſe thoſe people of being raſh, who entertained ſuſpicions to Savonarola's diſadvantage; all appearances were againſt him. It was already a prejudice againſt him, that being perſonally challenged to enter into the fire, he declined to enter himſelf, and ſubſtituted a deputy. He made a very fooliſh excuſe, when he pretended that by reaſon of the great work to which he was deſtined by God, it was beneath him to engage with a ſingle Franciſcan; for he could have done nothing more uſeful towards the advancement of that work, than the good ſucceſs of the trial would have been. What more authentic proof could he give of his extraordinary miſſion, than to convince the people that he paſſed unhurt thro' the middle of the flames which conſumed his accuſer? Would not this have been as ſufficient to legitimate his miſſion, as the puniſhment of Korah was to confirm that of Moſes? Obſerve well, that this Monk did not expreſs any doubt of the activity of the fire. He ſaid, he was fully perſuaded that he ſhould receive no manner of damage (70): ſince therefore he was to ſurvive the trial, he had no reaſon to believe that it would incapacitate him for executing his deſigns. On the contrary, he had reaſon to believe that it would render him the more capable of bringing them about. We ſee then that he gave grounds for a violent ſuſpicion, that he was afraid of loſing his honour and his life at the ſame time; and it was no ſign of courage his offering himſelf to the perſonal proof, provided his enemies at Rome would undergo it with him: for there is no manner of difference between promiſing nothing at all, and promiſing upon ſuch conditions as one knows will not be accepted.

Do not object to me his conſenting that one of his brethren ſhould enter into the fire, and let it not be concluded from thence that he acted ingenuouſly. I confeſs that he hazarded his reputation, as he ſays himſelf, and that he would have been obliged to abſcond, if his deputy had loſt his life. *Si uno di queſti tali andando ſotto la mia fede & per ſar l'ubediencia da me impoſta come ſi ſono prompſſiſſamente offeriti, ardeſſe nel fuoco, chi non vede ch'io & che queſta tutt'opera & impreſa di Dio andarebbe meco in ruina & ch'io non potrei piu in alcun luogo comparire* (71). But that does not prove his ſincerity; for the challenges of the Franciſcans had him reduced to ſuch a non-plus, that he could not preſerve his reputation but by expoſing himſelf to that teſt of fire, or by conſenting that one of his brethren ſhould do it. He confeſſes, that without this, the honour of God, and his holy truth, would fall to the ground: *Concluſa che noi non habbiamo offerito queſta tale ſperienza & fuoco, mà loro ſono quelli che ce l'hanno meſſo inanzi; & noi ſiamo coſtanti ad accettar la, accio che l'honor di Dio & la ſua ſanta verita non vadi per terra* (72). What was to be done in ſo great an extremity? It was neceſſary to ſhew confidence at leaſt in the perſon of a deputy, truſting to this, that the magiſtrates would not order the proof, or that, at worſt, expedients might be contrived to elude it, which would be of leſs conſequence, being employed by Dominic de Peſcia, than if Savonarola himſelf ſhould make uſe of them. Such were actually invented. It is true they were of no great ſervice; but the thing was gone ſo far, that it was not now the queſtion, whether one ſhould hazard nothing at all, but whether one ſhould hazard more or leſs.

(72) Ibid. p. 51.

The Friars minors obtained an indiſputable advantage: their champion diſcovered both a great deal of charity, and a great deal of courage; for he preſent-

ed himſelf to a certain death; he had good ſenſe enough to be perſuaded that the fire would give no quarter to him, he was ready to die for the ſalvation of ſo many ſouls, who, as he thought, were miſled by Savonarola. He hoped, that their eyes would be opened, and that the deceit would laſt no longer than they ſhould ſee the ſubſtitute of the deceiver periſh in the flames. He had ſome grounds to fear leſt they ſhould judge that, ſince the two antagoniſts periſhed alike, both ſides were in the wrong; but without doubt he hoped that the evil would entirely ceaſe, provided it was once believed that Savonarola erred. Note, That if the Dominicans, who offered themſelves to the trial, were fully perſuaded, that the fire would reſpect them, they did not ſhew much courage. Note alſo, that by virtue of that perſuaſion, they thought themſelves innocent of the crime of ſelf-murder. 'Mi confido, ſaid Savonarola (73), nel Sig. & Salvatore Jeſu Chriſto, & nel ſuo S. Evangelio, che ciaſcuno di loro ne uſcirà illeſo, cioè ſenza alcun danno, & quando di queſto dubitaſſe punto, non lo direi, per non eſſer homicida. - - - I truſt in our Lord and Saviour JEſUS CHRIST, and in his Goſpel, that every one of them ſhall come out unhurt, and if I had the leaſt doubt of it, I would not ſay ſo, for fear of being a murderer.' He laid that crime to the charge of his adverſaries, who offered themſelves to the proof, believing at the ſame time that they ſhould periſh in it (74).

[H] It is ſaid that he confeſſed his impoſture.] What Guicciardin relates, favours of a man who is tender of unfortunate peoples reputation. *Savonarola, ſays he, was examined with tortures, although they were not very ſevere; and upon the examination, a proceſs was publiſhed, which (laying aſide all the injurious reproaches that had been thrown out againſt him, of avarice, or bad morals, or of his having carried on ſecret intrigues with princes) contained, that his predictions had not proceeded from divine revelation, but from his own opinion, grounded upon the doctrine and obſervation of the holy ſcripture, and that he had not been induced thereto from any ill deſign, nor from a deſire of acquiring high preferments in the Church by that means: but that he had earneſtly wiſhed to be the inſtrument of calling a general council, in which the corrupt manners of the clergy might be reformed, and the ſtate of the Church of God, which had deviated ſo far, might be reduced to as great a reſemblance as poſſible of thoſe days that were neareſt to the times of the Apoſtles; and that he would have thought it a much greater honour to finiſh that great and uſeful work, than to obtain the papal dignity; becauſe the former could only proceed from a moſt excellent life and doctrine, and a ſingular reſpect for all men, whereas the latter was very often obtained by ill means, or by the favour of fortune. In conſequence of this proceſs, confirmed by him in the preſence of ſeveral Friars likewiſe of his order, but (if what his adherents publiſhed afterwards be true) in few words, and in ſuch as were capable of divers interpretations; by ſentence of the general of the Dominicans, and of Biſhop Romolino, who was afterwards Cardinal of Surrente, the commiſſaries deputed by the Pope, he and the other two Friars were with the uſual ceremonies in the Church of Rome degraded from their holy orders, and being delivered over to the ſecular arm, they were hanged and burnt* (75). He adds, that Savonarola ſuffered death courageouſly, without ſaying one word that might ſhew either his guilt or his innocence; but that this did not put an end to the difference in the opinions and paſſions of men; becauſe ſeveral perſons conſidered him as an impoſtor; and, on the other hand, ſeveral believed that the confeſſion which was publiſhed had been falſly invented, or that the torture had more power than truth, upon a man of his conſtitution, which was very delicate. They excuſed his frailty by the example of the prince of the Apoſtles, who, without being imprifoned, or conſtrained by any torture or extraordinary violence, did at the bare words of chambermaids and ſervants, deny that he was the diſciple of that Maſter, from whom he had ſeen ſo many holy precepts and miracles proceed.

There are three things to be conſidered in this narrative. The firſt is, That Savonarola was delivered over

(73) Ubi ſuper; pag. 48.

(74) Nè per queſto ſiamo noi crudeli & homicidi, ancorche li auverſari, quali ſi ſono ſottoſcritti publicamente confeſſano d'aver in queſto fuoco à morire & però non già noi, mà loro ſono crudeli & homicidi di ſe medefimi. Ibid. pag. 51.

(75) Guicciardin. lib. iii, near the end. ſ. l. 123.

fire without the consecrated host (i), and the other had exhorted him to it under the pretext of a revelation. The vigorous resistance, which the Jacobins made when mark (G). their

over to the secular arm, because, as he himself confessed, he had known things to come by acquired lights, and had aimed at nothing else in his actions, but to bring back the Church to her antient purity. The second is, That the confession he made thereupon was expressed in ambiguous words. The third is, That at his execution he neither owned that he was guilty, nor protested that he was innocent, and that nevertheless there were a good many persons who continued to look upon him as a saint, though they made no doubt of his having denied the truth in prison.

GUICCIARDIN censured.

I. I observe upon the first of these three articles, that Guicciardin has not discharged the duty of an historian well; for he has not only suppressed the greatest part of the accusations which were acknowledged as true by Savonarola, but he has likewise unfairly represented those which he has related. It was very allowable for him to believe that the Judges had oppressed the innocence of that Friar; but he had no right to mangle or disguise the representations which had been published of that case. Now he has done both, since it is certain that they contain several heads of accusation and confession which he has passed over in silence, and that in those which he has mentioned, he has struck out what things were criminal, and only left an idea of innocence. If an historian can be allowed thus to discharge the office of an advocate, he ought at most to do so by some reflexions apart, and not in the thread of the narration itself, which should be strictly conformable to the publick records. Guicciardin is too hard upon the Judges, and too easy to the party accused: it is not his fault if it be not believed that they caused a man to be burnt for having dared to affirm that by a strong meditation upon the oracles of the Bible, he had learned that certain things would happen. The pretension of such a man may be very rash, and liable to censure; but it does not render him worthy of corporal punishment: and consequently Savonarola's Judges would have been murderers and assassins, if they had put him to death for an offence of that nature. Let us see wherein the artifice and misrepresentation of the historian consists. He has separated two things which should have been put together; the one is what Savonarola confessed in prison, the other is what he had preached before. This Friar confessed that his knowledge of things to come was not infused, or an immediate revelation of the Holy Ghost; but he had boasted of such a revelation (76); and it is upon that account that his confession, which otherwise would have been a trifle, rendered him vastly guilty. He found himself convicted by his own confession of an horrible and infamous imposture. Guicciardin has taken great care not to furnish his readers with hints for this remark: he witholds, no doubt, that they might not compare Savonarola's confession with his preceding conduct. If you have a mind to know part of what Guicciardin has suppressed, read the following passage of Naclerus;

(76) Guicciardin himself affirms it in another place, viz. book ii, fol. m. 44, verso. Affirmando non predire questo, & molte altre cose, le quali continuamente predicava, per discorso humano, ne per Scienze di Scrittura; ma semplicemente per divina rivelatione. --- Affirming that he did not foresee this and many other things which he constantly preached up, by any human reasoning, nor by the knowledge of the Scriptures; but purely by divine revelation.

we find there, that, according to the acts of the process which was published, Savonarola acknowledged that his conduct had been one continued series of vanity and ambition, to which he had made his pretended prophecies subservient. 'Die nona mensis Aprilis, dictus F. Hieronymus, presentibus multis testibus, fuit interrogatus & examinatus in aula Baroncelli, primò verbis, post minis, dein cum tortura. demum 19. ejusdem mensis sine lacione dixit, omnia per ipsum prophetizata, fuisse ficta, & quòd ob gloriam humanam aucupandam talia predicaverit, & quòd videbatur civitas Florentia bonum instrumentum ad faciendum crescere suam gloriam. Et ad coadjuvandum suum finem, confessus est se prædicasse res, per quas Christiani cognoscerent abominaciones quæ fiebant Romæ, & quòd reges & principes se congregarent ad faciendum concilium: quòd ubi factum fuisset, sperasset deponi multos prælatos, etiam Papam: & quando fuisset assumptus in concilio, mansisset & itersisset in magna reputatione in toto mundo: & si non fuisset in papam electus, saltem primum locum tenuisset. De renovatione ecclesiæ & conversione infidelium, dixit se habere ex scriptura sacra, sed quòd fieri deberet citò, non habuerit

VOL. V. No. CXIX.

ex scripturis aut revelatione. Quòd offenderit se ivisse in paradysum, hoc fecisse se ad attribuendum sibi reputationem & gloriam. Circa factum inobedientie pontificis, quòd non ivit Romam, fecisse se, ne occideretur in via. Circa factum excommunicationis respondit, quanquam multis aliter videretur, crediderit ipse tamen illam esse veram & observandam, observaverit per aliquod tempus. Sed ubi viderit quòd ibat opus suum in ruinam, cepit modum non observandi, & quòd pertinaciter steterit contra pro honore, reputatione ac manutentione operis sui. Hæc & multa alia interpretatus est, prout in examine quod impressum est, continetur (77). --- On the ninth day of April the said Savonarola was, before many witnesses, interrogated and examined in the hall Baroncelli, first with words, afterwards, with threatenings, and last of all with the torture. At length, on the nineteenth of the same month, he freely owned, without being racked, that all his predictions had been feigned, and that he had preached up such things for the sake of human glory, and because the city of Florence seemed to him a proper instrument for procuring it. He confessed that in order to promote his ends, he had preached things, by which Christians might know the abominations which were practised at Rome, and kings and princes might jointly procure a council to be called; in consequence of which he had expected that many prelates, and the Pope himself, would have been deposed; that after he had been once respected in the council, his reputation should have been firmly established throughout the whole world; and that if he had not been chosen Pope, he would at least have held the first rank. As to the reformation of the Church, and the conversion of the infidels, he said, he had the knowledge of those things from scripture, but as to their happening soon, he neither knew it from scripture nor revelation. With respect to his saying that he had been in Paradise, he confessed, that he did it for the sake of acquiring glory and reputation to himself; and as to his disobeying the Pope, in not going to Rome, he attributed it to his fear of being killed by the way. Concerning the fact of excommunication, he answered, that though many were of a different opinion, he himself had believed it true and proper to be complied with, and that therefore he had submitted to it for some time. But when he saw his designs go to ruin, he took a resolution not to mind it, and that he had opposed it obstinately for the honour, reputation, and support, of his undertaking. These and many other things did he confess, as they are contained in the process that was printed.'

II. The second thing which I said was to be considered in Guicciardin's narrative, is, that Savonarola made use of expressions which had a double meaning. His apologists are perplexed a little upon that head, and they own that some votaries of that new faith wavered upon that occasion (78); but there were others who justified him by the example of the antient prophets, whose answers seemed to signify quite the reverse of what they intended. 'Illud affirmantes fuisse in usu prioribus illis veteris Testamenti prophetis, perdis interrogantibus oblique adeò ambigueque respondere, ut quæ affirmaverant negavisse viderentur, contraque quæ negaverant viderentur affirmasse. Sic Michæam Acabo Regi de Assyriis expugnandis respondisse; sic Prophetam Amos nec se Prophetam esse, sed nec Prophetæ filium dixisse. Sic Joannem Baptistam dum de Prophetia munere rogaretur loquutum fuisse. Et in hanc quoque sententiam Prophetæ Ezechielis nonnulla, deque responso Elisæ ad Hazaelem depromi dicebant (79). --- Affirming that

the antient prophets of the Old Testament were used to make such oblique and doubtful answers to the questions of the wicked, that they seemed to deny what they affirmed, and, on the other hand, to affirm what they denied. Thus such was Micah's answer to king Abab concerning his victory over the Assyrians; thus did the prophet Amos say, that he was neither a prophet, nor the son of a prophet. Thus, said they, John the Baptist answered, when he was asked whether he was a Prophet; they add, that some things to the same purpose might be quoted out of the Prophet Ezechiel, and out of Elisæ's answer to Hazael. They alledged (80) that

(77) Naclerus. Part. ii, Gen. L, pag. m. 990. See in Spisellus in Infel. Literato, pag. 659, a confession of Savonarola, in terms that are still more barbarous: it is taken from the book of John Poggius, Edit. 1498.

(78) See John Francis Picus, ubi supra, pag. m. 132.

(79) Id. ibid.

(80) Ibid. pag. 133.

(H) See in the remark [H], the words of Guicciardin.

their convent was attacked [I], did not well become the disciples of a prophet of the New Law, especially since this attack was countenanced by the authority of the magistrates (k). Some believed that Savonarola was very justly punished; but others considered him as a martyr, and endeavoured to have part of his ashes that they might keep them as a relick (l); for which reason they were thrown into the river. Books were written for his justification [K], and we must not omit that the Protestants have

(I) Sixt. Senensis, Biblioth. lib. iv, apud Pope Blount, Conf. Auth. pag. 345. See likewise the Protopographic of Du Verdier, Tom. iii, pag. 2333, and what I quote from John Francis Picas, in the remark [H] near the end.

that Thomas Aquinas affirms, that a person accused is not obliged to confess the truth before unjust judges. They remembered (81), that there had been martyrs whom the violence of torture had compelled to speak against their conscience; and thus they confirmed themselves in the credit which they had given to that new prophet. Such are the effects of being infatuated with a man, who acquires the reputation of an inspired saint. Such an infatuation is generally an incurable disease. Let the event give the lie to that man's prediction, let him vary, let him recant, let him contradict himself, let him fall into weaknesses and gross faults; for all this, people are not cured of their prepossession, they seek to justify him at the expence of the greatest faults of the ancient and new law, they will rather strip faults of their vicious nature, than believe that he is guilty of any faults (82).

The prepossession of Savonarola's votaries was so extravagant, that they religiously preserved all they could of the wood-pile where he was burnt. This superstition of theirs was foreseen, and for that reason all the ashes had been suddenly taken away and thrown into the river: but something remained, and there was even a bone that fell from amidst the ashes, and part of a finger which was carried off, during the time that they were throwing stones at the gibbet, where the three Dominicans were hanged. All these were kept as relicks, and, as some say, wrought a good many miracles. 'Corporum absumentur cineres quoscumque potuerunt in unum redactos, plaustrisque delatos, in Arni fluvium iniecerunt. Ex incendio superfuere nonnulla, quæ cautè rapta, religioseque servata sunt. Item os, quod puer quidam dum veheretur in Arnum, delapsum vehiculo pertulit ad matrem: Item & digiti cujusdam pars dum penderent de cruce, faxorum decussa grandine. Ab ipsis reliquiis quæ prodierunt signa divinitus suis referemus locis (83).

III. My third remark upon Guicciardin's narrative is, that St Peter's example does but little serve to justify the Florentine prophet; for that Apostle's fault was followed by a quick repentance, and repaired by a long fidelity; but we do not find that Savonarola made use of the only means left to atone for his fault. It was to declare upon the scaffold, that he entreated God to forgive him, for having been so weak as to deny in prison, what he had affirmed in the pulpit. Guicciardin observes that he did not say a word, either to accuse or clear himself.

Let us not forget to observe that it is a difficult matter to reduce the apologists for certain people to a non-plus, for they almost continually find examples, which they place before us, as a barrier which we are obliged to respect. You see how Savonarola's friends endeavoured to shelter themselves under the ancient prophets, and the martyrs of the primitive church; and though they should be forced to confess that he had been seduced by the illusions of the devil, they would have modern saints to alledge in his justification. This is the observation of a Protestant divine.

Et dato intervenisse, says he (84), illi imaginationi illusionem aliquam & allocutionem diabolicam sive internam sive externam, hoc non magis ipsius orthodoxie, pietati, & particulari causæ, ob quam passus est præjudicare potest, quam Jordani, aliorumque sanctorum Papalium monachorum: de quorum illusionibus passim legendæ, & vitæ, Delrio l. 4. c. 1. qu. 3.

Theophilus Raynaud says that, according to Baptista Fulgofius, Savonarola confessed his impurities (85); but I do not find this in the chapter which he (86) cites. Father Baronius answering that passage of Theophilus Raynaud takes no notice of this false quotation (87). The testimony of Pierius Valerianus would have turned to better account (88).

[I] The vigorous resistance which the Dominicans made when their convent was attacked. They made provision of fire-arms, and killed five persons. Three

of them were killed, and particularly the brother of Savonarola. Quem (conventum S. Marci) Fratres ejusdem conventus bene claustrant & in eo bombardis & aliis armis offensivis muniti erant, quæ in populum traxerunt, qui tandem conventum vi intravit interfecit. quinque ex suis, tribus autem ex monachis, quodam Fratris professo Ordinis predicatorum germano dicti fratris Hieronymi & duobus aliis (89). They were obliged to set fire to the convent, in order to get the better of the Monks who defended it (90).

[K] Books were written in his justification. 'Dominic Benivenius published a book of his miracles and prophecies, and Francis Picas † was so warm in his defence that, notwithstanding he was extremely religious and a strict Catholic, he did not scruple to attack and very much to abridge the power and authority of the Pope, in order to shew that Alexander VI had no reason to forbid him the pulpit and to excommunicate him (90*).' This is what Gabriel Naudé says. He does not observe that this Benivenius published his book before Savonarola's death; I shall therefore add this particular as I find it in Du Verdier Vau Privas. Savonarola had acquired among the great

est part of the Florentines the character of a holy man and of a prophet, and as such had been cried up and defended in printed pieces, particularly in a treatise written by Dominic Benivenius, a Florentine Priest, in order to vindicate and prove the truth of the doctrine and prophecies preached up by the said Savonarola; which treatise was printed at Florence by Francis Bonacorso, in the year 1496 (91). Gilbert Voëtius observes, that this Benivenius published after the author's death the abridgement which Savonarola had written of his prophecies, and that he prefixed to it a Preface full of commendations (92). The same Voëtius adds, that Sabellicus in the IX book of the X Ennead, and Ferronus in the II book of the History of France, make a professed apology for this Dominican. He is mistaken (93) as to Arnoldus Ferronus, who only said, that there are people who pretend that Savonarola was justly put to death as an impostor, but that no body refuses him this commendation, that he was temperate, and besides a man of wit and learning. Hunc quod esset Galorum studiosior quam alii vellent, à Florentinis adnente Pontifice quasi violatæ persuasione reum damnatum: alii, cum importunis plebem falleret, & Auguris divini nomen aucuparetur, jure casum volunt: certe ad temperantiam & sobrietatis laudem, doctrinæ & ingenii gloriam adjecisse cum nemo diffidetur (94). Without doubt what

misled Voëtius was his seeing Sabellicus and Ferronus quoted near one another in the margin of Martin del Rio, and his not considering the disjunctive which that author makes use of. It plainly insinuates, that Ferronus is only alledged as an Historian who doubts whether Savonarola deserved death. 'Ex partium studio, & Alexandri VI atque Medicorum odio factum, ut non consideranter Historici nonnulli † defensionem Savonarolæ susceperunt, vel damnationis justitiam in dubium vocarent (95). - - - It was owing to party-zeal, and their hatred to Alexander VI and the family de Medicis, that some Historians rashly undertook the defence of Savonarola, or called the justice of his sentence in question.'

Naudé is in the right to say that John Francis Picas was warm in the defence of Savonarola. He makes him a Saint who wrought miracles; and he intreats his readers to remember him in their prayers to God, and to Jerom Savonarola (96). He says (97) that the heart of that holy man was found in the river, that he has a part of it, and that it is so much the dearer to him as he has found by experience that it cures sick people, and drives out Devils. He observes (98) that a great number of those who persecuted that Dominican died miserably (99), and among these he reckons Pope Alexander VI. He mentions two traditions touching that Pope's death, which, as he says, happened

(89) Excerpta ex Diario Burchardi, pag. 54.

(90) Conceramus templi foribus nec incurta irruptione (Savonarola) comprehenditur. Jo. vius, in Elég. cap. xlii, pag. 190. See him also in Vita Leonis X, pag. 52.

† In Apolog. pro Hieron. Savonarol. viri prophete innocentia.

(90*) Naudé, Apologie des grands Hommes, pag. 452.

(91) Du Verdier, Protopogr. Tom. iii, pag. 2333.

(92) Voëtius, ubi supra, p. 1068.

(93) He has misled Spizelius, ubi supra, pag. 628.

(94) Arnoldus Ferronus, de Rebus gestis Gallorum, lib. ii, circa fin. f. 45. Edit. Paris. 1555, in 8vo.

† Sabellicus. Ennead. 10, lib. ix, Arn. Ferron. lib. ii, Rerum Francicar. & alii.

(95) Mart. Del Rio, Disquis. Magic. lib. iv, cap. i, 298ff. ii, §. vi, pag. m. 197.

(96) Jo. Francis Picas, ubi supra, p. 108.

(97) Id. ibid. pag. 136, 137.

(98) Id. ibid. pag. 137, & seq.

(99) Father Baronius, Apolog. Ord. Predicator. Tom. ii, pag. 88, theates Theophilus Raynaud in the following manner. Non videt vinctam capiti suo impendentem, qualem ferent adversariarum 80, qui in illum con-

juraverant, cognoscere eam hunc over his head, such as was felt by eighty of his adversaries, who had conspired against him, and who all came to an untimely and miserable end.

(81) Ibid.

tort
Johanna

(82) See the remark . . . of the article . . . or what Seneca says of Cato's drunkenness.

(83) Jo. Francis Picas, ubi supra, p. 166; he says, in that very place that Savonarola's heart was found in the river Arno two days after. He boasts that he had a part of it. See the following remark citation (97).

(84) Voëtius, Disput. Theolog. Tom. ii, pag. 2070.

(85) Theophilus Raynaud, de immunitate Cyriacorum, Distr. vi, pag. 298, Apompeiæ.

(86) Theophilus Raynaud, quotes Baptista Fulgofius l. tit. de Religio cultu. c. i. I make use of the edition printed Coloniz 1604, in 8vo.

(87) Vincent. Baronius, Apolog. Ordinis Predicator. Tom. ii, pag. 88, & seq.

(88) See his words in the remark [M].

have declared for him [L]. He died however like a good Roman Catholic (m). There

is

(m) See the passage of Coëffeteau in the remark [L].

(100) Had mul-
to post tempore.
Fr. Fr. Picus,
ubi supra, pag.
139.

self
to
the

(102) Id. ibid.
pag. 125.

(103) Spizelius,
ub supra, pag.
633, quotes a
passage of it. I
believe it is of
this book that
Mr Du Pleffis,
*Myſtère d'In-
iquité*, p. 571,
ſays, when he
ſays that John
Picus Mirandola-
nus, (he ſhould
have ſaid John
Francis) wrote a
book on purpoſe
to defend Savon-
arola againſt
the Pope.

(104) See the
Journal des Spa-
vans of the 20th
of January 1676,
pag. 23. Dutch
edition.

(105) In Tom.
xviii, Annalium.

(106) In Apolo-
get. Ord. Præd.
Tom. ii, pag. 88,
& ſeq.

(107) In Select.
Hiſt. Eccleſ.
Capit. Sæc. xv,
xvi.

(108) See in the
following remark
the paſſage of
Coëffeteau.

(109) In the Life
of Savonarola.

(110) Cocheus,
Append. Part. iii,
ad Conradum
Brunum de Sedi-
tionibus, p. 350.

(111) See Voë-
tius, ubi ſupra,
Part. ii, p. 1068,
ubi ſequitur San-
dæus lib. iii,
theolog. var.
comment. 22,
pag. 567.

(112) In Prelo
illuſt. Viror.
Italæ.

(113) Jovius in
Elog. pag. 100.

pened ſoon after (100). There were however four
years between Savonarola's death and Pope Alexander's.
One of theſe traditions is that the Devil ſtrangled him;
the other that the poiſon which he prepared for ſome
cardinals was given to him by miſtake (101). Note
that according to the firſt tradition he had made him-
ſelf over to the Devil upon condition that he ſhould
attain to the Papal dignity. The apologet makes
mention of another book which he had written in de-
fence of Savonarola's revelations. 'Ad hæc viſa quæ
' ſibi divinitus offerrebantur ſcriptis mandata, uno com-
' plexus eſt libro, cui titulus eſt *Revelationum Com-
' pendium*, in quem inſipienter inſectus eſt quidam
' *Samuel Caſſinenſis* ex ordine Minorum, qui vulgo
' *Zoccolanti* dicuntur libello proprio & peculiari,
' quem vix in publicum datum inita deſenſione *Hie-
' ronymi* conſutandum ſuſcepi, deſenſionemque illius in-
' ſcripti *Hieronymo Tornelio* præſidi ordinis Minorum
' (102). . . . Moreover he comprehended his celeſtial vi-
' ſions, which he had deſcribed at large before, in one
' book intitled *Revelationum Compendium*. Againſt
' this one Samuel Caſſinenſis, of the order of *Fryars Mi-
' nor*, who are commonly called *Zoccolanti*, inveighed
' ſo ſlightly in a particular book, which was no ſooner pub-
' liſhed than I undertook to confute it and defend Savona-
' rola. This vindication I inſcribed to Hieronymus
' *Tornelius*, general of the ſaid order of *Fryars*. He
had likewiſe written a book to ſhew that Savonarola
had been excommunicated unjuſtly. *Deſenſio Hieronymi
Savonarolæ ſive de injuſta ejus excommunicatione ad Her-
culum æſteſem* (103). He delayed publiſhing the life
of our Dominican till the year 1530. Dr Bates has
inſerted it in his *Vitæ ſelectorum aliquot Virorum*, printed
in the year 1681 at London. Father Quetif, the
Jacobin, had publiſhed it at Paris in the year 1674: he
was the firſt that publiſhed it entire. He added notes
to it, and ſeveral other tracts (104); and he is one of
the moſt conſiderable apologetiſts for Savonarola. Se-
veral of his brethren have ſignaliſed themſelves in the
defence of that prophet. See particularly Bzovius
(105), Vincent Baronius (106), Noel Alexander
(107), &c.

I am ſurprized that Gabriel Naudé has made no
mention of the apology written by the Dominican Thomas
Neri (108), nor of that which was compoſed by
Ambroſe Catharinus. One Timothy Peruginus (109)
was likewiſe an advocate for Savonarola. Note that
Catharinus did not adhere to his firſt ſentiments. 'Anno
Domini 1494, Hieronymum Savonarolam, Ordinis ſui
fratrem, propter fructum prædicationis deſendit, licet
per errorem, at nunc ſenex in tertio de Conſideratione
libro ſuo fatetur (110). . . . In the year 1494, he
defended Savonarola, a *Fryar* of his order, on account
of his great ſucceſs in preaching. But therein he did wrong,
as he confeſſes, now when he is old, in his third book
upon *Conſideration*. He is even numbered among thoſe
who have attacked Savonarola (111). I ſhould never have
done if I were to give the liſt of all thoſe who have
praiſed that Dominican: we ſhould find there particularly
Marſilius Ficinus, Matthew Toſcanus (112), and Flami-
nius. The laſt made four verſes which Jovius has
thought proper to give (113) in that very place where
he owns that out of tendernels he paſſes by the inſulting
epitaph which another Poet had compoſed. That which
Flaminus wrote is as follows.

Dum fera flamma tuos, Hieronyme, paſcitur artus,
Religio flevit dilaniata comas;
Flevit, & ô dixit crudeles parcite flammæ;
Parcite, ſunt iſto viſcera noſtra rogo.

While, holy Jerom, the devouring flame
Prey'd on thy tender limbs, religion came;
The goddeſs wept, and tore her ſacred hair,
Then, in an agony of wild deſpair,
Ob ſtop, ſhe cry'd, ſtop cruel flames, a wile,
And ſpare my bowels in the burning pile.

[L] The Proteſtants have declared for him.] Let us
begin with a paſſage of Gabriel Naudé: it is in page
453 of his apology for the great men that have been

accuſed of Magic. Beza, Vigner, Coppel, du Pleſſis
Mornai †, and all the Lutherans of Germany commonly
call Savonarola in their books the faithful witneſs of
Truth, the forerunner of the Evangelical Reformation,
the ſcourge of the great Babylon, the ſworn enemy of the
Roman Anti-Chriſt, and to conclude in a word with
Jeſſenius à Jeſſen, the Luther of Italy. I wonder they
do not likewiſe call him the John Huſ of the ſame coun-
try, ſince they were both put to the ſame death, were
both Hereticks, and both have their names marked
with great letters in the Register and Journal of their
Martyrs, witneſſes the following verſes which they put un-
der his effigies,

En Monachus ſolers: rerum ſerutator acutus
Martyrio ornatus, Savonarola pius.

Behold acute Savonarola, here
The Monk, the Martyr, and the Saint appear.

He adds that Beza ſays expreſſly when he ſpeaks of him
in his eulogies, that his having ſo far diſpleaſed Alexan-
der VI., was a great proof of his fingular piety, that
this wicked Pope could have no reſt till he had cauſed
him to be moſt unworthily burnt. *Homini tam perditè
ſcelerato, quàm ſuit Alexander ille Borgia Pontifex bujus
nominis ſextus uſque adeo diſplicuiſſe, ut non niſi te in-
digniſſimè damnato & cremato quieſcere potuiſſet, maxi-
mum eſſe videtur ſingularis tuæ pietatis argumentum* (114).
It is an argument good enough for an Orator, but not
for a writer that would ſpeak hiſtorically or dogmati-
cally, ſince the moſt cruel tyrants put ſome people to
death juſtly (115).

Naudé might have quoted Bale, Flacius Illyricus, John
Wolfius, and Verheiden. This laſt author ſpeaks of
Savonarola in a ſtile of admiration (116). It muſt ne-
vertheleſs be acknowledged that he only conſidered Sa-
vonarola in an advantageous light: a great ſource of
false reaſonings. Mr du Pleſſis Mornai gave into the
ſame ſnare; he did not ſhew this perſon but on the
ſide that appeared fair to him (117). This was the
reaſon that when one of his antagoniſts preſented the
other ſide to the readers, the diſpute became more in-
tricate, and there was a neceſſity for going back. I
ſhall cite Coëffeteau's words. He that deſires to ſee Sa-
vonarola's doctrine defended againſt thoſe who accuſed him
of Heresy, let him read the learned apology which Tho-
mas Neri a Florentine Monk of his order wrote for him;
and particularly as to what concerns the article of Juſti-
fication, which du Pleſſis does moſt of all inſiſt upon, let
him read the answer to the firſt objection, and he will
know that never any man ſpoke more like a Catholic than
he, nor in a manner more agreeable to the doctrine of the
Church of Rome. . . . Such reaſon is there to believe
that he died a Catholic, and here follows the account
which his great friend the learned Prince of Miran-
dola gives of the matter. Savonarola, ſays he,
having notice given him of his being condemned to
die, called immediately for a Prieſt to whom he
might confeſs his ſins, and deſired to receive the moſt
holy communion, which being brought to him, he
begged earneſtly that they would allow him to take
and hold the Sacrament between his hands; and this
being granted to him, he began to ſay, with great
chearfulneſs and devotion, that he knew and was
aſſured that therein was the great and true God, the
fountain of ſupreme goodneſs, and the maker of
heaven and of earth, and of all creatures: that he
knew for certain that therein alſo was preſent the
moſt holy, indiviſible, and inſeparable Trinity, the
Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, &c. Do you
think, Mr du Pleſſis, that a Lutheran or Calviniſt
would have died in this manner, and made ſuch a
confeſſion of faith? Let your Beza therefore take
him from among the idols of your party: let not
Luther call upon him any more, as a voucher to his
impiety, and as for you do not perſiſt in making
him an Heretic contrary to his own confeſſion. Cer-
tain it is, that if he had been ſuch, neither Picus
Mirandolanus, nor Marſilius Ficinus, nor Neri, nor
ſo many other famous men, who have always lived
in the Communion of the Church of Rome, would
have taken it into their heads to celebrate his praife,
even

(114) Naudé, ubi
ſupra, p. 455.

(115) See the re-
mark [A] of
the article of the
Marſhal de MA-
RILLAC,
num. II.

(116) Verheiden,
in Iconibus, pag.
14, 15. Note,
that he is mi-
ſtaken in ſaying
that Savonarola
was burnt at fifty
years of age.

(117) See the
Myſtère d'In-
iquité, pag. 570,
& ſeq.

J. Pic. Mirand.
in Apolog.

w 20

is some foundation for doubting whether the title of Martyr, which has been bestowed upon him

even after his death. But with what face can you reckon among the Lutherans and Calvinists, a Monk who lived continually in his cloyster, strictly observing his vows, and so earnestly exhorting his brethren to do the like, that he appeared to be superfluous in his way of life? With what face can you reckon among the Lutherans and Calvinists, a Monk who constantly celebrated the holy sacrifice of the Mass, and who has even written books to explain the mysteries of it, and to teach us how we must partake of the fruit which God communicates to us therein? How can people place in the list of Lutherans or Calvinists, a man that always believed in the seven Sacraments of the Church, always invoked the Saints, and always prayed for the dead, whom he believed to be in Purgatory. Let any one take the pains to read Savonarola's books, and if he does not find there all that I have been saying of him, I am willing to pass for a calumniator. What if he had some particular opinions? We do not call people Heretics who only err, but such as join obliquity to error. To conclude, it was not for having groaned under the heavy load of abuses after a Reformation, that he was burnt: but his greatest crime was a state-crime, inasmuch as he preached in a Republic that was divided into factions, the most powerful of which, being opposed by him, put him to death as a seditious person (118).

† Liber Savan.
de Myft. Milie.

(118) Coeffeteau
Réponse au My-
stère d'iniquité,
pag. 1217.

(119) Rivet, Re-
marques sur la
Réponse au My-
stère d'iniquité,
Tom. II, p. 632.

† Oracolo della
riformazione della
Chiesa. In Ven-
etia al Segno del
Pozzo. ann.
1560. Index
lib. prohib. sub
Clemente VIII.

† 1 Thefl. II.
vet. 4.

(120) We shall
see in remark
[M], that his
crime included
an execrable im-
posture, viz. his
making people
believe that he
had immediate
Revelations.

(121) Rivet, ubi
supra, pag. 633.

This passage did a little surprize the apologist for Mr du Pleffis, and obliged him to give good words. True it is, replied Andrew Rivet (119) that either Savonarola did not know all the doctrine of Luther and Calvin, amidst the darkness of the time, or else he durst not in every point make an open profession of that doctrine, being surrounded by Inquisitors. It cannot be denied however that he saw the necessity of a Reformation in the Church, that he sighed after it, and expected it: and upon that account we place him in general among the witnesses of truth: knowing also, that in several particulars he taught more purely than the Monks of his time, as still appears by the books we have of his, especially by the collections of his Sermons preached at Florence upon the subject of reforming the Church. It is a sign that his writings were not relished by the Church of Rome, since Pope Clement VIII forbids the greatest part of his Sermons, and his Italian dialogue upon truth, to be read till they had undergone a purgation. If this truth were for his advantage, he would not consent to have his eyes shut. . . . It is a great prejudice in our favour his being among the prohibited authors. As for the circumstances of his death, it is very possible that there were some things which we should be unwilling to approve. But that does not at all oblige us to reject what he either did or said well. For in this and other things of the like nature, we follow St Paul's advice, *Try all things, and hold fast that which is good*, receiving no man, as the author of our faith who is only a man. . . . For the rest, if his crime had only been a state-crime (120), it is not at all likely that they would have burnt him: and what our History had advanced upon the authority of Guicciardin, shews that there was something else, namely that he pressed hard for a council to reform the corrupt manners of the Clergy, and to bring back the state of the Church of God, which had deviated so much, to the model of the Apostles. Upon this account it is that we consider him as one of us, notwithstanding that he was a Dominican (121). All this is weak; for he finds himself obliged tacitly to acknowledge that Savonarola died an idolater, and that he taught several doctrines which Luther and Calvin held in abomination. If his mind was earnestly set upon the Reformation of the Church, that might only concern bad morals, and the abuses which had crept into discipline; and in that case he would not deserve to be excluded from the number of true Roman Catholics. It is not at all to be doubted but that in the most corrupt ages, those who were the most devoted to the decisions of Councils, and to the Pope's authority, were nevertheless sensible that strange disorders were committed in the distribution of Indulgences, and in the election of Popes, and by the non-

observance of the rules of discipline, that there was an excessive worldly pomp in the court of Rome, and that it were to be wished a stop could be put to these disorders. Do we not see at this day monks (122), and parish-priests (123) write books against the abuses which are committed in religious worship? Are they for all that the less averse to what is called the sect of Calvin, the sect of Luther? Let us therefore say that Mr Rivet does not extricate himself well. He was to prove that Savonarola condemned the decisions of Councils which Calvin and Luther have condemned. But this is what he has not done; he contents himself with saying, that the Pope did forbid several of Savonarola's pieces to be read till they had undergone a purgation. This remark is too loose, for we know that the congregation of the Index does sometimes take the same method with certain books where there is nothing but trifles, or equivocal expressions, to be corrected. Rivet exposes some faults of Coeffeteau concerning the dispute between John Fisher and Luther; he says (124), that as Fisher does not make the least mention of Savonarola's writings, it is without any reason asserted, that he has shown by all the writings of this great man, that he was entirely against what Luther taught. Rivet also observes, that it is false that Luther quoted anything from Savonarola in point of doctrine; he only said, that he seemed to de-

(122) Father
Mabillon in his
traité de igno-
torum Sanctorum
cultu.

(123) Mr Thiers,
in several books,
and particularly
in that of the
Dévotion la plus
nécessaire & la
plus négligée.
See also the tra-
tise on the Ju-
bilee of which
the Journalists of
Trevoux have
given an extract
in their month of
July 1702, édi-
tion of France.

(124) Rivet,
ubi supra, pag.
632.

whom the murderers had burnt in divers places. It is nevertheless true (125), that Luther quotes him as an author that is very orthodox upon the subject of justification and the merit of good works; but if he had known that this Monk died in committing acts of idolatry, would he have presumed to reckon him among the saints of JESUS CHRIST?

If you have a mind to know what Savonarola's Orthodoxy was, read this passage of Mr du Pleffis. He explodes human traditions as much as possible in his books, acknowledges no salvation but in gratuitous justification by faith in CHRIST, and to that he adheres without depending upon any other merit: he is for giving the sacrament in both species, absolutely condemns indulgences, and, as well in point of life as in point of doctrine, owns Antichrist to be in the court of Rome. The doctrine of free justification, in particular, is excellently handled in his Meditations upon the Psalms xxx and l, which Possévinus, the Jesuit, acknowledges to have been written by him the evening before his execution. As for his ser-

• Possévinus in
Apparat. Tom. I.

mons, and other books, the Index Romanus has maimed and disfigured them at pleasure (126). Since Mr du Pleffis only cites Possévinus, a man, who sometimes judged of books that he had never read (127), it would have been proper that Rivet, his defender, had opposed to Coeffeteau good extracts from Savonarola's works, to the end that the reader might certainly know whether that Monk condemned the doctrine itself of indulgences, or only the abuses in the practice, and whether, setting aside all traditions, he was for retaining nothing but what was contained in the Scripture. It is not at all probable that his views were such, since he approved of monastic vows. It is not a sure way to judge of what an author believed dogmatically concerning gratuitous justification, and the merit of good works, from a work which he composes in order to prepare himself for death; for in that situation people humble themselves as much as they can, and have recourse to the most certain remedy, which is the grace and mercy of GOD (128). Lastly, it is necessary to distinguish whether an author swerves from the decision of councils, or from the particular sentiments of schoolmen. These sentiments did sometimes acquire such a large extent, that they almost hid the decision of the council under their shadow. It may therefore appear that a man, who opposes them, does really swerve from the doctrine of the Church of Rome, but sometimes it is only a false appearance: the doctrine of justification is no longer so great a subject of dispute, since it has been thoroughly sifted and explained: I say this without adopting entirely the following words of Mr Peliffon. 'A great part of Germany is long ago weary of being called Lutherans and Protestants rather than Catholics. They are privately ashamed of having made a breach for the sake of questions that are forgotten, and which

(125) In the pre-
face which he
prefixed to the
Meditations of
Savonarola, Edit.
1523. Mr Sec-
kendorf Histor.
Lutheran. quotes
this subtle preface.

(126) Du Pleffis,
ubi supra, p. 572.

(127) See the re-
mark [F], of
the article MA-
CHIAVEL.

(128) See what
I have quoted
from BELLAR-
MINE, in the
text of his article
citation (2).

him by some authors, justly belongs to him [M]. It is said that the council of Pisa promised

cease to be questions, now that people are less warm; and more willing to hear and understand one another: disputes which made so great a noise in the beginning of the schism, and which no body mentions now, concerning justification by faith, or by the merit of good works, concerning the efficacy of the sacraments, by the *opus operatum*, or by the *opus operantis*, and other things of the like nature (129).

(129) Pelisson, de la Tolerance des Religions, pag. 141, 142.

As Coëffeteau was a Dominican, and consequently very much disposed to save the honour of Savonarola, I see, without surprise, that he does not complain of Du Pleſſis, for having left out of the long quotation of Guicciardin what concerns the trial of fire. I think it as little strange, that he does not find fault with an explication of his, which is very liable to censure. Guicciardin *alleging here*, they are the words of Mr Du Pleſſis, *no other crime but this, that whereas he had formerly ascribed his predictions to divine revelation, at his death he acknowledged that he had them from the observation and interpretation of the holy Scripture, without doubt of the Apocalypse, which with us signifies the same thing as Revelation, and which we are very well assured is divine* (130). This interpretation cannot agree with Guicciardin's text; for as we have seen above (131), that history affirms (132) that Savonarola had not grounded his sermons upon the knowledge of Scripture, nor upon human reasoning, but merely upon a celestial revelation; that nevertheless he confessed before his judges (133) his having foretold things to come, not by a divine revelation, but by a particular opinion into which he had been led by the study of the word of God. It is then evident that there is a contradiction between what he confessed to his Judges, and what he said before: and it is not necessary to point out the illusion of Du Pleſſis; every body may readily perceive it, and conclude from thence, that the force of prejudices is very apt to seduce people, and that it strangely misleads such authors as have a mind to justify, at any rate, those whose testimony seems useful to them.

(130) Du Pleſſis, ubi supra, pag. 572.

(131) In the remark [H].

(132) Guicciardin, lib. ii, fol. m. 44, verso.

(133) Id. ibid. fol. 100.

partial

(134) Jo. Franc. Picus, ubi supra, pag. 112, 113.

(135) In the remark [L], citation (126).

(136) Reaſner, in Diario, p. 79, & in indice.

(137) Heidegger, in Histor. Papat. pag. 191, 192, & in indice.

[M] There is some reason for doubting whether the title of martyr . . . justly belongs to him.] We have seen (135), that Luther gave him this title. Reuſner (136), Heidegger (137), and some other Protestants, give it to him; but Rivet, who had read Coëffeteau, was more reserved, as has been seen in the foregoing remark. It is not very easy to conceive how the Protestants could place among the martyrs of JESUS CHRIST a man who had celebrated the mass, and invoked the saints all his life, and who, in the article of death, had communicated, according to the ceremonies of Rome, with an act of faith touching the real Presence, and with an act of adoration to the sacrament, which he held between his hands. This, according to the principle of the Protestants, was to live and die in the bosom of idolatry, and consequently out of the way of salvation. Now a reprobate and damned person cannot be a true martyr, although even he should lose his life for the sake of orthodox opinions. Is it not certain that if Alexander VI had put a man to death, who preached up the greatest part of the Protestant doctrines, but who at the same time was an Antitrinitarian, the ministers would think that neither such a person's sufferings, nor his declamations against Rome, nor his zeal for the reformation of the Church did any honour to their party? Why? Because dying in the guilt of an heresy, which damns people, he could not be considered otherwise than as a son of Gehenna, and slave to the Devil. The very same thing must be said of those who die in a state of idolatry.

Among so many authors who affirm that Savonarola suffered the punishment of fire for the zeal which had moved him to preach against the Pope, there is not, perhaps, one that has duly examined his trial. It is nevertheless highly necessary to read, with attention, all the acts of a martyrdom, before one pronounces that this or that person died the martyrs of

JESUS CHRIST. For if the Judges, who condemn an orthodox man to death, declare in their sentence that they do not punish him for the sake of his opinions, but because he had endeavoured to establish them by seditious ways, he cannot be accounted a martyr, unless it be certain that he was fairly accused of sedition. It is therefore requisite to examine maturely, and without prejudice, all the parts of a trial, and if we find by this examination that the orthodox man was convicted of having spirited up the people to demolish the altars and plunder the churches, and of having even set his hand to the work, we ought to acknowledge that the sentence, which condemns him to death for this cause, is not the condemnation of a martyr. A minister who should return at this day (138) into France, and who should be taken and hanged for preaching privately, would deserve the title of a martyr, altho' even the Judges should expressly affirm in their sentence, that they condemned him because he had acted against the edicts of the prince; but if they grounded their condemnation wholly upon this, that he had been convicted of acting as a spy, and of plotting insurrections in favour of the enemies of the state, there would be no more any room for pretending that he was a martyr. I suppose the proofs to be legal and suitable to the practice of criminal courts with respect to the depositions of witnesses, or intercepted letters, or the accused party's own confession, should it even be extorted by the rack; for this last proof is a legal one in several countries, and it cannot be invalidated juridically under pretence that pain forces some people, of a delicate make, to accuse themselves of what they have not done. It would not be sufficient to say at random, that the Judges had suborned false witnesses, and forged letters: it would be necessary to bring good proofs for this, without resting upon probabilities. All the world knows that the Jesuits are reproached with having converted into martyrs some of their brethren who were punished as state-criminals. The compilers of Martyrologies ought to have the delicacy of Julius Cæsar, who desired that his wife should be not only virtuous, but also free from suspicion (139). If Judges are to be arraigned in the case of martyrdom, things should be brought to a moral demonstration; for otherwise the innocence of the martyrs will be a perpetual subject of dispute, a dubious virtue, and liable to suspicion at least.

I put this question now to those who say that Savonarola was burnt for no other reason, but because he had incurred the displeasure of the court of Rome. Have you read the acts of his trial? Did you find there that he was charged with no other crime but railing at the Pope, despising the excommunications of Rome, and preaching, that the Church wanted to be reformed? In that case I yield the point to you. But as you cannot have read them without finding that among several other shameful confessions which were drawn from him, he acknowledges that his predictions were only grounded upon the consequences which he had deduced from Scripture it is impossible for you to justify yourselves, your report is very unfaithful.

In effect, this acknowledgment of Savonarola convicted him of an imposture that was full of prophana-tion and impiety, since he had said, for some years, that his knowledge of things to come proceeded from an immediate and prophetic inspiration. This, no doubt, was the principal reason which the Judges alledged for sentencing him to be burnt. The manner in which Mr Du Pleſſis Mornai endeavours to reconcile these two things, is wrong; I have shewn the invalidity of it (140). Those who would excuse Savonarola by the goodness of his intentions, do not deserve a hearing; for it is certain that Numa Pompilius, and some other antient legislators had the public interest in view, when they gave out that God dictated to them the ordinances which they established. Is this pretext sufficient to clear them from the infamous character of impostors? But granting that they might be excused, it would be impossible to excuse Savonarola. A Christian, a Monk, who profanes the name of God to such a degree as to put off his particular opinions for immediate revelations, is infinitely more criminal than the Gentiles, who were wanting in their respect for the false gods of Paganism.

(138) I write this in the year 1704.

strange talk on tortur

(139) Τὴν Καὶ οὐρανοῦ γυναικαὶ καὶ διαβολῆς διὰ καθάρσεως εἶναι. Cæsar uxorem etiam criminatam (and not criminals as Xenander has translated) immunitum, Plut. Apoph. p. 306. A. See him also in Vita Cæsar, pag. 712, and Sueton. in Cæsar. cap. lxxv.

the more shame then

(140) In the foregoing remark.

promised his canonization to the Dominicans, provided they would take part against Pope

If you answer, that this was not the true reason of Savonarola's punishment, it was only the pretence, I ask you, is a man allowed, upon certain facts, to give his conjectures, and interpretations, which are charitable, with respect to the party accused, and malicious with respect to the Judges? And after all, this does not justify the persons whose narratives he examines; for they say not a word concerning the motives which the Judges alledged. They decide the point without setting forth the tenor of the acts. Does not this shew a conduct full of temerity and passion?

This does not concern those who acknowledge that the records of the trial charge several great crimes upon Savonarola, but who pretend that foul play was used in drawing up these records, and that there appeared falsified copies of them. Spizelius tells us, that the famous Mr Magliabechi communicated to him several remarks concerning this falsification. 'Quid,

quod inquisitionis etiam seu examinis libellus & commentarius duplex fabricatus sit; sincerus unus, alter a Cecone quodam Astuario falsatus & legitimo suppositus referat Timotheo Perusino, cap. 49. Vit. Hieron. §. Qui de iniquissima & sceleratissima pro-

† Narrat. ibid. Perusinus, verum & sincerum Processum Hieronymi, ab eodem Cecone nequam, Lucretia de Medici, Leonis Papae X sorori, Jacobi Salviati conjugii fuisse postea concessum, cuius & ipsa lectione commota mitior exinde & equior fuerit. --- Perusinus relates in the same place, that the true and genuine trial of Savonarola was afterwards communicated by the said villain Cecco to Lucretia de Medici, after to Pope Leo X. and wife to James Salviati, and that the reading of it made such an impression upon her as to give her a more favourable opinion of Savonarola from that time.

(141) Spizelius, ubi supra, pag. 662.

(142) Gratianus, de Causis, Viros. illustr. pag. 140.

(143) See the remark [K].

(144) Liplius, Monit. & Exempl. Politic. lib. i, cap. iii, pag. m. 139, 140.

who come under that class, are not at all favourable

to our Dominican. One of them declares, without any ceremony, that he was burnt for the imposture and impiety of which he was convicted. Savonarola

Divi Dominici sacris initiatus non modo literatus, sed magnae apud literatos omnes auctoritatis, Christianae disciplinae concinator egregius, admirabilis omnino doctrinae, nisi pravo eam ingenio contaminasset, postquam facundia fretus fuit Florentinum populum eo compulerat, ut ab Alexandro Pontifice Maximo, atque adeo ab Ecclesiae Romanae institutis dissentiret, majoremque sibi adrogaret auctoritatem, quam ab ipso rerum optime per manus traditam adlocutus esset Petri successor Rom. Pontifex; de doctrina sua, deque Dei familiaritate, quae se ad colloquium usque dignatum palam profitebatur, fidem equo pertinacius tueri perleverat, mendacitatis & imposturae demum convictus, impietatisque damnatus; in urbis, quam deceperat, medio cum affectis ali-

(145) Pierius Valerianus, de Literat. Infelicitate, lib. ii, p. m. 78, 79.

quot concrematus est (145). -- Savonarola the Dominican was not only learned himself, but likewise a man of great authority among the learned, and an excellent preacher of Christian discipline. His doctrine was thoroughly admirable, if he had not corrupted it by an evil disposition. By his eloquence he induced the people of Florence to dissent from Pope Alexander, and consequently from the institutions of the Romish church. He took upon him a greater authority than the Pope of Rome, as St Peter's successor, had received, handed down to him from God himself. He persisted with an unreasonable obstinacy in defending his doctrine, and boasting of his familiarity with God, which he publicly declared had gone so far as to be admitted to converse with him. At last, being convicted as a liar and impostor, and condemned for his impiety, he was burnt, with some of his under-agents, in the middle of that city which he had deceived. The judgment which Gratianus passes upon him is much of the same nature (146). I cannot tell whether the Judges knew of the letters which Savonarola wrote to Charles VIII, exhorting him to return into Italy, and to reform the Church by the sword (147). They would have found there a just cause to condemn him for treason, for it is an act of rebellion to call in foreign armies: the heads of a faction cannot lawfully use such means to render it the uppermost in their country. On the other hand, it was a strange, if not a mad, project, to think of making the sword of a king of France the instrument of reforming the Church. Did he want him to employ dragooning? Or was it only his desire, that he should oblige the court of Rome, by the terror of his arms, to call a council? But what freedom could there be in an assembly held by the will of a conqueror? Would people dare to give their opinions otherwise than he should think fit.

(146) Gratianus, ubi supra, p. 141.

(147) See in the remark [D] the words of Philip de Comines.

To say something of Savonarola's sentiments with respect to excommunication, I shall observe that the Protestants are mistaken, perhaps when they conceive him to be orthodox upon this point. Take notice, I pray, that on his being excommunicated by Alexander VI, he left off going into the pulpit for some time; but when he perceived that silence diminished his credit, and put a stop to his designs, he began to preach again, and continued to do it till the magistrates forbade him (148). This unequal conduct is neither worthy of a Prophet, nor of a new Apostle: the same reason which hindered him from submitting to the Pope's orders, should have hindered him from submitting to the orders of the magistrates; for if the interests of the great work, to which he fancied himself commissioned in an extraordinary manner, required that notwithstanding the Pope's orders, he should exercise the function of a preacher, since it is better to obey God than men (149), they likewise required him to exercise it notwithstanding the prohibition of the secular arm. There is some probability that he would have alledged the same reasons against a council which he did against Alexander VI, in case the council should have treated him in the same manner that the Pope had done. He would have believed then that there was no tribunal upon earth which could put him to silence; and who knows if he did not fancy that as a prophet he ought to hold immediately of God, and enjoy the privilege of a special commission to bring all his causes directly before the court of Heaven?

(148) Taken from Guicciardini, lib. iii: I have quoted his words in the rem. [C].

(149) Cuius Man- dato (Papae) non obediunt aliter: Deo obediunt oportere magis quam hominibus. Bur- chardus in Dicitur, pag. 46.

Pope Julius II, but that they refused to buy it at that price (*n*). He wrote many books wherein we find a great deal of unktion and piety [*N*]. I say something of a letter which he wrote to the Pope, wherein he examines, among other things laid to his charge,

(*n*) Baron Apolog. Ordinis Prædict. Tom. ii, pag. 91.

tyranny

Heaven? The discipline of the Protestants does not allow of such notions: it establishes tribunals which forbid preaching, suspend, and excommunicate; it requires that their authority should be submitted to, and treats as schismatical and contumacious persons, those who shake off this yoke, under the pretence that they have been unlawfully condemned (150).

But what shall we say of the submission which Savonarola promised in his letter to the Pope, dated the twenty-ninth of September, 1497. He clears himself as well as he can from every thing that had been said of him to the Pope; he alleges strong reasons why he had not taken a journey to Rome when the Pope sent for him. He treats as slanderers those who termed it disobedience: he declares that he is ready to retract any thing said or written by him, which his Holiness shall judge worthy of censure. He concludes by submitting his person, his writings, and his words, to the authority of the Church, and to that of the Pope.

Dignetur Sanctitas vestra mihi significare quid ex omnibus que scripti vel dixi sit revocandum, & ego id liberrime faciam; nam & hac vice & semper, sicut sepius dixi, ac etiam scripsi, missum & omnia mea dicta & scripta subijcio correctioni S. R. E. & S. P. cui semper missum & fratres meos ejusdem pedibus prostratus plurimum commendo (151). If he had pretended that as a Prophet, he was exempted from all Ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and if he had been such a man as the Protestants extolled, what I have just now quoted would be the language of a great hypocrite.

Let us observe, that if this Dominican was not an impostor, he must necessarily have been a prodigious Fanatic. I prove it thus: He foretold, among other things, the approaching conversion of the Mahometans, and shewed himself to be so fully persuaded of the certainty of this prophecy, that he declared, that whoever should enter into the fire for the support of it, would come off without receiving any damage (152). If he spoke sincerely, his persuasion was as strong as it could possibly be. Now since the falsity of the prediction makes it plainly appear that he was not inspired, we ought to conclude that his Fanaticism was come to the highest pitch. Every body, I think, must know that the virtue of a Fanatic, his zeal, his mortifications, are not words of a double meaning. It is generally a virtue proceeding from vapours, an irregularity of the organs, a disorder in some fibres of the brain. I am willing to believe that those who have so much cried up the martyrdom of Savonarola had never read the facts which I have mentioned in this remark, nor made the reflexions which naturally arise from them. I must do this justice to Voëtius, that altho' he has disputed the ground by inches in favour of that Dominican, he does not fail to acknowledge that he had somewhat of a vertigo. He does not make him a true Prophet of the New Law, as others have done

(153). 'Ego, ut viri illius sanctitas & zelus communiter describitur & in scriptis ejus, præsertim prædictis elucet, partim politicis conjecturis, (ut erat peripicacissimus politicus), partim ferventissimo studio & forti imaginationi talium rerum, quas prædictabat, & inde ortæ phantasticæ infirmitati ac vertigini prædictiones illas tribuerem' (154). - - - *As the zeal and holy life of that man are generally described, and as they shine forth in his writings, especially in his practical ones, I am tempted to impute his predictions, partly to his political conjectures, (for he was a most discerning Politician) partly to his fervent study and strong imagination of such things as he foretold, and to a sanctifical infirmity and vertigo proceeding from thence.*

When he says that the Protestants contented themselves with alledging this man to their adversaries as a domestic evidence, and for an argument *ad hominem*, he shews what they all should have done, but not what they all did. 'Nec obscurè perstringit nostros (Nau-dæus) qui propter communionem scilicet hæreticos virum illum laudaverint. Sed duo illi repono: quorum primum est in illo quinque admiranda prædicari, eruditionem; eloquentiam; sanctitatem & zelum; studium orthodoxiæ & reformationis ecclesiæ: prophetias & hinc tantam ejus æstimationem apud optimum quemque in orbe Papali: nil ergo mirum, si nostri ad hominem (uti ajunt) hunc domesticum

testem adversariis suis opposuerint; quidquid ipsi de eo senserint. Alterum est, &c. (155). - - - (155) Id. ibid. pag. 1069. Neither does he (Naudé) obscurely glance at the Protestants, as if they had praised this man on account of his being a joint partaker with them in Heresy. But I say two things in answer to him; first, that five admirable qualities were ascribed to him, learning, eloquence, sanctity and zeal, a concern for orthodoxy and the reformation of the Church, and the gift of prophecy, for which he was so much esteemed by the best of the Roman Catholics; so that it was no wonder if the Protestants in an argument *ad hominem* (as the phrase is) opposed this domestic evidence to their adversaries, whatever their own private opinion of him was. The other is, &c. It is certain that Savonarola not only knew the corruption of the Church, but also shewed a great desire to correct it. If he had only known it, he had been in the same case with other people; for even the most licentious priests knew very well, that a clergyman guilty of concubinage, simony, &c. was in a disorderly way; but they did not wish for a reformation of abuses. There are few people at this day in Rome itself who do not think that the intrigues made use of for the election of the Popes are an evil; and how many good Papists are there who wish to see a stop put to this disorder, and to several others? What was particular in Savonarola was, therefore his daring to say, that it was necessary to banish the corruption: and upon that footing, the Protestants might place him in general among the witnesses of truth. I do not believe that the compilers of these witnesses have always acted with a suitable discernment. This by the by. If Ferrante Palavicino, who was hanged for his books against the Pope; if the authors of the Syndicat of Alexander VII, and the Historian of Dona Olympia, had lived in the XIIIth or XIVth century, Flacius Illyricus might have put them in his catalogue; nevertheless there are no persons less worthy of that place than such authors.

Note, That there are Protestants who maintain that Savonarola was an impostor. Read the thesis *Artes tyrannicas Hieronymi Savonarolæ representant*, - - - *Representing the tyrannical arts of Jerom Savonarola*, which was defended at Lëna in the year 1690, under the presidency of Mr Buddeus.

[*N*] He wrote a great many books, wherein we find a good deal of unktion and piety. This is Mr Du Pin's judgment upon them: He has composed (says he) a prodigious number of books, moral, spiritual, and practical: they abound in the unktion and maxims of piety: he there freely censures vice, and teaches the purest and the most sublime morality (157). Mr Du Pin has given us the catalogue of this Fryar's works, we find it also in the Appendix to Dr Cave, with a great many particulars concerning the different editions (158). Some of them were put in the *Index Librorum prohibitorum & expurgandorum*, and there arose a great dispute under Pope Paul IV, whether or not they should all be treated in the same manner; but by the extraordinary vigilance of the Dominicans it was carried in the negative, and it was resolved to stand to what had already been decreed against some of them, and that even these should not be branded as heretical or erroneous: the penalty of suspension was thought sufficient (159). Of all the many books written by Savonarola, none has been more universally approved of than that which is intitled, *Triumphus Crucis, seu de Fidei Christianæ veritate*, - - - *The Triumph of the Cross, or of the Truth of Christianity*. Cardinal Onophrius (160), who died at Rome in the year 1646, ordered by a codicil annexed to his last will, that they should cause it to be reprinted in good characters. . . . with the Paraphrase of the same author upon the Miserere, and left five hundred crowns for that purpose (161). Let us observe that Savonarola's book against Judicial Astrology, was printed in Italian, at Florence, in the year 1495, and that it was translated into Latin, and illustrated with notes, by Thomas Boninsegni. This translation was printed at Florence in the year 1581, in 8vo (162). The same book was translated into High Dutch, by Thomas Erastus (163). It is said that Savonarola encouraged John Picus to write against Judicial Astrology (164). The reason that is given for his hatred to

know & blab - 2 things

(150) Witnesses what passed in Holland in the year 1667, against the minister Labadie, who among other books caused one to be printed with this title, *Traité de faison ecclésiastique & théologique tout ensemble, des Confessions, des Ecclésiastiques, Suspendus, Interdits ou Excommunications, &c.*

(151) Savonar. Epist. ad Alexandrum VI, in the Preuves sur l'Histoire de Comines, p. 346. A Proof of Savonarola's Fanaticism.

(152) See the remark [G].

(153) Gurtlerus, (for example) professor of Divinity at Deventer. He proves it by the passage of Philip de Comines, which he quotes according to the bad translation of Sleidan. See his *Systema Theologicæ Prebæticæ*, cap. xxiv, pag. 430, 431, Edit. Amst. 1702.

(154) Voëtius, ubi supra, Part ii, pag. 1070.

(156) Du Pin, Biblioth. Tom. xii, pag. 115, Dutch Edition.

(157) Ib. p. 116.

(158) Wharton, Appendix ad Histor. Literariam Gul. Cave, pag. 164, & seq.

(159) See Wharton, ibid. p. 163.

(160) He was brother to Urban VIII, and had been a Capuchin Friar. Pierre de S. Romuald, *Journal Chronol.* Tom. ii, pag. m. 289.

(161) Ibid. See also the Preuves sur Philippe de Comines, pag. m. 346.

(162) Wharton, ubi supra, pag. 164.

(163) Verheiden, in Iconib. p. 15.

(164) Bullart, Académie des Sciences, Tom. ii, pag. 6.

(o) See in the remark [K], the words of Arnol-
dus Ferronus.

(P) See Naucle-
rus, *Geno. L.*
Part. ii, pag. m.
989.

charge, the accusation of his boasting that he conversed with God [O]. He had great conflicts with the devils, and rendered himself formidable to these princes of darkness [P]. I must not forget that one of the things which served to make him odious was his affection for the King of France (o). There is room to believe that he was attached to that prince, because having presumed to prophecy that great revolutions would happen, and turning his eyes on all sides to seek out the Cyrus destined by God to fulfil that great work (p), he found none so fit for that purpose as Charles VIII. From that moment he declared him to be the chosen Cyrus of God, and dedicated all his services to him. It is the common practice of these false prophets, and we have examples of it

to Astrologers appears to me very chimerical: however, I shall recite it, it will serve to shew the credulity of Florimond de Remond. The excessive vanity of Savonarola, who pretended to be a prophet, was presently found out by the very Astrologers; for as there was a conjunction of Venus and Saturn, and the Moon was in the meridian of her hemisphere, on the twenty-first of September, 1452, at forty-four minutes past five in the afternoon, they immediately saw the pride and arrogance of that Monk. For this reason was he such a bitter enemy to Astrology, having armed Picus Mirandolani against it (165).

(165) Florimond
de Remond, *Hist.*
de l'Herésie,
liv. i, chap. v.
num. 4, pag. m.
30.

[O] I say something of a letter . . . wherein, among other accusations, he examines that, of his boasting that he conversed with God. There is no doubt but that this is no proof that he himself had acknowledged it expressly. Those who are fond of a devotee, ascribe many more things to him than he himself pretends to. They presently go beyond bounds, by amplifying. If he confesses that God has been graciously pleased to reveal some event to him, and that he partakes of immediate illumination, they officiously decide the manner of it, and affirm, at last, that God converses with him as he did with Moses. Be it as it will, the prevailing opinion was, that he himself pretended to talk with God. Here is a great witness for this opinion. The people of Florence are not foolish, whom, nevertheless, Friar Savonarola persuaded that he conversed with God. It is thus that Gabriel Naudé (166) cites the testimony of Machiavel. I shall give it more at large, to the end that the tenderness of the author, and the occasion of his discourse may be seen. He had just said that, tho' it be more easy to persuade ignorant people into a new thing, it is not impossible to do the same by people of sense. After that, he quotes the example of Friar Jerom. 'Al popolo di Firenze non pare essere né ignorante né rozzo, nondimeno da Frate Girolamo Savonarola fu persuaso che parlava con Dio. Io non voglio giudicare s'egli era vero o no, perché d'un tanto huomo se ne debbe parlare con riverenza. Ma io dico bene che infiniti lo credevano, senza havere visto cosa nessuna straordinaria, da farlo loro credere; perché la vita sua, la dottrina, il soggetto che predicava, erano sufficienti a fargli prestare fede (167). . . . The people of Florence neither seem to be ignorant nor foolish, and nevertheless they suffered themselves to be persuaded by Friar Jerom Savonarola that he conversed with God. I will not pretend to judge whether this was true or false, because one ought to speak with reverence of so great a man: but this I may say, that vast numbers of people believed it, without having seen any thing extraordinary to make them do so; because his life, his doctrine, and the subject that he pitched upon were sufficient to gain credit to him.' We have seen above (168) the testimony of Pierius Valerianus. I could cite a great many others, but where is the necessity of compiling? Do we need any other proofs but the letter which Savonarola wrote to Pope Alexander VI, to vindicate himself from the accusations contained in a brief of the said Pope? The fourth of these accusations is, that he was said to converse with God (169). He answers, that he never spoke so in express words, but that, supposing he had even made use of that expression, he should not deserve to be punished, since there is no law for punishing those who say that they converse with God. He adds, that such a law would be absurd and impious, since no man can impose a law upon God, who may converse with whom he pleases. Quarto dicitur & cum deo loqui: hoc etiam nunquam expressè dixi, nec unquam utroque modo loquendi, ut testis est universus populus Florentinus: quod etiam si dixissem nullam propter hoc incurrerem poenam: non enim invenitur in aliquo loco scriptum, nec in

(167) Machiav.
Discorsi sopra
Tito Livio, lib. i,
cap. xi, p. m. 32.

(168) In the re-
mark [M], ci-
tat. 146.

(169) Quarto
dicitur & cum
deo loqui. Savon.
Epist. ad Alexan-
dram VI: It is
in the Preuves for
les Mémoires de
Phil. de Comines,
p. m. 317,
& seq. Burchard,
in his Diarium,
pag. m. 46, says
In predicationibus
suis publicis
dicebat Salvato-
rem nostrum
sepe sibi loqui.
- - - He said
publicly in his
sermons that our
Saviour often con-
versed with him.

toto corpore Juris Canonici nec Civilis nec in aliquo authentico libro, quod qui dixit se cum deo loqui puniatur: stultum etiam esset & impium facere talem legem, cum nullus possit imponere legem Deo; potest enim ipse loqui cum quibus vult, & eis præcipere ut dicant, Hoc dixit Dominus meus, sicut Prophetæ faciebant (170).

(170) Savonar.
ibidem.

His answers to the greatest part of the other accusations go almost upon the same foundation. He denies (171), for example, that he had boasted of being a prophet; but he maintains, that if he had done so, 340. he should not be liable to punishment. He does not acknowledge (172) that he said absolutely, and with a design to make himself equal to God, *If am a liar, Jesus Christ is so*. He confines himself to certain particular cases, wherein he pretends that he might lawfully use that expression. He has recourse to a distinction of the like nature, when he tries to justify himself for having said (173), that such as did not give credit to his predictions were out of the way of salvation. I only meant that, says he, of such people as opposed me through a spirit of obstinacy. He was no bad proficient in the art of Sophistry, that art which is so necessary to those who deal in predictions (174).

(171) Ibid. pag.
340.

(172) Ibid. pag.
339.

(173) Ibid.

[P] He had great conflicts with the devils, and rendered himself formidable to these princes of darkness. Naudé puts him 'in the rank . . . of those Monks of whom St Jerom says, qui demonum contra se pugnantium portenta fingunt, ut apud imperitos & vulgi homines miraculum sui faciant, - - - who invent strange stories of their fighting with devils, in order to excite the admiration of vulgar and ignorant people, since the half of the book, which he wrote upon his prophecies, contains nothing else but the conference he had with the devil whom he mistook for a hermit (175).' John Francis Picus affirms, that the devils which tormented the bodies of possessed people, or haunted the convent of the Dominicans, very much dreaded the sight of Savonarola, and that out of pure spite and rage they always pronounced his name, with some alteration or abridgment of the letters. They threatened him often, and fled as fast as they could, being awed by the words which he pronounced against them. He drove them from the cells of the monastery, among other means, by the sprinkling of holy water, accompanied with the singing of Psalms. For this reason they desisted from tormenting the other Monks, and redoubled their efforts against him alone. He was sometimes obliged to stop short, while he was walking the rounds in the convent, with a design to protect the Friars from their insults; for they had thickened the air to such a degree, that he could not go any further. I shall quote my author words; they are more emphatical than the idea which I give of them. *Dæmones qui vel obfessa corpora vexabant, vel ad hominum terriculamenta per ades sancti Marci strepabant, mirum in modum ab aspectu Hieronymi formidabant, nec unquam ejus sincere nomen prærabie exprimebant, sed aut literas inverberantes, aut nomen decurrantes aut in aliud ludicrum transformabant (176).*

(174) See the re-
mark [K] of
the article DE-
JOTARUS.

(175) Naudé, ubi
supra, p. 451.

(176) Jo. Franc.
Picus, in Vita
Savonarolæ, pag.
123.

it which are of a fresher date still than that of Drabicius. I do not know whether Savonarola had not attended to a maxim which Machiavel has published since, quoting him for an example of it [Q]. This maxim is, that Prophets who are not supported by the secular arm, nor by any other weapons besides their own tongue and the prepossession of the people, *sola Majestate armati, armed with nothing else but majesty*, are exposed to terrible changes of fortune. I shall make a remark upon the different ways of writing his name [R].

Juls -
Ho

(177) Id. ibid.
pag. 124.

mkmt

(178) Id. ibid.
pag. 123.

REFLECTIONS
upon a passage of
Mr Claude, con-
cerning Luther.

Luther's

(179) Claude
Défense de la Ré-
formation, pag.
136.
Jeau
aux Préjugés
Legitimes contre
les Calvinistes,
p. 364: the Brus-
sels edition 1683.

† This second
question is, whe-
ther the Monks
in Luther's time
used to stuff
books with their
exploits against
the Devil by rhe-
torical figures
like the story
which Luther
tells of his con-
ference with
the Devil, which
story Mr Claude
would gladly put
off for a rhetori-
cal figure.

Et cellas omnes psalmis & aqua sacra guttis seu propugnaculis armatis, sic densarunt aërem (mibi postea sicut ipse retulit) ulterius ut sibi facultas omnino per cenobium incendendi præclusa videretur; hisque sunt illi verbis interminati. Quot tibi malorum aceruas & queris; Nos in te namque tot & tanta concitabimus, ut sustinere non valeas. Ad quæ latus ille respondit, quæcumque vellet pararent & exerèrent, bonum nihil se formidare, quia adiutorium ejus in nomine Domini qui fecit cælum & terram (177). This passage is in the chapter where the author relates the extacies of Savonarola, and that the Holy Ghost appeared in the shape of a dove, and put his bill to that Friar's ear. Silvester ejus vite comes & Martyrii confors, roganti mibi de Hieronymi sanctitate, atque obsecranti ut occulti quippiam in rerum ejus confirmationem (sciebam enim eum multorum secretorum conficium) affirmavit, columbe speciem, quæ sancti Spiritus præsentiam gratiamque indicaret, semel atque iterum se vidisse Hieronymi humero insidentem, argenteis aureisque coruscantem pennis redimitam, & rostro in aurem ipsius porrecto insulurantem (178). - - - Sylvester, who was companion to Savonarola in his life, and partaker with him in his martyrdom, when I asked him concerning Savonarola's sanctity, and begged that he would give me some secret proof of it, (for I knew that Sylvester was well acquainted with many secret particulars of Savonarola's life) assured me, that he had seen oftener than once the appearance of a dove, which intimated the presence and grace of the Holy Ghost, perch upon Savonarola's shoulder, and glittering with gold and silver feathers, whispering him with it's bill in his ear.

In reading this remark, perhaps, some people will call to mind a certain circumstance in the disputes which Mr. Claude had with the gentlemen of Port Royal, and will possibly imagine that these gentlemen did a rash thing, when they challenged him to prove, that in Luther's time the Monks talked loudly of their exploits against the devils. This makes me say, that Savonarola's example would have been of no service to Mr. Claude. Every body knows that the controverted-writers of the church of Rome object, as a very strong argument, the dispute which Luther relates to have passed between him and the devil concerning the nails. Mr. Claude, when he comes to answer this objection, says, among other things, that Luther, following the stile of the Monks of that time, who used by a kind of rhetorical figure to stuff books with their exploits against the devil, relates that once upon his awaking in the night, the devil accused him that he had caused the people of GOD to commit idolatry, and had committed idolatry himself during the space of fifteen years that he had said private masses (179).

The reply that was made to this passage is reduced to three questions, the last of which I leave out: for it is sufficient to mention here the first and second. The first is, whether a sensible person can believe that Luther's story is a rhetorical figure. The second, whether this figure be an usual thing with the Monks (180).

What was said upon the first question would be superfluous here; I shall only speak of the explication of the second.

The second question † may be decided with as little difficulty; for it consists in a fact which it concerns Mr. Claude to prove, and he deserves to be looked upon as a slanderous person, unless he can justify the same by examples. He says, that the Monks of that time used, by a kind of rhetorical figure, to stuff books with their exploits against the devil. We confess that we know no examples of such fi-

gures. There are Monks who relate apparitions of devils, but then they relate them as true, and with an intention to make them pass for such. If these apparitions are well-grounded, they were in the right to relate them, and the holy fathers have done so before them. If they have believed them upon too slight a foundation, their credulity is to be censured. If they have related them without believing what they told, they deserve the character of knaves and impostors. But Mr. Claude cannot prove that any one has related stories like that which Luther tells, and with circumstances as particular as those inserted by him, at the same time that he only wanted to make them pass for rhetorical figures. We therefore still expect that Mr. Claude should explain himself upon this point, and unless he do so, he cannot escape being condemned by wise people, as guilty of a dishonourable malignity (181).

It is manifest that Savonarola's exploits against the devils cannot be alledged as a proof of what Mr. Claude had advanced; for they are not at all things that were related by a kind of rhetorical figure.

[Q] A maxim that Machiavel has published since, quoting him for an example of it. I shall cite him according to the French translation of Mr. Amelot, and with his notes. To (182) understand this point well, it is necessary to see whether these Legislators stand by themselves, or depend upon others, that is to say, whether, in order to carry on their enterprize, they are obliged to make use of prayers and entreaties, and in that case they are always unsuccessful: or if they are able to force an obedience, and then they hardly ever fail to succeed. From thence it comes that all the princes, whom I have named, with arms prevailed, and without them were undone. For, besides the reasons mentioned, there is a fickleness in the nature of people. It is easy to persuade them of a thing, but difficult to keep them up in that persuasion. Things should therefore be so well ordered, that when they no longer believe, they may be compelled to believe by force. Moses, Cyrus, Theseus, and Romulus, could never have got their laws to be observed long, if they had been unarmed, as it happened in our days to the Dominican Jerom Savonarola, who was ruined for want of having the means in his hands of obliging those who had once believed his words to persist in their faith, and of compelling the incredulous to believe them †.

[R] I shall make a remark upon the different ways of writing his name. The true name is Savonarola; but the French have been allowed to change the termination a little by saying Savonarole. They should be satisfied with this alteration, and not say Savonarole, as they almost all do. Some have carried their liberty a great deal further; Du Verdier Vauprivas (183) writes Savonarole: Prateolus (184) Savanarola: Du Pleffis Mornai (185), and James Gohori (186), Savonaroola: Florimond de Remond (187) Savanarolle: a disciple of Mr. Buddeus (188) Savanorola. This confirms what I have said in other places (189).

(184) In his Prosopographie, Tom. iii, p. 2350. (185) In Vol. II, of his Histoire de l'Eglise, fol. 304. (186) In the translation of Machiavel upon Titus Livius, lib. i, ch. xi. (187) Hist. de l'Herésie, liv. ii, ch. i, p. m. 121. (188) In a thess maintained at Jena, in the year 1690. (189) In the remark [B] of the article EPHORUS. See likewise the article MONTMAUR, at the beginning of the text, in the margin.

(181) Ibid. pag.
372, 373.

(182) Machiavel,
in his treatise,
Del Principe,
chap. vi.

Whoever reads
the Bible with a
sound judgment,
says Machiavel,
(in the 30th
chapter of the
third book of his
Discourses) will
see that Moses,
to render his laws
inviolable, was
obliged to put
to death an infinite
number of
people, who op-
posed his designs
out of envy.
Moses having cal-
led the Israelites
together, said un-
to them: Thus
saith the Lord,
God of Israel, put
every man his
sword by his side,
and go in and out
from gate to gate
throughout the
camp, and slay
every man his
brother, and every
man his com-
panion, and every
man his neighbour.
And the children
of Levi did ac-
cording to the
word of Moses:
and there fell of
the people that day
about three thou-
sand men. (Exod.
xxxii. 27, 28.)

† Machiavel says,
he had persuaded
the people of
Florence, that he
conferred with
God (Disc. lib. i,
cap. xi.) Nardi
says that those of
Savonarola's par-
ty were called at
Florence, Prag-
noni, that is to
say, the Weepers
or Hypocrites:
and his enemies,
Arrabati, that is
to say, the mad
or undisciplinable
(Hyst. Flor. lib. ii.)

SAWICKI (GASPAR) a Jesuit, was born at Vilna in Lithuania in 1542. He entered into the society of Jesuits at Rome in 1566, and after having studied Divinity, he returned into Poland and taught controversy at Vilna. He was for nine years Prefect of the novices at Cracow, and superior of the professed house five years in the same city. He had in other places no less honourable employments. He was also a preacher. He followed the ambassadors of the King of Poland into Muscovy, and was a great assistance to them during the three years of a close imprisonment he spent with them. Notwithstanding his great age, and his sickness, he was obliged to accept the office of procurator of the Jesuits at Rome, and acquitted himself very well in it: but as he was returning into Poland, he died in a post-chariot near Francfort upon the Oder, the nineteenth of January 1620. He composed many books, wherein, instead of his own name, he took a supposititious one (a) [A]. I do not believe now that it is he, who treated Erasmus ill, in a book published under the name of Gaspar Cichocius [B].

(a) Taken from the Bibliothèque of Alegambe, p. 152.

[A] He composed many books, wherein, instead of his own name, he took a supposititious one. That which he intitled, *Anatomia consilii editi de stabilenda pace Regni Polonie, Jesuitis pulsus*, was published in 1611, under the name of Gaspar Cichocki. He published in the Polish tongue a dialogue, *Curforis & Nautæ in quo de violentia Gedanensium Monialium S. Brigittæ per Hereticos facta proscriptio narratio instituitur*; and he took the name of Lunowki. He composed under that of John Golubski, *Replica rumorum Polonianum ab heretico Ministro per Prussiam sparsorum. Triplica contra duplicem Ministri Torontensis. Mirabilis concordia, seu potius verissima rabies Evangelicorum inter se, contra Joannem Triviecki Hereticum* (1).

(1) Taken from Alegambe, Bibl. Scripior. Societas Jesu, p. 152, 153.

(2) Th. Raynaudus, Erotomat. de malis ac bonis Libris, p. 25.

[B] That he treated Erasmus ill. Father Theophilus Raynaud having mentioned some things very disadvantageous to Erasmus, refers his reader to Gaspar Cichocius: *Videndus qui varias ejus impietates & adversus eum judicia sapientum addens Gaspar Cichocius*, lib. 1. Alloquiorum cap. 19. & 20 (2). Guy Patin, who knew books well, and had a good library, was short in the matter: it is probable he thought he could hear no news of that book at Paris, since he consulted the oracle at Lyons, I mean the author himself, who had cited Cichocius. Give me leave, says he to his friend of Lyons, to be a little importunate with you: When you see Father Theophilus, try to know of

him who Gaspar Cichocius is, lib. 1. Alloquiorum, who writ against Erasmus, and where that book was printed (3). He gives us no account of any answer. As for me, I ingenuously confess I never saw that book: those whom I have consulted about it, told me that they had never heard of such an author. I thought it was Gaspar Sawicki, and I affirmed it in the first edition of this Dictionary; but I am now of another opinion: I find it was a canon and curate of Sandomir. He is cited in a book of Stanislaus Lubieński (4). I have read in Simon Starovolski, that Gaspar Cichocius, born at Tarnowitz, a city of the lesser Poland, was made Master of Arts in 1567, and that afterwards he obtained of Cardinal George Radziwil, this canonry and rectory, and that he composed two books, the one called *Anatomia*, to justify the Jesuits, and the other *Alloquia Oficiana*, to refute the errors of Heretics (5). This last work would have brought a great mischief upon him, for he treated the King of England very ill in it; but death freed him from the danger. *Fecit . . . librum . . . Alloquia Oficiana dictum, quo Hereticorum errores ostendit ac refutat simul, quamvis successu parum felici, quod minus honorificam in eis Regis Angli mentionem fecisset: tulissetque sane multa acerba & gravia, ni mors senem opportune liberasset* (6).

(3) Patin, *Tm. letter cxxxvi.*

(4) Gaspar Cichocius Canonici & Parochi Sandomiriensis in Alloquiis Oficibus memorie prodidit. Stanislaus Lubieński, *Hist. Reform. Polon.* pag. 20.

(5) Simon Starovolski, *Elog. & Vit. centum Poloniarum Scripior.* cap. lxxix, pag. 100.

(6) Id. ibid.

(a) Vossius, de Hist. Lat. p. 616.

(b) Politian. Epist. III, lib. v, & Ep. xviii, lib. xii.

(c) As culx in the feminine gender, and *monstrum* in the masculine gender. Polit. Epist. viii, & xvi, lib. xii.

(d) See the 12th book of Politian's letters. You will find also three letters of Scala in the fifth.

SCALA (BARTHOLOMEW) a learned man in the XVth century, was born at Florence in the year 1424 (a). He was the son of a Miller [A]; but he raised himself by his industry and learning. He was a domestic of Cosmo de Medicis, after which the Florentines raised him by degrees to several considerable employments, and ennobled him, and gave him a place in the senate [B]. He was also secretary to that Republic (b). He wrote Latin tolerably well for those times, but now and then a barbarism escaped him (c). Politian having criticized on a little Poem of Scala, opened the way to a quarrel, which increased much by the answers and replies (d). It is said that Scala bore him already a private grudge, because several letters he had writ in the name of the Republic had not pleased Laurence de Medicis, who had employed Politian to write others (e). Be this how it will, Scala undertook to write the History of Florence, from the foundation of that city till the year 1450. His work comprehends twenty books, but he only completed five, because death hindered his going on. Nevertheless he lived seventy-three years, for he did not die till the year 1497. He also composed the life of Vitalian Borromeo, and an harangue to Innocent

(e) Scia autem tu quoque literas illum sepe tuas publice scriptas rejecisse, nobisque dedisse mandata, que prima odii livorique in me causa extitit. . . . But you likewise know that he often rejected the letters, which you had written in the name of the Republic, and gave me the charge of composing them, which was the first cause of your hatred and ill will to me. Polit. Ep. xviii, lib. xii.

[A] He was the son of a Miller. It is Leander Albertus who tells us so. Bartholomæus Scala, says he

(1) Descript. Ital. p. 70.

(1), vir doctus, ut potius Mufarum alumnus, quam inter rotas molarum natus videretur. . . . Bartholomæus Scala, a learned man, who rather seems to have been the foster-child of the Muses than one born in a mill. Scala writes himself, that he was of a low extraction. Veni nudus, omnium rerum bonarum egenus ad remp. vilissimis ortus parentibus, multa cum fide, nullis omnino divitiis, aut titulis, nullis clientelis, nullis cognationibus (2). . . . I came to the Republic naked and destitute of every thing, being born of the meanest parents. I brought with me a great deal of integrity, but no riches nor titles, neither dependents nor relations. Politian having called him *monstrum fursuraceum*, . . . a many monster, gives this reason for it: 'Monstrum quidem qui ex colluvione monstrorum compositus es: fursuraceum vero in prinitio foribus natus, & quidem pistrino dignissimus (3). . . . You are a monster truly, as being made up of a filthy jumble of monsters; and many, as having been born in a dirty

(2) Scala, Epist. ad Ang. Politian. It is the 16th of the 12th book of Politian's letters. Paris 1526, in 4to.

(3) Politian. Epist. xviii, lib. xii.

grinding-house, which is indeed much the fittest place for you.

[B] The Florentines raised him, and gave him a place in the senate. Speaking of this in the letter just now cited, he says: 'Cosmus tamen pater patriæ nostræ me complexus est, recepitque in familiæ obsequia. Interea Florentinus populus ad prioratum me exivit, deinde ad vexilliferatum; tandemque & in Senatorium me ordinem equestrumque collocavit, tanto profecto suffragiorum consensu, ut nihil esse factum unquam popularius multi putarent (4). . . . Nevertheless Cosmo, the true father of our country, cast a favourable eye upon me, and received me into the number of his domestics. In the mean time the people of Florence raised me to the dignity of a prior, afterwards to that of a standard-bearer, and last of all they placed me in the rank of senators and knights, with such an unanimity of suffrages, that, in the opinion of many, nothing was ever done in a more popular way. Politian would have thought, that he had treated him too well if he had said to him, Cabal did as much towards it as merit: He

(4) Scala, *ibid.*

Innocent VIII &c (f) [C]. Alexandra SCALA his daughter was well versed in the Greek and Latin tongues, as I shall presently shew, and thereby she came to be married to a learned Greek. Politian praised her much, he did not think it at all fit that he should extend to the daughter the reflexions which he had cast upon the father. The daughter on her side had no regard to that quarrel, but answered the civilities of Politian with other civilities.

He pretends that it was a mere sport of fortune. 'De honoribus quidem nihil est quod tibi nimium placeas; vetus enim ludus hic, ut indigni tollantur in altum, videlicet ut hoc quoque posse fortuna declaret, cuius tu solius opus es (5). -- You have no reason to value yourself on account of your preferments, because they are entirely owing to fortune, whose old game it is to exalt men of no merit, on purpose to shew that to this also her power extends.'

[C] He also composed . . . an *harangue* to Innocent VIII, &c.] The list of his works, if I am not mistaken, is pretty complete in the catalogue of the Florentine writers, composed by Pocciantius, and printed at Florence in 1589. There were then but few of

Scala's writings printed. Two learned Danes took care to publish the chief of them, viz. the Florentine History (6), and the Life of Vitalian Borromeo (7). I cannot tell whether the Apologies, which Marullus Ficinus very much esteemed, and the Letter which he writ upon the question, *Whether a wife man ought to marry* (8), have been published. *Apologi centum ad Laurentium Medicem, quos miris encomiis exornat Ficinus in 8vo, libro epistolarum* (9).

It is mentioned in the same Journal of Italy. (8) This question was handled by Heinſius. See in Baudii Amores the letter, An & qualis viro literato sit duenda uxor? To which is added the dissertation of an anonymous writer, De Matrimonio Literati, an coelibem esse an nubere conveniat? It is in a collection of several pieces, printed in the year 1606. (9) Pocciantius de Scriptor. Florentinis, p. 24.

(f) Vossius, de Hist. Lat. p. 616.

(6) Oliget Jacobus published it in 4to. It is mentioned in the fourth Journal of Italy 1677.

(7) Christopher Bartholinus published it. It is mentioned in the same Journal of Italy.

SCALA (ALEXANDRA) daughter to one learned man and wife to another, was her self well skilled both in the Greek and Latin tongues (a). Her father was the abovementioned Bartholomew Scala. I have spoken in its proper place, of Michael Marullus her husband. Politian lived in a more amicable way with her than with her father. He praised her often in Greek; she answered him in the same language (b). They writ verses to each other, which were printed: but what Marullus and Politian writ to one another, was the farthest thing in the world from compliments (c); it was a war of erudition, full of animosity and injurious words. The reason why Marullus married Alexandra Scala, was because he would perfect himself in the Latin tongue [A], if we may believe Paulus Jovius: but if we may believe her husband, she was very beautiful, and very virtuous, and why should we doubt that those good qualities, and the employments of her father might not have procured to her the courtship of Marullus? It would be a very edifying thing to see this Poet make verses in praise of his wife [B]; for we scarce see any

(a) Vossius, Hist. Lat. p. 616.

(b) Id. ibid.

(c) Cum Politiano . . . maledicentissimis epistolis lites extendere. Jovius, Eleg. cap. xxviii.

[A] Because he would perfect himself in the Latin tongue. I shall set down a passage of Paulus Jovius. Nihil jam Græcè doctum esse satis ad laudem putabat, nisi tota patrii sermonis facultas Romanæ facundia jungeretur, PROPTEREA Florentiæ Alexandriæ eruditi ingenii puellam uxorem duxit (1). --

(1) Jovius, Eleg. cap. xxviii.

He did not think it a sufficient praise to him that he was master of the Greek tongue, unless to his native stock he could likewise join the Roman eloquence, for which reason he married, at Florence, Alexandra, a young woman of wit and learning. Mr Varillas paraphrasing according to his custom what he finds in books, enlarges upon Paul Jovius in this manner: 'The love Marullus had for the Latin tongue, made him marry the daughter of Bartholomew Scala (2), who understood and spoke it admirably well. She taught him so well, that Laurence de Medicis found him capable of translating the Morals of Plutarch (3). I have already shewed that Marullus made Latin verses before he married Alexandra Scala; and therefore Jovius says too much, and Varillas, instead of rectifying it, amplifies it. We may compare his pen to spectacles.

(2) The Printers have put Scala.

(3) Varillas, Anecdotes de Florence, p. 179.

[B] Make verses in praise of his wife.] We are not to believe, that all the verses we find in Marullus's poems to the praise of Alexandra Scala, were made after he married her; we can, at most, only suspect this little epigram to have been so (4).

(4) Lib. iv, pag. m. 80.

Quod tam tota decens, formosaque tota venusta
Rara quidem, sed non unica Scala mea es;
At quod casta, decens, at quod formosa pudica,
Dispeream si non unica Scala mea es.
Nam cum Pieridum reputo commercia sacra,
Jam non ulterius unica, Scala dea es.

My Scala, while I mark and trace
Your ev'ry charm, and ev'ry grace,
I own such beauty to be rare;
Yet others may be found as fair.
But when your heav'nly charms I see
From all immodest tincture free,

Then let me perish, but I find
Scala the phoenix of her kind.
While left, as president of wit,
I see you with the Muses sit,
Scala no more a phoenix, is
A goddess mix'd with goddesses.

But if we consider it well, we shall find no expression here that signifies any thing of marriage; *mea Scala* may as well be applied to a mistress as to a wife; and we see that Marullus makes use of the same mark of tenderness towards Sappho,

Hoc Sappho melior mea,
Cujus facta domi distaque plurima
Præstans ingenium inquinant.

In this my Sappho's overcome,
Whose actions and discourse at home
Defile her noble wit.

says he (5), praising the good manners which Alexandra Scala learned in the service of the Muses. All the other verses he made in her praise, do manifestly relate to the time that preceded their marriage. There are some wherein he praises her (6), because when she was about fifteen years of age, she made admirable verses.

(5) Epigr. lib. iv, pag. m. 71.

(6) Lib. iii, p. 64.

Cum versu referas novem sorores,
Vix lustris bene adhuc tribus peractis,
Cum dulci sale seriisque blandis
Ipsam jam superes puella patrem,
Quo nihil gravius facietisque est.

Since e're threes lustrems of your age
Be reckon'd up, you thus engage
In Verse and Poetry divine
To be the rival of the Nine;
Since you at such an age excel
Your father who compar'd so well,

Both

(2) Vossius, *ubi supra*.

any now of this nature [C]: marriage commonly dries up the Poetical vein, which flowed so abundantly for a mistress. But it does not appear that when he made those verses on her, he was her husband. This learned Florentine woman died in 1506 (d).

*Both in the humorous and gay,
And in the grave and solemn way.*

In this same epigram he calls her *mea Scala*; yet one cannot believe that he was then her husband. Let us see what he says to her father.

Plus multo tamen, ô beate amice, est
Quod Scalas Latio pater dedisti,
Aucturam numerum novem fororum
Caelo carmine, castiore vita (7).

(7) Lib. iii, p. 54.

*But this, O happy friend, is more
Than all which you have done before,
In that you gave us Scala. She
Will one among the Muses be;
So chaste her numbers are, and still
Her life more chaste . . .*

He was not then his son-in-law, when he spoke to him in that manner. That is plain.

[C] *We scarce see any now of this nature.* There are many modern Poets, who would look upon themselves to be highly reproached for having prodigally spent their praises, if they should be told that they had praised their very wives. They would think that this expression would have more force, than if it should be said of them, that they had praised all from the scepter down to the shepherd's crook, and from the cedar of mount Lebanon, to the hyssop that grows on the wall. They would believe that this idea would give their flatteries the same extent which is given to love, in the following verses (8):

(8) Histoire Amoureuse Gaules.

SCAMANDER, a river of Phrygia near Troy. It was also called Xanthus; but there was a great difference between these two names: Scamander belonged to human language, Xanthus to that of the gods (a). This is the opinion of Homer. Some writers pretend that this Poet means that Xanthus was the ancient name of this river [A], and that Scamander was the modern: others say, that it was called Scamander before it was called Xanthus [B], and several etymologies are given of those two names (b). It is pretended that the waters of that river had the property of making women's hair that bathed in it, of a light colour, and that the Trojan women

(a) See the remark [A].

(b) See the remark [B].

[A] *Some writers pretend, that Homer means that Xanthus was the ancient name of this river.* Let us first cite what he says.

Ἄντα δ' ἄρ' Ἡραίοιο μέγας ποταμὸς βαυ-
δίνεις
Ὀν ἔανθον καλέουσ' θεοὶ, ἄνδρες δὲ Σκάμαν-
δρον.

Contra autem & Vulcanum magnus Fluvius vortibus profundus

Quem Xanthum vocant dii, homines vero Scamanderum (1).

(1) Homer. Iliad. lib. xx, ver. 73.

*With fiery Vulcan last in battle stands
The sacred flood that rolls on golden sands;
Xanthus his name, with those of heavenly birth,
But call'd Scamander by the sons of earth.*

POPE.

Meziriac makes this remark upon it: 'As, says he, Vigenere has well observed upon the Scamander of Philostratus, when Homer gives two names to some things, one according to the gods, and the other according to men; it is to be understood that that of the gods is the ancient, and almost forgotten name, and that of men the modern and most in use (2). He might have cited the scholiast upon Homer to this purpose, and not Vigenere. Τὸν δ' ἰωνύμων τὸ μὲν περὶ γενέσθαι ὄνομα εἰς θεῶν ἀναφέρει ὁ ποιητής, τὸ δὲ μετὰ γενέσθαι εἰς ἀνθρώπων (3). Observe that Plutarch owns that Xanthus was the ancient name (4). He adds, that this river was not called Scamander till Scamander the son of

(2) Meziriac upon Ovid's Epistles. p. 467.

(3) Schol. in Iliad. lib. xx, ver. 74.

(4) Plutarch. de Fluvio, p. m. 43.

Coribas, had drowned himself in it, having lost his senses by an excess of devotion; that is, by having assiduously at the mysteries of the mother of the gods. For so Meziriac (5) explains the Greek of Plutarch. Mauffac explains it otherwise. Τὴν τῆς Ρίης μυστηρίων τελεμάνων αἰονιδίως θεῶν μανθῶ, ἐμμανῆς ἐγένετο. Dum Rheæ mysteria celebrantur derепente conspectus furere coepit (6). -- Being (6) Plutarch. suddenly discovered and seen by those who were celebrating the mysteries of Rhea, he went mad.

[B] *Others say it was called Scamander before it was called Xanthus.* Meziriac quotes three authors upon this matter. These are his words (7): 'Aristotle (7) Meziriac, book iii. chap. 12. of his history of animals, speaks thus: Δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ ὁ Σκάμανδρος ποταμὸς ἔανθον, ὅτι καὶ τὸν Ὀμήρου ἀντι Fluvius, p. 281. Σκάμανδρον ἔανθον προσεγορεύειν αὐτόν. It seems quotes that Plutarch, that the river Scamander makes sleep of a reddish colour, and that for this reason Homer calls it Xanthus, instead of Scamander. Antigonus paradox 74, follows Aristotle and cites him. Aelian book viii. chap. 21. de animalibus, says the same more clearly still. Ὁ δὲ ἐν Τροίᾳ Σκάμανδρος, ἐπεὶ ἔανθας ἀποφαίνει πύσας τὰς οἰς, πρὸς τὸν Σκάμανδρον τῷ ἔξ ἀρχῆς, ἄλλο ὄνομα ἢ τὸν προσβατῶν ἐπικτηντος χροῖα ἔδετο. τὸν ἔανθον. The river of Troas called Scamander, because it makes the sheep reddish that drink of its waters, has got the name of Xanthus, besides that of Scamander, which it had before.' After this Meziriac says (8), that the river Scamander, according to some, owes its origin to Hercules. That Hero being ready to die of thirst, fell a digging the earth, out of which sprung the head of a river, which from thence was called Scamander, as if one should say σκάμμα ἀνδρός, the digging of a man. There is a scholiast

(11) Stat. Silv. V. lib. iii.

(10) Martial. Epig. xxi, lib. ii.

(5) Meziriac, *ubi supra*, p. 468.(6) Plutarch. *ubi supra*, p. 44.(7) Meziriac, *ubi supra*, p. 468.(8) Meziriac, *ubi supra*, p. 468.

women made use of that advantage [C]. It is also said that the maids of that country, as soon as they were betrothed, went thither, to offer their virginity to Scamander; which gave an opportunity to a young Athenian to enjoy Callirrhoe [D]. I do not think that

(9) The scholiast upon Homer, in *Iliad*. xxi. apud Meziriac, *ibid.* p. 469.

(10) Ξάνθος δὲ ἐκλήθη ὅτι λευκαίνει τὸ ὤμας αὐτῶν. ὁ δὲ ἔκρινεν αὐτῶν. Meziriac, *ibid.*

(11) Meziriac, *ibid.*

(12) Plin. *lib. ii.* cap. ciii. p. m. 252, 253.

(13) Vigenere, on the Scamander, of Philostratus, p. 8. of the first volume, Edit. in 4to.

(14) It is the tenth. They are printed with Demosthenes. See p. 127. of the Geneva edition 1607.

(15) Æschines, ubi supra.

scholiast (9) who says, that the place where Hercules digged the ground yielded some drops of water, because it had been struck with thunder, as a consequence of the prayers which that hero had directed to Jupiter, when he was much distressed with thirst. This scholiast pretends that the river that flowed out of this place was called Scamander, because it caled Hercules, as if one should say Camander, γέννημον καμάτην ακὼν αὐτῷ. He adds, That it was called Xanthus, because the Trojan women, by washing themselves in it, made their hair become light-coloured (10). The author of the great Etymologicon tells us, that this river took its name from Scamander the son of Teucer, who came into Phrygia out of the isle of Crete his native country; but that afterwards this river was called Xanthus, because the three goddesses, before they set themselves before Paris to be judged by him, went and washed themselves in this river, which made their hair light coloured (11). All this overthrows the hypothesis of those, who say that the name Xanthus preceded that of Scamander.

[C] It is pretended that its waters . . . had the property of making the women's hair that bathed in it of a light colour, and that the Trojan women made use of that advantage.] See the proofs of all this in the preceding remark. It had also the same virtue upon sheep, as may be seen by the three authorities of Meziriac; to which I add these words of Pliny: 'In Bœotia amnis Melas oves nigras (facit) . . . rufaque juxta Ilium Xanthus unde & nomen amni (12). The river Melas in Bœotia makes the sheep black . . . and Xanthus near Troy makes them red, from whence also the name of that river is derived.'

[D] And that the maids . . . offered their virginity to Scamander, which gave occasion to a young Athenian to enjoy Callirrhoe.] I will relate this story as we find it in Vigenere. In this river, (as Æschines relates in his epistles) young maids were wont to bathe themselves when they were betrothed, invoking the river in these words, λέγε μὲν Σκάμανδρε τὴν παρθενίαν. Receive, oh Scamander, my virginity. This gave an opportunity to Cimon the Athenian, who was desperately in love with Callirrhoe already promised to another, to hide himself among the bushes that grew along the water-side, and put on a hat of rushes and reeds; and when the damsel came as usual to bathe, and had pronounced in fingering the afore said words, he came out of his ambush, and told her he willingly accepted of it: And so having carried her upon the bank, he presently deflowered her (13). It is certain that this is found in one of Æschines's letters (14), and therefore the citation is just; but Vigenere has not related all that he should have told his readers: It is necessary they should know some other circumstances to make the most instructive reflexions. I say then that Æschines does not speak of this adventure, as of a history learned by tradition, or read in some old chronicle. If he had spoke of it in this manner, we might place his story in the rank of Boccace's novels; it would be more reasonable not to believe it, than to believe it. He speaks of it as of a thing almost done in his sight: 'Ἡμεῖς ἄμα τε τοῖς οἰκείοις τῶν γαμμένων καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὄχλοις παύροθεν τὴν ἐστὶν καὶ τὰ λεῖρά τῶν παρθένων, ἢ ἡμεῖς τοῖς ἐξωτέρω ὄραν, ἰδομένη. Nos una cum cognatis nupturarum & cæteris turbis eminus festum & lavacra virginum quatenus fas nobis externis erat, spectabamus (15). - - - We, together with the relations of the bride's, and the other multitude, looked on at a distance, and saw the festival and batings of the virgins, as far as it was allowed to us strangers. His fellow-traveller was the person, who committed that infamous act; he censured him for it, and found that he was impudent, and alledged for his excuse, that many had played the same trick before. It is necessary also to know the simplicity of the young maid, who was abused: She was fully persuaded that it was the god Scamander who had got her maiden-head; for, four days after, spying Cimon among those that were looking on to see a procession pass, she saluted him with a great deal of respect, and told her

nurse, There is Scamander, on whom I bestowed my virginity. The nurse made a great cry, and so the matter was divulged. Τέτλαρον ὕστερον ἡμέρῃς πομπὴ μὲν ἦν Ἀρεσδίου ἐπὶ πομπῇ δὲ αἱ νεῶς γεγαμμέναι καὶ ἡμεῖς τὴν πομπὴν ἰδομένη. ἡ δὲ νύμφη ἰδὼσα τὸν Κίμωνα ὡς μὲν δὲ αὐτῷ κακὸν συνεδίδα ἄμα ἡμοὶ δέωμενον. προσεκύνησε καὶ ἀποβλήσασα πρὸς τὴν τερεὶν ὄρεσιν, τίθη. τὸν Σκάμανδρον, ὃ τὴν παρθενίαν ἰδὼσα, καὶ ἡ τίθη ἀκῶσα, ἀνέκραγε, καὶ τὸ πρῶμα ἔκπυον γίνεσθαι. Cum quatrīdus post pompa esset veneris, & recens nuptæ ei pompæ interesset, nos quoque illam spectabamus. Spontæ autem Cimonem conficatus, ut nullius mali sibi conficium, unâ mecum spectantem, bonorem ei præbuit: & nutricem intuita, Vides (inquit) mea nutrix, Scamandrum, cui virginitatem dedi? quo illa audito, exclamat: itaque facinus divulgatur (16). When we consider that wit and learning never appeared with so much lustre, as in the age that Æschines lived in, we may the better apprehend the fatal power of a false religion. It destroys good sense, it extinguishes the light of nature, and in some sort degrades a man to the condition of a brute beast. Callirrhoe, was born of an illustrious family (17), and was without doubt, nobly educated; and yet the impertinencies of the poets, canonized by the heathen priests, had so much corrupted her judgment, that in good earnest she believed rivers were deities, who crowned themselves with reeds, and could enjoy a woman. In the reign of Tiberius, an illustrious lady was not less simple (18); she believed she had lain with Anubis, and bragged of it as of a great favour. The Monks, who have played so many tricks chiefly to inveigle women, never durst, that I know of, tell them that such a faint would lie with them. The ideas of purity and immateriality have always been strictly joined in Christianity with those of beatification. But I make no doubt, if they would undertake such a thing, but they might bring some devout women, that now are, to believe what the Roman votary of Anubis suffered herself to be persuaded of. This maxim, *The corruption of the most excellent things is the worst* (19), is verified by the example of religion. There is nothing so advantageous to man, if we consider either the mind or the heart, as to know God well: On the other hand, nothing is so fatal to all the faculties of a reasonable mind, as to know God ill, as the Pagans did. Observe what Homer says, that the priest of Scamander was honoured at Troy as a god.

Τὴν ὕπερβον Δολοπῆον, ὡς ῥα Σκάμανδρε Ἀρνήρ ἐτίτυκτο, θεὸς δ' ὡς τίς το δῆμον.

Hypfenora nobilem
Filiū magnanimi Dolopionis qui Scamandri
Sacerdos factus fuerat, Dei vero inftar honorabatur
à populo (20).

Then dy'd Hypfenor, generous and divine,
Sprung from the brave Dolopion's mighty line;
Who near ador'd Scamander made abode,
Priest of the stream, and honour'd as a god.

POPE.

I shall make one observation more upon the small effect which the light of learning had against the darkness of idolatry. Cicero admired the divinity of Romulus, because it was not established in the days of ignorance, when it was so much the more easy to put off fictions, because rude and ignorant minds were brought without any difficulty to believe them; but in an age, when learning was already far advanced, and had entirely abolished the ancient barbarity, under which the uncultivated spirit of the first men had been detained. It seems, that from this principle, he would conclude that neither fiction nor imposture had any share in the belief of the Romans concerning the divinity of Romulus. *Magis est in Romulo admirandum, quod cæteri, qui*

(17) Παρθὸς δὲ τὴν ἐπιφανῆ, illustre patri nata. *Id. ibid.* p. 125.

(18) See Josephus, *Antiq. lib. xviii. ch. iv.*

(19) Corruptione optimi pessima.

(20) Homer. *Iliad*. lib. v. ver. 76.

that this river merited the reputation which it has acquired by the help of the Poets, but, on the other hand, it was more considerable than some fancy [E]. Julia, the daughter of Augustus, had like to have been drowned in it; Agrippa, her husband, was very much affected with the danger she had been in [F], and shewed his indignation, for what had happened, against the Trojans, tho' they ought not to have been made accountable for it

qui dii ex hominibus facti esse dicuntur, minus eruditus bonum feculis fuerunt, ut fingendi preclivior esset ratio, quum imperiti facile ad credendum impellerentur. Romuli autem etatem minus bis sexcentis annis jam inveteratis literis, atque doctrinis, omnique illo antiquo ex inculta hominum vita errore sublati fuisse cernimus. . . . Ex quo intelligi potest, permultis annis ante Homerum fuisse quam Romulum, ut jam doctis hominibus ac temporibus ipsi eruditus ad fingendum vix quicquam esset loci. Antiquitas enim recepit fabulas fidas etiam nonnunquam incondite. Hæc etas autem jam exulta præsertim elu-

(21) Cicero, de Republica, lib. iii, apud Augustinum, de Civitate Dei, lib. xxii, cap. vi, p. m. 1036, 1037.

(22) August. ibid. p. 1037.

(23) See the remark [F], of the article OLYMPIAS.

(24) See Suetonius, in Cæsare, cap. 88.

(25) Horat. Ep. i, lib. ii.

(26) Homer. Iliad. lib. xxi, ver. 2.

(27) Huc ab Idæo monte demissus Scamander exit, & Simois fama quam natura majora flumina. Pompon. Mela, lib. i, cap. xviii.

stasas reddere oves creditur: quamobrem Xanthum pro Scamandro nuncupatum ab Homero autumant. As if Aristotle meant that Homer had taken Scamander for Xanthus; for Xanthus is as much as to say *fluvius, fair*. Let the question therefore be put, whether Scamander and Xanthus be the same or no (28)? If the last half of this passage had not been full of faults, I had not quoted it. I find there first of all this falsity, that, in the time of Aristotle, the river Scamander was not to be found. In the second place, it is false that the words which are quoted out of Aristotle, do prove what Belon designed to prove. Lastly, He should have said that Xanthus and Scamander are all one. I do not criticise upon the other half of the passage. Belon speaks as an eye-witness. I will not bring into question his sincerity, nor give any credit to Thevet, who says that Xanthus and Simois are great rivers. I should be sorry to contradict

such a man. They are Lewis Guion's words (29) concerning Thevet; but what I say of it (30), I have borrowed from Belon, a Physician of Mans, out of the second book of his Observations, and I have often heard him relate it, being at Paris, to Postel, whose company I frequented four years. Besides, one called Albert le Bon, who says he was in those parts, and stayed there a whole winter, perfectly agrees with what Belon has written on that subject. I believe Thevet never was there, and that what he writ was only by hearsay. But as on the one side I do not deny what Belon says, I am sure on the other side, that those rivers were not antiently so little. Their waters may have taken another course, either under the earth, or otherwise: So that tho' the Moderns may say, without any hyperbole, what they assert; they cannot engage us to believe that Pliny is mistaken, when he speaks of the Scamander as of a navigable river (31). Scamander amnis navigabilis, & in promontorio quondam Sigeum oppidum, dein portus Achæorum, in quem influit Xanthus (32) Simeonti junctus, stagnumque prius faciens Palescamander. The words of Strabo are not less favourable to me: They teach us that the Scamander having received the Simois, dragged along so much mud and sand, that they had almost filled up the mouth of the river, and formed lakes and morasses (33). This cannot be said of a little brook or rivulet, but of rivers that are pretty considerable.

[F] Agrippa, her husband, was very much affected with the danger she had been in.] The fragments of Nicolas Damascen tell us that Julia had like to have been drowned there, in the year of Rome 738, and that Agrippa was so angry with the Trojans, under the pretence of their not having sent guides to this prince, that he fined them in a hundred thousand drachms (34). This punishment was unjust, for they had not received any notice of her arrival. Behold, will some say, a man who may be put in the number of cuckolds who have been very obliging and kind to their wives. If ever man was a cuckold, Agrippa was: I appeal to the answer that she gave to those who wondered that her children were so like Agrippa: I never am unfaithful to him, said she, but when I find myself with child. Cumque consilii flagitiorum mirarentur quo modo similes Agrippæ filios pareret, quæ tam vulgo potestatem sui corporis faceret: ait; Numquam enim nisi navi plena tollo vectorem (35). Suetonius observes that one of the reasons why Tiberius made some difficulty to marry Julia was, because she had been too free with him during her marriage with Agrippa (36). How often were the galants of that prince put to the torture? Pliny reckons this inquisition among the misfortunes of Agrippa (37). The cuckoldom of this favourite is therefore a certain thing: but can his good nature towards her be sufficiently proved by the indignation he shewed against the Trojans? I do not believe it; for it is probable his love for Julia was not the true cause of his anger; it was an effect of policy. He was angry, either to make Augustus believe that he seriously espoused the interest of Julia, or to maintain his credit. A subject married

(28) Belon, Si-

gulariter, book ii, ch. vi, p. 182.

(29) Louis Guyon, Diver-

les Leçons, Tom. i, book ii, ch. 2, p. 261.

(30) He had just before quoted Belon's words, about the smallness of those two rivers.

(31) Plinius, lib. v, ch. xxxi, p. m. 610.

(32) Pliny should have said that Xanthus and Scamander are the same river.

(33) Strabo, lib. xiii, p. 410.

(34) Nicol. Damascen. in excerptis à Valerio editis, p. 418.

(35) Macrobius Saturnalis, lib. ii, cap. v, p. m. 275.

(36) Julia more improbatum ut quam sensisset sui quoque sub priore marito appetentem quod iam vulgo etiam estimabatur. Suetonius, in Tiberio, cap. viii.

(37) In tormentis adulterii compungitur. Plinius, lib. viii, cap. viii, pag. m. 22.

it. Strabo criticises upon Homer concerning the spring of the river Scamander [G]. There were other rivers of the same name [H]. I shall not have much to say against Mr Moreri [I].

married to the daughter of his sovereign, is not at liberty to forbear punishing such as dishonour his wife: Whatever he may be inwardly, he is outwardly obliged to appear on such occasions revengeful. Besides, Agrippa knew very well, that the Trojans had not grounded their conduct upon any discontent which he could have to his wife. Thus, the contempt they might have shewed for her, had fallen upon himself; and consequently he thought himself obliged, out of policy, to punish them for it, to teach all subjects to fear and honour him.

[G] Strabo criticises upon Homer, about the spring of the Scamander. That Poet says, that this river had two springs, the one cold, and the other hot, near Troy (38); but Strabo (39) assures us, that it had only one spring upon mount Ida, and that this spring was cold. He conjectures the hot spring was destroyed, and consequently he does not accule Homer of being mistaken in that point.

[H] There were other rivers of the same name. There was one of them in Sicily (40), near Egella, and another in Boeotia. The latter was a monument of the frailty of the female sex. The matter of fact was thus. Deimachus, the son of Eleon, accompanied Hercules to the expedition of Troy. The war grew long, he designed to divert himself with a young maid that was much in love with him. She was the daughter of Scamander, and was called Glaucia. She at last moved Deimachus, he gratified her desires, and got her with child.

Some time after he was killed in a battle. Glaucia, who was afraid she could not hide her fault, fled to the protection of Hercules, and told him all that had passed between Deimachus and her, and found him a man full of compassion, who, besides, was glad that the race of his friend was not extinct. He carried her into Boeotia with the son of which she was delivered, and put her into the hands of Eleon. This son was called Scamander, and reigned in the country. He gave his name to the river Inachus (41).

[I] I have not much to say against Moreri. I. According to him, Castaldus assures us, that the Scamander is at present called Simois; but Ortelius cites Castaldus, to prove that the modern name is Simoeres (42). II. It is too general an expression to say, that this river falls into the *Ægean sea*. He should have said, that its mouth is at the promontory of Sigeum (43). III. These words *epotaque flumina Mædo prædente*, are ill placed immediately after these, *Herodotus in 4to*, relates, that the army of Xerxes dried it up; for there is none but would imagine that this Latin is the translation of the very words of Herodotus: which is false. It is Juvenal whom he ought to have cited for these Latin words (44). He ought to have cited Herodotus, 'Ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ ῥέματος, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ ῥέματος, τῆς τε καὶ τοῖς κλῖμασι πινόμενοι. Hunc (Scamandrum) profluentem sua aqua defluit nec hominibus jumentisque potantibus sufficit (45).

(41) Taken from Plutarch in questionibus Græcis, p. 301.

(42) Ortelius, in Thesuro Geograph. Voce Scamandrus, in Edit. Hancov. in 4to.

(43) Strabo, lib. xiii, p. 411.

(44) Juven. Stat. X, ver. 177.

(45) Herodot. p. m. 400.

(38) Homer. Iliad. lib. xxii, ver. 147.

(39) Strabo, lib. xiii, p. 414.

(40) See Strabo, lib. xiii, and Diodorus Siculus, lib. xx.

(a) It was in the year 1648.

SCHEFFER (JOHN) Professor in the university of Upsal, and one of the most learned men of his time, was born at Straßburg in 1621. He was not thirty years old when he went into Sweden, where Queen Christina gave a favourable reception to all learned men. He had already shewed his learning by the works he had published [A]. The professorship, to which he had been called, was given him (a) in the university of Upsal, by the care and interest of the Barons Skytte. It was the same professorship that Freinshemius had, and which he left to be the queen's library-keeper; it was, I say, the professorship of Eloquence and Politics (b). Scheffer gained great applause in this professorship, and was much esteemed by the learned Christina, who settled a very good pension upon him, which she paid him even after she had abdicated her dominions. He composed, by her order, some books [B]. His employments multiplied afterwards, for he was made library-keeper of the university of Upsal, Regius professor honorary of the Law of Nature (c), and member of an academy which was wholly taken up in illustrating the Swedish antiquities. The works he published in this last quality are a most illustrious proof of his diligence, and of his zeal for the honour of that nation. He died the twenty-sixth of March 1679 (d). The catalogue of his writings has been printed more than once [C].

(b) It was founded by John Skytte in the year 1625.

(c) Professor Juris Naturæ ac Gentium.

(d) Taken from his Elegy prefixed to a book printed at Amsterdam in 1698, with this title, *Job. Schefferi Miscellanea*, which differs only from the *Lectionum Academicarum Liber*, printed at Hamburg 1675, as to the title and some Prolegomena.

(1) Prefixed to his *Miscellanea*, at Amsterdam 1698.

(2) In 8vo.

(3) Likewise in 8vo.

[A] He had already shewed his learning by the works he had published. These three are mentioned in his elegy (1): *Dissertatio de varietate Navium*, printed in 1643, in 4to. *Agrippa liberator seu de novis Tabulis*, printed in 1645, in 120. *Æliani variae Historiæ Notis illustrata*, printed in 1647, in 8vo.

[B] He composed, by her order, some books. Queen Christina obliged him to translate out of Greek into Latin the *Strategicum Mauriti*, and to illustrate the Philosophy of Pythagoras. The *Strategicum* and the *Æliani Tabula*, which he caused to be printed (2) in Greek and Latin, with notes, at Upsal, in the year 1664, were never printed before. He published the same year, and in the same place (3), an essay of his enquiries into the Philosophy of Pythagoras, *De natura & constitutione Philosophiæ Italice seu Pythagoricæ Liber prodromus magni Operis de Philosophia Pythagorica, de Vita Pythagoræ, & de claris Pythagoricis*.

[C] The catalogue of his writings has been printed more than once. He himself prefixed it to his *Lectiones Academicæ*, published at Hamburg, 1675; and he informed his reader that the catalogue of his books had been added by his Bookfeller to his Political Dissertations upon Livy, in the year 1665. From that time, continues he, my friends have exhorted me from several places, to publish the sequel of that catalogue. I do it, the more willingly, because I am certain it contains some works, that are not known in foreign countries, and that lie here in the dust, either through the negligence of my Bookfeller at Upsal, or for other

reasons. *Quem (Indicem) eo libentius juris facio publici quo scio certius, esse quæ foveat Librarij Upsalensis, siue causis aliis hic jacent pulvere sepulta, & iccirco alibi ignorantur* (4). I shall observe, by the by, that it is of great importance to an author, that his works be printed by a Bookfeller who knows how to sell them; for among idle or unskillful Bookfellers, the best books lie upon their hands. There is to be seen a more exact catalogue of the works of Schefferus in *Suecia literata*; and we have a new one prefixed to a book sold at Amsterdam as printed in 1698, with the title of *Job. Schefferi Miscellanea*. It is divided into four classes. The first contains what he has writ concerning Sweden: I will only mention the *Upsalia Antiqua, cujus occasione plurima in Antiquitatibus Borealibus & gentium vicinarum explicantur*. This work was printed at Upsal in 1666, in 8vo. The author has left it to his heirs, corrected and enlarged. *De situ & vocabulo Upsaliæ Epistola deservior*, at Stockholm, 1677, in 8vo. *Memorabilium Sueciæ Gentis Exemplorum Liber*, at Hamburg, 1671, in 8vo. *De tribus orbibus aureis nuper in Scania erutis in terra Disquisitio Antiquaria*, at Stockholm, 1676, in 8vo. *De antiquis verisque Regni Sueciæ Insignibus*, at the same place, 1678, in 4to. *Lapponia seu Gentis Regionisque Lapponum Descriptio accurata cum figuris*, at Francfort, 1673, in 4to. This work was printed in English at Oxford, 1674, in High Dutch at Nuremberg the same year, in 4to, and in French (5) at Paris, in 1678, in 4to. It was found very much enlarged in the

(5) Father Lubin is the author of that version.

SCHEIBLERUS. SCHESTED.

the study of the author. *Suecia Literata seu de Scriptis et Scriptioribus Gentis Sueciae, Opus postumum*, Stockholm, 1680, in 8vo. There is in it a catalogue of the Swedish writers and of foreigners who have writ books in Swedish. It is disposed, not according to an alphabetical order, but according to Chronology. There is a great defect in the index, for the authors are placed in it only according to their Christian names. The author, perhaps, would have mended that fault, if he had been alive when it was printed. Mr Mollerus has given a second edition (6) of it, and has added many curious and instructive remarks to it; *Hypomnemata*, as he calls them, *Historico-Critica paucula à pluribus selecta*. The supplements he has made to the article of our Scheffer, may be of very great use to those who would know the circumstances or dependencies of the writings of this professor. The second class of his writings contains *Autores Græci et Latini illustratos*. You may see there that he has published, with Notes, the Panegyric of Pacatus (7), the various Histories of Ælian, the Fables of Phædrus, the Fragments of Petronius, Justin, Hyginus, Obsequens, &c. The third class contains the Miscellanies, that is to say, the work I have already mentioned, *de Philosophia Pythagorica*, and his book *de Militia navali Veterum*,

printed at Upsal in the year 1653, in 4to, which was found with so many corrections and additions in the study of the author, that it is a new work (8). That *de Antiquorum Torquibus*, printed at Stockholm in 1656, in 8vo. That *de Re Vebiculari Veterum, cum Pyrrhi Ligorii Libro ejusdem argumenti ex Italica Lingua in Latinam versis et Animadversionibus illustrato*, printed at Francfort in 1671, in 4to. That *de Arte pingendi*, printed at Nuremberg in 1669, in 8vo. *Index in Libros Grotii de Jure Belli et Pacis. Consilium de Institutione Literaria*, &c. The fourth class contains the books not printed, which consist of Notes upon the author of the book concerning the Pre-Adamites, of Letters, Harangues, Programs, *Adversaria*, &c. In the supplements of Mr Mollerus to the second edition of *Suecia Literata*, it is observed, that there were published after the death of the author, *Breviarium Politicorum Aristotelis*, at Stockholm, 1684, in 8vo, and *Hugo Grotius de Jure Belli et Pacis*, in 8vo, and *Hugo Grotius de la Gardie, enucleatus, usum Gustavi Adolphi Comitiss de la Gardie, enucleatus*, at Stetin, 1693, in 12mo. Observe that Scheffer, under the supposititious name of Constantinus Opellus (9), printed a letter, wherein he attacks the book of Mark Meibomius *de Trirerum fabrica*, published at Amsterdam, 1671, in 4to.

(8) Quos in auctoris mutatis atque emendatis reliquit Schefferus, ut haberi possint pro auctoris novis.

(6) At Hamburg 1698, in 8vo.

(7) At Stockholm, in 1651, & 1668, in 8vo.

(9) Joh. Mollerus, Hypomnemata, ad Sueciam Literatam, p. 460.

(a) In Germany in the county of Waldeck in the circle of Westphalia.

(b) In Latin Tremonia. It is in the county of Marck, in the circle of Westphalia.

(c) Taken from the Theatre of Paul Freher, p. 571, 572. The death of Scheiblerus is put there on the 21st of November; but his son has put it on the 10th according to the old style, which is the 20th according to the new.

SCHEIBLERUS (CHRISTOPHER) was born in the year 1589 at Armsfeld (a) where his father was minister. He made such a considerable progress in his studies that he was appointed professor of the Greek tongue in the university of Gießen, and afterwards of Logic and Metaphysics in the year 1610, when he was no more than one and twenty years of age. In the year 1614 he was made professor of Natural Philosophy. He behaved in his employments with great diligence, till such time as the university was transported from Gießen to Marbourg in the year 1624. He was called in 1625 by the magistrates of the imperial city of Dortmund (b), and accepted of the place which they offered to him of superintendent of the church and rector of the college. He contented himself with these during his whole life, for he always refused the more considerable employments that were presented to him elsewhere. He was going to preach a sermon in praise of Luther on the tenth of November 1653, when he was surprised with an Apoplexy of which he died suddenly in the vestry (c) of St Mary's Church (d). He was a laborious man, and most assiduous in discharging his painful functions. He preached twice a week and gave several lectures every day. He taught Divinity, Metaphysics, and Hebrew, and pretty often caused Thebes to be maintained before him (e). He published divers books [A]. Among other children he left JOHN SCHEIBLERUS, who has been professor of church-history in the university of Gießen.

(1) Witte, *Diarium Biographicum*, ad 10, Nov. 1653.

(a) See the book intitled, *Le Comte d'Ulfeld, Nouvelle Historique*, printed at Paris in 1677.

(b) See the remark [L] of the article U L F E L D.

(c) *Memoir*, pag. 141, Dutch Edit.

[A] He published divers books. You may find a list of them in pag. 572, of the Theatre of Paul Freherus, and a better still in the *Diarium Biographicum* cum (1). I shall only speak of his Logic, which of all his writings, had the greatest run. He began with publishing, in the year 1613, the *Introductio Logica*; he added to it, in the year 1614, *Commentaria Topica*; and, in 1619, the treatise *de Propositionibus*, and another, *de Syllogismis et Methodis*. Then the work was compleat. There have been several editions of it; but many errors crept into them. The author revised and corrected it some time before his death, a Bookfeller having undertaken to publish a new edition of it, which he actually did in the year 1654, in 4to. It is better than the foregoing editions, without even excepting the Geneva one (2), in 1651 (3). We must observe that Scheiblerus had published his Metaphysics before the two last parts of his Logic were printed. He understood perfectly well the subtleties and abstract notions of the schools.

(2) They call it *Ebradunensis* in the title of the Gießen edition. This makes me believe that the Geneva Bookfeller, caused to be put in some of the copies, *Ebraduni*, that is at Iverdun, a town of the Canton of Bern, where they printed for the Bookfellers of Geneva.

(d) See the Epith Deductory of the Logic of Scheiblerus, in the Gießen edition 1654.

(e) Freher in Theatre, pag. 572.

(3) Taken from the preface of Scheiblerus's Logic, in the edition of Gießen, 1654.

SCHESTED (ANNIBAL) a Danish nobleman of great wit and merit, married a daughter of Christian IV King of Denmark, sister of the Countess Eleonora, of whom I shall speak in the article of Count Ulfeld. It has been said (a) that this count and Mr Schefted loved, both at once, the Countess Eleonora, and that this rivalry was the cause of the great hatred that was between them all their life. They were always on different sides; and when Mr Schefted pleaded the cause of the king, who wanted to divorce his wife, the other pleaded for the queen. The Judges pronounced sentence in favour of the wife against the husband, and the breach was made up soon after. Mr Ulfeld married the Countess Eleonora; his rival afterwards married one of her sisters: but his hatred continued, and it is said that he gave sad proofs of it when this count was detained prisoner at Malmoë by the Swedes (b). The Chevalier de Terlon (c) tells us, that Mr Schefted was made prisoner near Copenhagen by a Swedish party, and that the great civilities which the King of Sweden shewed him, made him suspected by the court of Denmark; and on the other side the Swedes suspected that he had suffered himself to be taken on purpose, that he might send advice to Copenhagen of what passed in their camp. This Chevalier says hereupon, that Annibal Schefted always gave to the King of Denmark constant proofs not only of a great respect, but likewise of all the zeal and fidelity that a prince can

can expect from the most affectionate of his subjects. He was sent ambassador into Sweden after the treaty of peace concluded the twenty-seventh of December 1659. You will find in the Supplement of Moreri (*d*), that he died at Paris the twenty-third of October 1666, aged fifty-eight years, and that he was there as plenipotentiary of Denmark for the negotiation of a treaty of peace. (1) At the word Hannibal.

SCHILLER (ELIAS) published in the German tongue a book of controversy, which was confuted by a professor of Divinity at Franeker, in the year 1641. That professor's name was Nicolas Vedelius: he informs us that Dr Schiller's book had been printed a very few years before at Cologne, under the title of *The Grounds of the Catholic Truth*, that it was a piece well digested and extremely capable of imposing upon the people, and that it was not at all surprising if such a book, considering the situation of affairs at that time, had shaken or perverted several Protestants in Germany: that the author, who presumed too much upon the force of his pretended proofs (*A*), and who had forsaken Lutheranism to embrace Popery, did at bottom exhibit nothing else but quirks and cavils, and only fought to withdraw the decision of controversies from the tribunal of Scripture (*a*).

[*A*] He presumed too much upon the force of his pretended arguments.] Some of hisrodomontados appear in the following words of Vedelius: 'Placet autem Schillerus in labore isto sibi adeo, ut capite nono gloriatur libellum suum esse invictum & irrefutabilem: concidere per eum, totum ministerium Evangelicorum, Confessionem Augustanam, formulam Concordiæ, Catechismi, Reformationem, preteritionem SUB UTRAQUE & omnia. Etiam quomvis indolentem & imperitum Scripturæ Laicum posse omnia nostra beneficio sui trahere refutare, & e contrario totam Catholicam, ut loquitur, Religionem defendere. Hinc capita singula ferè Thrasionica jactatione concludit: Quid quæso, ait, adversum hæc dici potest? Et cap. 14. ex argumentis suis quibus probare volebat Ecclesiam Romanensem habere assentientiam perpetuam Spiritus S. educit confectiones, quas irrefragabiliter inde sequi pronunciat. Eodemque capite gloriatur se posuisse fundamentum Catholicæ veritatis, quod nullo modo everti & concuti possit: idque adeo declarasse & probasse ut etiam idiota & Scripturæ Sacre ignarus quivis homo non solum tuto & infallibiliter superstruere possit omnes & singulos articulos suæ Catholicæ Religionis & fidei, sed etiam omnibus Hæreticis uno ictu os obturare, & omnes ipsorum fidei Confessiones prosternere queat, &c. Sic ille ipse de suo opere judicat oblitus cum reliquâ veritate etiam moniti à Spiritu S. profecti: laudet te os alienum, &c. (1). -- Schillerus, says he, is so pleased with his performance, that in the ninth chapter he proudly asserts his book to be unanswerable: and that by it the whole ministry of the Protestants, the confession of

Augsburg, their form of concord, their catechism, reformation, their pretensions of communicating in both species, &c. fall to the ground at once. That by the help of his treatise any ignorant layman is able to confute all our arguments, and to defend every part of the Catholic religion, as he calls it. There is scarce a chapter which he does not end with a vain-glorious insult: and what, says he, can be answered to these things? In the fourteenth chapter, where he endeavours to prove the continual presence of the Holy Ghost with the Church of Rome, he draws consequences from his arguments, which, as he says, follow incon- testably. And in the same chapter he boasts, that he had laid down a true and unalterable foundation for the Catholic truth; and this he pretends to have made so certain, and clear, that any simple or illiterate man, who knows nothing of the Bible, may not only safely and infallibly build every article of his Catholic faith upon it, but may likewise be capable of putting Heretics to silence, and demolishing all their creeds at a blow, &c. In this manner does he extol his own work, forgetting, among other sacred truths, the wholesome advice of the Scripture, which says, Let the mouth of another commend thee, &c. Vedelius undertook to confute him, because he heard that a Protestant gentleman, being staggered with the reading of his book, was ready to fly off. He spent no more than eleven days in confuting him, amidst his other public and private business (2). His answer contains 125 pages in 12mo. (2) Idem, ibid.

SCHILLING (CHRISTOPHER) was one of the learned men of the XVIIth century, especially in Greek (*a*). He was a native of Franckenstein in Silesia, and taught first at Hirschberg in his own country, and afterwards in the Palatinate, and at last he was admitted Physician in the university of Padua. The reason that made him leave Hirschberg, was because he had a dispute concerning the Eucharist with Balthasar Tilesius, minister of that place; for he inserted in the Catechism which he dictated to his disciples, certain things which he had of Melanchthon (*b*), and which did not please Tilesius. The conclusion of this dispute was, that Schilling lost his place, as I have already observed in the article of David PAREUS. He retired into the Palatinate, and was made rector of the college, which the Elector Frederic III founded at that time at Amberg. It was in the year 1566. He was afterwards rector of the college of Heidelberg, from whence, I think, he went away because of some dispute about precedence. He is an author [*A*].

(1) Nicol. Vedelius, Prefation. Ecclesiæ. Catholicæ, folio 42.

[*A*] He is an author.] There is a collection of his Greek and Latin poems, printed at Geneva in the year 1580 (1), and some letters upon questions of

Physic, in a collection of pieces printed in 1598 at Franecort (2).

(a) See the Life of David Pareus, pag. m. 8, 11, 12, 25.

(b) He had been Melanchthon's Disciple at Wittemberg for the space of nine years.

(2) Linden, renovat. p. 180.

SCHOMBERG (NICOLAS OF) Cardinal and Archbishop of Capua in the XVIth century, was a German, of the noble and ancient family of Schomberg in Misnia. He had been a Dominican friar, and it was Savonarola who gave him the habit at Florence in 1497 (*a*), and who by his preaching had stirred up in him a desire of entering into that order; for Schomberg travelled into Italy only out of curiosity. He had several employments among the Dominicans; he taught Divinity at Rome and Florence; he was prior in a convent of the latter city, and was made Procurator-general of that order by the choice of the famous Thomas de Vio who was General of it, and who has made himself so well known under the name of Cardinal Cajetan.

VOL. V.

X

(a) According to Seckendorf, Hist. Luther. lib. iii. pag. 93. It was in the year 1495.

(b) Cardinal Palavicini, ubi infra says it was Clement VII. (c) Ex Bibl. Ordin. Prædic. Altamura, p. 271. (d) *Id. ib.* Ruperzæus, Nomenclat. Cardinal. pag. m. 125. Lettere di Principi, lib. iii, fol. 33. Ughellus, Tom. vi. in Archiep. Capuan. (e) Oldoinus, Athen. Roman. pag. 506. (f) It is to be found fol. 33, of the third book, printed at Venice in 1581. (g) Palavic. Hist. del Concil. lib. iii, cap. xvi, ex Relatione Legati Soriani. M. Seckendorf, Hist. Lutheran. lib. iii, pag. 92, *demus*. (b) Altamura, ubi supra.

Cajetan. Leo X (b) gave to Schomberg the Archbishopric of Capua in the year 1520. Clement VII made him one of his most intimate counsellors, and sent him into France to negotiate a peace between Charles V and Francis I. As he was not a very acceptable man to the French, he had much ado to obtain leave to be at the conferences of Cambray, where he contributed much to the peace that was concluded there. Paul III made him a cardinal-priest by the title of Saint Sixtus in the year 1535 (c). It is said that even before he was made a cardinal, he had like to have been elected Pope in the conclaves, wherein Hadrian VI and Clement VII were chosen (d). He preached five sermons before Pope Julius II upon the temptation of JESUS CHRIST, which were much esteemed [A]. There are some of his letters in the collection of those of princes (e), and one among the rest upon the death of Sir Thomas More chancellor of England (f). It is said that he was cousin of the nun who was married to Luther (g). He died at Rome September 29, 1537, aged a little more than sixty-five years, and was buried in the convent della Minerva near Cardinal Cajetan his good friend (b). Consult the History of Lutheranism by Seckendorf, pag 92. lib. iii. You will find a fine elogy upon this prelate prefixed to each of the two dialogues of Alcyonius *de Exilio*.

[A] He preached five sermons . . . which were much esteemed.] He preached them in the year 1505 (1). They were printed in the year 1511. The very next year they were re-printed at Leipzig (2), where (2) By the care of John Schleiniz his cousin, Bishop of Meissen. *Seckend. ibid.*

they were also printed again in the year 1684 (3). (3) Afta Erud. because the copies of them were become very scarce. Altamura had no reason to say, that these sermons were preached before Leo X; for they came out of the press before the creation of that Pope.

SCHOMBERG (THEODORICUS OF) a German gentleman, served in the army of the Reifters, which Prince John Casimir, son of the Elector Palatine brought into France, to the assistance of the Protestants in the year 1567, and performed a very courageous action at the passage of the river Seine [A]. He continued afterwards to do a great many good services, till he was killed at the battle of Ivry in the year 1590, having given great proofs of his valour, and contributed notably to the victory which Henry IV gained (a).

(a) Thuanus, lib. xcvi. Di. vila, lib. xi.

[A] He performed a very courageous action at the passage of the river Seine.] The Royalists had cast into the ford, planks nailed with circles and caltrops, and were in order of battle on the other side of the river. The Protestants placed four hundred Arquebusers, by the willows on the banks of the river, for a guard to those who cleared the ford with rakes. Schom-

berg threw himself into the river across all this, and made so brisk a charge upon the enemy, that he killed forty upon the spot, and brought two standards to the Prince of Condé, who having no order of knighthood to give him, put about his neck a chain worth two-hundred crowns at the head of the army (1). (1) D'Aubigné, Tom. i, liv. 14, ch. xv.

(a) Thuan. lib. xxv. (b) Magnis Germanorum exercitiis cum supremi castrorum Tribuni dignitate præfuit. Thuanus, lib. xcvi. *M. le Laboureur*, Addit. to the Memoirs of Castelnaud, says that he had that command under the title of Colonel of the Black Bands. (c) See Thuanus's Life and his History, lib. xcvi, ad ann. 1599.

SCHOMBERG (GASPER DE) Count of Nanteuil, a German gentleman of an ancient family in Misnia [A], being in France during the religious wars, was so much esteemed, that Charles IX took him into his service. He was at first engaged in the Huguenot party; for while he studied at Angers in the year 1562, he put himself at the head of the Protestants, to hinder the Catholics from making themselves masters of that city (a); but not having succeeded in his design, he retired to the Prince of Condé, who sent him into Germany to carry letters to the Duke of Deux-Ponts, to hasten the levies that were expected from him, and to the Landgrave of Hesse, to obtain assistance of men and money. He became afterwards a Royalist, and very much thwarted the designs of his first master. He hindered him dexterously [B] in the year 1568 from being succoured by the troops of the Prince of Orange. He was often sent into Germany to make levies there, and acquitted himself with a great deal of honour in the command that he had of those troops (b). But he was not less fit for the cabinet than for the field, as he plainly made it appear in many important negotiations. Thuanus, who negotiated with him the accommodation of the Duke of Mercœur, and many affairs concerning the edict of Nantes, does very much commend him (c): he assures us, that he was a man of great wit, and of an admirable prudence, very

[A] Of an ancient family in Misnia.] I remember to have read the funeral oration of Henry de Schomberg, son of this gentleman, pronounced at Toulouse by Peter de Bertier, who was afterwards Bishop of Montauban. I have forgot the words he made use of to celebrate the high birth of the deceased: I can nevertheless affirm, that he gave out that his ancestors had been raised to the most eminent employments in Saxony, and that they had been of the first rank for many ages in those parts. But Mr de Seckendorf observes, that his family was never raised in Germany to the dignity of a count; and that Gaspar de Schomberg was of a branch collateral to that of Cardinal de Schomberg. See his History of Lutheranism, book 3. p. 92.

[B] He dexterously hindered.] I shall make use of the very words of d'Aubigné. 'Near Soissons, says he (1), Gaspard Schomberg came by the king's order to the prince (2), with whom he treated of a general agreement to assist his army with money, and make them return into Germany; but he privately managed the greatest part of the captains so well, that when the Prince spoke to them of going to join the Prince of Condé, he found them all cold divines, and bad partisans, discouraging of the justice of war, without forgetting the right of kings, and the affairs they had in their own country. Schomberg went away, having received some abusive language, and even a box of the ear from Genlis; and the Prince was forced to go towards Strasbourg, and fell his

(1) D'Aubigné, Histoire Universelle, Tom. i, liv. v, ch. xxviii, pag. m. 482.

(2) That is, to the Prince of Orange.

very skillful in the affairs of war, dextrous and experienced in negotiations, of a manly persuasive eloquence, of a singular probity, civil, magnificent, officious and obliging to every body. He gave evidence of a particular zeal for the good and glory of France, under three kings successively, during the space of thirty-five years. He loved learned men; and, to say all in few words, he did every thing with so much honour and disinterestedness, that neither the dignities with which he was invested, nor the great affairs that went through his hands both in peace and war, prevented his leaving a great many debts behind him. He died of a sudden death in his coach near St Antony's gate in returning from Conflans, where he had assisted at a council held there by Henry IV, to name commissioners for executing the edict of Nantes. It was on the fifteenth of March 1599. He had been naturalized in 1570, and made some time after governor of the upper and lower Marche (d). He had married Joan Chateigner de la Rochepezai, widow of Henry Clutin Sieur d'Oisel, ambassador of France at Rome, by whom he had two sons and three daughters [C]. I could not discover for a long time whose son the young Schomberg was, who was killed at the famous duel of Quelus and Entraguet in the year 1578 (e). He was one of the seconds of the latter; and this was the first time that seconds fought (f): but at last I have found in Father Anfelme (g) that he was brother to our Gaspar de Schomberg.

Those who have a mind to see a particular account of his actions and employments, with remarks upon the antiquity of his family and the glory of his ancestors, need only consult the elogies of Sammarthanus (b).

'his plate, his tapestry, his moveables, and his spare cloaths, dividing all among the chiefs, and giving them (if not what he ought) at least what he could; and afterwards he mortgaged to them the principality of Orange and Montfort, promising to pay them the interest and principal within twelve years: And he and those, who were better minded, joined the Duke of Deux-Ponts, who was then preparing for the wars of France.' See Mr Varillas in the life of Charles IX, in the year 1568, but especially Thuanus lib. 43. in the same year.

[C] *Two sons and three daughters.* HENRY, of whom I give an article; HANNIBAL, who was killed in the war of Hungary against the Turks; CATHERINE, who died before her father, without leaving any children by her marriage with Lewis de Barbançon, Sieur de Cany; MARGARET, who was not married, and FRANCES, who left children by her marriage with Francis de Dailon, Count du Lude (3).

(d) *Father Anfelme, Hist. des grands Officiers, pag. 248.*

(e) *Journal de Henri III.*

(f) *Mezerei, Abrégé Chronologique, Tom. v, pag. 231, ad ann. 1578.*

(g) *Pag. 678, of Tom. i, of the Palais de l'Honneur.*

(b) *You find there at the end of the fifth book, Abell Sammarthani Scævola F. Elogium illustriſſime gentis Schombergiæ.*

SCHOMBERG (HENRY DE) son of the foregoing, was a Marshal of France, and of a much distinguished merit, not only for his brave actions, but also for his excellent qualities. One may see an account of his employs and actions in Mr Moreri, who has copied it out of Father Anfelme. He might also have copied what follows (a), viz. That Henry de Schomberg was first married in the year 1599, to Frances d'Epinaï (b), sister and heiress to Charles Marquis d'Epinaï in Bretagne; and afterwards, in 1631 to Anne de la Guiche, daughter and heiress to Philibert de la Guiche, Great-Master of the Ordinance of France. He had by his first wife Charles de Schomberg, of whom I shall speak below, and a daughter who was married to Roger du Pleffis, Duke de la Roche-Guyon, Knight of the king's orders, and first gentleman of the bed-chamber. By the second marriage he had a posthumous daughter, who was baptized at Paris the fifth of March 1633, and who was married to Charles de Rohan, Duke of Mombazon, and Prince of Guemené.

(3) *Anfelme, Hist. des grands Officiers, pag. 248.*

(a) *Anfelme, Hist. des grands Officiers, p. 248.*

(b) *She died the sixth of January, 1602.*

SCHOMBERG (CHARLES DE) son of the foregoing, was Duke of Haluïn by his marriage with the duchess of that name, and Marshal of France. You may see an account of his dignities and exploits in Moreri, copied word by word from Father

(a) *Histoire des grands Officiers, pag. 257.*

(b) *The book intitled, L'Etat présent de la France, printed in 1637, says pag. 89, that this Anne d'Haluïn's second husband, was Hen-*

ry de Foix, and de la Valette, Count de Candali, eldest son of the late Duke d'Eproun, from whom she caused herself to be divorced, in order to marry Monsieur de Schomberg.

ry de Foix, and de la Valette, Count de Candali, eldest son of the late Duke d'Eproun, from whom she caused herself to be divorced, in order to marry Monsieur de Schomberg.

(1) *The title says A Cologne, chez Pierre Marteau.*

(2) *He is the same man who for a long time wrote the Historical and Political Mercury, who composed the Life of Mr de Turenne, the Memoirs d'Artagnan, of the Marchioness de Fresne, the Annals of the Fontaine, of the Marquis de Mombazon, &c. He came back to Holland after the peace of Ryſwick, and took the name of Mr de Mill. His true name is De Courtille: he is of Champagne.*

[A] *A modern satirist has given her a furious stab.* It is the author of a book which was printed at the Hague (1), in the year 1687, with this title; *Mémoires de Mr L. C. D. R. concernant ce qui s'est passé de plus particulier sous le règne du Cardinal de Richelieu, & du Cardinal Mazarin.* It is not well known who wrote this book (2); it is only guessed that it was one who had been secretary to the Counts de Soissons, neice to Cardinal Mazarin. He has, without doubt, a great deal of wit; but there never was such a packer of all sorts of stories, nor such a compiler of all the satirical rhapsodies that are to be picked up in the taverns and armies. There is nothing more false than

Court and Paris, the Conversations of Colbert and Bouin, the Memoirs of the Marquis de Mombazon, &c. He came back to Holland after the peace of Ryſwick, and took the name of Mr de Mill. His true name is De Courtille: he is of Champagne.

than what we read in the first tome of the *Mélanges* of Vigneul Marville (3) in these words: 'From that time (4), the Petits Maîtres were not heard of till the time of cardinal de Richelieu, who kept in his service a certain number of bold and resolute fellows, whom he employed in the execution of his designs. Rochefort, whose memoirs are published, was one of them.' This pretended Rochefort was either not born, or at least was very young when this cardinal died. Be this how it will, he says, pag. 93. *That the Duchess of Chevreuse was apprehensive, left la Porte nubom, though he was a Taylor by trade, she had taken into her bed, should sacrifice her to the wife of the Marshal of Schomberg, who, after having resisted the king's addresses, could not, according to common fame, defend herself from a person so meanly descended.* Before I mention what the Abbot Faydit has published on this

(3) *Pag. 324, of the first edition of Rouën.*

(4) *That is from the time of Henry III.*

had a great kindness for her, and she suffered a disgrace which rather heightened than diminished her reputation [B].

this subject, I shall make this little remark; that the time that is allotted for this affair, is that which passed between the death of Cardinal de Richelieu, and that of Lewis XIII. Now at that time the Marshal de Schomberg had not married the lady in question; and therefore, it is an absurd thing to give her that title. Let us see what the Abbot Faydit says.

(5) Vis. The abstract of a sermon preached on St Polycarp's day in the church of St John en Greve at Paris, with the proofs of the facts alleged therein. That book was printed in the year 1689, see pag. 36.

(6) Scarron did it.

(7) The Abbot Faydit, Supplément à la Differtation sur le Sermon de Saint Polycarpe.

* It is in the sixth volume, for the month of August, p. 189.

I confess, says he, 'That what determined me, when I composed my book (5), to set down at length the passage of Celsus, was only the design I had effectually to comfort, by the example of the most blessed virgin, a most virtuous lady, whose honour was attacked by a most unjust and cruel calumny. Those who know me, are not ignorant that I have a long time made profession of honouring illustrious Dukes and Marshalls of France, who having been, in her youth, the ornament and admiration of the court, as well for her eminent piety as for her beauty and wit, is become, in her old age, the edification of all the town by the continual examples of her virtues, and the joy of all those who see her, by the sweetness of her conversation. But as there is nothing so pure but what is attacked by calumny, there is an insolent scribbler, who in a book full of falsities, intitled, *Memoires de M. L. C. D. R.* has had the impudence to bespatter with his venomous satire so fine a life, and without considering that this lady, of whom he speaks so ill, is the same whom the poets, who are naturally satirical, called in her youth *Sainte Haut* . . . (6): he has not been afraid, with the basest and most ridiculous detraction that could be thought of, to give her for a galant, a man whom she had never either seen or known. Going one day to visit her, I found her a little astonished to see herself so basely treated in that impertinent book: I could not forbear telling her, on purpose to comfort her, that the most blessed virgin herself, who was the purest of all creatures, had been either not able, or not willing, to escape the calumnies of insolent men; and that a little after her death, a famous writer had the impudence to assert, *That she had lived in a criminal correspondence with a soldier called P A N - T H E R, and that he was the father of J E S U S C H R I S T.* As this seemed new to her, and was besides a proper ground of consolation in her case; she gave me to understand, that she should take it as a favour, if I would write out that passage for her (7).

I thought myself obliged not to leave out any thing in this discourse; for it seemed to me, that every thing in it might be of some use to one or other. I will add one observation; which is, that so many persons ought not to be suffered to have the boldness to defame the greatest names. I know several persons, who are very much grieved at the impunity of this licentiousness. It would be more tolerable, if those satirical authors were sure of what they publish: but for the most part they have no certainty of it, and sometimes they know they lie, and they would obstinately refuse to retract, if their calumnies were made evident. They would not imitate the act of an honest man, which is published in the *Mercur Politique*, for the month of December 1695. Let us copy the passage. These are the words of the author of that work: 'Since I am upon the subject of the late Archbishop of Paris, I find myself obliged to say, that I am sorry I have related *, what the author of l'Esprit de Mr Arnaud, has said of the Dukes de la Meilleraye. The author of that satire, who has advanced indiscreetly, so many facts that are found to be false, has put her in the number of some ladies, with whom it is pretended that this archbishop was in a correspondence of gallantry; and yet it is certain, that dukes never in her life spoke with that prelate. It is the testimony which all Paris gives her. I am convinced that Madam de la Meil-

leraye was little concerned at the report of this chimerical commerce upon the credit of an author, who will never pass for canonical. I am very willing, notwithstanding, for my own interest, to disown what I have said, tho' in truth I believed nothing of it, as I did plainly enough insinuate. (8).

[B] Lewis XIII had a great kindness for her, and she suffered a disgrace, which rather heightened than diminished her reputation. One may see a pretty large account of this amour, in the *Intrigues Galantes de la Cour de France*. Cardinal de Richelieu, as we are told, was much alarmed at this passion of the king, tho' Mademoiselle de Hautefort had not the same penetration, nor a mind so capable of intrigues (9), as the first mistress (10); he was alarmed, I say, after he discovered that she was wholly governed by the counsels of Mademoiselle de Chennevaux (11). He and St Mars pressed the king so much, that he sent orders to those two ladies to be gone presently from the court, and they entered forthwith into a convent at Paris: But the cardinal would not let them stay long there; he obliged them to retire; Mademoiselle de Chennevaux into Poitou, and Mademoiselle de Hautefort to one of her country seats, forty leagues from the court (12). This passion of the king was mixed with great respect, and great jealousy. He durst not take the least liberty with that lady, as may be judged by what I am going to say. One day the queen having received a billet, of which she was willing to make a mystery, pinned it to the tapestry of her chamber, that she might not forget to answer it, and the king coming in a little while after, the queen not desiring that he should see it, commanded Madam de Hautefort, who was her lady of honour, to take it, and hold it fast, which she did. The king would needs take it from her, and they struggled a pretty while in sport; but Madam de Hautefort, not being able to defend herself any longer, put the billet in her bosom, which proved a sure sanctuary to it; for the king durst not touch there, and had no more the curiosity to see it (13). That is a proof of his respect; here is another of his jealousy.

The Marquis de Gevres was killed, while all things were making ready for his marriage with Mademoiselle de Hautefort. The king, entering some days after into her chamber, found her upon her knees before her praying-desk, and coming softly up to her, he saw that she was reading the vespers for the dead, and imagining that it was for the Marquis de Gevres, he conceived so strong a jealousy, that he would not for six weeks hear her spoken of, tho' he himself had proposed the match; which may be attributed to the usual caprices of love, which often looks upon, as an evil, the things that it has earnestly wished for (14). I desire to be looked upon here, only as a copy; for I will not warrant that this author is exact, as to the bottom of this affair, and much less, that he has not made transpositions of times and places. I have some scruple about this story, in the *Continuation of the Menagiana*. Madam de Schomberg de Hautefort, was one of the ladies that Lewis XIII used to see; but she was disgusted with the court, and retired to the *Magdelonnettes*. The Abbot de la Victoire going thither to see her, said to her: Madam, is it then to honour the king that you are retired thither (15)? I make upon this three observations. 1. This lady could never be called Mademoiselle de Schomberg; for the latter name came only by her marriage with the Marshal de Schomberg. 2. Her retreat from the court was against her will. 3. It is very odd, that among so many sorts of convents, she should chuse the *Magdelonnettes*, a place in some manner designed for public penance. This made me doubt of her having retired thither; but I have been well informed that she did.

As to what further concerns her, she was a second time disgraced under the regency of Anne of Austria. See the stanzas that Benferade made upon that subject (16).

(8) *Mercur Historique & Politique*, December 1695, pag. 661, 662.

(9) *Intrigues Galantes de la Cour de France*, Tom. II, pag. 183.

(10) Madam de la Fayette, whom the cardinal had removed from the court.

(11) I think it should be Chennevaux.

(12) *Intrigues Galantes*, ibid. pag. 186.

(13) Ibid. p. 184.

(14) Ibid. p. 115.

(15) *Suite du Menagiana*, pag. 379, *Dutels Edit.*

(16) They are in the 5th volume of the collection of the best pieces of the French Poets, printed in 1692, p. 187, of the Dutch Edition.

SCHOMBERG (FREDERIC DE) created Marshal of France on the thirtieth of July, in the year 1675, and killed at the famous passage of the Boyne in Ireland, on the tenth of July 1690, was one of the greatest captains of his time, and commanded armies under more kings, and was raised to eminent dignities in more countries than any other. He would deserve a long article here; but not having received the memoirs which I expected, I am forced to refer it to another time. He is one of those great men, whose History ought to be written by an able pen. I do not doubt but that the Duke of Schomberg, his worthy son, has already thought of procuring this honour to his family (a), and this fine present to the common-wealth of learning.

In the mean time, one may be informed of many things, by consulting the memoirs of Mr Fremont d'Ablancourt, published in the year 1700. You will find an extract of them in the *Histoire des Ouvrages des Savans* - - *History of the Works of the Learned*, for the month of November 1700.

(a) It is different from that of the Marshals of Schomberg, mentioned in the foregoing articles. See *Seckendorf, Hiflor. Lutherani*, lib. iii, pag. 93, *littera b*, where he shews that their seat was upon the Rhine, in the diocese of Trier. *Theodorice de Schomberg, de quo supra*, was of this family, if we believe the State of France, *Tom ii*, pag. 166, *Edit. 1680*.

SCHORUS (ANTONY) a native of Hoochstraten in Brabant (a), was one of the best Grammarians of the XVIth century. He laboured very diligently to introduce Cicero's Latin into the schools (b), and composed some books very useful for that purpose [A]. A comedy, which he made his scholars act at Heidelberg, where he taught the *Belles Lettres*, was the cause that he was forced to fly [B]. He died at Laufanne, in the year 1552 (c).

[A] He composed some books very useful for that purpose. That which is called *Thesaurus Ciceronianus*, is a methodical abridgment of Robert Stephens, and of the observations of Nizolius. His *Phrases Linguae Latinae*, ratiocue observandorum eorum in auctoribus legendis quae praecipuum ac singularem vim aut usum habent, were printed at Basil in 1550 (1), and afterwards re-printed a great many times (2). They printed at Strasbourg in 1549, his two books *de ratione discendae Latinae & Graecae Linguae* (3).

[B] A comedy . . . was the cause that he was forced to fly. This comedy was only acted in his own house, in the presence of few people: Nevertheless, it made a noise, which soon reached the emperor's ears, and obliged him to give orders that this fault should not go unpunished. The Elector Palatine, Frederic II, having read the emperor's letter to him about it, was much troubled; he knew nothing of the matter; but he quickly informed himself of it. Schorus made his escape; some of his scholars were imprisoned by the rector of the university. Here is the ground of the complaint. This comedy introduced religion, desiring to be lodged with great men; they shut the doors against her: she addressed herself at last to persons of the meanest rank, who gave her a lodging. What will people think of the great ones, said the emperor, if it be once permitted to decry them upon the stage as the persecutors of religion? You will find this account in the thirteenth book of the annals of Hubert Leodius. A modern author has cited this, to shew that comedies may be permitted (4), and he observes, that in England and the Low-Countries, the liberty of the comedians was very serviceable to the introduction of the Reformation. *Saepe actores quam artificiosius perstringunt vitia inveterata publicaeque grassantia, quod alii certe vix tanta cum avaritia auderent. Nec absque fructu: prout contigit circa Reformationis initia in Anglia, ut observavit vir pietate atque doctrina conspicuus Johannes Foxus in Historia Ecclesiae Anglicanae. Similiter in Belgio comediae;*

à viris doctis scriptae, cum exhiberent quam graphice in Theatro Babylonis turpitudinem, hanc parum sub initium Reformationis quam plurimos commoverunt, nec minus cum fructu spectatorum profuturunt Antichristianam doctrinam, quam Orthodoxam veritatem eidem oppositam afferuerunt (5). I must needs say here, that in 1558, there was acted at Rochelle, before the King and Queen of Navarre (6), a comedy, which represented the abuses of Popery, and the remedy that might be brought to it out of Scripture. *The clergy was offended at it, and made complaints to the King of Navarre himself* (7). Mr Vincent, Minister of Rochelle, adds to the recital of this adventure a solid reflexion. I do not think, says he (8), That, under pretence of the historical account I have given, it will be imputed to me, that I pretend to authorize this manner of treating things that belong to religion. . . . (9). If it be true, as it was loudly said at Rochelle, that all this (10) came from Joan d'Albret, Queen of Navarre, who would, in her turn (11), make use of the liberty of the stage, to make it tell truths, which the doctors of the Church of Rome had but too justly drawn upon themselves (12); we cannot at all give our approbation to it. We know that religion is too grave and too holy to be brought upon the stage under any pretence whatsoever, and that she is too much an enemy of the world, and its foolish vanities, to beg aid of its ministers. Nevertheless, as God is admirable in all his ways, and knows how to draw good out of evil when he pleases; and as, to correct a prophet that was going astray from his duty, he made an ass speak: He permitted here one of the stages of the world to speak, since the pulpits were silent; he permitted, I say, to the shame of the pastors of that time, that some comedians, whose profession it is to represent fables, should at that time be doctors of truth, since the pastors, whose business it was to preach that truth, did no longer teach any thing but fables.

(a) Valer. Andr. Bibliotheca Belg. pag. 76.

(b) Id. ibid.

(c) Id. ibid. & Simlerus, in Epitom. Bibl. Gesneri, p. 67.

(5) Id. ib. pag. 507.

(6) Antony de Bourbon and Joan d'Albret.

(7) Vincent, Recherches pour les commencemens & les premiers progrès de la Reformation en la Ville de la Rochelle, pag. 40.

See above the second article NAVARRE, remark [E].

(8) Id. ibid. pag. 40, 41.

(9) Id. ib. p. 43.

(10) Id. ibid. pag. 42.

(11) To understand this, the reader ought to know that the author had been speaking of a dramatic piece acted at Paris, in the college of Navarre, against Margaret de Valois, mother to Joan d'Albret. See above the first article NAVARRE, citat. (22).

(12) Id. ib. p. 43.

* Num. xxii. 28.

SCOT (REGINALD) an English gentleman, composed a book, whereof all the copies that could be found were burnt (a). He endeavoured to shew, that all the accounts of Magicians and witches are chimerical. The first part of this work was translated into Dutch, and printed in 1609, and made a great impression upon the readers (b). Mr Voëtius complains much of it [A].

[A] Mr Voëtius complains much of it. The passage I am going to cite, will serve both for a proof of, and a comment on this article. Reginaldus Scot (1) nobilis Anglus magiae crimen aperte negavit, & ex professo oppugnavit, omnes ejus mirabiles effectus aut ad melancholiam, aliosve naturales morbos, aut ad artem, industriam, & agilitatem hominum, agmentis & praestigiiis suis illudentium, aut ad stolidas imaginationes, dictorum magorum, aut ad vanas

nugas & fisiones eorumdem magorum referens. Ejus liber tit. *Discovery of witchcraft* in Anglia combustus est; quem nominatim etiam perstringit Sereniss. Magnae Britanniae Rex Jacobus in *Demonologia*, eumque tangit diffusissime eruditionis Theologus Johannes Raynoldus, in *ens. lib. Apocryph. tom. 2. praefat.* 169 (2). In eundem, sed innotinatum clamum strinxit eximius & subacti iudicii Theologus Gulielm. Perkinsius in *tractatu de Bafanologia. Pars libri istius* Reginaldi

(a) Voët. ubi infra, pag. 544.

(b) Voët. Disputat. Theol. Tom. iii, pag. 573.

(1) He calls him twice Scot, pag. 544.

(2) It should be 196. That fault proceeds from a transposition of figures, which is a thing but too common among Printers.

VOL. V.

Witchery

(3) Giff. Vo-
etius, Disputat.
Theolog. Tom.
iii, pag. 564,
565.

Reginaldi Scot *elenctica* (nam reliqua in editione Anglicana conjurationes continebat) in Belgicum idioma translata est, ante annos aliquot Lugd. Batav. per Thomam Baffon: ex illius libri lectione, seu fonte perenni, non pauci ab illo tempore docti & indocti in Belgio fluctuare, & de Magia *αλεγεινῆς* ac *λειτουργικῆς*, (ut Libertinis & Semilibertinis infesta est patria nostra) quin eo ignorantie sepe prolabi, ut non inique illis applicari poterit, quod Sereniss. Rex Jacobus in *Dæmonologia* subdito suo Reginaldo Scot: *esse quasi novos Sadduceos*: cum omnes diabolorum operationes, & apparitiones suaviter exhibant, tanquam anicularum, aut superstitionis meticolosæ phantasmata ac fabellas (3). An English nobleman openly denied, and professedly wrote against the crime of witchcraft, imputing all its wonderful effects either to melancholy and other natural distempers, or to the art, industry, and agility of men, that delude people with their subtle contrivances and tricks, or to the foolish imaginations, idle talk, and groundless fictions of those called witches. His book intitled, The discovery of witchcraft, was burnt in England. His

most serene majesty James, King of Great Britain, strikes at it by name in his *Dæmonologia*. John Reynolds, a divine of a most extensive learning, touches upon it in his censure on the Apocryphal books. Against the same book, tho' without naming it, William Perkins, an excellent divine, and of a well formed judgment, also exercised his pen. The reasoning part of this book of Scot, was translated into Dutch some years ago at Leyden by Thomas Baffon. From the reading of that book, as from a perpetual spring, not a few from that time in Holland, both learned and unlearned, began to waver and to grow Scepticks and Libertines in the article of witchcraft, (as our country is very much pestered with Libertines and Half-Libertines) nay, to such a depth of ignorance do they often fall, that what King James in his *Dæmonologia* said of his subject Reginald Scot, may be very justly applied to them: that they are a kind of new Sadducees: Since they laugh at all the operations and apparitions of devils, accounting them no better than the fancies and stories of old women, or of a fearful superstition.

(a) From thence comes the fir-
name of *Libboco-*
mus.

(b) See the E-
pistle Dedicatory
to his first vo-
lume against the
Institution of
Calvin.

SCHULTINGIUS (CORNELIUS) a licentiate in Divinity and canon of St Andrew at Cologne towards the latter end of the XVIth century, was of Steinwich (a) in Over-Yffel. He applied himself very much to controversy, and after having published several books against the Protestants [A], he undertook as his master-piece to confute the Institution of Calvin. He thought this would be attacking them in their chief fortrefs (b). I shall speak of this confutation, and thereby make a supplement to what I have said already (c) upon the editions of that book of Calvin [B]. There is a great

(c) In the re-
marks [F] and
[BB] of the ar-
ticle CALVIN.

[A] Several books against the Protestants.] Valerius Andreas gives us the following catalogue. *Edidit Ecclesiasticæ Disciplinæ Libros VI. Coloniae. Bibliothecam Ecclesiasticam. Ibid. 1599, & 1602. Opus variarum Lectionum & Animadversionum adversus Libr. I. Institutionum Joani. Calvini. Ibid. 1601. 4. Refutationem totius Theologiæ Calvinianæ, præsertim Institutionum ejusdem Calvini. Ibid. 4. Thesaurum Antiquitatum Ecclesiasticarum, & VII prioribus Annalium Baronii Tomis, contra Centuriatores Magdeburgenses ac Calvinistas, totidem Tomis ordine Alphabetico contextum. Ibid. Tragicomediam Constantini Magni & S. Helenæ. Ibid. 1602. Confessionem Hieronymianam, & D. Hieronymi Operibus juxta Locorum Theologorum capita. Tomi IV, apud Mylium, 1584. fol. Denique Hierarchiam Anacrysin adversus varios Calvinistarum Libros & celebratas ab eisdem Synodos. Ibidem apud Herm.*

(1) Valer. Andr.
Bibl. Belgic. pag.
164.

Hobergium, 1604 (1). The Oxford catalogue takes notice that the *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica, seu Commentarius de explicatione Missalis & Breviarii*, comprehends four volumes, and that the *Varia Lectiones & Animadversiones contra Institutiones Calvinæ & Petri Martyris Locos communes*, comprehends five, printed in the year 1602. The whole title of this book will be seen in the following remark. Valerius Andreas is not at all distinct upon this head: he has first taken notice of what the author published against the first book of Calvin's Institution; and afterwards he has marked down, in a loose manner, the confutation of the Institution. He should have said that the *Opus variarum Lectionum, &c.* contains four volumes against the four books of the Institution, and that they were printed in the year 1602, at Cologne, by Stephen Hemmerden, at the author's expence. Observe, he fancied that his books nettled the Heretics very much, and that his pen was so formidable to them that the English would not suffer what he published to be imported into their country. *Mordere, fugillare, arrodere Calvinistæ non prætermittunt, cum Hieronymianam Confessionem, de Disciplina Ecclesiastica libros, Thesaurum Antiquitatum Ecclesiasticarum, tum omnium maximè Bibliothecam Ecclesiasticam, seu Comment. sacros de explicatione Missalis & Breviarii, propter eorum cænas, ritus, agendas, & formulas reprehensas ad id in Angliam in primis expleverunt, ut publicè prohiberent in insulam importari* (2).

(2) Schulting.
Epist. Dedicat.
Tom. i, Bibl.
Catholicæ.

[B] I shall speak of this confutation, and thereby make a supplement to what I have said already upon the editions of Calvin's Institution.] The title which Schultingius gave to the first volume of his book is *Bibliotheca Catholica & Orthodoxa, contra summam totius Theologiæ Calvinianæ in Institutionibus Joannis Calvini & Locis communibus Petri Martyris, breviter comprehensæ: vel*

potius, Variarum Lectionum & Animadversionum contra primum Librum Institutionum Joannis Calvini Tomus primus. The title of the following volumes differs only from this in respect of the number as well of the volume, as of the book of the Institution which is confuted. It may be affirmed, with reason, that this book of Schultingius is no more than an indigested heap of collections, and a laborious rhapsody. It is almost nothing but a piece composed of borrowed passages, and an index of the authors who have confuted Calvin on the matters in controversy. The errors of pointing, and orthography, and all others, which Printers are liable to commit, are innumerable in it; but be this how it will, it may serve for a repertory, and I have found in it facts concerning Calvin's Institution, which seemed to me very well worth being taken notice of, allowing them even to be fabulous.

Our canon begins with comparing Calvin's Institution and the common-places of Martyr (3). He finds in both the same disposition of the subjects, the same order of books and chapters, and the same arguments against the Romish religion. He will not declare himself on either side of the question, whether Calvin be the plagiarist of Martyr, as some great men believe (4), or whether he took all from his own stock, as some others imagine; but however it be, he peremptorily decides that Martyr was a more learned man than Calvin. If he had read the preface to the common-places of Martyr, he would have known certainly how to regulate his opinion touching the question of plagiarism; for it appears by that preface that these common-places were drawn up and digested after the death of Martyr. Dr Burnet has made use of this observation to expose a mistake of Mr Varillas (5). Let us remember that Martyr did not embrace the Protestant religion till the year 1542, and that he died three years after the last revival of Calvin's Institution, from whence it follows that neither his common-places, nor even his other books, could have served as models, nor as an original ground-work to the Institution, the third edition of which, as enlarged by the author, was in the year 1543.

After that the canon observes the great credit which this book of Calvin's has obtained among the Protestants. He quotes (6) a minister (7), who has given an abridgement of it in the German tongue, and who assures us, that since the birth of JESUS CHRIST there has not appeared a more pious nor a more useful book than this. He says that Picator, in his epitome of the same book (8), and Beza, in the preface to his Confession of Faith, make the same judgment of it; and that in England they want

(3) Schulting.
Tom. i, Biblioth.
Cathol. pag. 1.

(4) Quod magis
viri sentiant.
Id. ibid.

(5) See the second Criticism of Dr Burnet, upon Varillas's History of Heresy, p. 15, and following.

(6) Schulting.
ubi supra, pag. 6.

(7) Caspar Olearius, minister of the Elector Palatine.

(8) Printed at Herborn in the year 1586.

little

great deal of passion and heat in the writings of this canon of Cologne: he observes that the

little of preferring Calvin's Institution to the Bible, that the bishops order all the ministers to get that book almost by heart; that they lay it upon the pulpit in their churches; that in Scotland they make the study of Divinity begin with the reading of this Institution; that at Heidelberg, Geneva, Herborn, and in the Calvinists universities, they expound it publicly; that in Holland the laymen as well as ministers have it always in their hands, curiously bound. This is the substance of a more ample discourse, which I shall quote entire, for the rarity of the fact, according to the Latin of the author. *In Anglia ejus (Calvini) Institutiones ipsi penè Bibliis scripturis præferuntur, mandant pseudopiscopi omnibus ministris, ut penè ad verbum has ediscant, nec unquam de manibus deponant, collocantur in templis sublimi loco in pulpito, custodiuntur tanta diligentia ac si Sibyllina forent oracula, quæ summa fidelitate apud Romanos asseruata fuisse, veteres Romani scriptores tradidere. In Scotia omnes studiosi adolescentes post susceptum gradum magistratus, studium Theologiæ ab his principiis nempe lectione Institutionum incobant. Omnes Apostolice Monachi, Sacerdotes, Canonici, quotquot à nobis ad ipsos deficiunt, jubentur initio suæ scilicet conversionis fundamenta prima Theologiæ ex hisce Institutionibus addiscere, ut ex Symbolis eorum Belgici collegi. Heidelberg, Genevæ, Herbornæ & in Universitatibus Calvinistarum vel ipsæ Institutiones, vel earum compendia publicè à doctores Studio Theologiæ explicantur. He Institutiones ab ipsis in omnes linguas vertuntur, ut omnium nationum homines hoc veneno pestifero inficere, & corrumpere possint. In Belgio nullus est verbi minister & præco, nullus Senatorii ordinis vir paulo latior, nullus præfex vel præfatus, breviter, nullus sacrarum literarum cupidus (omnes autem penè sunt ejusmodi in Theologia Calviniana versati à supremo consiliario usque ad infimum aurigam & nautam) qui non hæc aureas scilicet eorum judicio Institutiones nocturna verset manu versetque diurna, extrinsecus auro, purpura omnique preciosissimo ornatus vestiant & ornant tanquam præstantissimam margaritam evangelicam & quasi thesaurum cælitus delapsam, ex his libris omnes controversas decidunt & dijudicant (9).* Every body perceives that there are too many hyperboles and childish exaggerations in this passage.

Let us see what he says upon the editions of Calvin's Institution.

He finds that they became more correct in proportion as the author multiplied them, and therefore as the first is the most imperfect, the last, which is that of the year 1559, is the most perfect, it seems to him that Calvin, looking on that work as his favourite production, he applied his whole wit and vigour to correct, embellish, and enlarge it, to the end that he might therein give a very compleat system, and a perfect idea of his Theology. *Videtur autem mihi Joannes Calvinus, ab eo tempore quo scribere cepit, deinceps usque ad finem vite suæ, omne studium suum omnemque operam & vires ad has Institutiones augendas, locupletandas sic contulisse, ut sua Theologiæ perfectam ideam & speciem exhiberet (10).* This notion agrees well enough with the preface which Calvin has put before the edition of the year 1559. Scultingius observes (11), that the first edition is of Basil 1536, in 8vo; that the second is of Strasbourg, 1539, in folio; that the third is of Geneva, 1545, in folio, and in 8vo; and the fourth is of Geneva, 1559, in folio, and in 8vo. That the edition which the university of Heidelberg caused to be published in the year 1572, differs from the rest in several things, and is the worst of all; that two were published at Laufanne, with notes; the one in the year 1576, the other in 1585: that the German translation of Heidelberg differs prodigiously (12) from the text of John Calvin; that the first, viz. that of Basil, 1536, is divided into no more than eight chapters (13), and contains no advertisement to the reader; that the Geneva Catechism has been added to the third edition; that Bellarmine, in the fourth chapter of the first book of Pontifice, quotes an edition of the year 1554, and shews wherein it is contrary to the edition which followed; that the edition of Strasbourg, 1539, carries this title, *Institutio Christianæ Religionis nunc vere demum suo titulo respondens, auctore Alcuino: Argentorati apud Wendelinum (14) mense augusti anno Domini 1. 5. 3. 9.*, and that before the Epistle Dedicatory

are to be read these words, *Potentissimo Illustrissimoque Monarchæ magno Francorum Regi Principi ac Domino suo Alcuino*, which insinuates that it is Alcuinus who addresses his discourse to Charlemagne; the false name of Alcuinus having appeared in the first edition, they wrongfully put in the second *nunc demum suo titulo respondens* (15); that many variations are found in the doctrine of Calvin when the different editions which he has given of this book are compared together (16); that the editions published by the Booksellers, without his being concerned in them, vary still more, they have added, changed, and left out, many things in them, according to the taste of particular men: *Si sæpius & plures editiones inveniantur sunt Typographorum non Calvini, ibi sunt multa adjecta, mutata, ablata pro judicio privatorum hominum* (17); that the method of this book is wonderful, and that it may be compared to the Institutes of Justinian, which, as the Lawyers justly acknowledge, have been formed with so much order and symmetry, that nothing can go beyond them. *Methodus profecto addi insignis est & artificiosa ut cum Institutionibus Justiniani conferri possint, quo Lib. bro Jureconsulti merito sentiunt, nihil scriptum esse magis methodicè, nisi forte hoc alcuini merito displicere possit quod de Principiis Theologiæ (à quibus omnis ordini debet dispositio) non in 1. statim libro, ut fieri oportuisse multi sentiant, sed in ultimo libro 4. tractant, nempe de auctoritate Ecclesiæ, Pontificis, Conciliorum & Sacre Scripturæ. Methodum Albertus Pighius valde laudat & stilum orationis ac stilum dicendi* (18). That as soon as this book of Calvin came out of the press at Strasbourg about the year 1545, Bernard Cincius, Bishop of Aquila carried a copy of it to Cardinal Marcellus Cervinus, the Pope's legate, at the court of the emperor (19); that these two able men, being of opinion that this book was more dangerous than the other writings of the Lutherans (20), put Albertus Pighius upon examining it, who having judged that Calvin was an antagonist worthy of his notice, undertook to confute him; and that he began with the subject of Grace and of Free-will; upon which he published ten books against Calvin; that he had a design to publish others upon justification and the principle of faith, but that death hindered him from finishing them. *Hic (Albertus) Calvinum nequaquam contemnendum sed dignum antagonisten, quo cum congregaretur, in quem calumiam stringeret, ac pro pietate & orthodoxa fide decertaret judicavit. Quo factum est, ut decem libros de gratia, & libero arbitrio contra Joan. Calvinum in lucem emisserit, cui si diuturnior vita superstes fuisset, proposuerat etiam de justificatione hominis, & de principiis credendorum contra eundem Calvinum scribere, & ad ista tria primaria puncta ejusdemque annexa, nempe de gratia & libero arbitrio, de justificatione, de Principiis credendorum incubatos non abjolveret, nec in lucem edidit* (21).

Let us make some remarks upon this account of the canon of Cologne.

I. First of all we must lay it down as a certain fact (22), that the Epistle Dedicatory of the Institution was dated from Basil, not on the first of August 1536, as several editions have it, but on the first of August 1535, as it is to be seen in some others. It is a strong presumption that the first edition is of the year 1535, since it is highly probable that the book was compleat and ready for the press when the author dedicated his Epistle Dedicatory. If it was, we should have room to conclude that the copy which is kept in the Library of Geneva (23), which wants the forty-two first pages, but which takes notice, at the end, that the impression was finished in the month of March 1536, is not the first edition; for if it were, we must say that Calvin left Basil before his book was printed, and that the Printer made no great haste, and did not finish the edition till the month of March 1536. This is not probable, and it is far less so than to suppose that a book so well written as this, and so fit for the times, was sold off with so great dispatch that it was very soon necessary to think of a second edition, which was finished in the month of March 1536. Observe well, that Theodore Beza assures us (24), that Calvin caused his Institution to be printed at Basil, and departed not from Basil till after the edition of the book (25): Secondly, That he relates so many journeys which the author made

(15) Id. ibid. pag. 20.

(16) Calvinus in tempore editionum diversarum & in doctrina Institutionum non sibi constabat, sed modis variis mutavit. Idem, ibid. pag. 19. See also the beginning of the Epistle Dedicatory of the fourth volume.

(17) Schult. Bibl. Cathol. Tom. i. pag. 19.

(18) Id. ib. p. 7.

(19) Id. ibid. pag. 39.

(20) Reliqua Lutheranorum Scripta esse ditionem, hoc acriter mordere & fortius stringere. Id. ibid. p. 39, 40.

(21) Id. ibid.

(22) See the remark [F.] of the article CALVIN.

(23) See the same remark of the same article.

(24) Beza, preface to the Commentaries of Calvin upon Job, pag. 7.

(25) Editio hoc libro fuisse veluti præstita Patrie fide, Calvinum viscode Ferrarientis Ducis... desiderium inessit. Beza, in Vita Calvini, p. 367, 368. Tom. iii. Operum.

† Libri Institutionum in Anglia in tanto pretio sunt, ut tum Anglicæ exactissime verbi in singulis Ecclesiis à parochiis legendi appendantur, tum in utraque illic Academia, cursu Philosophico absoluti, futuris Theologis hic primum ante omnia prælegantur. D. Stapletonius in Promptuario quadragesimali in feria 4 Hebdomadæ Sanctæ.

(9) Schult. ubi supra, pag. 7: he repeats the same thing, pag. 487 of the second volume, and in the Epistle Dedicatory of the third volume.

(10) Id. ibid. pag. 18.

(11) Id. ibid. pag. 19.

(12) Toto cælo aberrat. Id. ibid.

(13) Nevertheless he says, pag. 39, that it contained sixteen chapters.

(14) He should have added here Ribolium.

the Heretics censured them, and that their coming into England was absolutely forbidden (d). He died on the twenty-third of April 1604 (e). Mr Konig makes, two authors of him, the one called Conrad Schultingius, the other Cornelius Schultingius.

(d) See the remark [A] at the end. (e) Valer. Andreas, Bibl. Belgic. pag. 164.

(26) *Id. ibid.* See the remark [U], of the article CALVIN. made from that time till the summer of 1536 (26), that Calvin must necessarily have gone from Basil soon after the date of this Epistle Dedicatory. It will be objected, that the Printer has set down the year 1536 in the title page, although the book was to be sold in the month of August 1535. I confess that this way of anticipating upon the following year is frequent among Bookfellers, but generally they do not begin it in the month of August, and after all, that does not remove the difficulty which I ground upon the date of the month of March 1536, which is to be seen in the Geneva copy. I conclude that tho' there be some probability that the first edition was dated in the year 1536, by the Bookfeller, it is likewise probable that it was dated from the year 1535. It is thus that one might expatiate on every side in the vast field of probability, if there was not a fixed point which determines the whole dispute in my favour. They are the words of Calvin himself, which I have quoted in another place (27), and by which we learn that he went from Basil soon after his book had seen the light there. This is a demonstration that the edition, which was completed in the month of March 1536, is not the first.

II. In the second place I observe, that Schultingius was in the right not to reckon for the second and third editions any besides those which were made upon the revivals of Calvin. He does well, according to this rule, in giving the second place to the edition of Strasbourg, 1539, but he is in the wrong to reckon that of Geneva, 1545 for the third: for it was preceded by the edition of Strasbourg, 1543, corrected and enlarged by the author.

DATE of the Geneva Catechism.

(28) To the ministers of Friesland.

(29) Beza, preface to the Commentaries of Calvin upon Joshua, pag. 8.

(30) The same, pag. 12.

(31) In the remark [B] of the article SPAIN (JOHN OR).

IV. I cannot allow to Schultingius the chronology he makes use of, with respect to the edition, which animated Pighius to write against Calvin. It was neither that of 1545, nor even that of 1543, but that of 1539. He was no longer alive in the year 1543. His book had appeared some time before, and was confuted by Calvin in the beginning of the year 1543.

(32) The one of the matters, the other of the places of Scripture.

(33) The Bookfeller of Geneva, who published the Latin edition of 1550, made an excuse for having trusted to the edition of Strasbourg, where the greatest part of the quotations were falsely set down in the margin, which he remedied in the Index.

(34) Marlorat, Preface to the Index.

considering the prodigious number of editions that this book of Calvin has undergone.

It has been so often reprinted, that it is not to be A CATECHISM conceived how the author of the *Essais de Literature* on the *Essais de Literature*.

could make (35) an article of the *Christian Institution* of Calvin, without saying one word which should make us understand that it had been printed oftener than once. He has contented himself with observing (36) that the author published it at Basil about the year 1534. I do not know whether he him-

self perceived this fault, or whether he was told of it; but he corrected it by an addition at the end of his little book. That addition tells us (37), that this book of Calvin is dated from Basil the first of August 1536; that it was, in some respect, no more than the first draught of a larger performance; that it was then that Paul Thurius (38) composed the distich which made so much noise (39); that there has been five editions of this book; that of Basil, 1535; that of Strasbourg, 1539; the second of Strasbourg, 1543; that of Strasbourg, in 4to, 1544; that of Geneva, which is the fifth, 1550; and that in the year 1558, the author revised his book and divided it into four parts. I wish he had corrected the false date of the first of August 1536. He was more obliged to it than any other, since he was ready to say that the first edition is of Basil, 1535. He would be very much puzzled, if he should undertake to prove that Paul Thurius composed his distich in the year 1535. Nothing is more easy than to prove to him that he has been in the wrong to reduce the editions of Calvin's Institution to five. He reckons up six himself, for undoubtedly he meant, that the revival made by Calvin in the year 1558 was followed by a new edition, and it is very certain that it was so. People will very justly think it strange, that the author of the *Essays of Literature*, having proposed to himself to speak of none but scarce books, should have made an article of Calvin's Institution; for no book was ever so common as this; it has been so many times reprinted, that copies of it are to be found in the very Brokers stalls through all the towns of Holland; and unless it be a fine edition, and in folio, they do not cost above three pence or a groat. See the margin (40).

An observation has been made which shews that this book of Calvin has been sifted, scanned, anatomized, in all the different manners possible, by the Roman Catholics. They have taken notice that the first word is *all*, and the last *impiety*, and this has appeared very mysterious. The fact is certain in the French translation, but not in the original Latin. *Institutionem Calvinii observantur quidam hoc verbo omnis incipere et in istud impietas desinere; id tamen præter mentem Autoris, ita divino consilio contigisse censent, ut Argumentum sit Librum totius impietatis esse quasi Encyclopediam, eaque sola constare* (41).

The editions of Calvin's Institution, which I have seen, are the following: that of Geneva, 1550, in 4to, ex Officina Joannis Gerardi; that of Robert Stephens, 1553, in folio (42). These two are in Latin, and contain no more than twenty-one chapters, divided each into several sections. The French edition of Geneva, printed for John Gerard, 1553, in 4to. The Latin edition of Geneva, printed for Francis Perrin, 1568, in folio. Six other French editions of the same city: one printed for Conrad Badius, 1560, in folio; one from the Printing-house of James Bourgeois, 1562, in 4to; one from the Printing-house of Thomas Courteau, 1564, in 8vo; the French edition of Lyons, printed for John Martin, 1565, in 8vo; one printed for Francis Perrin, 1566, in folio; and one from the Printing-house of Jacob Stoer, 1609, in folio. I have likewise seen the Latin edition, published at Geneva, by John Le Preux, in folio, in the year 1590. It is augmented with the analysis, and some other pieces composed by different authors. The editions of Geneva, in 8vo, printed for John Le Preux, 1592, and 1602, are agreeable to this. I add, that the Geneva edition of 1617, in folio, apud Joh. Vignon,

(35) In the *Essays of August*, 1702, p. 98.

(36) *Ibid.* p. 98.

(37) *Ibid.* p. 98.

(38) He should find it in the remark [F] of the article CALVIN.

(39) You will find it in the remark [F] of the article CALVIN.

(40) There is in the Journal of Trevoux, January 1703, edition of Amsterdam, a Memoir touching the *Essays of Literature*, in which there is a censure on what concerns the Institution of Calvin.

(41) Vincent. Baronius, Parnet. ad Th. Raynaud. in *lucina* Apologet. Ord. Dominik. folio, quod prædicti sunt.

(42) The printing of it was finished on the fourth of February 1553.

Vignon, Petrus & Jacobus Clouët, makes the sixth volume of a Latin edition of John Calvin's works. Together with his letters it likewise makes a volume of

his works in the Amsterdam edition, printed for John James Schipper, in the year 1667, in folio.

SCHUTZE (JOHN) a Lutheran minister in Germany in the XVIth century, published among other books a piece to which he gave the title of *Sacramentarius Diabolus* - - *The Sacramentarian Devil*. One may judge by this of the rage which animated him against the Zuinglians [A]. He likewise published in the year 1579, a book containing fifty reasons why a man should not embrace the communion of the Calvinists.

[A] *The rage which animated him against the Zuinglians.* To the end that one may judge of the piece by the pattern, I shall quote a passage which I find in George Braunius. We shall see there, that our Schutze represented the Calvinists as persons that were the most turbulent, seditious, and cruel. 'Hic seditionis genius non tantum Lutheranos, sed & Galinistis furoris ministros, magis exagitat quod Lutherani in Confratribus suis accurate observant, dum inter varias causas, quare Sacramentariam Calvinistarum Doctrinam acceptare nequeant præcipuum & illam allegent, quod seditiosi, & tumultuosi sint, pacis publicæ & tranquillitatis politicæ turbatores, quorum hoc unicum institutum est, ut seditionum factiones, tumultum, dissidia, ac tandem cædem ac sanguinis effusionem procurent. Maxime cum duplici nomine latrones existant, non fatiati si hominum animas Doctrinæ falsitate interimant, verum etiam, omnem quam possunt cunque diligentiam adhibeant ut per seditiones, latrocinia, & cædes pro nefario suo genio in civitatibus instituant. Hoc Joannes Schutzius in causarum explicatione, & in Sacramentarii suo Diabolo pagina 354 (1). - - This spirit of sedition, says he, not only possesses the Lutherans, but rages still more among the furious ministers of Calvin, which the Lutherans have taken notice of in their brethren; since among the various reasons why they cannot embrace the sacramentary doctrine of the Calvinists, they allege this for the chief, that they are a disorderly and riotous sect, enemies to the public peace and tranquillity, and that their only principles are to beget tumult, discord, sedition, and at length murder and bloodshed. Especially since they are robbers in a double respect, as they do not satisfy themselves with killing the souls of men by their false doctrine, but likewise apply their utmost diligence to blow up seditions, and thereby to fill cities with murder and rapine, for to such things the wicked bent of their genius prompts them. This says John Schutze, &c.'

It is to be observed, that George Braun, a clergyman of Cologne, here accuses the Protestants of a seditious and violent humour, which is a reproach that is cast upon them by an infinite number of other Popish writers, and which is the same, that on all occasions they object to the Romish party. Juvenal certainly could not have read this passage of George Braun without crying out :

SCIOPIUS (a) (GASPAR) one of the most famous writers of the XVIIth century, was a German. His enemies have published many shameful things concerning his family [A]. He studied at Amberg, and then at Heidelberg, and afterwards at Altdorf, at the charges of the Elector Palatine. Having made a considerable stay at

Ingolstadt,

[A] *His enemies have published many shameful things concerning his family.* They published (1) that he was born in a village, where his father was sexton, *hoc vespillone atque ædituo in pago quodam non ignoto, natus est Gaspar Sciopius*; That his father one day made a grave too little, and being unwilling to make it longer, he cut off the feet of the dead body. *Hiberno quodam tempore, terra firmiter gelu confixita, sepeliendum accepit cadaver, cui jam sepulchrum effoderat, sed mensura breviora quam pro mole; ibi vir fortissimus ne tanto in frigore terra deducenda esset, pedibus cadaver mutilat, & in fossam quam sepulchrum verius recondit* (2). That having got some money together he went into Poland, where he served a Printer; that afterwards he was a pedlar, and went from village to village, as the Savoyards do, to sell small wares; that he left off that trade, and lifted himself a soldier; that he came back into the Palatinate after the death

VOL. V.

Quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes?
Quis cœlum terris non misceat, & mare cœlo,
Si fur displiceat Verri? homicida Miloni?
Clodius accuset mœchos? Catilina Cethegum?
In tabulam Syllæ si dicant discipuli tres (2):

(2) Juven. Sat. II, ver 24.

..... In vain

The Gracchi of sedition must complain.

*'Twould make you swear the planets from their spheres,
Should Verres peach thieves, Milo murderers,
Clodius tax barwds, Cethegus Cataline,
Or Sylla's pupils, Sylla's rules decline.*

TATÈ.

Be that as it will, let us cite another instance of Schutze's rancour. *Sacramentarius Camerina ac festina est quedam, in quam multa hæreses confluent, ultima Satanæ ira, quam furis agitatus contra Christum ejusque Ecclesiam exercet. Et qui Sacramentarium partes sequitur, is manifestus est, atque ejuratus hostis Dei & fidei, quàm in Baptismo Christo dedit, oblitus* (3).

This is maintaining that the opinion of the Calvinists touching the Eucharist is the sink of many heresies, and the utmost effort of Satan's rage; and that one cannot adhere to it without becoming the sworn enemy of God, and without forgetting what he promised to JESUS CHRIST in his baptism. Now to maintain such a thing as this, is it not a downright fit of madness. I appeal to the Lutheran ministers of the present time. They are a good deal more moderate than their ancestors, and they doubleless see, that the quality of the tenets in which the two Protestant communions differ, is not of the same kind which they believed formerly, when the sacramentary war heated their spirits too much, and spread on both sides a flood of defamation. That furious storm being calmed by degrees, they have found out at last, that the subject of the dispute was not of that importance. How many things of that nature are discovered by experience (4)? But alas! how little do we profit thereby! There arise very frequent disputes among divines: they are treated as if the fundamentals of religion were concerned, and they do not remember that they treat as a meer trifle now, what their predecessors had looked upon as a debate of the utmost consequence.

(3) Schutzius, Prefat. in Librum 50 Causarum, apud Braunium in Tremontium Catholico Defensione, pag. 294

(4) See the remarks [E] and [F], of the article AMYRAULT, and the remark [D] of the article GOMARUS.

(a) His true name was Sciopius, but he changed it into Sciopius, to bring it to the Italian pronunciation.

of Frederic III, and obtained there a small employment (3); that he sold corn, and gained something by it; that he obtained the judicature of a small place, and at the end of the year lifted himself for the expedition of Cologne, and was made provost of the army; that after the death of the Elector Lewis, he returned to his first post, and made himself a good Miller there; that he was sent to a town that mutinied, and commanded the soldiers there; that he was a Brewer there; that he was there with his wife and his daughter, but would not let them see any body. They add, that his wife was a Hessian, and had followed into Hungary a man who kept her. From the day after he was killed, she lay with Sciopius, who afterwards despised her so much, that he made her work like a servant, without either seeing or speaking to her. On the contrary, he made his maid eat at his table, and admitted her to his bed from time to time (4). The daughter,

(2) In præfatura Burcktwiciana, tenue officium ac vile obtinuit, quod Notarium five Actuarium præfecturæ vocare possit. Ibid. pag. 139.

(4) Contra vero, quasi veris rerum vicibus ancillæ fortissimo Herculi adhaerere, cibum una capere, & si res ita ferret, thorum genalem occupare. Id. ibid. pag. 141.

(b) See the remark [B].

(:) Ibid. p. 142, 143.

(6) Ibid. p. 141.

(7) See the book intituled, Oporini Grubini Amphotides Scioppiana, pag. 28.

(8) *Oporinus*
Grubinius, *Am-*
phot. Scioppian.
pag. 31.

(9) *His Theses de Injuriis.*

(10) Vita & Pa-
rentes, Gasp.
Schoppij, *init.*

(11) lb. p. 151,
152.

(12) See Ampho-
tides Scioppianæ,
p. 190, & seq.

• Prolusion, pag
202.

(13) Baillet, En-
fans celebres,
пмт. 69.

(14) Octavius
Ferrarius, in
Prolusione cui ti-
tulus Quo pretio
viri principes
litteras ac lite-
ratos habuerint.

Adolefcentem ac pœne puerum id ingeni, atque eruditionis speciem dedidit, ut vix tribus lustris exple-tis non unum opus publici juris faceret, quod exactæ ætatis iudicium, totiusque antiquitatis solidam cognitionem præ se ferret (15). — That noble he was a *stripling*, and almost yet a boy, he gave such proof of his wit and learning, that before he was scarcely *in his fifteenth year* he had published more than one book, which showed his ripe judgment, and his well-digested knowledge of all antiquity.' But it will be better to judge of Scioppius by what he says of himself. It appears from the following words, that he was near seventeen years of age, when he published his first book: It consisted of Latin verses.

Extant typis Heidelbergensibus impressa complura Scioppii carmina anno 1593, cum haud etiam septimum decimum ætatis annum compleisset, antiquiora illa plus fatiis, sic tamen ut variam eruditionem accurata probatissimorum auctorum lætione comparatam passim præferant: quo ipso tempore etiam Dialectica & Rhetorica æquales & convictores suos, illustres nobilesque adolefcentes, cum eos à Magistris suis negligi doleat, docere, ausus est (16). — There are extant several poems of Scioppius, printed at Heidelberg in the year 1593, when he was not full seventeen years of age. They have indeed too much of an antique form, but in such a manner, that they evince where shew his various erudition, acquired by a diligent reading of the best books. At the same time he had the courage to instruct several young gentlemen of distinction, that were his fellow-students and companions in Logic and Rhetoric, perceiving them to be neglected by their masters.' To know how many books he published before he was twenty-four years of age, we need only cast our eyes upon the following list. Let us remember that in the year 1593, he was in his seventeenth year, as we have been just told by himself. *Verisimilium libri quatuor. Editi Noribergæ in 8vo apud Paulum Kaufmannum Anno 1595, Disputatio de Injuriis. Apud eundem in 4to Anno 1597. Summæ pæctarum Læctionum libri quinque. Apud eundem in 8vo Anno 1597. Commentarius de Arte Critica. Noriber-gæ in 8vo apud Valentinum Furrmannum Anno 1597. Notationes Criticæ in Phædrum cum Ritterhusii in eundem scriptorem Commentario editæ Lugduni Batavor. in 8vo apud Fr. Raphelengium Anno 1597. Libellus de suis ad Catholicos migratione (17), deque auctoritate Ecclesiæ in sacra scriptura interpretanda. Editus Romæ apud Zanetum in 8vo 1599. Epistola de variis fidei contro-versiis ad primarium quandam Germaniæ Jurisconsultum. Ingolstadtis in 4to apud Angermarium Anno 1599 (18).*

They say that we must add to this lift the commentary upon the Priapea, whereof the epistle dedicatory is dated from Ingolstadt in the year 1595, and that the author did not think fit to mention it in the catalogue of his works, because his enemies cried him down for having commented upon such an obscene collection of verses as the Priapea are. He defended himself from that reproach by denying the fact, and maintained, that this commentary was a work of Goldastus, who by an egregious fraud had published it, said he, as the performance of Scioppius (19): However, he alledged in his vindication, that Scaliger had made some commentaries upon the Priapea, and upon Catullus, and that Douza had made one upon Petronius. But he changed the state of the question; for the true ground of the accusation was, not that he had commented upon obscene verses, but that he had stuffed his commentary with so great a number of filthy particulars (20). Besides, he complained in that book, that men have not received from nature the same strength as sparrows. His enemies took him up for it, and he was laughed at to some purpose in the satire intitled, *Hercules tuam fidem* (21). He did certainly deserve it; here is the passage, and his reflexion upon it. 'Cum Ingolstadii agerem, vidi e regione Musei mei passerem coitum vicies repetentem, & inde adeo ad languorem datum, at avolatulum

(15) *Id.* in Pro-
fusione cui titulus
Literatorum fa-
nus.

(16) Oporinus
Grubinius, ubi
supra, pag. 39.

(17) Freherus is therefore mistaken, *pag.* 775, of his *Theatrum*, where he says that Scioppius turned Papist, in the year 1601.

(18) These titles are taken from the *Indiculus* of Scioppius's works prefixed to the *Amphotides Scioppianæ*.

(19) See the Amphipodides Scioppianæ, pag. 102, & seq, and his letter ad Saulum Mercerum, at the end of the Scylliger hypobolimagus.

(20) Lusus diverforum in Priapum poetarum libero commentario illustravit, quo post hominum memoriam, nihil fecius ab ullo cinædo aut lubricini omnium profuturo in lucem editum fuisset, omnes fantentur. *Vita & Parentes Gaspar. Schoppii*, p. 142.

(21) *Pař.* 59.
See also Merici
Casauboni Pictas,
pař. 21.

after he had been some time at Verona, he returned into Germany, from whence he went again into Italy, and published at Ferrara a panegyric upon the King of Spain, and Clement VIII. He endeavoured to raise himself at the court of Rome, and used all his industry towards it; nevertheless his fortune was but mean, and he was not well pleased with it, for all the lofty titles he bestowed upon himself (c) [C]. Before he travelled into Italy the first time, he plaid Gifanius a trick, which I have mentioned in another place (d). He turned a Roman Catholic about the year 1599. I do not know the reason why he was so angry with the Jesuits; but it is certain he was their great enemy, and wrote many sharp libels against them under divers supposititious names [D]. On the other side he inveighed with the utmost fury against the Protestants, and solicited

(c) Taken from a book intitled, Vita & Parentes Gaip. Schoppij à Germano quodam contubernali ejus confcripta, printed at Leyden, with Confutatio Fabulæ Burdonum.

(d) In the remark [F] of the article GILFANIUS.

(22) Scioppius, Commentar. in Priapeia, Carm. xxv, pag. 35, Edit. 1664, in 8vo.

rus in terram decideret. En fortem iniquam. Hoc passeribus datum; negatum hominibus? Næ qui facinus hujusmodi imitari auit, faxim ut Picos qui aureos montes colunt, divitiis ille solus superet. Præ milite Plautino omnes eum sectaturas fœminas scilicet (22). - - - While I lived at Ingolstadt, I saw opposite to my study, a sparrow repeating the act of love twenty times, and afterwards so saint and wary that he fell to the ground, when he attempted to fly away. Unequal fortune! Why is this given to sparrows and denied to men? Truly, I will grant that he alone, who can imitate an action of this kind, surpasses in riches the Pici who live upon the golden mountains.

Take notice of these two things, 1. Those who took his part, denied that he was the author of that commentary on the Priapeia. 2. His reflexion about the pretended happiness of sparrows was enlarged upon, and made worse than it was. To prove the first head, I shall set down the words of the author of a small book, intituled *de tribus Capellis*: He was a Jesuit, as I have said in another place (23). 'De Commentario si tibi, Joseph, Scioppius hoc dicat: Scripsi fateor, commentarium in Priapeia: Sed septenum denum annorum puer, sed in hereticorum scholis institutus, sed exemplo tuo invitatus. Atque nollem id factum. Et si fas dicere (sed fas) cum illa scribebam, Optarem nullas tunc habuisse manus. Quid hoc autem, Burdo, dic, tua fide, ad rem attinet? Num tu idcirco Scaligerum te esse evinces, quia Scioppius nescio quid ineptiarum per ludum atque jocum puer verius, quam adolescens olim chartis illevisit, quod nunc ævi consiliique maturior, vero vultu damnat & opus. . . . Hoc igitur tibi si dicat ille, non te elinguem protinus, & Burdonem efficiat? Quid si autem dicat hoc Scioppius tibi quod dixit jam aliis prius, Non scripsi. Scripsit ea vero, inquit: certe vulgavit quidam quem dicere nolo, quia tu illum ignorare non potes (24). - - - If Scioppius should say to you, Scaliger, concerning his commentary: I confess that I writ the commentary upon the Priapeia: but I was a boy of seventeen years of age, but I was brought up in the schools of heretics, but I was prompted to it by your example. I wish that I had not done it. And if it be lawful for me to say so, (but it is lawful) I could wish that I had had no hands at the time when I writ those things. But tell me truly, you Burdo, what is that to the purpose? Will you therefore prove yourself to be Scaliger, because Scioppius long ago, whilst he was yet a boy rather than a young man, writ some foolish things which, now that his age and judgement are riper, he sincerely condemns. . . . If therefore Scioppius should speak in this manner to you, would not he presently strike you dumb like a Burdo as you are? But what if Scioppius should say to you, as he has said to others before, I did not write it. But it was written, says he, at least published by a certain person whom I will not mention, because you cannot but know him. One would think there are some oblique expressions in those words, that look like an acknowledgment of his fault; but at the bottom, they contain, a plain denial of his being guilty of it. Note, That Scioppius set to great value on the *tres Capellæ*, that he inserted that piece in one of his books (25). As to the second head, I need only quote the author of the *Censure de la Doctrine curieuse* of Father Garasse; these are his words: pag. 705. Garasse says, that a small book came out without the author's name, written by one of the new dogmatists, who considering the indefatigable heat of pigeons and sparrows in their fits of love, made a vow to renounce heaven, if G O D would be pleased to change him into a pigeon or into a sparrow. Garasse needs not trouble himself about the name of this new dogmatist:

It is his good friend Scioppius, that wonderful good man, that great wit, who makes this fine and pious wish in his commentaries, in Priap. pag. 63 (26). It is certain, that these words of Mr Ogier (27) contain a calumny against Scioppius; for this vow of renouncing heaven is not to be found in the place quoted by him.

I think I may say, that if one of Scioppius's books gave occasion to have an ill opinion of his morals, all his books in general shewed that he was not a debauched man; for if he had lost his time in making love and drinking, he could not have produced so many books. They must be the fruit of great labour, and required a continual and strong application to study, and the conversation of learned men. Accordingly we find, that he calls the professors of Altdorf and Ingolstadt to witness, that the life he had led was quite different from that of the youth whom they instructed (28). He mentions a poem that he published to exhort the rector Wesenbecius to suppress the debaucheries of the scholars. Cum Petrus Wesenbecius Jurisconsultus Academiæ Rector creatus fuisset, longum Scioppius carmen Noribergæ imprimendum dedit, quo corruptos juventutis mores acerbè describit, ipsumque Rectorem cohortatur, ut disciplinam restituere, frenu nimis laxata contrahere, nominatim vero christatorum peccatorum usu & nocturnis commessationibus juventutis concussationibus interdiceret Academicis vellet, in contumaces vero refractarios severe animadvertat (29). He alleges an epistle dedicatory, wherein he told us why he had so few friends, and why the scholars looked upon him as a Misanthrope: The reason of it was because he shunned their collations, their walks, and their drinking-bouts, and kept close in his study all day long. Frequentes istas adolescentibus computationes ut fugiam suadere mihi potest vel valetudinis ratio, quam diligenter cordi habeo, vel consilium quod à meis præceptoribus neglectus, & ceteroquin ingenio non nimis docili præditus jam olim cepi de studiis solidum diem ab usque mane ad vesperam sine ulla potu & cibo naviter persequendi, vel cura denique quam in majoribus meis imitandis ponere decrevi &c. Aliis itaque pro divinitate & facilitate ingenii sui, ad quæ ego impenso labore meo & indefesso studio adspiro nihil agendo vel commessando consequuntur, per me quidem potare, plurimisque sibi hac comitate suæ amicos parare licet: dum mihi vicissim hoc non ægre largiantur, ut quam illi ex couponis ego ex laboribus voluntatem capiam, & laudem continentie, ut ego voco, ut illi, Morositatis, à majoribus meis acceptam & in me transmissam, studiosè conservem &c (30). He was justly accounted an ill man; but his faults, like those of some other proud, satirical, and passionate learned men, were not irregularities of the body, but vices of the mind.

[C] The lofty titles he bestowed upon himself.] He was made Patrician of Rome, Knight of St Peter, counsellor to the Emperor, counsellor to the King of Spain, counsellor to the Archduke, Count Palatine (31); and lastly, he was adorned with the title of Count de Clara Valle.

[D] He wrote many sharp libels against the Jesuits under divers supposititious names.] It is affirmed in the book I have quoted several times (32), that before he changed his religion, he published some verses, wherein he called their society, *Iberam parricidalem cohortem*, - - - a Spanish cohort of parricides, and that afterwards he fell violently upon them in a piece that was seen at Rome by several people: Quos petulantissimo postea scripto quod Romæ plurimi viderunt, & è quo nulla hic adferri poterant, petiit. Mention is made of a fragment of a letter, importing, that he said long after his apostasy, that there were few learned persons, and very few honest men in that order (33). He answers as to the Poem, that he spoke of the Jesuits

(26) Censure de la Doctrine Curieuse, p. 190.

(27) He is the author of the Censure de la Doctrine Curieuse de Garasse.

(28) See the Amphotides, p. 40, & seq.

(29) Ibid. pag. 40, 41.

(30) Ibid. pag. 43, 44. See below remark [7].

(31) Vita & Parentes Schoppij, p. 156.

(32) Ibid. p. 146.

(33) Inter Jesuitas viros eruditos paucos, paucissimos bonos reperiri ait. Ibid. pag. 155.

(23) In the article MATMAN.

(24) Cornelius Denius Brugensis, in Capellis, pag. m. 320, 321.

(25) In the Amphotides Scioppius, which he published in 1611. I make use of that edition.

the princes to extirpate them by the most bloody means [E]. He was not contented to

(34) Oporinus Grubinius, Amphotides Scioppian. pag. 126.

(35) Ib. p. 129.

(36) Neque etiam ut multum Italici præfati & Græciensibus Jesuitis blandiatur animum inducere potest. Ibid.

(37) Ibid.

(38) Défense des nouveaux Chrétiens, Part. I, ch. i, Art. i, pag. m. 5.

(39) That is, the author of the Morale Pratique.

(40) Morale pratique, Tom. iii, pag. 124.

(41) Id. ibid. pag. 125.

fuits according to the notions Gifanius had given him of them; but he denies that those verses had been made public (34). He also denies (35) what is charged upon him in the fragment of the letter, and only confesses that he does not approve the conduct of the Jesuits in every thing, and cannot resolve to court them (36), though he acknowledges that God is the author of their institution, and that their society is not only of great use to Christianity, but also very necessary; so that he is sure that if they carefully observe their statutes, Herefy will be quickly destroyed. *Tamen Societatis Jesu institutum ab ipso deo auctore profectum, et tunc reipublice Christiane non modo summo opere utile, sed omnino etiam necessarium esse credit, cui si convenienter vivant, qui religio Sacramento ei se obstrinxerunt, propediem fore confidit, ut ad tibicines mittatur, Harcique lessus fiat, neque cuiquam sine scelere aliter videri posse, persuasum habet* (37). In order to know whether he altered his opinion, we need only read these words of Father le Tellier (38). *He (39) must not pretend to have the honour of being the first who formed the design of converting the Jesuits. The glory of it is due a long time ago to his worthy predecessor the famous Gaspar Scioppius, who writ so much upon that matter, making it the subject of several libels. It is no wonder that those, who have inherited his implacable hatred against the Jesuits, should be likewise acted by the odd and hypocritical zeal of that writer, the most furious and infamous calumniator that ever was, as every body confesses, and that they should tread in his steps to this very day.* Mr Arnauld, at whom these words were levelled, answered many things: I shall transcribe some of them. (40) Are you searchers of hearts? boldly to decide, that it was through an implacable hatred against the Jesuits, that Scioppius gave an ill character of your society in several books, and that if he shews any zeal for the Church, it can only have been an hypocritical zeal. If this be allowed, what virtue may not be cried down by making it pass for hypocrisy? (41) I am not concerned in the least for Scioppius's good or bad reputation. But since those, who abuse him most, acknowledge that he was a man of great parts, and a very learned Critic and Humanist, he deserves I should say something of him, and observe that whereas you do now furiously inveigh against him, you did formerly bestow great encomiums upon him. Scioppius had three sorts of enemies, who jointly cried him down as being too fatirical and passionate. The first were the Protestants, whom he had forsaken to turn Catholic, and particularly Joseph Scaliger, and his friends, who looked upon that pretended Prince of Verona as the hero of their sect. They were particularly offended because he had wounded their Scaliger in the most sensible part, by making his pretended descent from the Princes of Verona, pass for an idle story; and the most judicious persons are now agreed that he was in the right. His second enemies were the men of letters; he fell under their indignation by his too great fondness for the purity of the Latin tongue. Perhaps, no man since the age of Augustus knew better than he the niceties of that language. But he was so scrupulous that he could not endure any word should be taken in a different sense, from what it had at Rome in the best times, or that any other construction should be put upon it; hence it was that he found barbarisms and solecisms in most authors of this time, who pretended to write good Latin. He would have been serviceable to the common-wealth of learning, had he been contented to observe those faults in civil, gentle, and polite terms. But he did it in too harsh and shocking a manner, so far as to say that the taking of a certain word in a certain sense deserved Naticidium (42). This was, no doubt, very scandalous and pedantic; but it was no sufficient reason to give him so many hard words, and to call him the most cruel of all wild beasts. For those, who took too much pride, as well as he, in speaking good Latin, might have despised those mean things, and profited by his reproofs. But it is well known that Philologists are a sort of choleric people, that are very apt to fall into a passion for meer trifles; and that they are as much vexed at being reproached with a solecism, as if an honest man was accused of

having betrayed his friend: and because they know how to give hard words in a very fine style, they inspire many people with their passions. This is the chief reason why Scioppius has been so much cried down. His too free and too vehement criticisms, upon many authors that were the most esteemed for their style, have stirred up against him almost the whole posse of the Latinists. You, Fathers, have been his third and last enemies. But I must observe, that whilst he wrote only against the Protestants, the Scaligers, and the Philologists, you heaped praises upon him. Nay, you forgave him, though he blamed your method of teaching human learning; and you did not take it ill that he was praised and esteemed by Popes, Kings, and Emperors. He published a small piece in 1636, wherein, to vindicate himself against those who reviled him, he mentions a brief of Urban VIII, to the most Christian King, which is very much to his honour, and some other letters of the Emperor Ferdinand II, of his Catholic Majesty Philip IV, of the Dukes of Florence and Mantua, and some very advantageous testimonies of Cardinal Bellarmine, and many other Jesuits, who praise him for his wit, learning, eloquence, zeal, virtue, integrity, piety, religion, prudence, wisdom, and great knowledge of the true sense of the scripture; who profess to admire him as a man famous all over the world, and call him the king of learned men, *Perillustri viro Gaspari Scioppio eruditorem Regi.* Do you think, Fathers, you can easily make the public believe that a man, whom you have so much commended for so long a time, is become all of a sudden the most wicked man in the world; and that his zeal for the Church, which you highly extolled, is become an odd hypocritical zeal, because he has declared in some of his books what he blamed in your conduct, as so many persons eminent for their piety have done before and after him, such as Arias Montanus, Lanusa, Lewis Sotelo, Diego Colado, Dom John de Palafox, and many others? If he has been too sharp, and too passionate, if he has mentioned some matters of fact too scandalous, I do not pretend to justify him in that respect. But unless you give seven or eight pregnant instances of his falsities, you must not expect to be believed, when you call him the most furious calumniator that ever was.

Mr Baillet says, that Scioppius appeared in print under many false names, that he might attack with more impunity not only several private persons of great note, but chiefly the whole body of the Jesuits, against whom he wrote above thirty treatises, the very titles whereof are enough to strike us with horror. He promises to unmask him in his treatise of authors disguised under the names of Juniperus Anconitanus, Denius, A Fano Sancti Benedicti, Groppius, Grubinius, Hay, Krigloeder, Sotelo, Vargas, and some others (43). You will find in Placcius the titles of a prodigious number of books published or made ready for the press by Scioppius against the Jesuits (44).

[E] He solicited princes to extirpate the Protestants by the most bloody means.] You need only read the book he published at Pavia in the year 1619, with this title, *Gaspar Scioppii Consilii Regii Classicum belli sacri, sive Heldus redivivus, hoc est ad Carolum V. imperatorem Augustum Suavia de Christiani Caesaris erga Principes Ecclesie rebelles officio, deque veris compescendorum Hæreticorum Ecclesieque in pace collocandæ rationibus.* A Lutheran of Strasbourg (45) answered it, and his answer is worth the reading: it is intitled, *Tuba pacis occientia Scioppiano belli sacri classico, Salpistæ Theodosis Berenico, Norico, historiæ et patriæ studio.* See also Justus Meyerus's (46) treatise, intitled, *Juris publici capitalis questio, sint na Protestantes jure Casareo heretici et ultimo supplicio afficiendi, contra sanguinarium Gaspar Scioppii Classicum.* You may see likewise the book intitled, *Cancellaria Hispanica*, wherein you will find some extracts of that book of Scioppius (47). Note, that he boasts of having been the principal contriver of the Catholic League, which proved so prejudicial to the Protestants in Germany. Having published a list of his exploits, to let the public see in what manner he had improved the talents which God committed to him (48), he reckons in the seventh place, *Fœdus Catholicum in Germania, cujus primum auctorem & actorem*

(43) Baillet, Joann. sur les Critiques Gramm. num. 555.

(44) Placcius, Anonymus, ch. ix, nam. 248, p. 67, 68.

(45) Matth. Berneggerus, presbiter of Hystoria.

(46) Professor of the Civil-Law at Strasbourg.

(47) Adjecti sunt sub finem Flores Scioppiani ex Classico Belli sacri.

(48) Talenta Christi Gaspari Scioppiani ad negotiandum creata.

(42) See the passage quoted below in the remark [F].

to vent his rage against Scaliger, Casaubon (e), and du Pleffis Mornai [F], &c: he attacked even the King of England, without any regard [G]; which was the reason why the Ambassador of that Prince, at the court of Spain, made use of violent means against such an insolent writer, who afterwards boasted of the wounds [H] which it was thought he had received upon that occasion. Going through Venice in the year 1607, he had a conference with Father Paul, and endeavoured by promises and threatnings to bring him over to the Pope's party. That, and perhaps other reasons besides, occasioned his being imprisoned for some days. He was reproached with it; but the circumstances of his imprisonment were not well represented [I]. One of the things which he most pretended to, was a fine Latin style. He found out Barbarisms in

(e) See the remark [S].

* auctorem fuisse Scioppium, literis ipsius Cæsaris manu confcriptis, & Trevirensis Electoris testimonio doceri potest: sicut etiam Comes Tilius in poculi auri, quod ei donavit, inscriptione, fœderis illius primum auctorem appellat: qui scyphus apud Benedictinos Weingartenses etiamnum servatur (49). - - - The Catholic league in Germany, of which Scioppius was the principal author and manager, may be proved by a letter, written with the Emperor's own hand, and by the testimony of the Elector of Treves; as likewise Count Tili in the inscription of the gilded cup, which he gave him as a present, calls him the chief author of that league: which cup is still preserved in the convent of Benedictines at Weingart.

(49) See the book entitled, *Gaspar Scioppius de pœdia humanarum ac divinarum literarum*, p. 25.

[F] He vented his rage . . . against du Pleffis Mornai.] The fury with which he endeavours to turn him into ridicule (50) in his *Alexipharmacum Regium fœlli draconum* & *veneno aspidum sub Philippi Mornai de Pleffis nupta Papatus historia abdito oppositum*, & *Seren. D. Jacobi Magnæ Britannicæ Regi, sive Januariæ loco muneris missum* (51), is so excessive, that I do not think any thing more severe can be written against an author. I could, says he (52), make a pretty large volume of the solecisms, barbarisms, and other faults of elocution, which I have found in the *Mystery of Iniquity* (53); but I will spare the Calvinists the grief of seeing their Heclor deserving not only the ferula of Casaubon, the Prince of Pedants, *Alpha Cathedraliorum*, but also the rod of the meanest school-master, quem quicunque virgator ubere virgindemia afficiat, & multiplicem jactura natis expiare culpam cogat.

(50) Among other things for exhorting King James to make war against the Pope.

(51) It is a book in 4to of 79 pages, printed at Mentz in 1612.

(52) Pag. 32.

(53) That is, in the Latin edition.

[G] He attacked . . . the King of England, without any regard.] See among other books his *Ecclesiasticus auctoritatis Serenissimi D. Jacobi Magnæ Britannicæ Regis oppositum*, printed in the year 1611, and his *Calvary Regium Britannicæ Regi graviter ex oculis laboranti muneris missum*, printed the same year. But see particularly his *Corona Regia* (54); for I still maintain that he is the author of that piece (55). Ferrarius, who praised him so much, reproaches him with, what he reckons a great fault, his having lampooned and criticized upon all sorts of people, without even sparing the supreme powers, and crowned heads. Cum quæ de ejus ingenio, doctrina, immensisque in re literaria laboribus inficari non possit, quæ essent totius Orbis testimonio comprobata, veritatis accusationem nimiamque ejus ingenii asperitatem, judiciumque subalterum, omnibusque infestum arguebat. Nam ne ipsi quidem Regibus supremisque potestatibus unquam pepercisset, cum nimia, ac pœne Cynica detrahendi libidine omnes ordines non solum multo sale defricaret, sed in omnem verborum etiam prætextatorum amaritudinem effusus, ipsa literarum capita virosque superum cultu reverendos totis voluminibus concideret, asperisque facetiis jocum ac ludibrium faceret (56).

(54) See the article PUTEANUS, remark [F].

(55) See Ferrarius in Mantissa Anatomie Jeuiticæ, pag. 63.

(56) Octavio Ferrarius, in *Liberatorum funere*.

He was so insolent as to abuse King Henry IV, in a most outrageous manner in his *Ecclesiasticus*; which was the main reason why that book was burnt at Paris. See the Continuator of Thuanus's History in the fifth book, pag. 314, under the year 1612.

[H] He boasted of the wounds.] I have already quoted the book, wherein he gives an account how he had employed his talents: we find there, that the servants of the English ambassador set upon him at Madrid, in the year 1614, and that they cried out, thinking they had killed him, Well, well, we have at last made away with that great Papist. *Sicariorum undecim de familia Oratoris Anglici, qui cum anno 1614, Madridi Scioppium multis vulneribus, ut rebantur, confectum pro mortuo relinquerent, ita sibi per vias rem præclavæ gestam gratulantes audiebantur*: Euge, jam tandem magnum illum Papistam jugulavimus. *Quæ de re typis descripta extat Narratio, quæ Legatus Latino inscribitur* (57). Mr Colomies has published a letter,

(57) Gaspar Scioppius, *Pœdia humanarum ac divinarum literarum*, pag. 26.

wherein Scioppius declares that he has been persecuted by the Protestants, and that they have shot at him, and given him several thrusts, so as to believe they had killed him; but that, though he had rendered himself odious to the Heretics, for having stoutly maintained the ecclesiastical authority of the Pope, he should think himself to be a more pernicious Heretic than Luther and Calvin, if he should write according to Baronius's principles, in favour of the pretended power of the Pope over the temporalities of kings. *Io per difender l'Apostolato del Papa ho scritto tanti libri, quante forse nessun altro, e fui perseguitato da Protestanti, che mi tirarono delle archibugiate, e sfecate, & mi lasciarono per morto. Ma Dio mi guardi che non mi metta mai a dir una parola sola in difesa del Dominato, con che mi farei maggior heretico che Lutero & Calvino, si como piu volte con vostra D. Reverendissima mi sono dichiarato, e spero di morir buon Catolico Romano a dispetto della Corte Romana e di tutti i suoi adulatori* (58).

It appears from the last part of this passage, that Scioppius was not well pleased with the court of Rome. He had been saying (59) that it is very proper Baronius should be discredited, as an enemy to sovereign princes, and to acknowledge that the annals of that cardinal contain many falsities, and that a Benedictine Monk had collected two thousand of them (60). Scioppius spoke otherwise, when he wrote, against King James, his *Ecclesiasticus*, that was burnt at Paris. He glories in the disgrace of his book, and says that his effigies was hanged in England, in a farce that was acted before the king. Nay, he says the Protestant league declared, that the public good required Scioppius should be put to death; which was the reason why the ambassador of his Catholic Majesty sent him to Milan. Here follows the sixth article of the account which he gives of his administration.

(61) *Contemptus mortis: cujus specimen est Ecclesiæ & Sedis Apostolicæ defensio*. 1. *Contra Gallos à quibus Ecclesiasticus ejus publice crematus fuit, quem tamen librum Cardinalis Bellarminus, alique magni Theologi summis tulerunt laudibus*. 2. *Contra Regem Angliæ, cujus librum quatuor diversis libris editis profigavit: qui propterea scripto publico remedium ei violentum fuit comminatus, ejusque libros in foro exurendos curavit*. In *Mimo tandem, seu Comædiæ ludicro coram se acto personam ejus induci fecit, hancque in ipsum panem statui, ut faucibus ejus elisis animam per inferiorem gutturem exploderet* (62): *velut in Hæretici Elenchomeni præfatione videre est*. 3. *Contra Principes Protestantæ fœderis Hallensis socios, qui Rotemburgi in concilio decreverunt, ipsi Scioppio sublato omnino opus esse: quæ oratori Hispanico D. Baltasari Zunica causa fuit, ut cum Germania relicta Mediolanum concedere juberet, Insubricæque Præfidi salutem ejus literis accuratissime commendaret*.

[I] He was reproached with it, but the circumstances of his imprisonment were not well represented.] We must keep to Brother Fulgentius's narrative. Which is as follows (63): 'At the time that those disputes were adjusted at Venice, Gaspar Scioppius arrived there, a man well known in the world by the many books which he has published. He came from Rome in his way to Germany, as he said, whither he was going, as it was discovered, to carry a book injurious to the Republic, in order to get it printed there, with some other pieces full of impious things, as that of a certain Dominican Monk, called Thomas Campanella. . . . (64) Whether it was upon that account, or for some other unknown reason, it is certain, that he fell into disgrace, and was arrested by a public order, and detained three or four days, after which they commanded him to depart instantly. Before this misfortune happened to him, he had a conference with the Father, in which they discussed

(58) A letter of Scioppius to Father Fulgentius, Theologer of the Republic of Venice. It is dated from Padua the ninth of June 1636. Mr Colomies has inserted it in his *Observationes Juræ*, pag. 6, & 74.

(59) So bene che egli per ignoranza ed inadvertenza scrisse molte cose falsissime: di tal maniera che un Padre di San Benedetto, mio allievo, dice di haver raccolto due mila errori di suoi Annali, ed io giudico che importi non poco, che quest' uomo sia discreditato, come nemico della giurisdizione di tutti i Sovrani Principi, il quali volse ancora in temporalibus loggettare al Papa, *Ibid.* pag. 8.

(60) See what Patru says in the *Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres*, April 1684, pag. 117.

(61) Scioppius, *Pœdia*, p. 25.

(62) See Merici Casauboni *Pœdia*, pag. 23.

(63) Vie du Père Paul, pag. 191, *Leyden* 1661.

(64) *Ibid.* pag. 198.

(f) See the passage of Lambecius in the remark [K].

in the writings of the modern authors, that were the most esteemed for their eloquence, and did not even spare the most eloquent writers of ancient Rome [K]. He deserved and did not even spare the most eloquent writers of ancient Rome (f). This as a Grammarian the odious title that was given to Diogenes as a Philosopher (f). This is saying all. He had got himself so many enemies, that at last he was afraid he should not find a place of safety to retire into. It was to no purpose that he kept himself quiet at Padua, and was taken up with apocalyptic chimeras, wherewith he troubled Cardinal Mazarin [L], he did not for that cease to be in fear of some attempt upon his life. This inclines one to believe that there did not want a foundation for saying that he turned

‘couraged a long time about learning, and particularly about the doctrine of the Stoics, which he professed that he would retrieve from obscurity, and let it in the fairest and most advantageous light imaginable, as well as many other of his learned reflexions, intermixing therewith a great deal of state-affairs, and particularly such as concerned the Protestants of Germany. And then taking the Father aside, he represented to him, that the Pope, as being a great prince, had very long hands, and that therefore some misfortune would certainly happen to him, since the Pope thought he had been very much offended by him; and that he would have caused him to be killed, had he been willing to revenge himself in that manner. But that the Pope had no other design but to take him alive, causing him to be fetched away from Venice itself, in order that he might be conducted to Rome. Nevertheless Scioppius offered, if he would give him leave, to negotiate his reconciliation, with as much honour and advantage as he could desire; adding, that he was empowered to treat with the Princes of Germany, even about their conversion. The Father answered that he knew nothing he had done at which his Holiness had reason to be offended (65). . . . (66) That, as for the rest, he thanked him for his good affection, but gave himself no manner of trouble about his advices, and was resolved not in the least to depart from the interest of the public, since he had not undertaken the defence of it till he was fully assured of the justice of his cause. His two propositions, of causing the Father to be killed, or of carrying him away alive, seemed very strange, and almost incredible; but by what happened soon after, one may easily judge that Scioppius knew what he said, and that such designs had been formed against the Father long before. After he was gone from Venice, he wrote a satirical discourse, wherein mentioning his conference with the Father, he declared that he had found him to be a man neither unlearned nor timorous (67).’

(65) The words which I leave out contain the passage concerning self-murder, which I have set down in the article SAINT-CYRAN, citat. (6).

(66) Vie du Pere Paul, p. 195.

(67) See Vita & Parentes Gaspar. Scioppius, pag. 156.

(68) Ibid. p. 150.

(69) Scioppius Monaci jam effe & in transitu jus civitatis Venetæ adeptum biduana carceratione, cum Paulum Servitum insolentius ac minaciter allocutus suspensum fecisset. Lingelshelm, Epistola lxxx ad Bengarsium: It is dated the seventh of November 1607.

It appears from this account, that the friends of Scaliger were grossly mistaken, when they published that Scioppius went to Venice soon after the senate's proclamation against those who had endeavoured to assassinate Father Paul; and that Scioppius was arrested upon a suspicion that he had a hand in the assassination. *Venetiam profectus est. Promulgata erat paulo ante capitalis sententia in farios aliquos (assassinos vocant) qui Paulum illum Servitum, cujus scriptum pro asserione juris Venetæ Reip. in manibus omnium versatur, aggressi fuerant, & vulnera aliquot, quæ tamen levisia præter mentem eorum non essent, inflixerant. Eo ergo in tempore in urbem cum veniret, jussu magistratus in carcerem deductus est, quasi rei hujus confcius, aut qui alterius eo explorator venisset (68).* Such a falsity must needs have been prejudicial to Scaliger's cause; and the more, because he and his friends made it appear upon other heads, that they received bad memoirs concerning Scioppius. Had they consulted Lingelshelm, they might have known that Scioppius was not arrested on account of Fra-Paolo's assassination; but because he had made himself suspected, by reason of the haughty and threatening words which he made use of in a conversation with that Servite (69). Scioppius says he was arrested, upon information that he was the author of a book injurious to the Republic of Venice; and that he was going to negotiate against it in the Pope's name, with some princes of Germany. *Fidem habuerunt Julio Adolpho Weiserhemio, homini Saxoni, qui . . . clam ad eos detulit Scioppium auctorem esse libri cujusdam pro Pontifice adversus ipsos scripti & Monachii typis impressi, hoc titulo, Nicodemi Macri Romani cum Nicolao Crasso Veneto disceptatio, &c. (quod quidem opus perpetuo sale ut facietia diffusus, & eruditiois varietate admirabile, præ quo Ivo tuus Villoma-*

rus nec bisere auferet, multi docti viri non nisi à Scioppio profecti potuisse persuasum habebant) & tunc quoque Pontificis missu ad Principes quosdam in rempublicam ipsorum inflammandos in Germaniam profecti (70). It is certain, that Scioppius writ that book: Rhodius and Placcius are mistaken in ascribing it to a professor of Bologna called Ascanius Perius (71). See the Visiera Alzata (72) of Peter James Villani of the Academy of the Humoristi, Geniali, & Infucundi.

[K] He did not even spare the most eloquent author of ancient Rome. Read these words of Balzac ‘The accuser of Cicero, about whom you desire to be informed, is the dreadful Scioppius. He has published a book at Milan, in which he accused Cicero of improprieties and barbarisms. There is but one copy of it in France, and Messieurs Du Puy lent it me when I was at Paris. This injustice done to Cicero would prove a consolation to Scaliger, if he was to return again into the world. But I expect that the same Scioppius will shortly put out another book, wherein he will undertake to prove that Cato was a wicked man, and Julius Cæsar a bad soldier (73).’ When he was but twenty years of age, he found out that Phædrus favoured sometimes of the barbarousness of Thrace his native country (74). It is therefore no wonder, that he should accuse (75) Scaliger, Liptius, Casaubon, Thuanus, Possevin (76), Vossius, Strada, &c. of incongruity of speech. His criticisms are sometimes well-grounded, but not always.

See what the learned Borrichius wrote against him, in defence of Vossius and Father Strada (77). A Jesuit (78) of the college of Rome made an apology for the latter, but I do not know whether it has been printed. Those who affirm magisterially, that certain phrases are meer barbarisms and solecisms, venture very much; for how often have the words and expressions, which they condemned, been shewed to them in classical authors? The difficulty that is to be found in such kind of disputes (79), will plainly appear to those, who will be at the pains to examine the books of John Vorstius, *De Latinitate merito aut falso suspecta*; those of Christopher Cellarius, *De Latinitate mediæ & infimæ ætatis*, and *De barbarismis & idiotismis sermōnis Latini*; and those which Vossius, Borrichius, &c. have published upon that subject. But to return to Scioppius, I must observe that he promised a book, intitled *Hercules Coprophorus*, wherein he had collected a vast number of barbarisms and solecisms: It was there that he was to shew (80) the faults of Julius Cæsar Scaliger's stile. Observe well these words of Lambecius; they fully represent the cavilling and troublesome humour of that critic. ‘Homo, ut notissimum est, ingenii maligni, & oris maledicentissimi, qui propter præstantissimum & de re literaria optime meritum virorum invidas ac injurias calumniationes, merito Canis Grammaticus appellatur (81). . . . A man, as is very well known, of a malignant genius, and of a most slanderous tongue, who on account of his spiteful and injurious way of calumniating men, that are truly excellent and famous for their learning, is justly called the grammatical Cur. See the margin (82).’

His boldness in criticising upon the stile or the expressions of Cicero, will be less surprising, if it be considered, that this father of eloquence has been censured by such men at all times. Their number is incredible. See the preface to the book intitled, *Cicero à calumniis vindicatus*, written by Andreas Schottus: It is a very curious piece; the eighth chapter is an answer to those who pretend that Cicero is guilty of solecisms.

[L] Apocalyptic chimeras, wherewith he troubled Cardinal Mazarin. This is a particular not very well known. Naudé, in order to refute those who complained that the cardinal did not answer all the letters that

(70) Oporium Grubinius, ubi supra, pag. 163.

(71) See Placcius, de Anonymia & Pseudonymia, in Appendice, pag. 33.

(72) The Journal of Leipzig, for the month of June 1690, pag. 363, mentions it.

(73) Balzac, Letter xii, to Chaplain, Aug. ii, dated the 22d of April 1637.

(74) See Schoffius in the Life of Phædrus. That author is mistaken in the preface, wherein he calls Scioppius Conrad, instead of Gaspar.

(75) See his Scaliger hypobolismus, and the Tract de Scilo Historico.

(76) The Physician who wrote a History of the house of Gonzaga, &c.

(77) It is the Appendix of the book intitled, Olai Borrichii Cogitationes de varia Latine Lingue ætatis & scripto . . . Vossii de Vitiis Sermonis.

(78) Called Pierucci. See Borrichius, ibid. p. 268.

(79) See the Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, for May 1701, pag. 517.

(80) See his Alexipharmacum Regium.

(81) Lambecius, apud Magrum, Eponymolog. Critico, pag. 740.

(82) Mr Grævius has very well described the satirical humour of Scioppius in his preface to the works of Daniel Eremita, printed at Utrecht in 1701.

turned his eyes toward Holland, and expressed some desire of going back to the communion of the Protestants [M]. Authors do not agree about the year wherein he died;

(83) Naudé Dialogue de Malcusi, pag. 454.

(84) Ib. p. 455.

(85) That book of Naudé was written in 1649.

that were written to him, says (83), 'That the office of first minister in France . . . is like a net, in which all mad, melancholy, hypochondriac, and extravagant men are caught; like a rock, on which the ship of fools (*navis illa narragomia seu Stultifera Brentii*) splits; and like a load-stone, which attracts all the visionaries that are in the kingdom. So that if the first minister was obliged to read all the chimerical designs, all the extravagant proposals, and all the ridiculous and impertinent advices of those men, he would not have time enough to read and examine them, though he should lay aside his most serious affairs, to mind none but those. . . . (84) I have known within these five years (85), three men of great virtue, and extraordinary learnings, of whom the first, who is Cattius, a canon of the city of Arras, maintains, that there is a mountain of gold in Palestine, which the holy scripture promises to Christians, when they shall have conquered the Turks; and that God will have a new temple built for him in the middle of Jerusalem: He has got the plan of that temple engraved, with all the proofs and explications of his opinion, taken from holy writ. The second, who is Scioppius, a person sufficiently known all over Europe, pretends that no father or doctor of the church did ever understand the holy scripture better, or by means thereof more certainly know the end of the world, and the mysteries of St John's Revelation than he: and the third, called Dr Colombi, is now busy to get a general council assembled, wherein the pretensions of the king of France to Navarre and Franche Comté, may be decided in his favour, and has even drawn up all the decrees and canons, which it will be requisite to make for that purpose. As I have seen part of the writings which those three men have sent to the cardinal, with a view to support their chimerical designs by his authority; I am perfectly well assured, that if the cardinal had been so injudicious as to mind them, they would have cut out more work for him than his best secretary could have dispatched. And because every body pretends to be a politician, foolish and extravagant men must needs be more numerous among those of that profession, than among others: Which does likewise multiply the number of advices, counsels, designs, memoirs, and such like pieces, which are all equally impertinent, and alike proper to make the ministers to whom they are addressed lose their time, if they should be simple enough to mind them. And yet because they are not so, and because their experience and knowledge of affairs enable them to know immediately, *quid solidam crepet*, - - - *what things have a solid appearance*; those hypochondriac and melancholy gentlemen, thinking themselves repulsed, take from thence occasion to blame them, and to say, that they do not answer letters of consequence, for they look upon their follies as things of great moment, *juxta illud*, - - - *according to the saying*,

Quisquis amat ranam, ranam putat esse Dianam.

A frog to him who such a thing esteems,

No more a frog, but fair Diana seems.

That they neglect great affairs, and the certain means of getting money, of making peace, and of saving the kingdom, to mind trifling things, and to play with monkeys. And it happens, by reason of their many complaints and clamours, that a poor minister, whose business sometimes gives him no breathing time, is accused of not discharging the duties of his office, of too much indulging his pleasures, of neglecting the letters and advices he receives, and of being unworthy of such a post: In short, if they were to be credited,

Collige farcinulas dicet libertus & exi,

Jam graves es nobis.

Pack up your baggage, shall the steward say,

And go, for you are burthenfome, away.

Several people will doubtless blame me for not leaving out what does not belong to Scioppius in this long passage; but I refer them to many other readers, who will be very well pleased with the reflexions of Gabriel Naudé which I have quoted.

Such was the fate of Scioppius: After he had spent many years in censuring, biting, and defaming every body, he applied himself to the prophecies of the holy scripture; he looked for the key of them, and flattered himself that he found out the key which St Peter left, which no body had discovered till then (86). Weary of so many engagements, and of the many blows he had given and received, he shut himself up in that tower, he fixed upon that work and imposed this upon himself for the task of his old age. A happy man, if he wholly left off his satirical humour, and had no desire of exciting people to great revolutions, by telling them that the promises contained in the Apocalypse would be shortly fulfilled. All those who have concerned themselves in such an undertaking, did not stay, as he did, till they were weary of their slanders: On the contrary, some made their weapons sharper by it, and grew more satirical; others designed only to excite the passions, and to stir up the people. You will find the plan of Scioppius's book, in a letter written by him from Padua, the twentieth of February 1642. It appears from it, that great things were to happen in a short time, and that he brought the art of prophesying into a system. *Quatuor libellos*, said he (87), *istis indicibus seu titulis jam confectos habeo*. 1. *Fons sapientiæ intus ad digito monstratus, hoc est, Eclogæ ex Sacra Scriptura & sanctis Patribus de Sacra Scriptura studio, ejusque studii necessitate, utilitate, adjumentis & temporibus*. 2. *Clavis scientiæ ad aperienda regni cælorum mysteria propediem consummanda, hoc est; specimen Exegeseos Prophetiæ in Psal. xlv*. 3. *Annunciatio regni Christi ac populi Christiani in orbem terræ futurum usque ad novissimum annorum & expeditionem Gog & interfectionem ejus*. 4. *Systēma artis prophetandi, continens ejus artis finem, officia, materiam subjectam & instrumenta, exemplo Galeni in systēmate artis medicæ*.

[M] That he expressed some desire of going back to the communion of the Protestants.] Mr Arnauld could not believe it. 'There is one thing that would give a very ill opinion of Scioppius, if it were true: viz. That he had a mind, in his old days, to enter into articles with the Dutch, about his religion, and that accordingly he writ to Leyden, that he would turn Protestant if they were willing to receive him. But this is so unlikely, that the bare authority of Hornius is not sufficient to make us believe it. He expresses in all his books so much zeal for the Catholic religion, and so great an aversion for heretics, that it is highly improbable he intended to return to his first religion. Besides, he was a man of so great parts, not to mention his noble birth, that if he had been mean enough to entertain such a thought, he would have found but too many Protestant princes ready to receive him with open arms, without being obliged to ask a livelihood of the professors of Leyden, whom he had cruelly offended by his usage of Joseph Scaliger, their hero and their idol. This is all that I could say, not having Hornius's book by me. But I have just now received the whole passage of that author, which I have inserted at the bottom of the page, because the bare reading of it is sufficient to hinder us from giving any credit to it; it is so full of passion and fury against the Catholics in general, and Scioppius in particular, accusing the former of a barbarous design of murdering all the Protestants, and the latter, of being the promoter of that cruel resolution (88). Here follows the passage that was sent to Mr Arnauld: I take it from the 386th page of George Hornius's *Ecclesiastical History* (89), continued and commented upon by Mr Leydecker. 'Nunquam res Evangelicorum in majori positæ erant difcrimine, quam post illam Bohemiorum calamitatem. Jesuitæ enim jam quasi *parta de Univerſa Germania*, imo omnibus Evangelicis, victoriâ, insolenter triumphabant, ac nil nisi cædem Protestantium sperabant, quodam flagitiosissimo *Grammatico*, & ob scelera *Athorſi* Noricorum commissa infami, Gaspare Scioppio,

(86) Me jam exegesi seu prophetia scripturæ (quam S. Petrus vocat) plus quingenta folia expleville, ea ipsa clave ad aperienda ejus mysteria usum quam idem Apostolus nobis reliquit vix tamen à quoquam adhuc intellectum. Scioppius, *Epist. ad Vossium*. It is the 334th among the letters written to Vossius, pag. m. 225.

(87) Sciopp. *Epist. ad Vossium*, pag. 225.

(88) *Morale pratique*, Tom. iii, ch. vi, pag. 129, 130.

(89) *Edit. Lugd. Bat.* 1687. I shall observe for the benefit of those who have another edition, that this passage is to be found numero 6, of the third article of the third period.

died, but I think his death ought to be placed in the year 1649 [N]. It cannot be denied that he was a very learned man; and had he had as much moderation and probity as he had learning and wit, he would be justly reckoned one of the heroes of the common-wealth of learning. His application to study, his memory, the multitude of his books, the quickness of his parts, his eloquence, and his ascendant over his enemies [O], are surprising things: but his victories cost him dear, for he was

Schoppio, ex Palatinatu superiore Neagora oriundo, fed indigno, qui tam præstanti nationi apud posteros accensetur, (five, ut se appellari Italice malebat Scioppio) homine in apostasiam prolapsio, classicum canente & totale excidium Protestantium promittente, ac suadente: qui tamen nihil nisi miserabilis literator fuit, ut opera ejus inepta & maligna ostendunt, ac extrema senectâ, scriptis Patavio, ubi præ Jesuitarum, vitæ ejus infidantium, metu delitescerebat, Leidam literis, transitionem iterum ad evangelicos offerebat, si in gratiam reciperetur, sed rejectus Apostata contentusque ob vanitatem fuit. . . . The affairs of the Evangelics were never in a more dangerous situation, than they were after that calamity of the Bohemians. For the Jesuits, as if they had obtained a complete victory over all Germany, nay over the whole body of the Evangelics, triumphed insolently, and meditated nothing less than a massacre of the Protestants; a certain Grammarian of a most wicked life, and infamous on account of the crimes which he had committed at Aldorf, I mean Gaspar Schoppius, born at Neagora in the Upper Palatinate, though unworthy that posterity should reckon him to be of that noble nation, (or as he rather chose to be called after the Italian manner Scioppius) a man that had apostatized, founding the charge, and promising and advising the total destruction of the Protestants: who nevertheless was no more than a miserable smatterer in learning, as it evidently appears from his foolish and spiteful productions; when he was extremely old, he wrote letters to Leyden from Padua, (where he was lurking for fear of the Jesuits, who had designs against his life) in which letters he offered to return to the Protestants, if he could be received into favour, but the Apostate was rejected and despised on account of his vanity. I have hardly read any author, who mentions this design of Scioppius, without quoting Hornius for it. Which makes me apt to think, that no other authority can be alledged; and I doubt one voucher is not sufficient in a fact of such a nature. I have heard a learned Lutheran say, that Scioppius's letters, upon that subject have been in Boetclerus's hands. But why then were they not published; for it is well known, that many people look upon Hornius's narrative as a meer fable? It is at least an infiduciation, which deserved to be censured by the academical senate. One cannot say, that the most illustrious university of Leyden rejected Scioppius's offers, without doing them wrong. Such a conduct would have been neither consistent with human prudence nor Christian charity. It would have been a glorious thing for the Protestants to regain such a man; besides, ought not the Church to open her arms at all times to her revolted children? Must she not, like the good shepherd, go in search of all the sheep that are gone astray? Much more would she be guilty, if she shut the door against the sheep, that are willing to return into the fold. Was it an impossible thing for Scioppius to repent? Could it be certainly determined that his request was a trick? But, however that was, might they not have taken care to prevent his doing any mischief. Take notice, that he observes in his letters to Vossius, that the prophetic books which he desired to publish, contained nothing contrary to the Church of Rome. He gives plainly to understand, that he acknowledges the injustice and usurpation of the court of Rome, but he says nothing whereby it appears that he intended to retire among the Protestants. Vix autem sperare audeo, fore ut quicquam istorum in Italia edendi venia mihi detur, non quod quicquam in eis vel decretis Romanæ Ecclesiæ de fide, vel bonis moribus adversetur, sed quod mores Curie Romanæ omnes Ecclesiæ leges jam olim in potestatem suam perduxerint, nec jam quicquam fas sit quicquam tale dicere aut scribere, quale ipsi Pontifices in D. Bernardo, Brigitta & Catharina Senensi non modo verè recteque dictum falsi sunt, sed etiam pro saluberrimo fidelium dogmate religiosè observari voluerunt (90). Observe also, that this letter con-

(90) Scioppius, Epist. ad Vol. sum, p. 225, 226: It is dated the 20th of February 1642.

tains all sorts of civilities, and several marks of confidence with respect to Vossius.

[N] His death ought to be placed in the year 1649 (91). It will appear from the following words of

Mr Baillet, that few people know when Scioppius departed this life. This uncertainty would have vexed him, had he foreseen it, when he made so great a noise all over Europe. (92) I have not been able hitherto to know precisely in what year he died. Mr

Patin, the father, says it was in 1649. Mr † Lambecius tells us he was writing books still in 1652. Others

seem to say that he lived beyond the year 1660. Mr † Galois, speaking of him in 1665, says he had

been lately dead. Mr † Conigius writing in 1678, has these words, Paucis ab hinc annis vivere desit, -

he ceased to live a few years ago. To which I add, that others place his death in the year 1663 (93).

Of all those writers, Mr Patin is he who comes nearest to the truth; for it is certain Scioppius died in the

year 1649. Ferrarius speaks of him, as of a man who was no longer alive, in a speech (94) which he

delivered in the sixteenth year of his professorship at Padua (95). But he began to be a professor in that

university in the year 1634 (96), and therefore he said so in 1650. From whence it ought to be concluded

that Patin had not been ill informed about the year in which Scioppius died, when he wrote the following

passage, on the thirteenth of July, 1649. (97) This year proves very fatal to men of letters: since

Mr Hofman's and Mr Pietre's decease, we have also lost Mr des Yveteaux, who had been the late king's

preceptor; Mr Justel, secretary to the king, a learned man, who did formerly belong to the Marshal

de Bouillon. Besides, Vossius and Spanheim are dead in Holland; Paganinus Gaudentius in Italy,

and likewise Gaspar Scioppius, who wrote about forty-three years ago a very infamous book against

the incomparable Joseph Scaliger. This Scioppius was a Lutheran in his youth; he turned Roman

Catholic by reading Baronius's Annals, as he said. Afterwards he went to Rome; where he was a domestic of Cardinal Madrucio's. He had a mind

then to turn Jesuit (98); but the society were of opinion that it was better for him to remain a lay-

man, and that he could do them greater services, which he actually did by writing against Scaliger.

He made some journeys for them to Germany and Venice in disguise (99). Afterwards he had a pension from the emperor: but at last he declared

himself an enemy to the emperor and the Jesuits, and went to Padua for the safety of his person,

where he lived secure from all his enemies, having obtained a pardon for his past life from the Republic of Venice. He is suspected to be the most con-

siderable author of many small pieces published against the Jesuits within these fifteen years, and

among others, of the Anatomia Societatis, & de Stragematis Jesuitarum. He formerly told one of his friends, who is also very much mine, that Cardinal

Baronius had solicited him by letters, when he was in Germany, to turn Catholic, and promised, in

that case, to procure him a Cardinal's hat (100); and that Baronius himself hoped to be made Pope

after Paul V.

[O] His application to study, his memory, the multitude of his books . . . his ascendant over his enemies.]

Ferrarius tells us, in the passage which I am going to cite, that he studied night and day; that during the

fourteen last years of his life he kept himself shut up in a little room, and that his conversation with

those that went to visit him, run only upon learning; that, like another Ezra, he might have restored the holy Scripture, if it had been lost; and that

he repeated passages of it at a breath for several hours together with such a memory, that those who heard

dined at Amberg with the Prince of Anhalt, governor of the Palatinate, and was kindly used by him. See *Amphibol. Sci. pp. pag. 129, 130.*

(91) *As Mr Witte does, in Diario Biographico.*

(92) Baillet, *États célèbres, Art. 69.*

(93) In his Letters.

(94) Tom. i. Bibl. Vind. Cel. cap. l. lib. i.

(95) Journal des Savans.

(96) Bibl. vet. & nov.

(97) Obiit anno 1663 octogenario major. *Pape Blount, Confessio Auditorum, pag. 692.* He would have lived eighty seven years if he had lived till 1663.

(98) That which is intitled *Funus Literarum.*

(99) Per exedim annos in Patavino Gymnasio . . . Rhetorica partes implet. *Ibid. circa fin.*

(100) Carolus Patinus in Lyceo Patavino, p. 15.

(91) *As Mr Witte does, in Diario Biographico.*

(92) Baillet, *États célèbres, Art. 69.*

(93) In his Letters.

(94) Tom. i. Bibl. Vind. Cel. cap. l. lib. i.

(95) Journal des Savans.

(96) Bibl. vet. & nov.

(97) Obiit anno 1663 octogenario major. *Pape Blount, Confessio Auditorum, pag. 692.* He would have lived eighty seven years if he had lived till 1663.

(98) That which is intitled *Funus Literarum.*

(99) Per exedim annos in Patavino Gymnasio . . . Rhetorica partes implet. *Ibid. circa fin.*

(100) Carolus Patinus in Lyceo Patavino, p. 15.

(97) *Guy Patin, Letter xv, of the 1st edition, and xxii of the 2d, page 96, of the first volume, Edit. of Geneva 1691.*

(98) Others say he was a Jesuit, and that he left that order. See Mr Baillet, *Jesuits, on the Critic-Grammarians, num. 535.* It is a mistake. See *Amphibol. Sciopp. p. 169.*

(99) This seems to be false: The first journey he made into Germany was after his turning Roman Catholic, was in the year 1607, when he was arrested at Venice for some days. He appeared in Germany with pomp, and as being in the service of the Archduke Ferdinand. (See *Vita & Peritum Gasparis Scioppii, p. 155, 156.*) Nay he

(100) See *Amphibol. Scioppianæ, pag. 169.*

(90) Scioppius, Epist. ad Vol. sum, p. 225, 226: It is dated the 20th of February 1642.

(91) *As Mr Witte does, in Diario Biographico.*

(92) Baillet, *États célèbres, Art. 69.*

(93) In his Letters.

(94) Tom. i. Bibl. Vind. Cel. cap. l. lib. i.

(95) Journal des Savans.

(96) Bibl. vet. & nov.

(97) Obiit anno 1663 octogenario major. *Pape Blount, Confessio Auditorum, pag. 692.* He would have lived eighty seven years if he had lived till 1663.

(98) That which is intitled *Funus Literarum.*

(99) Per exedim annos in Patavino Gymnasio . . . Rhetorica partes implet. *Ibid. circa fin.*

(100) Carolus Patinus in Lyceo Patavino, p. 15.

was strangely abused; nay, he mistrusted sometimes his dreadful pen [P]. He had the whole Bible at his fingers end (g). It is not true that he would not suffer his picture to be drawn [Q]. He left behind him several manuscripts which are very

(g) See Ferrarius's words in the remark [O].

him could not sufficiently admire him, especially considering that he drew from them very singular doctrines, and such as were unknown to the most learned. The number of his books exceeded the number of his years. Ferrarius having mentioned the interest he had with the Popes and several princes, and the public employments bestowed upon him, goes on thus (101): *De nec inanium pertæsus in se ipsum recederet, & partim Mediolani, partim in hac Urbe (102) victurus, æternum libris bonæ fidei posteritatis negotium transgeret. Eos libris in ore famæ in commendatione omnium versari. Quumque per omnes fere disciplinas capax ingenium circumtulisset, duo tamen in ipso exemplo satis exprimi, nedum laudari posse, judicii vim in aliorum scriptis æstimandis, & ad latinæ orationis censuram exigendis miram, atque exactam, tantam vero sacrarum literarum peritiam, quantam fortasse nullus ad hanc diem, quantamque nemo credat, qui illam auribus non usurparit. Ut, quod olim de Efdra dictum est, deperditos linguæ sanctæ Codices solus reparare potuerit. Scilicet usque ad extremam senectutem, nuntio rebus humanis remisso, noctu dique in sacrarum literarum commentatione incredibili labore versatum ut ipsum aduentibus per plures horas uno veluti spiritu infinita sacræ paginæ loca inusitata memoriæ felicitate suppetebant, atque attentius repræsentaret, atque ex ipsi divinæ sapientiæ penetralibus arcana etiam doctissimis ignorata exprimeret. Nimirum cum raro alias prodire in publicum sole-ret, extremis temporibus quatuordecim annos domo, ac ferme angusto cubiculo clausum diebus noctibus jungentem lucubrare perpetuo solitum, cumque à doctis inviseretur, ne unquam à literis abscederet variis, ac festiuis de re literaria sermonibus profundæ eruditionis fructus uberrimos communicare consuevisse, huncque ipsi ludum, hoc otium, hoc laborum le-vamen semper fuisse. Nec mirum si etate exacta plures libros à se confectos, quam annos numeraret, ejusque opera vel magnam Bibliothecam instruere possent, ipsæ vivæ ac perambulantes Bibliotheca merito appellaretur.*

The ascendant he had over his adversaries is a kind of prodigy. I have quoted above a passage out of Mr Baillet in his book concerning famous children, wherein that author confesses (103), that G O D did almost in every thing reward his indefatigable labour with great success; the sequel of that passage runs thus (104): G O D permitted not that his excessive labours should occasion his death, or prejudice his health; but was pleased to let him live in the world for the space of twenty olympiads, and perhaps more (105), for the execution of his designs, and the trial of many people.

[P] For he was strangely abused; nay, he mistrusted his pen. Soon after the publication of the Scaliger Hypobolimus, some outrageous pieces came out against him. Baudius took Scaliger's part in verse, and Heinsius (106) in prose. Another author made a bloody satire, intitled, *Vita & parentes Gasparis Scioppij*. Scaliger did not remain idle: he published *Confutatio Fabulæ Burdonum*, under the name of Janus Rustgerfius, which he denoted only by the initial letters J. R. (107). Barthius came in for one, and wrote three satires against Scioppius, which I have mentioned in another place (108). Here follow the titles of some other pieces against the same man. *Alberti de Albertis Lydius lapidis ingenii, spiritus ac morum Gasparis Scioppij. Ejusdem Vindiciæ generales adversus famo-sos Scioppij Libellos in Jesuitarum, at Munich, 1649, in 12mo. Henrici Wottoni Epistola de G. Scioppio cui propter argumenti similitudinem etiam alia adjecta sunt, at Amberg, 1637.* One of the chief writers for the Jesuits against him was Father Laurence Forerus, who published *Grammaticus Proteus, arcanorum Societatis Jesu Dædalus delolatus, & genuino suo vultu repræsen-tatus: accessit aularium animadversionum in Gasparis Scioppij Ecclesiasticam Astrologiam, at Ingolstadt, 1636, in 8vo. Appendix ad Grammaticum Proteum quid de relatione Alphonfi de Vargas sit sentiendum, in the same place, and in the same year, in 8vo.* 'The Je-suits, they are Mr. Baillet's words (109), represent him as the greatest knave, and the most profligate man in the world, and as the public pest of learning and of human society. And indeed the greatest men of that time complained of him, almost all with

one voice, Catholics, Heretics, and even the Deists, and all of them voted for his proscription, because he attacked every body without distinction, defamed the most honest men with as much pleasure as impudence, and took a pride in neither sparing quality nor merit.' Ferrarius, who praised him so much, acknowledges that he was forced to hear very unpleasant stories (110).

I have said that he did not always trust his pen: the thing is this. A pretender to great matters in the common wealth of learning took delight in abusing Scioppius, and placing him in the lowest rank of men of letters. He even threatened to write a book against him, which should convict him in the eyes of the whole world to be nothing but a mere ignoramus. Scioppius sent him word that he should hold his tongue, and that if he continued to vex him, he would bring himself into trouble, not in the court of Parnassus, before the Muses, but before the tribunal of the Magistrates; that Scioppius laying down the weapons of learning, would employ no other writings against him, but such as the records of Bologna could afford him; that he would take care to get a copy of the information and sentence, whereby that man was convicted of several crimes. These are, said he, the arms I shall make use of, if he continues to be troublesome to me. When the man had been threatened thus, he gave over the design of writing against Scioppius, but continued to speak ill of him. Nicus Erythræus relates the thing very handsomely; the reader will be glad to see his Latin; the thing would want some of its principal beauties if I did not give it in my author's own terms. 'Cum de singulis, de trahendi gratia, maledice contumelioseque loquere-tur, Gasparem vero Scioppium, qui in literaria Rep. in primis ordinibus numeratur, imi subiectioni virum, atque inter literatos proletarios, ut ita dicam, referendum esse aiebat; quem ille Scioppium, quoniam in quodam libello sua tempora, quasi literatis viris non amica, modeste reprehenderat, cepit contumelias omnibus lacerare, atque palam eum infantem, rudem, & omnino omnis eruditionis expertem atque ignarum asserere, minitaturque, se libro edito ejus infamiam palam omnibus facturum. At Scioppius misit illi, qui diceret, si sibi amplius molestus esset, non se pugnaturum cum eo eloquentiæ doctrinæque armis, sed dictis testium, ac sententiis judicum, in publicas tabulas relatis, quibus Bononiæ, malorum facinorum argutus, evictus, ac condemnatus fuisset; his se armis curaturum, ut ejus projecta ad detrahendum bonis viris audacia infringeretur, ac retunderetur. Hic auditis, a scribendi contra illum sententia destitit, seque tantum intra verba continuit (111).' This may be looked upon as a very mortifying disgrace for Scioppius. Properly speaking, Zoilus Ardelio triumphed over him; for when a man of letters, in a dispute of learning, has recourse to magistrates, bailiffs, and attorneys, it is a sign he mistrusts his pen and his knowledge. He changes the state of the question; he shuns the fight, he dares not enter the list with his antagonist (112).

[Q] It is not true that he would not suffer his picture to be drawn. Thomas Bartholinus says, that Scioppius would never suffer his picture to be drawn or engraved, tho' his friends desired it; and he conjectures that this was owing to his fear of enchantments. But because he is mistaken as to the fact (113), his conjecture ought not much to be minded. However I shall set down his words, which contain some other examples that are a little more certain (114). 'Adduci nunquam potuit. Gaspar Scioppius, quamquam sæpe ab amicis rogatus, ut effigiem suam vel coloribus picturæ vel æri cælatorum committeret. Nescio an fascino metu, quod adversariorum, quos & magnos & multos habuit, prestigias timeret. Hinc maluit cum Actio Poeta, voluminum non imaginum certamina exercere. Certe nec Palestrinus, nec Velfrus (115) nec Pinellus, Viri magni se vivos depingi voluerunt, sicut Calceolarius in Musco prodidit. . . . Gaspar Scioppius could never be prevailed upon, tho' he was often importuned by his friends, to suffer his picture to be

(110) Ita multum in se odit concelle ut aemulas ipse quoque historias audire cohercet, bellique plerumque civilibus Mulierum pacem inquietaret. Ferrarius ubi supra.

(111) Nicus Erythræus. Pinacoth. I, p. 241. He speaks of one Zoilus Ardelio. It is doubtful a just position name.

(112) Compare with this what shall be said in the remarks [D] and [E] of the article THO-MAS.

(113) Scioppius, mentions his Print. p. 51, and 100, of his *Am-plius Scioppia-næ*. It may be seen in Frehe-rus's *Theatrum*, pag. 766.

(114) Thom. Bartholin. d. le-gendis Libris, pag. 63, 66.

(115) I speak of it in the remark [G] of his article.

(101) Oslavius Ferrarius, in Prolusione cui titulus Funus Literatorum.

(102) That is, at Padua.

(103) Baillet, *Enfances célèbres*, Art. 69.

(104) Ibid.

(105) Mr Baillet, *Jugum des Scavans, sur les Crit. Gramm.* num. 435, says he lived above eighty years: it is certain he lived but seventy-three.

(106) It is he who made the satire intitled, *Hercules tuam fidem five Munsteris hypobolimus, and another piece intitled, Virgula divina five Apotheosis Lucretii Vespillonia.*

(107) See Thomafius, *Præfat. in Orationes* Mureti, p. 24.

(108) In the article BARTHO-LINUS, rem. [Q].

(109) Baillet, *Jugum des Scavans*, ubi supra, num. 535.

very much commended [R]. I have not been able to find the eulogies of Julius Cæsar Capaci, wherein honourable mention is made of him. Two little books have appeared under the name of ANDREAS SCIOPPIUS, Gaspar's brother [S]. It is a supposititious name.

If any one desires to know how earnestly Scioppius applied himself in his youth to get an exact knowledge of the Latin tongue, he must read his *Scaliger Hypobolimus* folio 401. Being told that the reading of the ancient Poets was dangerous for young people, and being desirous to learn Latin from the best authors, without doing any prejudice to his virtue, he made use of a remedy, which deserves to be mentioned [T].

'be either painted or engraved. I do not know whether this proceeded from his fear of enchantments, because he dreaded the tricks of his adversaries, who were both many and considerable. But he rather chose, with the Poet Accius, to distinguish himself by books than by pictures. Certain it is, that neither Palæottus, nor Vellerus, nor Pinellus, all three great men, would suffer their pictures to be drawn, while they were alive, as Calceolarius has given an account in his *Museum*.' Batholius might have added to the three

examples of Calceolarius, a King of Lacedæmon (116), the Philosopher Plotinus (117), and a famous English Divine (118), &c.

[R] Several manuscripts that are very much commended. Read these words of Morhofius: 'Libri Scioppiani divini multi, atque inter illos ejus *Theſaurus, sive abſolutiſſimi de linguâ Latinâ Commentarii* apud Joh. Michaelem Pieruccium, Professore Patavinum, latitant, neque hunc in diem lucem, cum indignatione eruditorum, vident; de quibus legentibus est Gregor. Let. Ital. regnante part. 3. lib. 3. pag. 325. Magna hujus libri expectatio apud literatos est, & qui viderunt, ita commendant, ut in illo genere nil simile à quoquam scriptum illis esse videatur (119). . . . Several books of Scioppius are in manuscript, and among them his *Theſaurus sive abſolutiſſimi de Linguâ Latinâ Commentarii*, remain in the hands of John Michael Pieruccius, professor at Padua, and are not yet published, to the no small indignation of the learned world. Concerning these read Gregor. Let. Ital. regnante part. 3. lib. 3. pag. 325. Great is the expectation of that book which we have mentioned, and good judges, who have seen it, praise it to such a degree, that they think no writing of the kind was ever to be compared with it.' This Pieruccius is probably the same upon whom Scioppius bestowed so many encomiums in his letter to Vossius, and who wished he might have been professor of Philosophy in Holland. Scioppius had taken him into his house, and made him his sole heir (120).

[S] Andreas Scioppius, Gaspar's brother. . . . is a supposititious name. It is thought (121) that the Jesuit Garaffe is the author of two satires, one of which is intitled, *Andreas Scioppii Gasparii fratris Horofcopus Anticotoni, ejusque Germanorum Martillarii, & Hardivillerii vita, mors, cenotaphium, Apoteosis* (122); and the other, *Andreas Scioppii Gasparii fratris Elixir Calvinisticum, seu lapis Philosophicæ reformatæ à Calvinio Genevæ primum effusus, dein ab Isaac Casaubono Londini politus, cum testamentario Anticotoni codice nuper invento* (123). Mr Baillet (124) does very well observe that Gaspar Scioppius had no brother, that write any thing; but that, in point of satire, the pretended Andreas deserved to be Gaspar's brother. The son of Isaac Casaubon made the same observation. *Præam*, says he (125), *nisi merueris hic homo quisquis sit, ut Gasparis Scioppii frater credatur esse*. He had been saying, *Certum est tale illud esse scriptum ut ipse Gaspar Schop. illius auctor esse poterit: adeo mendacii & calumniæ refertum est, adeo plenum maledictis & conviciis, &c.* Soon after he speaks of a satire written by Gaspar Scioppius, as Eudæmon-Joannes acknowledges (126). That satire is intitled, *Holsernis Kriſtſæderi Landſperga Bavarii responſio ad epistolam Isaac Casauboni, Regii in Angliâ Archipædagogi pro viro clarissimo Gaspare Scioppio* (127). Casaubon is accused in it not only of being ignorant of the Latin tongue, but also of being a pimp, a whoremonger, an adulterer, and a thief, and some thing worse still: *Ille meo patri, quem scit ipse spectatissimæ semper integritatis fuisse, supra, furta, lenocinia, adulteria, (hec ipsa enim crimina illi impingit, & alia quoque vel dictu sæda) audent obicere? mirum mihi videtur & incredibile, nisi quod Schoppium co-*

gito (128). The reading of that book, if Scioppius may be believed, threw Casaubon into a fit of melancholy of which he died (129). Meric Casaubon (130) refutes this by his father's journal, whereby it appears, under the first of the ides of March, that Casaubon despised that satire. Having read the infamous things that are published in it against himself, his father, and his wife, he wrote in his journal that he gloried in suffering with his family all those reproaches for the sake of JESUS CHRIST. His son observes in the margin, that there is nothing in that libel of Scioppius against his mother. He accuses that satirical writer of Atheism, and proves it in the following manner. Scioppius has collected the finest passages of the scripture, wherein we are forbidden to rail at our neighbours; and at the same time the tract wherein he has inserted them is a violent satire: his design was therefore to let the public know that he laughs at the scripture. *Quum intenderet alius inaudito exemplo calumniari, & omni convitiarum genere prosequi, congerit præcipuos S. Scripturis locos quibus vetatur aliis ullam omnino contumeliam facere, aut convitiarum dicere: novum ut omnibus palam faciat, quo loco Dei mandata habeat homo perditus, atque Deo ipsi (borresco referens) illudat (131)?* The following words of Mr Baillet may be added to that Latin passage. 'Casaubon calls him the most cruel of all wild beasts, and pretends in another book of his that Scioppius was a professed enemy to God, and that he had found in one of his books execrable blasphemies against the divine authority of the holy scripture (132). But it is to be observed that those blasphemies are only strained expressions about the authority, which the Roman Catholics pretend the Church has received from God to explain the scripture. *Ducit bodie familiam*, they are Casaubon's words (133), *inter hujus generis hereticos hostis Dei certissimus Scioppius; in cujus Ecclesiastica leviter inspecio, multas legi superioribus diebus adversus rædæonæus Scripturas, blasphemias longe dirisimas.*

After this digression I return to Father Garaffe, and I say he could not have pitched upon a more proper brotherhood. Mr Baillet (134) observes, that there was in the beginning of our century one ANDREW SCIOPPIUS, in Saxony, a Lutheran; but I cannot believe, adds he, that he was Gaspar's near relation. I can say nothing upon this subject, I only know that our Scioppius calls Conrad Schoppius, a learned man, who was still living in 1633, his cousin (135). He taught Rhetoric at Berne (136), and had been Professor of Eloquence and Poetry at Heidelberg (137). I would not affirm that CONRAD SCHOPPIUS, a Taylor of Francfort (138), one of the chief authors of the insurrection which happened in that town in the year 1614, and beheaded two years after (139), was not related to Gaspar. There has been a minister, called CONRAD SCHOPPIUS, who published some Latin sermons (140).

[T] He made use of a remedy, which deserves to be mentioned. It consisted in mortifying his body by a strict diet. He fasted whole days in Germany poring upon his books; and when he was at Rome, he wholly abstained from wine, meat, eggs, and fish: he made but one meal in a day, and eat then nothing but very common things and in a small quantity; half a cabbage, a little rice, a small piece of cheese, a pear or an apple; and both in winter and summer, he had no other bed than boards, two blankets, and a pillow (141). There is no doubt but these are excellent remedies against the rage of incontinency, when a man does sincerely desire to live chaste. Those, who pretend that they are not very effectual, and that marriage is the only true remedy, are such as never tried them, or do not much care

(128) Meric Casaubonus, vid. supra, p. 21.

(129) Scribit hic nebulo patrem meum postquam legerat hunc fœm libellum, ex desperatione vite renuntiasse, æque inde vivere desisse. Id. ibid. pag. 24.

(130) Ib. p. 25.

(131) Ib. p. 20.

† Isaac Casaubon. in Epistol.

† Id. Casub. Exercit. i. in Baron. pag. 109. M.

(132) Baillet,

Jugemens des Savans, ubi supra, tom. 535.

(133) In Apparatu. Baronii, §. xxxiii, pag. 133, Edit. Genevæ. 1663.

(134) In Vol. i. of the Anti, Art. 15, §. 5.

(135) See the 20th letter of the fifth book *Supplementum* of Gaspar Scioppius.

(136) See the Epistle Dedicatory of Freinhemius's Commentary upon Quintus Curtius.

(137) See the verses he made for Philip Pareus: they are prefixed to the *Lexicon Criticum* of the same Pareus.

(138) See the Continuator of Thuanus's History, lib. viii, pag. 433.

(139) Idem, ib. x, pag. 658.

(140) Draudius mentions them in his *Bibliotheca Classica*.

(141) Cubitus . . . affert sine ulla culcita cervicali tantum duobusque lodicibus instructi. Scioppius, ubi infra, fol. 251.

(116) AGESILAUS: see the end of his article.

(117) See his article, remark [A].

(118) Gataker, see the beginning of his Life.

(119) Morhof. Polyhist. lib. i, cap. vii, p. 62.

(120) See the letters written to Vossius, pag. m. 224.

(121) See Mr Baillet, Auteurs deguez, Part. iii, cap. iii, §. 2, and in the Catalogue.

(122) Printed at Antwerp for Jerome Verdussen, 1614, in 4to.

(123) Printed at Antwerp for the heirs of Martin Nutius 1615, in 4to.

(124) Baillet, in Tom. i. of the Anti, Art. 15, §. 1.

(125) Meric Casaubonus, in Pietate, p. 18.

(126) Castigationum, lib. ii, pag. 125.

(127) Printed at Ingolstadt, 1615, in 8vo.

to resist luxury; and therefore their testimony is of no great force: but the affair we are now upon is a relation, not a dispute. Here follow Scioppius's words (142). 'Cum primis ineuntis adolescentiæ meæ annis veteres scriptores, & in primis poetas legere cuperem, & viros autem doctos audirem, qui arma pruriginis, hoc est, obscena illa poetarum carmina isti præsertim ætati propter periculum etiam atque etiam cavenda dicerent: excogitavi rationem, qua cum minimo meo damno aut periculo utilitates, quæ ex lectione ista peti possunt, haurirem. . . . Ego qui lubricas illas poetarum cantilenas tuto, & ut ait Lucretius, mea sine parte periculi percipere cuperem, temperantiæ & abstinentiæ ultro me colligandum præbui. Nam ut Terentius ait, sine Cerere & Baccho friget Venus: five ut ante ipsum Euripides:

Ἐν πλοσμοῦν τοῖς Κύπρις, ἐν πινύντι δ' ὕ.

Saturis adest Venus, non esurientibus.

Monstrum scilicet haberetur libido sine gula (ait Tertullianus) (143). . . . (144) In libidinem ebullire, res laterum est ac virium. Vires autem, ne infirmitas forsan perdat militiam, cibis excitantur. Scitis, ait ille, quid tentare soleat humanam satietatem. Toto itaque biennio sic in Germania vixi, ut integros dies aridus, siccus ac jejunos in studendo consumerem, omninoque prandia ignorarem. Veni postea in Italiam; ubi cum plerisque omnes scriptores veteres tam Græcos, quam Latinos, diligenti lectione contrivissem, excerpissemque sedulo omnia, quæ ad corrigendos ordinandosque mores & affectus & ad vitam quam tranquillissimè agendam usui fore visa essent. . . . Non modo his, quod in sculis sibi non probari Plato ostendit, sed etiam semel in die saturum fieri, & vino carere nolle, non satis eo dignum esse deprehendi, qui sibi legendis sapientiæ magistris illis operæ pretium fecisse videretur. . . . Quare ne in legendis istis oleum & operam perdidissem, tamquam germanus Stoicus quique ad vitam potius, quæ didicisset, quam ad disputationes referenda conferret, vinum aqua ex præfluente Tiberi haurita mutavi, quod ignem scilicet, ut Plato ait, igni addendum non putarem: tum carnes in perpetuum à mensa mea proscripti, non solum † διὰ τὴν καθαρίαν τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς κρεοφαγίας ἐργασίαν, sed etiam ἀσκήσεως χάριν καὶ τὰ μὴ σφραγῶν περὶ τὰ ἀπορροισία τὴν σάρκα, ut idem Clemens loquitur, cum verissime à S. Hieronymo dictum sit: *Esum carnis esse feminarium libidinis*. Sed etiam piscibus & ovis culina ac mensa mea interdixi, quod hæc quidem * στυγία plus satis experimentis didicissem, piscium vero esu majorem etiam, quam carni, voluptatem capere solem: quare dimidiato caule & aliquantulo oryze cum piro aut pomo & casei frustillo contentus, ipsas viginti quatuor horas durare soleo, eadem opera jentans, prandens, cœnans ac commissans. . . . While very early in my youth I had an inclination to read the ancient authors, and especially the Poets, and hearing learned men say that these instruments of wantonness, I mean the obscene verses of the Poets, ought strictly to be guarded against at those years, on account of their dangerous consequences, I thought of a way by which with the least prejudice or hazard to myself I might reap the advantages of such reading. . . . Desiring to peruse these dangerous productions of the Poets in safety, and without my share in the danger, as Lucretius words it, I frankly bound myself over to temperance and abstinence. For, as Terence says, Love languishes without good victuals and drink: or, as Euripides be-

Love thrives with plenty, but with hunger dies.

Luft without good cheer (says Tertullian) would be looked upon as a prodigy. . . . The babbings of lust are the effects of a vigorous and healthy body. But this vigour is provoked and set on by victuals. You know, says he, what temptations a man generally has after a belly-full, &c. . . . Wherefore like a

true Stoic, and one who thought his learning was rather to be applied to his life and manners than to disputes, that I might not lose my labour in reading these books, I changed my wine for the water of the Tiber, because I was unwilling, as Plato says, to add fire to fire. I likewise for ever banished meat from my table, not only on account of the heaviness which is occasioned by the eating thereof, but also for the sake of exercise, and that my flesh might not have too great an itching to love-affairs, as the same Clemens says; and as it is most truly affirmed by St. Jerome: That the eating of flesh is the nursery of lust, &c. Take notice that he says (145) that before he had read Father Collier's books, he practised most of those things only to live in conformity to reason, but after he had read these, he directed them to God. It is also to be observed that he believed the reading of some books could excite the most drowsy tempers. He reckoned among those books some commentaries of Scaliger and their text. (146) Vos autem capulares illi, vieti, edentuli, & jam diu Acheronti debiti, si jam vos opus perdere & tamquam caballos in clivo non facere pudet, ut Satyrion compendi faciatis, familiares hujus mei auctores, in eosdemque notas legite,

--- Accendi queis frigidus ævo

Laomedontiades aut Nestoris hernia possit (147).

But ye, decrepit, shrivelled, toothless old men, whose bodies are long ago due to their graves, if ye be not beneforth ashamed to lose your labour, and to fumble like worn out jades upon the mountain, instead of all provocatives, read the authors of this friend of mine, and his notes upon the same,

So full, so fierce, so vigorous, and so strong
That looking on would make old Nestor young.

DRYDEN.

And because he took hold of every opportunity to insult that great man, he tells him in a reproachful manner that he slighted his father's judgment, in commenting upon certain authors. I shall set down his words, that the reader may see that men of great virtue and learning, though belonging to the same family, are divided in their opinions about obscenities. (148) Scioppius, Cum pater tuus obscenos & immemorabiles Aufonii, Martiali, simulumque poetarum versus negavit à Critico censendos, atque adeo ne legendos quidem omnino, aut audiendos, sed detestandos & flammis expiandos, & pro signis Priapi, adeoque pro libris honori ejus scriptis, sanctorum imagines à nobis habendas esse contenderit. . . . (149) Tu exortus es homo sanctissimus & castitatis ac pudicitie exemplar atque specimen, qui non modò illum ipsum censura patris tui notatum Aufonium, sed hoc etiam Burdigalensi Triphallo nullo deterius mutoniato Catullum, Tibullum, Propertium, & Priapeiorum versuum scriptores, magna temporis curæque impensa à te recensitos, castigatos, nec penitendos (ut gloriaris) commentariis illustratos emittere & adolescentibus commendare auderes. Hoc, satis scio, nullo modo patri tuo probare posses. . . . After your father had declared that the leud and infamous productions of Aufonius, Martial, and the like Poets, did not deserve the remarks of any Critic, and therefore that they were not to be read or heard, but to be detested and burnt, and that instead of the statues of Priapus, and books written in honour of him, we ought to have the images of the Saints. . . . You appeared, a man of eminent sanctity, forsooth, and a singular instance of modesty, who have taken care to publish, for the benefit of the youth, not only that same Aufonius, whom your father marked with a note of infamy, but likewise these other masterpieces of ribaldry Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and the authors of the Priapeia, after having revised and corrected them with great loss of time and pains, and illustrated them, with a commentary of which, as you boast, you have no reason to be ashamed. Thus, I am well assured, you could no ways justify to your father.

(142) Idem, in Scalig. hypobolim. fol. 250.

(143) You will find above in the remark [†], num. iv. of the article EREMITA, the sequel of Tertullian's words, and several passages of the like nature.

(144) Scioppius, ibid. verfo.

† Non solum propter hebetudinem, quæ ex carniū esu generatur, sed etiam exercitationis gratia, & ne carnis nimis perprurificat ad Venerem.

* Pruriginem commovetia.

(147) Juvén. Sat. vi, ver. 323.

(148) Scioppius, ibid. fol. 281. verfo.

(149) Ibid. fol. 282.

(a) Marcel, *cb.*
viii, of the de-
lethful Folie,
pag. 123, Lyons
1650.

(b) Naudé Apo-
log. des grans
Hommes, *cb.*
xvii, p. m. 496.

[(§ a) In his
18th Macaronic.
The passage be-
gins with, *Ecc*
Michaelis de
incantu Re-
gule Scoti.
R. E. M. CRIT.]

(c) Naudé, *ibid.*

SCOTUS (MICHAEL) a learned man, and a great lover of Mathematics and Astrology, lived in the XIIIth century. He was well beloved by the Emperor Frederic II to whom he dedicated all his books. They have put him in the class of Magicians, and they tell us that he frequently invited several persons to dinner, without causing any thing to be got ready for them, but that having made his guests sit down at table, he forced the spirits to bring him meat from all parts, and when it was come he told the company, *Gentlemen, this comes from the kitchen of the King of France, and this from the kitchen of the King of Spain; that comes from England, &c.* (a). Merlinus Coccaius has diverted himself with describing his enchantments (b) (§ 2). The Poet Dante adopted the common error [A]. We have more reason to believe John Bacon, an English Carmelite, and the Prince of the Averroists (c), who quotes (d) Michael Scotus as a great Divine. We have likewise more reason to believe Pitseus who commends him very much [B]. However it be, it is said that this pretended Magician forefaw in what manner he should die, and that he foretold the place where the Emperor Frederick II should lose his life [C]. I shall say something of his books [D].

[A] The Poet Dante adopted the common error.] There are his words at the end of the XXth Canto of his Hell.

Quell' altro, che ne' fianchi è così poco,
Michele Scotto fù, che veramente
Delle Magiche frode fe' pe il gioco.

He there with meagre sides was Michael Scot,
Who truly had the art of Magic got.

[B] Pitseus commends him very much.] He says in express words, that though Michael Scot was accounted a Magician by the vulgar and rabble of the ignorant, yet wise men have entertained a quite different opinion of him. "Prudentum tamen & cordatorum hominum longe aliud fuit judicium, qui potius perspicax ejus in scrutandis rebus abditis admirabantur ingenium, laudabant industriam, quam reprehendendam judicabant curiositatem, inspiciebantque hominis scientiam, non suspicabantur culpam (1)."

• Pitseus 1. vo-
lum. de rebus
Anglicis.

(1) Naudé Apo-
logie des grans
Hommes, *cb.*
xvii, pag. 498.

(2) Grangier in
his French Com-
mentary upon
Dante's Inferno,
pag. 254, 255.

[C] He forefaw in what manner he should die, and marked the place where the Emperor Frederic II should lose his life.] This I find in a commentator upon Dante. "Michael the Scotchman, says he (2), lived

in the reign of the Emperor Frederic II, and foretold to him the place where he should die, which he said was Florence. Wherein the said emperor was deceived by reason of the equivocal name; for he did not die at Florence, the chief town of Tuscany, but in a castle of Apulia called Fiorenzola. That Magician forefaw that he himself should die by the fall of a stone, that should break his head. Which accordingly came to pass; for one day being at church bare-headed to worship the body and blood of JESUS CHRIST, the rope fastened to the bell that was ringing, made a large stone fall upon his head, and immediately he thought he should die, which he did suddenly."

[D] I shall say something of his books.] He wrote a treatise about Physiognomy, and a book containing several questions upon Sacroboles's sphere, and a History of Animals (3). He should have been mentioned in the great catalogue of Vossius (4), on account of the second of these three books; but I did not find him there. The treatise about Physiognomy was written at the request of the Emperor Frederic II, I have it in Italian: The title runs thus: *Physiognomia laqual compilo Maestro Michael Scotto, à preghi di Federico Romano Imperatore, huomo di gran scienza: & è cosa molto notabile, e da tener secreta però che l'è di grande efficacia, & comprende cose scritte della natura, bastanti ad ogni Astrologo: & è diviso in tre parti.* It was printed at Venice per Marchio Sessa, in 1533. It is a book in octavo consisting of seven sheets.

(d) Part. iii.
Sentent. Disting.
xxiii.

(3) See Naudé,
ubi supra, pag.
496.

(4) Vossius, de
Scient. Mathem.

SCRIBONIUS (WILLIAM ADOLPHUS) a German Physician and Philosopher, and author of several books [A], was born at Marburg, and lived towards the latter end of the XVIth century. As he had a great esteem for the method of Ramus, he published Logical Expositions of some of the sciences, and I believe that he begun with *Rerum Physicarum juxta leges logicas methodica Explicatio*. It is a book of 107 pages in 8vo, printed at Francfort in the year 1577. He was one of those who maintained that witches ought to be punished, and that the proof of water was lawful in this kind of prosecution (a). One may see in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (b), that they reprinted in the year 1686 a letter which he wrote upon this subject.

(a) See Voëtii
Disputat. Select.
Tom. iii, p. 568,
573.

(b) For the
month of August
1686, Art. ii,
pag. 890.

[A] Author of several books.] I have taken notice in the text of what I reckon to be his first production. He caused it to be reprinted oftner than once, and enlarged it considerably, so that in the edition of Basil 1583 he divided it into three books. It was reprinted the same year at London with his *Isagoge Sphærica methodicè propostæ*, in 8vo. His Physics were reprinted at Cambridge cum *Animadversionibus Timothei Brighti*, in the year 1584 in 8vo. His *Idea Medicinæ secundum Logicas leges informandæ* came out at Lemgow the same year in 8vo. He added to it a treatise de *inspectione urinarum contra eos qui ex qualibet urina de qualibet morbo judicare volunt. Item de hydropæ, de podagra, & dysenteria physilogia corporis*. His book de *Jagarum*

natura & potestate deque his rellis cognoscendis & puniendis: ubi de purgatione earum per aquam frigidam contra Johannem Ewichium & Henricum Newwaldum, was printed at Marburg the year 1588 in 8vo. His *Anti-Piscator Logicus ad Logicas exercitationes Johannis Piscatoris respondens* was printed at Basil the same year in 8vo. I do not think that he was an Anti-Ramist, as Mr Baillet believed (1) on account of that book. He styles Ramus in an epistle dedicatory (2) *Philosophiæ sinceriores antistes*, - - - the head of a better Philosophy. Let us not forget that he procured a new edition of *Theſaurus pauperum Petri Hispani*, and of *Theſaurus sanitatis* of Liebauld, at Francfort 1578 in 8vo.

(1) Tom. ii, of
the Anti, Art.
140.

(2) That of Re-
rum Physicarum
juxta leges logi-
cis methodica
Explicatio.

SCULTETUS (ABRAHAM) professor of Divinity at Heidelberg, and author of several books [A], was born at Grunberg in Silesia on the twenty-fourth of August

[A] He is author of several books.] We have seen in the text of this article that he taught scholars in his room while he was yet a scholar himself. The lectures he read to them upon Morality and the Sphere at

August 1566 (a), and after he had studied there till the year 1582, he was sent to Breilaw to make further improvements. He was quickly recalled from thence, because his father, who had lately lost all that he had in the great fire of Grunberg (b), was no longer able to maintain him at the college, and designed to make him learn a trade. The young man did not like such a proposal, and in order to pursue his studies went in quest of a tutorship. He found a good one in the house of a burgo-master of Freistadt (c); which gave him an opportunity to hear Abraham Bucholcer preach (d). He made a journey into Poland in the year 1584, and the year following went to Gorlitz in Lufatia, where he staid above two years, going constantly to the public lectures, and reading private ones to others (e). He acted those two parts in the university of Wittemberg in 1588, and 1589, and then in that of Heidelberg till he was admitted minister in the year 1594. He exercised his ministry, in a village of the Palatinate (f) for some months, and then he was invited by the Elector Palatine to be one of his preachers. I shall speak of a conference he had with Samuel Huberus [B]. He was chosen minister of St Francis's church at Heidelberg in the year 1598, and two years after he was admitted into the Ecclesiastical senate. He was several times employed to visit the churches and schools of the Palatinate; and notwithstanding those avocations, he wrote some books which required great labour. He followed the Prince of Anhalt to the war of Juliers in the year 1610, and applied himself to settling Ecclesiastical affairs in those parts, with great prudence and vigilance. He attended the Prince Palatine Frederic V in his journey into England, in the year 1612; and got himself acquainted with the most learned men of that country. He went to the court of Brandenburg, in the year 1614, the Elector John Sigismund, who was ready to renounce Lutheranism, having desired to concert with him the measures it was proper for him to follow in this change. He executed well the commissions that were given him in such a juncture (g). Being returned to Heidelberg, he, for very good reasons, accepted of the charge of preacher to the court. He obtained leave to resign it in the year 1618, when he was appointed professor of Divinity. He was soon after deputed to the synod of Dort, and endeavoured at first to reconcile the contending parties; but perceiving that it was in vain, he stoutly maintained the doctrines of the Contra-Remonstrants. He preached at Francfort the year following, during the fitting of the electoral diet; for his master appointed him preacher to the deputies he sent thither. He followed that prince into Bohemia, and having retired into Silesia, after the fatal battle of Prague, he resolved to return to Heidelberg, in order to discharge the office of professor. He was no sooner arrived there, but all academical exercises ceased: the enemies being at the gates, most of the professors fled away. He retired to Bretten, and then to Schorndorf, in the duchy of Wirtemberg, from whence he went to Embden, in August 1622. The King of Bohemia, his master, had consented that the city of Embden should offer him a minister's place. This call was accepted of (h): but the Professor of Heidelberg

at Heidelberg, produced a book which was soon after printed and explained in some illustrious schools. *In eadem Scholâ meâ privatâ Auditoribus petentibus doctrinam Morum & Siderum explicabam; unde mihi Ethicorum libri duo, Sphericorum libri tres confecti, qui non ita multo post publicati, & in aliquot Illustribus Scholis fuerunt enarrati* (1). Samuel Huberus being called to Wittemberg, in the year 1593, made an oration *de diffidiis in religione*. - - - of *diffentions in point of religion*. Scultetus published a confutation of it without putting his name to it. *Scholâ & Notis in illam, sed sine nomine editi, in quibus homini crassos errores in Logica, crassiores in Grammaticâ, crassissimos in Theologiâ commisit* (2). He composed at the same time, 1. An Analysis of the works of the Fathers, which was printed some years after at Amberg, and intitled *Medulla Patrum* (3). 2. An *Agagoe Historica in V. T. libros*, together with an Analysis of Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Polybius, Dionysius Halicarnassensis, &c. He lost that work and several others after the battle of Prague, and particularly the History of the Reformation (4). He took a journey into Silesia in 1594, and returning to Heidelberg he went through Gorlitz, where he made a funeral oration on Laurentius Ludovicus (5), which was printed, and afterwards inserted by Melchior Adam in his lives of the Philosophers. This Laurence had been Melancthon's scholar, and principal of a college at Gorlitz (6). Martin Mylius, who succeeded him, desired Scultetus to pay that duty to his old master (7). Scultetus published in 1611, an exposition of the gospels for Sunday, which was translated out of German into several languages (8), and put into the *Index librorum prohibitorum*, - - - of *prohibited books*, at Rome (9). He published two sermons he had preached in the synod of Dort, two other sermons preached by him at Heidelberg in the secular year of the Reformation, and that which he had

preached at Prague against idols. Take notice that he did not lose all his Annals of the Reformation; for he published the two first decads before he went into Bohemia with the Elector his master. I find that he wrote *Idea concionum in Esaiam, Epistolâ D. Pauli ad Romanos & Hebræos & Psalmos Davidis, & observationes Grammaticæ, Logicæ, Historicæ, & Theologicæ in historiam Jesu Christi nati, educati, baptizati & tentati, & in historiam concionum & miraculorum Jesu Christi, & de precatone tractatio logica & Theologica, & Joannis Baptista logice descriptus*. See Freherus's *Theatrum* (10). He had a hand in the Greek and Latin edition (11) of St Athanasius, and of the councils of Nice and Ephesus; to which, he added a short History of the seven universal councils, and his translation of twenty Greek sermons (12). I shall say nothing of his German books against a Jesuit of Mentz, against M. de Neer's apostacy, and against the confession of Cologne, &c. (13). See again Freherus's *Theatrum*.

[B] I shall speak of a conference which he had with Samuel Huberus.] In the year 1606 he was sent to Newstad to confer with a mathematician (14), who had been employed to finish and publish a book of Rhetoric (15), and who put off from day to day the publication of that work. He went in the name of the great council, to discourse with him about what was necessary to be done, in order to make an end of that edition. He found Samuel Huberus at Spire, in the inn where he lay. That man was preparing a book for the next Francfort fair, and no sooner knew who Scultetus was, but he proposed to him a dispute upon controversies in religion: It was accepted, and lasted from nine a'clock in the morning till three in the afternoon, in the presence of the Lutheran ministers. It turned upon the doctrine of Predestination (16). Scultetus came off at last by an argument, which was a kind of a personal jeff. Tandem abfolvi

(a) And not 1556, as Freherus, *Theatri*, p. 424, affirms. He says in the following page that Scultetus died the 24th of October 1625, aged 59 years. It is a wrong calculation.

(b) The 26th of July 1582.

(c) Near Grunberg.

(d) The author of some Chronological books.

(e) Publice didici, privatim docui. *Abraham Scultetus, ubi infra, citation (b), pag. 16.*

(f) Called Schriesheim, near Heidelberg.

(g) *Profectus sum Bellinum ibique rem Christi, pro virili ad mentem usque Octobrem, egi. - - - I went to Berlin, where I exerted myself as much as I could in the service of Christianity till the month of October.* Id. *ibid.*

(h) Taken from a book of Abraham Scultetus intitled, *de curriculum vite*. . . . *Narratio apologetica*, printed at Embden 1625, in 4to.

(10) Freher. *Theatrum*, pag. 425.

(11) Printed for Commelin 1601.

(12) Scultet. ubi supra, pag. 35.

(13) Id. *ibid.* pag. 24.

(14) Called L. Valentinus Otto.

(15) I think it was Canon triangulorum. See Vossius, de Scient. Mathem. pag. 66.

(16) Taken from Scultetus, ubi supra, p. 32, 33.

(1) Scultetus, in *Narrat. Apologetica de curriculum vite*, pag. 23.

(2) Id. *ibid.*

(3) That work contains four parts, which came out one after another.

(4) Scultetus, ubi supra.

(5) Id. *ibid.* pag. 28.

(6) Id. *ib.* p. 16.

(7) Id. *ib.* p. 28.

(8) Id. *ib.* p. 52.

(9) Id. *ibid.* pag. 67. It was in the decree of the 10th of May 1613.

(17) Paul. Freher. in Theatr. pag. 425, but according to Witte in his *Diarium*, it was in 1624.

Heidelberg did not enjoy it very long, for he died on the twenty-fourth of October 1625 (i). He was married three times, and left but one daughter behind him [C]. No man was ever more cruelly slandered by his enemies [D]. I have said in another place (k), that he did not approve that the Protestants should write one against another. What

(k) In the note PITISCUS remark [B].

(17) Id. *ibid.* pag. 33.

'me argumento in speciem quidem sed re ipsa minime jocofo, quo docui Huberum non esse Ecclesiae veræ filium (17). - - At last I got off clear by an argument which seemed to be, but in truth was not, a joke, by which I proved that Huberus was not a son of the true Church.' I will prove to you, said he to Huberus, that you do not belong to the true Church: it is certainly either among the Reform- ed, or among the Lutherans, or among the Ro- man Catholics. But you have left the communion of the Reformed, you have been expelled from that of the Lutherans, and you write against the Roman; therefore, &c. The dispute went on quietly, for the two chief qualities of a good disputant met in Huberus; he patiently heard his antagonists, tho' never so prolix, and meekly bore their hard words. *Atta & peracta sunt omnia tranquilla: Neque enim dissimulanda sunt omnia tranquilla: Disputatores primæ sunt, dam est: quæ duæ virtutes in Disputatore primæ sunt, eas ambas in Hubero deprehendisse, patientiam adver- sarium prolixæ suæ explicantem audiendi, & lenitatem etiam asperæ dictæ perferendi* (18). He maintained that all men are elected, and perplexed Hunnius, who de- nied the election of some persons (19). *Primum laudo Huberi ratiocinationem qua Aegidium Hunnius Witem- bergæ confinxerat, qui nec Huberi generalem, nec Re- formatorum specialem electionem agnoscere voluit* (20).

(18) Id. *ibid.*

(19) See the re- mark [E] in the article HUN- NIUS.

(20) Scultet, ubi supra, p. 33.

(21) Id. *ib.* p. 29.

(22) Id. *ib.* p. 44.

(23) In viduitate sedecim menses vixi, quibus corpusculum meum cum non uno morbo attentaretur, valetudinis curatricem quaesivi. Id. *ibid.*

(24) Id. *ib.* p. 45.

(25) Id. *ib.* p. 47.

(26) Id. *ib.* p. 23, 45.

(27) Id. *ibid.* pag. 76, 77.

[C] He was married three times, and left but one daughter behind him.] His first wife was Catherine Bergia, whom he married at Heidelberg in Novem- ber 1594 (21). He lost her the twenty-fifth of March 1605, and continued sixteen months a melancholy widower (22), so sickly, that he thought his health requir- ed he should have some body to take care of it (23). He therefore married Catherine Lorichia, the widow of Dr Rhodinus, and having lost her the twentieth of October 1607, he married another widow the eigh- teenth of July 1608 (24), by whom he had a daugh- ter, the first of December 1609 (25), who, together with her mother, were the companions of his exile at Embden, in the year 1624 (26). [D] No man was ever more cruelly slandered by his enemies.] He expresses himself thus in the Epistle Dedicatory of his 'Narratio Apologetica. Dentatis scriptis, infamibus Theſibus, contumeliosis anagrammatismis, picturis, cantilenis, in nomen, in famam, in doctrinam meam involarunt, perindeque omnis generis convitiis in me debacchati sunt, ac si ego unus essem qui omnem Israelæ turbarim & solem, quod dicitur, ex univer- so mundo sustulerim. - - They attacked my reputa- tion and doctrine with satirical writings, infamous theſes, contumelious anagrams, pictures, ballads; and they railed at me in such a furious manner, as if I had been the only man that had troubled Israel, or who, as the saying is, had taken the sun out of the world.' I cannot tell whether there was any good ground for those slanders, but I believe the free access he had to princes, made him odious to several people; and that the uneasiness of some, and the joy of others, after the misfortune of the Elector Palatine in Bohemia, brought to light the ill effects of envy. The court preacher was attacked when thought to be under dis- grace, and the ice being once broken, every body fell upon him; the first satires made way for others; it was like a snow-ball that went always increasing. He was accused (27) of having advised the Elector Pala- tine to accept of the crown of Bohemia: He was made answerable for all the calamities which followed that enterprise; it was objected to him, that instead of discharging the duties of his professorship at Heidel- berg, he had acted the part of an intriguing man, and an Iconoclast in Bohemia; and that he shewed him- self an Atheist, by approving the union of the kingdoms of Hungary and Bohemia: he was blamed for having persecuted the Roman Catholics, the Lutherans and the Unitarians; and it was given out that he had lost his master's favour, and all his employments, after the battle of Prague. This was dispersed by word of mouth, and in writing in the courts of princes, and in the universities and towns. He was four years without justifying himself; but at last he took up the

pen in his own defence, in imitation of St Basil. Hæc dicta, scripta, decantata per Regum, per Prin- cipum aulas, per Academias, per urbes & oppida: Quæ nisi reprimere, famæ meæ prodigum jure me- rito haberer. Quod si quis quaerat: Cur in quar- tum annum responsum, ad tam atroces calumnias distulerim? is hoc à me audiat: imitatum me fuisse Basilium illum Magnum, qui cum undique appeteret, adeo perturbatus fuit, ut non veritus sit scri- bere Epistolâ septuagesimâ nonâ, parum aliquando abſuisse, quin de omnium hominum fide & sinceritate dubitaret: indixit autem sibi ipsi silentium in ter- tium usque annum ne quid præcipitatur effunderet: postea varias apologias texuit (28). - - If I should give no check to these speeches and writings, that are so much talked of in the courts of kings, in the univer- sities, towns, and cities, I might justly be considered as a man prodigal of his reputation. But if any one ask me why I have delayed making a proper reply to such bitter calumnies for the space of four years, I answer that in this I have imitated the great St Basil, who, when he was attacked from all quarters, in his con- fusion, did not scruple to say, that he was sometimes ready to call the truth and sincerity of all men into question: he therefore prescribed silence to himself for three years, lest he should utter any thing rashly: after- ward he composed several vindications. Observe, by the by, that those words of St Basil are wonderful. Men are so easily prepossessed by ill reports, or so blindly adapt their behaviour to the service of calumny, that there is sometimes ground to believe that equity and uprightness are wholly banished from this world. Scultetus answers (29), 1. That he had no hand in the deliberation, whether the Elector Palatine should accept of the crown of Bohemia; but he confesses, that he preached a sermon, wherein he congratulated him for having accepted of this present of the Bohemians; and encouraged him by the words of the Lord, to behave himself valiantly in that enterprise (30). 2. That Frederic Balduinus, professor of Divinity at Wit- temberg, who blamied him for leaving his church and his professor's chair (31), had a colleague who went to preach in the country of Brandenburg, contrary to the prince's edicts. This is approving at home what one condemns abroad, though the domestic action be much more inexcusable than that of the foreigner; for, adds Scultetus, I followed my elector's orders with the con- sent of the university. *Magnum crimen profecto, ac in- dubitè, Balduino iudice, majus longè eo, cui D. Meisne- rus Balduini collega obnoxius: cui è Saxoniâ in Mar- chiam ire, contra Sereniss. Electoris Brandenburgici edi- ctum, in Gynæceum Electorale irripere, ibidem concionari nulla religio fuit. Hæc, quæ nullo colore defendi pos- sunt, probat domi Balduinus: foris in concionatorio ad- buc vivebam, volentem, jubentem, consentiente Academia, in Boimiam sequutus sum* (32). 3. That (33) the new King of Bohemia promised to all his subjects a free exercise of their religion, and kept his word to them; that he took only for his own use, the church of the citadel of Prague, out of which he removed all the idols. Scultetus owns that he advised him to it, and that he gave himself no rest till he had obtained it. He maintains, that he acted in that respect like a good Christian. He says, that as soon as the sermon he had preached upon that subject came to be published, the Lutherans and the Papists raised a dreadful noise every where, which was suppressed by a learned an- swer of Theophilus Mosanus. 4. That when he said (34), in his sermon upon the alliance renewed between Bohemia and Hungary, on the fifteenth of April 1620, that this confederacy was acceptable to God, since all those who entered into it professed the same faith; he only meant the Reformed and the Lutherans, and not the Papists, Anabaptists, and Arians. He com- plains (35), that Luke Olander (36) having read this sermon, openly maintained in a public disputation, that Scultetus was an Atheist (37), since he made no difference between Lutheranism, Calvinism, and Po- pery. 5. He protests that he never excited the king,

(29) Pro concione Majestati ipsius gratulatus, illam- que verba Domini è Joſua petitis ad id, quod suscepit, forti- ter agendum, or- hortatus sum. Id. *ibid.* p. 76.

(31) In libello quodam Germa- nico, quem de idolis scriptis, reſponſum est, quædam, qui Ecclesie & Academiae Præ- latus obligatus, in Boimiam cum Rege meo pro- fecutus sum. Id. *ibid.*

(32) Id. *ibid.* pag. 78.

(33) Id. *ibid.*

(34) Id. *ibid.* pag. 81.

(35) Id. *ibid.* pag. 83.

(36) Professor Divinitatis at Ti- bingen, and chancellor of the university.

(37) Quibus- dam- que factis Olander publi- theſi è me THEUM pro- mat. Id. *ibid.*

What he observes in answer to a man, who accused him of having raised a sacramental war in the Palatinate [E], is a remarkable thing. I should make no difficulty to believe that

his master, to persecute the Papists and the Lutherans, and that it was false to say they had been persecuted. *Circumferuntur varii libelli de Reformatione Boëmica, partim Latinâ, partim Germanicâ linguâ scripti: quibus si fides habenda; in Boëmiâ, me instigatore, Pontificii duriter afflicti: Lutherani magno numero gressi: ipsi proceres Regni de libertate religionis suæ sunt periclitati* (38). He refers the reader (39) to a German book, wherein it was plainly made out, That this persecution was a chimerical thing; and takes advantage (40) of the contradictions of those, who had mentioned that revolution of Bohemia in their writings. He speaks (41) of a letter handed about under the supposititious name of a man of Antwerp, wherein he was desired to recommend the doctrine of Ubiquity to the king his master. He does not deny (42) that being consulted about the reformation of the Churches immediately subject to the king, he answered, That the king's religion might be established in them, since the people desired it, and the priests were not qualified to explain the Scripture. 6. Lastly, He shews, that after the battle of Prague, he did not lose his master's favour, as his enemies had given out. In order to colour that lie, they invented several reasons of his disgrace, and they went even so far as to accuse him of a heinous crime. *Unde haud difficulter colligere est cujus spiritus filii fuerint: qui, me Uratislaviâ vix digresso, disseminare hoc in orbem Germania non dubitavit: me omni gratiâ Regis excidisse; officio motum esse. Et ut res colorem haberet: pro sua quisquam libidine causas finxit: alius, consilia mea de suscipiendo regno Boëmico: alius, demolitionem statuarum & idolorum Pragensem: alius (quod Deus æternum averruncasset) atrox aliquod crimen* (43).

(38) Id. *ibid.*
pag. 86.

(39) Id. *ibid.*

(40) Id. *ibid.*
pag. 87.

(41) Id. *ibid.*
pag. 89.

(42) Id. *ib.*

(43) Id. *ibid.*
pag. 93.

(44) Id. *ibid.*
pag. 99.

The libellers persecuted him in his very exile. He was informed from good hands (44), in the year 1624, that the secretary of a certain prince had affirmed in the Lower Saxony, and even at the court of the King of Sweden, that Scultetus had departed this life towards the latter end of the year 1623, three days after having published a book full of absurd and heterodox opinions, which had obliged the magistrates of Embden to suppress it. Some body writ into the country of Brandenburg, that he had foreseen it long ago: and yet there never was any such book. A Dutch piece was published the year following, which contained a description of the devastations made in East-Friesland by Mansfeld's troops. The author having employed his slander against the States-General, and some illustrious persons, attacked Scultetus particularly, and accused him of having thanked God in the pulpit, for the irruption of those troops. And yet it was a notorious thing, that he had only thanked him for the retreat of those furious soldiers; which was attested in a book written to confute that libel.

I shall make no excuse for the length of this remark, being persuaded, that all men of sense will grant, that there are no collections of greater use than those which can any ways serve to resist two such terrible plagues, as the impudence of libellers, and the credulity of those who read their books. It is of great concern for the publick good, to make it appear by many plain instances, that there are no lies which passionate men are not capable of divulging against their neighbour's honour, and which the people is not capable of believing. It signifies nothing to confute those satirical writers by the absurdity of their stories, and by their contradictions, they persist in their boldness, and new calumniators are no ways daunted thereby. It signifies nothing to make those blush, who have been rash and simple enough to swallow down a thousand fabulous stories, maliciously and grossly invented. The very next day, they as readily give ear to others. To this kind of writings we may justly apply these lines,

Mais ils trouvent pourtant, quoi qu'on en puisse dire,
Un marchand pour les vendre, & des fots pour les
lire (45).

(45) Boileau,
Satire II, ver.
81.

- - - In spite of all that one can say,
Yet still they find a Bookseller to vend them,
And fools besides to read and to commend them,

nay, what is worse, to believe them. One should not therefore be weary of collecting stories that resemble the facts which I have just now compiled.

Take notice that I do not pretend to justify Scultetus in all respects. I make no doubt, that he was guilty of the fault, which a court divine does seldom avoid. I fancy, he concerned himself too much with political affairs, and brought temporal interests too often into his sermons. He was somewhat hasty in advising the destruction of images, and did not consider, that his master was not sufficiently settled upon his throne, to undertake such an innovation. But how can it be helped? Men are blinded by the first favours of fortune; they fancy, that since the kingdom of God is concerned in the case, one good success will follow another, as in the time of Joshua, and that there is nothing like making haste.

[E] *A man having raised a sacramental war in the Palatinate.* Here follow some further slanders against Scultetus, which he rejects as horrid lies. A certain apostate, *scilicet* be (46), has given out, that I excited a sacramental war in the Palatinate, in the year 1603. *Scult. ibid. pag. 39.*

No body ever heard of such a war, but only of a little dispute about eucharistical phrases, between the professors of the university, and the ministers of the church. It is well known, *continues* be, that the doctrine of the sacraments was purified from the Romish idolatry, and from scholastical phrases by Zuinglius and Oecolampadius; and that the loss which the canton of Zurich sustained in the fight, wherein Zuinglius was killed, broke the league lately concluded between some cantons of Switzerland, the city of Strasbourg, and the Landgrave of Hesse. Whereupon Martin Bucer being too timorous, was afraid that the whole party would sink, unless he strengthened, with a new alliance, the towns of the Upper Germany, and particularly Strasbourg, where he taught. He cast his eye upon the potent Duke of Saxony, and the better to gain him, he endeavoured to make every body believe that Luther's and Zuinglius's opinions concerning the Lord's-supper, were the same in the main, and that a mere dispute about words had prevented their agreement. He further said, that it was better to use Luther's than Zuinglius's expressions, because the latter spoke too meanly of the eucharist, and the other in a sublime manner. He inspired the same thoughts into John Calvin, who had fled from France to Strasbourg (47). This intrigue of Bucer introduced the Lutheran expressions into the towns of the Upper Germany especially after the fatal concordate of Wittenberg. The Divines, who taught in Saxony, under the Elector Christian, used themselves to those phrases of Consubstantiation, *Phrasibus illis mystificis assueverant*; so that being expelled after that prince's death, and retiring into the Palatinate, they took the ministers, who used Zuinglius's expressions in that country, to be heterodox: which occasioned a dissension; but it was so happily, and so quickly suppressed, that from that time forward there was visibly a better understanding between the Divines of the university and the rest. The apostate had given out, That the Elector Palatine caused a book, written upon that quarrel, to be burnt. Scultetus maintains that it is a lie (48). One may very well presume, that he speaks truth; for tho' it be a great piece of boldness, to affirm that a prince has caused such or such a book to be condemned to the fire, when it is false; it is still a greater piece of impudence to deny it, when it is true.

A man well acquainted with the secret history of the Church, might inform us that journeys and conferences about religion, are generally set a foot by some temporal motive. Bucer's conduct affords an instance of it: I have elsewhere mentioned (49) another like it taken from the same Scultetus. We are told that Bucer repented of having mediated the formulary of concord (50). *Bucer dixit se penitus dare quod causam publicam homo privatus voluisset componere, & tam multa prava dogmata conciliare* (51). Peter Martyr, who heard him say so in England, told Bullinger of it; Daniel Tossanus had it from Bullinger, and Pezelius from Daniel Tossanus, in the presence of Scultetus, who inserted it in the history of his life.

[F] *It*

(47) Hence it was, probably, that Calvin in his Catechism and elsewhere, made use of phrases, which seem to imply the substantial presence of the body of our Lord.

(48) *Esse autem vel à me, vel ab aliis Ministris Palatinis, vel ab omnibus conjunctim scriptum aliquod super hac re publicum, quod Serenissimi Electoris iussu Vulcano fuerit consecratum; tam ego constanter nego, quam id desperatus Apostata petulanter affirmat.* *Id. ibid. p. 40, 41.*

(49) Remark [M] of the article B E Z A.

(50) That is to say, that of Wittenberg in 1536.

(51) Scultet. *ubi supra*, p. 25.

SCULTETUS. SEBONDE.

that he would have cleared himself better from the charge of his having induced the Elector, his master, to accept of the crown of Bohemia, if that enterprise had proved successful. In that case there would have been no necessity for him to deny the fact [F], he would have been loaded with benedictions, and admired for his prudence: men do very seldom judge of things any otherwise than by the event.

[F] In that case there would have been no necessity for him to deny the fact. Certain Critics severe, and sometimes too peevish, take delight in exclaiming against preachers, who encourage princes to make war, without considering that they are the ministers of the Prince of peace. A preacher will patiently bear this censure when the war, which he exhorted to, proves very successful: but since the enterprise of the Elector Palatine, Frederic V, was attended with great misfortunes; it could not but be an unpleasant thing for a church-man to be told, in a reproachful manner, that he had engaged him in it. If a Divine, preaching before him, had exhorted him to undertake that war, alledging the most proper texts of the Scripture, and particularly these words of the Psalmist, *Accingere gladio tuo super femur tuum potentissime*, &c (52). Which may be translated thus:

Gird on thy sword, most mighty prince,
And clad in rich array,
With glorious ornaments of pow'r,
Majestic pomp display.
Ride on in state, and still protect
The weak, the just, and true;
Whilst thy right hand, with swift revenge
Does all thy foes pursue.

(a) See the end of the remark [A].

SEBONDE (a) (RAYMUNDUS) professor of Physic, Philosophy, and Divinity [A] at Toulouse in the XVth century, was a native of Barcelona. He was esteemed for his parts and learning, and wrote some books, whereof the most considerable is that which is intitled, *Theologia naturalis, five Liber Creaturarum*. That book must certainly not be in favour of the notions of a vulgar author, nor of one that creeps upon the surface of prejudices, since Montagne set a singular value upon it [B]. He translated it into French [C], and made an apology for it [D], which is the longest chapter of his essays.

[A] Professor of Physic, &c. I follow Mr de Mauflac, who gives him all those titles in his *Prolegomena* upon Raymond Martini. 'Sciendum est, says he, Raymundum Sebonde nec Dominicanum, nec in Hebraicis aliisque linguis Orientalibus valde versatum fuisse, quamvis eum ex Judæo Christianum nobis representet Michael à Monte toto capite Apologia. . . . Sed tantum Hispanum & Barcinonensem atque in Academia Tolosana Medicinæ Professore, Philosophiæ, sacraque scientiæ, eoque gradu illic insignitum. . . . We must know, says he, that Raymond Sebonde was neither a Dominican, nor well skilled in the Hebrew and Oriental tongues, although Montagne, through the whole chapter of his Apology, represents him as one who, of a Jew, had turned Christian. . . . but only a Spaniard of Barcelona, &c.' I find in the abridgment of Geisner's *Bibliothèque* the title of a book (1), which is a dialogue, inter Raymundum Sebondum Artium Medicinæ ac Theologiæ Professore & Dominicum Seminiverbium. I have just now run over that Apology for Sebonde, on purpose to know whether the author represents him as a Jew converted to Christianity, and I have not been so lucky as to discover the least hint of it; but because I have not read every line of it, I do not pretend to deny in all respects what Mr de Mauflac affirms. I shall only affirm that Montagne says little of Sebonde in all that long Apology, except in the beginning. Note, that Geisner calls him Sebeyde, and says, in the margin, he is also called Sabunde (2). The title prefixed to the prologue of the *Liber Creaturarum* in the Strasbourg edition, 1496, favours this last name: *Compositus à venerabili viro magistro Raimundo de Sabunde in artibus & medicina doctore, & in sacra pagina egregio Professore*.

(1) The same with *Viola Arminæ*.

(2) Geisner, in *Bibliotheca*.

[B] Montagne set a singular value upon it. See the following remark, and the remark [D].

[C] He translated it into French. I shall give an account of this translation: it may help to make

Such a preacher, I say, would have made a merit of it, if the new king well settled upon the throne of Bohemia, had secured the peace of Germany, and the liberty of conscience from the ill designs of the court of Vienna. But that enterprise proved unfortunate, and then no body was willing to confess he had advised it: so much men are afraid of the wrong custom of judging of things by the event. I call it wrong; for on many thousand occasions, there is more prudence in those who do not succeed, than in those who do. How many ill-concerted enterprises have proved successful? And how many well laid designs have proved fatal? Nay, it frequently falls out, that a great design carried on according to the best rules of policy, succeeds by unforeseen means, and such as no body depended upon. Be that as it will, the posture of affairs was such in Germany, when endeavours were used to bestow a crown upon the Elector Palatine, that prudence required the venturing a great deal. By running no hazard, there was ground to fear a slavery, which includes all sorts of misery under the Popish domination; but if the revolution of Bohemia could have been supported, it would have put the Protestants in a condition to give law. It was therefore chiefly on account of his profession that Abraham Scultetus ought to have been ashamed of the advices which he had given.

Sebonde known. Let us hear what the translator says (3); 'Peter Brunel (4), a man accounted very learned in his time, having been for some time at Montagne in my father's company, with some other persons of his character, presented him, at his departure, with a book, intitled, *Theologia naturalis, five Liber creaturarum Raymundi de Sebonde*. And because the Italian and Spanish languages were very familiar to my father, and that book is written in a kind of Spanish jargon, dressed out with Latin terminations, he hoped my father might make use of it with a very little help, and recommended it to him as a book very useful, and suited to the time when he gave it him, which was when the new doctrine of Luther began to be in vogue. . . .

(5) My father, some days before he died, having by chance found that book, under a heap of useless papers, ordered me to translate it into French. (5) Montagne, ubi supra, pag. 185.

It is an easy task to translate such authors as him, where there is little to do but to represent the matter; but when a book is written with great politeness and elegance, the translation of it is a difficult undertaking, especially into a language that has not the same force. It was a very strange and new employment for me; but being then, as it happened, at leisure, and being unwilling to disobey the least command of the best father that ever was, I did it as well as I could; which pleased him wonderfully, and he ordered the translation to be printed, which was executed after his death. La Croix du Maine places that impression in the year 1569. Those dialogues concerning the nature of man (so he intitles the book of Raymond Sebonde, translated by Montagne) have been printed at Paris for Gabriel Buon, in 1569, and for Giles Gourbin, in the same year (6). Du Verdier (7) does not mention the same title, nor so ancient an edition. These are his words: *Le livre des creatures. Raymond Sebon est l'auteur de it: that book contains three hundred and thirty chapters, and was printed*

(3) Montagne, *Essays*, book ii, ch. xii, pag. m. 134.

(4) It should be Brunel.

(5) Montagne, ubi supra, pag. 185.

(6) La Croix du Maine, *Bibl. Française*, pag. 329.

(7) *Bibl. p. 375*, at the word Michael de Montagne.

effays. Few people have known exactly in what time Sebonde lived, or what he was. Montagne wonders how such an author could remain in so great an obscurity: all that we know of him, says he (b), is that he was a Spaniard, who made profession of Physic at Toulouse about two hundred years ago. Scaliger says in a letter written in the year 1606 (c), that Sebonde lived at Toulouse two hundred and thirty years before, or thereabouts. This does not very well agree with the Abbot Trithemius (d), who places the death of that Physician in the year 1432. I have observed in another place (e), the other mistakes of Scaliger concerning that man. He took him to be a Dominican Monk, and ascribed to him a book against the Jews, intituled, *Pugio fidei* - - the dagger of faith, of which Raymund Martini is the author. Our Sebonde was not very well known to Gabriel Naudæus, a man of a prodigious memory, and who had a vast knowledge of books and manuscripts; for speaking of what Scaliger says concerning Galatinus and Sebonde, he does not observe any fault in it (f). What concerns the other writings of our Sebonde will be seen in a remark [E].

(b) *Essays, lib. ii, ch. xii, p. 186, of Tom. ii, Paris 1659; in 12mo.*

(c) It is the 241st.

(d) See *Mauffac's Prolegomena prefixed to the Pugio fidei.*

(e) In the remark [C] of the article MARTINI.

(f) Naudæus, in *Bibliogr. Polit.*

printed at Paris in 8vo, for Giles Gourbin, in 1581. I have seen, continues he, another translation of the same book in very old French. These last words shew he does not mean John Martin's translation published in the year 1551 (8). There is another reason for it, viz. That John Martin and Montagne did not translate the same book. The book translated by John Martin contains seven dialogues. But the book translated by Montagne is not written by way of dialogue: it is divided into three hundred and thirty chapters, as du Verdier observes; and it is certain there is but one man, who speaks in the book of Sebonde, which contains three hundred and thirty chapters. From whence we may infer that La Croix du Maine does not well quote the title of Montagne's translation, and that the dialogues of Sebonde are only a cold dish heated again; for it appears from the very title of the translation that it contains the same things as the book of the Creatures. The title runs thus: *La Theologie naturelle de Raymond Sebond comprise en sept dialogues intitulez autrement, de la nature de l'homme* (9). See hereafter the titles of the books of that doctor.

(8) *Ibid. p. 720.*

(9) *Ibid. p. 720.*

(10) Montagne, ubi supra, pag. 186.

(11) *Ib. p. 187.*

(12) *Ib. p. 202.*

(13) *Pag. 187.*

(14) *Pag. 202.*

[D] He made an apology for it. He himself tells us what moved him to it (10). I thought the notions of that author were very fine, the contexture of his discourse very close, and his design very pious. And because many people read that book, and particularly the ladies, to whom we ought to be more servicable, I have often had occasion to help them, by answering two main objections raised against that author. His design is noble and bold, for he undertakes to establish and prove against the Atheists all the articles of the Christian religion, by natural and human arguments. This occasioned the two objections which Montagne proposed to answer. Some said (11) that the Christians hurt themselves by pretending to build their belief upon human arguments, since it is the work of faith, and of a particular inspiration of the divine grace. Others said (12), that Sebonde's arguments were weak and unfit to prove what he intends, and undertook to confute them easily. Montagne thought himself obliged to answer (13) the former gently and respectfully, because it seemed to him that there was something of a pious zeal in their objection: but, says he (14), the others ought to be handled more roughly, for they are more dangerous and malicious than the first. The method he took, was to wrest out of their hands the weak arms of their reason, by shewing them the emptiness and ignorance of men, and the divine Majesty, to which alone belongs knowledge. Those, who know Montagne's character, may easily guess

that he gave himself a large scope. The judgment he makes of the arguments alledged by his author, is too edifying not to be inserted in this place. To speak the truth, says (15), I find him so resolute and successful in establishing the articles of the Christian religion by natural proofs, that I think no body can go farther than he upon that subject, and that none did ever equal him. . . . I asked formerly Hadrian Turnebus, a very knowing man, what that book might be: he answered, that he thought it was a quintessence drawn out of Thomas Aquinas; and indeed that vast genius, full of an unbounded learning, and of an admirable subtilty, was the only man capable of such notions. . . . I know, Montagne goes on (16), a man of note, bred up a scholar, who confessed to me, that he had been reclaimed from his unbelief, by Sebonde's arguments. Every body has not so good an opinion of that book as Montagne. Father Theophilus Raynaud (17) speaks of it with contempt; and a Lutheran professor (18) laughed heartily at Comenius, for saying (19) that Sebonde has so demonstratively proved whatever concerns the knowledge and glory of God, and the knowledge and salvation of man, that nothing can be alledged against it. That professor maintains, that in many things, which are not very obscure, that Spaniard argues pitifully, and he alleges, as an instance of it, the explication of the causes which produce discord among men.

(15) *Pag. 186.*

(16) *Pag. 201.*

(17) *Prolegomena Theolog. Nat. num. 86.*

(18) *Jacob. Thomastus, Praefat. LXXVII, Lips. 1681.*

(19) *Comenius, de uno necessario, cap. vi, p. 49.*

[E] The other writings of our Sebonde. His other books are *Quæstiones disputatæ. Viola animæ per modum dialogi de hominis natura tractans ad cognoscendum se, Deum & hominem, & omne debitum quod Deo obligatur & proximo. Colonia apud Henricum Quentel 1501, in 4to* (20). The dialogues of *Natura hominis*, printed at Lyons in 1568, are probably the same book with *Viola Animæ*; the latter differs from the *Theologia Naturalis*, only as to the method. This plainly appears from the bare consideration of the following title: *Theologia naturalis, sive liber Creaturarum, specialiter de homine & de natura ejus in quantum homo, & de his quæ sunt ei necessaria ad cognoscendum se ipsum & Deum, & omne debitum ad quod homo tenetur & obligatur tam Deo quam proximo*. The author was one of those men, who, when they have published a book which pleases them, or for which they are esteemed, produce it from time to time under different attires, like those Cooks, who serve the same meat dressed in different ways. I never saw any body that did not allow, that the first edition of the *Theologia Naturalis* is that of Paris, 1509: nevertheless, I have one of Strasbourg, in folio, printed in a Gothic letter, in the year 1496.

(20) See the Epitome of Gellner's Bibliothecæ.

SEDULIUS (CAIUS CÆLIUS, or CÆCILIUS) flourished in the Vth century [A]. He was a priest (a), and wrote a Poem, intituled, *Paschale Carmen*, and a book in prose upon the same subject, intituled, *Paschale Opus*. These two pieces have been

(a) See the remark [C] towards the end.

(1) See *Father Labbe, Differt. de Script. Eccles. Tom. ii, p. 329.*

(2) *Ila confona exhibit Uffierius ex Thorneyana Bibliotheca. Id. ibid.*

(3) *Ibid. pag. 333, 334.*

[A] He flourished in the Vth century. Some think he wrote his Poem under the reign of Theodosius the younger, and Valentinian III. This is observed in the manuscript of Petrus Pithæus (1), and in another ancient manuscript mentioned by Archbishop Usher (2). According to this way of reckoning he must have flourished about the year 430. Father Sirmond found in the best manuscripts of Gennadius, that Sedulius died in the reign of the emperors above-mentioned (3). Nevertheless Archbishop Usher places him after the year 470. The reason alledged by him, viz. That Sedu-

lius's book was found scattered among his papers, and put into a good order, and published by the consul Turcius Rufus Asterius (4), is not a convincing one; for that Asterius may very well be the same that was consul with Protogenes in the year 449. And though it were granted to Archbishop Usher, that it is he who was consul with Præsidius, in the year 494; yet there will be no necessity to grant him what he says, since there might have been some years between the death of Sedulius, and the time when his book was put into order, and imparted to the public (5). There is in

(4) See *Father Labbe, ibid. pag. 325.*

(5) See *Labbe, ibid. pag. 334.*

VOL. V.

D d

been preserved [B]. He is said to have written a commentary upon St Paul's Epistles, but it ought rather to be ascribed to one SEDULIUS a Scotchman, of a much later standing [C]. We are told that the fault of a transcriber, who put the word *Hæreticus* instead of *Heroicus*, was the cause why the Poet Sedulius was hated; and that this hatred did extend to all the Poets [D]. It is allowed that he was a man of parts, and that there

the old editions of the *Carmen Paschale*, an epistle dedicatory in verse, from which it should be inferred, that this work was dedicated to the Emperor Theodosius I; but it is very likely that this epistle belonged to a more ancient Poem, and that it was prefixed to this by a mistake, on account of the conformity of the subjects. This is Archbishop Usher's, and Father Labbe's opinion (6). However it be, it is not doubted but that Sigebert is mistaken, who says, that Sedulius flourished in the reign of Constant and Constantius; that is, between the year 340, and the year 350. It is also thought that Albertus Stadenus is in the wrong, to place him about the year 378 (7). What is certain is, that this Poem of Sedulius came out before Pope Gelasius made his decree, and consequently before the year 496, in which that Bishop of Rome died: That, I say, is very certain; for this piece of Sedulius is mentioned in that decree (8).

[B] *These two pieces have been preserved.* The *Paschale Carmen*, id est, de Christi miraculis libri quinti (9), has been often printed with the epistle dedicatory to the priest Macedonius and without it. The *Paschale Opus*, which is also divided into five books, and dedicated to the same Macedonius, was published at Paris by Franciscus Juretus in 1585, from Pithæus's manuscript. It is the first edition. Note that the priest Macedonius exhorted the author to put the *Paschale Carmen* into prose: and therefore Sigebert is mistaken, who says that the prose was published before the verses. *Sedulius Episcopus ad Macedonium Prefbyterum scriptis libros de miraculis Veteris & Novi Testamenti, quos postea sub metrica lege redactos prætitulavit Paschale carmen* (10). We have also some other Poems of Sedulius: the first edition of his poetical works is that of Aldus Manutius 1502. The best is that of Paris 1624, in the eighth volume of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. See Father Labbe (11) and Dr

(6) See the same, *ibid.* pag. 333.
(7) See the same, *ibid.* pag. 332.
(8) Gratian. Can. Sancta Romana, *Diffl. XV.* apud Labbe, *ibid.* pag. 325.
(9) Mr du Pin, *Bibl. Tom. iii.* Part. ii, p. 75, of the Dutch Edition mentions only four books.
(10) Sigebertus, *cap. vi.* Catalogi, apud Labbe, *ubi supra*, pag. 328, 329.
(11) Labbe, *ibid.* Cave (12). pag. 335.

[C] *To one SEDULIUS a Scotchman, of a much later standing.* Mention is made of one Sedulius Episcopus Britanniae, who, together with Fergusus a Scotch bishop, assisted at a council held at Rome in the year 721. Bale, Simler, and some others, call that Sedulius bishop of the Southern Scotch, and say he wrote the canons of a council held at Rome. The subscriptions in the printed books run thus, *Sedulius Episcopus Britanniae de genere Scotorum, & Fergusus Episcopus Scotiae Pictus huic constituto à nobis promulgato subscripsimus* (13). Heptadannus (14) a Monk of St Gall mentions one Sedulius a Scotchman, under the year 818. *Sedulius Scotus clarus habetur.* It is to him that Father Labbe (15) ascribes the *Collectaneum seu explanatio in omnes epistolas S. Pauli*, printed first at Basil in 1528, and then inserted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. It is nothing else but a rhapsody made up of several extracts from Origen, Eusebius, St Jerom, &c. Aubertin (16) ascribes it to Bishop Sedulius, who, together with Fergusus, assisted at a council of Rome under Gregory II, or Gregory III. Here follow the reasons alleged by Father Labbe. That manner of commenting upon the scripture, does very much favour of the IXth century (17), and it seems that the author of that *Collectaneum in Paulum*, wrote likewise the *Collectaneum in Mattheum*, which is to be found in the library of the Jesuits of Paris, written upon very fine parchment, and with a very fair hand, above seven or eight hundred years old. Were it true that the *Collectaneum in Mattheum*, and the *Collectaneum in Paulum* were written by one and the same author, it would afford us a convincing proof against the learned Usher, Archbishop of Armagh, who pretended that the *Collectaneum in Paulum* was the work of the same Sedulius, who wrote the *Carmen Paschale* in the Vth century; for the author of the *Collectaneum in Mattheum*, quotes not only the Poet Sedulius, but also Pope Gregory I, St Isidorus, Arculfus, and the venerable Bede, who flourished in the VIIIth century (18). If what Mr Du Pin affirms (19), were true, viz. That the author of the *Collectaneum in Paulum* quotes Pope St Gregory and the venerable Bede; Father Labbe would be very much to

(12) Cave, *Hist. Liter.* pag. 337.
(13) Taken from Father Labbe, *ubi supra*, pag. 328.
(14) He composed some short *Annales* inserted by du Chesne, in the third volume of his *Collection of the Historians of France*.
(15) Labbe, *ubi supra*, p. 338.
(16) See Labbe, *ibid.*
(17) *Id.* *ib.* pag. 335.
(18) See Labbe, *ibid.*
(19) Du Pin, *ubi supra*, pag. 375.

blame for not alledging that reason against Archbishop Usher, and I should very much wonder at Usher's positively saying, that the Poet Sedulius wrote the commentary upon St Paul's epistles. I do not wonder that he said so, though doubtless he was not ignorant that the Jesuit Justiniani (20) observes, that the author of that *Collectaneum in Paulum* transcribed some words from the twenty-first chapter of the nineteenth book of St Gregory's *Moralia* upon Job; for as he knew that this Jesuit declares, that those words were transcribed without naming St Gregory, *cujus verba transcripsit tacito ejus nomine*, he might have thought that Sedulius did not transcribe from St Gregory, but that this Pope transcribed from Sedulius. He was not obliged to be of Justiniani's opinion, who does not think it likely that St Gregory should have borrowed any thing from Sedulius: 'Nec verisimile videatur Gregorium ea à Sedulio mutuatum esse, cum plane Gregoriani styli simplicitatem redolant qui more suo hæc Apostoli verba non tam ad scribentis mentem, quam apte ad mores informandos explicat' (21). --- (21) *Ibid.*, *quod eundem*, p. 338. 'Nor does it seem probable that Gregory borrowed these things from Sedulius, since they plainly savour of the simplicity of Gregory's style, who, according to his custom, in explaining these words of the Apostle, does not so much consider the express meaning of the author, as how they may be fitly applied to form the manners.' All this serves to shew that Mr du Pin is mistaken. It would not be sufficient to know that Sedulius, the author of that commentary upon St Paul, is a different man from Sedulius the Poet; it is further necessary to know whether the latter was a Scotchman. Many affirm it, but I do not find they alledge good reasons for it. The inscription of an excellent manuscript in the abbey of Fulde, *Sedulii Scoti Hiberniensis in omnes Epistolas Pauli collectaneum*, which Archbishop Usher alledges as a very good argument, can be of no force, so long as one may believe with great probability, that the author of that *Collectaneum* is not the Poet Sedulius. Trithemius may repeat as often as he pleases, that these words *Sedulius Scotigena*, are prefixed to a book of letters, he will never prove the affirmative of this question. It should be proved first of all that Sedulius the Poet is the author of those letters. In a word, since the ancient authors never said that our Sedulius was a Scotchman, we are not at all to mind what the following ages can suggest to us upon that head. One might lay some stress upon it, if there had been no Sedulius, that was a Scotchman; but since it is certain that there has been one or two, it is no difficult thing to apprehend that the Poet has been confounded with one of them. See Father Labbe (22). (22) Labbe, *ubi supra*, p. 338. It were to be wished that he had made as many discussions upon each ecclesiastical writer, as upon the Poet Sedulius. I observe, by the by, that he has very well confuted those, who pretend that this Poet was a Bishop. He alledges the silence of the antients; he shews that Gennadius's testimony is insignificant: Gennadius, says he, Salvian, Prosper Aquitanus, and some others, have been improperly stiled bishops by several authors. The title of *Antistes* bestowed upon Sedulius was bestowed upon priests. Dexter's Chronicle, wherein mention is made of Sedulius, *Episcopus Oretanus* in the year 428, is a supposititious book. Isidorus Hispalensis would not have stiled Sedulius barely a priest, if he could have honoured the Spanish nation with such a bishop (23). (23) *Ex eodem*, pag. 331, 332.

[D] *The fault of a transcriber . . . was the cause that the Poet Sedulius was hated, and that this hatred did extend to all the Poets.* It is said that Paul II, conceived a great hatred against the Poets, by reason of that fault of the transcribers, and that many Professors of the Canon Law, for the same reason, looked upon all sorts of Poems as heretical works. What a ridiculous thing would this be! Let us quote Mr de Boissieu. 'Veteres librorum indiligenter scripti, vel ex Tullii, Strabonis, Hieronymi, & aliorum querelis patet. Unde multi gravissimorum virorum errores emanarunt: quod hoc duntaxat exemplo probasse mihi sufficiat. Cum in prima parte Decreti,

(20) Benedicti Justiniani in I ad Corinth. cap. vi, vers. 5, apud Labbe, *ibid.* pag. 337.

(21) *Ibid.*, *quod eundem*, p. 338.

(22) Labbe, *ubi supra*, p. 338.

(23) *Ex eodem*, pag. 331, 332.

there is something great and noble in the turn of his Poem, that his thoughts are Poetical, and his verses tolerable (b) [E]. What Moreri says of him wants to be new moulded from the beginning to the end.

(b) Du Pin, Bibl. Tom. iv, pag. m. 75.

* Decreti, distinct. 15. c. 3. hæc Gelasii Pontificis verba, Item venerabilis viri Sedulii Paschale opus, quod heroicis versibus descriptis, insigni laude præferimus, depravata essent, & pro heroicis, librorum incuria, legeretur, hæreticis, mendum hoc, Paulum secundum, Pontificem maximum ad Poetarum capitale odium perduxit, & plurimis aliis, Legum Professoribus, imposuit, ut omnia poemata, quamvis sacra, hæretica esse duxerint; ut Pierius Valerianus, in oratione pro Sacerdotum barbis scriptum reliquit. O rem ridiculam, Cato, & jocosam (24). -- The complaints of Tully, Strabo, Jerom, and others make it very plain that the old transcribers wrote incorrectly; from whence proceeded the errors of many great men. It will be sufficient for me to prove this by one example. Whereas in the first part of the decree, these words of Pope Gelasius, We likewise honour and praise very much the Paschal performance of the venerable Sedulius, which he wrote in heroic verse, were corrupted, and through the carelessness of the transcribers the word Heretic was written instead of Heroic, this error induced Paul II, &c. . . . as Pierius Valerianus has written in his Oration, &c. A merry story indeed! Others apply this to Pope Hadrian VI. Read the following passage, and compare it exactly with Boissieu's words. Unum adhuc addam, unde pateat, quædam plerumque depravati Codices afferant. In Canonibus à Gratiano digestis, dist. 15. Ubi recitatur insigniter salutare Decretum Gelasii, hæc sententia est: Venerabilis viri Sedulii Paschale opus, quod heroicis descriptis versibus, insigni laude proferendum. Ibi vulgata ante hac exemplaria pro heroicis, hæreticis habuere. Quod bonis quibusdam Canonistis suspicionem movit, Poemata omnia esse hæretica, Poëtaque inter pios, esse sacra trahent, neutiquam annumerari. Id quod Hadriano illi Batavo, qui Caroli V. Præceptor fuerat, adeo persuasum fuit, ut nullum hominum genus majori prosequeretur odio, quam Poetas. Et adhuc aliqui, ut Pierius clarissimus affirmat, non mali aliqui præfules, depravata illius loci lectione inducti, neminem sacerdotio dignum arbitrantur, qui unquam in Parnasso somnians (25). By comparing those two passages one with another, there is ground to suspect that one of those two authors quoted Pierius Valerianus without reading him; for if what concerns Paul II (26), is to be found in that writing, how comes it that Philippus Carolus says nothing of it? Why does he only mention Hadrian VI? Take notice that what he says of this last Pope does not prove that the word hæreticis instead of heroicis made him hate the Poets. He only says occasionally that Hadrian VI, being fully persuaded that they were unworthy to be numbered among pious men, hated them to the highest degree. And therefore I do not pretend to prove by the testimony of that author, that what Boissieu says of Paul II, is applied to Hadrian VI. The proof I bring for it is a passage probably occasioned by a careless and hasty reading of Philippus Carolus's words. Ajunt eum (Hadrianum) nullum hominum genus majore prosequeretur odio quam poetas, eo quod in antiquis exemplaribus Canonum à Gratiano digestorum legitur decretum Gelasii in hæc verba: Venerabilis viri

* Sedulii Paschale opus, quod hæreticis descriptis versibus, &c. cum ibi heroicis legi debere jam pridem monuerint viri eruditi (27). -- They say that he (meaning Hadrian) hated no sort of men more than the Poets, because in the old copies of the Canons, digested by Gratian, the decree of Gelasius was thus worded: Venerabilis viri, &c.

I suspect the truth of this account, and am apt to take it for a story forged by the Italian Humanists, on purpose to ridicule the enemies of good literature. Nevertheless I do not deny that the fault of a transcriber may have frequently produced disorders both in the heart and understanding. But I know that Paul II, and Hadrian VI, had some other reasons for hating the Poets; and I cannot apprehend that ignorance should be able to make one and the same person act so contrary to good sense as to hate the Poets for the reason alledged here, and yet to reverence Pope Gelasius: for it ought to be observed that the decree into which the word hæreticis had crept instead of heroicis contains an encomium upon Sedulius's Poem. It is also to be observed that we are not told that this mistake did lessen in the least the veneration that Pontif was in.

[E] It is allowed that he was a man of great parts, and that there is something noble in the turn of his Poem, &c.] I shall add to this testimony of Mr du Pin Borrichius's own words, whereof Mr Baillet gives us the sense (28). 'Diction Sedulii facili, ingeniosa, numerosa, perspicua, sic satis munda (si excipias profodica quædam delicta) (29). -- Sedulius's style is easy, harmonious, elegant, perspicuous, and correct enough, (if you only except a few errors in the profody). Venantius Fortunatus bestows pretty large encomiums upon our Poet.

Quod tonat Ambrosius, Hieronymus atque cornicat,
Sive Augustinus fonte fluente rigat,
Sedulius dulcis, quod Orosius edit acutus,
Regula Cæsarii linea nata sibi est (30).

In thunder Ambrose does his mind declare,
Jerom in words that swift as light'ning are;
Sedulius is sweet, Orosius source,
And Austin waters like a summer show'r:
The rule of great Cæsarius is a line
Made for himself, and perfectly divine.

And in another place:

Majestatis opus metri canit arte Juvenus,
Hinc quoque conspicui radiavit lingua Seduli (31).

The learn'd Juvenus in heroic verse
Does the great work of majesty rehearse.
Hence too Sedulius chose his radiant theme,
And grew conspicuous in the book of fame.

See some other encomiums in Pather Labbe (32).

(27) Autor anonymus Notar. ad Sannazarii Poëmata, Epig. IV, lib. iii, pag. 237, Edit. Amstel. 1689.

(28) Baillet, Jugem. for les Poëtes, num. 1192.

(29) Borrich. Dilect. de Poëtis, pag. 76.

(30) Venant. Fortunatus, Epig. I, lib. viii, apud Phil. Labbe, de Script. Ecclesiast. Tom. II, pag. 326.

(31) Id. initio, lib. I, de Vita Sancti Martini, apud eund. ibid.

(32) Labbe, ibid. pag. 327.

SEGLA (WILLIAM DE, SIEUR DE CAIRAS) was counsellor in the parliament of Toulouse towards the beginning of the XVIIth century. It was he, who made a report of a criminal process, which has been placed among the Tragical Histories of that time [A], and for the clearing up of which Mr de Verdun, first president in the parliament

[A] Among the tragical Histories of that time.] There is an account of it in the *Mercurius Francicus* (1). Violante de Bats, a native of Spain, and a very leud woman, consented to the assassination of her husband, being angry with him, because he would not allow her the liberty she desired of receiving her lovers, the chief of whom was an Augustin Monk, Professor of Divinity in the university of Toulouse. His name was Peter Arias Burdeus, and he was born at Granada in Spain. He, and a counsellor in the Seneschal's court were the chief contrivers of the assassination. That woman's husband was killed with seventeen wounds, in

the month of July 1608. Burdeus being convicted of adultery and murder was condemned to be beheaded and quartered, which was executed in the month of February 1609. Violante was likewise put to death with some others of her ruffians. Burdeus's adultery was proved against him by a sufficient number of witnesses, viz. by a woman who maintained in the presence of him and Violante, that she had seen them in the very fact in the wood of the farm of Laura; quiet, belonging to a convent of Nuns; and by another, who affirmed that she had seen them going into the said wood by themselves. There were also some

(24) Dionys. Salvagnus Boetius, Not. ad Poëm. Ovidii in Ibin, pag. m. 127.

(25) Philippus Carolus, in Dilectat. de Criticis, pag. 17, 18. It is prefixed to his notes upon August. Gellius, printed at Nuremberg, in 1663.

(26) I have consulted the dissertation of Pierius Valerianus, pro Sacerdotum barbis, and I have found in pag. 24, of the Paris edition 1531, apud Christ. Wechel, the sense of the whole quotation of Philippus Carolus, but nothing concerning Paul II.

(1) Tom. I, fol. 325 verso, & seq. ad ann. 1609.

(a) In 1611, Mr de Verdon was then first president in the parliament of Paris.

parliament of Toulouse, took all possible pains. The parties accused were at last convicted, and punished according to their deserts: and because William de Segla was thoroughly acquainted with that cause, the first president (a) exhorted him to publish it. The Latin letter he received from him was prefixed to the book which he put out, wherein you find, besides an account of the proceedings, a hundred and thirty one observations full of learning [B]. The family of Segla is still in being at Toulouse, where they hold places in the parliament.

some other particular witnesses, one of which had seen them kiss one another in a lascivious manner, while they were sitting at table in his garden in one of the suburbs of the town. The other had seen them twice in a chamber for the space of two hours. . . . That crime was also called a sacrilege, there being some ground to suspect that he had lain with Violante in a confessional in St James's church; for two witnesses deposed that he had been two full hours in the said confessional with a pretty tall gentlewoman, such as Violante was. Besides, there was a spiritual incest and adultery in the case, because Violante was his daughter by confession, whom he owned to have confessed two or three times in

our Lady's chapel in the cloyster of the convent of the Augustins. As for what concerns the murder, the common report, &c (2).

[B] *Observations full of learning.* They are intermixed with the most curious passages of the ancient authors, according to the fashion of that time. Those, which concern the disorders occasioned by love, and the artifices of courtizans, have not been forgotten. That book was printed at Paris in the year 1613, in 8vo, Corras, a counsellor in the parliament of Toulouse, who made a report of the process of the man, who through an imposture, pretended to be Martin Guerre, had before published a like commentary upon a process and a sentence.

(2) Segla, *Hist. tragique*, p. 14, & seq.

SEYMOUR (ANNE, MARGARET, and JOAN) three sisters illustrious for their learning in England in the XVIth century. They composed a hundred and four Latin distichs upon the death of Margaret de Valois Queen of Navarre, and sister to Francis I, which were soon after translated into Greek, French, and Italian, and printed at Paris in the year 1551, with this title, *Tombeau de Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre*. Nicolas Denifot (a), who had been tutor to these three learned English ladies [A], made a collection containing the translations of their distichs, and some other verses both in their praise, and upon the death of the Queen of Navarre, and dedicated it to Margaret de Valois Duchefs of Berry, sister to Henry II [B]. The little

(a) He styled himself d'Albinois, *Alcinous Comes in Latine*, as Chancellor de l'Hôpital calls him.

[A] Denifot . . . had been tutor to these three learned English ladies.] Ronfard deserves to be heard upon this head, tho' his phrases favour of the barbarousness, that was still in the French language when he wrote.

alterations in it afterwards. I make use of the last editions.

[B . . . He dedicated the whole to Margaret . . . sister to Henry II.] The Chancellor de l'Hôpital did not forget that circumstance in the following verses, which he made on that learned princess.

Denizot se vante heuré
D'avoir oublié sa terre,
Et passager, demeuré
Trois ans en vostre Angleterre,
Et d'avoir cogneu vos yeux,
Où les Amours gracieux
Doucement leurs fleches dardent
Contre ceux qui vous regardent :
Voir & d'avoir quelquefois
Tant levé sa petiteffe,
Que sous l'outil de sa vois
Rabota vostre jeunesse,
Vous ouvrant les beaux secrets
Des vieux Latins & des Grecs,
Don't l'honneur se renouvelle
Par vostre Mufe nouvelle (1).

(1) Ronfard, ubi infra, pag. 618.

Denizot wants that he was blest
For having left his native shore,
And lived in England as a guest
Full six and thirty months; - - - or more.
'Twas there he knew your eyes so well,
Where all the graceful cupids dwell,
And softly let their arrows fly
At every gazing slander-by.
For this he likewise did rejoice,
Accounting it his highest praise,
That you allow'd his humble voice
Your tender sentiments to raise,
While it disclosed unto your view,
All that the Greeks or Romans knew,
Whose honour is reviv'd again
By your sweet Muse's rival strain.

The ode, that contains these verses, was printed in the collection of the distichs; but Ronfard made many

Et tibi judicium, tibi doctas Delius aures
Præbuit ac regale referit pectus honestis
Artibus: eximiam raramque in Principe laudem.
Tantum nulla decus tulit unquam regia virgo.
Innumeros hæc causa viros, ut condere carmen
Utque suos vellent tibi consecrare labores
Impulit: hæc fuit iis scribendi causa poetis,
Virginibusque tribus vestigia pressa terendi.
Atque hic longinquis sua cœpit prima Britannis
Aureus incrementa liber sermone Latino.
Inde per Eurypus & formidabile nautis
Invadens spatium Belgas devenit & urbem
Parisiam, novus hospes iit perque ora manusque.
Res placuit nostris argumentumque poetis:
Continuoque alii maternâ vertere linguâ.
Græcâ alii, atque Itala, mox & nova jungere versûs
Collibuit, justique voluminis addere formam.

Phœbus your judgment and your ear refin'd,
With noble arts replenishing your mind:
High praise indeed! But such a praise as we
Most seldom due to your high station see.
No royal virgin ever did possess
True fame to such a glorious excess.
Hence is it that so many authors do
Inscribe and consecrate their works to you:
From hence inspir'd the cheerful poets sing,
And the three virgins to their chorus bring.
Far off in British land this golden book
In Latin verse it's first beginning took.
It was transported into Belgium next,
Passing the formidable space betwixt.
To Paris last the welcome stranger came,
Was read by all and prais'd. The noble Theme

little exactness of those, who have mentioned this collection [C], occasioned my affirming in the preface of this Dictionary, that the distichs were a different work from the epitaphs on the Queen of Navarre. I mend that fault now, and I do ingenuously confess that I have discovered the fallacy of my conjectures by reading the epitaph of that queen. Which should teach us, that a man ought to be very cautious in making conjectures about matters of fact. It is much better for him to suspend his judgment till he has seen all the writings concerning it. I retract what I have said against Mr Joli, and Moreri (b); and I do particularly acknowledge that they are excusable, for calling those three sisters PRINCESSSES, for they may possibly have seen that title prefixed to the collection published at Paris by Denisor; but I maintain still that they were not princesses. They have been praised by divers authors, particularly by Ronfard [D], and Nicolas de Herberai Sieur des Effars [E], so well known by his French translation of Amadis de Gaule. It is somewhat strange that they should be so little known at this day [F].

(b) All these faults have been acknowledged in the extract of a Letter dated the 23d of March 1693, inserted in the *Courier Galant* for April 1693.

*In all our Poets rous'd the like desire,
Some quickly clab'd it in a French attire.
By some it was translated into Greek;
And others made it in Italian speak.
Many did furnish it with new supplies,
To make the volume of a proper size.*

[C] The little exactness of those who had mentioned this collection.] Ronfard calls the distichs of those three sisters a *Christian song*. Richelet, who commented upon him, observes, that they were Christian distichs. Neither of them says any thing, whereby it may appear that those distichs concerned the deceased Queen of Navarre. Neither does Chancellor de l'Hospital intimate any such thing. Who therefore would have thought that they were epitaphs upon a queen? What do poets commonly put into such pieces but extravagant flatteries? Can any thing be more remote from Pibrac's Quatrains, or Michael Verin's distichs, than the tears of Poets upon the graves of great persons? I thought therefore (2), that those distichs stiled *Christian* were moral sentences, and not funeral elegies, and lavished incense. It would have deceived better judges than I am. But since I have seen that work, I must acknowledge that there are more christian and moral reflections than poetical phrases, in some verses of those illustrious sisters.

(2) See the project of this Dictionary, pag. 364, 365.

[D] They have been praised particularly by Ronfard.] His ode on those three English ladies (3), contains this praise among others, that if Orpheus heard them, he would be their scholar.

(3) It is the third of the fifth book.

*Mais si ce harpeur fameux
Oyoit le chant des Serenes,
Qui sonne aux bords escumeux
Des Albionnes arenes
Son Luth Payen il fendoit,
Et disciple se rendroit
Deffous leur chanson Chrestienne,
Dont la voix passe la sienne.
La science auparavant
Si long tems Orientale
Peu à peu marchant avant,
S'apparoist occidentale;
Et sans jamais se borner
N'a point cessé de tourner,
Tant qu'elle soit parvenue
A l'autre rive inconnue.
Là de son grave sourcy
Vint affoler le courage
De ces trois Vierges icy,
Les trois seules de notre âge.
Et si bien les sceut tenter,
Qu'ores on les oit chanter
Maint vers jumeau, qui surmontent
Les noires, rouges de honte (4).*

(4) Ronfard, *not w.*, of his Odes, pag. m. 617.

*If that harper so renown'd,
Could these charming Syrens hear
From the shores of Albion sound,
Wonder would perplex his ear,
He would break his pagan lyre,
And their scholar turn'd desire*

*Their sweetest Christian song to know
Which his own surpasses so.*

*Learning, for so many years
To the East confin'd before
In the West at length appears,
Still advancing more and more.
No waters did she make a strand
Till she reach'd that unknown land
Of the noble virgins three,
These three wonders of our age,
Whose extreme affection she
Came on purpose to engage.
Them she has instructed well,
As their many distichs tell.
Ours, as far as they have gone,
Blush to see themselves outdone.*

I shall occasionally observe that Richelet, who made a Commentary upon Ronfard's odes, did not understand the last verse but one of the quotation. It is plain, that *maint vers jumeau*, --- many twin-verses, signifies the hundred distichs of those three ladies, or those verses which they coupled two and two together, in imitation of Cato and Michael Verin: And yet the Commentator found himself here very much in the dark. He thinks that *jumeau*, (twins) signifies like one another; because, says he, they are sisters; or, it is an allusion to the tops of mount Parnassus, which are double, whither the Poets go to learn how to make well a verse, which he calls *jumeau*, as if one should say *Parnassian*. You may judge whether the Commentators upon the antients Poets do not frequently deceive us, since those who undertake to explain the Poets of their own time, and of their own country, are liable to such mistakes. I could easily shew, that Muret, who commented upon some poems of Ronfard, did not always rightly understand his French words.

[E] . . . and by Nicolas de Herberai Sieur des Effars.] The praises he bestows upon the three English sisters are contained in a letter he writ to them, which was prefixed to the collection of epitaphs upon Queen Margaret.

[F] It is strange that they should be so little known at this day.] I asked some Englishmen very learned and well versed in the knowledge of books and authors, what those three famous English ladies were, telling them at the same time the little I knew of the matter: They answered me, that they were absolutely unknown to them. I had the same answer from Paris, tho' I consulted some persons, who are hardly equalled by any body else in the knowledge of such things. These three illustrious English ladies must needs have fallen into oblivion, since Mr Juncker says nothing of them in the catalogue of learned women, lately published by him (5). He quotes Pitfeus sometimes; and therefore since he does not speak of the three sisters Seymour, it is a sign Pitfeus does not speak of them neither. A friend of mine had assured me before, that neither Bale nor Pitfeus, who have so fully treated of the writings of that learned nation, say any thing of these three sisters.

(5) It is an Appendix to the book *de EpheMERIDIBUS sive DIARIIS ERUDITIONUM*, published by him at Leipzig in 1693 in 12mo.

VOL. V.

E c

SELEMNUS,

SELEMNUS.

SELEMNUS, a river of Achaia, had been a very handsome young shepherd. The nymph Argyra fell so passionately in love with him, that she used to come out of the bottom of the sea to go and lie with him. But when the prime of Selemnus's beauty vanished away by age, the nymph left off going to him. The young man died of grief for it, and was metamorphosed into a river by the goddess Venus. That change did not cure him of his passion: Venus was obliged to interpose; she granted him the favour of forgetting that nymph. It is said that from that time the river Selemnus had an admirable virtue; which was that the persons of both sexes who bathed themselves in it, no longer remembered the object of their love (a). Pausanias is in the right to say, that if the water of that river had such a virtue, it would be more valuable than great fums of money [A].

(a) Ex Pausania, lib. vii, p. 229.

[A] If it's water had such a virtue, it would be more valuable than great fums of money. We must not believe all that the Poets and writers of romances make amorous people say; the descriptions of their sufferings are hyperbolic: however, it must be granted, that love is an inexhaustible source of miseries and disorders. It is a very necessary passion upon earth for the preservation of animals: It is the soul of the world with respect to them; nay, it is certain, that the Divine Providence has annexed a thousand charms and pleasures to so necessary a passion; but, on the other hand, it is attended with a thousand troubles. How many people can neither eat, nor drink, nor sleep, and lose their health and wits upon that account? The number of those who die of it is greater than it is thought: Those who hang themselves for it, are indeed few; nevertheless, there are some. This concerns those whose love is not answered. As for those who are as much beloved as they love others, they pay dear for their pleasures; for not to say, that their reason is disordered, and that their passion is frequently contrary to their true interest, whereby they are exposed to a vast number of troubles; does not bare jealousy, which commonly attends their passion, make them sufficiently unhappy? Can there be a more lamentable, melancholy, and dreadful condition than that of jealous people? Let their jealousy be well or ill-grounded, it is all one; their torment is equally great; they are not the less persecuted by the chimeras and phantoms of their imagination; the fire wherewith they are wasted and consumed, is not more tolerable for it: and therefore it may be said, that if there was a river in the world which could cure lovers, it would be more valuable than gold. Εἰ δὲ μέγιστον ἀλυσίας τῆ λόγου τιμώτερον χρημάτων πολλῶν εἶναι ἀνθρώποις τὸ ὕδωρ τῆ Σελέμνου. *Quid nisi commentitium esset, quantavis pecunia videri posset ea*

(1) To understand this, one must read these verses of Pindar, O. I. Olymp. Ἀριεὺν μὲν ὕδωρ δὲ θεῶν ἀλυσίας ἀνθρώπων πῦρ ἔστι διαπρίπτου νοῦν τὴν μαγάνορος ἔχοντα παλιν. Optima quidem est aqua: & aurum, velut ignis nocet ardens, consumat eximie inter superbificas divitias.

(2) Pausanias, lib. vii, p. 229.

Che, mentre con la fiamma il gelo mesco,
Tutto il Regno d' Amor turba, e contrista.

Siama altera e sdegnosa la mia Dellia, purché non
rivolga cortese, e pia lo sguarda soave altrove: mi
fia scarfa de suoi favori: avara delle sue gratie, che
tuttavia,

--- Un più gentile

Stato del mio non è sotto la Luna,
Si dolce è del mio amaro la radice.

Ma non posso già soffrire, che i begli occhi fereni,
i quali accifero nel mio petto fiamma inestinguibile
d' Amore habbiano a rischiare il fosco d'Horatio
co'i raggi della lor luce,

Si nieghi a me, purché a ciascun si nieghi;
Che, purché altrui non splenda il mio bel Sole,
Ne le tenebre ancor vivrò beato (3).

(3) Lodovico Zuccolo, *Accademico Filopono di Faenza*, Dialogo della Gelosia, p. 129, 130.

I have not a heart of such impenetrable stuff as can
resist the black poison of jealousy,

Which, intermixing ice with flames, confounds,
And shakes love's empire to it's utmost bounds.

Let my Delia be baughty and disdainful to me, provided that she do not, in the height of her courtesy and compassion, bestow her sweet glances elsewhere: let her be sparing of her favours to me; niggardly of her graces, yet still,

A more delightful state than what I feel,
Not the broadfield of fancy does contain,
So sweet the root is of my bitter pain.

But I cannot bear that those bright and beautiful eyes, which have kindled in my breast an unquenchable fire of love, should illuminate the darkness of Horatio with their beams of light.

If that fair sun do not to others shine;
Although he never bear these eyes of mine,
Yet shall I live in darkness happy still.

But because he cannot even promise to himself this melancholy comfort, he gives himself up to despair, and eases his grief only by curling jealousy as a monster come out of hell. 'Ma, se il mio male rimane affatto senza rimedio, non mi si tolga alme- no, ch'io sfoghi in qualche modo il mio cordoglio co' lamenti, e co' pianti.

O forella di morte, onde veniste,
D'invidia figlia, fiero, horribil mostro,
Che fai miei giorni lagrimosi, e tristi;
Tornati a l'infernale, oscuro chioffro,
Che troppo co' tuoi morsi il sen m'apristi,
Onde il velen, la piaga, e'l dolor mostro (4).

(4) Id. *Ibid.* p. 137.

But if there be no remedy left for my misfortune, at least let me not be hindered from discharging some part of my bitter anguish in lamentations and complaints.

Sister of death, whence art thou come? -- Away
Thou child of envy, and thou beast of prey,
By whom in sorrow all my days I tell;
Return black monster to thy native hell.
Too deep thy tusks are in my bosom found,
For see, the poison sisters in the wound.

I have read in a certain book which was printed with the satire upon the hermaphrodites (5), that a lady having sung with a melancholy tune (6), and made it appear by her looks (7) that her heart was sorrowful; some body asked her what made her so melancholy; and that instead of giving any answer to the question, she spoke the words of Ludovico,

(5) See the remark [C] in the article SALMACIS, at the end.

(6) Discours de Iacophile à Lionne, pag. 96.

(7) *Ibid.*

Che dolce piu, che piu giocondo stato,
Saria, di quel, d'un amoroso core:
Che viver piu felice, & piu beato,
Che ritrovarsi in servitu d'amore,
Se non fosse ciascuno stimolato,
Da quel sospetto rio, da quel timore,
Da quel martir, da quella frenesia,
Da quella rabia detta gelozia.

What joys so pure could any mortal find
As those which harbour in a love-sick mind.

What

*What life could to our faintest experience prove
More happy than the servitude of love;
But that there is a sting in every breast.
Of cur'd suspicion, enemy to rest,
A spark of frenzy which possesses all,
And which the rage of jealousy we call.*

(8) It is to be found in page 548, of *Chenier's Oeuvres* *Mémoires*.

Doublets; it was the torments of jealousy which obliged a Poet of the same country to make a sonnet (8), wherein he tells his confessor, If you design to punish me for the faults which love has made me commit,

enjoin me to fall in love again, for there is no greater torment than that.

*Se pur brami punir l'anima errante,
Fa ch'io torni ad amar, che fra mortali
Non v'è pena maggior ch' esser amante.*

*If you would punish me for errors past,
Then bid me love again. What can be worse?
To be a lover is the greatest curse.*

SELVE (JOHN DE) first president in the parliament of Paris, in the reign of Francis I. See his article in Moreri's Dictionary. I shall only add to it three or four particulars, imparted to me by Mr Baluze, whereby it may be rectified and improved. It is not true that this president was originally from the Milanese: he was born in the Limousin; and it is very likely that he and his ancestors were natives of the city of Tulle [A]. They father upon him a book which he did not write [B], and it is without any good reason that an Historian charges him with having corrupted the memoirs of Philip de Comines [C]. His true name was John de SALVA [D]. Those, who made the eulogies of the first presidents of Paris place his death in August 1529. But John Bertaud, who made and printed his epitaph in that same year, informs us, that he was buried at St Nicolas du Chardonnet the eleventh of December. That epitaph is not upon his tomb, but another very modern (a).

(a) Memoir communicated by Baluzius.

[A] He was born in the Limousin, and it is very likely that he and his ancestors were natives of the city of Tulle. My reasons for it are these. I shall use the very words of the learned man, who has done me the honour to furnish me with some memoirs for this article. (1) John de Selve was a native of Limousin: 'There is no difficulty in it. Clear proof of it may be seen at the beginning of the treatise de Beneficio; besides, the same is confirmed by Gabriel Lurbaeus; in his book concerning the illustrious men of Aquitaine. But it is not known from what town or place of the Limousin he came. There is reason to believe he was born at Tulle; the chief town of the Lower Limousin. What makes me think so is, that I find in an old record of the year 1431; John de Salva, named among the chief inhabitants of that town; and his posterity continues still there; but they go by the name of la Selve. It is very likely then, the reputation of John de Selve, first president of the parliament of Paris, made the authors in that family who live still at Tulle, change their name into that of Selve become famous by that first president. Besides this conjecture, which is very probable, I find in the inquest of nobility of Christopher de Lestange, Bishop of Carcassonne, and commander of the king's order, made in the year 1617, that the first president was the son of John de Selve, which perfectly agrees with John de Salva, mentioned in the year 1431, since there are a hundred full years from that year to 1529, when the first president died. Besides the same inquest informs us, that Margaret de Selve his sister, was married to Peter de Juyé an inhabitant of Tulle.'

From whence it is easy to infer, that the genealogy of the family of Selve, printed in the eulogies of the first presidents of Paris, is not exact, particularly in saying, that the grandfather of the president, was a gentleman of the Milanese.

[B] A book of which he is not the author, is fathered upon him. He is commonly said to be the author of the treatise de Beneficio. But John Bertaud (2) informs us, that it is not he, but his brother, who is the author of it. *Adde se. recor. Do. Joannem de Salva senatus Parrisiensis principem: cujus frater Joannes de Salva inter reliquos quum primis honoris, sicuti probitatis sue facile dedit documentum quam de beneficio insignem tractatum edidit* (3).

[C] It is without any good reason that an Historian charges him with having corrupted the memoirs of Philip de Comines. What Belcarius bishop of Metz, advances in his history book vii. chap. x. is not likely, viz. That the first president de Selve, who, says he, was ignorant of the transactions in the reign

of Lewis XI, and Charles VIII his son, corrupted and curtailed in several places, the memoirs of Philip de Comines. For the first edition of those memoirs came out in 1524. But the first president was hardly at leisure then to print books, and particularly other peoples works. Besides, the editions agree with several ancient manuscripts, as it has been observed by M. Godefroy in his preface to those memoirs (4).

[D] His true name was John de SALVA. So he is called in the epistle dedicatory to John Raulin's epistles printed at Paris in the year 1521. *Robertus Raulin Joanni de Salva Parisiensis senatus primo praefidi.* And in the epistle, alluding to his name, he says among other things, *te natum Salvum fecit, ut alios absque improperio Salvos faceres.* And in the epigram printed next to the epistle dedicatory:

*Astruit ante obitum nullum censura Solonis
Salvum. Te talem primus ortus habet.*

In the relation of the conference held at Madrid in the year 1525, in order to get Francis I. released; he is called John de Salva, in a copy made at that time which I have by me. It is true, that the word Salva has been dashed out since, and the word Selve has been put into the margin.

In the treaty of marriage between Hercules d'Este, the son of Alphonse Duke of Ferrara, with Renata of France, made at St Germain en Laye, on the nineteenth of February 1527, that president, who was Renata's attorney, is called Johannes de Salva, in an old copy of that time, which I have likewise by me.

John Bertaud a native of Perigord, published in the year 1529, three books, *de cognatione sacerdotum Joannes Baptista*; wherein making an enumeration of the famous Canonists and Civilians, particularly of those of Aquitaine, he says, *Adde se. recor. Do. Joannem de Salva senatus Parrisiensis principem.* And in the epistle to Francis de Marillac, first president in the parliament of Rouen, who had married a daughter of the first president de Salva, he says: *fidelissima uxor tua Magdalena à Salva.* The same made an epitaph upon the first president de Salva, wherein making an abridgment of his life, he begins with these verses:

*Salva domus dedit hanc, qui Salvos fecit utique
Oppressos misera condicione reos* (5).

(5) Ibid.

(1) A Memoir communicated by Baluzius.

(4) The same Memoir.

(2) In the book mentioned at the beginning of the last paragraph of the remark [D].

(3) The same Memoir.

SENGBERE (POLYCARP) a Civilian in the XVIIth century, was a native of Brunfwic. He wrote a book against Salmafius [A]. 'He disputed with one Macquin for a professorship of the Civil-Law in the university of Angers (a). Menage, who had been his disciple, did not forget to serve him on that occasion; but Macquin was preferred to him, because he was more learned. Nevertheless, by reason of his merit, and because he was a man of parts, the magistrates of Angers bestowed upon him a yearly pension of an hundred crowns to keep him in their town; and Mr de Boilefue, jointly with some others, gave him as much, so that he had six hundred livres a year. He was accused of having bribed his judges; but Mr Menage made his defence. Those, who have published some memoirs for Menage's life (b), say that he pleaded several causes in the parliament of Paris, one, among others, for M. Sengbere, who had a mind to divorce his wife on account of adultery (c). It is very strange that he should say nothing of it speaking of that process [B]; for the occasion seemed necessarily to require, that he should not forget to

(a) Menagiana, pag. 94, of the first Dutch edition.

(b) They are prefixed to the continuation of the Menagiana.

(c) See remark [C] of the article MENAGE.

[A] He wrote a book against Salmafius. Here follows a piece of Menage's conversations. 'Sengbere, my master in the Civil-Law, wrote against Salmafius's book *de Mutuo*: The sheets were sent to Salmafius as they were printing, and he wrote to me, that Sengbere gave him no hard words, but that his raileries were as sharp as injurious words. He acquainted me, at the same time, that he would answer that book. But Sengbere cleared the matter better than he, and he made no answer (1).'

[B] It is very strange that he should say nothing of it, speaking of that process. He speaks of that process with great ingenuity, and without any design of concealing the weak side of his master. 'Sengbere, doctor of the Civil-Law at Angers, having accused and convicted of adultery his wife, who was a very handsome woman, got her confined to a convent, and took a concubine in her place. A jester happening to be in a company where they were discoursing of his case, said in a pleasant manner: 'since he wanted a whore, he might as well have kept his wife (2). If Menage pleaded for the husband upon that occasion, one can hardly apprehend why he did not say so, when he related that Sengbere carried the cause. He did not forget to say that he had been his defender upon a less important subject (3), viz. when Sengbere was charged with having bribed the judges of the dispute about a professorship. This is not very intelligible, for he had been cast. Is it customary for those, who carry the cause, to accuse the person who loses it, of having bribed the judges? Would not such an accusation reflect upon the judges, rather than the person accused of having bribed them? Is not a judge, who suffers himself to be bribed, more guilty than the briber? That passage of the Menagiana ought therefore to be rectified; and instead of these words, *he was accused of having bribed the judges*, it should be, that he was accused of having endeavoured to bribe them. The judges would not have been interested in that cause; they would not have been forced to side with Sengbere: and it may very well happen that a man, who cast his adversary, is willing to carry his triumph further, and load him with a new confusion, by proving that he intended to have recourse to fraud and bribery.

(4) Remark [C] I have said in another place (4), that some wished this pleading of Menage had been printed. He was an advocate very well qualified to succeed in such a cause. He might have said many things fitly applied and handsomely turned: and since the wife was convicted, and her beauty, though ever so great, could not save her; it is to be presumed, that the proofs of the husband were as strong as his advocate could have wished. But it was a great advantage for his advocate, and a circumstance the more favourable, because it afforded a character of superiority very proper to confound the common topics, alledged by the wife's advocate. When a cause about adultery is doubtful, the advocate who pleads against the husband, speaks in an insulting manner, and ridicules him unmercifully; at which the advocate, who pleads against the wife, is not a little embarrassed. But why do I say, when such a cause is doubtful? I should have said even when it is not at all doubtful (5). I shall quote Mr Chevreau for it, who gives us the following account of an ancient gentleman, who had married a young woman. 'Ever since she found herself mistress of the best part of his estate by virtue of that donative, she minded nothing but fine clothes and good cheer,

and expressed a great contempt or indifference for all the caresses of her old husband.

'Hinc dolor, hinc lachrymæ,

'Hence grief, hence tears.

But there is something more afflicting for the good old man, and if you desire to know it in a few words, it is that for men of his age

'Est indeclinabile cornu.

'Horns are unavoidable.

In reality, he had as undeniable proofs, as any geometrical demonstrations can be, that she made him a cuckold, and that his wife, whom he used to call his treasure, was only a treasure of iniquity. What ever reasons his relations could alledge to induce him, for their own credit, not to make the cause of his vexation public, he only consulted his anger, being resolved to get her confined to a nunnery, by the same sentence that should make the donative void. He has powerfully carried on the prosecution, and produced many writings against her, and even mortgaged a fine estate in land in order to execute his project. The lady pitched upon an advocate, who expressed himself with a wonderful easiness; and is not covetous in the least, being as rich as he is voluptuous; and it is said, he never pleads a great cause for a handsome lady, but he has an enjoyment for it. He mightily exaggerated the noble birth, and the personal merit of that lady; her virtue, which appeared in her very looks; the intolerable jealousy of her husband grounded upon dreams; and the loathsomeness and ridiculousness of old age. It was also said, this pleading was that of an advocate, who was to be paid by enjoyment and love, and that his fair client rewarded him accordingly. The cause had been twice heard, and was put off till the month of September after the festival of St Martin. The two parties are gone, the gentleman to his village, and the lady to the house she is possessed of by the contract of her marriage. In the mean time, a nephew of the old gentleman gave him a visit to know the particulars of his law-suit, of which he had been informed only by imperfect and partial accounts, although he had been told that the young lady's advocate had abused him in a most insulting manner (6). The nephew advised him to put an end to that suit by a good reconciliation, and even told him, that it had been better if he had not begun it. He alledged himself for an example, and did not forget his brother's conduct. 'My brother, and I, said he (7), do not much care to dive into things, that would vex us, if we should find them out; nor does it appear to us that the greatest happiness of a husband consists in being a shrewd diviner. We only aim at a quiet life; and it is our opinion, that a man who continually watches his wife, must needs take an ill course. The remonstrances of a jealous husband are suspected; his prohibitions frequently enrage a wanton woman, prepossessed with this opinion, that stolen waters are the sweetest: And we could never apprehend, that a tutoring husband proved more acceptable than a tyrannical one. Violent means betray a brutish temper; and whoever has recourse to the law, must expect to be laughed at by the judges, who

(6) Chevreau Oeuvres mêlées, pag. 52, & 54.

(7) Ibid. p. 57.

to mention the service he had done to his master.

- (8) Ibid. p. 58.
- (9) Compare what you will find citat. (14) of the article SAINT-CYRE.
- (10) Chev. ibid. pag. 60.
- (11) Juven. Sat. II, ver. 37.
- (12) The *Lex Julia de Adulteriis* is ascribed by several learned men to Augustus and not Julius Cæsar.
- (13) Barnabas Brillonius ad legem Julianam de Adulteriis, pag. 150.

mus Constantinus capitis poena adulterii crimen vindicandum constituit †, . . . Capitalet autem poenam Justinianus in masculis probat, mulierem verò verberibus cæsam in monasterium detrudi præcipit, data potestate marito intra biennium, si hoc exiffimaverit, eam inde revocandi, quo transacto, aut viro præmortuo, eam raso capite, monastico habitu acciri, & illic omni vitæ tempore manere † jubet. † Nou. ut nulli.

— Constantine was the first who decreed a capital punishment for the crime of adultery . . . Justinian approved that men should suffer death, but that women should be whipped, and then shut up in a monastery, giving power to their husbands to take them thence within two years; which if not done, he ordered her to be shaved, clothed in the monastic habit, and there to remain during life. That severity was abated by degrees, and in some provinces (14) an adulteress was allowed one half of the estate purchased by her husband. Pope Honorius III, reformed that scandalous custom. Apud Rupellanos . . . jam olim invaluerat nonnullæ consuetudines, quarum duo capita à jure, & honestate publica abhorrentia damnavit Honorius III. P. in Epistola decretali ad Majorem & Burgenfies de Rupella. Primum fuit . . . Alterum fuit, ut mulier ob adulterium non amitteret lucrum mediæ partis omnium bonorum per virum quæstorum constante matrimonio: consuetudinem emendavit Pontifex, quoad proderat mulieribus adulteris (15). — With the Rochellers . . . some customs had long prevailed, of which two that were inconsistent with justice and common decency, were condemned by Pope Honorius III, in a decretal epistle to the magistrates and inhabitants of Rochelle. The first was . . . The other was, that a woman for adultery should not lose her privilege of enjoying half her husband's estate, which was acquired during the marriage. These were abolished by the Pope, as to the privilege of adulterous women.

It is to be observed that the jest, mentioned by Menage (16), is faulty, as most witty sayings are: if it be strictly examined, it will be found to imply a falsity; for, in mens opinion, the unfaithfulness of a wife is the disgrace of the husband. The keeping of a concubine is not liable to such a construction, and does not require that a man should have the same regard for her as for a wife; and therefore Sengbere's choice was not attended with like inconveniences, as the jester supposed.

† L. quamvis 2. C. de adulter.

† Nou. ut nulli.

(14) Rochelle for instance.

(15) Alteferra Rerum Aquitanic. lib. III, cap. xxviii, pag. 227.

(16) I think he repeated it upon another occasion; for methinks he says in another place of the Menagiana (I cannot find the page again) that a gentleman having parted with his wife, and taken a concubine, his man said, Ah fir, since you could not be without a . . . why did not you keep your lady?

SENERTUS (DANIEL) an eminent Physician, was born the twenty-fifth of November 1572 at Breslaw, where his father was a Shoe-maker. He was sent to the university of Wittemberg in the year 1593, and there made a great progress in Philosophy and Physic (a). He visited the universities of Leipzig, Jena, and Francfort upon the Oder, and then went to Berlin in the year 1601, to practise Physic; he staid not long there but quickly returned to Wittemberg, where he took his degree of Doctor of Physic the tenth of September in the same year, and at a year's end he was made professor of the same faculty: He was the first, who introduced the study of Chymistry into that university; and he acquired a great reputation by his works [A], and by his practice [B]. He had three wives, and had no children by the two last; but he had seven by the first. He died of the plague at Wittemberg the twenty-first of July 1637 (b). He got some adversaries by the liberty he took to contradict the antients; but none of his opinions was less approved than what he advanced concerning the origin of souls.

[A] He acquired a great reputation by his works. They are many, and have been often printed in France and Italy. The last edition, if I am not mistaken, is that of Lyons, 1676, it is divided into six volumes in folio. The foregoing editions were only divided into three volumes (1).

[B] . . . and by his practice. Sick people had recourse to him from all parts, and he denied no body his assistance. He took what they gave him for his fees, and exacted nothing; nay, he restored to the poor what they gave him (2). The plague raged at Wittemberg above seven times whilst he was a professor in that town; but he never went away, and never refused to assist sick people. The Elector of Saxony, whom he cured of a great sickness in the year 1628, made him one of his Physicians in ordinary, and yet allowed him the liberty of living at Wittemberg. Several dukes, princes, counts, and gentlemen, used, with success, his advice and prescriptions

in their sicknesses. Nicolas Sapienza, great standard-bearer of Lithuania, not knowing what to do to recover his health, applied himself to the Physicians of Padua. They advised him to put himself into Sennertus's hands (3). Accordingly he took a journey to Wittemberg, and went home again perfectly recovered. Polonus . . . non vidit tantum atque coram admiratus SENERTUM esse; sed maus ingenti beneficio etiam, cum vidisset, discessit. Ut intelligeret, nil supra verum narrasse famam: & pauciora propemodum retulisse: expertus novissime opulatore felicitissimum; quem Medicæ eruditionis principem salutaverat ante (4). — The Polishman . . . not only saw and admired Sennertus; but after having received wonderful benefit by him, departed, well satisfied that same had not said more, but rather less of him than what he deserved, having found in him a most happy assistance, whom before he had called the prince of Physicians.

(3) Ibid.

(4) Augustus Buchnerus, in Orat. funebri Sennerti, apud Witte, Memor. Medicor. p. 97.

[C] He

(1) See Mercklinus in Lindenio renovato.

(2) Pauperibus honoraria affertibus ea restituit. Vita Sennerti, in limine Operum.

VOL. V.

F f

He believed that the seed of all living creatures is animated [C], and that the soul of that

[C] He believed that the seed of all living creatures was animated.] The difficulties he found in other opinions made him embrace this. The common doctrine of the school-men seemed to him absurd (5), viz. That substantial forms are not produced; for they say, the attribute of being produced belongs to a natural compound, and not to its parts. He was not satisfied with the opinion of Avicenna, that there is a celestial intelligence appointed for the formation of souls, which makes use of seeds only as of an instrument.

(5) Toletus, *Commentariorum in Aristotelis Metaphysicam*, lib. i, cap. 123, Tom. i, Edit. Lugd. 1676.

(6) Sennert. *ibid.* cap. ii.

(7) Fernelius, *lib. i, de abditis causis pluribus in locis, acrius defendit omnem animam à celo proficisci, & à celo animam omnem in materiam preparatam & ideam immitti*, *Id. ibid.* pag. 124.

(8) Vide Jacobum Schegkium, *lib. i, de plast. feminis facultate*, apud Sennert. *Ibid.* cap. v, pag. 127.

(9) *Ibid.* p. 130.

(10) Galen. *lib. iii, de Usu Part.* cap. x.

(11) Franc. Titelmanus, *lib. viii, Phys.* cap. xi.

(12) Titelmanus, *ibid.* apud Sennertum, de *Generat. vivent.* cap. i, pag. 130, Tom. i.

(13) Sennert. *ibid.*

but such difficulty, have perceived, that these operations proceed from the soul, which lies concealed in the seed. I had rather say, as Galen does, that we are altogether in the dark about it, than ascribe to a soul, hid in a small egg, the ability that is requisite to form the body of an ant, the body of a chicken, &c. Sennertus does very well confute the hypotheses different from his; but he admits of certain things, which cannot be understood. He says (14), that human souls have no quantity, and that they are indivisible, and yet that each of them can produce its kind; that is, that the soul of a dog can produce many other souls of dogs. This would be a true creation, and a more difficult work than the conversion of the seed into an organized body. Had he known the hypothesis, which has been invented since he died, I believe he would have heartily embraced it; it is the hypothesis mentioned by me before (15), which has afforded many fine hints to the illustrious Mr Leibniz: It is that of modern Natural Philosophers, who having discovered, with the help of microscopes, that there are animals in the seed, think that living bodies are organized before they are born, and probably from the beginning of all things. Which leads them to this thought, That ever since the first original of things, the souls have been united to the same organized bodies; and that generation or birth is only the extension or growth of the individual, which is the primitive and continual subject of the soul; that this subject is not destroyed by death; that it loses only the particles of matter wherewith it was enlarged; that it recovers new ones in another birth, &c. This hypothesis removes the great difficulties that occur in assigning the cause of organization. To have recourse to God as to the immediate cause, is not to philosophize. To have recourse to the general laws of the communication of motion is but a poor solution; for since it is agreed by all sects, that those laws cannot produce, I will not say a mill, or a clock, but the coarsest tool that is in a Smith's shop, how shall they be able to produce the body of a dog, or even a rose and a pomegranate? To have recourse to the celestial bodies, or to substantial forms, is a pitiful shift. We want, in this case, a cause which has an idea of its work, and knows how to form it: those two things are requisite in those who make a watch, and build a ship; much more are they necessary in the cause of the organization of living bodies. It is certain the celestial bodies have no idea of a human body, and that they know not how it ought to be formed. The Peripatetics own that the substantial forms of plants and beasts know not how matter ought to be modified, to give it the organs that are in a tree or in a chicken; and therefore they are not the cause of that organization. Those who say they are the cause of it, tho' they know not the contrivance of that work, are a thousand times more absurd than those, who should say that a man can make a clock without thinking of it, without having even had any idea of it, and without knowing what he does, or what he designs. This objection shews the falsity of Sennertus's opinion; for he would not have said that the souls he admitted in the seed of plants and animals, had an idea of all the organs of plants and animals, and knew how to frame and place them in their proper places. And therefore it had been a great help to him, if he had been told that there are organized individuals in the seed; for it is more easy to conceive that a soul united to such individuals may be the cause of their growth, than it is to apprehend that it can organize a drop of liquor, and change it into the body of a dog. I know some understanding men, who pretend to comprehend that the general laws of the communication of motion, tho' never so simple and so few, are sufficient to make a *farus* grow, provided it be already organized. But I confess my own weakness: I cannot well apprehend it. It seems to me, that a small organized atom cannot become a chicken, a dog, a calf, &c. unless an intelligent cause directs the motion of the matter that makes it grow; a cause, I say, which has an idea of that little machine, and knows how to extend and increase it according to its due proportions. I think it will be granted me, that it is not more easy to conceive that the laws of motion may be the only cause of the building of a little house; than

(14) Sennert. *ibid.* pag. 132, fol. 1, 2.

(15) In the article RORARIUS remark [H].

WHETHER the general laws of motion are sufficient for the organization of bodies.

that feed produces organization. He was accused of blasphemy and impiety on pretence that he taught that the souls of beasts are not material [D]; which was supposed to be the same thing as if he had taught that they are no less immortal than those of men. He

(16) Note, that I own there is this difference between the enlarging of a house and the growth of a *seius*, that the organs of a *seius* are moulds, thro' which a new matter may be filtrated and distributed. A little house has no such thing.

(17) Alphonsus Caranza, a Spanish Civilian, in the first chapter of his tract *De parva natur. & legitime*, having rejected all the causes that are alleged of the formation of our bodies, ascribes it to God. *Sennertus, ubi supra*, cap. xii, p. 144 confutes him.

(18) See remark [M], of the article MORIN (J. BAPT.)

(19) Henr. More, de Anima lib. ii, cap. iv.

(20) See above citation (6).

(21) Sennert, ubi supra, cap. ix, pag. 137.

(22) Abse qua divina voluntate & peculiari erga homines gratia si fuisset, formæ humanæ non essent quam brutum. *Ibid.* cap. xiv, p. 147.

than it is to conceive, that they can change it into a large palace, in which each room, each door, each window, &c. keep the same proportions observed by the builder of the little house (16). If those two things are equally difficult, why should we believe that the laws of motion, which cannot organize a small particle of matter, will be able, if it be organized, to change it into an animal a thousand times bigger, all the proportions being duly observed in an almost infinite number of organs of different nature; some of which are soft, others fluid, others hard, &c. I should therefore think it probable that the growth of a *seius*, tho' organized ever since the beginning of the world, is directed by a particular cause, which has an idea of that work, and knows how to enlarge it; as an Architect has an idea of a building, and knows how to enlarge it, when he executes a plan ready made, which he lays upon his table. A great many people will grant me that animals have their parts unfolded in the womb; that they are there nourished; and receive their growth by the direction of a providence; but they will say that God directs all those things (17). I declare to them that they go from the question; for we do not enquire here into the first cause, the general author of all things; we enquire into the second cause, and the particular reason of each effect. To assign no other cause than God in this enquiry, does not become a Philosopher. Tell me, I pray, suppose there were rational inhabitants in the planets, and they should come down into one of our houses, and discover the use of rooms, of windows, of bolts, &c. and at last they should be contented to admire the providence of God, who has raised such a convenient building for men, would they not be rightly accounted ignorant? They would not know that this house was built by men, and that a human Architect directed the situation of the stones, boards, &c. according to the uses he designed them for. It is true, man receives that knowledge from God; but God is not the next, natural, and immediate cause of that building. The same ought to be said of the machine of trees and animals, they depend upon the particular direction of some second cause, which has received from God the knowledge and industry that are requisite for such a work. The difficulty lies in assigning that second cause. Some will have it that the substantial form of each mixed body is a spirit, on which God has bestowed the knowledge that is necessary to produce the temper, and effects, of that mixed body (18). Dr Henry More, who believed the pre-existence of souls (19), was of opinion, that being united to matter, they themselves frame an organized body to reside in it. That hypothesis may be confuted by our ignorance of what ought to be done, in order to put together nerves, veins, bones, &c. It might be answered, that the soul forgets all those ideas, as soon as her lodging is finished, because the coarseness of the organs of a human body breaks the communication she had before with very subtle occasional causes. But I had rather suppose that the soul itself does not direct the motions necessary for the growth of its own *seius*; I had rather ascribe that direction to another spirit. If any one had a mind to rectify the suppositions of Avicenna (20), he might say that there is a created intelligence, which presides over the organization of animals, and makes, as it were, a kind of a general manufacture of them; that it has an infinite number of workers under its direction, some for the bodies of birds, others for the bodies of fishes, &c. just as in our towns we see great variety of tradesmen; some make watches, others make cloaths, &c. [D] He was accused. . . of impiety, because he taught that the souls of beasts are not material. He rejects (21) the opinion of those, who maintain that they are not of a more noble nature than the elements; and he says, that they are by their nature as immortal as the souls of men; so that if the latter do not perish with their bodies, as the others do, it is through a special favour of the Creator (22). He could not deny that he ascribed an incorporeal nature to the souls of beasts; for he acknowledged that they are not produced from matter, and he laughed at the school-

mens education; but he would not say that they are immortal. Freitag (23), who writ against him with great fury, did not fail to object to him that his doctrine was impious and blasphemous: which was the reason why a book was published (24) in his vindication with this title. *De origine & natura animarum in brutis sententia clariff. Theologorum in aliquot Germaniae Academiis, quibus simul Daniel Sennertus à crimine blasphemiae & hæreses à Joh. Freitagio ipsi intentato abfoluitur.* Freitag giving the alarm, applied himself to all the universities in Christendom; and to all the lovers of orthodoxy, earnestly exhorting them not to suffer those pernicious innovations. He asked the Divines, whether they would bear that impious opinion, which ascribed immortality to the souls of beasts, which revived the doctrine of the Transmigration of souls, &c. Admittent ne Theologi impiam illam de actu formarum entitativo, quo animis brutorum talis assignatur essentia & substantia, quæ extrâ propriam quam informant materiam, alibi subsistere & existerè possint, opinionem? quæ Metempsychosis reducitur, Palingenesia adstruitur, & pecudum animabus immortalitas comparatur. Perentine commentum de generatione formarum corruptibilium ex nihilo, è diametro sacræ scripturæ aduersum & inimicum (25) Will Divines agree to that impious opinion concerning the essential act of forms, whereby such an essence and substance is ascribed to the souls of beasts, that they can subsist and exist separate from their proper matter whereby they inform? whereby the transmigration of souls is revived, their regeneration established, and immortality attributed to the souls of brutes. Can they bear the fiction concerning the production of corruptible forms from nothing, diametrically opposite and contrary to the sacred Scriptures? He supposes that the greatest part of the professors of Wittemberg were willing to fling those monsters, but that the great interest of their colleague prevented their rising up against him. Non ignoro Reverendos & celeberrimos Theologie in Academia Witteburgica Professores, caterisque Clarissimos Professores & Philosophos, paucis sæcè Sennertiana, qui ab ipsius auspiciis dependent, & sputa Sennerti lingunt, quod ejus promotione gaudeant, exceptis, non tantum dissentire, sed & omni conatu id velle, ut erroris bi in ipsâ herbâ supprimantur, verum ita cobideri quod aduersus ipsum Vajorem Sennertum magnatum quorundam favore sustulit subnixumque vix nutrire & hifcere audent (26). Sennertus complained that Freitag imputed to him such consequences as he did not acknowledge. 'Malitia verò est, says he (27), quod passim opiniones mihi assignit, quæ mihi nunquam in mentem venerunt. Inter quas non postrema est, quod scribit, me statuere bestialium animarum immortalitatem. Pro bono Viro Freitagium non habeo, donec monstraverit locum, in quo statuerim, animam canis, equi, bovis, leonis, asneris, anatis, corvi, & similibus brutorum esse immortales, & post mortem supervenire. Consequentia verò, quibus id è meis opinionibus extorquere vult, nullæ sunt. Etsi enim insectorum, & sponte naturæ formæ corpore organico ad sensum dissoluta in materia instar feminis sese habente aliquandiu consistere possint: tamen immortales non sunt, sed suo tempore abolerentur. Neque ideò animæ brutorum sunt immortales, quia ex nihilo à Deo creatæ sunt. Neque enim immobilis, ut putat regula est, quod aliquid quod semel fuit, in nihilum redigi nequeat. Longe rectius J. C. Scaliger, exerc. 307. sect. 20. scribit, &c. . . But it is from malice, that he every where imputes to me opinions which never came into my mind. Among which it is not the least, that I maintain the immortality of the souls of brutes, I shall not take Freitagius for a good man until he point out the place, in which I have affirmed, that the soul of a dog, horse, ox, lion, goose, duck, raven, and the like brutes, are immortal, and remain after death. And there are no consequences whereby that can be extorted from my opinions. For altho' the forms of insects, and things beginning naturally, the organical body, as to sense, being dissolved, may, for some time, remain in a matter resembling feed: yet they are not immortal, but perish in their usual time. Neither are the souls of brutes therefore immortal, be-

(23) A Physician and professor of Philosophy at Groningen.

(24) At Francfort 1638, in 8vo, See Lindennius renovatus, pag. 237.

(25) Joh. Freitagius, in Apolog. ad Orbis Christiani Academiis, p. 18. It is prefixed to the book intitled, Novæ Sæcæ Sennerto Paracelsi recens in Philosophiam & Medicinam introductæ, quæ antiquæ veritatis oracula, & Aristotelicæ ac Galenicæ doctrinæ fundamenta convellere & stirpiti eradicare moliantur novatores. Detectio & solida Refutatio, printed at Amsterdam 1637, in 8vo.

(26) Joh. Freitag. in Apolog. ad Orbis Christiani Academiis, pag. 18.

(27) Sennertus, Epist. ad Joh. Sperlingem, in Lib. 2, p. 131. Defensio Tractatus de origine formarum pro D. Daniele Sennerto, contra D. Johannem Freitag. Auctore M. Johanne Sperlingem, Phyl. Prof. P. at Wittemberg. 1638, in 8vo.

He rejected that consequence; he durst not say, as others do, that the souls of brutes subsist after the death of the subjects which they had animated [E]. His opinion about the

'cause they are created of nothing by G O D. For it is not, as he thinks, an unchangeable rule, that any thing which once existed, cannot be reduced to nothing. Much better does J. C. Scaliger write, &c. It is not impossible but that Sennertus, tho' a man of great parts, might not perceive that the consequences ascribed to him, did naturally result from his principle; but it is still more likely that he perceived them, but durst not own them, *propter metum Judaeorum*, for fear of his enemies. And therefore he rather chose, by disowning these consequences, to be accounted a man, who did not argue well, and proposed a confused system, than to expose himself to all the consequences of the doctrine of the immortality of beasts. However it be, any Philosopher, who pretends to argue consequentially, will always chuse rather to say, that he knows not what the souls of beasts are, than to maintain, on the one side, that they are produced out of nothing, independently upon matter, and on the other, that they are not created beings, and that they are annihilated as soon as the brute ceases to live. Such was the confused opinion of Sennertus.

His apologist (28) positively declares, that the souls of beasts are made out of nothing, and yet that they are not produced by creation. He quotes Dannhæw- (29) rus (29), who alleged the *species intellectuales*, to shew whatever is made out of nothing, is not a created being. He quotes Thummus (30), who alleged the habits of the soul to prove the same thing. Thus the Peripatetics elude every thing with arguments *ad hominem*. Freitag does continually object to Sennertus, that he believes the immortality of the souls of beasts; he falls into a Poetical enthusiasm to exhort all manner of beasts to shout with joy and triumph; he pretends that our Physician revives the idle fancies of Paracelsus, who taught, that all souls returned again into the world from time to time. 'Plaudite ait, oves & boves, lupi & scarabæi, & vespæ & quicquid usquam crabronum est.

Vita equidem vestris animis à funere restat,
Restat & in corpus posse redire novum.
Fœlices animæ quod ubivis esse potestis,
Dum triplicis mundi flamma resolvat opus.
Dicite quæ vobis statio & fortuna superest,
Cum ruat in priscum machina trina Chaos?

Subjicit. Hi scilicet sunt fructus floresque novæ doctrine à Paracelso profectæ, quam Christiani etiam (proh pudor!) ferè amplecti non erubescunt, quæ statuitur formas rerum præter humanam corruptibilitatem, officio informationis functas, essentiam & existentiam suam servare, ubi Paracelsus addit eas ire ad Orcum & Iliadum suum, & quotannis aut certis temporibus redire in mundi theatrum, & assumpto fabricatoque corpore personam suam pro avo sibi destinato sustinere, eaque depositâ vicissim ad suos ibi avos & proavos immortali quiete beatos redire (31). - - - Rejoice, says he, ye sheep and oxen, ye flies and beetles, wasps and all hornets. Your souls live after death, and may return into a new body. Happy souls! that may be where you will, whilst flames consume the triple world. Say what place and fortune you can have, when the threefold machine shall tumble into it's antient chaos. He adds. Those, forsooth, are the fruits and flowers of the new doctrine of Paracelsus, which even Christians, alas! are not ashamed to embrace, which teaches, that besides the human soul, the forms of things perishable do preserve their essence and existence, where Paracelsus adds, that they go into their place of reception, and yearly, or at certain times, return upon the stage of the world, and having assumed and framed a body, all their part for the time appointed, and quitting it again, return to their grandfathers and ancestors happy in an immortal rest. Sperlingen answers in few words, That it is neither his nor Sennertus's doctrine (32): He therefore tacitly confesses, that they know not how to draw from a principle the consequences arising from it, and that they ascribe a very strange conduct to G o d, viz. That he has ordered an almost infinite number of incorporeal substances to be created, which he is to

abolish and annihilate in a short time after. Heat produces every year an infinite number of little animals, which live no longer than the heat lasts. What disorder is it in nature, that so many spiritual souls should be annihilated, because there happens some alteration in the organs of animals? It is to be observed that the school Philosophers have used against the Cartesians the same cunning which Dannhæw- (29) erus and Thummus did use. They brought in some instances to shew, that some things are produced out of nothing, and yet are not properly created. The accidents of matter afforded them those instances; but the Cartesians answered, that those accidents are not beings distinct from the subject which they modify: and therefore the arguments made use of to prove that substantial forms would be created beings, cannot be retorted. The Cartesians reduce all the alterations of matter to local motion, and maintain that the motion of a body is the body itself, as it receives existence with new relations. They must therefore acknowledge that matter, considered as being in motion, is created, and that G o d alone can produce motion; for none but G o d can create. This might pass, if the schoolmen had not recourse to other examples; but they ask whether the free acts of a man's soul are distinct from the soul. If they are distinct from it, they are beings produced out of nothing, and yet not created; nothing then hinders but it may be said that substantial forms are not created. If they are not distinct from it, a man's soul, considered as willing a sin, is created: and therefore it is not the soul that forms that act of her will; for since it is not distinct from the substance of the soul, and the cannot be the cause of her own existence, it plainly follows, that she cannot be the cause of any of her thoughts. She is not therefore answerable for willing ill things *hic & nunc*, no more than for existing *hic & nunc*. The Cartesians know not how to answer that objection: the perplexity they are in brings in again the doctrine of substantial forms, and all the chimeras of the schools, because the arguments alledged by them prove too much. Such is the fate of disputes: they spring again out of their own ashes; the party ready to lay down their arms find at last some retortition, whereby they recover their strength, and the ground they had lost, and dispute it as before.

[E] He durst not say, as others do, that the souls of brutes subsist after the death of the subjects which they had animated. Joannes Scotus Erigena maintained not only that they are not material, but also that they continue to live after the death of the brutes. John Lippius, professor of Divinity at Strasbourg taught the same thing (33). Dr Henry More, a Cambridge Divine, asserts, that they subsist out of the body, and thinks it probable enough that they continue to live in that state, but dares not affirm it; only he alleges the reasons for and con (34). I have verified what a professor of Leipzig ascribes to him (35). *Morus & superstites* (animas brutorum) & in corpora alia remeare tradit, cap. 5. (36). That professor tells us a curious thing, viz. That a certain man had taught, a few years before, that if man had not sinned, brutes had never died, and that they shall be raised with men, to be transported into Heaven: which is the opinion of the Turks. *Abfurdisime omnium M. B. Semigentilis & semi Christianus ante paucos annos cum monstrosi opinionibus aliis etiam hanc protulit, bruta nisi peccavisset homo, moritura non fuisset, atque eadem tamen licet nunc moriantur, cum hominibus olim resuscitanda, & ab hoc centro mundi ad liberiora cæli spatia transferenda; quod somnium olim Muhammedis à Turcis hodie credi, testis est Joh. Andreas in libro de Confusione Sectæ Muhammeticæ* (37). He observes, that according to Taurellus, the souls of beasts are spiritual, and yet die with their bodies (38). Perhaps Taurellus argued inconsistently for fear of exposing himself; he rather chose to prejudice his reason than his fortune. Or perhaps he and Sennertus came to believe, out of a principle of religion, that G o d destroys the souls of beasts, that none might subsist forever but those of men. Perhaps this was the opinion of the most eminent Rabbi that hath flourished in the XVIIth century; for endeavouring to prove that the

(33) Substantiam incorpoream docuerunt Joannes Scotus Erigena, lib. iii, de divisione nature, n. 41. . . . Jo. Lippius . . . in Metaphysica magna lib. ii, cap. i, pag. 386. . . . ille, adversus Basilium & Gregorium Nyssenum disputans, vitam separata à corpore non amittere; sic, quæque sejunctas in ære existere atque modo aliquo operari opinatur, forte cum universo olim in nihilum redigendas. Joan. Cyprianus, Hist. Animal. Continuat. pag. 24.

(34) Henr. Morus, de Anima lib. ii, cap. vi, num. 105, pag. m. 106.

(35) Joan. Cyprianus, ubi supra, lib. ii, cap. vi, pag. 24.

(36) He is told have added lib. ii, pag. 90.

(37) Cyprian. Hist. Animal. Continuat. pag. 24.

(38) Substantiam incorpoream docuerunt . . . Nicolaus Taurellus . . . in libello de vita & morte quæst. altera, præf. 1v. . . . brutorum animas à morte superesse negat. fous 1d. ibid.

(28) Sperlingen, pag. 182, of the book, the title of which I have just now set down.

(29) Dannhæw- rus, in Collegio Psych. Disput. VI.

(30) Thummus, in Disputat. de traduce.

calls on
brutes to
rejoice

his
put

(31) Sperlingen, Defensio Tractatus, &c, p. 206, 207.

(32) Mendacium est, brutum animas nobis immortales & post mortem superstitis esse. Mendacium est, nobis animas illas ubique esse, & absque omni in mundo vagari materia. Mendacium est, nobis ortum ac interitum hominum & brutorum unum eundemque esse. Mendacium est, nobis bruta & homines formæ similes & materiæ pares esse. Ibid. pag. 210.

the cause of metals and minerals was somewhat singular; he believed they were formed by intelligent and spiritual Beings [F].

fouls of brutes do not subsist after this life, as mens fouls do, he does not alledge any reason taken from the internal constitution, or from the essence of those fouls. He merrily thus argues: We often dream, *says he*, that we see people that are deceased; but we never see in a dream any animal after it's death, tho' it has been familiarly bred in our houses. Spizelius has reason to reject this Logic, he should likewise have denied the fact. A great many people may disprove the Rabbi; they dream a thousand times of their dead dogs and horses. *Satis ineptè Menasse Ben Israel lib. I. de Refurr. Mort. cap. IX. contendit*, Animam hominum, non brutorum esse superitatem ex eo, quod saepe de illis somniamus qui jam diu è vita excessere, nunquam tamen somniamus de ulla bestia, quæ mortua sit, etiam si nobis familiaris ac domestica fuerit (39). Observe, that the pretended blasphemies charged upon Sennertus, by a Physician and professor of Philosophy at Groningen, were not looked upon as an ill doctrine by the German Divines. 'Non negandum est, post Franzii librum hunc (40) aliquoties editum Theologos Lipsienfes, Rostochienfes, Basileenses, Regiomontanos quinquaginta abhinc annis de animæ beatiarum interrogatos, inclinasse magis in Danielis Sennerti opinionem, cui asserenti animas brutorum olim ex nihilo creatas, & hodie etiam alterius quam elementaris naturæ esse, blasphemiam & hæresim Johanne Freitagius Professor Medicus Groningæ intenterat. Enim verò & eisdem nominatos Theologos legimus in Responsis suis candide disceptationem de naturâ elementari ejus animæ à se ad Philosophos devolvisse, eorumque libertati permittisse (41). - It is not to be denied, that after some editions of this book of Franzius, the Divines of Leipzig, Rostock, Basil, Königsberg, and others, being about fifty years since consulted about the soul of beasts, inclined more to the opinion of Daniel Sennertus, whom John Freitag, Professor of Medicine at Groningen, had charged with blasphemy and heresy, for asserting that the souls of beasts were at first created of nothing, and even at this day are not of an elementary nature. For we read that these same Divines did fairly refer to the Philosophers the controversy concerning the elementary nature of these souls, leaving them to their freedom of thought therein.'

(39) Spizelius, in Scrutinio Atheismi, pag. 125.

(40) That is, Historia Animarum, satura, written by Wolfgang Franzius Doctor of Divinity, where these words are to be found, cap. ii. pag. m. 14. Sciendum est animam bruti non esse spiritum incorporeum, qualis est nostra mens inviolabilis & immortalis, alias quæque bruta essent immortalia.

(41) Joh. Cyprinus, ubi supra, pag. 27.

I shall make a reflexion before I conclude this remark. Tho' Sennertus was pleased to say, that the fouls of brutes do not subsist after this life, as human fouls do, he laid down a doctrine, whereby it plainly appears, that the fouls of beasts are of the same species with those of men. The difference of their fate, as to duration, does not proceed from the difference of their perfections, but from the free will of the supreme master, who is a cause wholly external. Medals and money, which princes order to be stamped, are an image of the conduct which that Physician ascribes to God. Medals are stamped to last for ever; money is coined to last till a new order to the contrary; for after a certain time it is cried down, and melted, and converted into other forms: and medals and money are made of the same metal. According to Sennertus, a human soul is like medals, and the soul of a brute is like money. This is a dangerous opinion; it would follow from thence, that we cannot be sure of the immortality of our fouls but by revelation. Honoratus Fabri, the Jesuit, who uses Sennertus with the utmost contempt, and taxes him with grounding his doctrine upon frivolous objections and answers, maintains that this opinion is somewhat impious (42). Ad rationes n. 2. & 3. adductas nonnulla reponit, (Sennertus, Hypomen. 4. c. 10.) quæ nemo sapiens relere dignetur: v. g. vult, animam rationalem ex natura & indole sua immortalem non esse, sed tantum ex voluntate ac decreto Dei; sed contrarium demonstravi, & hoc nonnihil impietatis sapit: præterea vult semen decimum divina benedictione carere, ac proinde animam, quæ ipsi inerat, interire; si hæc nugæ non sint, nusquam invenies. . . . Denique quod adducit ex scriptura crescite & multiplicamini. . . . (43) plisquam inane est. . . . sed hæc mittamus, finamque hominem, ut egregium medicum, ita vix mediocre Philosophum, & prorsus Catholicum (44). - To the reasons mentioned n. 2. and 3. Sennertus gives some answers, which no wise man would vouchsafe to refuse; for instance, be

(42) Honoratus Fabri, de Generat. Hominis, lib. vii. Proposit. L. pag. 535. Edit. Norimbergæ, 1677.

(43) He says in another place, Bonus Sennertus frustra se torquet & recurrit ad sumum Crescite & multiplicamini; frustra alios ignorantia accusat, verum istarum Philosophicarum satis imperitus. Idem, lib. 7. de Gener. Animal. Proposit. lxxvi, pag. 178.

(44) I think it should be Academicum.

says, the rational soul is not, of it's proper nature and disposition, immortal, but only by the will and decree of GOD; but I have demonstrated the contrary, and it favours somewhat of impiety: moreover, he will have the separated seed to be without the divine benediction, and therefore the soul which was in it dies; if this is not trifling, nothing is. . . . Finally, what he brings from Scripture, be fruitful and multiply. . . . is most insignificant. . . . but we will let these things pass, and let the man alone, who though an excellent Physician, was scarcely an indifferent Philosopher, and altogether uncatolic. But notwithstanding his great contempt for the Philosophy of that Physician, he takes his objections against the common opinion of the school-men, concerning the fouls of brutes, to be unanswerable. He forsakes these men, and all the hypotheses opposed by Sennertus; and all that he says comes to this, that the fouls of beasts are not produced anew, that they are not absolute beings, but a refultance of a certain mixture of the four elements (45). This is an absurd opinion, which would lead us to say the same thing of human fouls.

[F] He believed that metals are formed by intelligent and spiritual Beings. He did not say what his antagonists imputed to him, that a stone produced another stone, and a piece of gold another piece of the same metal; but he said that some spirits, whose abode was unknown to him, and who keep only in certain places, insinuate themselves into mines and quarries, and there produce the several sorts of fossiles that are to be found in them. Let us see how he expresses himself: he invented not this opinion; many learned men have had the same thought. Malitiosè & illud mihi affingit; quasi statuam in lib. de consens. & dissens. cap. 9. quod lapis lapidem, gemma gemmam, metallum metallum generet. Neque enim tam stultus sum, ut credam, hunc adamantem, hanc crystallum, hoc aurum generare alium adamantem, aliam crystallum, aliud aurum, sicut planta una aliam, aut bos bovem (hæc enim generatio solum viventium est) generat. Hæc verò mea, Anselmi Boëtii, & aliorum doctorum Virorum mens est, omnia metalla, lapides, gemmas, quæ hæcenus è terra eruta sunt, & adhuc eruuntur, omnia in prima creatione secundum individua creata non esse, sed fodinas gemmarum & metallorum quod alleg. loc. pluribus historiis probavi, iterum repleri: & esse quosdam spiritus formam architectonicam metallorum & gemmarum in se continentes, qui in terra, quique secundum suam speciem, producant metalla, lapides, gemmas, illic figuram, colorem, & alia propria accidentia tribuant, & hos spiritus in fodinas & matrices gemmarum & metallorum sese diffundere, atque ista metalla & gemmas producere. Idque esse formas metallorum multiplicari, dixi. E quibus autem sedibus & locis spiritus illi proveniant, nobis ignotum est, utpote ignorantibus quænam globi terreni in terra constitutio sit. Hoc certum est, spiritus istos non ubivis terrarum reperiri, sed in quibusdam saltem locis (46). - He maliciously also and falsely represents me; as if I had said, that a stone generates a stone, a metal a metal. For I am not so foolish as to believe, that this diamond, this crystal, this gold, begets another diamond, another crystal, another gold, as one plant produces another plant, or one bull another; for this manner of production is only of things that have life. But this is not my opinion only, but is also that of Anselm, Boëtius, and of other learned men, that all metals, stones, gems, which hitherto have been, and still are, dug out of the earth, were not every individual formed at the first creation, but that the mines of gems and metals, are again replenished, as I have proved in the places above-mentioned by many Histories: and that there are certain spirits that have in them the architectonic forming of metals, and gems, which produce in the earth, every one according to it's species, metals, stones, gems, and give them figure, colour, and other proper accidents; and that these spirits diffuse themselves into the mines and veins of gems and metals, which there they produce. And this, I said, was to multiply forms of metals: but from what seats or places these spirits come, is to us unknown, being ignorant of the internal constitution of the terrestrial globe. This is certain, that these spirits are not to be found every where, but only

(45) See his first book, de Generatione Animalium, Proposit. lvi, & seq. pag. 164, & seq.

metals

(46) Daniel Sennertus, Epistola ad Joh. Sperlingum: It is in Sperling's tractatus de origine formarum.

G g

VOL. V.

'only in certain places.' This seems to be absurd; but if it be considered, 1. That a good Philosopher must assign another cause of the phenomena than God's will. 2. That neither the earth, nor the elementary qualities of fossils, nor their substantial forms, seem capable of any effect, that requires a certain disposition of parts, a choice, a knowledge of what is proper: I say, if this be considered, and besides that one cannot apprehend that the laws of motion should be able to place the particles of matter exactly as they ought to be in order to make gold,

a diamond, an emerald, &c. or to chuse those that are fit for it, that opinion of Sennertus seems to have some probability in it (47). Can the virtues of bodies, and the general laws of motion, make any thing in our shops and laboratories without our direction? Could they make a shoe, a glove, a needle, if men did not meddle with them? How then can one believe that they produce, without any direction, a vast number of things, a thousand times more difficult than our clocks?

(47) Compare what is said in mark [M] of the article MO. RINUS, (J. BAPT.)

(a) Witte, *Diat. Biograph. Tom. II*, pag. 172.

(b) *Id. ibid.*

(c) Conradus Samuel Schurz-leichius, *Orat. funeb. Andree Sennerti*, pag. 91, *Edit. Witt.* 1697.

(d) *Id. ibid.*

(1) Pag. 172, 173.

SENNERTUS (ANDREW) professor of the oriental languages in the university of Wittemberg his birth-place, published a great many books [A], which shew, that he learnedly and worthily discharged the duties of his professorship. He exercised it fifty one years (a), and died the twenty-second of December 1689 (b), being eighty-four years of age. He learned the Arabic tongue of Golius at Leyden, and found out a very good method to teach it (c). Dr Pocock, who understood it admirably well, gave him that encomium (d). He was commended for several other things in his funeral oration, and particularly for this, that the purity of his morals, and the temperance always visible in his conduct, procured him the advantage of attaining to a great old age, with the vigor of body and mind, that is necessary to bear the fatigues of study, and the cares of a professor (e).

(e) *Id. ibid.* pag. 95.

[A] He published a great many books. You will find a catalogue of them in the second volume (1), of Witte's *Diarum Biographicum*, out of which I shall only transcribe the following lines. *Athenae & inscriptiones Wittenbergenfes. Differtatio de quatuor linguae Ebraicae* et *etatibus. Scrutinium religionum, de religionum varietate, & una sola Christiana & vera. De principio religionis in genere, & Christianae in specie. De punctorum vocalium Ebr. neque cum literis, neque cum verbo Dei coarvitate; de Urim & Tumim.*

(a) Gio-Petro de Crescenzi *nel suo Amfiteatro Romano, apud Prioratum, Scena d'Humini illustri.*

(b) Priorato, *Scena d'Hum. illustri; and observe that his book was printed in 1659.*

SERBELLONE, an Italian family, which has afforded several men of note, as will appear hereafter. According to fabulous genealogies, it derives its original from Cerdubellius, the head of the Spaniards in the time of Scipio Africanus (a). We are told, that some ages ago, it was divided into three branches, because three brothers left Burgundy, where their family flourished, and one of them went to the kingdom of Valencia, the other to Naples, and the eldest to Milan. The Spanish branch removed long after into Sardinia, where it continues to this day. That of Naples is extinct, or has been re-united to that of Milan, which made a greater figure than the rest, and is still considerable (b). The persons I am going to speak of descended from it.

SERBELLONE (JOHN PETER) was the father and uncle of several illustrious persons. He married in the year 1506, Elizabeth Rainoldi, a woman of a noble and ancient family in Milan, and aunt of John Baptist Rainoldi, president of the senate of that town. He had by that marriage five sons and two daughters: one of the two daughters was a nun; the other was married to the Count de Macagno. GABRIEL his eldest son, was a very great captain. I shall bestow an article upon him. The second, whose name was JOHN BAPTIST, took orders, attached himself to the court of Rome, was made Bishop of Cassano in Calabria, where he did not reside, because he was employed in several important intrigues at Rome, and was appointed by Pope Pius IV, governor of the castle of St Angelo during his whole pontificate. The third son of Peter Serbellone was called FABRICIUS: I shall also bestow an article upon him. The fourth son was called JOHN ANTONY, who was Bishop of Foligno, and then of Novara, and the first cardinal whom Pope Pius IV made in the year 1560. He was governor of several towns in the Ecclesiastical state, legate of Perugia and Romagna, Bishop of Ostia and Velletri, and died Dean of the sacred college in the year 1591. He was a cunning Politician, who had a hand in the most secret negotiations of the court of Rome, under the Popes Pius IV, Pius V, Gregory XIII, and Sixtus V. Being cousin to Pius IV, he easily obtained some very considerable privileges for the college of Doctors at Milan. He found it more difficult to get them confirmed by Sixtus V, who had resolved to suppress them; but at last he carried his point, and even got those privileges enlarged. The last son concerned himself only with his domestic affairs. Our Serbellone had a sister called CECILIA, who was married in the year 1485, to Bernard de Medicis [A]. From this marriage came six sons and seven daughters (a) [B].

(a) Taken from Count Gualdo Priorato, *Scena d'Humini illustri.*

[A] Cecilia . . . was married to Bernard de Medicis. Priorato seems to approve those, who say that this Bernard was of the family of Medicis, which has obtained the supreme power at Florence (1); but many other writers call the family of Pius IV, by the name of Medequin, and not by that of Medicis. [B] . . . From this marriage came six sons and seven daughters. John James the eldest son, was the famous Marquis de Marignan, one of the greatest

captains of his age. The second, who was made cardinal by Paul III, was elected Pope in 1559, and took the name of Pius IV. Two other sons of Cecilia Serbellone, were successively Marquises of Marignan, after the death of their eldest brother. Their brother Gabriel served in the armies of Charles V with great courage: The youngest brother died a child. Of the seven daughters, none but two, viz. Margaret and Clara, remained in the world; the other five were made Nuns.

Nans. Margaret was married to the Count Gilbert Borromeo, and was the mother of St Charles Borromeo. Clara was the wife of Count Mark d'Al-

tempe (2). I have mentioned in another place (3) a cardinal who proceeded from this marriage.

(2) Taken from Count Guido ALTAEPS.

(3) In the article

SERBELLONE (GABRIEL) eldest son of the foregoing, was a warrior of great repute in the XVth century. He was knight of Malta, and grand prior of Hungary. He gave proofs of his valour when he defended Strigonia against the Ottoman forces, and signalized himself (a) at the famous passage of the Elbe, and at the battle that was fought soon after, in which Charles V. obtained a victory over the Duke of Saxony. He was Lieutenant-general of the imperial army. He had the same post in Italy in the army of the Marquis de Marignan his cousin, during the war of Siena, and it was to him that this place surrendered at last. He had before subdued (b) Saluzzes in Piedmont for the Emperor Charles V. After the taking of Siena, he took several other towns in Tuscany, which refused to acknowledge the house of Medicis; and being made general of the holy Church, both by sea and land, under the pontificate of Pius IV, he recovered Ascoli, he built several fortresses in the Ecclesiastical State fortified the castle of St Angelo, re-built Civita Vecchia, and performed several other things of that nature; for he was a very good engineer, which was the reason why, after the death of Pius IV, the King of Spain sent him into the kingdom of Naples, and into Sicily, to take a view of all the places, and order what he should think fit. Being gone occasionally into the isle of Malta, he there drew the plan, and laid the foundations of the new town (c). The Duke of Alva took him with him in the famous expedition of the Netherlands (d). Serbellone was general of the artillery, and went constantly before to make the ways ready; so that he had a great share in the glory of that famous march, one of the most remarkable operations that ever was seen in that kind. Though the engineer Paciotti, whom the Duke of Alva obtained of the Duke of Savoy, directed the construction of the citadel of Antwerp; yet it is certain, that Serbellone was the chief supervisor of that work (e). He returned some time after into Italy, and was at the battle of Lepanto, where he acquired great glory. He was there Captain-general of the artillery (f), and commander of a squadron of Spanish galleys. He was so much for giving battle, that he made Don Juan of Austria resolve upon it. The year following he commanded in Sicily, and was made viceroy of Tunis. The Turks having taken Gouletta, besieged him with so many troops in Tunis (g), where the citadel he was building was not yet finished, that after they had been repulsed in fourteen several assaults, at last they took the place sword in hand. He was made prisoner, and carried to Constantinople. He was exchanged for thirty-six Turkish officers taken at the battle of Lepanto [A]. When he arrived at Milan, his birth-place, in 1575, that city publicly expressed their joy for his arrival. He was Lieutenant-general to the Marquis d'Aimonte, governor of the Milanese, the two following years, that is, he governed that country alone; for the governor durst not stay in it by reason of the Plague. Afterwards Serbellone received orders to repair to the Netherlands, to command there immediately under Don Juan (h). He brought thither two thousand men raised in the Milanese. That prince had a great esteem for him, and gave him the title of father. He entrusted him with the care of hastening, as much as he could, the construction of the citadel of Namur (i); but they fell sick both of them [B], which put a stop to the work. Don Juan, who was only in the thirty-third year of his age died of his sickness: Serbellone, though above seventy years old, recovered of his (k). He had a great share in the taking of Maastricht [C]; and returned into Italy towards the latter end of the year 1579. He had been chosen to command the army which Philip II, intended to send into

(a) In 1547.

(b) In 1554.

(c) Ex Priorato; Scena d'Humini illustri.

(d) In 1567.

(e) Ex Strada, de Bello Belg. l. Dec. lib. vii, viii.

(f) In 1571.

(g) In 1574. See Thuanus; lib. lxxii.

(h) Ex Priorato; ubi supra.

(i) In 1578.

(k) Ex Strada, ubi supra, Dec. l. lib. x.

[A] He was exchanged for thirty six Turkish officers, taken at the battle of Lepanto.] Gregory XIII made that exchange. 'Nec multo ante redierat Gabriel Serbellonius ex Tunetana captivitate in libertatem affertus a Gregorio XIII, commutatione captivorum qui navalis victorie reliqui Adriana mole attinebant, charum in primis Austriaco ac partibus caput, exactæque non magis ætatis quam disciplinæ militaris exemplum (1). . . . Not long before this Gabriel Serbellone returned from his captivity at Tunis, being set at liberty by Pope Gregory XIII, in exchange for the prisoners, who remaining after the naval victory, were kept at Castle-Angelo, a man exceeding dear to Don Juan of Austria, and both an example of honourable old age, and a pattern for military discipline.'

(1) Strada, lib. x. Dec. l.

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) Hippolitus Pennoni.

youth and quality of Don Juan, whom he gave over; but since the Duke of Parma was to succeed Don Juan, Pennoni's freedom is not much to be wondered at.

[C] He had a great share in the taking of Maastricht.] Priorato says, it was Serbellone that took that town, and was the first that got into it. I durst not say so much, the thing being not likely, considering the age of that great captain. It should have been the action of an adventurer; for we must remember that Maastricht was taken by storm. Priorato is guilty of a surprising omission; for he says nothing of Serbellone's first journey into the Netherlands; and tho' he ascribes to him the construction of the citadel of Antwerp, which was built in his first journey, it plainly appears that he did not know that the Duke of Alva brought with him Gabriel Serbellone; he mentions the citadel of Antwerp only, after having mentioned Serbellone's journey in 1577, and the taking of Maastricht.

Thuanus mentions one Count Cernellone (§2), knight of Malta, and Prior of Hungary, who is the same with our Gabriel Serbellone, and yet he distinguishes them; for having said, that the Duke of Alva caused the citadel of Antwerp to be built, being advised to it by Chapin Vitelli and Count Cernellone, who had taken

[(§2) An error of the press corrected, letter C, of the Index of Thuanus, R. 32, C. 17.]

into Portugal, to seize on that kingdom as soon as Cardinal Henry should die; but he had not time to crown his glorious life with that great exploit. He died in January 1580, being ready to go into Spain (1). One of his sons was killed at the siege of Tunis (m).

(1) Ex Priorato, ubi supra.

(m) Thuan. lib. lxxiii, pag. 76.

taken a view of that place, he observes that the first who commanded in the citadel was Gabriel Serbellone. Cum arcis custodia primo cum idoneo praesidio attributa esset Gabrieli Serbellonio Mediolanensi spectatae virtutis Duci, cujus aliquoties à nobis supra facta mentio est (4). . . . When the defence of the castle had been committed to Gabriel Serbellone the Milanese, a general of approved valour, whom we have mentioned be-

(4) Thuan. lib. xli, pag. 830.

fore. It is certain he means two persons, and that he, who the Duke of Alva consulted, and sent to see the place, was Gabriel Serbellone: 'Antuerpiæ arcem fundabat, Paciotti Machinatoris ingenio, Serbellonii judicio (5). . . . He built the citadel of Antwerp, by the contrivance of the engineer Paciotti, and the advice of Serbellone.'

(5) Strada, lib. vii.

SERBELLONE (FABRICIUS) brother to the foregoing, was general of the Pope's troops in the country of Avignon, during the Civil wars in the reign of Charles IX. He was at first captain of an independent company, and governor of Pavia for the Emperor Charles V. Afterwards he exercised the office of Commissary-general of the army in Piedmont, and in the year 1560 he was appointed governor of the state of Avignon, by Pope Pius IV, and general of his armies (a). He violently sided with the Catholics against the Protestants, and was horribly hated and dreaded by the latter, by reason of the cruelties he exercised in Orange [A], wherein he was furiously seconded by the commanders of the French troops [B]. Pius V continued him in the same posts his predecessor had bestowed upon him in that country; but Serbellone did not long enjoy them: he went home in 1566, and being gone to Rome towards the latter end of the same year, to take upon him the chief command of the Pope's troops, he died in the house of the cardinal his brother. He had married Frances Malefina sister to the Marquis de Malgrado (b).

(a) Priorato, Scena, d'Huom. illustri.

(b) Ibid.

(1) Remark [C] of the article BEAUMONT.

(2) Varillas, Hist. de Charl. IX, Tom. i, pag. 202, 203.

(3) The sixth of June 1562.

[A] The cruelties he exercised in Orange. Having promised in another place (1) to speak of those cruelties in this article, the best thing I can do is to set down the words of an author who is accounted a good Catholic (2). He informs us that Fabricius Serbellone, a gentleman of Milan, of an ancient family, and of great experience, who gave himself over to most vices that prevail among his countrymen, as he was endowed with their virtues, joined with the Catholics of Provence, whom the Counts de Sommerive, de Suze, de Carces, &c. had gathered together, and persuaded them (3) to make an attempt upon Orange. He invested that town when the whole garrison was gone out, and taking advantage of that favourable juncture, he gave an assault as soon as his battery had made a sufficient breach. During the assault the Catholics, that were left in Orange, opened one gate to him. He went in thro' it, and his men were contented at first to kill every body they met in arms; but afterwards, they renewed the examples of the most refined cruelty invented formerly by tyrants. They employed their ingenuity in contriving how to make those, who had been so unhappy as to escape their first fury, feel themselves die, and killed them gradually. Some were thrown headlong upon stakes, halberds, pikes, and pikes. Some were hung in the chimnies, and burnt with a slow fire. They took delight in cutting the privy parts; and their fury spared neither children, nor old and sick people, nor the reapers, tho' the latter had no other arms than their sickles. Women and maids did not come off with the loss of their honour, and with being prostituted to the rabble; for they were set for a mark to be shot at, and after hung upon the windows. The boys were kept to compleat the abomination; and to add derision to their outrage, the ladies, who rather chose to die than to satisfy the lewdness of the victors, were exposed stark naked for a publick mockery, with horns thrust into those parts, which modesty does not permit to name. Some of both sexes were larded with slips of paper cut out of the Geneva Bibles. The very Catholics, who opened the gate, were not spared: For after a place had been appointed for them, and they had been told that they would be safe in it with their wives and children, they were all cut to pieces. There were only a hundred and

nine soldiers in the castle, who not being sufficient to defend it, desired to capitulate. All they proposed was granted them; but as soon as they came out, they were surrounded; and those who were not thought worthy of being killed by the soldiers, were thrown headlong from the top of a rock. After the plunder had been secured, the victors employed themselves in demolishing the walls of Orange; and Serbellone thinking that it would be a piece of madness to leave so near the country of Avignon a considerable town, the sovereign whereof was a Calvinist, set fire to it, which quickly consumed the bishop's palace, and three hundred houses with those, who had concealed themselves in them. The burning had gone on, had it not been for an extraordinary rain, which put it out in a moment, and disappointed those who stirred the fire.

D'Aubigne had said long before, that the Catholic historians had related what he says of the cruelties exercised at Orange (4). Doubtless he meant Thuanus, who relates (5) the whole matter as fully as related in the passage taken from Varillas, and as fully as Theodore Beza had related it (6). He meant, I say, Thuanus; but he had some reasons not to name him. It will be granted me that the historian, whose words I have transcribed, is a writer of greater authority, ad hominem, considering the time he wrote in.

(4) D'Aubigne, Tom. i, p. 204.

(5) Thuan. lib. lxxii, pag. m.

(6) Beza, Hist. Eccles. lib. xii, pag. 262.

[B] He was furiously seconded by the commanders of the French troops. It is observed in the relation of the sacking of Orange (7), that the castle, the bishop's palace, and several other places, were set on fire, and part of the walls pulled down at the solicitation of the Count de Suze. He satisfied his avarice as well as his cruelty; for he took part of the best booty, and furnished his house with it. These are the men, on whom we poor private people bestow so many panegyrics, upon account of their pretended zeal for religion and the glory of God: The Monluc, the Tavannes, the Suzes, and the Guises will be praised for ever among the votaries of the Church of Rome; but what did they do for their religion but get wealth, plunder, and domineer? Was this a service done to God, for which they deserved to be rewarded? O curas hominum, o quantum est in rebus inane (8)! . . . O empty toils! O vanity of things.

(8) Perissus, Sat. i, initia.

SERBELLONE (JOHN) the sixth son of John Baptist Serbellone, Count de Castillon, and Lord of Romagnano, was a great commander in the service of the King of Spain in the XVIIth century. He was a native of Milan. He performed his first military exploits in the year 1616. Being informed at Rome of the preparations that were making in the Milanese against the Duke of Savoy, he immediately repaired to Count John Peter his brother, colonel of horse, and general of the artillery, and governor of Gattinara. He applied himself so diligently to the service, that he made it appear

he was born for the war, and would raise himself in time. His brother having been killed at Verceil, as he was taking a view of that place, he had his regiment given him. He increased in that post the esteem he was in. He was wounded with a musket shot at the siege of Verceil, and lost his regiment some time after (a); but the same Duke of Fera, who had disbanded that regiment, gave him another of three thousand foot in 1620, during the troubles of the Valteline. The Protestants and the Catholics being come to blows in that country, our Count Serbellone was ordered to go and support the Catholics; and it is likely he did not use the Protestants too gently, since the governor of Milan was well pleased with his zeal and conduct, and gave a good character of him to the court: this implies it sufficiently. Notwithstanding which, his regiment was disbanded, when the Valteline was deposited into the hands of Gregory XV; but the troubles beginning soon again in that country, Serbellone was sent thither a second time, having the same post (b), and fuller commissions; and gave great satisfaction by his manner of opposing the French troops [A]; as it appeared by the offices bestowed upon him: he was made counsellor in the supreme council of Spain in the year 1625, commissary-general in the Milanese in 1627, general of the artillery and governor of Montferrat in 1628. He served under the Marquis of Spinola at the famous siege of Casal; and some years after (c) he went into Germany to serve in the quality of Captain-general of the artillery under the Duke of Fera. From the death of that Duke till the arrival of the Cardinal Infant, he had the chief command of the army in Alsace. He performed wonders at the battle of Nortlingen [B], which the Swedes lost the sixth of September 1634; and having followed the Cardinal Infant into Flanders, he settled winter quarters in the bishopric of Liege, and the next spring (d) obtained leave to go home. He did great services to the King of Spain against the Duke of Rohan in the Valteline [C], whilst they were raising in Germany the army he was designed to command. It was thought more proper to send him into Catalonia, where he commanded the horse [D] in the year 1637. He formed a very noble design, which was to besiege Leucate, the taking

(a) In 1618.

(b) In 1624.

(c) In 1633.

(d) In 1635.

[A] His manner of opposing the French troops. I do not follow my author in every thing, to avoid advancing falsities. Priorato will have it, that the following things happened in 1624, and 1625. 1. Serbellone's regiment was set on foot again. 2. He so diligently guarded the posts he had been trusted with in the Valteline, that the Marquis de Cœuvres, who commanded the French troops, could never get an inch of ground on that side. 3. Serbellone being sent against the Duke of Savoy, besieged and took Nice de la Paglia. 4. He returned to his former posts in the Valteline, where Colonel Papenheim (1) had commanded in his absence. 5. The Duke of Rohan succeeded the Marquis de Cœuvres, and could make no progress any more than he by reason of Serbellone's vigilance. 6. Serbellone being recalled to Milan upon more urgent business, left the command to Gualco colonel of horse. 7. The Duke of Rohan being informed of that change, advanced as far as Gravedone. 8. Serbellone was immediately sent back to stop him, and obliged him upon the news of his return to set fire to the palace of the Duke d'Alviti, and to retire for fear of engaging so brave a captain. The historian, having mentioned all these things, adds, that for an acknowledgment of all those services, Serbellone was made counsellor in the supreme council of Spain in July 1625. It is certain, that there are some falsities in this account. The Duke of Rohan did not command in the Valteline at that time. The Marquis de Cœuvres was there ever since France employed her forces there in 1624, till the execution of the treaty of peace in 1627. The Duke of Rohan was then busy enough in France, being engaged in the wars of religion. As for what concerns Serbellone's resistance, which was so great, according to Priorato, that the Marquis de Cœuvres could never get an inch of ground; I will not alledge against it, the histories which mention that Marquis's progress; for I might be answered, that Priorato does not mean the whole Valteline, but only a certain part of it, into which possibly, the French troops could not penetrate. But to speak the truth, this would be but a poor shift, and not much warranted by the author's expressions (2). I can convict him by his own words, of having confounded the time: And indeed, when he relates in another work (3) what happened in the Valteline, he places the Duke of Rohan's excursion to Gravedone in the year 1635. He is in the right as to that.

[B] He performed wonders at the battle of Nortlingen. He was posted upon a rising ground, which the council of war, held the day before the battle, VOL. V.

took to be of the greatest importance for the success of that great day. The Swedes had the same opinion of it, since they used their utmost endeavours to possess themselves of that post; but they were always vigorously repulsed by Serbellone. Therefore he had the satisfaction to hear the Cardinal Infant speak these words to him, in the presence of the King of Hungary; *Conde, por Dios y vos tenemos la victoria* (4). - - - *God and you have given us the victory.*

[C] He did great services . . . against the Duke of Rohan, in the Valteline. This belongs to the year 1635, and 1636. The author is in the right, with respect to that time, to say that the Duke of Rohan and Count Serbellone acted in the Valteline; But I doubt whether he gives a faithful account of what they did; for he supposes that there being three bodies of troops for France, the Duke of Rohan, who commanded one of those bodies, always endeavoured to join the two others, which might have proved very prejudicial to the Spaniards; but that the count prevented that junction. This is still false, if we depend upon the history of the Duke of Rohan (5). Therein we are told, that he had all his troops by him; but that he was so posted, that he had the Germans on one side, and the Spaniards on the other. Fernemont (6) commanded the Germans; Serbellone commanded the Spaniards. The Duke beat the Germans three times one after another; and then attacked Serbellone, who was advantageously intrenched at Morbeigne, and beat him. Of this Priorato says nothing at all. But it can hardly be doubted, considering that this history of the Duke of Rohan, especially what concerns the exploits in the Valteline, is all grounded upon memoirs, which seem to be very good. But what need we have recourse to memoirs. Does not Priorato in another book (7) mention the defeat of the Germans? And does not he say, that Serbellone was soundly beaten at Morbeigne? His own testimony is sufficient to confute whatever he says in his encomium upon Serbellone with respect to the Duke of Rohan. I must not forget what he says concerning Fernemont, viz. that he fell out with Serbellone, because he did not give him his due titles in a letter (8).

[D] He commanded the horse. Not that he commanded that army in chief; for it is certain he was under the Duke of Cardonna. It is true, the presence of that duke did not lessen his authority, as general of horse, during the siege of Leucate, for he was not there in person; and there was a French account, wherein to confute those who had given out that he had been killed in the field of battle, it was positively said, he had not been in the

(4) Priorato, ubi supra.

(5) Printed at Paris in 1666, and in Holland in 1667, in 12mo.

(6) Others call him Fernemont.

(7) Histor. delle Guerre di Ferdinando, &c.

(8) Ibid. lib. x., pag. m. 337.

(1) He who was killed at the battle of Lutzen.

(2) Governava il Conte Serbellone con tanta prudenza, e vigilanza tutti i Forti di QUELLE PARTI, che non quanti tentativi faceffe il Marchese di Cour Generali allhora di Francia IN QUELLE PARTI, non pote mai avanzar ne pure un palmo, tanto erano ben custoditi i detti posti.

(3) Histor. delle Guerre di Ferdinando, &c. lib. xii.

SERRONI. SERVILIA.

taking whereof would have made France very uneasy; but he was forced to raise the siege. He received many wounds as he was discharging the duties of a good general; and he was hardly recovered from his wounds, when he fell sick without any hopes of recovery. He died at Perpignan the twenty-first of February 1638. He had married Donna Luisa, daughter of the Marquis John Jerome Marin, descended from Thomas Marin Duke of Terranova. He had several children by her: the eldest was made Marquis de Romagnano by his Catholic Majesty (e).

(c) Ex Gualdo Priorato, Scena d'huomini illustri.

(g) Merc. Franco, Tom. xxi, pag. 503.

the battle, and that in imitation of the Catholic Kings, he was contented to be the spiritual and invisible head of that army, reserving to himself the title of General, but leaving the functions of that office to Serbellone (g).

Priorato does not express himself clearly enough: Any body would infer from his expressions (10), that the count had none above him but the court of Spain.

(10) Fu chiamato dal Re in Spagna, e fatto Maestro di Campo Generale dell'esercito di Catalogna. Nel passar d'Italia in quelle parti hebbe il commando sopra tutti i Generali e capi da guerra di quell'esercito. . . . benché prima del commando avesse fatta istanza per altri sei mila huomini, o almeno quattro, fu dal Conte Duca Privato del Re mantenuto con lettere affettuose in speranza grandi, ma non mai fuorcoro d'un solo fantacino. Scena d'huom. illustri.

SERRONI (HYACINTHUS) first Archbishop of Alby, lived in the XVIIth century. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (a), but correct two faults in it [A]. See also Moreri's Dictionary.

(a) For January 1687, p. 113.

[A] Correct two faults in it.] You will find in that book that this Prelate was born the third of August: it should be the thirtieth. You will find also there that the Bishop of Pamiers was his nephew; which is not true. The author should have said the Abbot de Camps, instead of that bishop. That abbot is a person of great learning, and merit, who has made a very fine collection of the most curious medals that can be found. This appears by the book, intitled, *Seleciora Numismata in ere maximi moduli à Museo Illustriissimi D. D. Francisci de Campi, Abbatis S. Marcelli, & B. Mariae de Siniaco, concisus interpretationibus per D. Vaillant D. M. & Cenomanensium Ducis Antiquarium illustrata*. It was printed at Paris in the year 1693, in 4to. Mr Vaillant, who is so famous for his great skill in medals, speaks of that abbot in the following manner at the beginning of that book. 'Nummos veteres ex omni materia, omnique modulo summa curâ multique sumptibus collegit undique multis ab hinc annis Illustriissimus ABBAS DE CAMPS, tam prospero successu, ut rei nummarie studiosis omnibus, Principibus etiam non paucis opulentior in eâ re tandem evaserit: hi siquidem nummos habent permultos, ille verò numismata maximi moduli mole, calaturâ, raritate, eximia, in quibus Imperatorum seriem, si paucos excipias, cernere licet, ut & res ab eis præclarè gestas, & quidquid in historiâ Romana legitur augustius. Ab amicis sæpe invitatus, ut quæ privatè studens, tùm utilitati, tùm voluptati sibi comparaverat, in publicum commodum transferret, annuit comiter votis amicorum, ipse tamen diversis negotiorum generibus implicatus ea in ære prius, prout extant in ipsis exemplaribus, accuratè incisa, explicanda mihi postmodum tradidit. . . . The most illustrious ABBOT DE CAMPS, with the greatest care, and at the greatest charge, many years ago, made a collection of ancient coins, of every matter and size, from all parts, so successfully, that at length he became more rich in this respect than all that were curious in coins, yea even than many princes: these, it is true, may have much money, but he has medals of greatest rarity for their size, engraving, and rarity, wherein it is to be seen the series of the emperors, their most noble achievements, and whatever else worthy of admiration is read in the Roman history. Being often desired by his friends to communicate to the public what he had purchased for

his own particular use and pleasure, he consented, and being himself taken up with variety of business, after he had caused them to be engraved in brass, delivered them to me to be explained.' If you consult the Abbot de la Roque (1) in the extract of a dissertation of the Abbot de Camps upon a Greek medal (2) of Antoninus Caracalla, you will find the following words in it: 'The curious of Rome and France have taken great pains to explain it, and have been divided in their opinions about the truth and singularity of the games represented upon it. The Abbot de Camps, who has a greater skill in medals than one would think, considering his age, and his great occupations, is of opinion that it is a shew of Funambuli, or Rope-dancers: whereupon he proposes his conjectures full of wit, and of a profound learning (3). . . . Having thus explained, with great wit and learning, the true sense of the reverse of that medal, he examines why they are Funambuli on the reverse of a medal of Caracalla, and what reason moved the Cypziceniens to present them to him (4).' We are told elsewhere, that he had searched, with great care, the rarest manuscripts, we are told this, I say, on occasion of a *Canon Burgalesis ex M. S. Codice vetustissimus*, which is in his hands (5). 'This council was never before published by any. We are obliged for it to the Abbot de Camps, who making a diligent search into every thing that may illustrate the history of the suffragancy of Alby, which he is writing, has inserted it at length in that history. He took it out of a manuscript of councils and tracts of ancient Fathers, whose antiquities, &c (6).' It is not to be doubted that he undertook to write the history of the suffragancy of Alby on account of our Hyacinthus Serroni, with whom he was in great favour, but not his relation. In the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* I went upon a hearsay, which I believed to be true the more readily, because I had read (7) that the abbot had the honour to be related to that archbishop, which was the reason why I was mistaken in this particular. Whilst I mend that fault, I am glad it appears that notwithstanding my mistake, I ascribed nothing to the Abbot de Camps, but what the archbishop, his patron, thought him worthy of. This is the ground of my commentary upon this article.

(1) In the *Journal des Savans*, of the 29th of November 1677, pag. 309, Dutch Edition.

(2) Which represents on the reverse some spectacles and public games, very singular, and hitherto little understood. *Id. ibid.*

(3) *Journal des Savans*, of November 29, 1677, pag. 310.

(4) *Ibid. p. 311.*

(5) *Journal des Savans*, of the 20th of November 1679, pag. 317, Dutch Edition.

(6) We find in the *Mercure Galant*, for the month of May, 1678, pag. 105, Holland edition, an Elogium of the Abbot de Camps.

(7) In the *Mercure Galant*, *ibid.* pag. 106.

(a) Plat. in Catoe minore, init. p. 759.

(b) *Id. ibid.* pag. 760. See also Cicero in Bruto, pag. m. 354.

SERVILIA, sister by the mother's side to Cato Uticensis (a), was married, first to Marcus Junius Brutus, by whom she had Brutus, who murdered Julius Cæsar; and after to Decimus Julius Silanus (b), who was consul in the year of Rome 691. She did not behave her self like a virtuous woman; for she was not only Julius Cæsar's mistress, and improved that opportunity to enrich herself with the spoils of unhappy people; but besides, she prostituted one of her daughters to her lover [A]. Her brother Cato

[A] She was Julius Cæsar's mistress, and improved . . . to enrich herself. . . . but besides, she prostituted one of her daughters to her lover.] See the

remark [A] in the article PORCIA, and the article CASSIUS (1), to which add these words of (1) Citation (1) Suetonius: 'Ante alias dilexit (Cæsar) M. Bruti matrem. Serviliam:

SERVILIA. SEVERUS.

123

Cato was very much surprised when they made him read a letter written by her [B]. She pretended to be descended from Servilius Ahala (c), who had killed Spurius Melius who had raised some factions at Rome in the year 316.

(c) Plut. in Brut. to, *ibid.* pag. 984.

(2) Sueton. in Cæsare, *cap.* 1.

• Serviliam : cui & proximo suo consulatu sexagies
• H. S. margaritam mercatus est : & bello civili super
• alias donationes, amplissima prædia ex auctionibus
• hæstæ minimo addidit. Cum quidem plerisque vili-
• tatem mirantibus, facetissime Cicero, *Quo melius,*
• inquit, *emptum sciatis, Tertia deducta est :* existima-
• batur enim Servilia, etiam filiam suam Tertiam Cæ-
• sari conciliare (2). - - - Above others Cæsar loved
• Servilia, the mother of M. Brutus : for whom, in
• his next consulship he purchased a pearl for sixty sister-
• ces : and in the civil war he gave her large manors,
• which he purchased at an easy rate. When most people
• were admiring their cheapness, Cicero very wittily re-
• plied, Quo melius emptum sciatis, Tertia deducta est ;
• playing upon the ambiguity of the words, which may
• either signify, That you may the better understand
• how cheap they are, a third was abated, or she gave
• her own daughter (whose name was Tertia) to Cæ-
• sar's embraces.

(3) See the article BRUTUS (MARC JUVENIUS), in the text over against citation (f).

[B] Cato was very much surprised when they made him read a letter written by her. Plutarch having said that Julius Cæsar gave orders to prevent Brutus's being killed in the battle of Pharsalia (3), adds the following words : ' And this he is believed to have done out of a tenderness to Servilia, the mother of Brutus ;

for Cæsar had, it seems, in his youth, been very intimate with Servilia, and she passionately in love with him : and so far as Brutus was born about that time, in which their loves were at the highest, Cæsar believed that he was begot by him. There goes a report too, that when some great and weighty matters, concerning the conspiracy of Catiline, which had like to have been the destruction of the common-wealth, were debated in the senate ; Cato and Cæsar, tho' differing in their opinions, were placed near to one another. In the middle of the debate, a paper was brought to Cæsar, which he took and read to himself. Upon this Cato cried out aloud, and blamed Cæsar for holding correspondence, and receiving letters from the enemies of the common-wealth. Upon which several of the senate murmured. Wherefore Cæsar delivered the note, as he had received it, to Cato, who reading it, found it to be a leud love-letter from his own sister Servilia ; wherefore he threw it back again to Cæsar, with these words, *Keep it to yourself, you fool.* Which being done, he resumed his discourse, and went on to tell his opinion, as before ; so public and notorious was Servilia's love to Cæsar (4).

(4) Plut. in Brut. to, *pag.* 986. See also the same author in Cicerone minore, p. 770.

SERVILIA, sister to the foregoing, and wife of Lucullus, was yet more leud than she. See the remark [A] of the article of PORCIA. Lucullus, who had divorced Clodia, a woman dissolute to the last degree, and infamous for her incest with her brothers, was not much better for marrying Servilia ; for, except the incest, she was not in the least inferior to leud Clodia [A]. Her husband bore it as well as he could, out of respect to his brother-in-law (a) ; but at last he could bear his wife no longer, and divorced her.

(a) Cato Uticensis.

[A] Except the incest, she was not the least inferior to leud Clodia. Plutarch uses the most severe expressions that can be employed to signify a dissolute life. Τῆς δὲ Κλωδίας, ἀποπληγμένης ὡς ἀσελγούς καὶ πορνῆς, Σερβιλίαν ἐγήμεν, ἀδελφὴν Κάτωνος, ἡ δὲ τὸν εὐτυχῆ γάμον ἐν γὰρ ἡ προσὴν αὐτῇ τῶν Κλωδίας κακῶν μόνον, ἢ τῶν ἀδελφῶν διαβολῇ. τὰλλα δὲ βδελυγνὰ ὁμοίως ἔσαν καὶ ἀκόλαστον ἡναγκάζειν εἰρεῖν ἀδελφύμενον Κάτωνα. τίλθῃ δὲ ἀπέπειν. Repudiata autem Clodia, lasciva & improba muliere, Serviliam duxit Catonis sororem : quæ item

nuptiæ parum faustæ fuere. Una enim carebat sola Clodii macularum infamia ex fratribus : cætera pariter flagitiosam & impudicam ut ferret Catonis reverentiâ vim intulit sibi. Postremò tolerare eam non valuit (1). - - - But having divorced Clodia, who was a most lascivious and wicked woman, he married Servilia the sister of Cato ; nor was this a happy marriage : for only one thing was wanting in her of the wickedness of Clodia, the criminal converse with her brothers. But otherwise being equally incontinent and flagitious, he bore with her out of regard to Cato. But at last put her away.

(1) Plutarch. in Lucullo, p. 517.

SEVERUS (CORNELIUS) a Latin Poet in Augustus's reign. I mention him only that I may correct some mistakes of la Popeliniere, Andreas Schottus, &c [A].

See

[A] Some mistakes of la Popeliniere, Andreas Schottus, &c.] La Popeliniere confounds that Poet with the Orator Caius Severus, for which he was censured by Vossius (1) ; but Vossius should not have quoted him in his *Historia* : he should have said in his *Historia Historiarum*, to prevent the ambiguity ; for the thing in question is to be found in the *Histoire des Histoires* (2), - - - *history of histories*, and not in the history of the civil wars : tho' one might easily suspect that la Popeliniere committed that mistake in this last book, since the modern Historians make sometimes digressions, or reflexions, which give them occasion to say what they know of antiquity. La Popeliniere is not exact in what he says of Cornelius Severus : he tells us that he had three different professions, that of an Historian, of a great Orator, and of an Epic Poet. The ancient writers represent him as a Poet, but they say nothing of his being an Historian or an Orator. It is true, some of his verses are to be found among the fragments taken from several pieces of Oratory (3) ; but he who collected all those fragments, says nothing whereby it appears, that Cornelius Severus made profession of Rhetoric, or the art of Oratory. Nevertheless this very thing, if I am not mistaken, led Crinitus into that error, and then la Popeliniere, who had it from him. Crinitus (4) gives it as a certain thing, that Cornelius Severus spent several years in making declamations, whilst Aulus Pollio, Pompeius Silo,

(1) Vossius de Histor. Latinis, *pag.* 109.

(2) *Pag.* 304.

(3) In Seneca the father, *Suafior.* ii, & vii.

(4) De Poët. Lat. *cap.* lvi.

Afelleius Fuscus, Sextilius Hena, Cæstius Pius, Porcius Latro, and Aufidius Bassus exercised the same profession. They are part of those mentioned by Seneca, who has collected their rhetorical flourishes. La Popeliniere names four of those declaimers with Cornelius Severus, going upon the same ground, *viz.* That Seneca has inserted some verses of that Cornelius in his Cento's.

Andreas Schottus, the Jesuit, is partly guilty of the same mistake, for in his tract *De claris apud Senecam Rhetoribus*, he mentions Cornelius Severus as one of them. Nay, he has committed a fault in the very beginning of his account of Severus, for he applies to him what ought only to be understood of Sextilius Hena, a Spanish Poet in Seneca. That Spanish Poet had made a poem, which began with this verse,

Defendens Cicero est, Latineque silentia lingue.

Cornelius Severus gave a better turn to that thought by saying,

Abstulit una dies ævi decus, idæque lætæ Conticuit Latine tristis sacundia lingue.

Whereupon Seneca says he will not commend his countryman for having made a very good verse upon Cicero's death, since there was a much finer one, *viz.* that

(c) At the word *Severus*. See Moreri's Dictionary (a), I shall also observe some of his mistakes [B].

that of Cornelius Severus. On the contrary, Father Schottus makes him say, that he will not commend his country-man Cornelius-Severus, for having made, &c. since it had produced a much finer one, viz. that of Cornelius Severus: which would be odd, and is not the author's meaning. Besides, it is not true that Cornelius Severus was a Spaniard; nor has that Jesuit placed him in the catalogue of the ancient writers of his nation (5).

(5) Bibliotheca Hispanica, Tom. ii.

(6) Vossius de Poëtis Latinis, pag. 33.

(7) That Scholiast quotes this verse, ad Sat. I. ver. 95.

(8) Vossius, de Hist. Lat. pag. 109.

Vossius, in one of his books (6) says, that the old scholiast upon Persius (7) quotes this verse of our Severus, *Pinea frondosum murmurat Apennini*; but in another book (8) he ascribes it to the ancient scholiast upon Horace, which is a mistake.

[B] See Moreri's Dictionary, I shall also observe some mistakes. I. Quintilian ought never to be quoted in French by the name of Fabius: It is an ambiguous and barbarous way of quoting him. II. The two Seneca's should not have been confounded. He, who

wrote the *Controversie* is the father of the author of the letters to Lucilius; and yet Moreri quotes them as being one and the same person. III. Moreri should have quoted the lxxixth letter of Seneca, and not the lxxixth. IV. He should have quoted the *Suaforia*, and not the controversy of Seneca. V. He should have said *Severus* and not *Severo*, in the verse of Ovid quoted by him. VI. This quotation of Seneca, in *Contr. sua* 6. is faulty in three respects. He should have put a full stop after *sua*, and have quoted the viith *Suaforia*, and not the viith (9), and *Contr.* should have been left out. But this is requiring too many things of Moreri; he took little care to enquire whether there is any difference between Seneca's *Controversie* and *Suaforia*. But however that be, the reader, who shall believe him, will not doubt that one of Seneca's books is intitled, *Controversie Suaforia*; a mistake which may be easily known, by the bare looking into good editions.

(9) Vossius, de Poëtis Lat. pag. 33, quotes the viith.

S E V E R U S (SULPICIOUS) flourished towards the beginning of the Vth century.

(a) See the remark [B].

(b) He says that Phetadius, Bishop of Agen, was his bishop: which does not prove that he was born in that diocese.

(c) Possévin, Bibl. Select. Tom. i, pag. m. 202.

He was illustrious for his birth, and eloquence, and more still for his virtue [A]. After he had appeared with great lustre at the bar, he married very advantageously (a), and soon after lost his wife, whereupon he quitted the world and became a Priest [B]. It is certain he was a native of the province of Aquitain [C]; but it may be doubted whether he was born in the diocese of Agen (b). The first edition of his works is little known [D]. An account of his life may be seen in Moreri's Dictionary, and in Mr du Pin's Bibliothéque; and therefore I shall not dwell upon it.

He has been censured for some things by Possévin (c), but much less than Sigonius who commented upon him. Guibert, Abbot of Gemblours, is very much mistaken in saying, that after St Martin's death, our Sulpicius Severus was promoted to the bishopric of

[A] He was illustrious for his birth . . . and more still for his virtue. Read these words of Gennadius, 'Vir genere & litteris nobilis, & paupertatis atque humilitatis amore conspicuus (1). . . A man illustrious by his birth and learning, and eminent for his love of poverty and humility.' But particularly read these verses of Paulinus, Bishop of Nola;

(1) Gennadius, de Scriptor. Eccl. cap. xix.

*Tessis adept docto mirabilis ore Severus,
Et tota Christum cordis virtute secutus
Insignis mundi titulus, sed clarior illa
Qua mundum tempesti sanctae virtute fidei,
Nobilitate potens, sed multo extensius idem
Nobilior Christi cultu, quam sanguinis ortu (2).*

(2) Paulin. lib. v. de Vita Sancti Martini.

[B] And soon after lost his wife . . . whereupon he became a priest. This appears by a letter Paulinus writ to him. 'Tu frater dilectissime, ad Dominum miraculo majore conversus es, quia etate florentior, laudibus abundantior, oneribus patrimonii levior, substantia facultatum non egentior, & in ipso adhuc mundi theatro, id est fori celebritate diversans, & facundi nominis palmam tenens, repentino impetu discussisti fervile peccati jugum, & lethalia carnis & sanguinis vincula rupisti. Neque te divitiarum trimonio familiae consularis adgescit, neque post conjugium peccandi licentia, & coelebs juvenus ab angusto salutis introitu, & arduo itinere virtutis, in mollem illam & spaciosam multorum viam revocare potuerunt (3). . . But you, my dear brother, were more wonderfully converted to the Lord, inasmuch as amidst all the secular advantages of blooming youth and wealth, and eloquence, in pleading before the courts of justice, you suddenly threw off the slavish yoke of sin, and broke the deadly bonds of flesh and blood. Neither could youth, nor increase of riches, by marrying with a noble family, turn you from the strait and arduous path of virtue and salvation to the spacious and easy way of the multitude.'

(3) Idem, Epist. vii.

(4) Severus Prefbyter cognomento Sulpicius Aquitanice Provinciae Gennadius, ubi supra.

(5) Sulpit. Severus, de Vita S. Martini, lib. iii.

[C] It is certain he was a native of the province of Aquitain. Gennadius says so (4); but the thing is still more certain from these words of Sulpicius Severus: 'Sed dum cogito me hominem Gallum inter Aquitanos verba facturum, vereor ne offendat vestras nimium urbanas aures sermo rusticior (5). . . But when I consider that I a Gaul am to speak before the Aquitanians, I am afraid lest my unpolite language should offend

'your nicer ears.' This passage is taken from a dialogue, the interlocutors whereof are Posthumianus, Sulpicius Severus, and Gallus. Take notice of the compliment of this last; he tells the two other interlocutors, that he is afraid, being a Gaul, that his language will appear harsh and barbarous to the nice ears of the Aquitanians. He looks upon himself as a goose among swans (6). That modesty, that humility, was suited to the state of that time: the Aquitanians were then the flower, the ornament, and the glory, of all the Gauls, in matter of wit and eloquence. The best Poets, the best Rhetoricians, and the most excellent Orators of the Roman empire were to be found in Aquitain. I except the Greeks, and I speak only of those, who wrote in Latin. See the catalogue of illustrious Aquitanians, collected by Althea (7).

(6) Argutus inter strepere aures olores. Virgil. Eclog. IX, ver. 36.

[D] The first edition . . . is little known. The abbreviators of Gesner, Father Labbe, Dr Cave, Mr du Pin, &c. who mention so many editions of that author, say nothing of the first. It was published by Matthias Flacius Illyricus, who put to it only the first letters of his name; which was the reason why a Catholic writer bestowed those praises upon him, of which he afterwards repented, when he came to know that he was a Lutheran. This I find in a satirical piece of Father Vavasseur against Bishop Godeau. 'Isto ferme pacto, says he (8), quamvis minus turpiter, utpote unus ac privatus, atque in causa leviori, clarissimus se scriptor deceptum sensit, & doluit. Cum enim mirificis laudibus extulisset eum, qui prius perelegantes Sulpitii Severi libros edidisset in lucem, neque thesaurum hunc, quem teneret solus, invidisset diutius literatis ac doctis; eumque cum propter tantum beneficium, tum maxime modestie nomine suspiceret, quod celasset nomen, literas modo, M. & F. adscripisset: intellectum est posterius, Matthiam Flaccium esse ejusmodi, hominem non solum non modestum, qui hoc modestiae causa non fecisset, sed etiam impurum & nequam haereticum, qui in centurias Magdeburgenses multa de suo, non tacito nomine, contulisset. Ut dictum nollet posterius laudator, & eum bonae, sed falsae de altero opinionis, & ridiculae credulitatis suae poeniteret. . . Much after the same manner, though less shamefully, as being only a single and private person, and in a smaller matter, a very famous writer found himself mistaken, and was vexed at his mistake. For having

(7) Ant. Dabnus Althea, Rerum Aquitanicarum Libri quinque.

(8) Paulus Romanus Candido Helychio, Antonius Godelius Episcopus Grassensis, an Elogii Aureliani Scriptor idoneus, p. 33.

of Beziers, notwithstanding his reluctance to it. It is certain he rose no higher than to the degree of priesthood. There has indeed been one Sulpicius among the bishops of Beziers; but that bishop was raised to that see one hundred and ninety years after St Martin's death (d).

(d) Ex Altierris, Rerum Aquitanic. lib. v, cap. viii, pag. 336.

' mightily extolled the man who had first published the
' most elegant works of Sulpicius Severus, and had no
' longer detained from the studios and learned, this
' treasure which he had alone possessed, and having great-
' ly esteemed him, both for so great a benefit, but chiefly
' on account of his modesty in concealing his name, and
' putting only two letters M and F; he afterwards un-
' derstood that Matthias Flaccius was the person, a man
' not only immodest, but likewise a foul mouthed and

' wicked heretic, who had put into the Centurie Mag-
' deburges many things of his own, without suppressing
' his name. So that he wished his preposterous praises
' had not been given, and repented of his good but false
' opinion, and of his ridiculous credulity.'

The largest Commentary we have upon our Seve-
rus's *Historia sacra*, is that of Christian Schotanus,
printed in folio at Franeker, 1664.

S F O R Z A, an illustrious family, derives its original from a peasant of Cotignola (a), who became one of the chiefest and most valiant captains of his age: his name was Giacomuzzo [A]; but according to the custom of the peasants of those parts, the two first syllables of his name were left out, and he was only called Muzzo. He left the plough and lifted himself, and quickly got the reputation of a resolute soldier. He spoke of nothing but of devastations and ransackings, and would get by force whatever he had a mind to. Which was the reason why he was surnamed Sforza (b), which became afterwards the proper name of the family descended from him (c). I must not forget that he was also surnamed Attendolo (d). See the first remark of this article. The famous Braccio was his fellow-soldier, under the General Alberic de Barbiano. At first they loved one another, as if they had been brothers; but their emulation or jealousy, which arose insensibly in their familiar conversation, turned at last into enmity. From that time they always embraced contrary parties, so that when one of them was made general of the troops of any prince or any republic, the other had the like employment in the state

that

(c) Collenuccio, Hist. Neap. lib. v, pag. m. 409, says that Queen Joan ordered it so. Voluit ut in illius memoriam omnibus deinde qui illo genere nascerentur, Sfortie cognomen inderetur.

[A] A peasant of Cotignola . . . his name was Giacomuzzo. That name is made up of two christian names, James Muzzo contracted into one: His surname was Attendolo. It is not agreed on all hands that he was a peasant's son: Sanovino says he was the grandson of a gentleman called John Attendolo, father of Michelin, a captain in the service of the Republic of Venice. He adds, that Michelin the father of our Sforza, married Polyxena de Sanseverino, and that he had two sisters, one of which was the wife of Ugolin Count de Centona, and the other was married to Martin Caraccioli Count de Santangelo, brother to the great Marshal of Naples (1). We read in Paulus Jovius, that Sforza was a man of a good family, *bonesta familia* (2). But Leandro Alberti going upon the testimony of a writer, a native of Cotignola (3), says that Giacomuzzo was a peasant, and actually digging the ground, when he began to consider whether he should list himself, as some of his companions advised him. He flung his spade upon a tree, and said he would be a soldier if it lodged there. It staid on the tree, and he lifted himself. *Muzzo lavorando la terra con la zappa indotto da alcuni compagni, la gittò sopra un albero, promettendogli, che se la rimaneva sopra quello, d'andar con loro alla guerra, la qual vi rimase, & così andò con loro, come dinota Pietro M. Caranto con molti altri scrittori* (4). The same author observes (5), that some writers, to ingratiate themselves with the Sforzas, pretended that neither Giacomuzzo nor Muzzo was the true name of that man; but that he was called Mutio, and was descended from Mutius Scævola; and they deny the whole story of the spade. These were flatterers, who had a mind to gain the favour of Giacomuzzo's posterity. This is what Leandro Alberti says. *Aurunga che alcuni cercando di acquistar gratia, scrivono altrimenti* (6). I do not know whether I am mistaken, but I imagine that some flatterers, even in the life-time of our Sforza, extolled his birth, and denied what was the common report; for tho' it be infinitely more glorious to be raised to a great fortune by noble exploits, notwithstanding the meanness of extraction, than to attain by the same means to the highest dignities with the help of a noble birth; yet most people are unwilling to be upbraided with the obscurity of their original. Most of those, who raise themselves from the lowest to the highest degree, are at last more willing not to be accounted ignoble, than to be looked upon as men, who have overcome by their personal merit the obstacles of a mean ex-

VOL. V.

traction (7). They are very glad when they are said to be descended from very illustrious ancestors, and when care is taken to make every body forget the mean condition they were born in. They are seldom of Agathocles's mind, who being made king, would be served at a table not only in plate, but also in earthen-ware, to let every body know that he was a porter's son (8).

*Fama est filiislibus cernasse Agathoclea regem,
Atque abacum Samio sepe ontrasse luto,
Fercula gemmatis quam poneret borrida vasis,
Et miseret opes pauperumque simul.
Quarenti causam, respondit: Rex ego qui sum
Sicanie, fignlo sam genitore satus* (9).

He pretended with good reason to heighten his glory, by shewing that he was the artificer of his own fortune. There are some Panegyrist in our days, who acknowledging on one hand, that their hero was a man of a most noble extraction; observe, on the other, that this lustre of his family did not contribute to his high preferments. So true it is, that the recommendation of relations is thought to weaken the proofs of the merit of those who are raised by that means. Here follows a passage of the funeral oration of Francis de Harlay Archbishop of Paris (10). 'Such noble talents could not be buried in obscurity, and there was no occasion to ask, how came he that was born so great to arrive at greatness. He was not beholden to favour for his elevation. His family, though never so noble, and so much respected, was not then in the happy circumstances of those houses, wherein the star of living fathers sends down favourable influences upon children; wherein children, born with merit, have the advantage of discovering it sooner than others, and of being more worthily rewarded for it; and wherein those, who are less favoured by nature than fortune, need only have a good conduct to receive the favours, which the credit of their families cannot fail to procure to them. But the successive preferments of the person we speak of, were not owing to such fortunate anticipations. Being more animated by the example of his relations to deserve dignities, than helped by their interest to attain to them; he must himself have been the author of his fortune.' However it be, I fancy Giacomuzzo was not much inclined to imitate Agathocles, and

(7) Compare this with what is said in the remark [A] of the article A. M I O T.

(8) Plut. in Agathoclem. pag. 176.

(9) Ausonius, Epigr. VIII, pag. m. 9.

(10) Delivered in the Metropolitan church of Paris, by Father Gailard a Jesuit, the 23d of November 1695. See pag. 16, 17, of the Dutch edition.

(a) A small town of Romagna between Imola and Faenza.

(b) Some say that Alberic de Barbiano gave it him, after he had seen him boldly revenge an injury that was done him.

(d) Taken from Leandro Alberti, Descrizione di tutta Italia, fol. 317, verso & 318, Venice edition 1561, in 4to.

(1) Taken from Francesco Sanovino dell' origine delle Caste illustri d'Italia, fol. m. 10, verso & 11.

(2) Jovius, Elog. viror. bellica virtute illustrium, lib. ii, pag. m. 192.

(3) Pietro M. Caranto.

(4) Leandro Alberti, Descrizione di tutta Italia, fol. m. 318.

(5) Id. ibid. fol. 317, verso.

(6) Id. ibid. fol. 318.

(c) Taken from
Paul Jovius in
Elogiis Virorum
bellica virtute il-
lustrium, lib. ii,
pag. m. 152, &
seq.

(f) Taken from
Leandro Alberti,
ubi supra.

(g) See the remark [E].

(11) See the remark [A] in the article TOUCHE.

(12) Paulus Jo-
vius, ubi supra,
pag. 192, 193.

(13) Compare what is said in remark [B] of the article CESAR, between citat. (13) and (14), and the remark of the article GON-TAUT (AR-MAND DE).

(14) Pandulphus
Collenucius Hi-
stor. Neapolit.
lib. v, pag. 408.
Edit. Latinae
Dordrac, 1618,
in 8vo.

(15) It is in the *Mercurius Galenus*, for November 1678, page 164, of the Dutch edition.

(16) Taken from
Sanlovinio, ubi
supra.

(17) See the *Mercurius Galant* for November 1678, pag. 164, in the genealogical table.

(18) Ibid. pag.
165.

(19) Not his lawful but his natural son, as Leandro Alberti observes, *Descrit. d'Italia*, folio 318, verso.

(20) Taken from
Sanfouino, *ubi*
supra.

chief heir of his valour (b) and fortune. *He had him by a woman of pleasure, who followed the army (i); her name was Lucia Terzana (k).*

- (b) This must not be understood, as if none of the rest had been warriors. *Varillas, who says, ubi infra, that none of them had a martial inclination, is mistaken.* (i) *Varillas, Hist. de Louis XI. liv. ii, pag. 134. Dutch edition.*
 (k) See the Genealogical table of the house of Sforza, p. 164, of the *Mercur Galant* for November 1678, Dutch edition.

(21) Paulus Jovius, ubi supra, pag. 192.

frugi disciplina, convictu subitario & planè militari, contemptuque prorsus omnis luxuriæ lætabatur; utpote qui valida potius quam decora arma, proceros & peracres generosæ sobolis equos, vir equitandi peritissimus, vera imperatoris dignitatis instrumenta esse putaret, nec quicquam ad inanem speciem exquisiti ornatus ostentare consueisset (21). - - - In Braccio, the lively force of a crafty and prevailing wit was conspicuous; but in Sfortia simplicity of nature, without craft, without learning, a constant and undaunted vigour, of an open mind, especially being joined to a robust body fitted for the fatigues of war. Braccio, being of a more delicate habit of body, took great pleasure in living splendidly, and in sumptuous provisions of all sorts, being profuse and covetous, even to injustice, of what was the property of others. On the contrary, Sfortia, being unacquainted with nice living, and frugal, was pleased with easily provided military fare, utterly despising all luxury, for he judged strong rather than beautiful armour, tall and bigg mettled horses of a generous breed, to be the proper furniture of mar-

tial dignity; nor had he ever used exquisite ornament for an empty show. Perhaps, some will think that Sforza's plain way, and his aversion for luxury, may be alledged to shew the falsity of the slanderous reports that have been spread of his and the Queen of Naples amours; but this would be an ill-grounded imagination, since it is otherwise certain he loved women, and was of signal strength of body, which was no small bait for that prince's (22). She loaded him with favours. 'Cossui . . . fondò la grandezza della sua famiglia, non solamente col nome, chiamandola Sforza, mai col Stato; perciocché fatto Generale de gli esserciti di Giovanna 2. Regina di Napoli, con laquale si dice, che hebbe da fare, hebbe in dono da lei, Benevento, Manfredonia, Baroli, & Trani con più di 20, castella (23). - - - Being made general of the army of Joan II, Queen of Naples, with whom he is said to have had an amorous correspondence, he was presented by her with Benevento, Manfredonia, Baroli, and Trani, and more than twenty castles. See the Margin (24).

(22) See the remark [I] of the article NAPLES (JOAN II, QUEEN OF.)

(23) Sanfivino, ubi supra.

(24) We read in pag. 38, of the *Ritratti & Elogii, di Capitani illustri*, edition of Rome, 1646, that after he had overcome near Aquila, the troops of Antognaccio and of James Caldora, and then made Caldora and the Count de Monte Riso prisoners, and forced several barons to take an oath to Queen Joan, she made him High Constable of the kingdom.

S F O R Z A (FRANCIS) natural son of Giacomuzzo Attendolo, who is the subject of the foregoing article, made still a more splendid fortune than his father. He was created Count of Tricarico at thirteen years of age, by Ladislaus King of Naples (a), and was early accounted a great warrior. He defeated the troops commanded by Braccio, which disputed the passage of the Pescara (b): but that advantage proved of no use to him; for his father having been drowned in that river, the design of raising the siege of Aquila was laid aside. Francis Sforza was then but twenty-three years of age (c). He was confirmed by Queen Joan in all the dignities, and in the possession of all the lands she had bestowed upon Giacomuzzo, and he received orders from that prince to make himself ready for the siege of Naples. He very much contributed to the reduction of that town (d), and then to the victory obtained near Aquila over the troops of Braccio, the second of June 1425 (e). Pope Martin V sent him against Nicolas Trincio, Lord of Foligno, and he forced him to accept of a peace upon the conditions he proposed to him. Afterwards he served the Duke of Milan both against the Florentines and the Venetians, and signalized himself on several occasions (f). He did also many services to Queen Joan; and when she died, which happened in 1435, he applied himself, to Renatus d'Anjou, whom she had made her heir. That prince was unhappy, and obliged to yield to his ill fortune. But Sforza, who had no less industry than courage, never wanted means to support himself. He made himself master of several places in the March of Ancona, and even usurped some states belonging to the Church. Whereupon he was excommunicated by Pope Eugenius IV (g) [A], who, not satisfied to have struck him with the spiritual thunder-bolt, had recourse to temporal arms and confederacies, whereby Francis Sforza lost the March of Ancona in 1444 (h). He quickly recovered himself by gaining a battle, in which the son of Picenini and Cardinal de Fermo, the Pope's legate, were taken prisoners (i). I should be too long, if I was to give a particular account of all the wars wherein he was engaged; and therefore I shall only say, that by the treaty of peace concluded the twenty-second of November 1441, it was agreed that he should marry the natural daughter of the Duke of Milan (k). Accordingly he married her, which made way for a great fortune; for he became Duke of Milan after the death of his father-in-law [B]. That succession did belong to a prince of the house of France (l), and yet it fell to Francis Sforza, who was favoured therein by Lewis XI (m). He possessed this state till he died, and governed it with great moderation, and was accounted one of the greatest princes of Italy. It has been said of him

(a) Collenucius, Hist. Neapol. lib. v, pag. m. 409, Mr Varillas, Histoire de Louis XI, liv. ii, p. 134, says he was only 20.

(d) It was subdued for the queen in January 1425.

(e) Ex eodem Collenuc. ibid. pag. 409, 410.

(f) See the book intitled *Ritratti & Elogii di Capitani illustri*, pag. 131, edition of Rome 1646.

(g) Spondanus, ad ann. 1442, num. 11.

(h) Vianoli, Historia Veneta, Tom. i, pag. 598.

(i) Id. ibid. pag. 599.

(k) Id. ibid. pag. 590.

(l) See Varillas, Hist. de Louis XI, book ii.

(m) Id. ibid.

bim

[A] Whereupon he was excommunicated by Pope Eugenius IV. This was a great alteration; for the same Pope had given him formerly the keeping of the March of Ancona, the dignity of Gonfaloniere of the Church, and a commission to make war against Nicolas Fortebraccio, who had seized upon several places in the Ecclesiastical State. Sforza did very well discharge that commission, and defeated the troops of Fortebraccio at Tivoli. Note, that afterwards this Pope, the Venetians, and the Florentines, gave him the com-

mand of their troops, when they declared war against the Duke of Milan (1).

[B] He became Duke of Milan after the death of his father-in-law. Philip Maria Visconti, who possessed that duchy, died in the month of August 1447, leaving no other child behind him, but a natural daughter married to Francis Sforza. Many laid a claim to that succession. The Emperor Frederic III maintained that this duchy was devolved to the empire, since the last duke had left no lawful issue. Alfonso, King of Naples,

(1) Taken from the *Ritratti & Elogii di Capitani illustri*, pag. 131, 132, edition of Rome 1646.

(*) Varillas, *ibid.*
pag. 140.

him that no usurper was ever a better sovereign (8). He was certainly endowed with several good qualities, and though he had never studied, yet he promoted learning, and spoke with as much eloquence as an Orator [C], and argued about political affairs with a wonderful strength of wit and judgment. The animosity wherewith he went about to destroy the whole faction of Braccio, was thought to be excessive [D]. He died the eighth

(2) See Spondanus's Annals.
ad ann. 1447.
num. 7.

(3) Leand. Albertus, Descript.
Italicae, pag. 678,
Edit. Latinae
1657, in folio.

(4) Vianoli, Histor.
Veneta,
Tom. i. p. 604.

(5) Ben convenendosi la spada
che quella mano
che vuole scettro.
Vianoli, ubi su-
pra.

(6) *Id. ibid.* pag.
605, 606.

(7) *Id. ibid.* pag.
606.

(8) *Id. ibid.* pag.
607.

(9) Vianoli, says
1449.

(10) *Id. ibid.*
pag. 613, 614.

Naples, alleged the last will of that duke, who had made him his heir. The Duke of Orleans alleged his being related to him, for he was the son of Valentin, sister to that duke. Francis Sforza grounded his pretension upon the duke's adoption, to which he added the right of his wife (2). During those contentions, the Milanese thought they had a favourable opportunity to erect themselves into a Republic. Wherefore they elected twelve magistrates, whom they called the conservators of liberty (3), and tore the last will of the late duke, and gave the command of the troops to Francis Sforza, to continue the war with the Venetians (4). This last point of their conduct was very impolitic, and inconsistent with their design of establishing a republican government. They were not sensible that there is nothing more favourable to those, who have a mind to sway a scepter, than to put the sword into their hands (5). That captain-general of the Milanese gained great advantages over the Republic of Venice. His reputation was more and more increased by it; and doubtless it was the reason why the Milanese deprived him of new occasions of signaling himself: they divided his army, and lessened his entourage. He understood the meaning of it, and found it expedient which did very much favour his ambition. He made a proposal of peace to the Republic of Venice. 'Doppo questi avvenimenti mostrò inclinazione lo Sforza a reconciliarsi coi Veneti; mosso a ciò principalmente dai trattamenti che riceveva dai Milanesi troppo aspri; e come di gelosi della di lui potenza ingrati, e spiacevoli, mentre con la divisione delle sue genti, e con lo scemamento dell' esercito gli andavano tarpando l'ali per impedirgli il volo alla Ducale altezza; onde fu spedito da esso a Venetia Clemente Tealdino Secretario, che si trovava prigioniero con Almorò Donato nella Rocca di Cremona a proporre la trattazione della pace (6). . . . After these events, Sforza appeared inclined to make his peace with the Venetians, being chiefly induced to it by the harsh usage he met with from the Milanese, who being jealous of his power, and afterwards ungrateful to him and dissatisfied with him, endeavoured, by dividing his troops and reducing his army, to stop him in his progress to the ducal honour. Whereupon he dispatched to Venice the secretary Clemente Tealdino, who was then prisoner in the castle of Cremona with Almorò Donato, to propose a treaty of peace.' His proposals were approved of, and a treaty was concluded, whereby the Republic engaged to assist him with men and money, in order to make himself master of the town and duchy of Milan; and it was agreed upon, that all the conquests, as far as the river Adda, should belong to the Republic of Venice (7). As soon as the Duke of Savoy heard of that confederacy, he resolved to assist the Milanese, but the troops he sent them were cut to pieces by Francis Sforza before they joined those of Milan; and then he made it his business to strengthen that great city (8). The Venetians being apprehensive that he would subdue it, broke with him, and confederated with the Milanese. Nevertheless he pursued his point; he made an agreement with the Duke of Savoy, and confirmed the alliance between him and the Florentines. He hindered the Venetians from succouring Milan: a famine, and the divisions of the Milanese, and their spite against the Venetians, brought that great affair to an end; they submitted to him, and received him into their town the twenty-sixth of February, 1450 (9), and acknowledged him for their duke (10). Thus the measures that city and several other neighbouring towns had taken to set themselves at liberty, after the death of Philip Maria Visconti, vanished into smoke. Spondanus rightly observes, that many towns in Italy fell at that time into slavery, because they were too fond of avoiding it; for several factions starting up, they were sometimes for one form of government, and sometimes for another; and when one of the factions was uppermost, they cruelly treated the contrary party. Was not this making way for slavery? Mediolanenses servandæ per se libertatis impo-

tentes erant; & ut in his fieri mos erat civitatum Italianarum, illam tueri quærentes, mutuis dissensionibus, ac diversis regiminis mutationibus, crudelitibusque facili-
(11) Spondanus, ad ann. 1449, num. 7, p. m. 9.
diversis regiminis mutationibus, crudelitibusque facili-
tatem servituti viam sternerant (11). That annalist observes, that the populace of Milan killed the Venetian ambassador, having mutinied, because the succours promised by the Republic had not entered the town; and he adds, that the Venetians did cunningly put off the relief of it, in hopes to oblige the Milanese to submit to their domination (12).

(12) *Id. ibid.*
[C] He was endowed with many good qualities, and tho' he had never studied, yet he promoted learning, and spoke with as much eloquence as an Orator.] He expressed, upon several occasions, his great grief for his want of learning: his liberality towards learned men proceeded from his great desire that they should write his actions, and immortalize his name. He took care to procure that honour to his father, by the pen of a famous writer; but his own Historian was more famous still, and went about that work with an extreme diligence. I mean John Simoneta, who wrote the history of Francis Sforza in thirty-one books, and declares he advances nothing but what he had seen, or was very sure of. His work was printed at Milan in 1479, and reaches from the year 1424, to 1466 (13). Here follows a passage of Paul Jovius, which proves the text of this remark. 'In hunc hominem præter invictum corporis atque animi robur, summa etiam dona, quæ tribui poterant, natura contulerat personæ scilicet dignitatem eximiam; os probum, & in omni conspectu aspectum sine superbia suis pariter atque hostibus venerabilem, sic, ut cuncti in eo sæpius concionante facundiam absoluto oratore parem admirarentur, eoque plenius, quod nullas attigisset literas; & nihilo fecius in omni civili militarique negotio, efficacia prudentiæ, diviniq; iudicii vim expediam; & incredibilem afferret. Sed literarum decus, quum sese ejus expertem ingenuo pudore sæpe dolens fatetur, liberalissimè tuebatur. Justæ siquidem & veræ laudis, quæ viventi ornameto esset, & transiret ad posterum, erat avidissimus. A Joanne Simoneta namque insigni historico, & à Philopho poeta percelebri res suas bello paceque gestas perscribi celebrariq; jubebat, sicuti etiam patris vitam Leodori Cribellus ejus jussu antea perscripserat (14). . . . Upon this man, besides an invincible strength of body and mind, nature had bestowed all manner of gifts; namely, a singular dignity of personage; an excellent feature, and, on all occasions, an aspect without pride, respected by friends as well as enemies, so that all admired the eloquence of his frequent speeches equal to that of a complete Orator, and so much the more, as being unlearned; yet nevertheless in all civil and military affairs, he exerted a ready and wonderful strength of a prevailing prudence and a sublime judgment. But he would often acknowledge, ingenuously and with regret, his want of learning, of which he was a very liberal encourager. He was most desirous of a justly deserved praise, which might be his ornament whilst alive, and after pass to his posterity. He ordered his transactions in war and peace to be recorded, and published by John Simoneta, an eminent Historian, and by Philiphus, a very famous Poet, in like manner as Cribellus, by his command also, had written the life of his father.' He had been saying that Francis Sforza governed the Milanese for the space of sixteen years, with so much wisdom, justice, and mildness, and kept himself so free from all manner of vice (15), that he was accounted the best prince of that time. But Naucerius says, that the love of women made him commit some injustices in his old age (16).

[D] The animosity, wherewith he went about to destroy the whole faction of Braccio was thought to be excessive.] He had subdued it, but being afraid that the son of Piccinus might revive it again, he resolved to destroy him; and the better to succeed in it, he pretended to love him, and married him to one of his daughters. Afterwards he delivered him to Ferdinand, King of Naples, who, contrary to his word given, and all the rights of hospitality, caused him to be beheaded in prison.

eight of March 1466, aged sixty-five years (v). He left fifteen children behind him, some lawfully begotten, and others not; but his posterity was wholly extinct in 1535 [E]. The condition, which he required in treating of the marriage of his son with the daughter of the Marquis of Mantua, has something singular in it [F]: I shall make a remark

(v) Spondanus, ad ann. 1466, numb. 6, pag. m. 109.

prison. This was an horrid crime: Paul Jovius condemns it in very strong words. *Fuere qui ei (Francisco Sfortia) inexorabilis odii notam inurerent, quod persequende Bracciae factionis nunquam oblitus, Jacobum Piccinini filium summæ spei ducem, sub quo Bracciana arma reflorescere posse viderentur, nequaquam syn-cera fide in generum asseruerit; scilicet ut eo vinculo pignore deceptum, ad terribilissimam necem Ferdinando Neapolitano regi praderet. Ab eo enim rege contra fidem refricata veterum offensarum memoria, vir impiger in carcere per Ebtisepum servum averfa securi mactatus est, singulari quidem cum infamia tantorum principum, qui vindictæ libidinem sacrosanctæ fidei & hospitalis mensæ reli-gione prætulissent (17).*

(17) Jovius, in Elog. Virorum bellica virtute illustrium, lib. iii, pag. 222, 223.

(18) Sanfivino, dell' orig. delle Case illustri d'Italia, folio ii, verso.

(19) Id. ibid.

(20) In the article LAMPO-
NIANO.

(21) In the article ARAGON.
(Isabella of)

(22) Leand. Albertus, in Descript. Italie, pag. 680.

(23) Taken from Leander Albertus, ubi supra,

(24) Above, remark [C] of the article ARETIN (Francis).

[E] He left fifteen children (18) behind him, some lawfully begotten, and others not; but his posterity was . . . extinct in 1535.] His first wife was Polyxena Ruffa, whose dowry made him lord of three towns and above twenty castles. His second wife, as has been said above, was the only daughter of the Duke of Milan. The son who succeeded him was called JOHN GALEAZZO MARIA SFORZA (19). I have laid in another place (20) how he was killed. His son JOHN GALEAZZO SFORZA, who succeeded him, was then but four years of age, and LUDOVIC SFORZA his uncle, son of Francis, took care of his education. You may see in another place (21), how he perished in the year 1494. His son was excluded from the succession by the intrigues of Ludovic Sforza, who got himself declared Duke of Milan, and thereby obtained the imperial investiture, which his predecessors could never obtain: that investiture extended to natural children, in case the lawful issue should fail. *Is postquam à Maximiliano Imperatore novi principatus auctoritatem obtinisset, magna cum solemnitate totiusque civitatis gratulatione Ducatus insignia cepit, die qui D. Theodoro martyri festus habetur, anno à C. N. mccccxcv. Primus ex Sfortia gente Mediolanensis Ducatus titulum ac dignitatem jure nactus est, quoniam anteriores auctoritatem principatus ab Sacro Imperio Romano battenus imperare non potuerant. Fuit autem in formula Ludovici non solum de filiis iustis ut invicem sibi succedendi jus haberent, comprehendendum, sed etiam de nobis, uti ego vidi, si iustos non extare contingeret (22).* He was deprived of his states in the year 1499, by Lewis XII King of France, grandson to Valentina Visconti, daughter of John Galeazzo, Duke of Milan. He raised some troops in Switzerland, and the year following returned into the Milanese, and recovered most places of that duchy; but the Swiss delivered him to the French, and from that day till his death, which happened in the year 1508, he was kept in prison. Lewis XII possessed the Milanese for some years following; but lost it in 1512, and MAXIMILIAN SFORZA Ludovic's son, recovered it. He could not keep it after the victory which Francis I. obtained over the Swiss in the year 1515, at the battle of Marignan, and was forced to surrender himself. He was sent into France, where he died. FRANCIS SFORZA, his brother, was established in 1522, Duke of Milan, by the power of a league, which had overcome the French. He did not enjoy that state quietly, nor without interruption, being sometimes expelled by the French, and then restored by Charles V, and sometimes also ill used by that emperor, who at last admitted him into his favour in the year 1530. From that time he peaceably enjoyed his states till the year 1535, in which he died. He was the last of all those who descended from Francis Sforza, first of that name (23). Charles V then possessed himself of the Milanese, and he invested his son, Philip II, with it the twelfth of December 1549. The terms of the investiture take in Philip II and all his posterity, both males and females for ever, according to the order observed in the hereditary successions of states, that may fall to women.

[F] The condition which he required in treating of the marriage of his son to the daughter of the Marquis of Mantua, has something singular in it. I have laid in another place (24), that according to the agreement between him and Lewis Gonzaga, Marquis of Mantua, his son Galeazzo was to marry Dorothy, that

Marquis's daughter, provided it should appear that she had no crooked back, nor any other imperfection in her body, at fourteen years of age. By virtue of that agreement, he sent some Physicians to inspect the naked body of Dorothy; but the Marquis would not suffer it. A very learned Civilian being consulted about that question, maintained, that Francis Sforza was in the right. Many people were surprized at the answer of that advocate. Read the following passage of Camerarius in his historical meditations. 'Many wonder how Franciscus Aretinus, a famous Civilian, undertook to prove that Francis Sforza Duke of Milan, was in the right to require that Dorothy daughter of Ludovic Marquis of Mantua, contracted to Galeazzo the son of that duke, should be viewed naked by some Physicians he had sent for that purpose, to know whether there was any deformity in her body: That on the contrary, the Marquis was in the wrong to refuse such an inspection, offering only to shew them his daughter dressed in the petticoat, which Galeazzo had sent her (25).' Camerarius has read this particular in a book of Tiraquellus, whom he quotes. I shall set down Tiraquellus's own words, whereby it will appear that Philip Decius, a famous Civilian, approved the opinion of the Advocate Aretinus. 'Proinde non recte fortassis plerisque videbitur consuluisset vir aliquo doctissimus autorque gravissimus Fran. Are. conf. 142. ex facto proponitur quod illustri in tertio, & iterum in quarto dubio ejusdem conf. cum omnibus nervis contendit probare Franciscum Sfortiam Ducem Mediolani jure petiisse, ut Dorothea filia Ludovici Marchionis Mantuæ Galeatio ipsius Ducis filio desponsata, nuda à quibuscumque Medicis à se missis conspiceretur, ut hinc detegeretur, si qua puellæ esset deformitas: contra Ludovicum hoc ipsum injuria recusasse, sed tantum filiam obtulisse videndam, Cotta (sic enim appellat) quam ad eam Galeatius ipse miserat, cooperatam. Cujus tamen consilium probat Philip. Dec. in d. ca. proposuisti in 2. notab. An tamen bene uterque senserit, aliorum sit judicium (26). - - - Wherefore it will possibly be thought, that a right advice was not given by the Counsellor Francis Aretin, otherwise a most learned person and grave author, in maintaining that Francis Sforza, Duke of Milan, was in the right to demand, that Dorothea daughter of Lewis Marquis of Mantua, betrothed to Galeazzo the Duke's son, should be viewed naked by some Physicians sent on purpose, to see if there was any defect in her. On the other hand, that Lewis was in the wrong to refuse it, and only to offer his daughter to be seen in a petticoat, which Galeazzo himself had sent. Whose advice was notwithstanding approved by Philippus Decius. But whether they both were in the right, or not, let others judge.' You see that Tiraquellus durst not decide whether those two Civilians were in the right; and yet he comments in that very place upon a law, which he reduced to these terms, *Let the betrothed couple discover their deformities one to another; however, let them not strip themselves stark naked, and particularly let the woman forbear doing it. Suam quisque deformitatem futuro marito, aut uxori detegito. Ne tamen se propterea, præsertim scemina, nudato (27).* He had been saying, that if women have any bodily imperfection, that is not known, they ought to acquaint with it those whom they are to marry, verbally only, but not by shewing it. (28) *Illud sceminas ipsas monemus, ut si qua in eis sit occulta deformitas, ei certe cui habere velint, non re quidem, id est corporis nudatione, sed verbis adaperiant, propter eam maxime rationem (29) quæ à nobis dicta est cum de viris in bujus capitis initio loqueremur.* It seems therefore, that to avoid contradicting himself, he should have altogether condemned the opinion of the Civilian Franciscus Aretinus. It may be answered in his vindication, that there are some particular cases, or special agreements which dispense with the law, and that therefore he would not interpose his judgment about the conduct of Francis Sforza, and the Marquis of Mantua. He might have thought that there were some circum-

(25) Camerarius, Mediat. Historiques, Tom. i, book ii, ch. xv, pag. m. 168.

(26) Tiraquellus in Legem IV, connubial. num. 28, pag. m. 85.

(27) Id. ibid. pag. 87.

(28) Id. ibid.

(29) See that reason towards the latter end of this remark.

K k

VOL. V. No. CXXI.

remark on it.

circumstances in the case, which made the thing problematical. It is very likely Francis Sforza meant by the words of his agreement with Dorothy's father, that the should be searched, but that it was not in express words said, she should be seen stark naked. Had this clause been expressed, the Marquis of Mantua would have broke his word by refusing what the Duke required; and if it was not expressed, he might say he never meant that his daughter should be inspected after the manner the Duke would have it. Wherefore the reasons *pro* and *con* might have been specious, and hindered Tiraquellus from attempting to decide the matter. He was not ignorant that it was more necessary for sovereign princes than for private persons, to know whether there are any concealed imperfections, that may make one fear a woman's barrenness. Francis Sforza designed to marry his son to the daughter of Lewis Gonzaga; and therefore it highly concerned him that she should want nothing: And it is well known, that there are many customs contrary to the common practice in favour of princes. See what I have said before (30) concerning the custom of the Muscovites. It affords another reason for the doubting of Tiraquellus, and shewing that he does not contradict himself.

(30) Citation (64), of the article FULVIA.

(31) Sed & legimus olim in templum Fortune virilia ventitare mulieres solitas que nuptui dabantur: & corpore nudato, num quo vitio aut labe essent affectas explorari solere. Tiraquell. ubi supra, num. xi, pag. 82.

(32) Du Boulay, Thesor des Antiquités Romaines, pag. 516.

Rite Deam Latæ colitis matresque nurusque;
Et vos, quis vitæ longaque vestis abest.
Aurea marmoreo redimicula solvite collo:
Demite divitias: tota lavanda Dea est.
Aurea ficcato redimicula reddite collo:
Nunc alii flores, nunc nova danda rosa est.
Vos quoque sub viridi myrto jubet illa lavari:
Causaque, cur jubeat, (discite) certa subest.
Litore siccatat rorantes nuda capillos.
Viderunt Satyri turba proterva Deam.
Sensit, & apposita textit sua corpora myrto.
Tuta fuit facta: vosque referre jubet.
Discite nunc, quare Fortunæ ibura Virili
Detis eo, calida qui locus humet aqua,
Accipit ille locus posteo velamine cunctas;
Et vitium nudi corporis omne videt.
Ut tegat hoc, cælestes viros, Fortuna Virilis
Præstat: & hoc parvo thure rogata facit (33).

(33) Ovidius, Fastor. lib. iv, ver. 233.

That custom of the Roman virgins, so ill related by Tiraquellus, was a trick and a fraud, wholly contrary to the sincerity he recommends to women, in the preliminaries of marriage. They applied themselves to Fortuna Virilis, as others made their address to the goddess Laverna, and begged of her that she would render invisible the faults they were guilty of.

Pulcra Laverna

Da mihi fallere, da iustum sanctumque videri,
Noctem peccatis & fraudibus obijce nubem (34):

(34) Horat. Epist. xvi, lib. i, ver. 60.

Good, good Laverna, grant me aid
For such a cheat, let all believe me good;
Let me seem just and honest to the crowd,
And o'er my cheats and forgeries cast a cloud.

CREECH.

In a word, that practice of the Roman ladies was a very bad one, tho' it was not so abominable as that of the Egyptian women, who shewed their nakedness to the ox Apis, for the space of forty days. That ox was the chief deity of the Egyptians. *Εν δὲ ταῖς ἀποσιρμύταις τετραπάρων ἡμέραις μὲν ὁρῶσιν αὐτὸν αἱ γυναῖκες, κατὰ ἀρίστων ἰσχυμέναι, καὶ δεκνύουσιν ἀναστρέφουσαι τὰ ταύτων γυναικῶν μύρια. Per XL. illos dies faciem duntaxat ipsum (Apis) vident, ante faciem ejus constitutæ, elevatisque peplo inguina ostentant (35).* What an abominable notion had they of the gods, whom they made the spectators of such things! This was not only a sin offending against modesty, but also an impious thing; and I make no doubt, that all the Romans, who knew the rules of a modest education, condemned the ceremonies practised on the first day of April. One may, without reading St Jerom, approve what he says, to shew that we ought to be ashamed of our own nakedness. 'Scio præcepisse quoddam, ne virgo Christi cum eunuchis lavet, nec cum maritatis for-

(35) Diodorus Siculus, lib. i, pag. m. 54, cap. lxxxv. See the Hexameron Rustique, pag. m. 91.

minis: quia alii non deponant animos virorum: alia tumentibus uteris præferant foeditatem. Mihi omnino in adulta virgine lavacra displicent, quæ se ipsam debat erubescere, & nudam videre non posse (36). - - - I know some have taught, that a Christian virgin ought never to go into a bath with an eunuch or married women, because those have not laid aside their masculine inclinations; and the others, by their big-bellies may shew what is unseemly. As for myself, I am of opinion, that a virgin that is marriageable, should not go into a bath, who should even blush, and be averse to behold herself naked. It is not enough

(36) Hieronymus, Epistola ad Letam de instituta filia, Epist. lib. ii, pag. m. 264.

to condemn the impudent practices authorized by the laws of Lycurgus (37), we ought also to condemn the anniversary customs mentioned by Ovid: and if the difference between the Duke of Milan, and the Marquis of Mantua was to be decided, it were much better to praise the conduct of the Marquis than that of the Duke. The complaints of Cicero d'Hadria ought only to be looked upon as witticisms. He exclaims against the vast difference between all other purchases and marriage. If a man buys a house, he will see every nook and corner of it from the cellar to the garret; and yet he does not confine himself to it for his life: He may sell it again, or let it, if he does not like it. It is the same with all other merchandise. The only thing, says Cicero d'Hadria, a man cannot part with, when he has purchased it, is that about which he strikes a bargain without examining it. 'Tutte le cose si considerano prima che si comprino. Le cose si mirano, gli stromenti si odono, le povere si annasano, il vino si gusta, il panno si tocca, le fusa si maneggiano, le caraffe si palpano d'ogni parte se son intiere, i leuti s'abbracciano, le stringhe si stendono, i legni si misurano, le scarpe si calzano, i cavalli si cavalcano, le vacche si scegliono, e in somma tutte le cose si provano con quei sensi, con cui le habbiamo a goder prima, che si conchiudano il mercato. Le mogli sole, che non si possono mai più rifiutare in vita, con cui bisogna star sempre fino alla morte, si prendono a chiudi occhi, a gatt'orba, e come si dice, gatta in sacco. Ne pur si provano, perche non riuscirebbono al paragone. Ne pur si mostrano, perche se si vedessero si sprezzerebbono prima, che si pigliassero (38). - - - We examine every thing, before we purchase it. We view a boufe, try a musical instrument, smell a melon, taste wine, feel a piece of cloth, turn a spindle, view every side of a flask, to know if it is whole. We found a lute, wind up strings, measure wood, try on shoes, ride horses, chuse out cows; and in short we prove every thing in the manner we are to use it, before we make the bargain. Women alone, whom we can never re-

(37) See before the remarks [C], [D], and the following, of the article LYCURGUS. See also the article QUELLE-NEC, citation (41). Note that Montaigne in book iii of his Essays, ch. vi, pag. m. 129, & seq. seems willing to excuse Lycurgus.

(38) Lettere famigliari del Cicero d'Hadria, pag. m. 35. See above the remark [C].

LYCURGUS,

* turn as long as we live, and whom we must keep till we die, are taken blindly, like a pig in a poke. They are not tried, because they would not answer the test. neither do they suffer themselves to be viewed, because if they were seen, they would be slighted before they went off.' How comically they talk. He would introduce into our contracts of marriage, either the custom of the Taxites, an antient nation among the Indians (39), or that of the old Romans when they bought slaves; a custom which the Emperor Augustus made subservient to his unlawful love, as has been seen before in the article of Fulvia, citation

(39) Strabo, lib. xv, pag. m. 491, says, that among them, when a man could give no portion to his daughter, he carried her to the market-place, and gathered the people together by sound of trumpet. If any body offered to marry her, she stripped herself first backwards to the shoulders and then forwards.

(40) Above, citation (39).

(41) Tiraquellus, ubi supra, num. i, pag. 79.

(42) See above remark [D] of the article DULLIUS.

I have promised above (40) to mention the reason alleged by Tiraquellus, why a man and a woman, who design to marry, should discover their bodily imperfections to each other. A husband, says he, who does not declare them in due time, runs the hazard of being hated by his wife when she comes to know them: It is in vain for him to hope that she will not perceive them; people that lie together in the same bed must needs find them out. Contempt, hatred, and horror, will be the consequence of such a discovery; and then the wife will think of other men. *Si vir quispiam qui se matrimonio velit addicere, quicquam latentis vitii aut deformitatis in corpore habeat, id in primis uxori quam duciturus est, debeat, ne si jam consummato matrimonio resciscat (neque enim illam quam cum dies noctisque versaris diu latere potest . . .) te contemnat, detestetur, abhorreat: proindeque alios petulantius fectetur* (41). Let no man fancy (Tiraquellus goes on) that he will have a wife like that, who being married to one that had a sinking nose, did not complain of it, because she thought all men had the same defect (42). There are but two such instances mentioned by antient authors; and none but a madman will expect such a thing now a-days. *Et sane futurum adeo ne-*

minem infanum reor qui nostris praesertim temporibus, spem concipiat uxorem se his similem inventuram, eaque spe ductus suum illi vitium non patefaciat (43). This is what he says to persuade a man to conceal none of his imperfections, and to imitate the good example of the Philosopher Crates (44), and of the father (45) of the Emperor Galba. He uses the same arguments as to women, which he confirms by this, that marriage is a kind of purchase, and that justice requires the buyer should be informed of the latent faults of what he buys (46). He proves all this by several authorities.

I do not know what was the issue of the difference between the Duke of Milan and the Marquis of Mantua about Dorothy's marriage. I cannot tell whether any expedient was found out to satisfy the father of the betrothed; but I find in Sanfivino (47), that John Galeazzo Maria, the son of our Francis Sforza, had two wives: One of them was Sufanna de Gonzaga, and the other Bonna of Savoy. The Abbot de Marolles affirms that Sufanna de Gonzaga, the daughter of Lewis Marquis of Mantua, was married to Galeazzo Maria Sforza Duke of Milan (48). The same Sanfivino says in another place (49), that Dorothy Gonzaga, daughter of Lewis Gonzaga, Marquis of Mantua, was married to Galeazzo Maria Sforza Duke of Milan. It is very likely, that thro' a mistake he is frequently liable to, he calls the same person Sufanna in one place, and Dorothy in another. From whence it ought to be inferred that, according to him, the son of Francis Sforza was married to a daughter of the Marquis of Mantua; which would prove that the difference, concerning which Francis Aretin was consulted, was made up, and the marriage accomplished. But then it might be said, that Sanfivino, who is no exact writer, speaks of a marriage in general, tho' the thing went no farther than a betrothing.

(43) Tiraquellus in Legem IV, connubial. num. i, pag. 80.

(44) See the remark [A] in the article HIP-PARCHIA.

(45) He pulled off his gown, to show a rich and handsome lady, who courted him, that he had a crooked back. See Suetonius in Galba, cap. iii.

(46) See citation (f) of the article ABDAS.

(47) Sanfivino, ubi supra, fol. 11, verso.

(48) Marolles, Memoires, pag. 428.

(49) Fol. 359, verso.

S F O R Z A (CATHERINE) grand-daughter of the foregoing, was a lady of great courage; but she did an action which favoured much more of a man's boldness, than of a woman's modesty. Her subjects having made themselves masters of the castle of Rimini, she gave them her children as hostages to recover it; and then she threatened with death those, who had occasioned the insurrection; they answered her, that they would kill her children; thereupon she turned up her shift, and said, here is where-withal to get others [A]: barbarously, destroy the innocent hostages that are in your hands; I consent to it, provided my justice inflict upon you such a punishment as your wickedness deserves (a). She was the natural daughter of Galeazzo Maria Sforza, and

(a) Taken from Balthazar Bonifacius Historiae Ludicae, lib. v, cap. iv, pag. 127. He quotes the eighth book of Michael, Brutus's History of Florence.

was

(1) Compare this with the answer of the Egyptians, in the remark [D] of the article PSAMMITICHUS.

[A] Here is where-withal to get others (1). There could not be a more modest translation of the following words. 'Illa magno & virili animo sublata veste nudatoque ventre, En inquit, quo possim liberos iterum procreare. - - - She with a great and manly courage, taking up her garment, and uncovering her belly, Behold, says she, that whereby I can have more children.' The author, from whom I have this, and whom I have quoted in the margin of this article, had been relating the action of a Lacedaemonian woman, who seeing her sons run away from a fight, shewed them her nakedness, and asked them whether they would get in again into the same belly out of which they came when they were born, or whether they expected she should put them under her gown, that the enemies who pursued them, might not see them. She added to this question such a smart reprimand for their want of courage, that they returned to the fight and got the victory. He quotes the Apophthegms of the Lacedaemonian women, collected by Plutarch; but all these circumstances are not to be found in that author: He only says, that a woman of Lacedaemon shewed her belly to her sons when they ran away, and asked them whether they had a mind to get into it again (2). The other particulars are a fabulous addition of Balthazar Bonifacius. I call it fabulous, tho' it is to be found in Justin, with respect to other women, viz. the Persian women, when Cyrus engaged in a decisive battle against Artaxerxes king of the Medes. 'Pulsa itaque cum Persarum acies paulatim cederet; matres & uxores eorum obviam occurrunt: orant in praelium revertantur: cunctantibus, sublata veste, obscena corporis ostendunt, rogantes num in utero matrum vel uxorum velint refugere. Hac repressi castigatione, in praelium redeunt: & facta impressione, quos fugiebant, fugere compellunt

(4) Plot. in Apophthegm. Lacedaemonarum, pag. m. 241.

(3). - - - The Persian army being worsted, began gradually to give ground, they were met by their mothers and wives: they pray them to return to the fight: but delaying, they lift up their garments, shew their secret parts, asking if they would again take shelter in the wombs of their mothers or wives. Being checked by this reproof, they return to the battle, and charging afresh, put to flight those from whom they were flying. A commentator (4) observes, that Tacitus mentions a thing like this concerning the women of Germany; which is not true: The difference between that fact, and that of the Persian women, is great enough to make it a different thing. The women mentioned by Tacitus used only intreaties, and shewed nothing but their breasts. 'Memoriae proditur, quaedam acies inclinatam jam, & labantes a feminis restitutas, constantia precum & objectu pectorum, & monstrata cominus captivitate, quam longe impatientius seminarum suarum nomine timent: adeo ut efficacius obligentur animi civitatum quibus inter obsequia puellarum quoque nobiles imperantur (5). - - - It is recorded, that armies giving ground and ready to fly, have been restored by women, incessantly intreating, shewing their breasts, and telling them what slavery they were to undergo; which they dreaded so much the more upon account of their women. - - - that those cities are most effectually kept in subjection, by which amongst the hostages noble virgins are delivered up.' It were an unjust thing to say that I am a rambling commentator, and that I make digressions to fill up my page; for I only take notice of such mistakes as I meet in my way, after having censured Balthazar Bonifacius for advancing a falsity. His book, and those of innumerable other authors, are full of such liberty: therein you will find a thousand things, which the authors quoted by them say nothing of. If I had a

(4) Justin, lib. i, cap. vi, p. m. 20. See also Plutarch, de Virtutibus Mulierum, pag. 246.

(5) Tacit. de Germ. cap. viii.

- (b) Thomas Porcacchi, in his notes upon Guicciardin, lib. i, fol. 20, verso.
- (c) Guicciardin, lib. i, fol. 20, verso.
- (d) Id. *ibid.*
- (e) Id. *ibid.* fol. 126. See also Thomas's Life of Cæsar Borgia, pag. 270.
- (f) Guicciardin, *ibid.*
- (g) Idem, lib. iv, fol. 104, verso.
- (h) Id. *ibid.*
- (i) Varillas, Hist. de Louis XII, book i, pag. 55, 56.
- (j) Volaterranus, lib. iv, pag. 2.
- (k) He is mistaken; she had more than one son. See Guicciardin, book iv, fol. 126.
- (l) Varillas, Hist. de Louis XII, book i, pag. 55, 56.
- (m) Volaterranus, lib. iv, pag. 2.
- (n) That is, Catherine de Medicis, who has been Queen of France.
- (o) In tanto non si spaventò punto, che anzi alzatosi le vesti, e loro mostrando le parti vergognose disse, che de suoi figliuoli fu cesserò a voglia loro, che a lei rimaneva la stampa di tirare de gli altri. Boccacini, Raggioni di Parnasso, Cent. I, cap. lxxv, pag. m. 102.
- (p) *ibid.*

mind to swell my compilation by bringing in things by head and shoulders, should I forget to censure the same Bonifacius, for mentioning the action of Catherine Sforza, in a chapter wherein his business was only to bring some proofs of the physical virtues of the muliebre pudendum (6). Is that action well connected with the other accounts heaped up by him, and which concern I know not what faculty of driving away hail, laying storms, and frightening lions? I suspect he is guilty of a much greater blunder; I think he falsifies the main parts of the narrative of the historian quoted by him: it is quite different in the Supplement to Moreri's dictionary (7).

(6) It's title is de vi muliebris pudendi.

(7) In the article SFORZA (CATHERINE).

(8) Leand. Albert. in Descript. Ital. pag. 493.

(9) Porcacchi, notes upon Guicciardin, lib. iv, fol. 126.

(10) Hilarion de Cofte, Eloges des Dames, Tom. i, pag. 224.

[B] She was married to Jerom Riario. She brought him the Lordship of Imola for her portion; Galeazzo Sforza her father, had made himself master of it, by taking advantage of the quarrels, which arose in 1472, between Tadeo Manfredi Lord of Imola and his son. Jerom Riario, nephew to Sixtus the fourth, did very much embellish that town (8).

[C] It was upon this occasion, if we may believe, some writers . . . but they are mistaken. Thomas Porcacchi confutes those authors in his marginal notes upon Guicciardin's history: he shews, that the lady did that action when her husband was killed. These are his words: 'Hanno scritto alcuni, che Madama Caterina trovandosi assediata nella Rocca di Forlì dal Valentino, & havendo egli, per indurla ad arrendersi, minacciato d'a mazzarle i figliuoli, se non si arrendeva; ella con animo costante alzatasi i panni dinanzi; gli mostrò le parti vergognose, dicendo d'haver le forme da stamparne de gli altri: il che però si vede discordar da questo autore, che dice come la Rocca fu presa incontinente, che dentro ella vi fu ritirata: & è chiaro, che non hora, ma quando fu da Lodovico Panfecco amazzato il Sig. Girolamo Riario marito di lei, ella fece questo atto (9). . . . Some have written, that when Valentine besieged Catherine Sforza in the castle of Forlì, and, in order to force her to surrender, threatened, that if she did not she would immediately put her children to death; Catherine, with a resolute mind, pulled up her coats, and shewed him her privy parts, telling him that she had the mould for casting more. This however seems to disagree with what that author says, viz. that the castle was taken as soon as she entered it: It is plain, that she did this action, not at that time, but when her husband Girolamo Riario was murdered by Ludovico Panfecco.' The good Father Hilarion de Cofte durst not relate the thing, as it happened: He leaves out all the impudence of that action, to the end, questioning, that he might not let slip the opportunity of increasing the number of his heroins. But he is mistaken as to the circumstance of time, if Porcacchi is in the right. That Minime expresses himself thus (10): 'Catherine Sforza, the wife of John de Me-

dicis, the most courageous and valiant lady that ever was seen in Italy, gave her (11) the name of Catherine, when she was christened. That magnanimous hero, the worthy god-mother of Queen Catherine, gave a proof of her valour and courage, when she was besieged by Cæsar Borgia Duke of Valentinois in the fortrefs of Forlì; for being threatened by that cruel tyrant and monster of nature, with the loss and destruction of her children, if she refused to surrender, she boldly appeared upon the walls, and laughed at the rodomontades of that captain, laying her hand upon her gown, and telling him that she was young enough to get others.'

[D] She was privately married to John de Medicis. That marriage was known in time. Catherine Sforza had by that second husband John de Medicis, who was the Father of Cosmo de Medicis, the first great Duke of Tuscany. Boccacini has a witty conceit about it. He feigns that Catherine Sforza having declared, that she had the courage to shew the mould wherein she took upon herself to form other children (12), desired, that since she had been very much commended by all historians for that action, Apollo would be pleased to assign her a proper place upon Parnassus. The judges were divided in their opinions; some of them looked upon it as a brutish piece of leudness. Ad alcuni atto di sfacciatezza, e di bruta impudicitia parve quello, che così nobil signora haveva raccontato (13). Apollo judged that a regular observation of modesty did belong to private women; but that princesses were obliged upon some occasions to shew their virility. A counsellor gave his opinion in this manner: The place, out of which John de Medicis, father of the great Cosmo, came, did certainly deserve to be exposed to the public view. Ben degno di esser veduto da ogn' uno era quel luogo, donde era uscito il famoso Campione Giovan de Medici padre di quel gran Cosmo, &c (14).

[E] The scruples, which hindered the continuator of Moreri's Dictionary, to mention the immodest action of that lady. He hath coloured over the matter with an affected preciseness, which infinitely surpasseth that of the Monk; for he says, that lady was contented to answer that she might make up the loss of her children, and that it would bring an unavoidable calamity upon the rebels. Do what you can, and set it in what view you will, you will never be able to shew that he has discharged the duty of an historian, and that he has not neglected it in such a manner as is inexcusable; for we can discover in his words no shadow or footstep of what was done by Catherine Sforza; and yet it was an action so singular and so extraordinary, that it ought not to be passed over in silence. Perhaps, it will be said, that the thing was so impudent, that chaste ears would have been offended at it; and that instead of representing her as a most illustrious woman, she would have been exposed to the contempt of every reader.

Lewis Guicciardin [F].

reader. I answer, that those two excuses are insignificant: that if the first was a good one, a vast number of words should be suppressed in our language; we should never be allowed either to speak or to write *naked, nakedness, adultery, fornication*, and a thousand more which excite unavoidably obscene ideas. At this rate the Bible should be corrected, and the writers inspired by God, would be liable to censure; for they mention the nakedness of Noah (15), and of the Apostles (16), and did not scruple to express themselves naturally, and without circumlocution, upon such occasions, wherein one should have a regard to chaste ears, according to the principles I confute. Those, who understand the Hebrew tongue, are not ignorant that Moses made use of a very vulgar word (17), to denote the mortal blow the Midianitish woman had received. *Tu fortassis, ut sunt serè hypocritæ, verbis tetricis, rebus obscenæ, ne ipsum quidem Mosén istâ noxiâ immunem abs te dimiseris; cum alibi sæpius, tum etiam ubi Phineæ basia, quâ parte mulierem transfixeris, squa fides Hebræis, aperte narrat* (18). The second excuse

(15) Genes. ix.

(16) John xxi. 7.

(17) Num. xxv.

(18) Miltonus, in Defensione pro se contra Alexandrum Morum, pag. m. 75.

(19) See the remark [A], in the article DOMITIA.

(20) Plin. lib. ii, cap. ix, pag. m. 152.

is worse still, and would be of no use but to a writer of Romances. I confess that if such an author pitched upon Catherine Sforza to be his heroine, and the subject of an history, like so many sorry pieces that come out every day, which contain a thousand fables and chimeras, grafted upon real fact; I say, such an author might pass over in silence the faults of that lady? But an historian ought not to do it, he is obliged to represent the ill qualities of people: justice requires that what is blameable should be actually blamed, and whoever conceals the faults of persons, or extenuates them, imposes upon the world in several respects (19). Are we not thereby deprived of a knowledge that belongs to us, and induced to misapply our approbation. If our Catherine committed a fault, is it not reasonable she should suffer for it in some measure, by the judgment which the readers will pass upon it? And if all historians imitated the writer I speak of, would not men be exempted from the fear of being condemned by posterity, which is a mighty curb to keep them to their duty, and one of the greatest advantages that can be reaped from history? Will you say, that there was a necessity to pass over in silence such a piece of impudence, lest it should be imitated by others? But for the same reason all the lewd and disorderly actions of mankind should be omitted by historians: and they would not be allowed to write but in the stile of panegyrics. The profession of an historian should be ranked amongst the arts prohibited, and all nations obliged to use it as the Jews did painting. All historians should be ordered to confine themselves to the enquiry of natural things, and not to meddle with human life. Pliny would not have been much against such an order; for the care that was taken to write annals in order to make a discovery of crimes, whilst the works of nature remain unknown, was looked upon by him as a very pernicious thing. *Mira humani ingenii peste, sanguinem, & cædes condere annalibus juvat, ut scelera hominum noscantur mundi ipsius ignavis* (20). Perhaps, it will be said, that the author of the Supplement thought

he was to express himself, as if he had told a story in the presence of the most virtuous women in the world. I answer, this is a wrong notion: Those, who maintain that every word, which cannot be spoken before a virtuous woman, ought to be banished from a book, are mistaken. It is a maxim of over-nice and precise women; which you will easily grant, if you consider never so little the difference between a conversation and a book. An honest woman will be justly offended, if any one tells her an obscene story; but she will not blame an historian for relating it, provided he abstain from filthy words: An historian speaks to the public, and not to such or such a woman in particular; and therefore what he says is not offensive, as it would be, if it was said in a conversation or in a letter. In these two last cases he would have no very favourable notion of the modesty of those to whom he speaks or writes; and that is it that gives offence. They would apply the consequence personally to themselves; but none applies to himself in such a manner what concerns only the public. We are obliged to hear what we are told, or to read the letters that are written to us; but every body may read or lay aside a printed book. In fine, I observe that of all writers, those of dictionaries ought least to be over scrupulous, since such works are designed to give a clear and precise explication of things.

[F] I shall observe an error of the translator of a book of Lewis Guicciardin. I do not know that translator's name; but I know that he has translated several Italian books into French. He himself says so in his preface to the translation of *L'Hore di recreatione di M. Lodovico Guicciardini, Patrio Fiorentino*. These hours of recreation of Lewis Guicciardin are a collection of stories, sentences, and witty sayings. He did not there forget the action of our Catherine Sforza. Guicciardin says she did what I have related above in the citadel of Forli, when her husband had been killed. 'Ma la contessa animosa non mutando faccia, alzatasi tostante i panni davanti con fiero sguardo disse loro: Et non vi pare egli stolti ch'io habbia le forme di farne dell' altri?' The translator renders those Italian words thus: 'But the courageous countess, without altering her countenance, suddenly turning up her coat, told them with a proud look, Do not you think, you fools, that I have still beauty enough to get others (21)?' Nothing can be more absurd than to make her say upon such an occasion *I have still beauty enough*. If it was said in the foregoing words, that she unmasked herself to shew her face, there would be some coherency and justness in her discourse; but there is none at all if it be compared with what she had been doing. The author cannot be excused upon account of preciseness or modesty; for had he acted on such a principle, he would have omitted or wrapped up that action, instead of relating it as plainly as he does. His mistake proceeds from not knowing that the word *forme* in that place signifies moulds. This ignorance has occasioned a strange disorder in the sequel of the discourse.

(21) L'Hore di recreatione di Lodovico Guicciardini, folio 290, verso, edition of Paris, 1624, in 12mo.

S F O R Z A (ISABELLA) may be placed among learned women. She lived in the XVIth century. Some of her letters may be seen in the collection published at Venice by Hortensio Lando in the year 1549 [A]. And among others a letter of consolation,

[A] The collection published at Venice by Hortensio Lando, in the year 1549. Christofano Bronzini has recourse to that collection, being obliged to confute one of the interlocutors of his dialogues, who says, that few women were capable of writing two words. His answer is (1), 'Sono state tante, che passano le centinaia; e tanto degne di lode, che se voi vedeste le lettere loro (che con tanto sudore, con tanta diligenza, e spesa furono raccolte dal Sign. Hortensio Lando; & à persuasione, e preghiere di Ottaviano Raveria, eletto poi Vescovo di Terracina) date in luce, e stampate da Gabriel Giolito, l'anno 1549, vi chiarireste, con quanta eloquenza, con quanto artificio, con quanta osservanza, & bella maniera di dire, elle sapessero porre in carta altro, che quattro

(1) Christofano Bronzini, della dignità e Nobiltà delle Donne, Giornata quarta, pag. 40.

parole. - - - There have been so many, that we may reckon more than a hundred, and so worthy of praise, that if you saw their letters (which were collected with great labour and diligence, and at great expence by Hortensio Lando; at the persuasion and intreaty of Ottaviano Raveria, afterwards made Bishop of Terracina) published and printed by Gabriel Giolito in the year 1549, you would know with how great eloquence, art, propriety, and beautiful elocution, they were able to write more than four words. He is not contented in general to refer to that collection, he also took some letters out of it, and inserted them in his work; particularly with respect to our Isabella Sforza. You will find there the letter she writ to Bobbia. For the rest, such a work as that of Hortensio,

L I

consolation, which she wrote to Bonna Sforza, widow of the King of Poland, who was lately dead and that which she writ to Margaret Bobbia in vindication of Poetry.

tensio Lando, did very well deserve I should mention | most severe critics will excuse me for taking the liber-
some circumstances of it; and therefore I hope the | ty to set down Bronzini's words somewhat at large.

SICYON, a town of Peloponnesus, and the most ancient kingdom that ever was in Greece. Ægialeus is said to have been the first King of Sicyon, and we are told that he began to reign seventy-four years before the birth of Abraham (a). Zeuxippus was the last king: he was the twenty-sixth, and reigned thirty-two years. The form of the government was changed after his death: the priests exercised the supreme authority. That kingdom lasted nine hundred and sixty-two years [A]: it ended when Eli was High-priest and judge of the Jews (b). The worship which the Sicyonians paid to Bacchus, was not one of the least ridiculous parts of the Pagan religion [B].

(a) Eusebius, in Chron. pag. 11. supposes that Abraham was born the 22d year of the reign of Eue-
rops, second king of Sicyon, who succeeded Ægialeus, whose reign had lasted 52 years.

(b) August. de Civit. Dei. lib. xviii, cap. xix.

[A] That kingdom lasted nine hundred and sixty-two years. It lasted three years less, if we believe St Au-

gustin (1). A commentator upon that Father (2) has committed two faults in few words. He says, that according to Eusebius, that kingdom lasted eight hundred and sixty-two years; and he adds, that if the years be cast up, they will amount to nine hundred and seventy-two. It is certain Eusebius (3) mentions a duration of nine hundred and sixty-two years, and that the addition of the years of each king of Sicyon makes but nine hundred and sixty-two years. Eusebius reckons from Abraham's birth, and supposes that Patriarch was born in the twenty-second year of Eue-

rops, the second king of Sicyon, who succeeded Ægialeus, and reigned fifty-two years; and that the Kings of Sicyon failed in 889 (4). Add the numbers, and you will find the second fault I have censured.

[B] The worship which the Sicyonians paid to Bacchus was not one of the least ridiculous parts of the Pagan religion. They worshipped Bacchus under such an obscene name, that none but very impudent people can pronounce it in a free conversation. It is the name that such impudent people at this day give to midwives. Clemens Alexandrinus does justly blame the Heathens for such a turpitude. Διόνυσον δὲ ἡδὴ σιωπῶ τὸν χειρὶ-λάλην. Σικυνῶνιοι τῶτον περὶ σκυ-
νῶσιν ἐπὶ τῶν γυναικείων τὰς ἀνὰ τὸν Διόνυσον μορῆαν ἔχουσιν αἰσχρὸς καὶ τῆς ὕβρεως σέβας ὄντις ἀρχηγόν. Bacchum enim jam taceo pudendi contreflatorem. Eum adorant Sicyonii, qui Bacchum membris præficiunt muliebribus tanquam turpitudinis ac fordiditatis inspectorem, & quasi libidinis colant præ-

dictum (5). . . . The Sicyonians, says he, worship Bacchus as the inspector of the secret parts of women: they have allotted to him these parts as his demesne, his jurisdiction, and his province. Mr Costar writing in prose, took a more than poetical liberty, when he made use of those words of Clemens Alexandrinus to explain some verses of Horace. Such a liberty did not go unpunished; Mr de Girac did severely banter him for it under the following irony (6). 'I will not imitate him in his ill humour; on the contrary, I find he has been very successful in his explication of these verses of the same Poet (7).

Bacchum in remotis carmina rupibus
Vidi docentem, credite Posteri,
Nymphæque difcentes, & aures
Capripedium Satyrorum acutas.

Born out by an unusual rage,
I saw (believe it future age)

(1) Augustin. de Civitate Dei, lib. xviii, cap. xix.

(2) Leonardus Coqueus in hunc locum Augustini, pag. 605, Editionis Francos. 1661.

(3) Euseb. in Chron. ad ann. 889, pag. m. 96.

(4) That is, reckoning from Abraham's birth.

(5) Clem. Alex. and. Admonit. ad Gentes, pag. 25.

(6) Girac, Replique à Costar, §. iii, pag. 26.

(7) Horat. lib. ii, Od. XIX.

Bacchum in remotis carmina rupibus
Vidi docentem, credite Posteri,
Nymphæque difcentes, & aures
Capripedium Satyrorum acutas.

Born out by an unusual rage,
I saw (believe it future age)

SILANION, a famous Sculptor, flourished in the time of Alexander the Great, about the CXIVth Olympiad (a). He was an Athenian (b), and got a great skill in his art without being taught by any body (c). The statue of Sappho (d), that of one Satyrus, who had often carried the prize at the Grecian games (e), that of another champion called Demaratus (f), and that of Apollodorus a Sculptor, who could not be pleased with his own works [A], were accounted his chief pieces. He wrote a tract, wherein

(a) Plinius, lib. xxxiv, cap. viii, pag. m. 110.

(b) Pausan. lib. vi, cap. iv, pag. 461.

(c) Plinius. ubi supra.

(d) See the end of the text of the article SAPPHO.

[A] That of Apollodorus, a Sculptor, who could not be pleased with his own works. What Pliny says upon this is very remarkable, and shews Silanion's great skill in his art. Silanion Apollodorum fudit, fictorem ipsum,

Where Bacchus taught the nymphs a song,
In distant vales; from ev'ry wood
With prick'd up ears the satyrs flood,
And smiling fauns compos'd a list'ning throng.

CREECH.

I did not think fit, says Mr Costar (8), to write to you a pleasant thing concerning Bacchus's scholars, fearing my letter might fall into other hands than your's. But here I will be bolder, because I fancy this paper will be more secret. I have read in Clemens Alexandrinus, that Bacchus was worshipped among the Sicyonians under the name of χοῖες-λάλην, which signifies If it be so, do not ask me what he was doing in remotis with those beautiful nymphs. Certainly, none of them could come off. He felt them all one after another; and this was the fine lesson he gave them. I think, Sir, they wanted no pocket-book to write it down. Pray, let me know by the first opportunity what you think of it, &c. I am sorry I was not there, for I fancy this Bacchus was a jolly doctor, and that it was worth one's while to see him act such a part. He had an honest fellow for his tutor, a man of good example, who sets forth very fine moral reflections in Euripides's Cyclops. I do not ask Mr Costar what he would have done with those nymphs; but if he had lived at that time, we should not have known such fine things. However, I hope he will excuse me for leaving out two or three words, which none can be so impudent as to write or utter, excepting Bacchus's master, or his disciple, I mean, Silenus, and Mr Costar. Mr Menage knowing that the Latin word Porcus, and the Greek word χοῖς, signified that part of a woman, which modesty does not permit to name, made use of that erudition to give us the etymology of the epithet, under which Bacchus was worshipped at Sicyon (9).

Isaac Vossius advances an etymological conjecture grounded upon the obcenities over which Bacchus presided. Non ab hoc Orithagora (10), says he (11), nomen Orithagoræ est arcessendum, sed vero à numine salacissimo, ut existimo. Nullus dubito quin Bacchus ipse aliquando dictus sit Orithagoras. Antequam enim ille hortorum custos Lampasce nasceretur, notum est Bacchum comitesque ejus curam locorum muliebrium habuisse. Hinc fit ut non tantum ἰδύφαλλον ipsum vocarint, verum etiam idem significantibus vocabulis, ὀρθον, ὀρθανην, ἔσ' ὀρθάγορον. Sane apud Aristophanem ἐκκλησια-
ζούσας, cum juvencula hortatur anum prurientem, ut vocet Orithagoram, id non nisi de hoc demone peculiatore videtur intelligendum, uti ad illum locum fufius ostendimus.

(8) Note, that this is not to be found in the printed books of that author. He wrote it to Balzac: his letter came into Girc's hands, who inserted in this part of his reply, so much of it as he thought fit.

(9) Mr Costar is mistaken; it should be χοῖες-λάλην.

(10) An Historian mentioned by Strabo, Ælian, and Philostratus.

(11) Isaacus Vossius, in Pomponium Melam, lib. ii, cap. ii, pag. m. 133.

(12) Pausanias, ubi supra.

(13) Pausanias, ubi supra, pag. 487.

wherein he explained the rules of Symmetry if we may believe Vitruvius (g).

(g) Vitruvius, *Præf. lib. vii.*

ipsum, sed inter cunctos diligentissimum artis, & inimicum sui iudicem, crebro peracta signa frangentem, dum satiare cupiditate artis non quit, & ideo insanum cognominatum. Hoc in eo expressit, nec hominem ex ære fecit, sed iracundiam (1).

(1) Plinius, *lib. xxxiv, cap. viii.* pag. m. 126.

These words have been well enough understood by du Pinet; but he is strangely mistaken in the sequel of this passage. His translation runs thus: 'Silanion made the statue of Apollodorus, who was also a Sculptor, and very much esteemed. But he was so intent upon improving himself in his art, that he never liked his own work; so that very often, he broke very noble pieces out of anger, after he had made an end of them, thinking he could never do a thing well enough: which was the reason why many called him a madman. Silanion intending to shew it, made a statue of Anger, in a woman's cloaths, instead of Apollodorus.' I think there is a mistake in these words of the translator, in a woman's cloaths instead of Apollodorus. I do not believe this is Pliny's meaning; but only that Apollodorus's statue appeared so pationate and cholerick, that one would have taken it to be the very figure of Anger. See the epigrams of the Anthologia, quoted by Father Hardouin (2), upon a thought like that of Pliny. This mistake of du Pinet is inconsiderable, if compared with those that follow. Read first the Latin words of Pliny (3). *Et Achillem nobilem. Item Epistaten exercitum atletas: Strongylon Amazonem, quam ab excellentia crurum Eucnemem appellant, ob id in comitatu Neronis Principis circumlatam. Item fecit puerum, quem amando Brutus Philippiensis cognomine suo illustravit (4).* Du Pinet renders them thus: 'He made also an Achilles very much esteemed, and Epistates, who exercised the wrestlers. He also made Strongylon an Amazon, which he firnamed Eucnemus, that is, fine-legged; which the emperor Nero esteemed so much, that he had it commonly carried along with him. He also made a statue of a young boy, so beautiful, that Brutus of Philippopolis in Romania, was so much in love with it, that he called it by his own name.' You see he ascribes to Silanion all the works mentioned in the passage from Pliny, whereas he should only have ascribed to him the two first. The two others belonged to a famous statuary, whose name was Strongylon. He is mentioned in the first and ninth books of Pausanias (5): the translator took Strongylon for the name of an

(2) Hardouin in Plin. Tom. v, pag. 126.

(3) Plinius, ubi supra.

(4) Martial, Epigram. lxxvii, lib. ii, & Epig. ii, lib. ix, & Epig. cxi, lib. xiv. mentions that statue of a boy which Brutus loved.

(5) Pausan. lib. i, pag. 97, & lib. ix, pag. 767, Edit. 1696.

Amazon, whose statue had been made by Silanion. Besides, he was in the wrong to think that that statue was firnamed Fine-legged, by the Sculptor that made it; this is not what Pliny means. Lastly, if he had a mind to be understood, he should not have mentioned one Brutus of Philippopolis in Romania, but Brutus, who perished at the battle of Philippi, the same who murdered Julius Cæsar.

That the remark contained in this article, may serve as a supplement to the collections I have made in another place (6), concerning those who are never pleased with their productions, and spoil them by much revising them; I shall add to what Pliny says of Apollodorus, the words of the same author, wherein he does so well express the same fault of the Sculptor Callimachus. 'Ex omnibus autem maxime cognomine insignis est Callimachus, semper calumniator sui, nec finem habens diligentiae, ob id Cacizotechnos appellatus, memorabili exemplo adhibendi curæ modum. Hujus sunt saltantes Lacenæ; emendatum opus sed in quo gratiam omnem diligentia absterit (7). - - But of all, Callimachus was the most noted because of his surname, always blaming himself; nor ever setting any bounds to his care, for which he was called, Cacizotechnos, Spoil-work, a memorable example for prescribing bounds to our diligence. The Lacedemonian dancers are his work, a finished piece, but deprived of all it's graces by his too great care.'

Protagenes, amongst the Painters, was affected with the same disease, as Callimachus and Apollodorus among the Sculptors. We have seen (8), in another place, what judgment Apelles made of him; and we may add here, that this judgment was approved by Cicero. I shall set down his own words, because they may serve as an instruction to the writers, who are never weary of mending their composures: they know not that every thing ought to be kept within certain bounds. 'In omnibus rebus videndum est quatenus. Et si enim suus cuique modus est, tamen magis offendit nimium, quam parum. In quo Apelles pictores quoque eos peccare dicebat, qui non sentirent, quid esset satis (9). - - In all things it is to be considered what is enough. For seeing every thing has it's measure, too much is no less displeasing than too little. Whereupon Apelles said, that those Painters were to be blamed, who never perceived what was sufficient.'

(6) In the article LINACER remark [F], (where you will find in citation (17) the words of Pliny, concerning Protagenes) and remark [G] of the article MALHERBE.

(7) Plin. ubi supra, pag. 326.

(8) Above citation (17) of the article LINACER.

(9) Cicero de Oratore, cap. xxii.

SYLVIUS (FRANCIS) professor of Eloquence, and principal of Tournay-college at Paris, towards the beginning of the XVIth century, was a native of Amiens, where his father Nicolas du Bois was a Camblet-weaver (a). This Nicolas had fifteen children, eleven sons, and four daughters. Francis was the third; and being bred up a scholar, he became a learned man and settled at Paris. He Latinized his family name according to the custom of those times. He sent for two of his brothers, and instructed them very well in Classial learning: one of them called JOHN was made canon of Amiens, and curate of Monceaux; the other, whose name was JAMES, became a very learned Physician, as we shall see in the following article. Francis Sylvius found great barbarisms in the colleges; but he made it his business to restore the use of good Latin, and was one of the greatest promoters of polite learning in France. He directed the scholars to the best Latin authors; and so earnestly recommended to them the reading of Cicero, that it was not his fault if that Roman Orator was not made the only model of a good style (b) [A]. It is true, that before he gave such advices, he himself had been taught bad Latin (c), as it appears from some of his composures. He published several books [B]. I must not forget one thing that is very glorious to him: he

(a) *Cilicij panis & undulati bisso.* Renatus Moreau, in Vita Jacobi Sylvi.

(b) Ex eod. *Ibid.*

(c) See the remark [C].

[A] *It was not his fault, if that Roman Orator was not made the only model of a good style.* Renatus Moreau expresses this in very fine words, in the life of James Sylvius. I shall not set them down, but as to the epigram made upon Sylvius, by Gilbert Ducheri, I shall transcribe it entire, as I find it in the same life.

FRANCIS SYLVII RHETORIS TUMULUS.

*Quod nunquam potuit multorum exercitus olim
Barbarum Francis finibus exigere;
Illud militibus ter centum Sylvius egit,
Quo duce habet regnum lingua Latina suum.*

*Rem vero aggressus majorem, ut clarior esset
Romani princeps Tullius eloquii.
O mortem properam, Lachesisque brevissima pensa!
Re prope confecta Sylvius appetiit.*

[B] *He published several books.* *Progymnasmatum in artem Oratoriam Centuriae tres.* A Commentary upon twenty-one Orations of Cicero; upon his tract de Senectute, and his Paradoxes; and upon the Letters of Politian, and some other illustrious men (1). This last work has been reprinted several times. The third edition is of the year 1526. He dedicated it to Eustachius,

(1) Gésner. in Biblioth.

he procured an edition of Martial cleared from many obscenities in that Poet [C], that the youth might improve themselves by the reading of him, without endangering their morals.

stadius de Croy, Bishop of Arras, whom he had taught for the space of four years at Louvain; from whence it may be inferred, that he had some school in that university.

[C] He procured an edition of Martial, cleared from many obscenities.] Father Vavasseur would not deprive our Sylvius of the glory of being the first, who curtailed Martial, tho' the same thing was objected to the Jesuits, and he might have turned it to their advantage. These are his words: 'Quod utinam fecit. These are his words: 'femus primi rem tantam, tam utilem omnibus, tam necessariam juventuti, eaque nobis solida & integra laus & propria maneret, cœpisse vel sic de virtutis ac morum disciplina bene mereri. Sed est qui hanc nobis lauream præripuerit, antequam etiam nati, ut sic dicam, essemus. Anno enim superioris sæculi decimo quarto Franciscus quidam Sylvius, Ambianus, in Academia Parisiensis qui tum degeret ac literas publice profiteretur, quasi Augiæ stibulum purgaturus, hunc se laborem Herculeum suscepisse declarat, horrida quidem & insolenter ac barbarè scripta epistola, facile ut appareat potiore ei curam fuisse morum quam Latini sermonis; sed ex qua tamen intelligitur, &c. (2.) - - - I wish we had been the first who did a thing so great, so profitable to all, so necessary to youth; and that the whole praise of having so well deserved, for instruction in virtue and good manners had belonged to us. But there is one who carried off the prize, even before we were born. For in the fourteenth year of the last century, one Francis Sylvius of Amiens, who then taught in the university of Paris, declared he had undertaken that Herculean

(2) Vavasseur, de Epigrammate, pag. 255, & seq.

task, in an unpolished and barbarous epistle; so that it plainly appeared, he regarded more the purity of manners, than of his Latin style; whereby nevertheless may be known, &c.' Afterwards he gives us the title of that edition. *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammatum lectoris castimonia dignorum liber: ubi omnia Veneris illius desuendæ quasi irritamenta, quibus passim fordidatus leporum naves corrugabat, accurata Francisci Sylvi Ambianensis diligentia deletili spongia deterfa sunt & eluta.* He also gives us the title of the Epistle Dedicatory. *Reverendum in Christo Patrem D. Nicolaum Constantinum; & D. Hadrianum Henoncurium, Horesæ amicitia ferrumine conferruminatos Franciscus Sylvius Ambianus salute plurima impetratur.* He tells us that this Epistle Dedicatory is written in a very barbarous style, and very different from that which the author acquired some time after. *Respondet inscriptioni sæda & ridicula etiam informis quæ sequitur epistola, quem sermonem tamen suum Sylvius, quod vix credat, Montausieri (3), aliquot post annis ita emendavit, ut à se totus diversus & alius planè scriptor esse videatur.* The conclusion of that epistle runs thus: *Sylvio vestro qui literarum hæc bonas segetes ab illis officium lingue turpitudine multa sperantibus discriminavit, plausibiliter adplaudite.* Lastly, he says that Martial was not sufficiently purged, and that he has seen some very obscene words in that edition. *Vidi ego hunc ipsum librum à Jacobo Keruero, Christi anno 1535 publicatum, hac inscriptione quam modo posui, hac epistola quæ castissima & sanctissima omnia promitteret, nudis tamen & prætextatis aliquot vocibus spurcum atque infamem.*

(3) Father Vavasseur speaks to the Duke of Montausier tho' the whole book.

SYLVIUS (JAMES) brother to the foregoing, was one of the most famous Physicians of the XVIth century. He was born at Amiens in the year 1478, and went through his school learning at Paris under Francis Sylvius his brother. He learned in that school, and taught in Tournay-college the Latin tongue with much greater purity, than it had been taught for a long time; which was the reason why his writings were so much taken notice of because of the elegance of the style. Having an inclination to the study of Physic, he was contented to learn some Hebrew under the famous Vatablus, and resolved to learn Greek and Latin perfectly, in order to qualify himself for that study. It is true, he applied himself very diligently likewise to the Mathematics, and made so great a progress in that science, that he invented some machines, which he presented to the Provost of Merchants, and to the Echevins of Paris. When it was time for him to apply himself wholly to Physic; he studied it in the original authors, and so far engaged in the reading of Hippocrates and Galen, that he spent all his time in examining and translating those two authors. This made him sensible of the usefulness of Anatomy; and he applied himself to it so earnestly, that his skill in it was as great as the age he lived in could permit. He studied Pharmacy with no less application, and made several journeys to see the remedies produced by different countries in the places which produced them. Being returned to Paris, he betook himself to read lectures, whereby he got a great deal of money, of which he was too greedy [A]. He explained in two years time, a whole course of Physic taken from Hippocrates and Galen; and his reputation was so great, that people resorted to him from all parts of Europe. But before he was so well known,

he

[A] Of which he was too greedy.] A prodigious avarice obscured the splendor of many bright and fine qualities of our James Sylvius. He had so many scholars, that he should not have narrowly minded whether each of them paid him; and yet he was so rigid about it, that he made a horrid noise, when they did not pay him exactly five pence (1) per month a-piece, which was his pay. He fell once into so great a passion, because one or two of his scholars had not brought him his monthly money, that he swore he would leave off reading lectures, if the other scholars did not turn them out, or force them to pay him (2). He lived a most sordid life; he gave nothing but bare bread to his servants, and had no fire all the winter. Two things he used as a remedy against cold; he played at foot-ball, and carried a great log upon his shoulders from the lowest part of the house to the garret; and he said, the heat he got by such an exercise was more advantageous for health

(1) Henry Stephens, Apologie d'Herodote, pag. m. 168. Says it was a reason.

(2) Henry Stephens, *ibid.* Says he was present at that action.

than a fire. It is no wonder if he got a great deal of money, living such a sordid life, and if he hid his gold under ground. He had a house in St Marceau's suburb, where, it was said, he had hid five hundred Ducats: Some maintained they had seen them in a red purse; which was confirmed by a magician, who desired to have one half of that treasure for his pains of directing to it: But tho' they searched and dug the ground, they did not find a penny. When the house in which Sylvius had lived, in St James's street, was pulled down (3), in order to be re-built, the Mafons found some pittoles in it, and it was thought many more had been hid in it (4). Buchanan made a distich by way of epitaph, when Sylvius was so angry, that he was for turning out the two poor scholars who had not paid him (5). We are told (6), that on the funeral day, that distich was posted up to the church-door (7) by some of his hearers. It runs thus:

(3) In 1616.

(4) Ex Renato Moreau, in *gens Vita*.

(5) Henry Stephens, Apologie d'Herodote, pag. 168.

(6) Scæv. Sammarthani, in *Elogiis*, pag. n. 27.

(7) Moret says, on the door of his house, he did not mind the words in *epitaphi* of Sammarthani, which he quoteth.

Sylvius

he was very much thwarted by the Paris Physicians, who took it very ill, that a man who had taken no where his doctor's degree, should undertake to teach Physic in the Metropolis of the kingdom. Whereupon he went to Montpellier in 1530, to take his degree. He was there for some time, and then left the place in order to return to Paris, without being admitted doctor. His avarice allowed him not to be at the necessary charges [B]. Going by Lyons, he published there, at the request of two Physicians (a), a *Disputation de vini exhibitione in Febribus*. It is the first book he printed. Being come to Paris, he endeavored to reconcile himself with the Physicians, that he might have leave to teach; and he published a French Grammar, a work which cost him a great deal of pains, and was to be followed by another, which never came out, wherein he treated of the origin of the French tongue. He was admitted Bachelor of Physic in June 1531 [C], and it appears by the records of the Faculty, that in the year 1535, he taught in Tricquet-College, whilst Fernelius taught in Cornwall-College; but the latter had few auditors, whereas Sylvius had a great many [D]. The reason of which was because he made dissections, and taught Botany, and the preparation of remedies, which Fernelius did not do. Vidus Vidius, professor of Physic in the Royal College, being invited into Italy in the year 1548, none was thought better qualified than Sylvius to fill his place. He was unrefolved for the space of two years, whether he should accept of that employment; but at last he accepted it in 1550, and continued in it until his death, which happened the thirteenth of January 1555. It was the seventy-seventh year of his life (b) [E]. He was buried in the burying-place of poor scholars [F]. He never was married, and even had an aversion to women. He took more care to clear his style from the barbarisms that prevailed in the schools, than to leave off his rough and wild way [G]. He was so addicted to Galen's opinions, that he obstinately maintained his errors. Judicial Astrology was the only thing wherein he departed

(a) Symphorinus Champier, & Jerome Du-Mont.

(b) Taken from his Life prefixed to his works, and written by Renatus Moreau.

*Sylvius hic fitus est, gratis qui nil dedit unquam,
Mortuus & gratis quod legis ista, dolet.*

Henry Stephens translated it into French verse, thus (8).

(8) Apolog.
d'Herodote, pag.
168.

Ici git Sylvius auquel onq en sa vie
De donner rien gratis ne prit aucun' envie,
Et ores qu'il est mort, & tout rongé de vers,
Encores ha depit qu'on lit gratis ces vers.

*Here lies Sylvius in his grave,
Who when alive naught gratis gave,
And even grumbles now he's dead
That you these verses gratis read.*

Another satirical piece was published against him, wherein he was taxed with avarice in a pleasant manner: Moreau ascribes it to Henry Stephens. That libel was a dialogue, intitled *Sylvius ocreatus*, and the author of it took the name of Ludovicus Arribavenus Mantuanus. It is matter of fact, that Sylvius called for his boots a little before he died, and put them on, to sit by the fire side, and expired booted. Whereupon the author of the satire feigned that Sylvius had put on his boots to cross the Acheron without a boat, and without paying any thing for the ferryage. He was also bantered in that book, for loving to talk, in a Shoemaker's shop; which was somewhat strange for a man so learned, and so little sociable. One of his scholars, called John Melet, wrote an answer to that satire, under the fictitious name of Claudius Burgensis (9).

(9) E. Renatus Moreau, in Vita Jacobi Sylvi.

[B] His avarice allowed him not to be at the necessary charges.] Renatus Moreau heard an old Physician of Montpellier say, that Sylvius promised the professors of that university to bring a vast number of students from all parts of the kingdom, if they would admit him into their society gratis; and that his proposal not being accepted, he resolved to return to Paris, to desire the Faculty to give him leave to teach.

(10) In Catalogo Doctor. Montpel.

[C] He was admitted Bachelor of Physic in June 1531.] The records of the Faculty, which prove this fact, irrefragably confute those, who would maintain, after Ranchin (10), that Sylvius was a Physician at Montpellier; for since he was made bachelor of Physic after his journey to Montpellier, it is undeniable, that he was not admitted doctor at Montpellier, before he returned to Paris: Besides, it is certain he did not leave Paris after he took his bachelor's degree in that university (11).

(11) Moreau, in Vita Jacobi Sylvi.

[D] Sylvius had a great many.] He published for the use of his scholars, the practice of Mark Gatt-

VOL. V.

naria: it is said that nine hundred copies were sold off in one or two days, and that the Bookfeller was obliged to make a second edition (12). A Poet (13) who made his epitaph, says, that a thousand eyes were fixed upon him, when he read his lectures:

*Quem certa metodo medicis de rebus agentem,
Assidue in ludo totius principe terræ,
Mille acri assidue spectabant lumina visa.*

(12) Ibid.
(13) J. V. Virgatus, apud Moreau, ibid.

Moreau understands it of five hundred auditors, and quotes Sylvius himself, who says, he had but four hundred, *auditoribus circiter quadringentis* (14). If it be so, Moreau should not have said that Sylvius's school might be compared with that of Theophrastus (15), who had two thousand scholars. Henry Stephens (16) says only that Sylvius had two or three hundred scholars.

[E] He died the thirteenth of January 1555. It was in the seventy-seventh year of his life.] Renatus Moreau quotes five authors for it, viz. Mizaldus, Pächalis Gallus, Arribavenus (17), Claudius Burgensis, and la Croix du Maine. But he observes, at the same time, that Sammarthanus (18), and Gesner (19) say, that he lived only sixty-three years; that Du Breul (20) places his death on the first day of February 1554; and that according to Nancelius and Rouville, he flourished in 1557, and 1560. My edition of Du Breul of the year 1639 in quarto, places Sylvius's death in the sixty-third year of his life, and on the tenth of January 1554. Moreri, Merklinus (21), and Freherus (22) have committed the same mistake with Sammarthanus.

[F] He was buried in the burying-place of poor scholars.] He ordered it so by his will. That burying-place is before Montaigu-college. The funeral was performed with great pomp; all the university were present at it, and the Physicians put on their scarlet gowns, the name of that burying-place puts me in mind of a tract written by Sylvius in favour of poor scholars: It is intitled, *De vitiis ratione facili ac salubri pauperum Scholasticorum*. He prescribes them a diet, which, said he, God had put into his heart to publish; and he enters upon such a detail as would make the men of our age laugh, who are less tractable than those of Sylvius's time. He advises the scholars, who awake in the night, to cough and spit stoutly, and gives them several little expedients for keeping themselves from being cold in bed. 'Ut citius incalcescas pedes etiam in nates raduces, in lectum inspira. . . . To be the sooner warm, draw up your feet into your breech, and breathe in your bed. It is likely, he knew the benefit of them by his own experience.

[G] His rough and wild way.] He seldom jested, and seldom departed from his gravity; and when he had a mind to appear more sociable, by some witty conceit,

(14) Prefat. Libri de Olibus.

(15) Diog. Laërt. in ejus Vita.

(16) Apologie d'Herodote, pag. 168.

(17) See, above, the remark [A].

(18) In Elogiis, pag. m. 27.

(19) In II Catal. Libr. Galeni.

(20) In Antiquit. Parisienf.

(21) In Lindenio renovato.

(22) In Theatro Virorum Eruditione clarorum.

departed from him [H]. I shall say something of his writings [I]. He was very much at variance with Vefalius [K].

conceit, he did it somewhat uncouthly. Here is the only merry thought that is told of him: He said one day, *That he had parted with three beasts; his cat, his mule, and his maid.*

[H] *Judicial astrology was the only thing.* It had never been so much in vogue both at court and in the town, as in Sylvius's time; and yet (23) he opposed it stoutly, whenever there was occasion for it. One day after he had railed bitterly at the Astrologers, he told his good friend Turnebus, that he had often been at the trouble to run over the whole almanack, in the beginning of the year, and set down fair weather where there was rainy weather; wind instead of calm; cloudy weather instead of clear weather; and having observed the event, he had found at the year's end, that he had been a much better Astrologer than they (24).

(23) Note, that instead of *and yet*, one might say, *and therefore*. This sort of things have two faces.

(24) Turnebus, Epist. ad. Cardinal. Lotharingum, *præfixa* Opusc. Plotarchi de Orac. defectu.

(25) See the remark [K].

(26) Mine is that of Geneva 1665. The Epistle Dedicatory is dated the first of September 1629.

(27) De Illustratione Medicis Parisiensibus, by Renatus Moreau.

ny encomiums upon Sylvius, collected out of divers authors, whereby it appears that he was a man in great esteem.

[K] *He was very much at variance with Vefalius.* The latter gave Sylvius the greatest trouble that ever he had. Sylvius's excellency lay in Anatomy, and he was preparing a work upon that subject, which he looked upon as his master-piece. In the mean time, Vefalius publishes in 1541, his *Opus Anatomicum*, so well done, and with so many fine cuts, that every body admires it. Vefalius had been Sylvius's scholar for the space of three years, which was another cause of his vexation; the disciple supplants the master. Besides, he writes against Galen, and not only charges him with several faults, tho' perhaps without reason, but plainly shews some of his real errors. How could Sylvius bear this, being looked upon as the restorer and first interpreter of Galen? Sylvius kept no measures, he maintained that Galen had writ nothing but what was true, and indulged his anger to such a degree, that he continually inveighed against his antagonist. Sylvius *ita exarsit in iras tantoque odio commotus est in Vefalium, primo ut nihil à Galeno scriptum prolaturumque esse contenderet quod veritati non esset consentaneum; secundo ut nulla habita ratione ætatis et gravitatis sue, impetu quodam mentis fervore elatis animum declamandi in Vefalium (quem Vefanum appellabat) singulis diebus arripere, et contumeliosius exciperet, quam vel ipse propter prudentiam longa rerum experientia comparatam, vel Vefalius ob laudabile suum institutum ad utilitatem publicam destinatum mereretur* (28). The emperor's Physician, and even some courtiers, who hated Vefalius, because of his presumption and merit, threw oil into the fire. That quarrel produced many books, and the progress of it may be known by reading Sylvius's book in Vefanum, Vefalius's letter *de China radice*, a piece of Francis Puteus in Vefalium, another of Renatus Henerus in Sylvium, Fallopius's Anatomical Observations, and Cuneus's Apology against Puteus.

SIMON or SIMONIS (THEODORUS) was born at Berchtede in the country of Holstein (a). See the remark [I] of the article of JANSENIUS, to which you may add what follows. Fromondus maintains (b); that this man being set at liberty, abjured his Heresies at Louvain, and that Janfenius gave him wherewithal to pay his charges in the tavern, and to make his journey. He further says, that he had forsaken his order at Magdeburg before he came to Louvain. I shall speak of the answer that was made to this account [A]. Some persons may think that a certain very impious book concerns our Simonis [B]; and therefore I here give notice that it is false. He changed his name into that of *Philippus Cosmius* (c).

(a) Mollerus, *Usage ad Historiam Cheronensis Cimbricæ*, Part. iii, pag. 108.

(b) Lib. Fromondus *Crisi Desperata Cause Papatus*, cap. xlv, pag. 284.

(c) Bibl. Antiquit. pag. 143.

[A] *I shall speak of the answer that was made to this account.* I shall not repeat what concerns Simonis's journey to Louvain, and his conferences with Janfenius (1). I shall only say, that after he had left that town, he writ a piece, *De falsis principis fidei Pontificis ejusque Idolatria*, which he sent to Janfenius in 1631. It contained the motives of his conversion, and he hoped that Janfenius would answer him; but he was mistaken: his silence made him proceed, and write a letter (2) to him, wherein he earnestly desired to have an answer from him, and published it. That letter contains the history of his imprisonment: it was inserted in a book of Voëtius (3), in 1635. Whereupon Fromondus thought himself obliged to speak of Simonis, in answer to that book of Voëtius. He gave a very unfaithful account of the matter, if we may depend upon the answer that was made him. See the Apologetical Letter which Simonis inscribed to him: it is prefixed to his treatise *De statu & Religione propria Papatus adversus Cornelium Janfenium Episcopum Spremensem*, printed at Leyden in 1638. He maintains that Fromondus falsified and suppressed several circumstances of the fact; he denies that he had abjured the Catholic religion at Louvain; he owns that he was for some time in the order of the Premonstratenses, but that he left it before he made any vow (4).

(1) See the article JANSENIUS, remark [I].

(2) Dated from Emmeric, the 12th of February 1632.

(3) *Intituled Desperata Cause Papatus*, See pag. 762, & seq.

(4) A voti monastici & Ordinis religionis liber in hunc usque diem perstitit.

[B] *Some . . . may think that a certain very impious book concerns our Simonis.* To know in general that Si-

monis's name is in the title of such a book, and that Theodorus Simonis was successively a Lutheran, a Papist, a Lutheran, and a Socinian; and was rector of a Socinian college in Poland, and that the book in question was printed in Poland, are things which may make people judge that this book was written by that Socinian; for the time is not always minded. This is the subject of this remark. Those who desire to know something of that impious book, need only read the following passage of Spizelius: '*De Atheismo in Polonia, ex Attheo libello, Cracovia anno 1588 tit: Simonis Religio, auctore incerto edito, judicium fieri poterit in quo præter portentia innumera hæc quoque verba reperiuntur; Credo in tria, Cælum, Terram, & Cæli formam, in Cælum patrem, atque creatorem omnium. In Terram omnium matrem, atque nutricem, & in Cæli formam omnia sentientem, & intelligentem. Ede itaque, bibe, lude, jam Deus signum est* (5). - - One may form a judgment of the Atheism in Poland, by an impious book published at Cracow, in the year 1588, intituled, Simonis Religio, auctore incerto edito; wherein besides innumerable monstrous things these words are also found; I believe in three, the Heaven, the Earth, and the form of Heaven; in Heaven, the Father, and Creator of all things. In the Earth, the mother and nurse of all things; and in the form of Heaven, perceiving all things, and understanding them

at steli credo

(5) Spizelius, in *Serutinio Atheismi*, pag. 43, 44. See also the same Spizelius, in *infel. Literato*, pag. 355, where he speaks more at large of that impious book. See also the remark [D] of the article SIMONIS.

SIMONETTA

SIMONETTA (HYACINTHUS) a Gentleman of Milan, was much esteemed for his bravery, and experience in war. He was made prisoner by a Gentleman of Bretagne, called James de Rommelin, Lieutenant of a company of the Seneschal d'Armagnac. This Briton, who amongst the Military men was called the little Captain la Lande, because he was a younger brother of the house of la Lande, carried his prisoner to the city of Asti, and set him at liberty, after he had received his ransom. Simonetta complained that la Lande had treated him unworthily, and wrote something to him concerning it, and having received an answer, he sent him a challenge to fight, which he accepted, inasmuch that the conditions thereof being settled by John James Trivulso, who commanded in the Astefan for the King of France, Charles VIII, and by Lucio Malvecio, Lieutenant of the Duke of Milan, the two champions entered the lists in the year 1496. The victory fell to the Gentleman of Bretagne (a), of which Trivulso gave a certificate, that may be seen at length in Bertrand d'Argentré (b), who corrects some mistakes concerning that famous duel [A].

(a) Taken from Bertrand d'Argentré Histoire de Bretagne, lib. xii, cap. lxi.

(b) Ibid.

[A] D'Argentré corrects some mistakes concerning that famous duel. He censures (1) Arnoldus Ferron (2) for having said that la Lande was a native of Bourdeaux, descended of a citizen family, and that the duel was fought in the presence of Charles VIII. Here are three things that are false; for la Lande was a gentleman of Brittany, and did not fight till 1496; and the king returned into France in the beginning of the year 1495. La Lande's antagonist was not called Christopher Zerbulo, and was not of Genoa, as Arnold Ferron affirms: he was called Hyacinthus Simonetta, and was a native of Milan. They did not fight on foot with swords, nor did la Lande run his sword into the belly of his enemy, as Ferron pretends. They fought on horseback, and their first attack was with their lances running in a full career one against the other, and afterwards with battle-axes. Simonetta was wounded in the face (3), as Trivulso, who was a spectator of the combat, hath declared in his attesta-

(1) Ferron in Hist. Caroli VIII. folio m. 37, verso.

(2) D'Argentré, ubi supra, pag. 703.

tion. Note, that Symphorianus Champier (4) in his life of Charles VIII, is displeased with Sabellicus, who, out of hatred to the French, hath made no mention of this duel, notwithstanding it was so memorable that a trophy was erected in the place where it was fought. D'Argentré adds (5), that Alciatus, who was then a professor of the Civil Law at Milan, spoke of that adventure in a book which he wrote de Duello: but that he is mistaken in saying (6) that Simonetta fought with Baiard; for the duel of Baiard was with Dom Alfonso de Sotomajore, in the year 1503. This criticism is right; but it is not true that Alciatus at that time taught Civil Law at Milan. He never was professor of that science: and he was not above four or five years old when la Lande and Simonetta fought. He dedicated his treatise de singulari Certamine to Francis I. the first day of March, 1529; he was then at Avignon.

(4) Ferron, ubi supra, fol. 38.

(5) D'Argentré, pag. 704.

(6) Alciat. de singulari certamine, cap. xxviii, pag. 67, Edit. Lugd. 1543 in 8vo.

SIMONIDES, an Iambic Poet, was born at Minoa (a) a town of the Isle of Amorgos one of the Sporades (b). If we will believe Suidas, he flourished 406 years after the taking of Troy; but it is very likely he is not so ancient. He is quoted by Athenæus, Julius Pollux, Ælian, and some other authors. He made a very ridiculous satire against women [A].

(a) Stephanus Byzantinus, *Prologus*.

(b) Strabo, lib. x, sub fin.

[A] He made a very ridiculous satire against women. He supposed that their souls had a different original, according to the diversity of their humours; that the souls of some women came from horses, foxes, or apes, &c. and that the souls of others proceeded from the sea, or the earth, &c. Ælian quotes what he said concerning women, who loved to paint and trick up themselves: he derived their souls from horses. Καὶ ὁ Σιμωνίδης δὲ, ἐκ παντοδαπῶν θηρίων λήγων τὰς γυναῖκας γενέσθαι τε, καὶ διαπλάσσειναι, ὅσων ἐνταῖς ἐκ τῶν ἰππῶν τὸ τε φιλόκομον καὶ φιλόμυρον συνίσχθηται κατ' ἐκείνης φύσεως: Quin et Simonides fabulans ex diversis bestiarum naturis conformatas esse mulieres, nonnullis earum ornatus et sequentiorum studium ex eorum natura innatum esse scribit (1). I omit the Greek verses that follow in Æ-

(1) Ælian, de Animal. lib. xvi, cap. xxiv, pag. m. 941.

lian, and I shall only set down the conclusion of that passage in Latin. Talis quidem uxor præbet se spectaculum aliis jucundum, sed viro nocet suo: Nisi ille fuerit aut rex, aut vir præpotens. Hujusmodi uxor oblectare quem queat. The meaning of which is, that such a woman is a pleasant sight to other men, but very prejudicial to her husband, unless he be a king or a great lord. You will find in Stobæus not only the same verses mentioned by Ælian, but also many more out of the same work of Simonides (2). That Poet was very near as unjust as the Italian author, who maintained that women have no souls (3). For the rest, if I ascribe to this Simonides, and not to that mentioned in the following article, the verses quoted by Ælian, I do but follow Leo Allatius's opinion (4).

(2) Stobæus, Sermone LXXI, de Vituperio Mulierum, fol. m. 252, verso.

(3) See Vigneul Marville's Melanges, Tom. I, pag. 16, 17.

(4) Allatius, de Simonem Scriptis, pag. 206, 207.

SIMONIDES, one of the best ancient Poets, was a native of Ceos, an island of the Ægean Sea. He flourished still in the time of Xerxes's expedition, that is, about the LXXVth Olympiad. He exercised his talent in composing several sorts of Poems; but he succeeded chiefly in elegies [A]. It is said that he was preserved twice from the

[A] He succeeded chiefly in elegies. This we learn of Quintilian. 'Simonides tenuis (1), alioqui sermone proprio & jucunditate quadam commendari potest: præcipua tamen ejus in commovenda miseratione virtus, ut quidam in hac eum parte omnibus ejusdem operis autoribus præferant (2). - - - Simonides's style was plain, but fitted to the subject with a certain sweetness; but his principal excellency lay in raising commiseration, and he was by some preferred to all authors on that account.' Dionysius Halicarnassensis acknowledges, among other virtues, that Simonides had the talent of moving to pity, and places him in that respect much above Pindar. Σιμωνίδης δὲ παρὰ ἡμῶν τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων, τῆς συντάξεως τὴν ἀρίστην, πρὸς τοῖς κατὰ ὁ βελτίων εὐρίσκειται καὶ Πινδάρου τὸ εὐκρίσεις καὶ μὴ μεγαλοπρεπείας.

(1) Concerning the simplicity of Simonides. See Mr le Fevre, *Abregé de la Vie des Poètes Grecs*, pag. m. 38.

(2) Quintil. Institut. Orat. lib. x, cap. i, pag. m. 468.

ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκείνου παθητικῶς. Simonides vero observat nomen delictum compositionis accuratam rationem; ad hoc, in quo etiam multo melior est ipso Pindaro, miserationem commovet, non ut ille magnifice, sed suo ipso more pathetice (3). When Horace has a mind to denote lamenting Muses, he uses an expression which represents our Poet.

Sed ne reliquis, Musa proci, jocos
Cæcæ retrahes munera nœmæ (4).

Catullus may be also quoted for the same thing (5). One of the most famous works of Simonides was intitled *Lamentations* (6). I have said, in another place (7), that he carried the prize of the elegy from Æschylus.

(3) Dionys. Halic. de veter. Script. Cens.

(4) Horat. Ode i, lib. ii.

(5) Paulus quid jubet adlocutionis mollioris lacrymis Simonidis. Catullus, Epig. XXXIX.

(6) See Mr le Fevre, ubi supra, pag. 39.

(7) In the article ÆSCHYLUS, remark [C].

[B] It

(a) Plutarchus
an seni sit geren-
da Respubl. pag.
765, A.

the danger of imminent death, and that this was a reward of his virtue [B]. The invention of local memory is ascribed to him [C]. He is one of those Poets, whose vein and memory lasted a long time; for at eighty years of age he disputed the prize of Poetry, and carried it (d), and boasted of having the best memory of any man in the world

(8) That is, Ca-
stor and Pollux.

(9) Cicero de O-
ratore, lib. ii,
fol. 87. D. See
also Phædrus, lib.
iv, fol. xxiv.

(10) Val. Maxi-
mus, lib. i, cap.
viii, num. vii,
in Ext.

(11) Solin. cap.
i, pag. m. 11.

(12) Salmast. Ex-
ercit. Plin.
Tom. i, pag. 53.

(13) Quæquam
militum de
Tyndaridis fabu-
losum videtur,
neque omnino
huius rei memi-
nit usquam poë-
ta ipse, profecto
non taciturnus de
tanta sua gloria.
Quintilian, lib.
xii, cap. ii, pag.
m. 517.

(14) Id. ibid.

(15) They were
in a manner the
patrons of wrest-
lers.

(16) Girac, Re-
plique à Cœsar,
§. liii, pag. m.
465. He quotes
the words of Cal-
limachus, cited by
Suidas: I shall
speak of it after-
ward in remark
[E], citat (26).

[B] It is said that he was preserved twice from the danger of imminent death, and that this was a reward of his virtue. One day he supped at Scopas's house, and who was a considerable man for his noble birth, and great riches. After he had recited the Poem he had made for a set price in that man's honour, wherein he had inserted an encomium upon Castor and Pollux, he was told, that he should receive one half of the price agreed upon, that he might, if he thought fit, ask the other half of the Tyndarides (8), on whom he had bestowed as many praises as upon Scopas. Soon after he was informed that two young men stood at the door, and desired to speak with him. He went out and saw no body. In the mean time the room, where he had left Scopas, and the other guests, fell down, and they were all killed. Cicero relates this in very fine words. *Dicunt quum cœnaret Gramæus in Theſſalia Simonides apud Scopam fortunatum hominem et nobilem, cecidissetque id carmen, quod in eum scripsisset, in quo multa ornandi causa poetarum more in Castorem scripta, et Pollucem fuisset, nimis illum fœdè Simonides dixisset, se dimidium ejus ei quod pœctus esset pro illo carmine, daturum, reliquum à suis Tyndaridibus, quos æque laudasset, peteret, si ei videretur. Paulo post esse ferunt nuntiatus Simonidi, ut prodiret, juvenes stare ad januam duos quosdam, qui eum magnopere evocarent, surrexisse illum ipsum, prodisse, vidisse neminem. Hoc interim spatio conclavæ illud, ubi epularetur Scopas, cecidisse, ea ruina ipsum oppressum cum suis interisse (9). Valerius Maximus relates the same thing (10), but he is guilty of an inexcusable omission; for he does not say why Castor and Pollux did that good service to Simonides. Note, that Solinus ascribes to Pindar what all other writers ascribe to Simonides, with respect to this divine favour (11). Salmastius suspects that Solinus did so to conceal his theft, I mean, to make people believe that he was not a mere transcriber of Pliny (12). Observe also that Quintilian calls this apparition of the Tyndarides a fable (13), because that Poet, who doubtless would not have deprived himself of so great a glory, does not mention it in his works. He observes that authors do very much differ as to the person in whose honour Simonides made that poem: nor did they agree about the town where the entertainment was given. But he informs us of one thing, which Cicero should not have omitted. He tells us that the person, whom Simonides praised, was a victorious wrestler. *Cum pugili coronato carmen, quale componi victoribus solet, mercede pacta scripsisset; abnegata ei pecuniæ pars est, quod more poetis frequentissimo digressus, in laudes Castoris et Pollucis exierat (14).* The omission of this particular by Cicero is very prejudicial to Simonides; for one would think he had made improper digressions, and that he was so imprudent as to obscure the glory of the man, who had bought his panegyric, by inserting in it an encomium upon the gods. But if we consider that Simonides was to celebrate the victory of a wrestler, the objection vanishes away, and it is plain that Castor and Pollux (15) were to have a share in his praises. Wherefore it is not a blameable digression, but a necessary episode. As for the rest, Mr de Girac makes a wrong criticism upon Quintilian. *The learned Rhetorician, says he (16), would not have made use of a negative argument, if he had read in Callimachus that Simonides himself mentions that adventure in words full of gratitude towards his deliverers. It is certain that Quintilian might have said what he says, notwithstanding Callimachus's verses. There is a vast difference between what a Poet relates in his poems, and what others make him say in their writings.* Here follows the other miracle. Simonides having landed, found the dead body of an unknown man upon the shore, and buried it. That unknown man warned him in a dream, not to take shipping again the next day: Simonides followed his advice, and he saw the vessel shipwrecked. He made a poem upon that adventure. *Longe indulgentius Dii in poeta Simonides, cujus salutarem inter quietem admonitionem consilii firmitate roboraverunt. Is enim cum ad litus navem appulisset, inhumatumque corpus**

jacens sepulture mandasset, admonitus ab eo ne proximo die navigaret, in terra remansit: Qui inde solverant, fluctibus & procellis in conspectu ejus obruti sunt. Ipse lætatus est, quod vitam suam somnio, quam navi, credere maluisset. Memor autem beneficii, elegantissimo eum carmine æternitati consecravit, melius illi & diuturnius in animis hominum sepulchrum constituens, quam in desertis arenis struxerat (17). . . . The gods were far more indulgent to the Poet Simonides, and confirmed him in the resolution which he had taken from the wholesome advice he had received in his sleep. For when he was ready to take shipping, and had buried the dead body of a man which lay on the shore, he was warned by the same man not to go to sea the next day, and stay at land. They who had taken shipping perished, in his fight, by a storm, and were swallowed up in the waves. Simonides rejoiced, because he had trusted his life rather to a dream than a ship. Being mindful of the favour, he immortalized that man in a most elegant poem, erected a better and more durable tomb to him, than that which he had formerly built upon the desert sands. He did not think that humanity required any thing from him besides the burying of the dead body; but being so well rewarded for that favour, he went farther, and put this glorious epitaph upon the tomb of that unknown man.

ὄψ' αὖν Κείριο Σιμωνίδῃ ἐστὶ σωτήρ,
ὅς καὶ τεθνήσκ' ὤν' ἰ παρ' ἄλλ' ἔχεν.

Hic quidem Cei Simonidis est servator,
Qui & mortuus vivo retulit gratiam (18).

This is the tomb of the man who saved the life of Simonides of Ceos, and who, after his death, was grateful to the living.

[C] The invention of local memory is ascribed to him. It will not be improper to observe upon what occasion he invented it. When Scopas and his guests were crushed by the fall of the room, they were so disfigured that they could not be known one from another. And yet there was a necessity to know them; for those, who designed to bury them, desired to perform that duty, each to his kinsman. Simonides removed the difficulty; he remembered in what place each guest sat down at table, and was thereby enabled to tell each of their relations which of them was to be buried by him. Afterwards considering how necessary order is to preserve the ideas of objects, he invented the method of annexing them to certain places, that is, he was the inventor of local memory. Cicero shall be my voucher (19). *Non sum tanto ego, inquit, ingenio, quanto Themistocles fuit, ut oblivionis artem quam memoriam malim, gratiamque habeo Simonidi illi Cbio, quem primum servavit artem memoriam protulisse. Dicunt enim quum cœnaret . . . (20) Quos quum burnare vellent sui, neque possent obtritios interoscere ullo modo, Simonides dicitur ex eo quod meminisset quo eorum loco quique cubuisset, demonstrator uniuscujusque sepeliendi fuisse. Hac tum re admonitus invenisse fertur, ordinem esse maxime, qui memoriam lumen afferret. Itaque iis qui C. hanc partem ingenii exercerent, locos esse capiendos, et ea quæ memoria tenere vellent effingenda animo, atque in his locis collocanda: sic fore, ut ordinem rerum locorum ordo conservaret, res autem ipsas rerum effigies notaret, atque ut locis pro cera, simulacris pro literis uteremur.* That author observes, in another place, that Simonides had a very good memory (21). These words of Philostratus give a great idea of it: *Apollonius being an hundred years old had still a better memory than Simonides ever had in his greatest vigour; and he used to sing a canticle which that Poet had made in praise of memory, wherein he says, that every thing fades and vanishes away in time, whereas time never grows old, is never corrupted, and always remains the same, with memory that goes along with it (22).* Some authors say, that Simonides took some remedies to acquire a good memory, which produced the intended effect (23).

[D] At eighty years of age he disputed the prize of Poetry. This he mentioned in one of his poems.

(17) Valet.
Maximus, lib. i,
cap. vii, num. iii,
in Ext. See also
Cicero, de Di-
vinatione, lib. i,
fol. 308, C.

(18) Trete.
Cibitad. i, ffol.
xxiv. He quotes
one Aristides. See
Vollius, de Hi-
stor. Græcia, lib.
iii, cap. xxx,
pag. 331, where
he corrects this
passage of Tusa-
nus.

(19) Cicero de
Oratore, lib. ii,
fol. 87, D. See
also Quintilian,
lib. xi, cap. ii,
pag. 517.

(20) You may
see in the fore-
going citation
(9), the words I
omit here.

(21) Cicero,
Tusculan. Quest.
lib. i, fol. 249.

(22) Philostratus,
in the life of
Apollonius, book
i, ch. ix. See the
same in Vita
Sophistar. lib. ii,
in Proclo.

(23) Scriptorum
varii memorant
Cyrum regem
& Simonidem
Lyricum, &
Hippiam Eleum
. . . . ideo valuit
se memoria quod
epotis quibdam
remediis id im-
petarant. Anst.
Marcell. lib. xvi,
cap. v, pag. m.

Simonides,

(b) See the Greek Diftich mentioned by Arifides (αἱ) τῷ παραφθίγγματος. Valerius in Amm. Marcell. *lib. xvi. cap. vi*, pag. m. 176, quotes it. (c) Σιμωνίδης ὁ Κείος ἔτιπ' τὰ ἐνενήκοντα (ἔχον). Simonides Ceus supra nonaginta (vixit). Lucian, in *Macrobis*, fab. finem, pag. m. 644, Tom. ii. *Sudas* maket him live eighty-nine years, and not ninety-nine, at *Giraldus* des. Dialog. *lib. xi*, *Histories* Petrar. pag. 567.

(24) Valer.
Maximus, *lib.*
viii, cap. vii,
num. 13, in Ext.

(25) Διαλύει
τὸν τάφον τῷ
Σιμωνίδῃ μάλιστα
ἀνηθῶς τε
καὶ ἀνοίκτως.
Simonidis sepul-
chrum cum mag-
na contempe-
& crudeliter dis-
solvit. *Suidas*, in
Σιμωνίδης,
pag. π. 741,
742.

(26) Taken
from Suidas,
ibid.

(29) Id. *ibid.*
Part. ii, lib. iii,
cap. i, pag. m.
153.

(30) Suidas says that Simonides lived till the LXXVIIIth Olympiad.

(31) Cicero, de
Natura Deorum,
lib. i, pag. 83,
Edit. Lescalope-
rrij.

(32) See Ælian
Var. Histor.
lib. iv, cap. xv
& *lib. ix, cap. i*

is as much as to say, that if Oswald or those had asked

mean, the answer he gave to Hiero, tyrant of Syracuse, to whose court he went, notwithstanding

asked the most ignorant of the Christians, *What is GOD, and which are his attributes*, they would immediately have received a direct answer, and so full, that nothing would have been wanting. Tertullian goes too fast, and suffers himself to be carried away by his imagination. He considereth not that the Pagan Philosophers, who acknowledged themselves unable to satisfy the curiosity of those who asked them, what God was, were only at a loss for an answer, because they would not rest contented with the vulgar notions, as an ignorant person would have done. Nothing could have been more easy than for them to have answered, God is an infinite being, and omnipotent, who framed the universe and governs it, who punishes and rewards, who is angry with sinners, and is atoned by our sacrifices. In this manner would our trademen have answered Hiero, adding what we read in the Catechism concerning the persons in the Trinity, and the death and passion of JESUS CHRIST, &c. Once more, if Thales or Simonides had been satisfied with these general notions, they would not have demanded time to prepare their answer, they would have had it in readiness. But as they desired that all the terms of the definition required should be evidently indisputable, and found themselves, that whatever they could propose might be disputed, they demanded one delay after another, and at last were not able to answer. I believe Simonides imagined, that his answer would be proposed to be canvassed by all the fine wits of the court of Syracuse, and that he would be obliged to defend it by resolving all their difficulties.

(34) See, above, the remark [7] of the article EPICURUS, and Dr Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, in the History of the Works of the Learned, October 1699, pag. 442.

(35) Si mentem istam quasi animal aliquod esse voluit, erit ali-quid interius ex quo illud animal nominetur. Quid autem interius mente? Cingitur igitur corpore externo. Quod quoniam non placet, aperta, simplexque mens nullâ re adjunctâ quæ sentire possit, fugere intelligentiæ nostræ vim & notionem videtur. Cicero, lib. 1, de Natura Deorum, pag. 39. Edit. Lelkalepica.

This is what probably he thought with himself. If I say, that God is a being distinct from all the bodies which compose the universe, I shall be asked if the universe always existed, at least as to the matter of it? Had that matter an efficient cause? And if I answer that it had one, I oblige myself to maintain that it was made of nothing, but this is a doctrine I shall never be able to make either Hiero or the fine wits of his court to comprehend, and which I cannot comprehend myself: wherefore I have reason to be uncertain my self, whether that point is true or not: for so long as it is to me incomprehensible, I cannot be rightly assured of its state and nature. If I say, that the matter of the universe hath no efficient cause, I shall be asked, whence comes God to have the power over it, and why hath it not as much power over God as he hath over it (34)? I must give good reasons, why of two beings independent one of the other as to existence, equally necessary and eternal, one hath all power over the other, without being reciprocally liable to be acted upon by the other. It is not sufficient to say, that God is a being distinct from bodies which compose the universe. They will desire to know, whether he is like them with respect to extension, that is, whether he is extended. If I answer, that he is extended, they will infer that he is corporeal and material: and I do not find myself able to make them understand, that there are two kinds of extension, one corporeal, the other incorporeal; one composed of parts and consequently divisible, the other perfectly simple and of consequence indivisible. If I say that God is not extended, it will be inferred that he is no where, and that he cannot have any union with the world. And how then shall he move the bodies? How can he act where he is not? Besides, our understanding is not capable to conceive a substance unextended, and a spirit entirely separated from matter (35). But supposing it should be granted me, that God is an immaterial and unextended substance, a spirit infinite and omnipotent. How many new questions should I have to resolve? Does this spirit not necessarily exist, either with respect to his substance, or with respect to his qualities? Is not his power an attribute as necessary as his knowledge? Therefore he does not act freely, taking freedom to be the power of acting, or not acting. Whatever he does therefore is necessary and unavoidable; I shall be told that I entirely destroy religion, for religion is necessarily founded upon the supposition that God changeth his behaviour to men, as they change their manner of living; and if they did not appease him by their prayers, he would do a

great many things, which, in regard to their devotion, he will abstain from doing. But if to avoid this troublesome inconveniency, I have recourse to the hypothesis of the liberty of indifferency, and of conditional wills, I lay myself under an obligation to extensional plain, both how this sort of liberty can be consistent with a being that is not the cause of its own power (36), and how an infinite train of conditional decrees, is compatible with a cause infinitely wise and independent, which must have followed a plan fixed and immoveable, and which at bottom hath no attribute more essential than immutability; for there is not any excellency more evidently contained in the idea of a being infinitely perfect than this of unchangeableness. These are, if I am not mistaken, a few of the reasons which offered themselves to Simonides, when he sought for the definition demanded of him, and which made him determine not to give any, so afraid was he of affirming what was not true.

I may venture to say, that of most men it becomes Tertullian the least to insult our Thales, and to boast of our trademen, for had he been in the place of Thales or Simonides, he would have but poorly come off. His zeal and hasty temper would have prompted him to give an immediate answer to the question of Croesus, or that of Hiero. But if you desire to know what answer he would have made, read these words of Dailly (37): *How strange is his Philosophy, concerning the nature of GOD, whom he seems to make subject to passions like ours, to anger, to hatred, to grief? He ascribes to him a corporeal substance, not believing (as he says) that any one would deny that GOD is a body, which will surprise us less, if he boldly asserts, that there is no substance but what is corporeal.* Every one may see, that Tertullian would have defined God to be a corporeal substance subject to passions. If he had explained his definition, he would have said, that our sins exasperate the Deity, that he hates the crime, and feels a real sorrow when his laws are violated: but is easily appeased when his mercy is implored. Would he have been able to maintain this answer before Simonides, and the other sages, whom King Hiero entertained at his court? Would they not have objected to him that every body is divisible, and compounded of parts; and of consequence, that the infinitely perfect being is not a body. Would they not have said, that supreme happiness is essential to the divine nature, which therefore is not subject to passion, nor to any trouble or vexation? Would they not have said, that the divine nature is unchangeable, and consequently cannot alter either from love to hatred, or from hatred to love, nor from compassion to wrath, nor from wrath to compassion? If he had recurred to metaphors, would he not have been told, that Hiero wanted not a rhetorical answer, but an accurate definition, exactly conformable to the laws of Logic, or right reasoning. It will be owned, I assure myself, that Tertullian had done better had he been silent, as he was whom he insults. Let us suppose, that his Christian trademan whom he represents so knowing, were asked by Hiero, and should answer, *GOD is a being immaterial, infinite, all-powerful, perfectly good, perfectly happy, and infinitely just, who created all things according to the good pleasure of his own will*; can we think, that Simonides examining that answer, would not have said, all this I knew as well as you; but I would not venture to assert it, because it appears to me, that a being infinitely powerful, infinitely good, infinitely holy, and who had created all things with a perfect liberty of indifferency, would not have subjected man to that sinful and miserable state in which he lives. Had he left the soul at liberty to unite it self to the body or not, it would never have entered into the body; for by such a choice, the soul would have appeared too foolish to be the workmanship of a being infinitely perfect. If it is he who joins our souls to bodies, he must be induced to it by some determination natural and irresistible; for acting freely, that is, having power to act or to abstain from acting, to act after one, or after another manner, it cannot be imagined that he would have taken that course, seeing the soul by its union with the body, becomes subjected to a thousand

(36) The nature of God, with all his attributes, doth necessarily exist, wherefore his power and his will are necessary beings, but necessity excludes indifferency.

(37) Dailly of the right use of the Fathers, book ii, ch. iv, pag. 354.

† Tertull. lib. i, adv. Marc. cap. 25, & 1, 2, cap. xvi.

† Id. adv. Orig. cap. vii, & lib. ii, contra Marc. cap. xvi. Quis negabit Deum corpus esse, etsi Deus spiritus est?

† Id. lib. adv. Hermog. cap. 35. Cum ipsa substantia corpus sit cujusque.

withstanding his great age; being prompted to it by his covetousness, for he loved money

a thousand disgraceful and absurd disorders, and to almost a continual misery. 'Quinetiam dicunt, si anima est divina potestque vivere sejuncta à membris mortalibus, ut quid se miseræ carni insinuat? ejus vitio tot perpetitur mala, & admittat tot flagitia? ergo stulta est, si sponte hoc facit: at si invita nefandas corporis ingreditur latebras, quis cogit? an ipse Juppiter? ergo Deus nequaquam hanc diligit: imo carcere quam claudit tam turpi, odisse videtur (38).

(38) Palingenius, in Zodiaco Vitæ, lib. vii, pag. m. 189.

- - - But, moreover they say, If the soul is divine, and can live separated from its mortal members, why does it join itself to a miserable body? by the gravity of which it suffers so much evil, and commits so much wickedness? therefore it is foolish, if it does this of its own accord: but if unwillingly it enters the vile caverns of the body, who compels it? Does Jupiter himself? therefore GOD loves it not; yea, he appears to hate what he hath shut up in so detestable a prison. But we will not leave our Christian tradesman to sustain all the charge: we will call in a Divine, who may explain to Simonides the whole system of Grace, and all the oconomy of the decrees of Predestination: undoubtedly this Poet would answer him, you carry me from one dark region to another still more obscure. I cannot comprehend how under the government of a God who had the attributes you mention, there can ever be occasion for any punishment; for the sovereign power of such a deity, together with an unlimited goodness and holiness, would never permit any punishable crime to be perpetrated in his dominions. Such a being as this seems to me incapable of making his glory to result from the misery of another, or depend on the endless duration of infernal torments: I even apprehend there is a downright inconsistency betwixt these two things, three Persons who are but one God, of which the one punisheth, and the other is punished, and yet it cannot be said, that he who is punished, punisheth, and that he who punisheth is punished, tho' yet both, one and the other are only one and the self same substance, only one and the same God! These three Persons, I say, are to me a direct contradiction. Wherefore I chose rather to give no answer to the Prince of Syracuse, than to have proposed to him such definitions of God.

But, it may be said, Is then Tertullian grossly mistaken, when he prefers Christian tradesmen to the Philosophers? I answer, That what he asserts may very well be rectified. There needs only be said, that the meanest Christian tradesman does steadfastly believe more things concerning the nature of God, than the greatest of heathen Philosophers have been able to attain the knowledge of. He needs only declare that with his bare Catechism, he will give so great a number of particulars, that for one thing they did partly affirm, he will assert forty without hesitation. This is what Tertullian might have said without being mistaken. But these Christians so knowing in comparison of Thales, and any other Philosophers of ancient Greece, would have been as much at a stand what to say, and as silent as Thales, if they had offered nothing but what they did clearly and distinctly comprehend; and they are beholden for their great knowledge, only to their having the happiness of being educated in a Church, where they obtained an historical, and even sometimes a justifying faith of revealed truths. This convinces them of the existence of several things which they do not comprehend. Our greatest divines, if they acted as Simonides did, that is, if they affirmed nothing for certain concerning the nature of GOD, but what by the light of reason appeared to them undeniable, evident, and proof against all objections, would have continually demanded farther delays of all the Hierocles in the world. Add moreover, that though Simonides should have had the opportunity of consulting and examining the scriptures, without the influence either of education or grace, he would not have got out of his labyrinth and silence. Reason would forbid him to deny the facts contained in the scripture, and make him perceive something supernatural in the connection and order of these facts; but this would not have been sufficient to bring him to a determination. The powers of reason, and Philosophical examination, go no farther than to hold us in suspense, and to keep

us in fear of erring, whether we affirm, or whether we deny (39). Either the Grace of God, or education must necessarily come in to their assistance. And carefully observe, that there is not any system against which reason affords more objections than that of the gospel. The mystery of the Trinity, the incarnation of the Word, his death for the expiation of our sins, the propagation of Adam's sin, the eternal predestination of a few men to heavenly happiness, the eternal condemnation of almost all men to the torments of hell, which will never have an end; the loss of free-will ever since the fall of Adam, &c. are matters, which would have furnished Simonides with greater doubts, than his imagination did ever suggest to him. Let us mind what St Paul says (40), not only that the gospel was a stumbling-block to the Jews, and foolishness to the Greeks, but also that God saved men by the foolishness of preaching.

Here follows a consideration which, perhaps, ought not to be slighted. Simonides was, in all likelihood, in great difficulty, about the genus of the definition: he durst not say that God was matter, an hundred objections hindered him. He durst not say that God was a spirit; for he could apprehend nothing but under the notion of extension. Until Des Cartes, all our doctors, both Divines, and Philosophers, attributed extension to spirits; infinite extension to God, and finite to angels, and rational souls. It is true, they maintained that this extension was not material, nor compounded of parts, and that spirits are wholly in every part of the space wherein they are, *Toti in toto & toti in singulis partibus*. Hence proceeded the three species of local presence, *ubi circumscriptivum, ubi definitivum, ubi repletivum*, the first for bodies, the second for created spirits, the third for God. The Cartesians have rejected all these tenets, they say, that spirits have no kind of extension, nor local presence; but their opinion is rejected as very absurd. Wherefore almost all our Philosophers, and all our Divines, do at this day still teach according to the popular opinion, that the substance of God is diffused through infinite spaces. But certainly, this is pulling down with one hand, what hath been set up by the other; it is, in effect, ascribing to God materiality, which had been denied of him. You say, that he is a spirit, very well, this is ascribing to him a nature different from matter: but at the same time you say, that his substance is diffused every where: you say therefore that he is extended: but we have no idea of two kinds of extension; we clearly conceive that all extension of whatever kind it be, hath distinct parts, impenetrable, and separable from one another: it is monstrous to say that the soul is all in the brain, and all in the heart. It is inconceivable, that the divine extension, and the extension of matter can be in the same place; this would be a real penetration of dimensions, which our reason cannot apprehend. Besides, things which are penetrated by a third, are penetrated by one another (41), and thus the heavens, and the terrestrial globe, are mutually penetrated; for they would be penetrated with the divine substance; which, according to you, has no parts; hence it follows, that the sun is penetrated by the same being as the earth. In one word, if matter is matter only because it is extended, by consequence all extension is matter: you cannot shew any attribute different from extension, by virtue of which matter is matter. The impenetrability of bodies can only result from their extension, we can conceive no other grounds of it, and so you must grant, that if spirits were extended, they would be impenetrable, wherefore they would not be different from bodies by penetrability. After all, according to the common doctrine, the divine extension is neither more nor less impenetrable or penetrable, than that of body. Its parts, call them virtual as much as you please, its parts, I say, cannot be penetrated one by another, but they may be penetrated by the parts of matter. Do not you say the same thing concerning the parts of matter; they cannot penetrate one another, but they can penetrate the virtual parts of the divine extension? If you will but attentively consult common sense, you will perceive, that when two extensions are penetratively in the same place, the one is as penetrable as the other. It cannot therefore be said, that

(39) Observe that the matter in question between Hiero and Simonides, was not the existence of God, but a true definition of what he is.

(40) 1 Cor. i. 23.

(41) Quæ penetrantur cum uno tertio penetrantur inter se. By this axiom, those are refuted who say that a solid body is made up of mathematical points.

extension of spirits

money (d), and knew that Hiero was a liberal prince. Some Divines would not have made

(d) See the remark [N], citation (86).

the extension of matter differs from any other sort of extension by impenetrability: It is therefore certain, that all extension is matter, and consequently you only take from God the name of matter, and attribute to him the thing itself; when you affirm that he is extended. Since therefore it was not possible for you to have done otherwise, you ought not to wonder, that Simonides durst not deny that God was matter; neither durst he affirm it; he chose rather to be silent. We must remember, that the most subtle Cartesian maintain, that we can form no idea of a spiritual substance. We only know by experience that it thinks, but we know not what is the nature of that thinks, whose modifications are thoughts; we know not what is the subject in which these thoughts exist, or the ground that supports them. Simonides perhaps, was hereby obliged not to say that God was a spirit. He could not conceive what a spirit was.

A Jesuit, who writ a commentary upon Cicero's books *De Natura Deorum*, does not blame Simonides for being so reserved, and wishes the ancient Poets and Philosophers, and the heretics had imitated him. What he observes, concerning the incomprehensibility of God, deserves to be transcribed here. 'Quæ Ter-

tullianus incititæ, alii modellæ dederunt. Atque utinam veteres philosophi, & poætæ, quique illos secuti sunt Hæretici, hac in parte tam reverendi, quam Thales, aut Simonides, fuissent: nunquam profecto adeo absurda, impia, & blasphema Divinæ Naturæ affinxissent, nunquam impigressent in fœdissimos errores, in quos per summam impudentiam præfidentur homunculos videmus, & dolemus impigressisse. Nimirum tenemur omnes magno quodam sciendi studio, cognoscendi verò numinis, multò majore: ex quo Deum quidem à nobis cognosci velle licet intelligere; sed intra fines præstitutos, & intra columnas, quibus suo ipse quasi digito inscripsit, Ne plus ultra: sunt enim divinis in rebus adyta quædam, in quæ Magnus Deus non vult nos penetrare: quod si quis temeritate, & confidentia sui elatus porro pergit, ac perumpere, hoc sacrarium attentat, quò penitus ingreditur, eo densiores illi tenebræ offunduntur, ut vel sic, & Divinæ Naturæ majestatem impervestigabilem, & humanæ mentis imbecillitatem, si quid sapit, agnoscat, ac confiteri cum Simonide cogatur, Quanto diutius considero, tantò mihi res videtur obscurior. Quemadmodum de specu quodam Coricio narrat Pomponius Mela, qui primùm jucundâ quadam amœnitatē allecat adeuntē ad se, donec altius, atque altius ingressos tandem horror quidam ac Majestas numinis illic inhabitantis pedem referre compellat (42). -- What Tertullian imputes to ignorance, others have ascribed to modesty, and I wish the ancient Philosophers and Poets, and the heretics who came after them, had in this matter been as reserved as Thales or Simonides were: They would never have attributed to the divine nature things so absurd, impious, and blasphemous, or ever have broached such detestable errors, as bold, impudent, and despicable men have done. All men are naturally very desirous of knowledge, but especially of the Deity: whereby we may perceive that GOD would be known by us, but he hath set certain bounds to our knowledge, beyond which we neither ought nor can proceed, and hath as it were erected pillars, engraven, as it were, with his own finger, with a Ne, plus ultra: For in things divine, there are holy recesses into which the great GOD will not permit us to enter; but if any, puffed up with rashness and confidence, will presumptuously attempt it, the further he goes, the more he will be surrounded by darkness, so that he will be obliged to acknowledge the unsearchable majesty of the divine nature, and the imbecility of the human mind, and confess with Simonides, The longer I consider, the matter appears to me the more obscure. As Pomponius Mela relates of a certain cave, that with a delightful pleasure at first allured those that entered, till going still further, a certain horror, and the majesty of the inhabiting Deity forced them to retire. Afterwards, he quotes a remarkable passage of St Augustin (43). A French author looked upon Simonides's modesty as a pious action, and took from thence occasion to inveigh against the boldness of the Eunomians. 'Remember, says he (44), the

pious modesty of Simonides, who having asked but one day of King Hiero, to discourse of the divine essence before him, asked him afterwards two days, and then three, protesting that the more he thought upon it, the more he found it difficult to perform his promise. For my part, I make no doubt, but that this humble acknowledgment of his ignorance was more acceptable to the Supreme Being, as much as heathen as Simonides was, than the boldness of an Eunomius, and of that kind of Ariens, who followed him, and boasted of comprehending God as fully as he could comprehend himself.' Du Pleffis Mornai, in the chapter wherein he proves by reasons and authorities that it is impossible to comprehend

God (45), did not forget Simonides's answer. He observes (46), without quoting any body, that this Poet taught very well that GOD is wisdom itself. He says in another place (47), that Aristotle in his *Metaphysics* mentions and commends the known answer of Simonides to Hiero, importing in short that none but GOD is a Metaphysician, that is, can speak of things that are above nature. In perusing the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle I could not find that passage. But be that as it will, the thought is very good, and is of the same import.

When I said that I have not in that work of Aristotle, met with that passage which Mr Du Pleffis quotes, it was in respect of the circumstances of that citation, namely, that it is an answer of Simonides to Hiero commended by Aristotle; for otherwise I found the following words in the second chapter of the first book. Διὸ καὶ δίκαιός ἐστιν ἐκ ἀνθρώπων νομοκράτορ αὐτῆς ἡ κτίσις. πολλὰ γὰρ ἡ φύσις δέλη τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐστίν. ὥς κατὰ Σιμωνίδην. Θεὸς δὲ μὴ ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ ἔχουσιν γέρας ἀνδρα δ' ἐκ ἀνθρώπων μὴ ζῆλον τὴν κατὰ αὐτὸν ἐπιστήμην. Quæ circa merito, ejus possessio non humana existimari potest. Multis enim in rebus serva natura hominum est. Itaque ut Simonidi placet, solus Deus hunc sibi honorem vindicat. At non decet virum eam scientiam, quæ sibi congruit, non querere (48). Those words amount to this: The knowledge of the first principles is so sublime, that it might be reasonably said, that the possession of it does not belong to man; and therefore, according to Simonides, that possession is the privilege of God only: But it were an unbecoming thing for man not to endeavour to know himself, or to neglect the knowledge that concerns him. I fancy, that if I had lived in Aristotle's time, I should have found his thought clearer than it is: However, I can find nothing in it, whereby it may appear that he commends or approves Simonides's opinion, and I have read some Commentators, who directly affirm that he confutes it. Fonseca making a paraphractical note upon those words of Aristotle puts in the margin *Refutatio sententiæ Simonidis*. Here is the text which answers to that summary. 'Adeo compertum est hanc scientiam non esse humanam possessionem, ut inde sumperit Simonides poeta sui erroris occasionem. Monebat enim iis tantum scientiis dandam esse hominibus operam, quæ cum mortali vita congruerent; proinde hanc scientiam, quæ de divinis rebus instituitur, relinquendam esse Deo, divinique substantiis, quod sit supra humanum captum. Cui inepto consilio, & virilis animi magnitudine indigno respondet Aristoteles, Non decere virum eam scientiam negligere, quæ maxime intellectui congruat, neque enim est putanda aliena ab humana natura, cujus præcipua pars est mens ipsa (49). -- That this knowledge (viz. of a GOD) is not in man's possession, is a truth so well known, that it occasioned the error of Simonides. For he advised that men should apply only to those sciences, which concerned this mortal life; wherefore that knowledge which concerns things divine, is to be left to GOD and divine beings, because it surpasses human capacity. To which unwise advice, unbecoming the excellency of the human soul, Aristotle hath given this answer, viz. That a man ought not to neglect that knowledge, which suits best to his mind; for that is not to be thought foreign to human nature, since the mind is the chief part of it.' He will have it (50) that Aristotle condemns a like thought of Simonides in another place, and that this Poet is hinted at in the following words: Χρηδὶς ἐκ κατὰ

Theodor. l. hæc. fabul.

(45) It is the 4th chapter of his book concerning the Truth of the Christian Religion.

(46) Ibid. fol. m.

(47) Ibid. ch. xx, fol. 266, verso. There is in the Latin edition of that book of Du Pleffis, pag. m. 446.

Aristoteles tritum illud Simonidis ad Hieronem laudat, de rebus, inquit, quæ præter naturam Deum soli credendum.

(48) Aristotel. *Metaphys.* lib. i, cap. ii, pag. m. 644, E.

(49) Fonseca in Arist. *Metaphys.* lib. i, cap. ii, des. For he advised that men should apply only to those sciences, which concerned this mortal life; wherefore that knowledge which concerns things divine, is to be left to GOD and divine beings, because it surpasses human capacity. To which unwise advice, unbecoming the excellency of the human soul, Aristotle hath given this answer, viz. That a man ought not to neglect that knowledge, which suits best to his mind; for that is not to be thought foreign to human nature, since the mind is the chief part of it.' He will have it (50) that Aristotle condemns a like thought of Simonides in another place, and that this Poet is hinted at in the following words: Χρηδὶς ἐκ κατὰ

(50) Id. ibid. Ser. Raynaud, Theol. Natur. pag. 1.

(42) Lescalopierius in Cicero's *De Natura Deorum*, lib. i, pag. 84, 85.

(43) Certè hoc est Deus, quod & cum dicitur, non potest dici: cum æstimatur, non potest æstimari: cum comparatur, non potest comparari: cum definitur, ipsa definitio crevit. Augustin. *Sermone de tempore CIX*, apud Lescalopierium, ibid. pag. 85.

(44) La Mothe le Vayer. *Lettres* cxi, pag. 26, of the 12th vol. Edit. in 12mo.

made the same acknowledgment he did, that he could not give a definition of God [G]. His

τὸς παραινύτας, ἀνδράσινα φροσύν, ἀνδρῶν
ὄντα, καὶ εἰρητὰ τὸν εἰρητὸν, ἀλλὰ ἐφ' ὅσον
ἐνδέχεται ἀπαθανάτισεν, καὶ ἀπαντα ποιεῖν
πρὸς τὸ ζῆν κατὰ τὸ κράτιστον τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ. Ne-
que nos oportet humana sapere ac sentire, ut quidam mo-
nent, cum finis homines: neque mortalia, cum mortales:
sed nos ipsos, quoad ejus fieri potest, à mortalitate vin-
dicare, atque omnia facere, ut ei nostri partem, quæ in
nobis est optima, convenienter vivamus (51). If this be
true, this sentence ought to be placed among those of
Simonides: viz. since we are but men, our know-
ledge should be but human; and since we are mortal,
we ought to be contented with the knowledge of
things mortal. We shall see another mistake of Du
Plessis Mornai. The first consists in affirming that
the abovementioned saying of Simonides was approved
by Aristotle.

(51) Aristot.
Moral. lib. x,
cap. vii, pag. m.
102, H.

(52) Plato, in
Protagoras, pag.
235, E.

We find in Plato's Protagoras (52), that that saying
was in a poem inscribed to Scopas, son of Creon the
Thebanian. It was not therefore an answer to King
Hiero: And it is to be observed that the thing spoken
of in that place is not science but virtue: and that
therefore it might be said, that Aristotle's applica-
tion is not right; or that our Poet made use of the
same thought sometimes with respect to moral, and
sometimes in relation to intellectual qualities. Plato is
very particular in his discussion of some verses, where-
in Simonides had said, that it is a difficult thing to
become a perfectly honest man, and that Pittacus was
very much mistaken in saying, that it is a difficult
thing to continue an honest man. "Ὅτι ἀνδρα ἀγα-
θὸν μὴ ἀλαθῶς γενέσθαι χαλεπὸν, χερσὶ τε
καὶ ποσὶ καὶ τῷ τετράγωνοι, ἀνεύθρηγε τετυγ-
μένον. Difficile esse virum vere bonum fieri, manibus
pedibusque & mente ad amissim quadratis (53). Χαλε-
πὸν ἐσθλὸν ἐμμενεῖν. Difficile est bonum manere (54).
One of Plato's interlocutors maintains that those words
of Simonides are contradictory. Another maintains
they are not, and understands them in this sense: It is
a difficult thing to become an honest man, and im-
possible to continue so always; and therefore Pittacus
is mistaken, for he supposes it is possible for a man
to persevere in the practice of virtue: Had he not
believed the possibility of it, he would not have said
that it is a difficult thing. This explication is proved
by a sentence of Simonides, inserted in the same
place, which imports, that it is the privilege of God
alone to be always good (55). "Ὅτι θεὸς ἀν μὲν
ἔχουσι τῷτο γέρας. Quod solus Deus hoc munere frui
dignus sit.

(53) Id. ibid.

(54) Id. ibid.
pag. 236, A.

(55) Plato, in
Protagoras, pag.
237, D. See also
pag. 239, C.

[G] Some Divines would not have made the same ac-
knowledgement he did, that he could not give a definition
of GOD.] A proof of this may be seen in the pre-
ceding remark; but here is an author who speaks
more plainly to the purpose. It is the famous Peter
Charron, a Prebend of Condom. The Deity, says
he (56), being so high, far removed from us, and
above our capacity, that we know not at all what
he is, either afar off or near, it is on one side, the
greatest and most outrageous presumption to decide
and determine concerning him, as the Atheists do:
who in all their objections speak of him as of a li-
mited Being, circumscribed, and of necessity such
and such, saying, if there were a God, he must
have been so and so; and being so, he would, should,
and might, do this thing, and the other which is not
done: Ergo: on the other hand, it is an error to
think to find any reason sufficiently demonstrative
to prove and establish evidently and necessarily what
God is: at which we ought not to be surprised,
but might well remain astonished if we should meet
with such. For it is not possible that human com-
prehension, nor the capacity of any created being,
should be able to reach so far. . . Deity, is what
cannot be known, nay even perceived, between
finite and infinite there is no proportion, no transi-
tion: infinity is altogether inaccessible, nay imper-
ceptible, God is the one, true, and only infinite.
The most exalted understanding, the highest stretch
of imagination, are as far from comprehending him,
as the lowest and meanest apprehension. The greatest
Philosopher, and the most learned Divine, know
not more or less of God, than the meanest trades-
man. Where there is no passage, no way, no ac-
cess, there can be neither far nor near. . . God;
VOL. V.

(56) Pierre
Charron, des
trois Veritez,
liv. i. ch. v.

God
in com-
preh-
hensible

Deity, Eternity, Omnipotence, Infinity, are only
words, and nothing more to us: they are not things
that can fall under human understanding. . . If
all we speak and affirm concerning God were rigou-
rously canvassed, it would be found only vanity and
ignorance. Wherefore it was the saying of a great
and ancient Doctor, that, To speak of GOD even
the things that were true, was most dangerous. The
reason of which sentence is, because not only such
and so sublime truths were debased in passing through
our senses, understandings, and mouths, but we even
do not know, nor can be certain, that they are
true. It is by chance we find them: for we are
altogether blind, and know neither what he is, nor
what he operates. But to speak of God with doubt-
ing and uncertainty, and as it were groping in the
dark, and by conjecture, is dangerous, and we
know not if God will approve it; unless it be be-
cause we have such confidence in his goodness, that
he takes well what is said of him with a good in-
tention, and to honour him as much as we can.
But, besides, who knows if this reliance on him is
pleasing to him, and that the divine goodness is
such as to accept what is done with a good inten-
tion, and to do him honour? This indeed is the
duty and effect of human goodness, created, and fi-
nite: but who knows if that which is divine, un-
created, and infinite, be of a like nature? And
even it is not universally agreed as to that which
is human, what are its rules and offices. . . There-
fore the fittest course that can be taken by one that is
desirous to think, and to frame an idea of the Deity,
is, that the soul, after an universal abstraction from
all things, raising itself above all, as in a vacuum,
indeterminate, and boundless, with a profound and
pure silence, an awful astonishment, an admiration
full of a timorous humility, raise in it self an ima-
gination of a luminous abyss, without bottom, with-
out banks, without shores, without high or low,
without laying hold upon, or attaching itself to any
thing present to the imagination, only to lose itself,
to be immersed, and yield itself to be swallowed up
in that infinity. To which come very near these
ancient sentences of the saints. The true knowledge
of God is an entire ignorance of him. To approach
God is to know him to be a light unaccessible,
and to be swallowed up by it. It is knowing him
in some measure to be sensible, that being above all,
he cannot be known: eloquently to praise him, is
with astonishment and terror to be silent, and in
silence to adore him in the soul. But because it is
extremely difficult, and next to impossible for the
soul, to remain in so uncertain and unconfined an in-
finity (for she would be bewildered, and at a stand)
like one, who confounded by the turning of his
head, not any more knowing where he is, lets
himself fall down: and although she could, being
stupified, incapable of moving, and seized with ter-
ror and admiration, she would not be able in any
manner to have communion with God, to pray to
him, call upon him, acknowledge him, honour
him; which are the first and principal points of all
religion: for in these performances, it is necessary,
that he be conceived with some quality, good,
powerful, wise, understanding, accepting our good
intentions: It is necessary, and cannot be otherwise
in this present state of life, that every one frame
and represent to himself an image of the Deity,
which he may regard, address, adhere to, and which
may be as his God. This the soul does, by rais-
ing her imagination above all things, and conceiv-
ing with all her might an infinite goodness, power,
and perfection. For the utmost and highest degree,
any one can rise to by the greatest stretch of ap-
prehension, is his God, and serves him for an image
of the deity: an image nevertheless false, that is, de-
ficient and imperfect: For the deity being, as hath
been said, unimaginable and infinite, to which the
soul cannot be said to approach by any conception,
either near or far off, nor can form any true image,
more than of a thing it knows not at all; it is suffi-
cient that she make it the least false, least imper-
fect, the most high, and the most pure she can.
Thousands of readers who shall find these thoughts of
a sublime genius in this Dictionary, had never known
them

His answer to a King of Lacedæmon produced the same effect as that of Solon to Cræsus [H]. Another answer is ascribed to him very like that of the Philosopher, who boasted that he carried about him his whole estate [I]. What he answered to Hiero's wife, ought not to be taken in a literal sense [K]. It was rather a jest than a serious declaration

them had I not recited them. This is the reason I caused them to be inserted in this remark.

It will possibly be said, that Charron is a Divine too much suspected to deserve that his principles should be repeated. We will remove this objection, and say that Arnobius has expressed himself in such a manner, as will highly justify the answer of Simonides. Has he not said that our words can express nothing concerning the nature of God, and that we ought to be silent, if we would form an idea of him; and to the end that our loose conjectures may make some search into this matter, as under a cloud, and in the dark, we ought to shut close our mouth?

O maxime, ô summe rerum invisibilium procreator!
ô ipse invisê, & nullis unquam comprehensibilis!
Prima . . . tu causa es, locus rerum ac spacium, fundamentum cunctorum quæcunque sunt, infinitus, ingenuus, immortalis, perpetuus, solus, quem nulla delineat forma corporalis, nulla determinat circumscriptio, qualitatibus expers, quantitatis sine situ, motu, & habitu, de quo nihil dici & exprimi mortalium potis est significatione verborum: qui, ut intelligaris, tacendum est; atque, ut per umbram te possit errans investigare suspicio, nihil est omnino mutiendum (57). - O immense, O supreme Creator of things invisible! O thou unseen, and uncomprehended by any beings! . . . Thou art the first cause, the place of beings, and the space, the foundation of all things that are, infinite, unbegotten, immortal, everlasting, alone, whom no corporeal form can represent, no limits can bound, without quality, quantity, without situation and motion, of whom nothing can be said or expressed in the language of mortal men: of whom, that thou mayst be known, we must be silent; and that wandering suspicion may search thee out in the dark, nothing is even to be uttered.

(57) Arnob. lib. i, pag. m. 17.

(58) See Elmenhorst upon this passage of Arnobius pag. m. 24.

(59) Minut. Felix, p. m. 143.

(60) Lescalop. in Cicero de Natura Deor. pag. 2.

(61) See Herodotus, lib. i, cap. LXXXVI.

(62) See Cornelius Nepos in the Life of Pausanias.

It would be no small ignorance to tell me, that this passage ought to be reckoned amongst the errors of Arnobius; for all who have read his Commentators may have seen, that the most orthodox Fathers of the Church have agreed with him in his opinion (58). Be pleased to read the Commentators on these words of Minucius Felix: Nobis ad intellectum pectus angustum est: & ideo sic eum (Deum) digne æstimamus, dum inestimabilem dicimus. Eloquar quemadmodum sentio, magnitudinem Dei, qui se putat nosse, minuit; qui non vult minuire, non novit. Nec nomen Deo quæras (59): - Our mind is too narrow to comprehend; and therefore we esteem GOD as we ought when we believe him inestimable: I will plainly declare what I think, whosoever believes that he knows the immensity of GOD does diminish it: he that will not lessen it, owns he knows it not. Neither do thou seek for the name of GOD. You shall find that they refer you to innumerable passages wherein the ancient Fathers agree with Arnobius in this matter. And observe, that the Jesuit Lescalopierus alleges those very words of Minutius Felix, to confirm the remark he had made, that the wisest and most modest Philosophers confess every where, that God is not only invisible and inexpressible, but also unintelligible. Sapientissimi quique ac modestissimi philosophorum Deum æstimator, non intelligibilem, æstimator minimè spectabilem, æstimator et æstimator indicibilem, & si fati, invocabilem, inominabilem, ubique confitemur, at nihil hunc in locum afferri potest illustrius, quam quod habet Minutius Felix (60).

[H] His answer . . . produced the same effect as that of Solon to Cræsus (61).] Pausanias sitting at table with Simonides, ordered him to speak some sentence. Remember, answered he, that you are a man. This saying appeared so insipid to Pausanias, that he did not mind it; but when he happened to be in a place of refuge, where he struggled with an intolerable hunger, and out of which he could not come, without running the hazard of being put to death, a misfortune he brought upon himself by his ambition, he remembered the words of that Poet, and cried out three times, O Simonides! how important was the meaning of the exhortation you gave me (62)!

Τὴν καὶ αὐτὴν ἐμνήσθην τὴν Σιμωνίδου, καὶ ἐξέβησεν εἰς τρις, ὡς ἐνός Κούης, μέγα τι ἀπὸ χρέμα ἦν ὁ

ἀνὴρ αὐτὸν ἐμνήσθην τὴν Σιμωνίδου, καὶ ἐξέβησεν εἰς τρις. Tunc in mentem ei venit Simonidis, & ter magna voce exclamavit: O Cee besper, magnam quiddam in tuo sermone inerat, ego vero inani persuasione eram adductus, ut eum nullius momenti putarem (63). It is certain, that if this sentence were sufficiently considered, and viewed with the eye of a Philosopher, nothing would be more mortifying and instructive, than to think seriously that we are men. This comprehends all the weakness, misery, and inconstancy, that can be thought of.

[I] Another answer is ascribed to him . . . very like that of a Philosopher, who boasted that he carried about him his whole estate. It is said that Simonides, in order to free himself from poverty, went about the great towns of Asia, where he sang for money the praises of conquerors. Being enriched by that means, he took shipping for the isle of Ceos, his native country. The ship was cast away: every body strove to save himself with whatever he could carry. Simonides took nothing, and being asked the reason of it, he answered (64), It is because all that I have is with me. Several of his ship-wrecked companions were drowned, sinking under the weight of what they had endeavoured to save. Those who landed, were plundered by robbers: Every one went to Clazomenæ, a town not far from the place where the ship was cast away. A citizen, who loved learning, and had read Simonides's poems with great admiration, knowing him, afforded him all necessities, whilst the rest were forced to beg in the streets. The Poet meeting them, told them his answer was right (65).

[K] What he answered to Hiero's wife, ought not to be taken in a literal sense. That princeps desired to know whether it was better to acquire learning than riches. Simonides answered her, That riches were better than learning; for, said he, I see every day learned men waiting upon rich people (66). We must not believe that he indeed valued silver and gold more than learning; but he made use of a nice railery to blame the diligence of the generality of men of letters, who court rich people, and endeavour to get some presents from them. He himself was touched by his own jest, since he went to the court of Syracusæ, thro' a motive of interest; and on several other occasions had made it his business to procure the means of life, and to mend his condition by the liberality of others. It might be said also, that he preferred riches to learning, considering the advantage that accrues from them. It is manifest, that riches are more proper than learning to procure temporal advantages, and whatever is most earnestly wished for in human life. In this sense it were true literally, that it is better to be rich than learned. I must not forget the reflexion that was made upon the proof alleged, by Simonides. It has been said, that it is the part of Physicians to visit sick people, and that for the same reason, it is requisite learned men should frequently visit those that are rich. Here are two witty sayings of an ancient Philosopher. Somebody was saying that he always saw the Philosophers resort to rich mens houses; Aristippus answered him, Do not Physicians go to sick people, and yet no body would rather chuse to be sick than to be a Physician (67).

Another time Diogenes asked him, Why do Philosophers visit rich people, and how comes it that rich people do not visit the Philosophers? His answer was (68), It is because the Philosophers know what they want, but rich people do not know it. Erasmus explains that answer in the following manner: The Philosophers are not ignorant that one cannot live without money, and therefore they ask of those that have it; but if rich men knew that they had need of learning, they would be more careful to make their court to the Philosophers. I omit Erasmus's moral reflexion; it may be seen in these Latin words. Philosophi sciunt absque pecunia vivi non posse: itaque petunt eos qui quod opus est dare possunt. Quod si divites aquè intelligerent se egere sapientia, multo magis tenerent philosophorum limina. Miserior enim est egestas animi quam corporis: atque hoc miserius egeni sunt divites

(63) Ælian. Var. Hist. lib. ix, cap. 26. See also Plutarch in Consolat. ad Apollonium, pag. 105, A.

(64) Metamorphosis, lib. ix, cap. 26. See also Plutarch in Consolat. ad Apollonium, pag. 105, A.

(65) Taken from Phaedrus, fab. xxi, lib. vi.

(66) Aristotle, Rhetoric, lib. ii, cap. xvi, pag. m. 438.

(67) Diogenes Laertius, in Aristippo, lib. ii, num. 70.

(68) Id. ibid. num. 69.

(e) See the remark [F] towards the end.

(f) Ἐμοιγε δ' ἑ-
ξαρκεῖ δὲ δὴ
μὴ κακὸς ἦ,
μὴ δ' ἀγαν ἀπά-
λαμνος. Mihi
satisfacit & ille
quisquis malus
non est, nimi-
umve ignavus.
Plato, in Protag.
pag. 240.

(g) Ex Platone,
ibid.

(b) Παίζων ἐν
τῷ βίῳ καὶ
περὶ μνηδὲν ἀ-
πλῶς σπουδᾶ-
ζουσιν. Ut ludamus
in vita, neque
ulli rei studeamus
serio. *Theo, Pro-
gymn.* cap. v,
pag. m. 84.

(i) See the Scholia upon Pindar in Oden II, Olymp. and the remark [C] of the article HIE-RO I.

of

(69) Erasmus in
Apophthegm.
lib. iii, in Agri-
stipp. num. 10,
pag. m. 186.

(70) I use the words of Mr le Fevre, *Journal du Journal*, page 19. Here are the words of Simonides, "Ἀμαδίς ποί γὰρ εἰπὼν ἡ ὥς ἔπ' ἐμὴ ἐξέπαυτ' αἰσθαι. Plut. de audiend. Poëtis, circa init. p. 15

(71) Erasmi. in
Apophthegm.
lib. vi, pag. m.
499, 500.

(72) Gorgias ille
Leontinus . . .
tragediam defini-
ebat, *Fallaci-*
am, qua qui
deciperet, iustior
eo qui non decipe-
ret, qui deciperet,
sapientior
eo qui non deciperet
quoniam, efficit. Daniel
Heinsius, *Orat.* de utilita-
te, quæ ex lectione
Tragediarum percipitur,
inquit. p. m. 269.
Plutarchi de audiendi Poetis,
pag. 15, quod
ibat saying of
Gorgias.

(73) *Id.* Hein-
sus, *ibid.*

(74) In the article AGESILAUS II. remark [C].

(75) Above citation (9) of the article P Y R- R H O.

(76) Suidas, in
Timonim.

(77) *Id. ibid.*

(78) Horat. Sat.
IV, lib. i, linit.

* divites quod non intelligant, quam pretiosa quamque
 * necessaria re careant (69). - - - Philosophers know
 * that it is impossible to live without money, therefore
 * they seek such as can give what is wanted. But if
 * the rich were sensible of their want of wisdom, they
 * would be much more assiduous at the bouises of Philo-
 * sophers. For the indigence of the mind is more misera-
 * ble than that of the body; and the more wretchedly in-
 * digent are the rich, because they know not how pre-
 * cious, and how necessary a thing they want.

[L.] He acknowledged himself incapable of deceiving stupid people. Erasmus did not forget, in his collection of Apophthegms, Simonides's answer to those who asked him, why he did not endeavour to engage the Thebælians to give him something, since he was so careful to get what he could in other countries: *Those men, said he, are not ingenious enough to be deceived by such as I am* (70). I shall fet down the whole passage of Erasmus, because it contains a good reflexion. *Idem* (Simonides) *quum cæteros laudando veneretur, ut aliquod daret, interrogatus cur non & Thebælos captaret, Stupidiores sunt, inquit, quàm ut à me falli possint. Qui querunt qui imponent, ad stupidos eunt. At qui tam erant stupidi, ut non sentirent ingenium poematum illius, nec tangeretur amore nominis in posteros transmittendi, non poterant ab illo falli* (71). Erasmus is in the right: those who have a mind to deceive others, look for fools; but those, who are too stupid to be sensible of the beauties of a poem, or to desire a long fame, were not fit to be deceived by Simonides. A thought of Gorgias Leontinus may be applied to this subject. He had defined tragedy a deceit, wherein the deceiver is more just than he, who does not deceive, and he who is deceived is more knowing than he who is not deceived (72). Whereupon Daniel Heinfius makes this observation. *A tantis viris posse decipi paucorum est: & illorum fere tantum, qui præstantiam eorum, si non affeque re ipsâ, mente ac intellectu æstimare ac assequi possunt, qui cum aliquo judicio decipiuntur* (73). . . . Few are capable of being deceived by so great men, and almost only those who have some confused notions of their excellency, can be deceived with false judgment. I have said elsewhere (74), that a great captain complained that his enemies were so silly, that he could not succeed in his stratagems against them. I have said also (75), that Balzac observed that the maids of his village were too silly to be deceived by a man of wit.

[M] He failed not to make himself dreaded by sharp invectives. Timocreon was his enemy (76). He was one of the Poets of the antient Comedy (77), and consequently he knew how to rail, and did it with an impudent licentiousness.

Eupolis atque Cratinus, Aristophanesque Poëtae,
Atque alii, quorum Comœdia prisca virorum est,
Si quis erat dignus describi, quod malus, aut fur,
Quod mœchus foret, aut sicarius, aut aliqui
Famofus; multâ cum libertate notabant (78).

*Cratin and Eupolis, that lash'd the age,
Those old Comedian furies of the stage :*

*If they were to describe a wile, unjust,
And cheating knave, or scourge a lawless lust,
Or other crimes : regardless of his fame
They shew'd the man, and boldly told his name.*

СВЯТЫЙ.

He composed a comedy against Simonides (79); and (79) Suidas, in
therefore it may be thought he used him severely: *Τίμωνίδην*.
nevertheless, some verses are still extant, wherein he
confesses that he had been the sufferer, and we have
his epitaph made by Simonides. It is very abusive.
(80) Id non impune fecisse (*Timocreonem*) colligo ex car- (80) Leo Allia-
minibus ejusdem Timocreonis nondum editis, qui in tus, de Simon-
semetipsum Simonidis dicitatem accusat, & plane vi- eus non Scriptis,
desperat metro Trochaico pentametro: ΚΑΤὰ ΜΥΣΤΑ- *POX.* 213.
ταίης τῆς Αἰδέως, ditionibus scilicet transpositis.

Κηϊα με προσήλθε φλυαρία ἐκ ἐθέλοντα,
Οὐκ ἐθέλοντά με προσήλθε Κηϊα φλυαρία.

Ceia me incesſit importuna loquacitas invitum,
Invitum me incesſit Ceia importuna loquacitas

Extatque hodie num Simonidis Epigramma in Timocreonis sepulchrum, quo injurias sibi illatas ultus pulchre fuisse sibi visus est.

Πολλὰ φαγὼν, καὶ πολλὰ πινὼν, καὶ πολλὰ
κακ' εἰπὼν
Ἄνθρωπος κείμαι Τιμοκρέων Ῥόδιος.

Cum multa comederim & multa biberim, multa
mala dixerim

Hominibus, jaceo Timocreon Rhodius (81).

(81) Athenæus,
lib. x, pag. 415.

I find in those poems of Timocreon which have not yet been published, that he did not abuse Simonides without suffering for it. He accuses himself for the prating (harangues) of Simonides, and plainly blames it, saying, I was seized with the troublesome loquacity of Simonides. And there is still extant an epigram of Simonides on the tomb of Timocreon, by which he thought he had handsomely requited the injuries which had been done by him. After I have eaten and drunken plentifully, and spoken a great deal of ill of men, here I lie, Timocreon of Rhodes.

[N] *His avarice is not to be excused, nor his mercenary pen.* I know what he answered those, who asked him why he was so covetous in his old age; because, said he (82), I had rather leave something to my enemies after my death, than want the assistance of my friends during my life. This answer is not altogether amiss; for there is nothing one ought more carefully to avoid than to be chargeable to any body, or to depend upon the discretion and caprices of others: but Simonides should not have been afraid of it; he might have avoided that misfortune, without being so intent upon getting money. . . . Another answer, less tolerable than the first, is ascribed to him. You may see that Plutarch does not approve of it. 'For not only,

(82) Stobaeus,
Serm. VIII, fol.
m. 55.

(k) Ἀνάγκη οὐδὲ
θεοὶ μάχονται.
Cum necessitate
neque Dii pug-
nant. *Suidas*, in
Σιμωνίδης, pag.
741.

(l) Gyrard. Dial.
IX de Poetar.
Hiflor. p. 462,
& seq.

Of all the sayings that are ascribed to him, I shall only mention this: he said, that necessity was a thing which the gods themselves would not oppose or resist (k). His father, Leoprepes, hath deserved to be mentioned for a good advice he gave to two young men (l). Though Gyrardus's collections are very good (l), they do not equal those of Allatius concerning our Simonides (m). He gives us the titles of all his Poems, as far as they can be known by the ancient monuments that are extant; but we do not find there Simonides's egg, mentioned by Mr Blondel the Architect (n). Mr Blondel is mistaken in this: he has confounded Simonides with Simmias Rhodius. If

(m) Allatius de
Simeonum Scrip-
tis, pag. 207,
& seq.

(n) In his *Comparaison de Pindare d'Horace*, pag. 32, Dutch edition. That fault has been observed in the remarks published in French, by a Dutch Advocate upon that work of Mr Blondel, at Rotterdam 1701.

Venus to old men is averse, . . .

as Euripides has it; but their appetite also to their meat and drink is for the most part dull, and as one would say, toothless; so that they have but little gulf and relish in them. They ought therefore to furnish themselves with pleasures of the mind, not ungenerous or illiberal, as Simonides said to those, who reproached him with covetousness, that being by his years deprived of other pleasures, he recreated his old age with the only delight he took in heap- ing up riches. But the political life, or the manage- ment of the common-wealth, has in it pleasures exceeding great, and no less honourable; being such, as it is probable the very gods do only, or at least chiefly enjoy themselves in; and these are the de- lights which proceed from doing good, or being beneficial to many, and the glory of great and hon- ourable actions (83). Had I curtailed this passage, I should have left out some things, that may be profit- able to the reader; but if he only draws from thence a proof of the avarice of our Poet, I shall be contented with it. His way of living was somewhat

(83) Plut. an
fieri sit gerenda
Respubl. pag.
786.

(84) He wrote
the Life of Si-
monides.

(85) Athen. lib.
xiv, pag. 656.

(86) Ælian.
Var. Hiflor.
lib. ix, cap. i.

(87) Ὅπως εἶ-
πεν ἦτα λίμ-
νος μεγαλο-
πρέπεια κατὰ
Φανὸς δ', καὶ
ἡ μὴ κορμιο-
της. Ut per-
specta fit inquit,
& Hieronis mag-
nificencia &
mea temperantia.
Athen. lib. xiv,
pag. 656.

He has been blamed for being the first that let out the Muses for hire: which, I think, ought not to be understood as if the Poets, who lived before him, had refused rewards. I believe they had an eye to the presents and liberalities of those, for whom they sung, and that they made heavy complaints against those un- grateful men, who gave them nothing, or gave them too little. How then shall we understand these re- proachful words of Callimachus?

Οὐ γὰρ ἐργάτιν τρέφω
τὴν μουσαν, ὡς ὁ Κεῖω· Ἰλλίχης νέπης.

Non enim mercenariam alio
Musam, ut Ceus ille Hyllichi nepos (88).

(88) Callimach.
in Fragm. p.
337. Edit.
Graevii 1697.

(89) See Tzetzes,
Chil. viii, num.
213.

My Muse, says he, is not mercenary like that of Si- monides. The latter was taxed with the same fault by Anacreon (89), and it is thought Pindar levelled a like stroke at him, when he spoke of a certain time when the Muses were not yet mercenary.

ἡ μουσα γὰρ ὃ φιλοκερδής
πῶ τίτ' ἢν, ἐδ' ἐργάτης,
ἐδ' ἐπὶ πρᾶντο γλυκεῖαι
μελίθροισι ποτὶ Τερψιχίρας,
ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρὶς ὧπα,
μαλ' ἀκέραιοι αἰοδαί (90).

(90) Pindar. Ol.
II, Isthm. p. m.
675.

These Greek verses are thus paraphrased by Benedi- ctus. 'Nondum enim Musa lucri amans erat, nec quemadmodum operarii operam mercede locabat. Neque à Terpsichore Lyricorum magistra dulces cantilenæ, molli vocis sono pronuntiandæ, suæque suavitate adblandientes, atque argenti in fronte mentionem facientes vendebantur. - - - For the Muses were not yet become lovers of gain; nor, like labourers, bired themselves out for money. Nor did Terpsichore, the mistress of Lyric Poets, set to sale her pleasing songs, to be softly pronounced, flattering with their soft sweetness, and mentioning money in the begin- ning.' If it be so, we must suppose that Simonides introduced an innovation, which consisted in making verses for a set price. He would not sing upon trust, nor rely on the generosity of his heroes: he would have, first of all, his wages agreed upon; and, perhaps, he desired sometimes to be paid before hand, or, at least, took an earnest. However it be, he does not deserve to be reckoned among the inventors of good things; he ought to be placed among those who have depraved or corrupted good customs. He dishonoured the Muses by his mercenary spirit, and disgracefully became a proverb (91). We are told (92), that he used to say, I have two trunks, one for salaries, and the other for favours; I open them from time to time, and I always find the trunk of salaries full, and that of favours empty. He needed not wonder at it; for since he did nothing gratis, he could not pretend to free gifts, but only to be paid according to his agreement he had made with his heroes. Perhaps, he intended only thereby to excuse the precautions he used. How do we know but this might be the thought: I had prepared two trunks, one for what I should receive by way of gift, and the other for what I should receive by way of payment: I never found any thing in the first, and therefore I have set a price to my poems: It has turned to a good account; the trunk for payments is always full. Some will have it, that by the trunk for favours, he meant thanks: if so, his meaning would be, that the trunk of thanks was of no use to him. He thought fit to search for some assistance from it, but never found any (93).

(91) See Eras-
mus upon the
proverb Simon-
idis cantilenæ,
Chil. II, Cen-
tur. IX, num.
12.

(92) Plut. de Co-
rrositate, p. 310.

(93) See Rhetor.
Phædrus, pag.
381, Edit. 1695.

(94) Phædr.
Fab. XXI, lib.
iv.

(95) Simonides
... victoria lau-
dem cuiusdam
Pythæ ut scriberet
condidit. Rhetor.
lib. i, c. 10. Id. Fab.
XXIV, lib. iv.

(96) Ex Aristot.
Rhetor. lib. iii,
cap. ii.

We read in Phædrus's Fables, that Simonides went about the towns of Asia to get money by fingering the praises of conquerors. The editions have *Mercede accepta laudem victorum canens* (94); but several Critics maintain, it should be *passa* instead of *accepta*, be- cause he used to make a bargain before hand. Which appears from another passage of the same Phædrus (95). This also appears from a story mentioned in Aristotle's Rhetoric. A man, who got the prize of the race, desired Simonides to make a triumphal song upon that subject: the Poet not being satisfied with the reward offered to him, answered, he could not treat that subject worthily; for that victory had been obtained in a race with mules, and he pretended that a mule did not afford matter for an encomium. But having a better price offered him, and at last such as he thought sufficient, he then made the Poem according to that man's desire (96).

[O] His father, Leoprepes, hath deserved to be mentioned for a good advice he gave to two young men. Two good friends asked him which was their best way to

If I have any thing to say against Moreri in the following Article.

to render their friendship perpetual. You must never | but one of you must shew respect to the anger of the
be angry, said he, one with another at the same time ; | other (97). It is a very judicious advice.

(97) *Ælianus*, Var. *Hist.* lib. iv, cap. xxxiv.

SIMONIDES, son of the daughter of the foregoing, was a native of the
isle of Ceos: some think he was surnamed Melicertes [A]. He flourished before the
Peloponnesian war, and writ three books of Genealogies, and three books of inventions
(a). I shall take notice of some small faults in Moreri's Dictionary [B]. Though
there have been several Simonides's (b), It would be I think a difficult thing to name any
of them that lived with Phalaris [C].

(a) Taken from
Suidas.

(b) See Vossius,
de Poëtis Græcis,
pag. 14.

[A] Some think that he was surnamed Melicertes. They are mistaken. This is not Suidas's meaning; but Vossius ascribes it to him, when he says that Simonides the grandfather, was surnamed Melicertes (1).

(1) Simonides
Ceus ex filia ne-
pos fuit Simon-
idis Lyrici, cog-
nomento Meli-
certæ qui memo-
riæ artem inve-
nisse dicitur.
Vossius, de Hist.
Græcis, lib. iv,
cap. vi, p. 454.

[B] I shall take notice of some small faults in Moreri's Dictionary. I. Moreri, says that he was esteemed in the LXXVth Olympiad, and that he died in the LXXXVIIIth, being eighty-nine years old. This is a wrong calculation. Simonides was at least twenty years of age when he came to be in repute; and therefore, according to Moreri, he should have been born in the LXth Olympiad: from whence it follows, that he would have died at 112 years old, or thereabouts, if he had lived till the LXXXVIIIth Olympiad. If Moreri shews himself a sorry Arithmetician in that respect, he makes it appear also, that he knew not how to transcribe the author quoted by him (2), for that author places the birth of Simonides in the LVth Olympiad, and his death in the LXXXVIIIth Olympiad: which will make up the eighty-nine years of life, that he gives him. II. Moreri mentions one Simonide de Melece (they are his words) more antient than the Lyric Poet, and, in all likelihood, the inventor of four letters of the Greek alphabet. Here is a very childish oversight; for these words Simonide de Melece, are the translation of these, *Simonides Melicus*, which signify *Simonides the Lyric Poet*, and which Moreri had read in Vossius. I could wish, for the honour of Vossius, that these two lines were not to be found in the fourteenth page of his book, concerning the Greek Poets. 'Simonides Melicus qui temporibus belli Medici vixit, quatuor vel quinque literas alphabeto finito adjecit, atque ita illud primus absolvit. . . . Simonides, the Lyric Poet, who lived in the time of the Bellum Medicum, added four or five letters to the alphabet, and so was the first who completed it.' He refers thus to the XXXIXth Olympiad: but we know not what he means by his *Bellum Medicum* at that time. Besides, when in the LVth Olympiad he mentions Simonides, who makes the subject of the foregoing article, he calls him a Lyric Poet, and ascribes to him the in-

vention of four letters (3). Whereby the reader is induced to believe, that he mentions the same Poet twice, and that he makes him flourish from the XXXIXth Olympiad till the LXXVth (4). I confess he observes in the fourteenth page, that Simonides, placed by Eusebius in the XXXIXth Olympiad, cannot be he that was born at Ceos; but why then does he call them both Lyric Poets, and ascribe to them the invention of four letters? But to return to Moreri. III. He says that Simonides the younger was the son of a sister of the other Simonides. He should have said the son of a daughter. He stumbled in a fair way, since he misunderstood these words of Vossius, *Simonides junior, Simonidis Lyrici & filia nepos* (5). IV. Moreri should not have ascribed some poems to him, since Suidas ascribes none to him, and seeing Vossius does not reckon him among the Poets. *Ambigo an & in p. 454. Poëtis ei sit locus* (6). V. Why does Moreri ascribe to him a treatise concerning things lately invented? Does Suidas, or any other writer, mention that circumstance? Were it not an absurd thing to say, that Polydore Virgil wrote a book, wherein he treats of those who had lately invented some things?

(3) Vossius, de
Poëtis Græcis,
pag. 20.

(4) He says he
writ a Poem up-
on the battle of
Salamis. Scripti,
says he, navale
prelium ad Sala-
minem quod
commisitum O-
lympiade
LXXXV. *Ld. ibid.*

(5) *Id. ibid. pag.*
34. See also the
same Vossius, de
Hist. Græcis,
in p. 454.

(6) *Idem, de*
Poëtis Græcis,
pag. 34.

[C] It would be . . . a difficult thing to name one Simonides, that lived with Phalaris. I have read a thing in Vossius's letters, which gives me occasion to make this remark. Vossius being uneasy on account of his friend Puteanus, who was brought into trouble for a political book, wishes his enemies may be contented to tell him what Phalaris did advise Simonides, *Mind only the Muses* (7). Doubtless there is here a slip of memory: I thought at first, that Vossius had said Phalaris instead of Hiero; from whence I concluded that Simonides concerned himself with some court intrigue, that was like to bring him into trouble: but at last, I found out where the mistake lay. Vossius named Simonides instead of Stephichorus, for it is Stephichorus whom Phalaris exhorted to meddle no more with state-affairs, and to mind only his Muses: *Μί-
λοισιν δ' ἐσσι μέσων ἐὺκλειῆς πόροι. Cura tibi fuit
præclara mufarum studia* (8).

(7) *Utinam notis
aliud audire cogi-
tur quam quod
olim in simili fe-
re negotio à Pha-
laris aiant
fuisse dictum Si-
monidi, μέλαιν
οὐ μὲν δὲν οὐ-
κὼς τὴν πόνον
Vossius, Epist.
CXCI, pag.
m. 218. See a-
bove citation.*

(8) of the arti-
cle PUTEA-
NUS.

(8) Phalaris,
Epist. CXLVII,
pag. 141, Edit.
Oxon. 1695.

SIMONIDES (SIMON) one of the best Latin Poets of the XVIth century, was born at Lemberg in Poland, and after having gone through a course of Philosophy at Cracovia, he went to Italy to compleat his studies; from whence he returned, so well stored with learning that John Zamoski, the greatest hero that was in Poland, chose him for his secretary, and shewed him much affection, and procured him the honour of knighthood. Pope Clement VIII honoured him with the poetic garland. Justus Lipsius gives him very great praises, comparing him to Catullus, and maintaining that his poetry might have raised the jealousy of the Antients (a). Simonides entertained in his house at Lemberg in the year 1597, with a very singular affection, George Douza in his journey to Constantinople, who was the son of Janus Douza, a good Poet, and good Humanist. This procured him an encomium to be seen below, together with the title of his Poems [A].

(a) Taken from
Starovolskius in
Centum Script.
Polon. pag. 130,
131.

[A] An encomium to be seen below, with the title of his poems. George Douza writing to his father a relation of his journey, speaks thus of his stay at Lemberg: 'Huic urbi (Leopoli) plurimum me debere fa-
' teor quod hic cum Simone Simonide hospitium &
' amicitiam contrahere licuerit: qui Vir quanto orche-
' stræ plausu Parnassi collem inlitterit, & Scriptis ejus
' editis Ælinopæane videlicet, & casto Josepho, tum
' Joëlis illâ Paraphrafi fati superque confitare arbi-
' tror (1). . . . To this city (Lemberg) I confess I am

(1) Georg. Dou-
za, de itinere
suo Constant.
pag. 14.

' much indebted, because here I had opportunity to lodge in
' the house of Simon Simonides, and to obtain his friend-
' ship: with how much applause of the learned this man
' appeared upon Parnassus, is, I think, sufficiently ma-
' nifest from the works which he published, namely, his
' Ælinopæane, his Josephus, and his paraphrase on Joel.
' His father wrote him a letter from Constantinople,
' wherein he expressed his gratitude for the good of-
' fices of Simonides, and his esteem he had long enter-
' tained for the poems of that Polish gentleman. ' Ne
' P p

scis, mi fili, quantā cum animi voluptate illam Epi-
 stolā tuā particulam legendo ruminaverim, ubi non
 modo tanti viri (Interpretis Polonici, natione Arme-
 nii) faventiam ultrō tibi oblatam gloriari ac prae-
 cas: verum etiam incomparabilis Viri Simonis Si-
 monidis benevolentiae fores jam pridem patefactas
 aditum tibi porrō ad doctissimi illius ac disertissimi
 Interpretis amicitiam concinnasse. . . . Nunc cel-
 sator esse cogor, ac commodiori tempore hoc scri-
 bendi officium referre, praesertim ad Simonem
 Simonidem, quem virum ego jam pridem ex Scriptis
 editis, Aelinopaeane puta, atque Odis Pindaricis tum
 Joelis Paraphrasi illā Poeticā multo quaestissimā,
 procul distitū licet, & veneratus sum & admira-
 ratus (2). . . . You cannot think, dear son, with what
 satisfaction I read that part of your letter, wherein
 you not only mention the friendship which so great a

(2) G. Douza de
 Joinville suo Con-
 stant. pag. 129.

man (the Polish interpreter, by nation an Armenian)
 offered to you of his own accord; but also that the
 obliging incomparable Simonides, by having received
 you kindly into his own house, has given some access to
 the friendship of that most learned and most eloquent in-
 terpreter. . . . but now I am obliged to put off to a
 more convenient opportunity my thanks, especially to
 Simon Simonides, a man whom I have long honoured
 and admired, thro' at a great distance, because of the
 works he hath published, namely, Aelinopaeane, his
 Pindaric Odes, and his poetical Paraphrase on Joel,
 which hath been much sought after.

Besides the poems, whose titles I have already men-
 tioned, Simonides composed Hercules praedictus: Pan-
 zila: Flagellum livoris: Ode in victriam, nuptias,
 atque obitum Samocis, inque victriam Thomae Samocis
 Joannis filii, &c (3).

(3) See Simon
 Steirovolcius, in
 Centum Script.
 Polon. pag. 131.

SIMONIUS (SIMON) a Physician and Philosopher, and author of several
 books [A], lived in the XVIth century. He was of Luca. I think he left his country
 that he might else where make open profession of the Reformed Religion. He was for
 some time, professor of Philosophy at Geneva, and afterwards in the university of
 Heidelberg. After this he was made professor of Physic in the university of Leipzig,
 whence he withdrew into Silesia and Moravia, and thence into Poland, where there is some
 ground to believe he became an Anti-Trinitarian about the end of his days (a). Two letters of
 Theodore Beza greatly confirm this conjecture; for it cannot well be doubted that they
 were written to Simonius [B], and it appears that he, to whom they were written at
 Heidelberg in 1568 and in 1569, followed the opinions of Valentinus Gentilis (b). The
 same letters inform us that Simonius was twice imprisoned at Geneva, and that he was
 censured by the ministers, and was of a restless spirit and at variance with all the world
 (c). He had the presumption to say before a full auditory at Heidelberg that he could
 raise objections to which St Paul himself could not have given an answer [C]. I know
 not

(a) Baillet, num.
 150, of the Anti.

(b) See the re-
 mark [C].

(c) Beza, Epist.
 LIV, pag. m.
 264.

[A] He is the author of several books.] He published
 at Geneva in 1566 a commentary on Aristotle's book
 De sensu & sensibili, in folio. You will find in Lindenius
 renovatus (1), that his Synopsis brevissima novae theoriae
 de humoralium febrium natura, periodis, signis, & cura-
 tione, was printed at Leipzig in the year 1577, in 8vo,
 and at Basil in the year 1580, in 8vo, with his Exa-
 men sententiae a Brunone Stedelio laetæ de iis quæ Joubertus
 ad explicandam febrium humoralium naturam in para-
 doxis suis disputavit; that his, Vera & indubitata ratio
 periodorum, nec non continuationis intermissionisque fe-
 brium humoralium was printed at Leipzig, in the year
 1575, in 4to; that his Methodus artificiosa curandæ
 pestis was printed in the same city, in the year 1576,
 in 4to; that the Simonius supplex was printed at Cra-
 cow in the year 1585, in 4to; that the Scopæ quibus
 vertitur Confutatio quam advocati Nicolai Buccella, Ita-
 li, Chirurgi Anabaptistæ, innumeris mendaciorum, calum-
 niarum, errorumque purgamentis insertam postremo emise-
 runt, was printed at Olmutz in the year 1589, in 4to;
 that his Disputatio de putredine was printed at Cracow
 in the year 1584 in 4to; and that his Respon-
 sum de obitu Stephani Polonorum Regis was printed
 at Olmutz in the year 1588, in 4to. The cata-
 logue of the Bodleian Library ascribes to him a trea-
 tise De vera Nobilitate, printed at Leipzig in the
 year 1572, in 4to: it was reprinted at Iena, in the
 year 1616, by the care of Thomas Sagittarius. This
 book is commended by Naudæus (2). What concerns
 the writings which Simonius published against James
 Schegkianus will afterwards be seen.

(2) Naudæus,
 Bibliogr. Politic.
 pag. m. 544.

[B] It cannot well be doubted that . . . two let-
 ters of Theodore Beza were written to Simonius.] One
 is the LIVth, and the other the LVIth. The latter
 is dated the 13th of March, 1569, and the former
 the 26th of May. The year is not set down, but it
 is undoubtedly the year 1568. What may persuade
 us that they were writ by Beza to Simonius, is his
 censuring a bad doctrine, which was seen in a book
 of Simonius (3). It is thereby that Mr Crenius has
 proved his conjecture. * Epistolæ LIV & LVI (Beza)
 * D. Simoni Simonio inscribendæ sunt. Nam quæ in
 hac ultima epistola Beza perfringit, ista omnia do-
 cuit Simonius in Lectione, quâ explicavit princi-
 pium illud Physicum: ex nihilo nihil fit; d. 30.
 * Decemb. 1568. Heidelb. (4). . . . The fifty-fourth
 * and fifty-sixth letters (of Beza) must be ascribed to
 * Simon Simonius. For all that Beza censures in this
 * last epistle, was taught by Simonius in the lecture where-
 * in he explained that principle of Natural Philosophy; Of
 * nothing nothing is made; on the 30th day of December,

(3) See the re-
 mark [C].

(4) Crenius, A-
 nimadv. Part. ii,
 pag. 91.

'1568, at Heidelberg.' If these words did not clearly
 shew that Simonius lived at Heidelberg when Beza
 wrote him those two letters, I could mention a thing
 which insinuates it. Simonius had written a letter to
 Theodore Beza, that being willing to dispute with
 those who condemned the Geneva discipline, he found
 himself unable to defend it, and there he particularly
 mentions Thomas Erasmus (5), who was then professor
 at Heidelberg.

[C] He had the presumption to say . . . that he could
 raise objections to which St Paul himself could not have
 given an answer.] Beza testifies his indignation there-
 upon as it deserved. 'Sed quo tandem loco, wrote he
 upon as it deserved. 'to him, postremum istud tuum dictum habebimus,
 'posse te multas rationes afferre, quibus ne Paulus
 'quidem ipse, si viveret, respondere posse? Itane
 'verò te potuisse desipere, ut istud quod vel cogi-
 'tare impium & in Deum ipsum blasphemum est,
 'palam etiam, tot audientibus, ausus sis effutire?
 'Tunc miser homuncio, ausus organo Dei electo,
 'cujus tonitrua ferre universa mundi sapientia non
 'potuit, tunc, inquam Spiritui Christi per os Aposto-
 'lorum loquentis opponere quicquam possis, quod re-
 'fellere Dei sapientia non possit? An ignoras quid
 'Elymæ mago, quid Alexandro fabro ærarior, lese
 'Pauli sapientia opponentibus contigerit (6)? . . .
 'But what can we think of that last assertion of your's,
 'that you could bring many objections which St Paul
 'himself, were he alive, could not answer? Is it pos-
 'sible you could be so void of sense, as publicly, and in
 'the hearing of so many people, to utter what was im-
 'pious and blasphemous even to think? Would you have
 'dared, wretched man, to oppose any thing against that
 'chosen instrument of G O D, whose thundering elo-
 'quence all the wisdom of the world was unable to
 'withstand, could you, I say, have objected any thing
 'against that Spirit of C H R I S T, speaking by the mouth
 'of his Apostles, which the wisdom of G O D could not
 'refute? Know you not what beset Elymas the Sorcerer,
 'and Alexander the Copper-smith, who opposed the wis-
 'dom of Paul? Observe that Beza was telling him
 his opinion of a tract concerning the Divine Essence.
 'Allatum est ad nos scriptum de Dei essentia, quod
 'aiunt vel à te dictatum, vel ex te fuisse exceptum,
 'breve quidem illud, seu ejusmodi ut summopere bo-
 'nos & doctos omnes Theologos fit optimo jure offen-
 'surum (7). . . . A dissertation was brought us, which
 'they say was either dictated by or received from you;
 'indeed, it is short, but such as will extremely offend
 'all good and learned Divines, and most justly.' Simonius
 in that tract maintained, that it may be said that the
 Son,

(5) It is of him
 Beza speaks,
 when he says in
 his LIVth letter,
 pag. 265: Et
 quod de quorundam
 hac in re
 judicium comme-
 moras, nihil
 me movet. Imò
 ne de illo quidem
 ipso cujus theses
 sunt, aliud mihi
 persuasi, quam
 veritati sponte
 cessurum. . . .
 And what you
 mention of some in
 this matter, sur-
 prises me not even
 as to the person,
 whose theses they
 are: I never
 thought otherwise,
 but that he, of his
 own accord,
 would yield to the
 truth.

(6) Beza, Epist.
 LVI, pag. 267.

(7) Ibid. p. 266.

not whether we might not conjecture that a book of which I have spoken before, and which bore the title of *Simonis Religio*, was a satire published against him [D]. I shall relate the disputes he had with James Schegkianus [E].

(8) Quum factum dici posse Filium dici, jactis Ariane blasphemiz fundamentum, loqueris contra Scripturam & omnium orthodoxorum morem, objicis omnes nostras Ecclesias calumnias aduersariarum, ut nemo pius hoc audire sine offensione possit, quibusque postea interpretationibus utaris. --- When you say that the Son of God may be said to have been made, you lay the foundation of the Arian blasphemy, speak contrary to the Scripture, and the expression of all Orthodox Divines, you expose all our churches to the reproach of their aduersaries, so as no pious ear can bear it without offence, whatever explanations you may after give. Id. ibid. See also pag. 265.

(9) Id. ibid. pag. 267.

(10) In the remark [B] of the article SIMON (THEODORE).

Son of God was made (8). He added, 1. That the doctrine of the Orthodox concerning the Trinity had no other advantage, but that it was less absurd than that of the Heretics. And, 2. That the Scripture did not afford wherewithal to answer the objections of the Arians, since it affords passages which they wrest to their own advantage. 'Jam vero quis illud ferat quod dicis, nempe eo differre, dogma aduersariarum à nostro, id est mendacium à veritate, tenebras à luce, quod illud quidem plura, nostrum verò pauciora ab- surda consequantur? . . . Quod autem dicere audes testimonium à veris principiis Scripturæ quamvis malè accommodatis niti Antitrinitarios, idèquæ ex verbo Dei ipsis responderi non posse, certè vox est piis omnibus intolerabilis, & quod ad me attinet, si ita sentis, vix alio te loco habuerim, quam hominis profus impij (9) --- But now who can bear what you say, namely, that the opinion of our aduersaries differs only from ours, that is a falsehood from the truth, darkness from light, in this, that theirs is attended with more, ours with fewer absurdities? As to what you presume to say, that the Anti-Trinitarians rely upon testimonies and true principles of Scripture, tho' ill applied, and that therefore they cannot be answered from the word of GOD, this certainly is an assertion intolerable to all pious persons; and as for myself, if this is indeed your persuasion, I cannot think of you otherwise, than as a person altogether impious.

[D] I know not whether we might not conjecture that a book . . . intitled, *Simonis Religio*, was a satire written against him.] That book was printed at Cracow in the year 1588, as I have said elsewhere (10). Which I believe was the time when our Simonius was in Poland. Possibly some adversary may have designed to defame him by publishing a book which might be taken for a description of the opinions of this Physician. This I give as a conjecture, which may excite some curious person to examine the matter,

if he should have the opportunity of a large library.

[E] I shall relate the disputes he had with James Schegkianus.] Here is the account which Mr Baillet hath given of it. 'The dispute began about the year 1569, and it extended to matters of Philosophy, Physics, and Theology. Simonius had advanced something concerning the cause and nature of the fever, which was not at all approved by Schegkianus, and which the latter had occasionally censured. Simonius was no less dissatisfied with this, than with what Schegkianus had objected to him some time before upon some points of Aristotle's Physics, and he refused it in a book, which he called *Anti-Schegkianus*, or rather *Anti-Schegkiana*. The work came out at Basil about the end of the year 1570, in 8vo, with the title of *Anti-Schegkianorum liber unus in quo ad objecta Schegkii respondetur, vœra nonnulla ejusdem errata incutuntur, novaque quamplurima peiora deteguntur*. Schegkianus preparing to answer this work, provisionally published the forerunner of his answer under the title of *Prodromus Anti-Simonii contra Simonem Simonium*, printed at Tubingen in Suabia in the year 1571, in 4to. When Simonius had seen that essay, he made a short reply, which he published not long after. This last work being come to Schegkianus's hands he examined it throughout, and his confutation was ready to be prefixed to his *Anti-Simonius*, and was printed in 1572, under the title of *Anatome Responsi Simonii ad Prodromum Anti-Simonii*. After that he published his large answer to the *Anti-Schegkiana* of Simonius, printed at Tubingen in the year 1573, under the title of *Anti-Simonius*, five, *Refutatio errorum in Philosophia Simonii in suo libro Anti-Schegkianorum, in quo plures quam trecenti errores ejusdem repelluntur*, &c. These two disputants had yet another conflict upon some controversial points in Theology, with respect to a book which Schegkianus had writ concerning the union of the two natures of JESUS CHRIST (11).'

(11) Baillet, num. 110. of the Anti. Note that he thought Simonius was in Saxony, who was then at Heidelberg.

SYNERGISTS. So they called in the XVIth century some German Divines, who thinking that Luther's hypothesis about Free-will was too harsh, taught that men are not converted by the Divine Grace, without the co-operation of human will. This was the fifth schism that arose among the Lutherans (a). Melancthon laid the foundation of it; for Victorinus Strigelius, and some other Divines, who had a great regard for his authority, considered some phrases which they found in his books, whereby it appeared that he ascribed a great power to man's will. Wherefore they maintained that the natural power of Free-will concurred with grace in the conversion of a sinner. George Major, Paul Eberus, Paul Crellius, and Piperinus were the other chief defenders of that opinion (b), and were persecuted by the faction of Illyricus. It is certain that Melancthon could not approve the rigid method of Luther and Calvin about the doctrine of Grace [A]; and it were in vain to alledge, as a proof of his being of the same

(a) Micræus, Syntagm. Hist. Eccles. pag. m. 865.

(b) Ex eodem, ibid.

[A] Melancthon could not approve the rigid method of Luther and Calvin about the doctrine of Grace.] Balduinus has given a good proof of it, when he published an abstract of a letter which Melancthon writ to Calvin, the 11th of May 1543. Calvin had dedicated to him his book *de servitute humani arbitrii* (1). Here is part of the letter wherein he thanks him for it. 'Malint te illam tuam excellentem eloquentiam in aliis materiis magis propriis Ecclesie consumere quam in questione *περί τῆς ἀνάγκης*. (I labebam amicū Tubingæ doctum hominem Franciscum Stadianum, qui dicere solebat se utrumque probare, evenire omnia ut divina providentia decrevit, & tamen esse contingentiam: sed se hæc conciliare non posse. Ego cum hypothesin hanc teneam, Deum non esse causam peccati nec velle peccatum; postea contingentiam in hac nostra infirmitate judicii nostri admittere, ut sciant rudes Davidem sua voluntate ultro rueri. Et eundem sentio cum haberet Spiritum sanctum, potuisse eum retinere & in ea lucta aliquam esse voluntatis actionem. Hæc et si subtilius disputari possunt, tamen ad regendas mentes hoc modo proposita, accommodata videntur. Accusamus ipsi nostram voluntatem cum labimur: non querimus in Dei consilio causam. E contra cum nos erigimus scimus Deum & velle opitulari & adesse luctantibus.

(1) Balduin. in Respons. altera ad Jo. Calvinum, pag. m. 139.

Μίρον ὄκτανεν (inquit Basilus) καὶ ὁδὸς παρὰ πᾶν/α. Excitatur ergo cura in nobis & laudatur Dei immensa bonitas, qui & promittit auxilium, & præstat sed petentibus (2). - - They wish you had rather employed your excellent eloquence in other matters more beneficial to the church than in the question concerning Necessity. I had a friend at Tubingen, a learned man, Francis Stadianus, who used to say, that he believed all things happened according to the decrees of divine providence, and that notwithstanding there were things contingent: but he knew not how to reconcile these two things. I hold this principle, that GOD is not the cause of sin, nor willeth it, and at the same time admit of contingency in this weakness of our judgment, that the ignorant may know that David sinned of his own free choice. And, I think, that having the holy Spirit, he might have retained it, and that in this conflict he might have some power over his will. Tho' these things might be argued more subtilly, yet thus proposed they seem sufficiently suited for the direction of our mind. We blame our own will when we fall; and do not seek the cause in the decree of GOD. On the contrary, when we bold out, we know that GOD hath will and does assist us. Be willing only and GOD is all sufficient, saith Basil. Thus our care is excited, and the boundless goodness of GOD is praised, who hath both promised assistance, and grants

(2) Melancthon. Epist. ad Calvin. and Balduinum, ibid.

same opinion with them upon that head, the great praises he bestowed upon their piety ; for

- 'grants it to those who ask it.' Every body knows that Calvin and Castalio were like fire and water with respect to those doctrines. Now Melancthon being at Worms in 1557, writ a very obliging letter to Castalio, which was a kind of a symbol of fraternity, about the doctrine of Predestination. Porro cum ex eo (ut scis) conventu amicissime scripsisset ad Castalionem, & ejus sententiam nescio quam de prædestinatione & libero arbitrio suam esse significaret: scire potuisti, & quam dampnaret tuam in eo viro vexando intemperiam, & quam ne tum quidem probaret omnia tua paradoxa (3). - - - Moreover seeing (as you know) that after the interview he had writ in a most friendly manner to Castalio, and signified his approbation of I know not what opinion of his concerning Predestination and Free-will: you might have understood, both how much he blamed your excessive vexation of that man, and how even then he disapproved all your paradoxes. They are Balduinus's words to Calvin; and it is to be observed, that he declares to him, he knows not where in Castalio's opinion consists. This ignorance proceeded from two causes: one was, that Castalio's book had been suppressed; the other, that Balduinus did not much care to examine the doctrine of Predestination. He confesses he does not understand it (4). 'Equidem arcanam illam $\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\ \alpha\nu\alpha\gamma\chi\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ quæstionem non excutio, neque Castalionem . . . unquam vidi vel audivi, ac ne per literas quidem unquam sum allocutus . . . neque quod de ea quæstione scripsit (nam & id supprimi pro tuo imperio iussisti) unquam legi: neque quod de fatali necessitate disputas satis intelligo, & in meis ad Minucium annotationibus nuper non dissimulavi mihi non liquere (5). - - - Indeed I do not much search into that abusive question concerning necessity, neither have I ever either seen or spoke with Castalio . . . nor so much as had any correspondence by letters . . . nor did I ever read what he wrote concerning this controversy, for you commanded it to be suppressed: neither do I sufficiently understand what you argue about fatal necessity, nor did I dissemble my ignorance of it in my notes upon Minutius.
- Let us see what Beza answered to that part of Balduinus's book. First, he denied that Melancthon had writ such a letter to Castalio (6): his reason for it was, that all the books of Melancthon, and even the letter produced by Balduinus, shewed that this German Divine differed from Calvin only in his way of expressing himself. In the second place, he alleged a fragment of that letter, to prove that there was a perfect agreement between Melancthon and the Divines of Geneva as to the doctrine. 'In rebus ipsis quam inter illum & nos convenit, unde tandem melius quam ex ipsius testimonio probabitur? Sic ergo scribit in iis literis quarum tu ipse partem castasti: Quum autem & honorifico me testimonio ornaris, & de tota re non solum piè, sed etiam eloquenter differueris, de utraque re, videlicet de mea gratitudine, & de ipsa disputatione coram nos, ut soliti sumus quoties unâ sumus, prolixè colloqui posse optarim. Est enim tantum vel ingenii vel doctrinæ mihi non arrego quantum tribuis, & nos imprimis in Ecclesia agnoscere nostram imbecillitatem decet, tamen benevolentia erga me tua vehementer delector, tibi gratiam habeo quòd in scripto luculento (loquitur autem de Calvini libris de libero arbitrio adversus Pighium scriptis) tanquam in illustris positam loco extare significationem amoris erga me tui voluisti. An hæc verba sunt, Balduine, hominis à Calvino dissentientis (7)? - - - How far we agreed with him as to the things themselves, whereby can it better be proved than by his own testimony? Thus he writes in these letters, a part of which you have quoted: Seeing then you have both given me an honourable testimony, and have reasoned upon the whole matter, not only piously but eloquently, I could have wished we might have discoursed at large of both matters, namely of my gratitude, and of the dispute itself before us, as we were wont when we were together. For although I do not arrogate to myself so much either of wit or learning, as you are pleased to ascribe to me, and it becomes us, especially in the Church, to acknowledge our own weakness, notwithstanding I am exceedingly delighted with your benevolence towards me, and esteem myself much beholden to you,
- that you would have the testimony of your love to me to be recorded in your excellent works (he speaks of Calvin's books concerning Free-will against Pighius). Are these, Balduinus, the expressions of a man, who differs from Calvin? Thirdly, he taxed Balduinus with a notorious falsification; and to prove his charge against him, he alleged a period maliciously left out of Melancthon's letter. That period runs thus: 'Hæc non scribo ut tibi tradam quasi dictata homini & eruditissimo & peritissimo exercitiorum pietatis: & quidem SCIO HÆC CUM TUIS CONGRUERE, sed sunt $\alpha\pi\alpha\chi\eta\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, & ad usum accommodata (8). - - - (8) Id. ibid. These things I write not, as if dictating to you, a man most learned and most skillful in all exercises of piety: and indeed I know THESE THINGS AGREE WITH YOUR THOUGHTS, but they are coarse, and fitted for use.' Beza's first observation is not solid; he himself affords us the refutation of it; for in a book, wherein he did not think of Balduinus, and was not aware of saying something that might serve that adversary, he ingenuously confesses that Melancthon had censured the Divines of Geneva, as if they had introduced the fatality of the Stoics. 'Basilæ verò Castellio . . . non obscurè Pelagianismum tuebatur. Quinetiam his de rebus ita scribere cœperat Philippus, ut quamvis antea Calvinus adversus Pighium libro diserte subscripsisset, tamen Genevenses quasi Stoicum Fatum invehentes notare quibudam videre-tur (9). - - - At Basil Castellio . . . did clearly enough mention Pelagianism. And even Melancthon began so to write of these things, that though before he had directly subscribed to Calvin's book against Pighius, he, notwithstanding, seemed to some to charge those of Geneva as introducing the fate of the Stoics.' These words of Beza plainly shew, that neither all the books of Melancthon, nor the very letter he writ to Calvin, (I mean the letter, out of which Balduinus quoted a passage) were proper to refute those who maintained that he had writ a letter of approbation to Castalio. The second part of Beza's answer has no force in it; for the praises Melancthon bestowed upon Calvin, do not prove that he was of his opinion. He had so much equity, moderation, and civility, that he did justice even to those who maintained opinions he did not approve. Tho' he was prepossessed in favour of Free-will, he could discern the great parts, and the piety, and eloquence which Calvin discovered in maintaining the contrary opinion, and could not forbear to congratulate him on account of his being author of such a work. I shall enlarge hereafter upon this thought (10). What Beza says in the third place is his best remark, and yet it is not very solid. He justly exclaims against Balduinus, and treats him as a deceiver: the omission of that period shews Balduinus's unfairness; he would not have left it out, had he not been afraid of doing himself some prejudice by producing it. And therefore he designed to impose upon his readers, and to carry the cause by a trick and *dolo malo*. But I must observe, that on this occasion Balduinus shewed as little judgment as sincerity; for had he considered well, he might easily have perceived that the period he left out was not prejudicial to him. A man who hath declared that he admits an active and even an antecedent concurrence of the will, and that he wishes no body would write books to maintain the necessity of human actions, shews plainly enough that he is not of Calvin's opinion. Now this is what Melancthon had declared in the words alleged by Balduinus: and therefore if he declares afterwards, that he does not advance those things, as if Calvin wanted to know them, and that he thinks they agree, at the bottom, with Calvin's doctrine, tho' they are not propoed with the subtilty of that Divine, but in a plain, coarse, and more popular manner; I say, if he acts thus, it is plain he does it out of civility, and compliment, to divest himself of the odious appearance of a man, who takes upon himself to advise and censure others. Every body knows there is a civil way of putting people in mind of their duty, which consists in telling them they are not ignorant that such and such things ought to be done, and that they do not want to be told of it. I cannot sufficiently wonder how Beza could undertake to maintain against Balduinus, that Melancthon, and the Divines of Geneva taught the same thing concerning Free-will.

for he was a man who knew very well how to avoid the ill consequences of prepossession. He believed that men might err through a good motive [B]. What I shall say thereupon will

(11) See above citation (9).

(12) Audiveras paulo antequam huc scriberes in Saxonia inter Illyricum & Victorinum magnam fuisse questionem *an sit adestus* Tu Illyricum qui tecum sentis, forte non potes: Victorinum qui Melancthonem sequitur non oppugnas. Balduinus, in Responsi. altera ad Calvin. pag. 141.

(13) Virgil. Eclog. I, ver. 72.

(14) Responsi. ad Calvinum & Bezan pro Franc. Balduino, fol. 145. verso.

melancthon
& Calvin

This he maintained in the year 1563. He knew what he wrote since in the life of Calvin (11); he was not ignorant of the disputes of the Synergists mentioned by Balduinus (12). But what will a man not do in the heat of dispute? *En quo discordia civis* (13)?

I fancy the readers will not be displeased to know what Balduinus replied. He was silent as to the omission of the period, finding no other way to hide his shame; but as to the rest, he answered haughtily, and in a few words, 'Nil quicquam impudentius dici aut fingi potest quam quod jam contendis, hac tota in re Philippum idem quod vos, & vos idem quod Philippus sentire. Nam etsi nonnisi postremis ejus libris & sententiis standum esse dicas, tamen quod postremo ad articulos Bavaricos scripsit, an cum doctrina in hoc genere vestra plane consentit (14)? - - - Nothing more impudent can be spoken or imagined than what you affirm, that in all this matter Melancthon is of the same opinion as you, and you as he. For though you say we must stand to his last books and opinions, yet what he last wrote upon the Bavarian articles, does it plainly agree with your doctrine upon this subject?' [B]

Melancthon believed that one might err through a good motive. A haughty and choleric Divine, will be so excessively fond of his opinions, that he thinks none can oppose them without acting against common sense, or the dictates of his conscience. He hardens and devotes himself to his own prejudices the more, as you strongly argue against him. But a moderate, modest, and humble Divine, and of a phlegmatic temper, as Melancthon was, takes a different course. Though he rejects an opinion as being false and dangerous, yet he will do justice to those who maintain it: He acknowledges not only their other excellent qualities, and commends them for them, but also does not scruple to own that they have very specious reasons to maintain it. He will not therefore break with them, nor loosen the bonds of fraternity, whilst the dissension is confined within certain bounds. From whence it appears that neither Melancthon's letters to Calvin, nor the praises he bestowed upon him in printed books, can prove that they agreed in the doctrine of Free-will. All that can be inferred from thence is, that he was so equitable as to distinguish these two things one from another, Calvin's doctrine, as he considered it, and that same doctrine as Calvin himself considered it. He thought that doctrine made God the author of sin; but he very well knew that Calvin did not teach it under that notion, and would have looked upon it as an abominable tenet if so considered. He was not ignorant, under what form it appeared to Calvin, namely, under the appearance of a system, grounded upon several passages of the scripture, and tending to maintain the rights of God's providence, and those of the dispensation of the new law. He was not ignorant that the doctrine of Free-will appeared to Calvin under a monstrous shape, as destructive of providence, and directly contrary to St Paul's Epistles, and to the glory that redounds to God from mens salvation. And therefore, tho' Melancthon did not approve Calvin's opinion, yet he believed that it was grounded upon a motive worthy of a good man, and a zealous servant of God: Notwithstanding their different notions, they agreed in this maxim, That of two opinions, that which is most consonant to the scripture, and to the glory of God, ought to be preferred to the other. Their perfect agreement in this point, occasioned their discord; for, in consequence of this maxim, Calvin embraced the doctrine of Necessity, and Melancthon that of Free-will. One of them believed that the supreme empire of God over all things, and the rights of a providence, worthy of the Infinite Being, required an absolute Predestination. The other believed that the goodness, holiness, and justice of the Supreme Being required there should be some contingency in our actions. Such were the grounds they went upon. Both of them aimed at the same thing, viz. at the greatest glory of God, but they took different ways. Was this a sufficient reason for them not to own one another for brethren, and fellow-labourers in the Lord's vineyard (15)?

VOL. V.

I foresee it will be objected to me, that those different ways should have obliged those two Divines to anathematize one another, since Melancthon should have believed that, under pretence of asserting the rights of the divine authority, Calvin destroyed the goodness, the holiness, and the justice of God, by making him the author of sin and eternal misery; and, on the contrary, Calvin should have maintained, that under colour of preserving those three divine attributes, Melancthon overturned providence and the empire of God, by asserting that man has a Free-will. But here is a very good solution to this difficulty. If Calvin had argued thus: Not being able to preserve all the attributes of God, I give over part of them, that I may preserve the rest, and I rather chuse to sacrifice the moral virtues to the physical ones, than the physical to the moral; I rather chuse to make him a powerful master, than a good master; he would have deserved to be anathematized by all men. But he maintained on all occasions, that, by asserting the supreme authority of God, he did not intend in the least to derogate from the moral Perfections of the infinite being, from his goodness, his holiness, his righteousness. And therefore Melancthon had been very unjust to have cavilled personally with him on that account, I mean to have imputed to him consequences, which at the worst were only drawn from his doctrine, since Calvin disowned them; which he did in these words. 'Ubique in scriptis suis clamat (Calvinus) quoties de peccato agitur, non miscendum esse Dei nomen: quia in Dei naturam non nisi perfecta rectitudo & aequitas competit. Quam putida igitur calumnia est, hominem de Ecclesia Dei bene meritum, crimine hoc involvere, quod Deum faciat autorem peccati? Docet quidem ubique nihil fieri nisi volente Deo. Interea quæ sceleratè sunt ab hominibus Deum arcano judicio ita moderari asserit, ne quid affine habeat hominum vitio. Summa doctrinæ ejus est, Deum mirabiliter, & modis nobis incognitis, in quemcumque vult finem omnia dirigere, ut æterna ejus voluntas prima sit rerum omnium causa. Cur autem velit Deus quod nobis videtur minimè consentaneum, fatetur esse incomprehensibile. Ideoque nimis curiosè & audacter investigandum esse negat: quoniam judicia Dei sint abyssus multa, & mysteria quæ modulum nostrum superant, reverenter adorare conveniat potius, quam excutere. Interea principium illud retinet, Quamvis nos ratio consilii lateat, semper tribuendam esse Deo justitiæ laudem: quia ejus voluntas summa sit equitatis regula (16). - - - Calvin in his writings every where declares, when he treats of the cause of sin, that the name of GOD ought not to be mentioned: because the nature of GOD is perfectly upright and righteous. How rank a calumny therefore is it, to charge a man who bath so well deserved of the Church of GOD, with making GOD the author of sin? He teaches indeed on all occasions, that nothing can be but what GOD wills. He says, that the wicked actions of men are so ruled by the secret judgment of GOD, as that he is no ways accessory to them. The sum of what he teaches is, that GOD wonderfully, and in ways to us unknown, directs all things to whatever end he pleases, so that his eternal will is the first cause of all things. But why GOD wills what seems to us not suitable to his nature, he acknowledges to be incomprehensible. And therefore denieth that it should be over-curiously and boldly searched into: because the judgments of GOD are a vast abyss, and mysteries beyond our reach, which ought with awful reverence to be adored rather than searched into. But still he keeps to this principle, tho' the reason of his counsel be unknown to us, the praise of righteousness is ever to be given to GOD: because his will is the supreme rule of equity.' Warm and passionate men will not be satisfied with such a wife answer; but Melancthon, who was a lover of peace, and whose great equity and modesty enabled him clearly to discover the weak and the strong side of the opinions he approved or rejected; Melancthon, I say, being of such a disposition of mind, was always ready to do justice to Calvin. Every body should imitate that equitable Divine. Tho' you should clearly prove against a Predestinarian, that his system is

Q9

necessarily

equitable

(16) Calvinus, in brevi Responsione ad diluendas nebulas cujusdam calumnie, pag. m. 290, Tractat. Theologicus. See Dictionary, citation (49), of the explanation on the Manichees.

SYNERGISTS.

154

will give me occasion to examine the answer [C], that was made to a passage in the Philosophical

necessarily attended with this consequence. Therefore God is the author of sin, you should be contented with this answer as to his person; I see, as well as with this answer as to his principle with that consequence, and my reason that sees it, does not afford me a sufficient knowledge to make me understand how I am mistaken in seeing it; nevertheless, I am fully persuaded, that God finds in the infinite treasures of his wisdom, a certain way of breaking that connexion; a way, I say, certain and most infallible, tho' it be unknown to me, and surpasses the reach of my knowledge. A Christian ought chiefly to value himself upon his submitting to God's authority.

Not to believe what is seen, ought frequently to be the motto of a Christian, as well as to believe what is not seen. This is, in effect, the sense of Calvin's words, which we have just now seen. Melancthon, and any other Divine, who asserts man's Free-will, would be the more to blame for not being satisfied with this answer, because they are forced to have recourse to such an explanation; for, provided they have any sincerity, they acknowledge that the manner of reconciling God's providence, and his precision with man's Free-will, is incomprehensible to them (17). Thus they are driven into the same precipice into which they drove others; they take refuge in their turn in the incomprehensibility of God's nature, with respect to the weakness of human reason.

It is therefore a great subject of scandal to see the divisions occasioned by the disputes about Grace. Every sect taxes the other with teaching impious things and horrid blasphemies, and carries animosity to the highest degree; and yet, it is about such doctrines that a mutual toleration should most readily take place. The too immoderate zeal of either of the parties might be excused, if they could clearly prove their opinions, and answer all objections clearly, directly, and in a convincing manner; but that men who are obliged to say, that they have no better solution to give, but that these are secrets impenetrable to the human mind, and concealed in the infinite treasures of the incomprehensible divine immensity: for such persons, I say, to practise barbarous cruelty, to thunder out anathemas, banish and hang those who dissent from them, is a thing which appears to me inexcusable. Melancthon was more human. He did not believe that those, who deny Free-will, are unworthy of being looked upon as God's servants; he excused them on account of the obscurity of the matter, and the goodness of their motives.

Nothing would be more useful than to make serious reflections upon what is to be found concerning that controversy in a book of Dr Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury (18).

[C] The answer, that was made to a passage in the Philosophical Commentary upon these words, Compel them to come in. I think one of the reasons why Melancthon expressed so great a moderation about this dispute, was his considering that the method God thought fit to use, was chosen by him among infinite others equally worthy of the most perfect being. Now this consequence arises from that consideration; viz. that a man may be mistaken in explaining Theological doctrines, without ascribing any thing to God that is prejudicial to his perfections: for those are mistaken, who embrace an hypothesis not consonant to what God has actually done; but if it be agreeable to one of the other methods he might have chosen, it ascribes to God a conduct altogether worthy of him. Let us clear the matter by an example. Let us suppose that Solomon, who used to exchange letters with the King of Tyre (19), writ to him a letter in cyphers, wherein he argued about a state affair. Let us suppose that Titius and Mevius being ordered to decypher that letter, did not make use of the same key; one of them took for an A what the other took for an O, and so with the other figures, Titius found out Solomon's intentions, and consequently Mevius missed it; but nevertheless Mevius found out so reasonable and so coherent a sense, that Solomon's wisdom appeared as much by it as by that of Mevius. It might have been objected to Mevius, that he ascribed some things to Solomon inconsistent with the usual course of prudence; but he might have

answered, that Solomon being a man of a vast genius, dived so far into political affairs, as to find out things that were above the capacity of other men. And therefore, would he have said, what surprises us in the present case, ought to be looked upon as an effect of his extraordinary wisdom. A like objection might have been raised against Titius, and he would have answered it the same way. The great genius of that King of Jerusalem would have served for a new key to resolve the particular difficulties in the explanation of the cypher. None but he could have determined whether Titius had been either more fortunate or more knowing than Mevius; but perceiving, on one hand, that Mevius ascribed to him a sublime reasoning, and on the other, that if there remained any difficulty in it, it was removed by a supposition very glorious to his wisdom, he might have been as well-pleased with Mevius as with Titius and might have spoken thus to them: One of you makes me think what I have thought, and the other what I might have thought with an equal glory.

It will be readily granted me, that this is an image of the fate of Astronomers, who explain the celestial phenomena by opposite systems. Those phenomena are like an enigmatical letter, delivered by God to be decyphered by Astronomers: Some take the motion of the earth, and others its rest, for their key. The revolution of the earth round its axes, is by some of them used to account for the precession of the equinoxes (20); others chuse rather spiral lines (21), and so of the rest. The three systems, viz. of Ptolemy, Copernicus, and Tycho Brahe, though never so different, each explains the phenomena; and yet there is but one that is true. This was Mr Marion's meaning (22), when he said that Copernicus's system was an opinion true in art, and false in nature. But as all the followers of those systems are agreed in admiring in the work the infinite power and infinite wisdom of the author of it, they are not afraid of offending God if they should be mistaken. They think that if he does not perform those things as they fancy he does, he might so do it without any prejudice to his perfections, and that having an infinite knowledge, he has the ideas of infinite plans of the world, all perfectly beautiful, and worthy of the most wise and most perfect being. I am sure that a Copernician, after much exclaiming against Ptolemy's system, and the perplexities of so many circles and epicycles, and against the insignificance of the prodigious swiftness of the firmament, &c. will confess, if he considers it, that all the faults he observes in that hypothesis might be made up by advantages, not to be found in the simple mechanism of the motion of the earth. Whoever considers the ideas of an infinite knowledge, will see the possibility of such a compensation; he will perceive that man is not the only being, for whom such great objects are designed. He will be sensible that the inconceivable rapidity of the celestial spheres might be of a wonderful use, with respect to some parts of the universe, placed beyond the reach of our sight; in a word, that if Ptolemy's system is false, yet it is still possible, and consequently very worthy of the Creator's wisdom; for if it was unworthy of it, it would not be possible. I do not think that any Astronomer, who is conscious to himself, that he prefers that system to all others, because all things duly considered, he believes it to be more consonant to God's choice, would be afraid of appearing before the judge of the world with such an opinion, tho' it should prove false. I think he would expect that the Copernican and himself should, both of them, receive an answer, much like that which I have supposed Solomon would have made to Titius and Mevius. Few people will deny this; but if the question was about a point of Divinity, an infinite number of Divines would deny it (23). I presume that Melancthon would be none of them, as to the two systems, concerning Predestination, that of Liberty, and that of Necessity. He would suppose that the system is false probable, possible, and not contrary to God's perfections.

Laying aside the doctrinal part of those questions, I shall mention a fact, which the laws of history warrant me to take notice of; and if I add some criticisms to my narrative, I shall do nothing inconsistent with the design of this Dictionary. A minister

(20) See Rohault's Physics, Tom. ii, ch. xii, pag. m. 77, and Regius's Philosophy, Vol. iii, lib. iii, Part ii, ch. vi, pag. m. 128, Edit. in 12mo.

(21) See the best instructed, Unus ou les Tables des Philosophes, Tom. iii, pag. 44.

(22) In one of his pleadings. See Mr Arnault, Difficulté à Souter, Part. i, pag. 101.

(23) If the question was only in foretel eclipses, and other phenomena, to satisfy our curiosity, or for the use of life, one might be free to chuse a system; different hypotheses might be reconciled with the same phenomena; or if one had an ill success, it were but a mistake attended with no ill consequence. Whether we follow Ptolemy's system, or Tycho-Brahe's, or Kepler's, or Copernicus's, it signifies but little, as long as we do not positively affirm a thing of which we have not a mathematical certainty. But it is not so with systems of religion. See, ubi infra, p. 355.

the ans r

in 2x ans

one

of many

Joe man

(17) Beza objects to them, that they have no other answer when they are pressed hard. I have quoted his words in the remark [H] of the article CASTALIO, citation (93).

(18) Mr de Beaumont gives an extract of it, in his Histoire des Ouvrages des Savans, Off. 1699, pag. 435, & seq. and also Bernard, in Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, for August 1700, pag. 155, & seq.

(19) Joseph. Ant. Jud. lib. viii, cap. ii, fol. m. 215.

Philosophical Commentary upon these words, *Compel them to come in.*

of Utrecht, in his reflexions upon the Philosophical Commentary, has confuted the following passage as strongly as he could. 'Here is a hint that may serve to remove the phantoms and panic fears, wherewith Divines have been so long troubled upon the subject of error; for it is certain, that the reason why men find so many arguments, which seem to be of an equal solidity to maintain truth and falshood in controversies about religion, is that most falsities that appear in them are as possible as the truths. In effect, we all suppose that revelation depends upon a free decree of God; for he is not necessitated by his nature to make men or any other being. And consequently he might, if he had pleased, have produced nothings, or produced a world different from this; and if he had designed to place therein men, he might have directed them to his ends, by methods quite contrary to those he has pitched upon, and which would have been equally worthy of the most perfect being; for an infinite wisdom has infinite ways of manifesting itself, that are all worthy of it. Which being so, it is no wonder if Divines find as many arguments to maintain Free-will as to impugn it; for we have ideas and principles to apprehend and to prove, that God could have made man a free creature, and not have bestowed upon him a liberty of indifference, as it is called; and the same may be said of an hundred other contradictory propositions, 2 *Tom. Suppl. chap. 24. pag. 308, 309, 310 (24).*' The reflexions upon this passage, as far as they concern the present subject, may be reduced to this interrogation: *Who told him that we have ideas and principles to apprehend and to prove, that GOD could make man a free creature, and forbear bestowing upon him a liberty of indifference (25).* I believe Mr Saurin would not have asked such a question, if he had well-considered, that for the space of one hundred and fifty years, a vast number of books have been published all over Europe, for and against liberty, in which each party make unanswerable objections. He would have confessed then that we have *ideas and principles to apprehend, &c.* Let him peruse some books written by the Arminians or the Calvinists, the Molinists or the Jansenists, and he will see that those ideas and principles are very plentiful in mens minds. He adds (26) that *there are contradictory things, repugnant to GOD's nature; and consequently impossible . . . that GOD could not create bodies without extension and three dimensions, nor spirits without being endowed with the faculty of thinking.* These words are to no purpose; for the commentator said nothing, whereby he insinuates that there are not some things absolutely impossible: To what purpose then does Mr Saurin observe, that the attributes, which constitute the essence of a creature, cannot be separated from it? Did the Commentator doubt of that truth? If God (Mr Saurin goes on) (27), *has not made man endowed with his liberty of indifference, our Philosopher cannot know whether he could have created him with that liberty; and whether that liberty is not as contradictory as a square circle, or an independent creature.* I do not understand this well enough to confute it; but I think that Melancthon being to answer such an objection, would have been contented to say, I do not love to use subtilities upon this subject, I follow the notions of the people, I believe God has freely made all his works, and I wonder a minister calls such a truth into question (28). His intimating that the liberty of indifference is as contradictory as a square circle is still more strange to me, since he affirms a little after, *that it is impossible GOD should produce an intelligent creature, without giving him some laws (29).* The laws God gave to Adam were attended with promises and threatenings: which clearly supposes that it was in Adam's power to obey or disobey. The most rigid Divines, St Augustin and Calvin, expressly teach, that men have lost their free-will only because Adam made an ill use of it in the terrestrial Paradise. I desire no more than this to be certain, that it is possible for God to bestow a liberty of indifference upon men. Had he not bestowed it upon Adam, all our systems of religion would come to nothing: From whence I conclude, that God gave him such a liberty; now every body knows, that from the act to the power, the consequence holds good (30). But I conceive he might

have made him determined to good things, in such a manner, as never to waver between good and evil; and therefore the hypothesis of man's liberty, and that of necessity, appear both possible to me. This is what I think Melancthon might have answered. I think also he would have taken it ill, that the author of the reflexions upon the Philosophical Commentary did not declare his opinion, but was contented with an *If GOD, &c.* an indeterminate phrase, from which one may infer, that the privation of free-will implies a contradiction: For if it should follow from God's creating Adam without a liberty of indifference, that it is a liberty which implies contradiction; others would maintain, that if he had created him with that liberty, it would follow, that the determination to one of the contraries would be as impossible as a square circle. I omit what the author of the reflexion says against the commentator, who advances that the proofs of a false thing are sometimes as good as the proofs of a true one. What Mr Saurin answers to it is full of needless things; for it is needless in a dispute to prove to an adversary what he does not deny. The only thing that does not seem superfluous is his saying, that the *reasons which determine us to the choice of a religion, ought to be moral demonstrations (31)*: But even that is of no use in the controversy about Free-will mentioned by the commentator; for since each party pretends to such demonstrations, it is referring us to equivocal signs.

Here follows another passage of the Commentary.

(32) What do they do then, when the revelation (32) *Id. ibid.* is doubtful about some point? Why some explain *pag. 327.*

it by one system, and others by another. Granting that one of those systems is consonant to the method which God has actually pitched upon, it does not follow that the other system is not consonant to what he might have done with the same glory and wisdom he has discovered by doing another thing, since we conceive that God might have done things otherwise than he has done them, a thousand different ways, all worthy of his infinite perfection: otherwise, he would not be a free being, and would not differ from the God of the Stoics, chained down by an unavoidable fate, a doctrine little better than Spinozism. And consequently, no false system can be pernicious; but when a Divine builds it upon notions, which he believes to be contrary to God's word, and unbecoming his majesty. But I think there are no such Divines in the world. 2 *Tom. Suppl. chap. 24. pag. 310, 311.* Mr Saurin comparing those words with another passage, wherein the commentator says, *he will not take advantage of the comparison of a prince, whose vast empire should contain many nations, that have different laws, ways, customs, and languages; thinks*

(33), that the commentator thereby justifies, not only all the sects of Christianity, but all those of Paganism. I wonder he did not perceive that his adversary confines himself to the systems grounded on the different senses put upon the scripture (34). Here follows another passage, at which you will be surprised. GOD might have done things otherwise than he has done them, a thousand different ways, all worthy of his infinite perfection. Mr Saurin (35) having quoted again those words of the Philosophical Commentary, confutes them with a distinction between the essential parts of religion, and those that are not essential; and then he says (36): 'The author makes

'no such distinction; he uses an universal proposition; GOD might have done things otherwise than he has done them, an hundred different ways. And what is there remarkable, is that among those different ways he reckons those, that have been imagined by the heathen Poets, and the Chinese Philosophers; for he will justify all the systems of religion, that have been invented by Divines, and received by the people. In order to prove his assertion, he alleges the liberty of God. Otherwise, says he, he would not be a free being, and would not differ from the GOD of the Stoics, chained down by an unavoidable fate, a doctrine little better than Spinozism. Were this consequence right, God would have the most dreadful liberty of indifference that can be imagined. He might lie and perjure himself, when he swears by himself: he might command us to hate him, and forbid

(24) Saurin, Reflex. sur les Droits de la Conscience, pag. 323.

(25) *Id. ibid.* pag. 324.

(26) *Id. ibid.*

(27) *Id. ibid.* pag. 325.

(28) The words, if God has not made man endowed with a liberty of indifference imply a doubt.

(29) Saurin, Reflex. sur les Droits de la Conscience, pag. 330.

(30) Ab acta vel potentiam valet consequentia.

(31) *Id. ibid.* pag. 329.

(34) What do they do then, when the revelation is doubtful about some point? Comment. Philosoph. quoted by Mr Saurin, *ubi supra*, pag. 327.

(35) *Id. ibid.* pag. 329.

(36) *Id. ibid.* pag. 330.

SIRIS.

156

forbid us to love him: he might command us to chery, and perjury, in a word all sorts of crimes: in short, he might turn all virtues into as many vices, and all vices into as many virtues. These few words are sufficient to refute those reflexions: mind this clause, ALL WORTHY OF HIS INFINITE PERFECTION. It shews, with the utmost evidence, that God's liberty does not consist in being able to act right or wrong, wisely or imprudently; but in having the power of choosing among infinite plans, equally beautiful and good, one or another, as he thinks fit. Can this signify that he might have introduced the false worship sung by the heathen Poets? Are they worthy of his infinite perfection?

SIRIS, a river of Italy, at the mouth of which there was a town called SIRIS, went successively by several other names [A]. That town was said to have been built by the Trojans, and to prove it, they shewed there a statue of the Trojan Minerva (a). It was shewn still in Strabo's time, as a miraculous image; for it looked downwards, and the reason given for it is, that the goddess conceived a great horror, when the Ionians took the town, and shewed no respect for that statue. Several inhabitants fled to that Minerva, and there implored the clemency of the conquerors, as in a place of refuge which they thought to be inviolable; but the enemies had no regard to their intreaties, and they were barbarously dragged out of that sanctuary (b). The goddess had not the courage to behold such an irreverence. This was the reason why she cast her eyes downwards. It was not the first time that a dreadful sight made her turn her eyes another way: she had done it before at Troy when Cassandra was ravished (c). The author, from whom I have these particulars, makes a judicious reflexion upon the great number of statues, which the Trojans were said to have consecrated since their dispersion [B]. Mr de Marolles, Abbot of Villeloin, made the same observation [C], upon the frequent multiplication of the same relick. I have observed in another place (d) Florus's mistake about the river Siris.

(a) Strabo, lib. vi, pag. 188.

(b) Id. ibid.

(c) Id. ibid.

(d) In the second article P Y R - R H U S, remark [C].

[A] Went successively by several other names. Consult Cluverius (1), he will tell you it was called *Leuternia*, *Polium*, *Heracium*. He says that the Tarentines having built Heraclea three miles above the mouth of the river Siris, removed thither the inhabitants of Siris; so that from that time the town of Siris was only the port of the town of Heraclea. According to Stephanus Byzantinus, the town of Siris was called *Polium* by the Trojans; but according to Tzetzes it was called *Polium*, before it went by the name of Siris. It may be inferred from Lycophron, Strabo, and the same Tzetzes, that *Leuternia* was its first name (2).

[B] Strabo makes a judicious reflexion upon the great number of statues. . . which the Trojans had consecrated since their dispersion. It is a piece of impudence, says he, to pretend, not only that a statue did formerly cast its eyes downwards, but even, that such a statue may be seen to this day. It is still a greater impudence to mention a great number of such statues brought from Troy. They boast at Rome, at Lavinium, at Luceria, and at Siris, that they have the Minerva of the Trojans; and what is said of the Trojan women is applied to several other places; and therefore tho' the thing be possible, it does not appear credible. *Ἰταμὸν μὲν ἔν καὶ τὸ ἔργον μνησθῆναι ὡς τε μὴ μόνον καλῶνται φαινόμενον, καθάπερ καὶ τὸ ἐν Ἰλίου ἀποσπέντα κατὰ τὸν Κασσάνδρας βιασμένον, ἀλλὰ καὶ καλῶνται δεικνυσθαι. Πολλοὶ δὲ ἰταμώτερον τὸ τοιαῦτα ποιεῖν ἐξ ἰλίου κομισμένην ἔχοντα ὅσα φασὶν οἱ συγγραφεῖς. καὶ γὰρ ἐν Ῥώμῃ, καὶ ἐν Λαβινίῳ, καὶ ἐν Λυκερίᾳ, καὶ ἐν Σιρίτιδι Ἰλίδος Ἀθηνᾶ καλεῖται ὡς ἐκείδεν κομισθείσα. Καὶ τὸ τῶν Τρωάδων δὲ τόλμημα, πεισθίσαι πολλὰ ἄλλ', καὶ ἀπιστοῖ φανταί, καίπερ δύνασθαι οἱ. Enimvero protervum est fingere, simulacrum aliquod non modo visum fuisse conivertit, sicut imaginem Minervae illi servat oculos avertisse cum violaretur Cassandra: sed fabule adicere, simulacrum etiamnum conivertit: confici. At multo etiam protervius est ea ab illo allata fabulari, quae scriptores ponunt. Nam & Romae, & Lavinii, & Luceriae, & Siritiidi Minerva habetur Iliaca, quasi ab illo allata: & facinus mulierum Trojanarum multis adscribitur locis, eoque fides ei derogatur cum fieri tamen potuerit (3). I have set down the Greek for the satisfaction of those, who are never pleased, unless they see the original words, and likewise to exempt my self from a strict translation of that passage. Strabo's reflexion is very judicious; for if the variations of Historians are not a certain character of fallity, they afford at least a just pretence to suspend one's belief: and when several towns pretend to have the same miraculous image, it is a very strong presumption that all of them fallily boast of it, and that the same trick,*

and the same interest moves them to set up their traditions.

[C] The Abbot of Villeloin made the same observation. Let us see his own words. 'As they were shewing (4) her the head of St John the Baptist, which the people there reverence as one of the most considerable relics in the world; after she had kissed it, she bad me come near, and do the same. I considered the shrine, and what was in it: I kissed it as others did, and was contented to say, as softly as possible, that it was the fifth or sixth head of St John the Baptist, which I had had the honour to kiss: at which her highness was a little surprised, and could not forbear smiling, but it was not perceived: and the sacrificer, or treasurer, who also took notice of what I said, replied, he could not deny that several others were mentioned (for perhaps he had been told that the same head was to be seen in St John's Church at Lyons, at St Jean de Morienne, at St Jean d'Angeli in Saintonge, at Rome, in Spain, in Germany, and in several other places) but that the head he shewed was the true one. And to prove the truth of his assertion, he desired us to observe the hole that was in the scull of that relic above the right eye, that it was the same hole that Herodias made in it with her knife when the head was brought to her in a dish. I think, said I, the Gospel does not mention so remarkable a particular; but perceiving he was resolved to maintain the contrary, I yielded very respectfully: and without entering into a farther examination of the matter, or alledging the authority of St Gregory Nazianzen, who says that all the bones of St John the Baptist were burnt in his time by the Donatists, in the town of Sebastia, and that nothing remained of them but a small part of the head, which was carried to Alexandria, I was contented to tell him that the tradition of so venerable a church as that of Amiens, was sufficient to authorize such a belief, tho' it was not above four hundred years old, and tho' it was not an article of faith. However, people purchased many representations of that holy relic, and the honest priest was very well satisfied (5). The author of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (6), speaking of a book written about the holy handkerchief, mentioned this passage of the Abbot of Villeloin, and related these words of Charles Patin, the son (7). I am only sorry to see so often the picture of the Virgin drawn by St Luke; for it is certain people are mistaken about most of them, it being unlikely that St Luke should have drawn so many pictures of the Virgin.

(4) He means the Princess Mary Gonzaga, who was then at Amiens.

(5) Marolles, *Memoires*, pag. 132, at the year 1641.

(6) For the month of September, 1685, pag. 999. He examines whether it be an important thing to multiply those things.

(7) Relations Historiques, p. 221. Edit. of Lyons 1676.

SIXTUS IV, made Pope in the year 1471, had been General of the Franciscans and his name was *Francesco della Rovere*. He was born the twenty-second of July 1414 at Cella (a) a town of the Riviera di Genoa, five miles from Savona. One of his Historians (b) ascribes to him all sorts of good qualities, a great learning, an ardent charity for the poor, a great liberality to the princes oppressed by the Turks, an admirable exactness in causing justice to be duly administered, and a great care of repairing the ruins of Rome, and adorning that town. He does not dissemble the faults for which he was blamed. 1. His committing many injustices in favour of his creatures [A]: 2. his stirring up a war in Italy very unseasonably: 3. his excommunicating Laurence de Medicis: 4. and then exercising all manner of hostilities against the Florentines. He does not charge him, as others do (c), with knowing and having contrived the conspiracy of the Pazzi. He says nothing of the dissolute life of the cardinals who were in favour under that reign, one of which, as many believe, is described in some verses of Baptista Mantuanus [B]. Nor does he mention the abominable lewdness, to which some say that Pope lent a helping hand. They will have it that he granted a

petition,

(a) Ghilini, Teatro, Parte II, p. 93. Rivot is mistaken in his Remarques sur la Réponse au Mystère d'Iniquité, Part. II, p. 62a, where he makes him a native of Albiscola.

(b) See the Life of Sixtus IV, at the end of Platina, fol. 363, 364. Edit. Lugd. 1512.

(c) See Varillas, Anecdotes de Florentins, p. 70, and the remark [A], citation (8) of that page. Consult also Machiavel, book viii, of the History of Florence.

[A] He was blamed . . . for committing many injustices in favour of his creatures. He was more indulgent to his relations than any other Pope, and he is blamed for having done and granted many things upon their account *præter fas jusque*, against all human and divine laws (1). The three Cardinals of his first promotion were Peter Riario of Savona, whom he brought up being a little boy, with his brother Jerome, both born in the same town, (not without mystery) and Julian his brother's son, who was afterwards Julius II (2). He bestowed great benefices upon Peter, a man so luxurious and prodigal, that he seemed to be born to throw away money, having spent, during the two years of his cardinalship, two hundred thousand crowns for his ordinary, and when he died, he owed sixty thousand crowns, and left many rich household goods, departing this world all over rotten, by reason of his debaucheries at twenty-eight years of age (3). It is he, whose prodigious prodigality has been described by Baptista Fulgiosius †, which he carried so far as to give his whore Tiresia pattins covered with pearls. Baptista Mantuanus † made also the following verses upon him, wherein he represents him saluted by Jupiter in Hell.

(1) Du Pleffis, Mornai, ex Volaterrano & O-nuphrio, in his Mystère d'Iniquité, p. 555.

(2) Du Pleffis, ibid.

(3) Volaterran. lib. xxii, p. m. 818.

† Baptista Fulgiosius, dictor. & factor. memorabil. lib. ix.

† Baptista Mantuanus, in Alphon. lib. xv.

(4) Du Pleffis, Mornai, Mystère d'Iniquité, p. 555.

(5) Simon Goulart in his Continuation of the Catalogus Testium Veritatis, does likewise apply them to Sixtus, and also what has been said above of the great expenses of Cardinal Peter Riario. Gresser, in Examin. Myst. p. 544, takes advantage of those variations.

(6) It should be Ferli.

(7) Coëffeteau, Réponse au Mystère d'Iniquité, p. 1205.

At tu implume caput cui tanta licentia quondam
Fœmineos fuit in coitus, tua furta putabas
Hic quoque prætextu mitræ impunita relinqui?
Sic meruit tua fœda Venus, &c. (4).

But thou bald-pate who so delighted was
With womens leud embraces, &c.

We shall see hereafter that Mr Jurieu applies those verses to Pope Sixtus (5), tho' he had read in Du Pleffis that they were made upon the cardinal I speak of. Coëffeteau does not deny the dissolute life of that cardinal, and adds that Sixtus was not more lucky in his choice of Jerome, if the Historians are to be credited, excepting that he was not given to sensuality, being only fond of hunting. This Jerome being made Prince of Imola and Friuli (6) by the Pope, married the bastard daughter of the Duke of Milan; and upon account of that marriage, Sixtus gave a cardinal's hat to Asciagne, the duke's son. Sixtus raised also Leonard, his brother's son, and married him to a bastard of King Ferdinand, and made him governor of Rome. When this nephew died, he raised in his room another nephew, brother . . . of Cardinal Julian, and made him Prince of Sorra and Senegaglia. This second nephew married Joan, daughter of Frederic de Montefeltro, Duke of Urbino, by whom he had Francis Maria, who, after the death of his uncle Guy Ubaldino, who died without male issue, succeeded by adoption to the Duchy of Urbino (7). Du Pleffis relates an abominable action in the following words. Sixtus, who designed to raise his dear Jerome, had a mind to make himself master of Florence; but Laurence and Julian de Medicis were an obstacle to it. He practised upon Francis Pazzi, who was the leader of the contrary faction, to attempt upon their lives; and, in order to carry on the thing with greater safety, he sent to Florence Raphael Riario, Cardinal of St George, a young man, and Jerome's nephew, to encourage the conspirators. Accordingly, upon a Sunday, they fell upon the Medicis in the middle of the

VOL. V.

service in St Reparada's church. Julian was there killed; Laurence was wounded, whom the sextons carried into the vestry, &c. (8).

[B] One of the Cardinals that were in favour, as many believe, is described in some verses of Baptista Mantuanus. You have seen in the foregoing remark four Latin verses of that Poet, which relate to the Cardinal Peter Riario, if we believe Mr du Pleffis. He is not the only author who applies them to him: others pretend they ought to be understood of Pope Sixtus. But the better to judge of the whole matter, it is necessary to consider the reflexions which an ingenious person has been pleased to send me. Here they are. (9) In order to understand those verses of Mantuanus, in the 4th book of his poem, intituled *Alphonus*, we must know that in that work, which is only a description of Alphonus's going through hell, the Poet represents the state of several souls, some of which were condemned to eternal torments, and others to those of purgatory. He feigns that Alphonus, son of John II, and grandson of Henry III, Kings of Castile, going with his father and grandfather from purgatory to the terrestrial Paradise, heard a long dialogue between the soul of a Pope in purgatory, and a Devil called Jupiter, who tormented him. The Pope's soul discovers its quality in these verses:

(8) Du Pleffis, Mystère d'Iniquité, p. 556.

(9) A manuscript Memoir of de la Monnoie.

Apud superos ego templa tenebam
Vaticana, dabant Reges his oscula plantis.

When living I posses'd
The Vatican, and sovereigns kiss'd these feet.

The Devil, in one of his replies, speaks to him thus,

At tu implume caput cui tanta licentia quondam,
Fœmineos fuit in coitus, &c.

But thou bald-pate who so delighted was
With womens leud embraces, &c.

from whence it follows that these verses ought to be understood of a Pope. The question is, Whether they are to be applied to Sixtus IV? The Commentator Badius says, he found in the margin of the copy he made use of this annotation *S. P. or. Minorum* in two places, viz. over-against these verses:

Prima sono vox languenti, miserere dolentum,
Et sine, clamabat, fessos spirare parumper.

The first I heard, with languid mourning voice,
Cries, pity us in pain, and let us breathe a while.

And eighty verses after, over-against this:

At tu implume caput, &c.

But thou bald-pate, &c.

From whence it appears, says he, that Pope Sixtus is meant by them, though he will not warrant the truth

R r

petition, wherein he was desired to permit the exercise of Sodomy, during three months in a year. I have traced this fact up to the origin [C], and shall give my thoughts of it in

truth of it: Nam Sixtus, *they are his words*, inter bonos numeratur Pontifices. Verum nullus malus purgatorio inferitur, purique tam pauci decedunt, ut nihil purgandum secum ferant, opera enim illorum sequuntur illos. - - - For Sixtus is reckoned among the good Popes; but wicked men are not sent to purgatory, and so few die so pure, as to want no purgation, for their works follow them. The same Commentator upon the verse: *At tu implume caput*, adds, that the Poet not having specified the Pope, he dares not specify him neither, notwithstanding the marginal note. And three lines after explaining this verse, At nisi feminea tandem prece motus olympi Rex afferret opem, &c. - - - Had not the Lord of Heaven, moved by a woman's prayer, at last assisted thee, &c. by feminea prece, - - - a woman's prayer, words which the Devil uses out of contempt, he understands Divæ Virginis cui, *says he*, si de Sixto quarto loquitur, studiosus admodum fuit, ejusque conceptionis diem celebrari indixit. - - - The holy virgin Mary, for whom Sixtus the IVth, if he is here meant, had the greatest regard, and appointed the day of her conception to be kept holy. Badius, for want of chronology, preposterously entangled himself. Properly speaking, those verses cannot be understood of Pope Sixtus, since Alphonfus, who is the hero of the Poem, dying on the fifth of July 1468, remained in purgatory, according to Mantuanus, till the taking of Negropont by Mahomet II, the 12th of July 1470; after which the Poet supposes that Alphonfus goes from purgatory to the terrestrial Paradise, and from thence to Heaven, where he arrived on Easter-day, the year following 1471, and consequently near four months before Sixtus was made Pope, and above thirteen years before he died. It is therefore more reasonable to believe that Mantuanus designed to make in general a description of a proud and voluptuous Pope, who however having obtained before his death the remission of his sins, by the Virgin's intercession, *Feminea prece*, was condemned in the other world, not to hell torments, as some authors have rashly affirmed, but only to those of purgatory. This is what the Devil himself owns, when the Poet introduces speaking to that Pope in these words:

At nisi feminea tandem prece motus olympi
Rex afferret opem, cum jam suspiria raucus
Ultima vix traheres, & mors incumberet ori,
Nostrer eras, ego jam stratum tibi molle parabam
Larga ubi tartareas intrat fentina cloacas,
Par meritis locus ille tuis, Deus iste malorum
Fautor, ut antiquis viduatam civibus aulam
Et nostro mestam exilio repararet, in astra
Colluivum vulgi humani, passimque volentes
Ire levat, &c.
Sic illi placet, & placeat, mihi forsitan olim
Non impune ferēs, & non sine vulnere multo
In loca pervenies quondam mea.

Had not the Lord of Heaven, moved by a woman's prayer, at last assisted thee when thou couldst hardly gasp, and death lay heavy on thee, thou hadst been mine. For thee I had prepared a downy bed, where the wide sink is disembogued into the infernal shore: a place most due to thy deserts. That God, abettor of the wicked, in order to repair his court, abandoned of it's old inhabitants, and sad for our exile, calls up to heaven, the dregs of human race, &c. For this is his good pleasure. So let it be. I may, in time, make thee severely suffer for it, and many lashes shalt thou feel, before thou enter those regions formerly possessed by us.

I do not deny that the Poet, who was naturally somewhat satirical, was pleased with putting into his description some strokes relating to the licentious life of some Popes and Prelates, whose memory was still fresh. Some curious persons have exercised their wit in making their applications. Some have said that the author meant Sixtus IV, and others that

he meant Paul II. At least, I find in the edition of Bologna, in folio, of the 11th of June 1502, over-against these verses, *Prima sine vox languenti misere dolentum, Et sine, clamabat*, &c. this marginal note, *Papa P.* And lower, over-against the verse, *At tu implume caput*, there is in the margin of the same edition *F. P. or. Minorum*, which some read, *Frater Petrus ordinis Minorum*, viz. Peter Riario a Cordelier, and afterwards a Cardinal, nephew to Pope Sixtus. I confess there is nothing in these last verses but what suits that Cardinal; but because it is certain the Poet brings only two interlocutors into his dialogue, viz. a Pope, whoever he be, and a devil, called Jupiter, it follows that a third cannot be admitted, and consequently that this conjecture, tho' never so probable, vanishes away.

There is another thing, whereby it may be proved, that Baptista Mantuanus did not mean Pope Sixtus, which is, that he commends him very much in the same work, wherein he deplores the corruption of his age. He praises him so far as to say, that if that corruption had not been so great as to be past curing, that Pope might have cured it.

Postquam rerum te Roma potentem
Fecit, & obscuro jubar hoc resplenduit orbi,
Exanimis virtus, scelerum sub mole sepulta
Respirare parum visa est, & tollere frontem:
Et nisi tot vitis hæc secula nostra fuissent
Depravata, boni poterant rectoris habent
Errantes frenare rotas, sed tantus equorum
Impetus aurigam superat, frustra que retractans
Lora gubernator sine lege per invia fertur,
Propterea fortem doleo mitissime Patrum
Sixte tuam, fueras annis melioribus aptus
Est tibi quæ tanto satis est in principe virtus (10).

(10) Bapt. Mantuanus, de calamitatibus suorum temporum. lib. iii.

When Rome made thee it's sovereign, a light shone o'er the darkned world; virtue expiring, and groaning under crimes, appeared again to breathe and raise her drooping head. Had not our age been so depraved by crimes, the reins in the hands of a good prince, might have restrained the wandring wheels of government. But the impetuous fury of the steeds overcomes the charioteer, who pulling back the reins in vain, is carried over pathless ground. Therefore, O Sixtus, I lament thy fate, Sixtus, the mildest of fathers, born for better times, endowed with every princely virtue.

[C] I have traced this fact up to the origin.] In the year 1686, Mr Jurieu published his *Prejugés légitimes contre le Papiſme*, wherein he says, among other things (11), that Sixtus IV was more debauched and vicious than one can imagine, and a Popish writer (12) says of him, that a petition was presented to him, by the family of the Cardinal of Santa Lucia, that they might be permitted to perform the act of sodomy during the three hottest months of the year, June, July, and August (§ a). He wrote under the petition, Let it be done as desired. It is for him that Baptista Mantuanus, who lived at that time made these verses (13):

At tu implume caput cui tanta licentia quondam
Femineos fuit in coitus: tua furta putabas
Hic quoque pretextu mitræ impunita relinqui,
Sic meruit tua fœda Venus: sic prodigia in omnem
Nequitam, ad virtutis opus tua avara libido,
Illa Dioneæ Cythereia munera conchæ,
Illa pudicitiam quibus impugnare solitas,
Et noctes emere & nudæ indulgere palestræ.

(11) Jurieu, *Prejug. légitim.* Tom. i, p. 246.

(12) See, below, citation (20).

[(§ a)] This petition supposes that the family which presented it, desired of the Pope the expedient proposal, only as a ragout, which might revive the appetite in a season, when it is not very strong for the usual food. REX. C. 117.]

(13) Mr Zuingler, professor of Divinity at Basel, affirms the same thing, p. 135, of his *Tractatus de Probis et Improbis*, printed in 1685.

But thou bald-pate who was so delighted with women's embraces, fancied thy crimes, protected by the mitre, might also here escape unpunished. This recompence thy wantonness deserves, thy filthy lust, profuse in every wicked act, and covetous in virtue, those lecherous arts so Corporis Christi by which you oft ensnared chastity, and purchased nights fit of pleasure, sporting in naked combats.

The

The Post introduces a devil speaking to Sixtus IV in Hell, and telling him, that his Papal mitre and bald pate will not prevent his being punished for his luxury, and lewdness, and for the venereal sports, upon which he bestowed so many days and nights. He quotes for the

petition, *Wesselius Groningensis. Tractatu de Tbesauro Ecclesie. Indulg.* I have been told that a very honest man, and a very good Protestant, having read that particular, went to Mr Jurieu in his study, and desired him to shew him the author, who relates such a monstrous thing; and that Mr Jurieu ingenuously confessed to him that he had him not, but that it is to be found in several good writers. That honest man went away very well satisfied with that answer. For my part, I confess I should not have been contented with it: the author of the *Prejugez* should have quoted Du Pleffis Mornai, from whom he had that passage; in a word, he should have added to the quotation, *apud Du Pleffis Mornai, Myst. d'Iniquité, pag. 557.* But notwithstanding this addition, I would have made further inquiries; for in short we ought to be informed how Du Pleffis came to know that Wesselius of Groningen relates such a thing. It is so strange, and so improbable, that one ought not to believe it without seeing it. I have therefore endeavoured to find out that book of Wesselius, and not being able to get it, I have looked for the answers that were made to Du Pleffis. Coeffeteau's answer seems to me weak; for he only excepts against the witness, because he was a Heretic, and because such a deposition shews his impudence. 'It is sufficient for the reader, says he (14), to know that Wesselius was a Heretic. Besides, it is a piece of impudence to write such a thing, nor can it be imagined that any man should have been so profligate as to think of what he imputes to Pope Sixtus, and to the Cardinals of St Sixtus, and Santa Lucia. I cannot apprehend how a gentleman could write down such filthy things.' This answer of Coeffeteau shews that he owns the thing to be in Wesselius, whereby he grants to Du Pleffis whatever he could desire. The Jesuit Gretser comes off much better; he denies that Wesselius said such a thing, and proves that he has not said so (15). 1. Because his treatise of Indulgences quoted by Du Pleffis, and published by Goldastus, a good Calvinist, contains not a word relating to the petition presented to the Pope. 2. Because Flacius Illyricus, who took out of Wesselius's works whatever he thought favourable to his design, did not mention what concerns that petition. From whence it plainly follows, that neither Flacius Illyricus, nor Goldastus, men thoroughly versed in the knowledge of such books, found in any library a manuscript of Wesselius's works, that contained the fact mentioned by Du Pleffis. The only authority that we have, is therefore that of Bale, who having related that particular (16), quotes for it the book of Papal Indulgences, written by Wesselius of Groningen. Not being willing to stop here, I further looked into the reply to Coeffeteau, made by a very learned minister (17), who had as much reading as any man in his time. He was not ignorant of what Gretser had answered; he replies nothing to it; which shews that Gretser did not tell a lie, in what he affirmed concerning Goldastus's edition, and Illyricus. From whence it ought to be concluded, that it is only upon Bale's credit that Wesselius mentioned the petition in question.

Which being so, I say that none will mention again such a petition, but a wretched rhapsodist, who transcribes and heaps up without any judgment, whatever he finds in the writers of his party; for, in short, if the author of the *Prejugez* had considered what he did, would he not have foreseen that such a petition would be denied, and would he not have made himself ready to maintain the truth of it; but then would he not have quickly found out that the thing could not be maintained? and if he had been a wise man, he had wholly laid aside that objection. Let us suppose an adversary, who attacks him upon that subject. Prove to me, will he say, that Sixtus IV granted the exercise of sodomy for three months yearly to those who petitioned him for it. Mr Jurieu will answer, that Wesselius of Groningen affirms it in his book concerning indulgences. This is not true, will the adversary reply; here is the book of Wesselius, published by a Protestant, but that fact is not to be found in it. Illyricus, another Protestant, who had so much perused Wesselius, did not find it neither: and therefore you calumniate Wesselius. No, will

Mr Jurieu say; I do not calumniate him, for Bale ascribes to him the thing in question. But the adversary will answer, if you had common sense, could you believe that the authority of a writer, so much cried down, and so much detested by the Church of Rome, will counterbalance Illyricus's silence, and Goldastus's edition? Why not, will Mr Jurieu reply: the Papiists have struck that passage out of Wesselius's book, and therefore Illyricus and Goldastus could not find it; but Bale had a copy that was not interpolated. And I maintain, will the antagonist say, that Bale made use of a copy, into which a man, who was no better than he, foisted that passage, if Bale himself was not the impostor; and after all, you are to shew me a manuscript of Wesselius, which favours you, and which you may oppose to Goldastus's edition, which confounds you. I do not know what Mr Jurieu could reply; and therefore he is like those imprudent accusers whom Cicero laughed at, who are nonplussed when their assertions are denied (18). Every wife man will grant, that the believing of a crime is not sufficient to charge any body with it, and that one must be in a capacity to prove it to those that deny it. Tho' you believe never so much that Sixtus IV. was guilty of such an abomination, and that Wesselius wrote so, you will not affirm it in a book, if you are a man of judgment, and if you have no better proofs than Mr Jurieu. For the rest, I do not pretend that these critical observations concern Mr Du Pleffis Mornai: he wrote in a time when men were not so nice; and Goldastus's edition was unknown to him (19).

I had almost forgot to observe, that none but a very ignorant or insincere man can maintain that Wesselius was a Papiist. If he had been a Papiist, would Luther have bestowed his encomium upon him? 'Prodiit en Wesselius, vir admirabilis ingenii, rari & magni spiritus, quem & ipsum apparet esse vere theodidactum, quales prophetavit fore Christianos' Esaias: neque enim ex hominibus accepisse judicari potest, sicut nec ego. Hic si mihi antea fuisset lectus, poterat hostibus meis videri Lutherus omnia ex Wesselo hausisse, adeo spiritus utriusque conspirat in unum, &c (20). - - Here is Wesselius, a man of admirable parts, of an excellent and great spirit, and who also appeared to be truly taught of G O D, such as Esaias prophesied Christians would be: for he cannot be judged to have learned of men, no more than I. Had I read him before, my enemies might have thought that Luther had taken all from Wesselius, such agreement there is betwixt the genius of both, &c.

Note, That Mr Saldenus, a Dutch minister at the Hague, affirms, that according to Agrippa, the permission I have been speaking of, was granted to a cardinal by Sixtus IV. *Idem hic Sixtus, teste Agrippa, Cardinali cuidam masculae Veneris usum certis mensibus secure indulget* (21). Agrippa says no such thing (§ 2). See below the remark [E].

[(§ 2)] Observe also that Johannes Lydius was very near falling into the same mistake with respect to Volaterranus. 'Quid dixisset pia Fœmina, says he', si Sixti Quarti audivisset impietatem, qui Cardinali Lucie Sodomiam tribus mensibus calidioribus permisit: teste Volaterrano in Declam. ad Leu. - - - What would the pious woman have said, had she heard of the impiety of Sixtus the fourth, who granted to the Cardinal of Lucia a dispensation for sodomy in the three hottest months: witness Volaterranus, &c. in Declam. ad Leu.' This passage was not unknown to Mr Bayle, who, finding the citation obscure and unintelligible, consulted Mr La Croze. He received from him an explanation of it, which he did not publish, and which I asked of that learned man. Here is the substance of it. A book intitled, *Mus exenteratus*, printed for the first time at Stutgard, in 1593, after having spoken of the pretended dispensation of Sixtus IV, in favour of sodomy, puts in the margin, *Volater. Lib. 22 Antrop. Stella in Sixto IV. Joh. Baleus Angelus. Agrippa in Declam. ad Lovanienfes, &c.* It is easy to perceive, that divers authors are there quoted indiscriminately who have spoken ill of Sixtus IV. Lydius, in all likelihood, used this testimony against him; and, whether by the error of the Printer, or of Lydius, or that of some author who had copied it before him, the words that are between *Volater.* and in *Declam.* were omitted. I add, that by an error of the press *Leu.* might very easily be changed into *Leu.* Mr Bayle hath acknowledged that Mr La Croze had very well guessed from whence the wrong citation of Lydius,

(18) Jam invideo magistro tuo, qui te tanta mercede. . . nihil sperare doceat. Quid est enim minus non dico Oratoris, sed hominis, quam id obicere alveitario, quod tibi si verbo negari, longius progressi non possit qui obicit?

Cicero Philipp. II, pag. 532, Edit. Abrami. To which these words of Lactantius may be added. Turpe est hominem ingeniosum dicere id quod si neget probare non possit. Infit. Divin. lib. iii, cap. xxviii, p. m. 219.

(19) The first volume of his *Mnarchia*, did not come out till after the *Mystes d'Iniquité*.

(20) Luther in a preface that was prefixed to a book of Wesselius. See Gelner's *Bibliotheca*, fol. 628.

(21) Saldenus, Oni Theolog. P. 162. *Idem quibus Agrippa de Veneris. Scient. cap. 64.*

* Pag. 9. Analec. ad Clemens. de corrupto Ecclesiæ statu.

+ See Mr Bayle's Letters, Tom. iii, Letter CCXLII, p. 914. of the Amsterdam edition, 1729.

(14) Coeffeteau, Réponse au Mystere d'Iniquité, p. 1207.

(15) Sed in illo libro (de Indulgentiis Papalibus) prout tomo primo memorabatur Goldastus & Goldastus Calvinista vulgatus est; nullum penitus de hac inexcipabili enormitate verbum reperitur; nec, quod mireris, Illyricus in Catalogo ejus meminit, eo loco ubi ex operibus Wesseli, ea, quæ ad fœrum forum facere credebant, excerptis. Gretserus, in Examini, Mysterii Phylæani, p. 545.

(16) Cent. VIII, cap. l.

(17) Andrew Rivet, See the second part of his book, pag. 625.

in the remarks. It is highly improbable [D]. If Sixtus IV, had granted such a petition, he

Lydius proceeded; and he observes that Volaterranus speaks not at all of that dispensation in the XXIII^d book of his Anthropologia, and that he had read over the *Declam. ad Lovanienfes* of Agrippa, without finding there any such thing. Thus this testimony falls still to the share of *Bale* alone. RRM. CRIT.]

† Letter CCLIII, pag. 957, ubi supra.

[D] It is highly improbable.] My design is not to extenuate the vices of those, who are said to have presented that petition; on the contrary I aggravate them: for I maintain, that if those men had been so wicked as to present it, and make use of the permission granted them, they were too profligate to care for such a permission. You may be sure that such men would not forbear plunging themselves into vice, till the Pope had granted their petition. Besides, was it necessary to draw up a petition in form, and to expect an answer to it in writing? Was it not sufficient to whisper it in the ear, without discovering such an abominable impudence to several persons? In short, I could be sooner persuaded of the truth than of the probability of such a proposition. The most profligate men do commonly observe a decorum, when they cannot offend against it without acting needlessly, or to their prejudice. If that Pope had a mind to grant a privilege, he might have done it by word of mouth, without exposing his reputation. If he grants it in writing, the conscience of the petitioners will not be more at rest for it, and he runs the hazard of being convicted of an abominable action by his own hand. Will a profligate man, if he has any wit, commit such a fault?

I must not forget an observation that is proper enough to shew the falsity of this story. It is supposed that the family of the Cardinal of Santa Lucia asked leave to perform the act of sodomy during the three hottest months in the year, viz. June, July, and August. There is in it a mistake in matter of fact, which makes the whole story suspected: it is supposed that lewd people in Italy are more tormented with their passion during the greatest heat, than at any other time; which is a false supposition. If you consult Physicians, they will tell you, that of all the seasons of the year, men are less inclined to venery in summer, because the heat weakens and enervates them. 'Coi-tum porro mulieres æstate magis appetunt, quia femina carum frigidum tunc calore temporis contem-peratur, ac movetur, in viris autem fit exhalatus, consumptio, ac debilitas à calore adaucto: Hyemis vero frigore vigoratur, & vegetior ac fortior red-ditur, ideoque magis appetunt viri hyeme, quam mulieres (22). . . . The amorous desires of women are strongest in summer, because the female seed being cold, is tempered and put into motion by the heat of that season; whereas the increase of heat produces exhalation, waisting, and weakness in the male seed, but the coldness of winter adds vigour, life, and strength to it. And therefore the amorous desires of men are stronger in the winter, than those of women.' If those, who vented this story, had pitched upon March, April, and May, it had been more likely. We are told in the *Menagiana* of a woman, who confessed she would not engage to be chaste in May, tho' she pretended to overcome the temptations of the flesh all the other months of the year. In France the month of May is accounted the strongest in that respect: and because all the effects of the spring are earlier in Italy, the month of April must needs be there what the month of May is in other countries. I would not have any consequences drawn from what we observe in plants and animals to man; they might be unexact, because man's industry affords him a thousand remedies against the severity of the winter, which are unknown to vegetables and beasts: however, I shall take notice of what the Naturalists observe, that the spring is the usual time of generations (23).

(22) Rodericus à Castro, de mor-bis mulierum, lib. iii, cap. iii, p. m. 108.

(23) Vere tu-ment terræ, & genitalia femina poscunt. *Virgil. Georg. lib. ii, ver. 324.* Continuè av-di-dis ubi subdita flamma medullis Vere magis (quia vere calor redit ossibus.) *Id. ibid. lib. iii, ver. 271.*

Nam simul ac species patefacta'it verna diei,
Et referata viget genitalis aura Favoni;
Aëria primum volucres te, Diva, tuumque
Significant initum percussæ corda tua vi:
Inde feræ pecudes persultant pabula læta,
Et rapidos tranant amnes; ita capta lepore,

Illecebrisque tuis omnis natura animantium
Te sequitur cupide, quo quamque inducere pergis:
Denique par maria, ac monteis fluviosque rapacis,
Frundiferaque domos avium, camposque virentis,
Omnibus incutiens blandum per pectora amorem,
Efficit, ut cupide generatim sæcla propagent (24).

(24) Lucret. lib. i, ver. 10.

When first the rising spring adorns the mead,
And a new scene of nature stands display'd,
When teeming buds and cheerful greens appear,
And western gales unlock the lazy year,
The joyous birds thy welcome first express,
Whose native songs thy genial fire confess:
Then savage beasts bound o'er their slighted food,
Struck with thy darts, and tempt the raging flood:
All nature is thy gift; earth, air, and sea:
Of all that breathe the various progeny,
Stung with delight, is goaded on by thee.
O'er barren mountains, o'er the flow'ry plain,
The leafy forest, and the liquid main,
Extends thy uncontrol'd and boundless reign.
Thro' all the living regions dost thou move,
And scatter'st where thou goest the kindly seeds of love.

DRYDEN.

What you have just now read out of the *Menagiana*, was quoted by me without book: I had not then time to look for the page; I have found it since; and tho' I saw I had not mistaken the sense of the author, I am sensible that I omitted some circumstances, that deserved to be mentioned. Here follows the whole passage. 'One day as we were discoursing of the effects of the month of May, which heats a new, not only the earth, and what is on it, but also revives love in the very bottom of the water: after a great deal of talk about that subject, the Marchioness de C. L. . . . mother of the Marchioness de S. . . . told me, I will engage to be chaste in all the months of the year, but I cannot be sure of it in May (25). A Physician, who continued the work of Laurence Joubert about popular errors, examines this question: Whether this saying be right, Do not sport much with women, but drink hard in the months that have no R (26). He disapproves that rule no farther than as it excludes the month of May; a month, says he (27), the most devoted to love: and I could easily believe that in ancient times people did not marry in that month, not so much out of jealousy, or for fear of getting bad wives, according to the Poet's saying, *Maio nubunt malæ, ætate de fure furor, quibus is then so violent in women, that they can hardly be satisfied, and therefore they may think of other men, to be as Martæ viri, Maio mulieres.* He had made use of these words in the foregoing page: 'If therefore the spring is the most proper time for such a sport, it seems unreasonable to abstain from it in all the months that have no R, since the spring begins only about the latter end of March, and lasts all April and May, which has the true qualities of heat and moistness; and it is then that the gaiety of the season fills all sorts of animals with love.'

(25) *Menagiana*, p. 170, of the second Dutch edition.

(26) Bachel, ubi infra.

(27) Bachel, *Ex-reurs populum touchant la Medicine & Regne de Sainté*, lib. ii, p. 301.

In furias ignemque ruunt, furor omnibus idem.

All are on fire, and the like flame
With equal fury burns the same.

'At this rate the spring, which is the best time of the year for such performances, would pass away without them (28). The doctrine of Rodericus à Castro above-mentioned (29), is that of the ancient Naturalists. One of the properties of summer, according to Hesiod, is to weaken the males, and kindle a greater love in females.

(28) *Id. ibid.*

(29) *Abom. cit. tion* (27).

Τῆμ' αὖ ποίτ' αἰ τ' αἰγες, καὶ οἱ αἰς αἰς,
Μαυλοτάλαι δὲ γυναῖκες, ἀναρῦτατοι δὲ τε αἰδρες
Εἰσιν.

Tunt

he would have fallen far short of the prudence and virtue which Clement VII discovered, when he thought that some ladies desired of him a permission to do an unlawful thing [E].

It

*Tunc pinguesque capreae, & vinum optimum,
Salacissima vero mulieres, & viri imbecillissimi
Junii* (30).

(30) Hesiod.
Oper. & Dies.
ver. 585.

(31) See Proclus
in Hesiod. *ibid.*
Consult *Menage*,
in Diog. Laërt.
lib. ix, p. 352,
and *Father Har-*
down, in Pli-
nium, *Tom. iv*,
p. 205, 206.

(32) Aristot.
Problem. 5. iv,
Quaest. xxvi.

The Poet Alcæus was of the same opinion (31). Aristotle supposes it to be true, and enquires into the reasons of it (32). The Moderns, who so much criticize the ancient Naturalists, have nothing to say against them upon that point. Mr Venette, a famous Physician, follows their opinion, and expresses himself fully to that purpose. 'The great heat of the months of July and of August, together with our fiery temper, destroys our natural heat, wastes our spirits, and weakens all the parts of our bodies. It produces a great deal of choler, and many sharp excrements, which afterwards make us weak and languishing. If we have then a mind to sport with women, our strength soon fails us; and tho' at first our passion enables us to make some efforts, we quickly find ourselves so weak, and so exhausted, that it is impossible for us to be stout champions. And if we have a mind to lose all our strength, and to be sick, we need only sport frequently with women. On the contrary, women are much more lascivious in summer-time. Their cold and moist temper is mended by the scorching heat of the sun. . . . Truly those amorous passions are not well distributed. Whilst women are fiery, we are languishing. Their passion no sooner begins to appear, but ours vanishes away, as if nature intended thereby to teach us, that the excess of love is wholly prejudicial to mens health (33).' This moral reflexion of Mr Venette puts me in mind of a passage in Pliny, wherein I thought he acknowledged a providence of nature in such a division of passions (34); but having more narrowly considered it, I find it ought not to be understood in that sense: nay, it seems to me that Pliny has committed a fault, which perhaps no body has taken notice of, and therefore I shall set down his words. *Urinam certe præcipue traditur (scilicet) sanare lichenas & lepras ex aceto. Venerem stimulare in Vitis, Hefiodo & Alcæo testibus: qui florentes ea cicadas acerrimi cantus esse, & mulieris libidinis avidissimas, viresque in coitum pigerrimos scripsere, velut providentia naturæ hoc adjumento tunc valentissimo* (35). That is to say, according to the artichok (36) is very proper to provoke urine:

(33) Venette,
Tableau de l'A-
mour Conjugal,
p. 180, 181.
Edit. 1696.

(34) As if na-
ture had designed
thus to distribute
the seasons of
love, to prevent
the ill conse-
quences of excess.

(35) Plin. lib.
xxii, cap. xxii,
p. m. 205, 206.

(36) Observe that
according to Sal-
mafius the *Scal-*
ymos of which
Pliny speaks af-
ter Hesiod, is
not the Arti-
choak. See Mr
Le Clerc in his
Notes on Hesiod,
p. 282. Edit.
1701.

(37) Bachot,
Vulgar Errors,
book ii, ch. ix,
p. 302, 303.

(38) Venus tum
(biem) non æque
perniciosa est. . .
Neque æstate ve-
ro, neque autum-
no utilis Venus
est. Tolerabi-
lior tamen per au-
tumnum: æstate
in totum, si fieri
potest, abstin-
dam est. Corn.
Celsus, lib. i,
cap. iii. p. 33,
34.

(39) Vir. that
which I have
mentioned above
citation (26).

*Dieta olivæta & quatre nodios in braguetta. . . .
A moist diet in June, July, and August, and four
buttons on the codpiece.*

If any one should say that some reasons, well known at Rome to debauched people, did, perhaps, occasion the asking of a dispensation for the three hottest months in the year, he should deserve no answer. Such a general discourse ought neither to be examined nor minded; and until a better reason be alledged, the first who mentioned that petition, will justly be accounted one of those satirical writers, who know not how to observe the rules of probability. We may apply to him these words of an ancient Father, *Voluntatem eum habere mentiendi, artem fingendi non habere*: he is very willing to tell a lie, but he does not understand the art of lying (40). This does not concern Wesselus of Groningen; for first, it is not known whether he mentioned that petition; that fact is not to be found in his books that are extant; and, in the second place, it may be presumed, that if he said something of it, it was upon the credit of another. He quoted somebody, or at least he made use of this clause, *Fama est, fertur, . . . It has been reported, it is said, &c.* However it be, I declare I do not take him to be the first author of that story. Many controvertists have been imposed upon by the name of such a wife and eminent Divine; but since they knew not how he spoke of it, whether he gave some proofs of it, or none at all, whether it was upon a hear-say, or upon the testimony of grave men, they have been too hasty in their judgment, and in their quotations. It is particularly about libels diffused against such persons as Sixtus IV., that one ought to act with deliberation. He had disturbed the public peace of Italy: he had laid an interdiction upon the Republics of Venice and Florence, and engaged in a violent war with both. There was not a little corruption in his court; his relations had made themselves odious by their ambition and debauchery. It was impossible but that many palquinades would come out against him (41). Any Venetian or Florentine, skilled in the art of slandering, could not fail to please his sovereigns or his fellow-citizens, by using his talent against the Pope. He might expect that his satirical strokes, whether true or false, would be very acceptable: it is a consolation for those who fear or hate a prince, to see him abused in libels; they believe every thing, every thing goes down in such a disposition, and therefore satirical writers do not much care to observe the rules of probability, being sure to make people believe the grossest lies. Which they are particularly sure of, when they can justly charge others with ill actions: those truths serve as a safe conduct to the falsities that go along with them (42). This observation might be of use at all times to those, who are not willing to confound well-grounded slanders with malicious calumnies. But to speak only of Sixtus IV. I observe, that if there was any ground for the petition in question, Wesselus would not be the only writer that had said something of it. How could he have found out what was unknown to the satirical writers of Venice and Florence?

[E] The virtue which Clement VII discovered, when he thought that some ladies desired he would permit them to do an unlawful thing.] This particular may be seen in a chronicle; it is not a story preserved by tradition. It may be found in the annals of Aquitaine, published several times by John Bouchet, who lived at that time (43). He speaks of the interview between Clement VII, and Francis I, at Marfeilles in 1533. 'During that interview between the Pope and the King, where all the royal family of France was, and several princes and lords, and also the Queen of France and her retinue, there was a common report, that a pleasant trick, deserving to be remembered, had been plaid to three ladies of the queen, who were all virtuous, chaste, and devout women. Those three ladies, who were all widows, having a weakly and sickly constitution, desired to have a licence from the Pope to eat flesh upon prohibited days; and in order to it, they made their application to the Duke of Albania, his near relation, who gave them his promise, and then sent for them to come to the Pope. That duke, who was very familiar

(40) It is observ-
ed in the eighth
volume of the
Morale pratique
des Jéuites, pag.
152, that this
lying was ap-
plied to the Je-
suit Brisaciet.

(41) Non modo
omnes Italie po-
tentatus in eos
(Veneras) concu-
tavit, sed etiam
veluti Clemens
VI, alias fecerat,
illos excoaravit, in-
terdixit, & om-
nibus dignitatibus
privavit. Nec
quoad vixit, illi
abolitionis be-
neficii impen-
dere voluit. Ex
quo multos de-
tractores habuit.
*Nauclerus, Ge-
ner. l. fol. m.*
979.

(42) Note, that
on the other
hand this mix-
ture of truths
and falsities is
favourable to
those who make
an apology for
persons that are
defamed; for
when the writer
of a libel is con-
victed of falshood
upon several
points, he be-
comes suspected
of calumny in
every thing else.

(43) He says,
fol. 270, verso,
edition of Poitiers
1557, that they
were printed at
Poitiers the
third time, in the
beginning of the
year 1533.

(4) Under the
word Rovere.

It is said that Sixtus died in the year 1484, of the grief he conceived, when he heard that the peace was concluded between the Duke of Ferrara and the Venetians [F]. He loved the war, and he has been looked upon as the disturber of the repose of Italy. Agrippa says one thing of him which deserves to be mentioned [G]. You may see in Moreri (d), that it has been said that this Pope got himself admitted into the house of la Rovere, which was very illustrious in Piedmont. That family was in possession of a strange prerogative [H].

All authors are agreed that Sixtus IV was a learned man. He had received his doctor's degree at Padua, and had read public lectures in the university of Bologna, at Pavia, at Siena, at Florence, and at Perugia. From the employment of a lecturer in the universities, he was promoted to several dignities: he was made first of all Provincial of the province of Liguria, and then Procurator-General of his order at the Court of Rome, and afterwards Vicar-General of Italy, and at last General of the Franciscans. After those preferments he received a cardinal's hat. He got a great reputation by the works,

with those ladies, having a mind to give some sport to the Pope and to the King, told the Pope, holy Father, there are three young ladies, who are widows, and of an age to get children, whom I take to have some lustful temptations, because they have desired me to beg of you that they may be allowed to make use of a man without marrying, when they are in great want of one. How, cousin, said the Pope, it were against God's commandment, from which I can dispense no body? I beseech you, holy Father, to hear them, and to make this remonstrance to them. Whereupon the ladies came into the hall where the Pope was, and after they had kneeled and kissed his feet, one of them said to him, Holy Father, we have desired the Duke of Albania to beg a favour of you, and to represent to you our age, frailty, and weak constitution. Daughters, said the Pope, your request is not reasonable, for it is contrary to the command of God. The widows not knowing what the Duke of Albania had told him, answered, Holy Father, be pleased to give us such a dispensation, three times in a week, at least in Lent, and without scandal. How, replied the Pope, must I give you leave to commit fornication? I should be damned if I did. Whereupon the ladies were sensible that there was some jest in the matter; and one of them said, We beg a dispensation to eat flesh upon prohibited days. The Duke of Albania told them, I thought, ladies, you meant live flesh. The Pope perceiving the jest, smiled, and told the duke, Cousin, you make the ladies blush; when the queen comes to hear of this, she will be displeased with it. The king, the queen, and the princes, were immediately told of it, and liked the humour very well (44). You will find this adventure in Brantome's Memoirs, towards the end of the second volume of his *Dames Galantes* (45), where it is related more at large than in the *Annals of Aquitaine*. He knew not that this story was to be found in that book: for he concludes thus: *I have been told the names of these three ladies, viz. the Lady de Chateau-briant, the Lady Chastillon, and the widow of the Bayliff of Caen, all very virtuous women. I have this story from the old courtiers* (46).

(44) Bouchet
Annales d'Aquitaine, fol. m.
267.

(45) Pag. m.
356, & seq.

(46) Brant.
Dames Galantes,
Tom. ii, p. 358.

(47) Volaterran.
lib. xxii, p.
819.

(48) Non potuit
sævum vis ulla
extinguere Six-
tum;
Audit tandem
nomine pacis,
ebit. See the end
of this remark,
Item. Dic unde
Alesto pax ista
refulset, & unde
Tam subito
reticent prelia?
Sixtus obit. Item,
Pacis ut hostis
eras, pace pe-
remptus obis.
Apud du Pleffis
Mornai, My-
stère d'Iniquité,
p. 556.

(49) That is, to
make war against
Tuscany.

[F] It is said he died . . . of the grief he conceived when he heard that a peace was made between the Duke of Ferrara and the Venetians. He had declared a war against the Republic of Venice, in favour of the Duke of Ferrara, and had a mind to keep it up; but his allies forsook him, and made a peace without consulting him. The grief he conceived upon it increased his gout, and carried him off in five days. What a vicar of the Prince of Peace, who says in his gospel, *Blessed are the peace makers. Quum pacem à sociis præter ejus voluntatem & consensum fieri conspiceret, ex animi uti putatur dolore, podagra insuper aggravante qua in ultimis annis maxime laborabat, in quintum diem expiravit* (47). He deserved the epitaphs, which the Poets made upon him (48).

I will not forget a fine passage of Alcyonius. 'Ad id (49) adductus videri poterat Ferdinandus à Xysto Pont. Max. qui & officii Pontificii, & religionis & Dei oblitus non secus in Italia bella excitare solebat atque illa Afiz aut Africa provincia esset, in qua Turcæ & Pœni regnarent, non pars Europæ ex flore clarissimorum virorum constans, cujus princeps esset pontifex maximus qui moderatissime & sapientissime clavum tanti imperii tenere & gubernacula

Reip. tractare in maximo cursu & fluctibus deberet. Dein eodem Xysto si non suafore & impulsore certe approbatore Veneti terra & aquis arma intulerunt Herculi Ferrariensi Principi (50). . . . Ferdinandus was thought to be brought into the war against Tuscany by Sixtus; a man who forgetting his duty as a Pope, forgetting his religion and his GOD, used to raise his wars in Italy, as if that country was a province of Asia, or of Africa, under the dominion of Turks or Carthaginians, and not that part of Europe which produces the most eminent and most illustrious men, and which has for its prince, a Pope, who ought to steer the helm of so great a government amidst the most violent storms with the greatest moderation and wisdom. Afterwards if it was not by the persuasion and instigation of Sixtus, it was certainly by his approbation that the Venetians made war by sea and land upon Hercules, Prince of Ferrara. Take notice that I have been informed by Mr de la Monnoie, that the first of the three epitaphs, which I have mentioned (51), from Du Pleffis Mornai, does not concern Pope Sixtus, and that it contains two verses of Sannazarius against Pope Alexander VI; also that it ought to be read *Sextum*, and not *Sixtum*; and that Sannazarius did rather praise Sixtus than blame him, as it appears from this epigram against the same Alexander. *Visuram se iterum Sixtum cum Roma putaret, Pro Sixto Sextum vidit & ingenuit*.

[G] Agrippa says one thing of him which deserves to be mentioned. Du Pleffis relates it thus. Among the pimps of these latter times, says Agrippa, Sixtus IV was most remarkable, who built a noble bawdy-house at Rome . . . The courtizans of Rome pay a Giulio every week to the Pope, and this yearly income does sometimes amount to above twenty thousand ducats; and that office is so particularly appropriated to the chiefs of the Church, that the rent of pimping is reckoned part of the Ecclesiastical revenues. For, says he, I heard formerly the computation made in the following manner: He has two benefices, a curacy of twenty ducats, a priory of forty, and three abbacies in a bawdy-house, who bring him twenty Giulio's every week (52). Those, who desire to see Agrippa's words, need only read the following passage. 'Sed & recentioribus temporibus Sixtus Pontifex Maximus Romæ nobile admodum lupanar extruxit . . . Multi alii magistratus . . . in civitatibus suis lupanaria construunt foventque, nonnihil ex meretricio questu etiam ærario suo accumulantes emolumentis: quod quidem in Italia non rarum est, ubi etiam Romana seorta in singulas hebdomadas Julium pendunt Pontifici, qui centus annuus nonnunquam viginti millia ducatos excedit, adeoque Ecclesiæ procerum id munus est, ut unâ cum Ecclesiæ proventibus etiam lenociniorum numerent mercēdem. Sic enim ego illos supputantes aliquando adivi; Habet, inquentes, ille duo beneficia, unum curatum aureorum viginti, alterum prioratum ducatorum quadraginta, & tres putanas in burdello, quæ reddunt singulis hebdomadibus Julios viginti (53).

[H] The family of Rovere . . . possessed a strange prerogative. It was a right over the maidenheads of the virgins, whom their vassals married. A cardinal of that house threw into the fire the patent of that privilege. 'Cotal costume (54) de pagani & da gentili, fu gia in Piemonte, & il Cardinale Illustrissimo Hieronimo della Rovere mi diceva haver egli stesso abbruciato il privilegio, che havea di cio la sua Casa (55). . . . This Pagan custom prevailed formerly

(50) Petrus Alcyonius, in Medice legatio poliorum, fol. 1, verso.

(51) Above citation (48).

(52) Du Pleffis, *Mystère of Iniquity*, p. 557.

(53) Agrippa, de vanitate Scientiar. cap. lxxv, Tom. ii, Opera, p. 135.

(54) The author had been speaking of that, which Malcolm king of Scotland had established.

(55) Bonifacio Vannozzi, *Avertimenti Politi*, Tom. ii, p. 255.

(e) See the article PLATINA, in the text, citation (g), and Bonanni, *ubi infra*, citation (j), p. 430.

he published [J], and being raised to the Papal See he made it appear that he was still a lover of learning; for he set up the library of the Vatican (e), and gave the direction of it to the learned Platina, and allowed yearly pensions to several other persons, who were to help him in taking care of the books, and transcribing Greek, Latin, and Hebrew manuscripts (f). He ordered the same Platina to write the History of the Popes (g). It has been observed that he was much more liberal to his sisters sons than to his brothers sons, and that among his sisters sons he particularly favoured Peter and Jerome Riario. This would not be a meer fantastical humour, as it is pretended but rather a very natural thing, were it true that he was their father, as some writers will have it [K]. He was the first who instituted the feast of the Conception and Presentation of the Holy Virgin, as also that of St Anne and St Joseph, and that of Francis of Assisi (b). He canonized Bonaventura (i), and appointed him a feast among those of the apostolical palace (k). He restored a devotion invented by St Dominic, which was discontinued, viz. that of the Rosary and the Psalter of the Holy Virgin (l). It is a mistake to say that he was the first who ordered that the Jubilee should be celebrated once in twenty-five years. That ordinance was made by Paul II, his predecessor, in the year 1470. He only confirmed it, and was the first who put it in execution in the year 1475 (m). The place which Polydore Virgil gives him among the inventors of things, does him little honour; for he ascribes to him the first creation of several offices that were bought [L]. This was the source of a disorder that increased daily. All authors

(f) Taken from Ghilini Teatro d'Humorini Letterati, Tom. ii, p. 93.

(g) Platina, *Epist. dedicat. ad Sixtum IV.*

(b) Vite Sixti IV., ad calcem Platinae, fol. m. 364.

(i) Id. *ibid.*

(k) Bonanni, in Numism. Pontificum, Tom. i, p. 91.

(l) Id. *ibid.*

(m) Id. *ibid.* p. 98.

'in Piedmont, and the most illustrious Cardinal Jerome della Rovere, told me that he himself had burnt the patent which his family had for that privilege.' They are the words of an author, who lived in the beginning of the XVIIth century. See the margin (56).

[J] The works which he published. Here follow the titles of them. *De sanguine Christi liber: De futuris contingentibus: Commentarii de Potentia Dei: De Conceptione B. Virginis: Contra errores cujusdam Carmelitæ Bononiensis qui affirmabat Deum sua omnipotentia, damnatum hominem salvare non posse.* He writ also a book to shew that Thomas Aquinas and Scotus, who differ so much in words, are at the bottom of the same opinion (57).

[K] He particularly favoured Peter and Jerome Riario. This would not be . . . a fantastical humour . . . were it true that he was their father, as some writers will have it.] (58) He had nine nephews, viz. five, whose name was de la Rovere, as his was, and they were the sons of his three brothers deceased, and four who went by the names of Riario, Baffo, and Sansoni, the three families into which his sisters, and one of his nieces, had been married. . . . (59) It was not barely the excess of the Pope's ambition that made it intolerable, since it was attended with a kind of oddness, grounded neither upon interest, nor upon probability: for tho' Sixtus in all appearance should have shewn more kindness to the five nephews I have just now mentioned, than to the other four, who were only related to him by his sister's side; and tho' he had all the reason in the world to do it; and that Julian, the eldest of them all, was endowed with all the wonderful qualities, which made afterwards his Pontificate so famous under the name of Julius II; it is certain he never could obtain of his uncle that he should behave as head of the house of la Rovere, or perform the functions of Cardinal Nephew, or that his brother, or his three cousins should have what was denied him. In a word, the strongest inclinations of Sixtus were always in favour of his sisters children, especially to those of the eldest, who had two sons, viz. Peter and Jerome Riario. Peter had been a Franciscan as well as his uncle, and perhaps deferred upon that account to have a great share in his uncle's affection. He was made cardinal on the same day that Julian was; but he had this advantage above him, that he was declared Cardinal Nephew, and obtained the bishopric of Treviso, which Julian had asked. Afterwards the most considerable benefices, that came to be vacant, were bestowed upon him; and he became so powerful, that he had a greater train than the rest of the sacred college . . .

(56) Mr Paris, minister of Katwick says in a Dutch book, intitled, *Kerwysle Oudebeden*, that is *Antiquities of Kerwic*, pag. 396, that certain lords in Holland (he names some of them) had such a privilege, and that it was suppressed by the States who gave them some money for the suppression of it.

(57) Taken from Ghilini, Teatro, Part ii, p. 94.

(58) Varillas, *A. neced. de Florence*, p. 67.

(59) Id. *ibid.* p. 68.

(60) Id. *ibid.* p. 69.

(61) Machiavelli, *delle Hist. Fiorentine*, lib. vii, p. m. 289.

'per l'adietro errori, si potevano sotto la Pontificale autorità nascondere. Haveva tra la sua famiglia Piero e Girolamo, i quali (secondo che ciascuno credeva) erano suoi figliuoli, nondimeno sotto altri più honesti nomi gli palliava. . . . This Pope was the first who began to shew how much a Pope could do, and that many things, formerly called errors, could be concealed under the Papal authority. Among others of his family, he had Peter and Jerome, who (as every one believed) were his own children; however he concealed them under honest names.' John Michael Brutus affirms, that Sixtus begot those two boys when he was but a Franciscan, and had them bred up under the name of his nephews to conceal his fault. *Ab eo cum adhuc ageret in Franciscanorum familia liberos susceptos fuisse: ac quo minor Parentis infamia esset, propinquorum honestiori nomine liberaliter quidem & honeste, sed non tamen in spem tantam educatos* (62).

Some say he was neither the father nor the uncle of Peter and James Riario, but that they were only his favourites. Coëffeteau put that sense upon the parenthesis of a passage above quoted (63), which contains these three words, *not without mystery*. These are Coëffeteau's words. *Du Plessis endeavours to find an abominable mystery in that love, which is a thing that a man who loves honour should have no thought of* (64). I own it, replies Rivet (65), 'in order to approve it, and much less to delight in it; but an honest man may take notice of it, and detect it in a sinful man, and it will no more defile his imagination than the words of the Scripture concerning the sodomites, or those of St Paul speaking of the heathens, in the first chapter of his epistle to the Romans. Certainly the words of Raphael Volaterranus, together with that extraordinary indulgence, may raise a suspicion in the most charitable persons: for, speaking of those two men, he says, *Petrus à puero, una cum Hieronymo fratre, sibi educaverat*, that he had brought them up for himself from their infancy.' Observe, that Mr Du Plessis has not taken care to express himself clearly. His words are so ill placed, that the best sense which can be put upon them is a falsehood. Having provided for these two, says he (66), *who were nearer related to him by love than kindred, he comes next to his relations. Jerome, his brother of the same nursery, whom he made Prince of Furl and of Imola.* Compare this with the words preceding, you shall find that by having provided for these two, he understands the promotion of Peter and Jerome Riario, from whence it follows that he meant, that Jerome, who was made Prince of Furl, was brother of Pope Sixtus, and a different person from that Jerome Riario whom he had mentioned: but this is a grand mistake.

[L] Polydore Virgil . . . ascribes to him the first creation of many offices that were bought.] See the second chapter of the eighth book of *Inventoribus Rerum*, out of which I shall set down the following passage. Pius II . . . following the example of John XXII, created some Abbreviators, and made it an office, which was bought as well as the rest. Afterwards Paul II, being a conscientious man, turned out those

(62) Jo. Michael Brutus, *Hist. Florent. lib. vii*, p. 387, apud Joann. Zuingerum, de Fæsto Corporis Christi, pag. 133.

(63) Citat. (a).

(64) Coëffeteau, answer to the *Mystery of Iniquity*, p. 1205.

(65) Rivet, *Remarques sur la Réponse au Mystère d'Iniquité*, Part. ii, p. 623. Note that he is mistaken in calling Peter and Jerome Riario by the name of la Rovere. Mr Zuinger, de Fæsto Corporis Christi, p. 133, has committed the same fault: Ad Petri Ruerii, quem pro Cingolo habuerat Sixtus & Hieronymi fratris sui (it should be ejus) postulationes, &c.

(66) Du Plessis, *Mystère d'Iniquité*, p. 555.

SIXTUS IV.

164

are not agreed that this pontif was a man of a mean extraction [M]. If he was, he may be properly alledged in confirmation of what I have said in another place (n), that the most haughty and daring men may be born among the dregs of the people; for his haughtiness was very great: the Florentines found it so by experience; for they could not be reconciled to him, but by submitting to the most shameful humiliations (o). Never was satisfaction more severe than what he imposed upon them. It is in vain for Father Bonanni to say that John Michael Brutus has no reason to complain of the harsh answer that was made by that Pope to their deputies: what he relates and what he confesses is a sufficient proof of the great mortification they sustained (p).

In refuting the error of Mr Saldenus (q), I might have censured still upon better grounds the author of *Turco-Papismus*; for he quotes Agrippa as having related that this Pope appointed places of prostitution as well for sodomitical leudnesses, as for others more ordinary, and granted the permission of the sin contrary to nature to a cardinal. He adds that Wesselus also speaks of it [N].

(n) Remark [L] of the article GREGORY VII.

(o) In the year 1430.

(p) See Bonanni, ubi supra, p. 102, & seq.

(q) At the end of remark [B].

those blood-suckers; but Sixtus restored them as so many servants necessary to a master, who is resolved to get money by any means whatsoever. Nay, he did worse, for he set up a band of solicitors, proctors, and lawyers, without whom no patents, called Bulls, could be drawn up, that being examined by several persons they might not be so easily interpolated and falsified. At last he appointed nine controllers or supervisors of the treasury, to whom he gave a salary, that their offices might be the better sold. Nor was he frustrated in his expectation; for an office that was sold before for five hundred ducats, sold most times for one, two, or three thousand ducats by reason of that salary, so carefully do they ply their business who buy their places. This gain proved such a charm to Innocent VIII, who succeeded Sixtus, that he set up an office of secretaries . . . and increased their number. Alexander VI appointed the collectors of bribes to the number of fourscore. I leave you to judge whether among an army or innumerable multitude of recorders and scribes, there is any want of sergeants, whose faces (as the Poet has it) are always pale with hunger, and who greedily feed upon the people: to whom we may add the Griffins, those who so well know how to shear sheep, I mean notaries and scribes who suck poor peoples substance, whom Nicolas III turned out, being afraid they would destroy the whole sheepfold (67). I need not inform my reader that this invention of Sixtus IV is blamed, not only as an unlawful means of getting money, but also as a very ill example which makes way for greater mischiefs. I might say many things upon it, if I would set up for a maker of political reflexions; but I do not pretend to that. I rather chuse to quote another writer, who mentions the same conduct of Sixtus IV: it will appear from his words, that it was grounded upon the desire of aggrandizing one of his nephews. Consider well the words of Varillas. 'The only thing that remained to be done by Riario, in order to complete his settlement, was to get footing in Umbria, from whence he might have easily penetrated into Romagna, and perhaps also into Tuscany; but having no troops, and wanting a great deal of money to raise some, his uncle did not scruple to sell the offices of the Chancery, and of the Court of Rome, which had been the reward of virtue and ability under the foregoing Popes. He created five colleges, through whose hands all the dispatches of the Datary were to go successively, and nine new offices in the apostolical chamber, which were bought very dear. He neither considered the shameful trade he was going to introduce, nor the honest liberty of which he deprived the Court of Rome, nor the in-

(67) Polyd. Virgil. de Inventor. Rerum, lib. viii, cap. ii, p. m. 432, 433. See Du Pleissin Mor-nay, Myſtere d'Iniquité, p. 556, 557.

(a) Taken from Sotuel, Biblioth. Scriptor. Societat. Jesu, p. 592, 593.

conveniences that would arise from putting an end to the labour and industry of the most refined Italians; by taking from them offices freely given, which was an allurement to them, and kept up their emulation. He increased the old taxes, and laid new ones: He also ordered extraordinary tithes to be paid (68).

[M] All authors are not agreed that this Pontif was a man of mean extraction. He was so, if we believe Machiavel (69), and many other authors who say his father was a Fisherman. Their proof for it would be a weak one, should they go upon the authority of Panninius, who observes that the inhabitants of the village, where he was born, do hardly get their livelihood any other way but by fishing; for that Historian says on the other side, that the family of that Pope was none of the most inconsiderable in the town of Savona, and that it was a branch of the house della Rovere, one of the most antient in Piedmont (70). It appears by several letters of that Pope, that he pretended to be a native of Savona; and it is observed that he was born by chance in the village of Cella, because his father and mother had fled thither during the plague that raged at Savona. It is further said, that family bore the arms of the house della Rovere (71) before Sixtus was born; which is alledged by some, to confute those who say, that the lords of that family bestowed their name and their arms upon Pope Sixtus. Francis Carriere says so in his exposition of the Prophetic Symbols of Malachi the Irish man. Father Oldoini has collected several reasons, to prove that our Francesco della Rovere was of a noble family, and that he turned Franciscan of his own motion, and not because poverty put him upon looking for a livelihood at the expence of others (72). See Father Bonanni's History of the Popes by medals, and compare with this the remark [A] in the article JULIUS II.

(68) Varillas, Anecd. de Florence, p. 70.

(69) Huomo di bassissima & vile conditione. Machiavel, delle Histor. Fiorentine, lib. vii, p. 239.

(70) See Bonanni, Numismat. Poetific. Romanor. Tom. i, p. 91.

(71) They are rebuses, viz. that kind of Oak which the Latins call Robur, the Italians Rovere, or Rovero, and the French Rovere.

(72) Bonanni, Numismat. Poetific. Romanor. Tom. i, p. 92.

[N] He quotes Agrippa as having related, &c. You shall see that it is an express, not an indirect, quotation; for he hath put in Italic characters what he hath taken from Agrippa. 'Sixto quarto nihil cogitari potest turpius aut iniquius; erat enim, & propter lenocinium, & nefandissimas libidines, infamis. Lupanaria, ut inquit Agrippa, utriusque Veneri crexit, cardinalique cuidam masculæ veneris usum sciant. c. de lenocinio. certis mensibus indulgi: hoc etiam attigit Wesselus Groningenfis (73). - - - Nothing can be imagined more base and filthy, than Sixtus IV; for he was infamous, both for his prostituting and encouraging the most abominable lust. He erected stews, as Agrippa relates, to both sorts of Veneries, and indulged the use of Sodomy, to a certain cardinal in certain months. This is also mentioned by Wesselus of Groningen. It is most false that Agrippa says any of these two things. See above (74).

+ De vanit, scient. c. de lenocinio.

Lib. de indulgentiis.

(73) Sotuel, in Turco-Papismus, lib. i, cap. xvii, p. 115.

(74) In the remark [G].

SMIGLECIUS (MARTIN) a native of Lemberg in Poland, turned Jesuit at Rome in the year 1581, where he studied with great application and good success. Being sent back into Poland, he taught Philosophy at Vilna four years, and Divinity ten years. He was rector of several colleges, and superior of the religious house at Cracow. He died at Kalisz after a long sickness the twenty-sixth of July 1618, at fifty-six years of age. He shewed an admirable patience in his adversity, especially during the sickness which consumed him by degrees (a). He applied himself very much to controversy both against the Protestants and the Unitarians. This appears from the books

books he published [A]. His Logic is very much esteemed [B]: it was printed in two volumes in 4to at Ingolstadt in the year 1618.

[A] *The books he published.* I omit those he wrote in his mother tongue, some of which are against the Arians (1); and I shall only set down the titles of those he composed in Latin, as I find them in Father Aleambe (2). *Latine editi de Zecharie Prophetæ pro Christi divinitate illustri testimonio, adversus Faustis Socii Anabaptistæ cavillationes. Vlnæ MDXCVI in 4to.* Nodum Gordium, seu, de Vocatione Ministrorum. *Cracoviæ MDCIX in 4to.* Nova Monstra novi Arianismi. *Nissæ MDCXII in 4to.* Verbum Caro factum, seu, de Divinâ Verbi Incarnati Natura, contra novos Arianos. *Cracoviæ MDCXIII in 4to.* Refutationem vanæ Dissolutionis Nodi Gordii de Vocatione Ministrorum, contra Joannem Volkium Ministrum Arianum. *ib. MDCXIV in 4to.* De erroribus novorum Arianorum, lib. ii, contra Valentinum Smalcium, *ibid. MDCXV in 4to.* De Christo vero & naturali filio Dei, ejusque pro nobis satisfactione, adversus Valentinum Smalcium Arianum, lib. ii. Accessit Responsio ad Refutationem C. errorum Smalcio objectorum. *ibidem MDCXV in 4to.* De Baptismo, adversus Hieronymum Moscorovium

Arianum, lib. i. *Ibidem eodem anno ac formâ.* De Ordinatione Sacerdotum in Ecclesiâ Romanâ, contra Jacobum Zaborovium Calvinianum Ministrum. *Cracoviæ MDCXVII.* De Notis Ministrorum. lib. ii. contra eundem. *MDCXVII.* Vanam sine viribus iram Ministrorum Evangelicorum. *Coloniæ apud Antonium Boitxerum MDCXI in 16mo.* Refutationem Epicherematis missionem Ministrorum Evangelicorum propugnantis. *MDCXII.*

[B] *His Logic is very much esteemed.* Smiglecius, a Polish Jesuit, was one of the last Logicians, who wrote upon Aristotle's Logic with the greatest subtilty and solidity. He dived into the bottom of that science with a clearness and exactness, hardly to be found in any other author. His Logic is an excellent work (3). This testimony of a fellow Jesuit will not appear a flattering one to those, who are capable of judging of such a book. The English have done justice to that work; it has been reprinted in their country.

(3) Rapin, Reflexions sur la Logique, num. viii, pag. m. 383.

SOCINUS (MARIANUS) a famous Civilian, was born at Siena the fourth of September 1401. He taught the Canon-Law at Padua and then at Siena: it appears from his works (a) that he understood it perfectly. He received in his country all the honours due to his great merit. He was deputed by his countrymen to Pope Pius II, who made him Advocate-Confistorial, and gave him several marks of a particular esteem. He was of a low stature [A], but of a strong constitution: he had a more universal knowledge than any other man in his time (b). It is said that one day he easily checked Politian's vanity [B]. What he answered to those, who asked him why he left off reading lectures, since he had a wife [C], is curious. He died at Siena the thirtieth of September 1467. See his encomium in the letters of Pius II (c). He left several children behind him, and among others a son, who exceeded him [D].

(a) See the remark [D], at the end.

(b) Æneas Silvius, Epist. cxlii, lib. i, apud Panzirol. de claris Legum Interpretibus, lib. iii, c. xxxv, p. m. 456, & seq.

(c) Taken from his Life, written by Panzirolus, in lib. iii, de claris Legum Interpretibus, p. m. 456, & seq.

[A] *He was of a low stature.* Æneas Silvius, his countryman, who was Pope by the name of Pius II, speaks of him thus (1). 'Nihil ei præter formam naturæ invidit. Humunculo est, nasci ex mea familia' (2) debuit cui parvorum hominum est cognomen. . . . Nature had been liberal to him in every thing, but his stature. He is a little man, he should have been of my family, whose surname is Piccolomini, i. e. little men.

(1) Pius II, was of the family Piccolomini.

(2) Panzirolus, de claris Legum Interpretibus, p. 457.

† Cornab. lib. iii, miscell. cap. xvi.

† Tiraquell. in 2. l. connubia glo. 1. part. 2. n. 25. Æneas Silvius, de dictis & factis Alexandri Regis, lib. iii, cap. xxviii.

(4) Panzirolus, de claris Legum Interpretibus, p. 457.

(5) Eo provectus est ut patrem superaverit. Panzirol. *ibid.* lib. ii, cap. xxviii, pag. 276.

[B] *It is said that one day he . . . checked Politian's vanity.* That great critic, who should have been contented with the reputation of an excellent Philologer, pretended also to be a Civilian of the first rank. He said one day that he could make better lectures of the Civil-law, than the famous Accursius; but our Socinus nonplussed him by the first question he put to him. (3) Semel etiam Angelum Politianum virum Græcis, Latinique literis impense eruditum, cum Senis in Juris civilis interpretationibus se vel Accursium superaturum jactabundus gloriaretur, leniter correxit, ab eo enim interrogatus Angelus, quis esset in jure suus heres, ob imperitiam obmutuit, ac pudore suffusus suæ audacie poenas dedit. . . . He one time gently reproved Politian, a man very well skilled in Greek and Latin, when he vainly boasted that he could exceed Accursius, in interpreting the Civil-law. Socinus asked him who was his heir at law, being ignorant, he made no answer, and suffered for his rashness, by the shame he was put to.

This seems to me a fabulous story, for Politian was but fifteen years of age, when Socinus died.

[C] *Since he had a wife.* He only answered, I have got a wife; and being told that Socrates did not leave off his lectures after he was married: it is, replied he, because Xantippe was an ill humoured woman, and perhaps ugly, whereas I have got a handsome and complaisant wife. *Uxore ducta, cum docendi munus intermisisset, interrogatus, cur id non continuaret, se conjugem duxisse respondit; et cum verò replicaretur, Socratem nunquam philosophiam ob uxorem deservisse, subiecit, illum molestem, et fortè turpem Xantippam, se autem formosam. Et obsequenter habere (4).*

[D] *He left . . . behind him . . . a son who exceeded him (5).* VIZ. BARTHOLOMEW SOCINUS, born at Siena the twenty-fifth of March 1437. He taught the Civil-law at Siena, and then at Pisa, whither he was called in 1474. Having a greater reputation than all the Civilians of his time, he was called

to Ferrara, where he was a professor four years; and then he performed the same function at Bologna, from whence he returned to Pisa, where he had a salary of a thousand ducats. There arose a great emulation between him and Jaso Mainus: they grew so hot in their disputes, that Laurence de Medicis went to Pisa on purpose, to have the pleasure of such a sight. He removed several times from one university to another, and at last a kind of palsy in the tongue having deprived him of his speech, he was only a chamber counsellor. He died at Siena in 1507 (6). He had more learning than virtue, for he lived a debauched life, and made so many foolish expences, that he was buried at the public charges. 'Illiberalibus verò moribus insignem doctrinam maculasse dictus est, qui chartarum, & alex. ludo supra modum deditus, non modo debitis lectionibus quandoque auditores fraudasse, sed infomnes etiam noctes turpiter egisse dicitur. Eo vitio paternis opibus consumptis, & universa, quam docendo, & de jure respondendo plurimum coegerat, pecunia effusa, ad extremam inopiam deductus est, usque adeo ut nec quod funeri suppetere, post se reliquisset dicitur. Eam ob causam semper egens undique pecuniam avarius conquirere cogebatur (7). . . . He is said to have sullied his excellent learning by his sordid life, being so addicted to cards and dice, that he not only deprived his scholars of their lectures, but spent therein whole nights. Hereby having consumed his patrimony, and whatever he gained by his scholars and consultations, he was reduced to extreme poverty, inasmuch that he is said not to have left wherewithal to bury him. And therefore being always in want, and covetous, he was forced to get money any how.' His memory failed him upon two remarkable occasions. 'Memorize imbecillitate bis inter orandum excidit. Primo cum anno MCCCCXCII. à Republica Senensi Alexandro VI. Pont. Max. suæ civitatis nomine gratulatum missus in prima præp. oratione, quam illi Angelus Politianus dictaverat, defecit, quod ubi Pontifex deprehendit, manum sublevaris fati sibi notam viri virtutem esse dixit, eumque Advocati Confistorialis titulo honestavit. Idem iterum illi Venetis contigit, ubi dum apud Augustinum Barbadium Reipublicæ Principem dicere conatur, excidentibus quæ antea excogitaverat, nihil exprimere potuit (8). . . . By the weakness of his memory, he failed twice in his speech. Once, when sent by his Republic to congratulate Pope Alexander VI,

(6) Taken from Panzirolus, ubi supra, p. 275, & seq.

(7) Id. *ibid.* p. 279.

(8) Id. *ibid.* p. 280.

T t

'be stopped almost in the beginning of his oration, which Angelus Politianus dictated; this, when the Pontif perceived, lifting up his hand, he said, that he sufficiently knew the ability of the man; and honoured him with the title of a Confessorial Advocate. The same thing happened to him another time at Venice, where, when he was endeavouring to make a speech before Augustinus Barbadius, the Doge of that Republic, forgetting what he had designed to deliver, he could not express any thing.' His consultations, and those of his father, have been collected into four volumes (9). Besides, (9) Printed at Venice in 1579. each of them wrote several other books that are printed.

(a) He was the son of ALEXANDER SOCINUS, the son of Marianus. To distinguish those two Marianus, the first is first named Senior, and the second Junior.

(b) See, above, remark [G], of the article ALCIATUS (ANDREW), the reputation he there acquired.

(c) Taken from Panzirolus, de claris Legum Interpretibus, lib. ii, cap. cxxii, pag. 338, & seq.

(d) Ibid. p. 341.

SOCINUS (MARIANUS) grand-son of the foregoing (a), was not less famous than his grand-father in the profession of the law. He was born at Siena the twenty-fifth of March 1482, and having taken his degree of Doctor of the Civil-law at Siena at twenty-one years of age, he taught that science there for several years, after which he was called to Pisa, where he taught it seven years. He was recalled to Siena, from whence at a year's end he went to Padua to be professor of the same science. From that place he removed to Bologna (b), to fill up the chair that was vacant by the return of Alciatus to Pavia in the year 1540. The pensions and privileges bestowed upon him, at Bologna, were so considerable, that he would not leave it, though he had very great offers made him in several other universities. He married Camilla Salvetta at Siena, and lost her after he had been married forty-six years. Having been used for a long time to lie with a woman, he could not be without one; he gave up himself to incontinency [A], whereby he got some distempers, which proved so troublesome to him, that at last the violence of the remedies he used, consumed his strength, and occasioned his death the nineteenth of August 1556 (c). If we believe Panzirolus (d), he had thirteen children (e), two of which only, viz. CELSUS and PHILIP out-lived him. Celsus who was professor of the Canon-law at Bologna, obtained there the professorship of the Civil-law after his father's death, and left it. Panzirolus should have known that Marianus left behind him a third son, called LÆLIUS SOCINUS, the first author of the Socinian sect [B]. ALEXANDER SOCINUS son of the same Marianus, and

(c) Panzirolus having said that they were ten sons, and three daughters, calls them all Filii a little after.

[A] He gave up himself to incontinency. I will express it in the words of Panzirolus. *Apud eos (Bononienfes) Camillam uxorem LXIII annum agentem amiffit, quicum annis XLVI vixerat. Postea uxori affuetus parum continenter vixiffe dicitur; unde contracto morbo non semel egrotavit, ac demum dum præfentantis remediis fubi mederi conatur, potentium pharmacorum vi oppreffus LXXIV. ætatis anno decessit (1).*

(1) Panzirolus, de claris Legum Interpretibus, pag. 341.

(2) Bibliotheca Antitrinitaria, pag. 18.

[B] He left behind him a third son called LÆLIUS SOCINUS, the first author of the Socinian sect. He was born at Siena in the year 1525 (2). Being designed for the Civil-law by his father, he began early to look for the foundations of that science in the word of God; and by that study he came to discover that the church of Rome taught many things contrary to revelation. Desiring to dive more and more into the true sense of the holy Scripture, he studied the Greek and the Hebrew, and even Arabic, and quickly left Italy to go into a Protestant country. Fear contributed also to his removing; for he knew that private opinions in matters of religion were not tolerated in his country. He began to travel in the year 1547, and spent four years in going thro' France, England, the Netherlands, Germany, and Poland; and then he settled at Zurich. He made himself known to the most learned men of that time, who expressed their esteem for him in their letters to him: but having discovered, by the doubts he proposed to them, that he suffered himself to be infected with the poison of the Arian or Photinian heresy, he made himself very much suspected. Calvin gave him very good advice about it in the year 1552. 'Quod pridem testatus sum, serio iterum moneo, nisi hunc quærendi pruritus mature corrigas, metuendum esse, ne tibi gravia tormenta accerfas (3). - - - What I formerly represented to you, I now again put you in mind of, that unless you in time restrain that itch of inquiry, it is to be feared, you will bring upon yourself grievous troubles.' Socinus making a good use of that advice, and more still of Servetus's execution, took care not to discover his thoughts but in a proper time and place, and behaved himself to dexterously, that he lived among the mortal enemies of his opinions, without being in the least injured by them. An example, that is proposed in his nephew's life to those, who expose themselves rashly to martyrdom, being sometimes more greedy of a great reputation, than truly zealous for truth. 'Sciant, quos nimia veri libertas in pericula sæpe interemptiva precipitat, ipsam illam, quam propugnant, veritatem in circumspècta prudentie lenitate, quam in effreni zelo plus habere præfidi. Ut qui ultro suis discriminiibus occurrant, magis ad privatam laudem, quam ad publici emolu-

(3) See the Life of Faustus Socinus, prefixed to the first volume of the Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum.

menti rationem festinare videantur (4). - - - Let them know, whom too great liberty in speaking unseasonably the truth oftentimes throws into dangers unexpected, that what they maintain, is better advanced, by a circumspèct prudential meekness, than by a headstrong zeal. And those who of their own accord go to meet the danger seem more to hasten to their own glory, than to regard the public good.' He found some disciples, who respectfully heard his instructions: they were Italians, who wandered up and down in Germany and Poland. He also communicated his errors to his relations by some writings he sent to them at Siena. He took a journey into Poland after his father's death (5), and obtained from the king some letters of recommendation to the Doge of Venice, and the Duke of Florence, that he might be safe at Venice all the time his affairs should require his stay there; for he intended to possess himself of his father's estate, and to settle the matter with his relations. It was about the year 1558, that he travelled into Poland. *Circa annum 1558, et 1559, literis Poloniæ atque Bohemiæ Regum muniri voluit, ut securus in urbe Veneta cum amicis de patrimonio agere posset. Tunc profecto patuit apud plerisque Germaniæ atque Poloniæ principes, ipsique adeo Reges, quantum in gratia potuerit. Summis enim studiis in ejus causa apud Ludovicum Prælum Venetiarum, atque Cosmum Hetrurici Duces certatum est (6).* His family was dispersed at that time: they were suspected of Heresy: his brother Camillus was imprisoned; some others fled away, and his nephew Faustus was one of them. Lælius returned into Switzerland, and died at Zurich in May 1562. Faustus was then at Lyons, and set out immediately when he heard that his uncle was dead. He arrived at Zurich before any of Lælius's papers had been conveyed away; he took possession of them, and made use of them afterwards (7).

(5) His father as I have said before, died at Bologna, in the year 1556.

(6) Vita Pauli Socialis, pag. 2.

(7) Taken from the Life of Faustus Socinus.

Some other circumstances are to be found in the Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum. LÆLIUS SOCINUS, born in the year 1525, began to confer about matters of religion in the year 1546, with above forty persons. They privately met in the territory of the Venetians (8), and brought into question particularly the mystery of the Trinity; and of Christ's satisfaction. Ochinus, Valentinus Gentilis, and Paul Acianus, assisted at those conferences. They were discovered: some of those innovators were apprehended, and condemned to death; the rest fled away. The Chronology of that author is not right, for Ochinus left Italy about the year 1542. Zanchius says, that Lælius Socinus endeavoured to infect him with his heretical notions, not by maintaining them in express words, but proposing them as doubts, and by way of a dispute. He adds, that

(8) Circa annum 1546, latitaverat cum sociis suis itidem Italia quorum nomen-rius quadragenarium excedebat, in Venetia, ditione, collegio colloqueque de religione, in quibus potissimum, &c. Biblioth. Antitrinit. pag.

and father of FAUSTUS SOCINUS, of whom I am going to speak, died very young, and with the reputation of a learned Civilian [C]. We have some works of his father

that Lælius understood very well Greek and Hebrew, and was a man of an unblameable life. 'Fuit Lælius, nobili honestaque familia natus: bene Græcè & Hebraicè doctus; vitæque etiam externæ inculpata: quarum rerum causa mihi quoque intercesserat cum illo non vulgaris amicitia; sed homo fuit plenus diversarum heresium: quas tamen mihi nunquam proponebat, nisi disputandi causa: & semper interrogans, quasi cuperet doceri (9). - - - This Lælius was descended of a noble and honourable family: well learnt in Greek and Hebrew; and also of an unblameable outward life: wherefore there was betwixt us a more than ordinary friendship; but he was a man full of Heresies: which yet he never proposed to me, but by way of dispute: and always asking questions, as desiring to be informed.'

(9) Zanchius, in Prefat. Libri de tribus Elohim, apud Bibl. Antitrit. pag. 19.

(10) He wrote it in the year 1561. *Biblioth. Antitrit.* pag. 21.

(11) It was reprinted in Holland in the year 1612, with some other pieces of the same nature. The year following it was printed in Dutch in the same country. *Ibid.* pag. 20.

(12) In Prefat. Compendii Socinianismi confutati.

(13) In Summa Controversæ.

(14) In the Bibl. Antitritarior. pag. 21, the second edition of that work is placed in the year 1584. But Placcius, de Pseudon. pag. 176, mentions an edition in 1577, Christlingæ, in 8vo. which probably is not the first.

(15) Joh. Albertus Faber, Decad. num. 25.

(16) Placcius, de Pseudonymis, pag. 161.

(17) Summa Controversæ. pag. 563, of the second edition, and 442 of the first.

(18) Joh. Albertus Faber, His Decad. Decadum, was printed in 1689.

(19) Joh. Albertus Faber, ubi supra, num. 25.

It is certain, that when Zanchius wrote those words, Lælius had composed a paraphrase upon the first chapter of St John's Gospel full of Photinianism (10). The same Lælius wrote a dialogue in 1554, against the book published by Calvin, to shew that Heretics ought to be punished with death. Calvinus and Vaticanus are the interlocutors of that dialogue (11): some ascribe it to Castilio; but others, as Cloppenburg (12) and Hoornbeek (13) ascribe it to Lælius Socinus. He is said also to be the author of the book, intitled, *de Hereticis capitali supplicio non afficiendis*, that was published (14) under the fictitious name of Minus Celsus Senensis, and there is more reason to ascribe it to him, than to Faustus Socinus. Some pretend that Lælius is the author of a book, intitled, *Martini Bellii Dialogus Lælius de Hereticis gladio coercendis*, published against Calvin, and they endeavour to prove it against Placcius by the testimony of the *Bibliotheca Antitritariorum* (15).

Observe, that Placcius ascribes that dialogue to Castilio, and refers us to Calvin's Life, where Beza boasts of having confuted that book of Castilio (16); but it is certain Beza makes no mention there of a piece, intitled, *Dialogus Lælius*. He only speaks of a *Farrago*, which he ascribes to Castilio, and against which he wrote a book. What he calls *Farrago*, is intitled, *De Hereticis, an sint persequendi, & omnino quomodo sit cum eis agendum, Luteri & Brentii, aliorumque multorum tam veterum tum recentiorum sententia. Liber hoc tam turbulento tempore pernecessarius, & cum omnibus tam potissimum principibus & magistratibus utilissimus, ad discendum, quodnam sit eorum in re tam controversa, tamque periculosa, officium; et* contains the following pieces, MARTINI BELLII prefatio, in qua quid sit hereticus, & quidnam cum eo agendum sit, demonstratur. MARTINI LUTERI sententia, in qua aperit ostenditur, hereticorum punitionem ad magistratum non pertinere. JOANNIS BRENTII de Anabaptistis, & ceteris qui heretici habentur, sententia, qua idem docet. Aliorum autorum, tum veterum, tum recentiorum, eadem de re sententia. Basilii Montfortii refutatio eorum, que pro persecutione dici solent. We may observe another small error in Mr Placcius; for he refers us to a book of Hoornbeek (17), wherein he only mentions the dialogue between Calvinus and Vaticanus. A learned German whom I have quoted (18), alleges this testimony of Placcius, and does not rectify it: he also alleges Mr Teissier, who only says in page 238, of the first volume of his additions to the eulogies taken from Thuanus, that Castilio is the author of a book published under the name of Martin Bellius, in which he endeavours to prove that Heretics ought not to be punished. Thus here are two authors quoted, the last of which does not say what is imputed to him, and the other is mistaken: but let us see whether the objection raised against the latter is a solid one. It is objected against Placcius, that Martini Bellii Dialogus Lælius de Hereticis gladio coercendis, is ascribed to Lælius Socinus in the *Bibliothèque de l'Antitritarian*. Verum in *Bibliotheca Antitritariorum* . . . pag. LXIV, & XX. ille tractatus Lælio Socino tribuitur, allegata in hac sententia auctoritate Johannis Cloppenburgii & Hoornbeckii (19). Consult the 64th page of that *Bibliothèque*, and you will find that it is thought Lælius Socinus Senensis took the name of Minus Celsus Senensis in a book, *De Hereticis non capitali supplicio afficiendis*. Consult the 20th page, and you will find that the dialogues between Calvinus and Vaticanus, wherein it is asserted that the power of the sword ought not to be extended to Here-

tics, is ascribed to Lælius Socinus by Cloppenburg and Hoornbeek. I need not say that there is little exactness in this account. As for what concerns the other writings of Socinus, the uncle, see the same *Bibliothèque*.

I must not forget a passage of Hoornbeek quoted in it, which testifies the esteem that Melancthon had conceived for Lælius Socinus. That passage will confirm what has been said above of Lælius's design to take a journey to Venice. 'Uti Zanchium, quamdiu cum eo viveret, mirifice sefellit Lælius; similiter bono viro Philippo Melanthoni, quocum triennium exegit familiariter, adeo imposuit, ut Philippus pro eo tanquam optimo viro a. c. 1570. intercesseret tum ad Imp. Maximilianum II. tum ad Poloniz regem Sigismundum, ut horum nomine Lælius Legati vicem Venetiis obire, eaque ratione paternam hereditatem, sibi ob consuetudinem cum Protestantibus in Germania, interclusam adire tutius posset (20). - - - *As Lælius wonderfully deceived Zanchius, so long as he lived with him; in like manner he so imposed on the good man Philip Melancthon, with whom he passed three years in a familiar manner, that Melancthon interceded for him, as for a deserving person, both with the Emperor Maximilian II, and with Sigismund, King of Poland, that Lælius might execute in their name an embassy to the Venetians, and by that means more safely get possession of his paternal inheritance, detained from him because of his familiarity with the German Protestants.* Father Maimbourg has committed some faults, which ought to be observed. Lælius Socinus, says he (21), and Matthew Gribaldus, came to Gentilis in Poland. He had been saying, that Gentilis being sent for by Blandrata, went into Poland, after he had privately left Geneva. Now you must know, that Gentilis having left Geneva, some time after he had made *Pamende honorable* on the second of September 1558, acted so many parts before he went into Poland (22), that it is probable he went not thither till about the year 1560. The Socinian Historians place that Journey in the year 1562, or in the year 1563 (23), and therefore he did not make it with Lælius Socinus; for the latter was in Poland about the year 1558 (24). Maimbourg adds, that as Gentilis and Lælius Socinus were returning thro' Germany and Switzerland into Italy, teaching their Doctrine every where, Socinus died at Basil, and Gentilis was apprehended by the magistrates of Berne (25). But we may remember that Socinus died at Zurich the sixteenth of May 1562, and Gentilis did not leave Poland till the year 1566.

[C] ALEXANDER SOCINUS . . . father of FAUSTUS SOCINUS . . . died very young, and with the reputation of a learned Civilian. He was admitted Doctor of the Civil-law at Siena in 1530. He had before maintained, during five days at Padua, and during two days at Siena, three hundred theses with great success. After he had been made Doctor he explained the Institutes in his native country, and then he was called to Padua to be professor in ordinary. The quarrels, that arose between him and the other professors, obliged him to return to Siena, where he continued to read public lectures. He went to Macerata in the year 1540, to teach the Civil-law in the university lately founded there, where he died the twenty-sixth of April 1541 (26). He had married Agnes Petrucci daughter of Burgesio Petrucci, and of Victoria Piccolomini. This Petrucci having succeeded his father Pandolphus, who had been the head of the Republic of Siena, could not keep his post long: he was driven from it by a contrary faction, and died soon after. Victoria Piccolomini his widow, sister, niece, or cousin to many great lords, bore that misfortune with great constancy, and lived fifty-six years after the death of her husband, in the constant practice of the virtues most essential to her sex. Her daughter, brought up by such a mother, answered her education, and was married to Alexander Socinus a young man of great parts (27). These are the father and mother of Faustus Socinus. Relicta vidua Victoria animam, quem in prioris fastigii splendore nunquam sustulerat, tam iniqua rerum vicissitudine frangi non permixti. Itaque annis quinquaginta sex, quibus maritus vitæ & domum fortuneque singulari

(20) See his article.

(21) See the article ALCIA-TUS (JOHN PAUL) remark [A].

(22) See the Life of Faustus Socinus, pag. ii.

(23) Maimbourg, Hist. de l'Arianisme, Tom. iii, pag. 361.

(24) Taken from Panzirolus, de claris Legum Interpret. p. 341.

(25) Alexander subtilitatem & pater ejus Marianus Junior Jurisconsultorum principes vocati sunt. Pile Fausti Socini, initio.

(20) Hoornbeek, Summa Controversæ, lib. vii, pag. 442, Edit. 1653.

(21) Maimbourg, Hist. de l'Arianisme, Tom. iii, pag. 351, 352, 353, Edit.

(22) See his article.

(23) See the article ALCIA-TUS (JOHN PAUL) remark [A].

(24) See the Life of Faustus Socinus, pag. ii.

(25) Maimbourg, Hist. de l'Arianisme, Tom. iii, pag. 361.

(26) Taken from Panzirolus, de claris Legum Interpret. p. 341.

(27) Alexander subtilitatem & pater ejus Marianus Junior Jurisconsultorum principes vocati sunt. Pile Fausti Socini, initio.

father [D].

singulari modestia & spectata integritate ac pudicitia vidui status solitudinem toleravit. Filiam Agnetam, quam, ut tanto genere dignum erat, sanctissimis moribus imbuerat, Alexandro Socino in matrimonium dedit, patricio quidem juveni, sed tamen privato. Is fuit Fausti nostri pater (28). Had Panzirolus known how Faustus Socinus turned his studies, he would not have used the following words. 'Ex eo (Alexandro) & Agnete ex Burghesia Pandulfi Petruccii Senarum Principis nepte natus, faustus preclari ingenii juvenis parentum vestigia secutus esse speratur' (29). --- Faustus Socinus, son of Alexander

(28) Ibid.

(29) Panzirol, de claris Legum Interpret. p. 342.

'Socinus and Agnes Petrucci, a youth of an excellent disposition, gave hopes that he would follow the footsteps of his parents.'

[D] We have some works of Marianus Socinus. The catalogue of the Bodleian library mentions a *Consilium in materia monetaria*, printed at Cologne in the year 1591. He is said to be the author of Bartolus's distinctions. He is said to be the author of Bartolus's distinctions. His consultations furnished materials for the book of the common opinions of the Doctors, published by one Musculus (30).

(30) Scripta distinctiones Bartoli, quæ Venerabili A. MDLXIV edidit, & Socino vindicavit, Simon Schardius. Etiam ex ejus consiliis collecta sunt communes Doctorum opiniones, editæ ab Erasmo Musculo Hanojenſe. Hoornbeck, Apparatu ad Socinian. Contraverſas, pag. 50.

SOCINUS (FAUSTUS) grand-son of the foregoing, and the chief founder of a very ill sect that goes by his name, and which, notwithstanding the persecutions, hath flourished a considerable time in Poland [A], was born at Siena the fifth of December 1539. He studied but little in his youth; he only had a tincture of Classical learning, and learned only the elements of Logic. The letters his uncle Lelius did write to his relations,

[A] A sect . . . which notwithstanding the persecutions, hath flourished a considerable time in Poland. Sigismund Augustus granted liberty of conscience to the sects which forsook the Church of Rome. They made no separate bodies at first; but when the Evangelics came to know the opinions of the Unitarians, they would no longer communicate with them; which occasioned two different communions. That rupture began at Cracow by the care of Gregory Pauli. The Unitarians had several churches in Poland and Lithuania, some in the great towns (1), and others in the country-seats of gentlemen. They established their metropolis at Racovia, in the Lesser Poland. There they had a yearly synod, there they erected a college, and set up a printing-house. Some Catholics sent their children to that college; and some joined with those heretics. Some Protestants did the same, and a vast number of books came out of the printing-house of Racovia, and were dispersed in foreign countries. This prosperity was interrupted in 1638; for some scholars of the college of Racovia having broke a wooden cross set up in a high-way, the Diet of Warlaw ordered that the college should be demolished, the Church of Racovia shut up, the printing-house of the Unitarians destroyed, and the ministers and teachers banished (2). This was executed. Some time after the Judges of Lublin destroyed the church of Kifelin, and that of Bereſc in Volhinia, under pretence that the ministers of Racovia, and the teachers of the college, had fled thither. The Diet of the year 1647 banished Jonas Slichtingius for publishing a book intitled, *Confessio Christiana*, and that book was burnt by the hands of the executioner. But, notwithstanding these misfortunes, the Unitarians performed their religious exercises in many places of that kingdom, till the year 1658. They were then expelled upon pretence that some of them had put themselves under the protection of the King of Sweden, who had conquered the greatest part of Poland. However that reason was not alleged in the edict of banishment; for they were afraid of offending the Swedes, who had stipulated a general amnesty for all the subjects of the King of Poland, who adhered to them during the invasion. Their banishment was only grounded upon their doctrine: they pretended, that in order, to draw God's blessing upon the kingdom, it was necessary to banish those, who denied the eternal Divinity of the Son of God. They were therefore ordered to depart from it upon pain of death: all their estates were confiscated, all persons were forbidden upon the same penalty, to give them any assistance, or any mark of affection in their exile (3). *Quum Suci Poloniam invaſissent, & pleraque ejus loca occupasset, ita ut & provinciæ multæ missis legatis Regi Suecorum ut victori sese subicerent, & exercitus ipsi cum Ducibus suis eidem sese addicerent, quia ex Unitariis nonnulli etiam ad Suecorum patrocinium & protectionem confugerant, quamvis multi eorum nullam cum Suecis inirent societatem, post Suecorum discesum, omnes ii quos Arianos vocant, publica regni constitutione, 1658 non prætextu perduellionis, ne Suci, qui per tractatus amnestiam iis qui ipsi adhaerant pacis sunt, offenderentur, sed directè ob religionem, ob id quod Jesu Filii Dei præeternam, quam vocant, Deitatem non agnoscant, ex-terres acii sunt, ut scilicet Deus hujus blasphemiam amitti,*

(1) Such as Cracow, Lublin, and Novogrod.

(2) I shall quote an author in the remark [L], who denies that all those things were contained in the decree of the Diet.

(3) Taken from the preface to the first volume of the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*.

omnia prospera ipsi regno tribueret: ita ut nisi patria excederent, accusati pena capitali subicerentur: bona quoque eorum fisco publico sunt applicata (4): & *vetitum ne quisquam eos ullo modo juvare, vel extra solum patrum exulantes, aliquo benignitatis ac benevolentiae indicio prosequi audeat, aliqui eidem cum ipsis penæ obnoxii futuri* (5). The Socinians never recovered of that severe blow: they dispersed themselves as well as they could in Transylvania, Silesia, Prussia, &c. There is a great fault in those Latin words, for they intimate a great falsity, viz. That the estates of the Unitarians were confiscated; and they say nothing of their being permitted to stay two years in the kingdom to settle their affairs. It is an usual thing for those, who complain of their sufferings, to suppress whatever might make their persecution look less violent than it was. And therefore in order to represent the true state of the thing, I must give another account of it contained in the following passage. 'As during the last war of the Swedes in Poland, it was found out that the Arians, or Socinians intending to raise themselves upon the ruins of the state, kept intelligence with Ragotſki Prince of Transylvania, who had attacked that kingdom at the same time; the Catholic Lords, in the general Diet of Warlaw, in the year 1658, took hold of that opportunity to exterminate out of Poland that abominable Heresy, which might bring still greater calamities upon the state, that had not been far from ruin. The Lutheran and Calvinist deputies, who were in that Diet, being apprehensive that a law enacted against those Heretics might be a precedent against themselves, and that in time they would be treated in the same manner, joined together in order to oppose it. But because their number was very small, if compared with the Catholics, and they were not deprived of their liberty, and besides they did not love the Arians, having more than once before demanded that they should not be tolerated in Poland, a law was at last enacted, with a common consent, against Arianism; and the Arians and Socinians comprehended under the same name, were obliged to abjure their heresy, or to depart the kingdom within two years, which were allowed them to sell their estates. That law, which was afterwards confirmed in the other general Diets, was none of those that lose by degrees the force that was given them in the heat of a zeal conceived from time to time against public disorders. It was executed, and is so to this day' (6).

Left any one should think that the Jesuit Maimbourg has given an unfair account, to praise the King and the States of Poland for having observed a kind of moderation, I must acquaint the reader that some Socinian writers (7) say, that the edict of the year 1658, allowed them three years to sell their estates, and that afterwards one of those three years was taken from them; so that the 10th of July 1660, was the day appointed for their departure (8). There is hardly any thing more lamentable than the description they make of the miseries they were exposed to from the year 1648, till they left Poland. They suffered a thousand insults during the two years allowed them; they could not sell their estates but at a very low rate; their misery was aggravated by all sorts of artifices.

(4) This is only to be understood of those effects which they could not sell in the time allowed them.

(5) The same preface, pag. 50.

(6) Maimbourg's Hist. de l'Arianisme, lib. xii, pag. 375, 376. of the 10th Jan. Dutch edition.

(7) See the two Letters printed at the end of the Historia Reformationis Polonice, pag. 278. & seq.

(8) Ibid. pag. 294.

relations, whereby they and their wives had imbibed many seeds of heresy (a), made an impression upon him; so that knowing himself not innocent he fled away as the rest, when the inquisition began to persecute that family. He was at Lyons when he heard of his uncle's death, and immediately set out to take possession of all the writings of the deceased. He returned into Italy, and became so acceptable to the Great Duke, that the charms of the court, and the honourable employments bestowed upon him, hindered him for the space of twelve years from remembering that he had been looked upon as the man, who was to put the last hand to the system of the Samofatenian Theology, which his uncle Lælius had begun. At last, the search after the Gospel truths appearing to him more valuable than the delights of a court life, he voluntarily left his country, and went into Germany in the year 1574, nor would he hearken to any persuasions to return, though he was desired to do it by the Great Duke. He stayed three years at Basil, where he studied Divinity with great application; and having embraced a doctrine very different from that of the Protestants, he resolved to maintain and spread it; and in order to it, he wrote a book *de Jesu Christo Servatore* [B]. He disputed at Zurich with Francis Puccius, in the beginning of the year 1578. The differences occasioned by the ill doctrine of Francis David, about the honours and the power of the Son of God, caused a great disturbance in the churches of Transilvania. Blandrata, a man of great authority in those churches, and at court, sent for Socinus, whom he took to be a person well qualified to pacify those troubles. He lodged him in the same house with Francis David; but the latter would not be undeceived, and maintained his opinion so openly and so boldly, that he was imprisoned. He died soon after; and Socinus was ill spoken of upon that account, though it is affirmed he had no hand in the counsels that were given to the Prince of Transilvania, to oppress Francis David. He retired into Poland in the year 1579, and desired to be admitted into the communion of the Unitarians; but because he differed from them in some points, and would not be silent,

(a) Hos inter quoque, suggerenda veritatis militis artem Lælius, ejus semina pariterat, exque longis licet terrarum spatii divisus, tam efficaci studio fovebat, ut nonnullorum uxores ignotas adhuc & abiens in partes traxerit. Vita Faust. Socini, pag. 2.

artifices. They do not forget the open infraction of perpetual and irrevocable edicts, and of the royal oaths, by virtue of which, they had been unmolested near one hundred years: much less do they forget to observe, that the Clergy moved the States of the kingdom to such an infraction, and King John Casimir to break the oath he had taken ten years before. 'Cœpit id primum odium Theologicum & furor vulgi; vis deinde confectis sacerdotibus occupata auctoritate Comitiorum, rescissis, projectis, spretis, pro omnium diffidentium pace ac securitate, quâ annis admodum centum gavisi sumus inviolati, severissimis legibus, gravissimis statutis, pactis, foederibus, promissis quæ omnium ordinum sanctissimo scito & conceptissimo Regum, hujus nominatim & quidem ter repetito jurejurando, sæpè & nuperrimè erant religiosissime & amplissime renovata, asserta, atque confirmata; ut vim juris obtinerent inviolabilis atque æterni (9). - - - It was begun first by the hatred of the clergy and the fury of the vulgar; and after carried on and completed by the violent rage of the priests, who prevailed both with the Diets to disannul, disregard, and destroy the most express, important, sacred promises, laws, and ordinances made for the peace and security of all dissenters in religion, which we enjoyed for near a century of years unviolated; and, with our kings, to break the most express and solemn oaths, and our present king in particular his oath thrice renewed, and most religiously and amply confirmed; which should have had the force of an eternal and inviolable law.' Two pages after, they set down the oath taken by the king, in 1648, and then they say (10): 'Decimo post anno, octavo videlicet quinquagesimo mense eodem, Papali plerique fascino incantati, Ordines Regni, ac fidei suæ, honoris ac conscientie religiosissimis nexibus obligatæ turpiter oblitæ, perculsi qui rectè sentiebant violentis clamoribus & minaci turba, Sanctissimam & Saluberrimam pacis legem, tot Comitiorum cautionibus, pactis, foederibus, stipulationibus, tot Regum à Sigismundo Augusto continua serie succedentium, publicis Sacramentis firmissimè constitutam, & nuper adeo tam sollicitè ac solemni ter constabilitam nobiscum, proficribant, nosque hoc ferunt, & natali solo exterminant diro decreto. - - - Ten years after, namely the fifty-eighth year, in the same month, the estates of the kingdom, most of them by a Papal fascination, basely forgetting their faith given, with the sacred ties of honour and conscience, and the sounder part overborn by the violent clamours and threats of the rabble, disannul and abolish the most sacred and wholesome law of peace, most firmly established by so many provisions, promises, laws, obligations of general Diets, and assured by the

'public solemn oaths of so many kings by an uninterrupted succession from Sigismund Augustus; and but lately carefully and solemnly confirmed to us; and by this terrible decree, they proscribed and drive us from our native country.' In order to know the vexations they were under before the revocation of the edicts, you need only read the Latin passage I am going to quote. It will appear from it, that the King and the Republic of Poland struck many blows one after another, before they came to the last extremities. France took the same course (11) against the Protestants. It appears also from the same passage, that the Unitarians ascribed all the calamities of Poland to the persecution which the sects, separated from the Church of Rome, had suffered in that kingdom, contrary to the faith of edicts. 'Poloniam deinde inauso omine commemorant, patriam nostram; quæ dum non tantum nobis, sed etiam Evangelicis, & aliis, contra jurisjurandi & foederum fidem, templa adimit, exercendæ religionis libertatem labefaciat, & variis pressuris ob diversum in sacris sensum, infestam sese præbet; vindicem Dei manum in se provocavit, & iis sese cladibus & calamitatibus involvit, quarum necdum finem videmus ullum: quæ quamdiu tantam tectam cuius servavit conscientie & religionis libertatem, altissima pace, & omnium bonorum felicitate cumulata floruit; sed ubi vinculum illud, æquali lege omnes de rebus divinis dissentientes continens, solvi cepit, omnia

(11) That is before the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685.

In pejus ruere, & retro sublapsa referri (12).

'- - - Then they mention Poland, our country, with an unlucky omen; which, while it takes away the churches and liberty of religion, not only from us, but also the Protestants and others, contrary to the faith of oaths and covenants, and oppresses us with manifold injuries, because of our different sentiments in matters of religion, hath provoked the avenging hand of GOD against it self, and incurred these destructions and calamities, of which we can yet see no end: so long as it is preserved to every one their liberty of conscience and religion, it flourished in profound peace and plenty of all blessings; but when that bond, which by an impartial and just law comprehended all that have different sentiments about religion, began to be dissolved, all things grew worse, and tended towards utter destruction.' Thus they speak in a writing which they presented to the States of the province of Holland in the year 1654.

(12) Apologia pro Veritate accusata, adversus Edictum Ordinum Hollandiæ, pag. 40.

[B] A book de Jesu Christo Servatore.] Therein he disputes against a minister of Paris (13), who being come to Basil, in his way to Francfort, lodged in the

(13) Called James Couet. He has been minister of the French Church at Basil: See above the remark of the article ROTAN.

VOL. V.

U u

(8) Christophorus Morhinius Pawlikovii Domini.

he met with a repulse. Nevertheless, he ceased not to write in favour of their churches against their enemies. The book he wrote against James Paleologus afforded his enemies a pretence to exasperate the King of Poland; and yet that book did not at all favour the sedition [C]. But though the bare reading of that book was sufficient to confute the informers, Socinus thought it expedient to leave Cracow, after he had been there four years, and to take sanctuary in the house of a Polish lord (b). He lived above three years under the protection of several lords of the kingdom, and also married a woman of a good family. He lost her in the year 1587, at which he was extremely afflicted

same house with him. That book was printed in 1595, by a disciple of the author. Socinus's name was put to it; it was the first time his name appeared in his works. Disputationem illam edidit postmodum Socini amicus & sequax, Elias Arcislevius, Polonus, An. M D XCV. præfixo, quod nunquam ante factum in aliis scriptis fuerat, Auctoris nomine (14). --- Elias Arcislevius, a native of Poland, a friend and follower of Socinus, published afterwards that dispute, prefixing to it the author's name, which had never been done in his other writings. I shall say by and by (15), why he was so long without putting his name to his books.

(14) Hoornbeek, in Apparatu ad Controvers. Socinianæ, pag. 51.

(15) In the remark [E].

[C] The book did not at all favour sedition. He there in so fully condemns the subjects who take up arms against their prince, and the Protestant divines who said that it was lawful to oppose those who oppressed the liberty of conscience, that perhaps the greatest sticklers for the arbitrary and despotical power of sovereigns never spoke more positively. He speaks rather like a monk, who let out to hire his pen, to make the Protestant Reformation odious, than like an Italian refugee. These are his words: 'Vestris belli gerendi Christiano populo concessionibus factum est, ut contra ipsum magistratum Christi nomine gaudens populus arma capere non dubitaverit, vobis non modo assentientibus, & approbantibus, verum etiam suadentibus, atque impellentibus, & libris præterea editis, id & posse, & debere fieri publice contestantibus, ac consentientibus. Testis est hodie eorum quæ dico orbis ipse terrarum, qui hæc fieri aut vidit, aut certissima fama accepit, sed testes potissimum sunt duæ nobilissimæ provincie Gallia, & Germania inferior, quæ civili sanguine jam diu madent, atque redundant, eo quod persuasum sit, ex certis quibusdam causis populo, seu populi parti, adversus dominum & principem suum Bellum gerere licere. Itaque hæc ætate nostra ab iis, qui Christianos se esse præcæteris jactant, per speciem Christianæ Religionis afferendæ, id fieri videmus, quod barbari atque effratati homines facere exhorrescunt, ut scilicet contra præprios reges arma ferant. Et tamen (si Deo placet) eos, qui ob prædictam sive in ipsa acie, sive alibi ceciderunt, & obtruncati sunt, in martyrum Christi numerum referri, publice audivimus. O seculum! Hi nimirum sunt, ut dixi, vestrarum belli gerendi concessionum fructus. Egregii vos scilicet magistratum defensores estis, qui populos contra magistratum, id est reges suos armatis, dum magistratu jubente, bello iuste geri posse docetis. Rege enim tyranno facto (quod quid sit, quilibet suo modo interpretatur) non regem amplius, sed populum ipsum, sive aliquos ex regni proceribus magistratum esse, vulgus hominum vobis ipsis indicantibus, vel certe annuentibus, contendit, quibus auctoribus, ex vestra disciplina, tyrannum illum, ut ipsi putant, ejusque vim armis repellere, cumque eo aperte bellum gerere non dubitant. Unde quot ingentia mala necessario proficiscantur plus fatis jam experientia novimus, quæ misere deplorari magis quam apte verbis explicari possunt (16). --- By your allowing Christian people to take up arms, it is come to pass, that people called by the name of Christ have not scrupled to rise up in arms against their magistrates, not only with your consent and approbation, but also by your advice and persuasion, and by printed books, publicly declaring and maintaining, that it may and ought to be done. All the world at this day, who have either seen or heard that such things are done, can witness the truth of what I say, but especially two famous countries, viz. France, and Lower Germany, which of a long time have been stained and overflowed with civil blood, because they are persuaded that it is lawful for a people, or a part of them, for certain causes, to fight against their lord and prince. Wherefore in these our days we have

(16) Socin. in Libro de Magistratu, advers. Paleologum, Part i, pag. 144, 145, apud Hoornbeek, in Apparatu ad Controvers. Socinianæ, pag. 58.

seen that done by those, who pretend to a greater perfection in Christianity than others, in defence, as they alledge, of religion, which barbarous and savage men would abhor; namely, to fight against their own kings. And notwithstanding such as have died on this account, whether in battle, or otherwise, have been publicly ranked amongst martyrs for CHRIST. These are, as I have said, the fruits of your allowing of making war. You are rare defenders of magistrates, who arm people against their magistrates, that is, their kings, whilst you teach that people may rise in arms without, and contrary to the command of their magistrates. For when a king becomes a tyrant, (and who is a tyrant every one pretends to judge) he is no more king, but the power devolves upon the people themselves, or some of the nobles, according to the opinion of the vulgar taught by you, or at least assented to, and that it is lawful to resist him, to repel force by force, and to wage open war against him, according to your doctrine. From whence, what prodigious and fatal mischiefs do necessarily arise, we are taught by awful experience, which may sooner be sadly lamented, than sufficiently described by words. Hoornbeek having quoted this long passage, adds a short confutation to it, and observes, among other things (17), that such a malicious reflection upon the conduct of the Dutch against Philip II, might have been alledged by the States-General, when they expelled the Socinians in the year 1598. I wonder that Cocceius, who quotes another passage out of that book of Socinus, knew not that this Heretic did particularly condemn the wars of the Dutch against Spain. Cocceius's words deserve to be inserted here: it appears from them, that in 1654, the Socinians did very much commend the conduct which Socinus had so much blamed in 1581. 'Socinus contra Paleologum, p. 261, dicit: Ex quo intelligi potest, quam præposterè ii se gerant, qui arma adversus eos, qui dominantur, capiunt, ut quemadmodum ajunt ipsi dominum & religionem tueantur. Ita Socinus A. C. 1581. locutus est. Neque est, puto, qui credat, cum non harum provinciarum proceres designasse. Nunc eques laudat scilicet Illustrium Ordinum pro præsumpta ipsa libertate conscientie gestum bellum, & Deum hanc præclaram Republicam elegisse dicit, ut illius libertatis, imò licentiæ, sedes esset (18). --- Socinus writing against Paleologus, says; Whereby it may be judged how posterously those act, who take up arms against their governors, that (as they give out) they may defend the worship of GOD and religion. Thus spoke Socinus in the year 1581. Nor is there any one, I think, who can imagine, that he did not here point out the chiefs of these provinces. Now truly the knight commendeth the war carried on by the illustrious States for that pretended liberty of conscience, and says, that GOD has chosen this famous Republic to be the seat of that liberty, or rather licence. But observe by the by, that informers are a sort of men that will do any thing; for Socinus was accused to the King of Poland as being the author of a seditious libel; and yet Socinus openly condemned in that book all the writers, who say that subjects may take up arms, and set up for judges of this question, Whether a prince is a tyrant or not? 'Stephanus tunc Regnum Poloniæ obtinebat. Ejus aures accusator imbutit seditiosi contra Magistratum scripti criminationes. Indignum esse, si auctore vago atque exuli Italo impune abeat hæc audacia. Libellus contra Paleologum designabatur. Qui licet aliud non postularet innocentie testimonium, quam sui lectionem, declinari tamen periculum placuit (19). --- Stephen was at that time King of Poland. He was told by an informer, that a seditious writing had been published against governors. That it would not be commendable to let this boldness of a vagrant author, an Italian, to go unpunished. The book against

(17) Hoornbeek, ibid. pag. 59.

(18) Cocceius in Examine Apologie Equitis Poloni, pag. 141.

(19) Viti Fanti Socin. fol. 113.

afflicted [D]; and to complete his affliction, he was deprived of the yearly income of his patrimony by the death of Francis de Medicis, Great Duke of Florence [E]. The consolation he had to see his doctrine approved at last by many ministers, was very much disturbed in 1598; for he received a thousand insults at Cracow, and his friends had much ado to rescue him out of the hands of the mob. He lost his household-goods, and some of his manuscripts, the loss of which he extremely lamented [F]. He lost, among others, that which he had writ against the Atheists. To avoid the like dangers for the time to come, he retired to a village about nine miles distant from Cracow, and he spent the remaining part of his life in the house of Abraham Blonski a Polish Gentleman (c). He died there the third of March 1604 (d). His sect was so far from dying with him, that it very much increased; but since it was expelled from Poland in 1658, it is very much decayed and very much diminished as to its visible state: I express my self so, because most people are persuaded that it has made an invisible progress, and grows daily more numerous; and it is thought, considering the present state of things, that Europe would be amazed to perceive itself Socinian in a little time, if potent princes made a public profession of that heresy, or only ordered that those, who profess it, should be freed from the temporal disadvantages that attend it. It is the opinion of several people, which makes them uneasy and alarms them. But others pretend there is nothing to fear, and that princes will never embrace a sect, which does not approve war, and the exercise of magistracies [G]. That very thing, say they, will always prejudice parti-

(c) Cum ad tam barbarum servitiae exemplum minime quoque accederent, Cracovia Ludovicus migravit, in pagum ultima sua habitatione atque obitu nobilem, novem circiter miliaribus Cracovia distans; ubi aliquot annos, usque mensis de sedibus viri nobilis Abrahami Blonskii, vicinus Stoinio vixit. Vita Fausti Socini, folio 3.

(d) Taken from his Life, written by Samuel Przys-covius, a Polish gentleman. It is prefixed to the first volume of the Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum.

^a Paleologus was meant. Which, tho' it wanted no other testimony of its innocence than only to be read, yet he thought fit to withdraw from that danger.

I do not think that any Socinian has hitherto maintained, That it is lawful to take up arms against one's prince; the reason of it is, that they have had no occasion to justify their sect upon that head. It has still its virginity in that respect, and is not like many others, which might say as the courtesan in Petronius, *Nunquam memini me Virginem fuisse*, &c. It is likely the Socinians have not had any convenient opportunity to imitate them.

[D] He lost his wife, in the year 1587, at which he was extremely afflicted. His grief was so violent, that his health was much impaired by it: he could not study for some time; he could not overcome the weakness that affected his body. His wife, some months before she died, was delivered of a daughter, who was afterwards married to a Polish gentleman, by whom she had several sons and daughters. *Filiam Agnetem suscepit circa Pentecostem anni 1587, ætatis 48, ex qua, cum post mortem patris Stanislaus Wiscovatio Equiti Polono nupsisset, nepotes neptisque etiamnum supersunt. Eodem anno in Septembrem amisit uxorem Elisabetham: quem casum viro luctuosum & acerbum gravius ægritudo corporis excepit: adeo quidem pertinax, ut per aliquot menses studiorum usum interceperet* (20).

(20) Vita F. Socini, ibid.

[E] He was deprived of the yearly income of his patrimony, by the death of Francis de Medicis, Great Duke of Florence. During the life of Isabella de Medicis, sister to the Great Duke, and wife of Paul Giordano de Ursini, the inquisitors endeavoured, in vain, to get that Heretic deprived of his estate. When she died, the Great Duke himself took care to protect him. He sent him word to return into Italy, and assured him that whatever happened, he would let him enjoy his income, and only recommended to him, not to put his name to his books. This was certainly a very great favour in a country where the court of Rome is so powerful. *Ne qua calamitatis species abesset, eadem fere tempestate, per mortem Francisci Magni Ducis Hetruriae, fructus bonorum ejus, quem quotannis ex Italia capiebat, penitus ipsi fuit ereptus. Sane aliquanto ante, criminatorem acerbitate ac minis Pontificum, bona ejus in periculum venerant. Sed Isabella Medicæ Magni Ducis Hetruriae sororis, quæ Paulo Jordano Ursino, quem supra memoravimus, nupta fuerat, dum vixit, mixto studio, & postea ipsius Francisci Magni Ducis benevolentia, factum est, ut illo supersite annuus ex iis redditus Socinus caperet. Adeo nondum illic meritorum ejus exoleverat memoria, ut literis ac precibus, damnati & exulsi, pridem destituti ac sepe depudati, principes difficillima in re gratificarentur. Humanissimi quoque literis compellatus, & in posterum quoque bono animo esse jussus est, quamdiu vita illis suppetere, dum ne in libris edendis nomen suum publice extare pateretur. Sed tunc illos principes infestum Socini fatum abstulerat* (21).

(21) Ibid.

[F] He lost . . . some . . . manuscripts, the loss of which he extremely lamented. The scholars of Cracow having stirred up some of the dregs of the people,

they entered Socinus's house; they dragged him half naked out of his chamber, tho' he was sick; they carried him along the streets; they cried, that he should be hanged; they beat him, and it was with extreme difficulty that a professor got him out of the hands of this rabble. His house was plundered, he lost his goods; but he particularly lamented the loss of some manuscripts, which he would have redeemed at the price of his blood. Let us hear what his Historian says. *Anno 1598. commota per Scholasticos infame plebis sæcæ, æger tunc & forte curandæ valetudini intentus, extrahitur à cubiculo seminudus, & per forum ac celeberrimas plateas, depositus ad supplicium plerisque contumeliose raptatur. Tandem in illa furentium colluvie pessime multatus, à M. Vadovita Professore Cracoviensi ægre furenti multitudini eripitur. Direptas tunc sarcinas & suppellectilem, quæque alia rapi potuere, longe minori dolore tulit, atque scriptorum quorundam jacturam irreparabilem, quam ipsius vitæ impendio sese redempturum fuisse sæpe professus est. Perit ibi una insignis contra Atheos labor, quem resellendis ingenuis magis cujusdam Viri commentis susceperat* (22).

[G] Princes will never embrace a sect, which does not approve war, and the exercise of magistracy. How many princes make a trade of their own subjects, as a private man deals in horses and sheep? They raise troops not to defend their frontiers, or to attack their enemies, but to make them serve other princes for money (23). They are very glad to have subjects always ready to lift themselves upon the first beating of a drum; they get a great deal by it, and therefore they would be sorry if they should turn Socinians; their treasury would be the worse for it. On the other side, most sovereign princes love to make irruptions into the neighbouring states, or to confederate with other princes who are at war; and it is of great moment for them that it should be known, that whoever attacks them will not do it with impunity. In all these views nothing could be more insignificant than to rule over men, who are engaged not to bear arms out of a principle of religion. There goes a story, which perhaps is only a meer jest, viz. That the King of Poland being attacked by the rebellious Cossacks, and by the Tartars, and wanting all his subjects to oppose the enemies, sent word to the Socinians to take up arms. They answered, that their conscience did not allow them to shed human blood; nor to do any harm to reasonable creatures. Whereupon, it was proposed to them to go to the army without putting any shot in their muskets: they were told that they would make a shew; which would prove of some use, because their enemies would be more afraid; but they had much ado to relish that expedient. See the end of the next remark. I have it from very good hands, that the Polish gentlemen of the Socinian persuasion went to the war, when the laws of the kingdom required it, and even that some of them professed a military life, without being obliged to it out of a necessity of obeying the laws of the kingdom: their sect did not approve their conduct in the last case.

[H] Few

(22) Ibid. fol. 3.

(23) Compare what is said above, at the end of the remark [L] of the article ANABAPTISTS; and the remark [E], of the article BULLINGER.

SOCINUS.

172

cular men against Socinianism; for few people can renounce ambition, and give over a military life [H]. To be convinced of it we need only consult experience; and consider what is

[H] Few people can renounce ambition, and give over a military life. Those, who love war, are innumerable, and are acted by very ambitious motives. Gentlemen, and those who live nobly, are excited thereto either by the sole desire of raising themselves, and acquiring glory, or, by a desire of supplying their wants. The soldiers are animated by laziness, and by debauchery: they hope to be idle the greatest part of the time; they hope to pillage and plunder, and to have plenty of good wine, and debauched women. In every town, those who are qualified to pretend to offices, sue for them with great earnestness, and leave nothing unattempted to obtain them. As soon as there is a vacancy, they immediately see several competitors, who have long before opened the way by their solicitations and liberalities: a plain demonstration that the desire of honours and dignities is very powerful, and very general. From whence it ought to be concluded that the Socinian religion cannot suit a whole nation, nay, nor the greatest number; it is only adapted to some persons of a particular temper: and if it be true, that a Pope hearing that the Protestants punished adulterers and fornicators, cried out, that their religion would be of no long continuance (24), it may be affirmed that his prognostication would have been more just, if he had applied it to a sect of men, who will neither bear arms nor exercise any office.

(24) See the article ABELIANS, citat. (3).

WHETHER the rejection of mysteries is a good way to get followers.

(25) See l'Esprit de Mr Arnaud, Tom. 1, cap. vii, pag. 211.

(26) According to Celsus, de Bello Civili, lib. ii, cap. iv, that state would be virtuous. Communis vitio nature, says he, ut invidis, latitantibus atque incognitis rebus magis confidamus, vehementiusque exterramur.

(27) Madam de Sablé, says in one of her Maxims (it is the xxxiith) We esteem those men most, the extent of whose ability we know not; for we always presume the best of what we see but by half.

to expect to be followed by the multitude. If he had a mind to satisfy his vanity in that respect, he should do as the hero of Lorenzo Gratian (28). But granting that those Italians have been so silly as to think that people would be freed from an intolerable yoke, if they were dispensed from believing the Trinity, &c. must we also grant that they thought the prohibition of civil and military employments would not be a yoke a thousand times heavier than that which they intended to break? Will any one be so unreasonable as to require that we should have such a notion of those men, who wanted neither wit nor address, as every body owns? What am I going to say will doubtless resolve the question. When men of parts, designing to set up a new sect, pitch upon a loose method, and substitute an easy doctrine in the room of a difficult one, it may be said that they do not pitch upon the most proper method to succeed in their design: but it ought not to be supposed that they are contented to suppress speculative mysteries, and that they keep the whole practical part, and even aggravate the yoke of the moral precepts. And yet this is supposed concerning the founders of the Socinian heresy; and therefore what is said of their design is a mistake. They are more rigid than other Christians about the prohibition of revenge, and the contempt of worldly honours; they are not for any mitigated or figurative explications of such texts of the Scripture as relate to morality. They have revived the severity of the Primitive Church, which did not approve that the Faithful should concern themselves with magistracies, and should have any hand in the death of their neighbour, so far that they would not have them to accuse malefactors. Non enim cum occidere Deus vetat, latrocinari nos tantum prohibet, quod ne per leges quidem publicas licet, sed ea quoque ne fiant monet, quæ apud homines pro licitis habentur. Ita neque militare iusto licebit, cujus militia est in ipsa iustitia, neque vero accusare quemquam crimine capitali, quia nihil distat, utrumne ferro, an verbo potius occidas, quoniam occisio ipsa prohibetur. Itaque in hoc Dei præcepto nullam prorsus exceptionem fieri oportet, quin occidere hominem sit semper nefas, quem Deus sanctum animal esse voluit (29). For when God forbids killing, he does not only prohibit robbery, which is done by the laws of the state, but also such things as by men are accounted lawful. Wherefore it is not lawful for a just man to fight, whose warfare must be the fight of faith; nor to accuse any of a capital crime; for if you kill it is no matter how, whether by sword or otherwise, because all killing is forbidden. Wherefore in this command of God, there ought to be no exception; but it is always a crime to kill a man, an animal, whom God would have saved. The prohibition of civil and military offices is a heavier burden than the prohibition of revenge; for it excludes the expedients both of deceiving one's self, and also of deceiving others. Those, who preach most earnestly against revenge, find out a thousand distinctions to elude that precept. Some say, they do not hate their neighbour as he is a man, but as he is an enemy of God: others protest, that they do him no harm to revenge a private quarrel, but for God's glory. This is approving, by the help of some distinctions, what one pretends to condemn. Some deceive themselves; others are mere hypocrites, who deceive the world: but no subterfuge can be alleged as to the doctrine which forbids going to the war, and exercising civil offices; those who profess such a doctrine must necessarily follow it; the practice cannot be separated from the theory; there are no distinctions, nor equivocations. It is therefore a true constraint; it is not a transient mortification, like that of those who discipline themselves once a year; it is a perpetual and continual state. We may therefore affirm that those Italian refugees were no cheats: they were deceived by their subtilties, and by relying too much upon the natural light of their reason; and if they kept only part of the Christian doctrines, it is because their first principle, whereby they will admit nothing that is directly against their reason, led them to it. This is apparently the cause of their choice; had they been meer cheats, greedy of followers, they would

(28) That hero says, that if he were platique incomprehensible, and that he discovered himself without being comprehended. Gran tressa en d'arte de extorsion ostentat alos caminientos, pero no a la comprehension. See Father Bouhours, Extraits d'Aristote, pag. 2. 34.

one right now

(29) Libani, lib. vi, cap. vii, pag. 2. 4th.

no cheat

(v) Apologie pour la Religion des Hollandais, by John Brun, printed in the year 1675.

is daily praftised. They alledge some other reasons [I] very proper to shew that this sect is not like to increafe. Those, who say that the Socinians have a full liberty of conscience in the United Provinces, are little acquainted with History [K], and will plainly see the contrary, if they read the answer that was made to Mr Stoupp's letters (f) Page 173. (e) they will find in it (f) the dates of many ordinances published against the sectaries. I shall say (g) something of those which concern the Socinians, and I shall dwell somewhat longer

(g) In the remark [L].

would have gone another way to work. Let us therefore condemn their principle, as a deceitful one, and not usurp the place of him that searcheth the reins and hearts. Their principle debases religion, and changes it into Philosophy. The greatness, authority and sovereignty of God require that we should here walk by faith and not by sight. A Spanish politician hath wisely said, that it is an excellent qualification to keep secret one's thoughts and resolutions. *Si todo exceso en secreto, lo es en caudal; sacramentar una voluntad para soberania. . . . Argoe eminencia de caudal penetrar toda voluntad agena; y conculque superioridad saber celar la propia.* See Father Bouhours, at page 201, of his *Entretiens d'Ariste & d'Eugene*.

The Heathens said, that mysteries better discover God's majesty, and are an image of his nature, because he cannot be perceived by our senses. *Ἡ κρύψις ἡ μυσικὴ τῶν ἱερῶν σεμνοποιεῖ τὸ θεῖον, μυστήριον τὴν φύσιν αὐτοῦ ἐκπνεύσαντων ἡμῶν τὴν αἰσθησιν.* *Mylica sacrorum occultatio maiestatem numini conciliat imitans ejus naturam effugientem sensus nostros.* They are Strabo's words, page 322, of the 10th book.

But what I am going to say may undeceive those, who flatter themselves that the averfeness of the Socinians for military and civil offices will always be a great obstacle to the progress of that sect. It is no article of the Socinian faith, that one ought to renounce civil and military offices. The Socinians are, in that respect, more indulgent than the Mennonites. They do not scruple to exercise public employments in Transylvania, and it is likely they would bear arms against other men do, if they had a prince of their religion.

[I] They alledge some other reasons. For if it be considered, that most men are more inclined to acquiesce in the inward sentiments, than to follow the thread of innumerable consequences methodically connected, and proceeding from distinct notions, and that they may be quickly and easily offended by the paradoxes which reason throws them upon, it will appear somewhat probable that the Socinian system is not very proper to gain the people. It may rather lead studious and speculative men to Scepticism. There will always be something defective in that system, whereby people may be kept from it. The eternity of matter, God's extension, the limitation of this extension, and of the Divine knowledge, and of hell torments, are Socinian doctrines, which being eloquently represented to princes and their subjects, will always inspire them with great horror. If it be a convenient thing to each private person not to be afraid of being punished after this life, yet it is more inconvenient to think that one is daily conversant with people who are not afraid of it. And therefore it is not the interest of private persons, that any doctrine tending to lessen the fear of hell torments should be admitted in their country; and it is probable that the preachers of such a loose doctrine will always be more offensive than acceptable to the public. A certain author says, that the same persons, who reject the Gospel by reason of the austerity of its moral precepts, would express a greater horror for a religion enjoining them to plunge themselves into the most infamous disorders, if it was offered to them, when they are able to reason, and before they are blinded by the prejudices of education (30). He has made some reflexions upon this, but he has omitted one of the best; for he says nothing of self-love, and personal interest. It is true, that a wicked man would like a doctrine, with respect to his own conscience, that should allow him to be a poisoner, and to commit adultery, perjury, &c. but he would not like it upon many other accounts. He has a mother, a wife, a sister, and nieces, who would vex him horribly, if they grew infamous for their leudness. There are more people, who can poison, rob, and cheat him, &c. than there are against whom he can commit the same crimes: Every body is more capable of being offended than of offending others; for of twenty equal persons, it is evident

that every one of them is less strong against nineteen than nineteen against one (31). It is therefore the interest of each private person, tho' never so wicked, that men should be taught such doctrines as will terrify the conscience.

[K] Those who say that the Socinians have a full liberty of conscience in the United Provinces, are little acquainted with History. The Unitarians made several attempts to settle in Holland. The first is ascribed to Erasmus Johannes, rector of a college at Antwerp, who published a book in the year 1585, without putting his name to it. That book is intitled, *Antitibetis doctrinae Christi & Antichristi de uno vero Deo*. Zanchius confuted it the year following. The second attempt was that of Cornelius Daems, a Civilian of Mechlin, who removed from Tergow, where he resided, to Utrecht, in order to disperse there some manuscript tracts of Socinus. The magistrates having notice of it, resolved to arrest him; but he ran away, and his papers were seized. He recovered them some months after, because the government of the town came into other hands. The third attempt was that of Ostorodius and Vaidovius, who came from Poland to Amsterdam in the year 1598, with many Socinian books printed and manuscript, which they began to get translated into Dutch (32). The magistrates having caused all those books to be seized, sent them to the university of Leyden, and then to the States-General; having first given a severe reprimand to those two Socinians, and commanded them to leave the country. The States-General being informed of the judgment passed upon those books by the Divines of Leyden, ordered them to be burnt in the presence of Ostorodius and Vaidovius, and commanded those two men to depart from the United Provinces within ten days (33). The judgment of the Leyden Divines imported, that those books were little different from Mahometism, and that they contained some blasphemies, that could not be tolerated among Christians without great impiety. *Scripta ista ad Turcismum proxime accedere, & veram eternamque Deitatem Christi Filii Dei, & Spiritus Sancti, officium Christi, beneficia ejus salutaria, & Baptismi sancti institutionem, & nostram Religionem erga eum officium evertere, & similia multa adeo blasphemata, ut sine gravissima impietate nec in vulgus spargi, nec inter Christianos ferri possint continere* (34). Adolphus Venator, a Minister of Alcaer, was confined to an island in 1617, for writing a book, that favoured of Socinianism, *quod portenta Sarmatica saperet* (35). The schism of the Arminians favoured the introduction of Socinianism into Holland; for they do not refuse to hold an ecclesiastical communion with the Socinians. Inasmuch that the latter might reside in many towns of the United Provinces without being known. The Prince of Transylvania intercepted a letter in 1638, wherein the Socinian John Sartorius (36), who lived at Amsterdam, acquainted a minister of his sect (37), that there were in Holland many persons (38) of their persuasion (39). It is certain that they had gained some followers at that time, and that their books were dispersed up and down. In order to put a stop to it, the magistrates of Amsterdam condemned some pieces of Volkelius to be burnt in the year 1642 (40). The synods of Holland have appeared very zealous to prevent the propagation of that heresy. They presented a petition to the States of the province in 1628, wherein they alledged several reasons why they should not tolerate it (41), and represented, among other things, that such a toleration would make the common-wealth of the United Provinces (42) stink all over Christendom. That remonstrance was published, and confuted. Those who confuted it, said in answer to that particular reason, that Poland then must be very stinking (43), since it granted liberty of conscience to the Socinians. Whereupon Voëtius says, that it is not true they ever had such liberty in Poland; and that the contrary appeared some years after by the ill usage they there met with. (44) *Sed infelices illi historici perperam*

(31) Even without supposing that the nineteen, act in concert against the twentieth.

(32) Taken from Gilbertus Voëtius, Disputat. Tom. iii, p. 811.

(33) Hoornbeek, Apparatu, ad Controversias Socinianas, pag. 98.

(34) Id. ibid.

(35) Voëtius Polit. Eccl. Tom. ii, lib. iv, p. 533.

(36) So Hoornbeek, and Voëtius, below citation (44), call him; but they should have said *John Sartorius*.

(37) Adam Franciscus, minister of Clauserburg.

(38) Magnam in his terris Socinianorum melleum effluat. Hoornbeek, ubi supra.

(39) Hoornbeek, Apparatu ad Controversias Socinianas, p. 97.

(40) See the article VOLKELIUS.

(41) Voëtius, ubi supra, Tom. ii, pag. 532.

(42) Inter alias motivas hanc fugerunt, quod hac ratione toti orbi Christiano fatidum redderetur federatum Belgium. Id. ibid.

(43) Oportere ut Regnum Poloniae admodum fetet. Id. ibid.

(44) Id. ibid.

(30) Penfées diverses sur les Comètes, num. 189, pag. 592.

VOL. V.

X x

longer upon that of the year 1653 [L]. The accusation published by a modern author, is

*perperam præsupponebant Regis & regni concessionem : quæ nulla erat (45), nec unquam fuit : & paucis an-
tis post satis ostendit regnum Polonicum quid iftic liberta-
tis cuius se fecit, & inter eas Socinianæ concessum sit.
Querant modo ex fratribus suis Sartorio, Jona Slich-
tingio, aliisque, quo loco nunc sit libertas iftorum.*
[L] I shall dwell somewhat longer upon the ordinance of
the year 1653. I do not know what the States of Hol-
land answered, in the year 1628, to the remonstrances
of their fynods ; but I have read the acts of what was
done in a like case in the year 1653. The deputies of
the same fynods represented to them that the followers
of Socinus, a fort of men who destroyed all Christia-
nity, the resurrection of the dead, the hopes of an
eternal life, &c. were so bold as to come into the
United Provinces, and particularly into Holland, there
to pervert the Faithful, and rend the Church ; that it
was well known how zealous the Ragotki's had been
against those Heretics in Transylvania, and what de-
grees had been made against them in Poland in the
years 1638, and 1647. That they had been expelled
from Poland ; that their church, their library, and
their printing-house had been destroyed, because they
had in the press a very scandalous book against the
mystery of the Trinity. *Quemadmodum Rakociana do-
mus in Transylvania adversus hos errorum seminatores
zelaverit ; quid Anno 1638, & 1647, in Polonia contra
ipfos actum sit, quomodo ex Polonia sint eje-
cti, & iftorum ædificia dispersa, iftorum cætus disjectus, templum,
bibliotheca dispersa, iftorum ædificia, quid librum sub prelo
habuerit hac inscriptione, Tormentum throno Trinita-
tem deturbans, in recenti memoria est (46). That the
States-General proceeded severely against them in the
year 1598. That in 1639, by the suggestion of the
English ambassador, all the provinces were informed
of the arrival of some Socinians, and desired, in time,
to prevent the evil by their decrees. That in the year
1640, the States of Holland acquainted the Synod of
Amsterdam with their resolution, importing that in what
concerned the proscription of the Socinians and their
books, all necessary orders would be given about it, as
soon as the state of the thing should be more exactly
known. Anno 1640 Synodo Amsterodamensi hoc decre-
tum illustrium & Præpotentium Ordinum intimatum est :
Quod attinet Socinianorum exclusionem & librorum ejus
Sectæ scitum est, si accuratius illustres Ordines doceantur,
Socinianos aut libros iftorum in hac provincia apparere,
ipfos tunc promit adversus ipfos & iftorum libros, prout
res exegerit, statuturos (47). That the States-General
ordered, the 17th of July 1651, pursuant to the advice
of the States of the province of Holland, given the
12th of April foregoing, that the infolence of the
sectaries should be effectually repressed, and good edicts
published against the Socinian books, &c. (48). After
this, the deputies of the fynods represent, that it is
plain those Heretics go all over the country, they use
all their endeavours to get proselytes, and disperse
many ill books (49) ; that they are the most danger-
ous enemies the Church can have, since, besides their
being cunning, and apparently devout, they teach a
doctrine that is not above the reach of reason. They
conclude, 1. With most humbly beseeching their illu-
strious lordships to prevent the evil in due time, by
proceeding against the persons, and forbidding the
conventicles, and prohibiting the books : 2. With in-
timating that they hope that at last their lordships
will execute the ordinances already made. Rogant sub-
missè illustrium VV. DD. cultores, Deputati Synodorum
Australis & Borealis Hollandiæ, ipsarum nomine, ut
huic malo in tempore obviam eatur, ut in personas statu-
tur, ut conventicula iftorum & libri prohibeantur, ut
præla & typographia ifto stercore non contaminentur, &
(50) Cocceius, in officina tam damnoſa merce vacuentur (50). The States
of Holland communicated this synodal petition to the
Faculty of Divinity of Leyden, desiring to have their
opinion about it. The Faculty answered, that nothing
could be more horrid and abominable than the Socia-
nian sect ; that it differed but little from Paganism (51) ;
that it was certain it crept into the country, and that
there was a necessity to pray to God that he would
inspire the States with a steady and holy resolution
of removing all those blasphemies, and suppressing
such wicked books. *Conſilium ſapiens, utile averſendis
omnibus Blaſphemiis & abolendis tam noxiis libris.**

Whereupon the States made an edict, whereby all
persons, whatever condition they might be of, were
forbidden to bring any of the Socinian heresies into
the country, or to impart them to others, or to hold
any assembly with such an intent. They declared that
all offenders should be banished the first time from the
province, as blasphemers of God's name, and distur-
bers of the public peace ; and in case of a relapse they
should be punished as should be thought fit. They
also forbade, under severe penalties, the impression and
the sale of the Socinian books, and ordered that this
edict should be published, and posted up wherever
it should be requisite, that none might pretend to be
ignorant of it. This is what they decreed the 19th of
September 1653. The magistrates of Utrecht pub-
lished a like edict in the year 1655 (52).

The Socinians were not silent : they employed one
of their ablest pens (53) to compose an apology, that
came out in the year 1654, with this title, *Apologia pro
veritate accusata ad illustriſſimos & potentiſſimos Hollan-
diæ & Weſt-Friſiæ Ordines, conſcripta ab Equite Polono.*
That piece is well written ; and with a great deal of modera-
tion, with an artful boldness in denying the accuſa-
tions. The author alleges the same general reasons
(54) made use of by Tertullian in his Apology, and
by Calvin in the Epistle Dedicatory of his Institutions,
and by several other Reformers in their books against
the Sorbonne. This is an unavoidable inconvenience :
a false Church, which pleads for Toleration, and com-
plains of the penal laws, alleges the same common
topics with the true Church in like circumstances.
The true Church, which desires that the sovereigns
would extirpate a false one, uses the same motives and
arguments alleged by the false one for the extirpation
of the true Church. It were to be wished, that com-
munities so different in the main, should not be like one
another in using the same stile and the same topics ; but
such a thing is not to be expected in this world. The
evil is past curing in that respect : man, among other
exercises, is obliged to search after truth, in the midst
of a hundred pretenders, who express themselves the
same way as to general reasons. But I proceed to
another observation.

When people present petitions against a party, they
ought to take special care not to alledge any facts
whereof they are not well informed, or which are only
equivocal proofs ; for some time after they are con-
futed in a manner very displeasing. For instance, the
Polish knight maintains, 1. That the Ragotki's never
persecuted the Socinians (55), and always maintained
them in the liberty of conscience which they had pro-
mised them, and did still maintain them in it (56).
2. That no advantage should have been taken of the
oppression the Socinians were exposed to in Poland,
nor of the destruction of their church at Racovia,
since the Evangelics met with the same troubles in that
country, and received at Vilna a treatment like that of
Racovia two years after, and under the same pretence.
(57) *Poloniam deinde, inſauſto omine cœmmemorant, patriam
noſtram ; quæ dum non tantum nobis, ſed etiam Evan-
gelicis (58) & aliis, contra juriſjurandi & fœderum
fidem, templa adimit, exercenda religionis libertatem
labefactat, & variis preſſuris, ob diverſum in ſacris
ſenſum, inſeſtam ſeſe præbet ; vindicem Dei manum in ſe
provocavit* (59) *Everſum nobis fuerit Racovia
templum, quanquam de everſione templi decretum nihil
habet, eo quo dicunt anno : ſed eodem exemplo everſum eſt
& Vilnæ Evangelicis biennio poſt ſuum templum. Puſi
fuerint Miniſtri Racovia, quanquam miniſtri Racovia de-
creto puſi non ſunt, ſed ſoli Profeſſores ; puſi ſunt & Vilnæ ;
proſcripti fuerint illi ; proſcripti ſunt & iſti ; & quidem illi
iſti, qui paulo ante Racoviano caſui ex ambone inſultave-
runt. Sic in nobis capſum, in Evangelicis, qui permiſerant,
ulterius progreſſum eſt exemplum. Exemplum enim tramites
querunt, nec ibi conſiſtunt, ubi capere. Occaſo & prætex-
tus utriuſque injuriæ & calamitatis innocentibus inferenda
ſuit idem, nempe imago juvenili quorundam temeritate
violata.* 3. That what happened at Racovia was not
grounded upon the impression of a book, whose title
was injurious to the Trinity. He proves it demonſtra-
tively by the decree of the Diet, which mentioned no
such book, and would have certainly mentioned it, if
it had been the reason of inflicting such a punishment
upon

(52) Voëtius,
Polit. Ecclesiæ,
Tom. 1, pag. 533.

(53) That of Jo-
anna Slichtingus.
See Biblioth. An-
tiquitatis,
pag. 130.

(54) I use this e-
pithet, because
the circumſtances
with respect to
the severity of the
penal laws, &c.
are not the same
as here in Ter-
tullian's and Cal-
vin's apologies.

for
ag. a
tel. n

(55) Apolog. pro
Veritate accusata,
pag. 39.

(56) Quibus hec
illuſtriſſima Do-
mus pacem & li-
bertatem con-
ſcientiæ & reli-
gionis juraſcit,
ſacroſanctæ cultu-
divit temper,
etiam ſanctiſſi-
dit. Ibid.

(57) Ib. p. 40.

(58) See John
Læſtus, in Com-
pend. Hiſtoriæ,
pag. m. 531, &
alibi, where he
ſhews the Evan-
gelics of Poland
loſt their
churches in ſeve-
ral places, ſome-
times by popular
commotions,
and ſometimes
by unjuſt pre-
ſentences.

(59) Apolog. pro
Veritate accusata,
pag. 41. What
I have omitted,
is found above,
citation (13).

is altogether improbable, viz. that the Socinian Heresies were privately taught at Port-Royal; and it is certain the story he has told about it is false. The public has seen the refutation

upon their sect. He adds, that John Lætus, the only author who mentions the pretended impression of that book, yet does not say that it occasioned the destruction of their school, and of their printing-house. Nam causa disturbance Racovianæ, quam accusatores nostros coram vobis pro vera venditare non pudet, ipso Decreto Comitiali manifestæ vanitatis coarguitur. Ajunt enim causam fuisse, quod librum habuerimus sub prælo, hoc titulo, *Tormentum throno Trinitatem deturbans*. Nullus liber unquam hoc titulo inter nos extitit, nedum ut sub prælo fuerit. . . .

Joan. Læti
Compend. Hist.
Leidæ 1643.
pag. 766, and it
is pag. 543, of
the edition of
1661.

Auctor istius commentii fuit Lætus quidam, Moravia, qui profugum sese ex Moravia, religionisve rebellionis causa oblitus; sed odii in nos ex suorum disciplina concepti non inmemor, in ipsa patria nostra, quæ exulem benigne suscepit & fovit, eo protèr viæ progressus est, ut nobis patriæ civibus insultare ausus fuerit, edito fumorum pleno libello; inter quos & hæc de libro isto fabula est. Et tamen hic ipse, quamvis vanus Auctor, dicit quidem illo ipso tempore, quo res Ecclesiæ nostræ Racoviæ sunt everse, *desudasse nostros in extrudendo ipso pessifero*, quem ait, libello: sed hanc fuisse causam adversariis illarum eventuarum non dicit: *Juventus*, inquit, *Scholæ animum præbuit, quæ effugium crucis deprecatur*. Sed narrationi illius per se vanæ, quo speciosior esset, asserendum aliquid fuit ab accusatoribus (60). . . .

(60) Apolog. pro
Veritat. accusat.,
pag. 42.

For the cause alleged of our disturbance at Racovia, which our enemies are not ashamed to maintain for true, is manifestly convicted of falsehood by the decree of the senate. For they say, that we had a book in the press with this title, *Tormentum Throno Trinitatem deturbans*. There was never any book with such a title amongst us much less was there any such in the press. . . . The author of this fiction was one Lætus, a Moravian, who, forgetting whether he had fled his country for religion, or rebellion, but not unmindful of his hatred to us, even in our country, which had so favourably received and entertained him, when exiled from his own, had the impudence to insult us in our own country, by publishing a book full of stories, among which is this fable concerning that book. And yet this very man, tho' he says, that at the time when our churches at Racovia were destroyed, we were labouring to hasten the publishing of that prencious book, as he calls it; yet that this was the cause our enemies did so, he says not. The youth of the school, says he, which had thrown down a picture of the cross, gave occasion thereto. But to this relation of his, ridiculous in itself, something was to be tacked by our enemies, that it might have the better appearance. Cocceius published a very solid answer to that manifesto of the Socinians, in the year 1656. I have consulted it particularly upon those three heads; for I expected there to find the apology confounded: but I have found nothing in it neither upon the first, nor upon the second head; and as for the third, all that Cocceius says, is, that there was a report, that the Socinians had such a book in the press, when they were so ill used at Racovia. *Quam causam habuerint Poloni eripiendæ vobis Racoviæ, non disputo. Certum est, eo tempore vulgatum fuisse rumorem, tale, quale libellus Deputatorum memorat, scriptum sub prælo sudasse* (61). Uncertain reports should never be depended upon in juridical pieces, such as the remonstrance of a synod to their sovereign, designed to obtain the suppression of a sect. In accusations that concern doctrines, it is more easy to justify an unexact assertion: for instance, it was positively said in the remonstrance, that the Socinians denied the resurrection of the dead, and eternal life. The Faculty of Divinity at Leyden affirmed likewise that they deny, as the Sadducees do, the life of the soul separated from the body, and the resurrection of the wicked. The Polish knight maintained that such an accusation was a calumny (62). *Quis non cupiat animas etiam corporibus carentes vivere, agere, intelligere; Dei conspectu & gaudiis celestibus perfrui, pro nobis, in corpore adhuc, tanquam in carcere agentibus, Deum orare, nostrique curam gerere? quis non pedibus in hanc sententiam eas? . . .* (63) Nos animarum, quamvis sine corporibus fuit statum, Deo relinquimus, certissima fide, quæ propria Christianorum est, mortuorum

(61) Cocceius, in
Examine Apolog.
Equisit. Poloni,
pag. 138.

(62) Apologia E.
quisit. Poloni,
pag. 73, 74.

Proley
(63) lb. p. 74.

resurrectionem complexi . . . Negare nos ajunt impiorum resurrectionem. Nos vero cum Apostolo ipem habemus in Deo, resurrectionem fore mortuorum, justorum & injutorum; justorum ad vite eterne gaudia; injutorum ad ignis æterni supplicia. Et hunc terrorem Domini, (qui baudquaquam vanus in ullis futurus est) scientes, homines suademus, Deo autem manifesti sumus, speramus vero etiam conscientis vestris fore manifestos (64). Cocceius was not silenced by this denial, grounded upon a book, in some measure liturgical and at least authentic, since it was an apology for the confession of faith: he confessed he knew nothing of that book (65), but alleged several quotations, and had something to say.

I shall observe, by the by, that nothing has proved more prejudicial to the Socinians, than a certain doctrine which they thought very proper to remove the greatest difficulty a Philosopher can find in our Theology. A thinking man, who only consults reason, and the bright idea of infinite goodness, which, morally speaking, makes up the principal character of the divine nature, will be offended at what we read in the Scripture concerning the eternity of hell torments; especially if he adds to it the paraphrases, and the many explications that are to be found in several books (66). Deus optimus maximus were the current and usual titles of the Divine Nature among the ancient Heathens: It was their set form, when they spoke of God, and they never said Deus severissimus, implacabilissimus. The two epithets Optimus and Maximus, properly speaking, were only the image and expression of one sole quality, I mean a supreme goodness; for goodness ought to be attended with greatness to appear in all it's lustre. But what, I pray you, is greatness? Is it any thing else besides magnanimity, generosity, liberality, magnificence, and pouring out of favours? This natural idea, which made the Heathens speak in that manner, is confirmed by the Scripture, wherein the goodness of God is all along extolled above his other attributes. Doing good, shewing mercy, is the daily and pleasant work of God, according to the Scripture: chastizing, punishing, shewing severity, is to him unusual and unpleasant work. And therefore so long as a man shall adhere to his natural reason, and not humbly submit to some passages in the gospel, he will look with abhorrence upon that doctrine of the infinite torments and punishments of the whole human race, except a few only. The Socinians, relying too much upon reason, have limited those torments, so much the more carefully, because they considered that men would be made to suffer only for sufferings sake, since no advantage would accrue from those torments to the sufferers or the spectators; a thing never done by any well regulated legislature. They hoped to bring over to Christianity by that means those, who are offended with a notion, that seems little consistent with the supreme goodness. But those Heretics were not aware that this very thing would make them more odious, and more unworthy of a toleration than all their other tenets. After all, few people are offended with the doctrine concerning the eternal duration of hell torments, and are like Theodorus Camphusius (67). He was a minister, born at Gorcum in Holland: he turned Socinian, and publicly declared he should have had no religion, had he not met with some books, wherein he found that hell torments will not last for ever. Memini, meminere & alii, fuisse quandam Didericum Camphusium, qui in epistola typis expressa, & canticis ipsius adjuncta, profiteretur, se primum fuisse ad relinquendam omnem religionem, donec incidisset in illos libros, qui docerent, perpetuos ignes nihil esse & eternos cruciatus (68).

[M] A modern author hath published, that the Socinian Heresies were privately taught at Port-Royal. The author of the *Politique du Clergé de France* affirms, that there is a third party, from which the Gallican Church has every thing to fear. They profess, says he (69), to believe that the Church of Rome is the true Church, to which one ought to be inseparably united, and should never be separated from it; and yet they do not follow her doctrines, and have no respect for her worship. Such men were never so numerous in that kingdom at they

† Act. xxiv. 15.

† 2 Cor. v. 11,
12. Vide Confess.
vindic. cap. xx.

(64) This may
serve as a proof of
what I observed
in the article of
ORIGEN, re-
mark [C], at
the end.

CONSIDERA-
TION, on the
Doctrine of the
eternity of Hell
torments.

(65) Negari à
suis impiorum re-
surrectionem, ne-
gat Eques. Citat
in margine Con-
fess. vindic. cap.
xx. Ipse Con-
fessio Belgica,
quæ Apologie ad-
jungi solet, in
capita distincta
non est. Quid li-
bri fit Confess.
vindic. adhuc ig-
noro. Cocceius, in
EXAMINE Apolog.
Equisit. Poloni,
pag. 220.

(66) See the
book, intitled,
*Les Mercurilles
de l'autre Monde*,
written by a ca-
non of Riez cal-
led Arnoux.

(67) In the vul-
gar Tongue,
*Dirk Raphaël
Camphusius*. He
was born in the
year 1586, and
died at Dockum
in Friesland in
the year 1627.
See the *Biblioth.
Antiqu. p. 112*,
and therein mend
Wicomi denatus.
He wrote several
pieces in Dutch,
and among others
one printed above
twenty times in
several sizes,
which consists of
songs, and other
Spiritual Poems,
very much es-
teemed by those
who are skilled
in Dutch Poetry.
The author dex-
terously inserted
in them his o-
pinions about se-
veral Christian
Doctrines, espe-
cially upon those
that concern
morality.

(68) Cocceius, in
Examine Apolog.
Equisit. Poloni,
pag. 305.

(69) *Politig. du
Clergé de France*,
pag. m. 90.

refutation of it (b). There are very few people that would not be extremely concerned, if

(b) See below the passage quoted citation (103).

they are now. Some of them carry their unbelief so far as to call in question the most important doctrines of Christianity. They are Socinians; they believe neither the mystery of the Trinity, nor that of the Incarnation. I know some things about it, that are so particular that I cannot doubt of it: I shall not impart them to you, for fear of scandalizing you. And what is most terrible is, that it is not only the religion of our young Abbots, but also of some grave and wise societies, that make a great shew of the purity of their morals, and of their adherence to the Catholic Faith. Let us see what Mr Arnauld answers to that author. A man must have neither honour nor conscience, who ascribes dismal and odious crimes to many persons, when every body may easily know that such horrid accusations are only grounded upon a meer calumny. But who does not see that no other thoughts can be entertained of this writer? There may be in France, and even among Abbots, some persons that are so impious as to believe neither the Trinity nor the Incarnation: but something else is requisite to say, without being guilty of a notorious calumny, that it is now the religion of our young Abbots. He must be sure that there are at least many of those young Abbots, who have no other religion but that. But how could he know it? If any of them were so unhappy as to entertain such impious opinions, would they be so imprudent as to declare them up and down, and thereby expose themselves to the dangerous consequences of it? Could such a folly be common to so many persons, that one might say, without fearing to be accounted an impostor, that it is the religion of young Abbots? And yet he is so impudent as to suppose it as a thing so well known, that it serves him only for a prelude to authorize a more horrid calumny; for he affirms it as a thing, of which he is very sure, that some grave, wise, and orderly societies, very regular in their life, and which are accounted Catholic, believe neither the Trinity nor the Incarnation no more than those Abbots. And what is more terrible, says he, is, that it is not only the religion of our young Abbots, but also of some grave and wise societies, that make a great shew of the purity of their morals, and of their adherence to the Catholic Faith. This exceeds all impudence to impute not to some private persons, but to societies, and not to one only, but to some societies, whom he very much commends for their wisdom and morals, that they do not believe the first mysteries of the Christian religion; and to suppose that those, who could put a stop to so great a disorder, know nothing of it, or knowing it are unwilling to suffer it; and lastly, to fancy that the world will be so silly as to believe such an incredible thing, upon the credit of an inconsiderable writer, who says in an anonymous book: I know some things about it that are so particular, that I cannot doubt of it, adding with a sorry craftiness, I shall not impart them to you, for fear of scandalizing you. One can hardly conceive how a man can carry boldness and calumny to such a degree. However, the thing is not so surprising in a Calvinist, he hath only, &c. (70).

(70) Arnauld, Apologie pour les Catholiques. Part. ii, ch. iv, pag. 31, & seq.

(71) Esprit de Monfr. Arnauld, Tom. i, ch. vi, pag. 196.

(72) Observe how little that author scruples to lie; for he wrote the Politique du Clergé, tho' he denies it.

The author of the Politique du Clergé could not well be silent after such a vigorous answer: I shall set down what he said in his vindication. He thought, says he (71), speaking of Mr Arnauld, that the author meant the Janfenists by those grave and wise societies, that make a great shew of the purity of their morals, and of their adherence to the Catholic Faith. Perhaps he is not in the wrong. I do not know the thoughts of the author of the Politique du Clergé (72); but I do very well know that there is ground to suspect those gentlemen of having a Theology not agreeable to Christianity, and bordering upon Socinianism. I am sorry I am obliged to say what you think on this, and what we have altogether reason to think. We do not love to oppress those unhappy men, who are already loaded with the public hatred. And indeed, were it not that we are forced to it by those gentlemen, we would not expose to the public view, what may confirm that suspicion. But they force us to it; and if they are displeased with what we are going to say, they must blame themselves for it. We would not be so positive as Filteau, and the Jesuite Meynier, who say that

those who go by the name of Janfenists are downright Deists, enemies to the mysteries of the Christian religion. But it is certain they have dropped some words against the Divinity of Jesus Christ, which give ground to suspect that they harbour dreadful monsters in their breasts. Pray, mind the proofs he alledges. Those gentlemen, says he (73), do not scruple to confess that the Divinity of Jesus Christ is not sufficiently proved in the holy Scripture. . . . (74) The author of the Perpetuite de la Foy, asks, † Why did not Jesus Christ discover his Divinity in such clear words that they might not be eluded? From those words, and from these, God was not willing that the Christian doctrines should be proposed with the utmost evidence, the author of the Politique du Clergé infers, that the Janfenists admit this principle: The Divinity of Jesus Christ, and the Trinity, are not clearly expressed in the Scripture (75). Afterwards he tells us, 1. That this principle is utterly false; for it is not true that the passages which prove Jesus Christ's Divinity, may be any ways eluded. We know there are no passages, tho' ever so clear, but what the Heretics may cavil upon. If this be called eluding, there is nothing in the holy Scripture, nor in any book in the world, or language of men, but what may be eluded. This he proves by shewing how one might cavil about some texts in the gospel, wherein Christ's humanity is asserted, and about the canons of the council of Nice (76), and a passage contrived on purpose (77), to be the clearest and the most distinct proof of the Trinity and Incarnation that can be imagined. In the second place he says (78), that it is the most shameful thing, and the greatest prevarication an orthodox Divine can be guilty of against the eternal Divinity of the Son of God, thus to give it up to the Hereticks, by acknowledging a thing so false, so dangerous, and so proper to confirm them in their errors. . . . (79) This confession, that the Divinity of the Son is not sufficiently explained in the written Revelation, is that very thing which confirms the Socinians in their Heresy, and may induce others to embrace it. In the 3d place he says (80), that Mr Arnauld ought to acknowledge, That until the council of Nice, it was lawful to deny the Divinity of Christ without running the hazard of one's salvation, and that if the Divinity of the Son was not an article of faith, necessary to salvation, for the space of three hundred years, it could not become so by the decision of a council; because, according to the wisest Doctors of the Romish Church, among whom the gentlemen of Port-Royal are to be reckoned, the Church, the Pope, nor the Councils, cannot make new articles of faith. From whence it follows, that to this very day the Divinity of the Son is not an article of faith, for which those who deny it deserve to be anathematized. Thus, by proceeding from one principle to another, it is plain it is not unreasonable to suspect that Mr Arnauld does not believe the mysteries of the Incarnation and Trinity, or at least, that he does not look upon them as essential parts of the Christian religion. In the 4th place he proves (81), that those gentlemen have made it appear that they have no great regard for the authority of the Church. Which being so, concludes he (82), since on one side the mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation cannot be proved by any passages of the Scripture, but what may be eluded, according to those gentlemen; and, on the other hand, since they are only grounded upon decisions, to which they do not think themselves obliged blindly to submit; it is plain those mysteries are built upon no solid foundation, and are only meer problems according to the Theology of the Port-Royal. In the fifth and last place, he entertains us with a story, to which he prefixes a preamble worth its weight in gold. I shall add a story, says he (83), which I publish with reluctance, and after long debating with myself. If those gentlemen had not provoked us so unjustly and so cruelly, we would have been more reserved; but we are not obliged to shew any regard to such a man as Mr Arnauld, who so plainly transgresses against the laws of charity and sincerity. Here follows a short account of that story. (84) About 15 or 20 years ago (85), a young man, the son of a treasurer of France in the Generality of Orleans, whose name was Picaut or Picot, and who was designed for the Church, studied at Paris, in the house of the gentlemen of Port-Royal. The conversation of a minister, who had changed his religion, and

(73) Esprit de Mr Arnauld, Tom. i, ch. vi, pag. 197.

(74) Id. ibid. pag. 198.

(75) Ibid. pag. 198.

(76) Ibid. pag. 198.

(77) Ibid. pag. 198.

(78) Ibid. pag. 198.

(79) Ibid. pag. 198.

(80) Ibid. pag. 198.

(81) Ibid. pag. 198.

(82) Ibid. pag. 198.

(83) Ibid. pag. 198.

(84) Ibid. pag. 198.

(85) Ibid. pag. 198.

(86) Ibid. pag. 198.

(87) Ibid. pag. 198.

(88) Ibid. pag. 198.

(89) Ibid. pag. 198.

(90) Ibid. pag. 198.

(91) Ibid. pag. 198.

(92) Ibid. pag. 198.

(93) Ibid. pag. 198.

(94) Ibid. pag. 198.

(95) Ibid. pag. 198.

(96) Ibid. pag. 198.

(97) Ibid. pag. 198.

(98) Ibid. pag. 198.

(99) Ibid. pag. 198.

(100) Ibid. pag. 198.

(101) Ibid. pag. 198.

(102) Ibid. pag. 198.

(103) Ibid. pag. 198.

(104) Ibid. pag. 198.

(105) Ibid. pag. 198.

(106) Ibid. pag. 198.

(107) Ibid. pag. 198.

(108) Ibid. pag. 198.

(109) Ibid. pag. 198.

(110) Ibid. pag. 198.

(111) Ibid. pag. 198.

(112) Ibid. pag. 198.

(113) Ibid. pag. 198.

(114) Ibid. pag. 198.

(115) Ibid. pag. 198.

if they had published a story as ill circumstantiated as that which concerns young Picaut, the

and the reading of some books, convinced him that the Pope is Anti-Christ; whereupon he wrote a piece for his own use, and being informed that it was come into the director's hands, and that his family had notice of it, he ran away. 'He came into Perche, where he had a living, to try whether he could get some money by it. He fell, by chance, into the hands of a Protestant gentleman, a person distinguished by his birth, and particularly by his merit. That gentleman being very well skilled in matters of religion, asked him several questions about the motives of his change; and as he proceeded from one subject to another, he perceived that this young man had the notions of the Socinians about the Trinity and Incarnation, and knew all their sorry objections; but otherwise, he was very fond of the opinions of the Church of Rome, and very little disposed to embrace the doctrines of the Reformed, excepting this, that the Pope is Anti-Christ. The gentleman was very much surprized to find this young man a Socinian, and asked where he had learned that doctrine. The young man answered, very freely, that he had learned it at Port-Royal, where he had studied; that several persons had the same opinions in that house; that the Novices and the Students were not allowed to read the books of Calvin and of the Calvinists, and that he had never read them; but for the Socinian books they were not shut up by themselves in the library, and every body might read them. Afterwards the young man made his escape into a remote province, and at last left the kingdom to avoid being molested by his relations. And it has been known since, that those who went about to instruct him, could never cure him of his Socinianism (86). What follows is the most curious part of the story, and therefore I must not forget it. The author of the apology for the Catholics, who falls into a violent passion when he meets with a word that vexes him ever so little, will doubtless call this story a piece of impudence, an imposture and a calumny. He will say, that all the fire in hell will not be sufficient to punish the author of so horrid a slander. But I must tell him, that I only warrant the truth of these two things. 1. That this young man told that story, and even to many persons very credible, and of known probity. 2. That this young man was truly Socinian, when he left the Divines of Port-Royal, and that he learned Socinianism in their house. As for what he adds, that his matters were infected with the same Herefy, I cannot tell whether it be true. But I see no reason why that Student should invent so horrid a calumny. And this, together with their way of speaking of the Trinity and Incarnation, may form, if not a proof, at least a very strong suspicion. This is what we know of the matter, and what we had to say about it. The public will judge of it, as they think fit. This is what people get by provoking others (87).'

This author did not think that Mr Arnauld's reply would contain but few words; he expected abundance of reflexions and exclamations, for he believed his History would produce great effects. But Mr Arnauld was contented to confute it in a few words, and with great moderation, tho' he knew very well how to be passionate. His answer runs thus: *He had a mind to make people believe that the Divines of Port-Royal had an aversion for Calvinism, but that they were very much inclined to the Socinian Herefy, for which he gives this proof. Some young children of quality were instructed at Port-Royal, in human learning, and at the same time care was taken to give them a pious education. Most of them were but ten, twelve, or fourteen years of age, and the oldest was hardly sixteen. The Greek and Latin methods, and the Greek roots in French verses were made for them. Now let us see what Mr Jurieu tells us in his famous book, intituled, L'Esprit de Mr Arnauld. He says the books of the Calvinists were carefully kept from them; but that they had a full liberty to read those of the Socinians, as much as they would; and that by the reading of those books, one of those children whom he names, and who was a native of Orleans, as he says, taking a liking to the Socinian errors, left the church, and turned Hugenot. But this story is utterly false.*

VOL. V.

There never was a child at Port-Royal of such a name and family as this is said to be; nay, there never was there any of the city of Orleans. The ground on which he builds that story, viz. that children of that age were allowed to read the Socinian books, sufficiently shews that one may expect any thing from a man, who does not scruple to publish such horrid and incredible lies (88).

Many reflexions might be made on the pains the author of *L'Esprit de Mr Arnauld* took to convict the gentlemen of Port-Royal of Socinianism; but I shall only make three.

The first is, that if any one accused that writer of the same thing, he would find the proofs of his accusation in *L'Esprit de Mr Arnauld*, for he needs only form this syllogism.

A man who believes on the one side, that the mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation cannot be proved by any passages of the scripture, but what may be eluded, and who on the other side does not blindly submit to the decisions of councils (89), is a Socinian.

But the author of *L'Esprit de Mr Arnauld* believes so, and makes no such submission.

Therefore he is a Socinian.

The major proposition of this syllogism is plainly the doctrine of that author; for intending to justify what he had said (90), that Socinianism was the Theology of some grave societies, meaning the gentlemen of Port-Royal, he alleges for a proof their teaching that Christ's Divinity has not been revealed with a sufficient evidence, and their giving ground to suspect that they do not believe one ought to submit to councils. He must therefore look upon this as an undoubted sign of the Socinian Herefy, otherwise he could not clear himself of calumny; his accusation would be ill proved, and he would be a false accuser. Wherefore I need only prove the minor proposition. It consists of two parts: the last does not want to be proved; for it is manifest enough that a Protestant minister does not blindly submit to councils: And the following words afford the proof of the first. *I am far from designing to lessen the force and clearness of those characters of the Divinity of the scripture; but I dare say that there is none of them but may be eluded by prophane men. None of them makes a proof, to which something may not be answered; and if they be considered together, tho' they have a greater force than when they stand by themselves, yet they are not strong enough to form a moral demonstration (91).* It were needless to object to me that this passage does not concern Christ's Divinity; for it were in vain to pretend that God has evidently revealed to us the Divinity of his Son in the scripture, if it was affirmed that it does not clearly appear, that the scripture is the word of God. But, besides, that author has (92) a dispute with another minister (93) about this question, Whether the belief of our mysteries supports the evidence of the testimony; and does not only deny it, but also maintains that the affirmative is a pernicious opinion. I am going to shew that he may receive another wound with his own weapon. You have said that it is not true that the passages, which prove Christ's Divinity, cannot be any ways eluded (94).

You have said that they are as clear as the passages which concern his humanity, and as clear as the decision of the council of Nice, or any text that one could contrive on purpose. The meaning of which is, that the cavils that might be raised against them are as insignificant, as those that should be raised against a text made on purpose. How come you then to confess (95) that the characters of the Divinity of the scripture may be eluded? How come you to say that the objections of the Socinians are considerable? These are your words. *The proofs of the scripture, on which the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the necessity of Grace, are grounded, have not the utmost degree of evidence: Those mysteries are liable to and admit of difficulties, not only with respect to human reason, but also in relation to the holy scripture, wherein there are several passages that want to be reconciled with the truth. Those, who take the objections of the Socinians against mysteries, and those of the Pelagians against Grace, to be vain and inconsiderable, are mistaken, and do not consider the thing with a due attention. They are real difficulties, and deserve to be cleared (96).* Remember that in the book, intituled, *L'Esprit de Mr Arnauld*, it is the greatest

(88) Arnauld, Differtation sur le prétendu bonheur du plaisir des sens, pag. 13, 14.

(89) See *L'Esprit de Mr Arnauld*, Tom. i, pag. 220.

(90) In the Politique du Clergé, pag. 90.

(91) Jurieu, Traité de la Nature & de la Grace, pag. 246.

(92) I write this in July 1696.

(93) See his two books against Mr Saurin.

(94) *Esprit de Mr Arnauld*, Tom. i, p. 201.

(95) Above citation (91).

(96) Jurieu, Défense de la Doctrine Universelle de l'Eglise, pag. 407.

(86) *Esprit de Mr Arnauld*, Tom. i, ch. vi, pag. 222.

(87) *Esprit de Mr Arnauld*, Tom. i, p. 224.

(i) Daniel Hartnagius, in *Continuatione Jo. Micronii Synonymi Historiae Ecclesiasticae*.

the chief witness alleged by the modern author I speak of [N]. I do not give a particular account of what concerns the opinions and books of Socinus: it may be seen in general in Moreri's Dictionary. A German Historian (i) has reduced the doctrine of the Socinians into 229 Propositions.

The most general objection, raised against them, is, that by refusing to believe what they think to be contrary to Philosophical truths, and by denying the unconceivable mysteries of the Christian religion, they open a way to Scepticism, Deism, and Atheism. Perhaps it might be objected to them, that they do the same, at least indirectly, by the way of explaining the passages of the Scripture, which concern the consubstantiality of the Word. For it seems to follow from their explications that the apostles, being animated with an ardent zeal for the glory of JESUS CHRIST, made use of the most strained figures and expressions that devotion can suggest, when they spoke of his perfections. Thus the votaries of the Holy Virgin have carried it as high, and as near a true and real deification as ever they could. But if the expressions of the Apostles were to be ascribed to an Enthusiastic zeal, and not to the immediate direction of the Holy Spirit, it is plain the Scripture would be of little more authority than the panegyrics upon the saints. But by over-throwing the inspiration of the sacred writers, the whole revelation comes to nothing, and then every thing will be a meer Philosophical dispute.

I forgot

baseness, and the highest prevarication an orthodox Divine can be guilty of against the eternal Divinity of the Son, thus to give it up to the Heretics, by making a confession so false, so dangerous, and so proper to confirm them in their errors (97), that is, by confessing as you do, that Christ has not discovered his Divinity in words so clear as not to be eluded (98).

(97) *Esprit de Mr Arnauld, Tom. i, pag. 209.*

(98) *See l'Esprit de Mr Arnauld, ibid. pag. 198.*

My second reflexion is, That if those proofs alleged to shew that the gentlemen of Port-Royal are Socinians, were good, it would follow from thence that the whole Romish Church is Socinian; for what has been said by those gentlemen concerning the obscurity of the Scripture, is the general doctrine of that Church. Besides, few Roman Catholics believe the Pope's infallibility in matters of fact; nay, they do not ascribe that privilege to universal councils. The Jesuits never denied the infallibility of those councils in point of doctrine, and even have acknowledged that the five propositions were heretical, in the sense they pretend the Popes have condemned them. What they have said in particular to justify some Nuns, who refused to subscribe to certain formularies, and to submit to some episcopal mandates, is of such a nature, that all Monks would say the same, if they were molested by Bishops. How often have they been at law with their Prelates? How often have they appealed against them to synods, or to the Pope? Is it not a plain demonstration, that they do not believe one ought to sacrifice one's knowledge to the authority of inferior tribunals? I confess, some say that a Monk ought blindly to obey his superior; but it is only in what concerns the discipline and observances; and they would not think themselves obliged to obey him, if he commanded them to believe what they know to have been condemned by the councils. And therefore if the gentlemen of Port-Royal are Socinians, because they say, on the one side, that our mysteries are not evidently contained in the Scripture; and, on the other, that one ought not to subscribe against one's conscience an episcopal mandate, or a bull that decides only a matter of fact, there is no university, nor religious community in the Church of Rome, but what is Socinian. Let us therefore admire the discerning faculty of Mr Arnauld's adversary; and let us confess that no man was ever more lucky than he in the choice of his proofs. It is not to be doubted, that if the Jesuits found themselves in the same circumstances with the Divines of Port-Royal, they would do what those Divines have done (99). Would that prove their being Socinians?

(99) During the congregation of Auxerre, Clement VIII, being not favourable to them, they publicly maintained at Rome, that it was no article of faith, to believe that Clement VIII was Pope. Others taught that he was not infallible. See the History of that Congregation printed in the year 1687, pag. 49. *Matthæus, Hist. de France*, book ii, is quoted in it.

My third reflexion concerns the great care that writer takes to excuse himself to the public, for revealing the secret of one *Picaut*, or *Picot*. He is afraid of undoing Port-Royal; he declares he has been a long time doubtful whether he should strike such a blow; he would never have done it, had those gentlemen been less unjust, and less cruel to his party: However, he applauds himself for his victory; *this is what people get, says he, by provoking others*. Does it not look like a convincing proof? Would not one think it is one of those productions, that put an end to all cavils, and further proceedings in a cause? But, after all, it appears that the only thing he objects against the

gentlemen of Port-Royal is a story, which he dares not warrant: He knows not whether it be true. Who will then believe it, since he himself doubts of it, being otherwise fully enough to fancy that his tale would cast so shameful a blot upon those gentlemen, that he is afraid of being guilty of a piece of cruelty? But let not that trouble his conscience: He may be very sure that such stories will never make any impression upon impartial men, nor even upon the Jesuits. I would not deny that *Picaut* said so; but he must be compared to those deserters, who tell a thousand lies to the besiegers about the state of the towns that are besieged out of which they escaped. I have a book printed at Cologne for Peter Marteau in the year 1679, and intitled, *Traité des Parlemens ou États généraux, composé par Pierre Picaut*. This is doubtless our fugitive; for there is a great deal of Socinianism in that book. When a grave man, who has a great reputation, leaves his country and his Church, what he says may be depended upon. This is what makes me believe that the author of the *Politique du Clergé* knew not what he said when he spoke of a third party, and of that vast number of Socinians of which he supposes France is full; for when I asked two or three years ago (100) a famous Father of the Oratory (101), whether it was true that there were many Socinians among the Clergy of France, he answered me that there was hardly any body who knew the works and doctrines of that sect. There are every where Unbelievers and Sceptics; but they are not Socinians.

Let us conclude, That the author of the *Politique du Clergé* not being able to prove the heinous accusation published by him against Port-Royal, is duly convicted of being a downright calumniator. The proofs alleged by him, ought to be compared with those of a man, who having said that the governor of a place is a traitor to his sovereign, should prove it; First, By imputing to him a conduct like that of all other governors, and of those whose fidelity he could not deny. Secondly, By publishing some silly story, which a soldier, who deserted from the place, told the enemies.

[N] What concerns young *Picaut*, the chief witness alleged by the modern author I speak of.] Here follows what Mr le Vassor did me the honour to write to me, the second of January 1697. 'If you had told me that you designed to speak of *Picaut's* adventure, which Mr Jurieu relates very wrong, I would have given you a good account of it. He was my countryman (102), and I was very well acquainted with him. His eldest brother married a near relation of mine. He was a young man, whom Aubert de Verfé spoiled with Socinianism, not at Port-Royal, but in a house of the Oratory, where they happened both to be. The Fathers of the Oratory sent away de Verfé as soon as they perceived that he dogmatized, and they kept *Picaut* for some time in order to cure him, but they could not do it.' This account does perfectly agree with a printed letter of Mr Simon, who says (103), 'I can assure you that there are in that libel (104) many false stories, which could not be spoiled by M. J. (105). For instance, can any thing be more false and more ridiculous than that, which is to be found at large in the two hundred

no 10 cm
100ms

(100) I write this in July 1696.

(101) *M. le Vassor*, who is now at London, and is very well known by his works, who professed Divinity in the Oratory, and is perfectly acquainted with the Civil and Ecclesiastical State of France.

(102) Mr le Vassor is a Native of Orleans.

(103) *Lettres Choisies de Mr Simon*, pag. 145.

(104) That is, *L'Esprit de Mr Arnauld*.

(105) This refers to these words of the same page. The man being vexed at that blunder, answered me very ingeniously, and without much consideration on what he said, speaking of Mr J. That man spoils every thing that is sent to him.

I forgot to say that there are some of the Orthodox who have complained that certain refutations of his books have notably conduced to the increasing of his sect [O].

and twenty first page, and the following, of the first volume. He supposes the gentlemen of Port-Royal had a house in Paris, where they taught their scholars Socinianism, and permitted them to read the books of the Socinians. That romance is so well circumstantiated, that any body would think at first, it is rather a true history than a fictitious story. And yet it is certain, the gentlemen of Port-Royal have had no school in Paris where they taught youth. Here is what gave occasion to that romance. The young man spoken of in that book, called Picaut, was in the institution of the Fathers of the Oratory, which is properly a place for the novices, who desire to be admitted into that congregation. A man very well known in the world, who had been a minister in Burgundy, and was expelled by his brethren, being convicted of Socinianism, happened to be there at the same time. The Fathers of the Oratory, who took him to be a converted minister, admitted him into their institution. It was he who turned the young man's brains with what he told him about the Apocalypse and Socinianism. Thus that Socinianism proceeded from your people, and not from the gentlemen of Port-Royal, nor from the Fathers of the Oratory. That school, wherein the Socinian books are not locked up, is a meer dream of your men, who give out through the whole book manifest lies for true stories.

[O] They have complained that certain refutations of his books have . . . conduced to the increasing of his sect.

(106) See his Letter, ad Fratres Belgas, it is the CCLIII of the collection of Letters published by the Remonstrants, Edit. Amst. 1684.

(107) Bodechoerus innotiens, pag. 15, apud Crenium Animadu. Part. xi, pag. 120, 121.

hurts his own cause

This is the judgment of Druſius (106) concerning a work published against Socinus by Sibrandus Lubbertus in the year 1611. 'Credebat ille (Lubbertus) . . . recte se facere atque utiliter, quod Socinum de Servatore integrum ederet cum proluxa refutatione. Sed vide quid collega ipſius J. Druſius de facto isto judicaverit: Plures solâ libri Socini lectione, & parum accuratâ ejus confutatione, Socinianos brevi tempore factos fuisse scribit, quàm multis ante annis per ceteros libros eorum facti fuerant. Nec mirum. Qui enim argumenta adversarii sui, cum nervis suis omnibus vibrata ac torta, valide non retorquet, is proponendo illa, plus obest causâ suâ, quàm confutando prodest (107). --- Lubbertus thought he did an useful thing in publishing the book of Socinus, de Servatore, entire, with a large refutation of it. But see what his colleague Druſius thought of it. He writes, that in a little time more people were made Socinians, by the reading of Socinus's book only, and its insufficient refutation, than for many years past by all their other writings. And no wonder. For whoever does not sufficiently answer all the arguments skillfully proposed and managed by an adversary, does more hurt to his own cause by proposing, than good by refuting them.' This we find in a work printed in the year 1624. The same thing is to be found in a letter which Arnold Poelenburg published in the year 1655. I will give you his own words, which censure two other authors who refuted the Socinians. 'Laudant vulgò & magnificè deprædicant Reformati consilium Magistratus Amstelodamensis, quò libros Crellii & Volckelii de vera religione jussit exurere. At à quo decretum istud Amplissimi Magistratus majore contemptu violatur, quàm a D. Mareſio, qui nobis duas jam partes istius operis combuſti ac intermortui in lucem vitæque revocavit? Qua in re aliorum Reformatorum exemplum imitari se dicit; nec dubium est, quin hunc quoque alii secuturi sint, qui pro sua parte diligenter incumbant, ut plurima Socinianorum scripta protrudant in lucem. Adjicitur quidem, factor, in plerisque adversariorum libris refutato; sed ut est hominum indoles ad deteriora proclivior, multo facilis hæresin, quàm veritatem alluere vulgò creditum est. Deinde addita refutatio interdum usque adeo frigida & infirma est, ut nulla res efficacius errorem in animos infillat, quàm ejusmodi refutatio. Hinc cum Sibrandus Lubbertus Socini librum de Servatore edidisset integrum, addidit proluxa responsione, Vir Clar. Joan. Druſius ipſius collega hoc factum sanè quàm ægerimè tulit, scriptique ejus libri editione, & parum accuratâ refutatione, plures ad Socinianismum brevi spatio temporis adductos, quàm omnibus Socinianorum libris, qui multis retrò annis exstitissent. Constat mihi ex relatu viri cujuscumque & docti, & pii, & à Socinianismo alieni, D. Gomarus

(at quales virum!) olim in Academia Leidensi prælegentes, argumenta quædam Socini refutasse; sed ita infelicitè, ut multò facturus fuisset satius, si ea penitus intacta reliquisset. Quod idem affirmare possis de plerisque scriptoribus hodiernis, qui ex Socini refutatione student inclarescere, magnamque nomen (imperitiæ credo suæ) ad posteros transmittere, cum passim paucas rationes, & multa convicia, velut de plauſtro, in adversarios congerant. Junium tamen, Placeum, aliisque his similes semper excipio, qui non maledictis, sed ut Theologos decuit, argumentis Socinum oppugnant (108). --- The methods taken to suppress the Socinian sect and their writings, by burning or answering their books, was so far from succeeding, that thereby their numbers were more increased, and their books became more known and sought after. That after the magistrates of Amsterdam had ordered the books of Crellius and Volckelii de vera religione to be burnt publicly, Mareſius began to reprint them, and had published two parts. That there was no doubt that example would be followed by others of the Reformed. That when Sibrandus Lubbertus had published the entire book of Socinus de Servatore, together with a long confutation, the famous Joannes Druſius, his colleague, was exceedingly displeased, and wrote to him, that by his publishing that book, and his insufficient answer, more people had been turned to Socinianism, than for many years past. That a certain learned and pious person, who also was aversè from Socinianism, had told him, that Gomarus, formerly a Professor of Divinity in the university of Leyden, had endeavored to refute some of the arguments of Socinus, but so unhappily, that he had done much better not to attempt it. And, finally, that the like might be said of most of the writers at that time, who thought to transmit their names to posterity by refuting Socinus; who may indeed be famous (or rather infamous) for using reproaches instead of arguments. But that Junius, Placeus, and others like them, who opposed to the Socinians not foul language but strong arguments, as it became Divines, were always to be excepted. See also the preface which Christian Hartfoecker (109) hath prefixed to this letter. Druſius, who is there quoted on the same account, is styled doctissimus & orthodoxus, most learned and most orthodox.

(108) Arnould Poelenburg, in Epistola ad C. H. thes ii, Christianum Hartfoeckerum, pag. 59, apud Crenium, ibid. pag. 122.

I leave my reader to judge of all this, and content myself to observe in general, that a slight refutation of a book, does only serve the more to recommend it. Mezerai has said the same thing many years ago. 'Du Pleſſis Mornai . . . had written a large volume against the Mafes: the importance of the subject, the quality of the author, the politeness of his stile, and strength which appeared in his arguments, and the authorities taken from the Fathers, to the number upwards of four thousand, had acquired him a great reputation; and it had been still heightened by the weak attacks of all who had attempted to refute him (110).'

(109) He was minister of the Arminians at Rotterdam, and is the father of Mr Hartfoecker the Philosopher.

(110) Mezerai, Abrégé Chron. Tom. vi, at the year 1600, pag. m. 223.

Others have observed that nothing is more pernicious than to use bad arguments against impious persons (111). The author of Religio Medici observes (112) that a man who would confirm himself in his opinions ought to dispute with such as are not well able to defend themselves, and that every one is not qualified to maintain the truth, there being such as know not the first principles, and that suffer themselves to be led by a preposterous zeal. They give occasion to the erroneous to attack some truths, which weak defenders are not able to support. Observe what St Augustine (113) acknowledges concerning disputes wherein he triumphed over the orthodox. It must not be forgot, that the most understanding authors choose rather to be silent than to attack a book which they find too hard. In this respect they take that course, which a great Politician would have to be pursued, when abuses are so confirmed by long custom, that a magistrate who would attempt a reformation, would but discover his own want of power, and indiscreetly expose his authority (114). These things were taken into consideration by Father Paul, when he was desired to write against the Squittinio della Libertà Pnera (115).

(111) Religio Medici, §. vi, pag. m. 36.

(112) See the remark [D] of his article.

(113) Omittere potius prævidua & adulta vitia quam hoc adsequi ut palam fieret quibus flagitiis impares essemus. Tiberius, apud Tacitum, Annal. lib. iii, cap. liii. See in the remark [L] of the article NESTORIUS, the application I have made of this passage of Tacitus.

(114) See the Abbé de St Real, pag. m. 37, of the Conjuraton des Espagnols contre Venise.

Nevertheless I think, that this assertion, It is better to give no answer at all to a dangerous book than a bad one, admits of a distinction; it is better, I say, with

with regard to those, who, laying aside prejudice, compare the objections and their answers, and who attentively consider every thing. But good souls, pious, and easy to be satisfied in matters which they believe, are much more scandalized with no answer than a weak one. They do not readily discern when an answer is insufficient: they always find some occasion to triumph; for there is no refutation so pitiful as not to discover some defects in the book of an adversary. These observations, I own, will signify little, and will be no decision of the principal question: but, however, they will please, and give satisfaction by an idea of superiority, to the prepossessed readers, and such as compare not one whole book to another whole book.

For the rest, the quotation from Mezerai brings to my memory what hath been said of the famous Count de Tilly, that he often acquired honour, partly by his own good conduct, and partly by the bad conduct of those he had to do with (116). He is not the only person of whom this may be said, Cæsar observed that Pompey, by a very singular good fortune, had acquired the surname of Great, for having vanquished some people

that knew nothing of war (117). It hath been said of some princes that they were great by their own virtues, and by the evil qualities of others, *magni sui virtutibus & vitiiis aliorum*.

[P] The treatise de *Autoritate S. Scripture*, which Vorstius caused to be reprinted at Steinfurt in the year 1611, in 8vo, with some additions, is a work of Faustus Socinus, who published it in the year 1588, under the name of *Dominicus Lopez Societatis Jesu*. They put in the title that it was printed at Sevil, *Hispali ex officina Lazari Ferrerii*. This work was printed in French at Basil without the author's name in the year 1592. In the advertisement of the Bookfeller it is said that the Divines of Basil had approved it after a careful examination, and that they had only disallowed three places, the censure whereof was inserted (118). The care of Vorstius to procure a new edition of it was used as a proof of his Socinianism. It cannot be denied that the doctrine of Socinus is to be found in that book; but it is otherwise full of very good proofs of the truth of the Christian Religion.

(117) See Apian, de Bello Civili, lib. ii, pag. m. 793; and Suetonius, in Cæfare, cap. xxxv.

(118) See the preface to the edition of Steinfurt.

(a) See Mr de la Loubere, Relation de Siam, Tom. i, ch. xxii, num. 4, 5, pag. m. 500, 501.

SOMMONA-CODOM. So the Siamese call a certain extraordinary man, whom they think to have attained to the supreme felicity (a). I mention him only to have an opportunity of examining a very subtle objection which Mr du Rondel proposed to me [A] against what I have said in the article of Lucretius (b), that the belief of GOD's existence without the belief of a providence, cannot be an inducement to virtue.

(b) At the end of the remark [K], of the article LUCRETIUS, the Philosopher.

Father

[A] I mention him only to have an opportunity of examining an objection . . . which Mr du Rondel proposed to me. Mr du Rondel having read what I have said at the end of the remark [I], in the article of Lucretius, was pleased to write to me, that he thought it would be opposed both by examples and arguments. For in the first place, at Siam, and in other countries, where they believe in Sommona-Codom, it is an undoubted doctrine that this God concerns himself with nothing in his Nireupan, and suffers every thing upon earth to take its own course; and yet they pray to him, call upon him, and use all their endeavours to imitate him in the practice of virtue. See the first tome of Mr de la Loubere's relation. But in the second place, supposing there was no Sommona-Codom, nor any other god in this world, the bare speaking of the gods, and annexing to those ideas all the beauty of morals, would induce many people to aspire to that degree of glory (1). Being under a necessity of laying aside a great many things till another time, I am forced, to my great grief, to suppress the sequel of Mr du Rondel's fine letter; but I shall give the substance of it in these few words: he in a lively manner sets forth the power of admiration, and shews by great examples, that the bare desire of imitating an excellent model, has induced men to very difficult actions (2).

(1) A Letter of Mr du Rondel, of the 28th of January, 1696.

(2) See the answer to the second part of the objection, below.

(3) La Loubere, Relation de Siam, Tom. i, ch. xxiv, pag. m. 533-534.

I. I shall answer first the objection he grounds upon the conduct of the Siamese; and the better to clear the matter, I shall first of all set down the words of the Historian. 'Sommona-Codom ordered, before he died, that statues and temples should be consecrated to him, and since his death he is in that state of rest, which they express by the word Nireupan. It is not a place, but a manner of being; for, say they, to speak properly, Sommona-Codom is no where, and enjoys no felicity: he has no power, and is not in a condition to do men either good or harm: the Portuguese call it annihilation. Nevertheless, the Siamese believe on the other side, that Sommona-Codom is happy, they put up prayers to him, and ask him whatever they want: whether it be that their doctrine is inconsistent with itself, or that they carry their worship beyond their doctrine: but in whatever sense they ascribe a power to Sommona-Codom, they are agreed in this, that he has no power, but over the Siamese, and does not concern himself with nations, that worship other men than him (3).' By this it plainly appears, that the Siamese speak inconsistently of their Sommona-Codom. They say that he enjoys no felicity; and, on the other hand, they think he is happy. One may therefore believe, that though they say he has no power, they take him to be very powerful: and therefore, it is no wonder if they pray to

him; their notions are so confused, that they allow them to affirm contradictory things of one and the same object. When they consider it in a certain sense, they say one thing of it, and when they consider it in another sense, they deny it. Their notions are different from their inward sentiments, which is the reason why their theory does not agree with their practice: however it be, we ought to believe that they do not invoke Sommona-Codom, as a Being to which they ascribe no power, and which minds nothing, but as a Being in which they acknowledge some power in some respects, by virtue of an inward sentiment, which commonly has a greater influence upon people, than the clear doctrines of speculative men. The Historian does clearly insinuate, that they ascribe some power to him; in whatever sense, says he, they ascribe it to him, they are agreed in this, that he has no power but over the Siamese. This is my first remark, to which I add this observation. They are fully persuaded that some things lead the soul to an eternal happiness or misery, and that whatever they can do in the honour of Sommona-Codom is fine, praise-worthy, just, and proper to make one attain to the supreme good. And therefore, though they should teach constantly, and without any appearance of contradiction, that he concerns himself with nothing, that he has no power, and does not hear the prayers put up to him, yet they would apply themselves to him in their necessity, and practise such virtues as he was pleased with; for it must, in their opinion, be the way to the supreme felicity. And therefore, I say, that their devotion and their practical morality are not contrary to what I advance; for they believe both an existence and a providence. It is true, they ascribe no providence to Sommona-Codom; but it is sufficient for my purpose, that they attribute it to something else, from which they expect to be rewarded for their good works. They have lost the idea of GOD, as well as the Chinese: but they have nevertheless preserved that antient maxim according to which virtue is to be rewarded, and vice to be punished (4). They ascribe therefore that distributive Justice to a blind fatality. It is from this fatality they expect their happiness, if they live virtuously; and they are persuaded it will reward them for the honours paid to Sommona-Codom. To have a right notion of their impious doctrine, one needs only consider the opinions of the Literati among the Chinese: they are those, who have degrees of literature, and the only men who have a share in the government. They are grown altogether impious, and though they have not altered the language of their predecessors, yet have made the soul of the heavens, and all other souls, to be I know not what aerial substances, destitute of intelligence: and they have established a blind fatality, as the only judge of men's actions.

distributed with some good

(4) Id. Ibid. ch. xxiii, num. 15, pag. 515.

Father Tachard relates several things of this Sommona-Codom, whom he calls *Sommonokbodom*. He is, says he (c), the god whom the Siamefe worship at this time. They suppose he was born a god by his own virtue, and that immediately after his birth, without any master to instruct him, he acquired, by a bare intuition of his mind, a perfect knowledge of whatever concerns Heaven and Earth, Paradise and Hell, and of the most impenetrable secrets of nature; that he remembered at the same time, whatever he had done in all the several lives he had lived; and that after he had taught those

(c) Tachard, *Voyage de Siam*, book vii, p. 205, Dutch Edit.

morid with god actions, that does, as they believe, what an omnipotent and most wise justice could do. They pretend that it is a thing consonant to the principles of nature, that virtue should be always attended with happiness, and vice with misery, by a certain, though unknown, sympathy between virtue and happiness, and between vice and misery (5). Thus the Chinese and Siamefe very much differ from Epicurus: they deny the existence of God, and acknowledge a providence (6), whereas Epicurus rejected a providence, and acknowledged the existence of a Deity. It is not therefore strange that the Siamefe should invoke Sommona-Codom, and endeavour to imitate his virtuous life; but one might wonder at Epicurus, if he had prayed to Jupiter, and laid a great constraint upon himself to honour the gods; for he was persuaded that his prayers and endeavours would be of no use to him. On the contrary, the Siamefe believe that their worship of the hero will bring them an ample reward. The blind fatality, the natural laws and sympathies they acknowledge between virtue and happiness, and between vice and misery, are as powerful a motive and as great a curb as the belief of a knowing providence.

(5) Id. ibid. mem. 14. p. 514.

(6) That is, a law whereby evil is punished, and virtue rewarded.

blind fatal

THAT the Doctrine of a natural and blind connexion between virtue and happiness, and between vice and misery, would have a greater influence on men than the Christian doctrine, concerning providence.

(7) That is, without considering the operation of the Divine Grace, upon souls predestinated.

(8) Compare with this the xviiith chapter of Ezekiel.

I go farther still, and I say that according to the course of nature (7), that belief has not so great an influence as the opinion of the Siamefe. A natural connexion between virtue and happiness, and between vice and misery, would be more proper to act upon a mercenary mind, than the persuasion of the orthodox, without the divine grace. That connexion would never fail to produce its full and perfect effect, since it would not be submitted to a cause, which thinks fit sometimes to derogate from its laws, to extend or confine them, and to hasten or retard the execution of them, in a word, to dispose of them according to its designs and various circumstances. That connexion, for that very reason that it were only a blind fatality, would afford good men a perfect certainty of a quick reward, and fill the wicked with a necessary fear of a quick punishment. But by supposing a providence, which disposes of all things according to its will, and with a wisdom, all the designs of which we do not comprehend, one cannot be certain that a good action will be profitable, or a bad one detrimental; for one may think, in each particular juncture, that it is one of the cases, wherein God is not pleased to follow the general law of rewarding good actions, or that of punishing evil ones. Christians are agreed that God suspends the execution of those laws as long as he thinks fit. They even say, that an old sinner, who has enjoyed all the pleasures of life, will be eternally happy, provided that on his death-bed he perform one act of true repentance; and that whoever in his old age departs from the way of virtue, tho' he hath pursued it for a long time through many troubles, will be eternally damned (8). Doubtless this may be the reason why the fear of God's judgments, or the hope of his rewards, make no great impression upon worldly people. If there was an indissoluble connexion between devoutly asking a good thing of God, and obtaining it, none could doubt of the efficacy of a devout prayer; but, according to the doctrine of divines about that part of Divine worship, none can be sure that the most earnest and devout prayers of a mother for the recovery or conversion of her son, or for the deliverance of her husband unjustly imprisoned, will be heard. Those, who have heard some Divines preach about the efficacy of prayer, or who have read some books upon that subject, know that the proofs alleged and grounded either upon arguments or examples, are very strong and cogent: however, the difficulties must be examined at last. Preachers do not conclude without supposing that it will be asked, How comes it that some things are not obtained tho' they be asked with faith, and for the greatest glory of God? Their answer is, That God refuses us what we asked of him upon several occasions, in order to try us, or humble us more and more,

or because he knows that the favours we pray for would be prejudicial to us, and because our wants, and what concerns his glory, are better known to him than to us. There is no case in which every body may not judge that his prayers may not be granted thro' one of those motives; hence it is that the hope of being heard is always mixed with great uncertainty, and that many people grow remiss in the practice of prayer, or only ask of God the general grace of acquiescing in his will. Men would act quite otherwise, were they persuaded that there is a necessary connexion between a devout prayer, and the obtaining of what is prayed for; they would apply themselves to providence in all their wants, as they come near a fire, when they are troubled with cold. And therefore since the Siamefe are persuaded that there is a fatal, immutable, and necessary connexion between virtue and happiness, and between vice and misery, that doctrine should be a more powerful inducement to virtue among them, than religion is in other countries. They should apply themselves to virtue in order to be happy, as they have recourse to food, when they are hungry; and they should depart from vice to avoid misery, as they keep off from the fire when they are afraid of being burnt. But then their morals would be wholly mercenary. The pure notions of honesty would not be their principle. I must observe, by the by, that it is very strange they should believe what is told of them concerning that fatal connexion. Is there no man among them that grows rich by unlawful means, or is poor without being accounted vicious, or that is wounded by endeavouring to save another man's life? I fancy, if they were pressed hard upon this head, they would come off with some Stoical notions, viz: that diseases, vexation, and poverty, are no evils, and that riches, pleasure, and health, are not good things (9). I could easily believe that the common people do not follow that opinion of a natural sympathy between virtue and happiness, and between vice and misery; and that it is only a doctrine of their men of letters, who have denied a providence, and nevertheless were sensible that it is an useful thing to preserve the common opinion concerning rewards and punishments.

imertu

fatal connexion

(9) Compare what is said before remark [X] of the article SADUCEES.

II. I come now to examine the other part of the objection. I grant, that a man may admire and honour an object without expecting any reward for it, besides the satisfaction of doing justice to merit; but I cannot grant that any man will invoke it against his inclinations, and offer sacrifices to it in order to please it, and appease its anger, if he be well persuaded, 1. That it concerns itself with nothing; takes care of nothing; that the ill lives of men do not displease it, and that their good lives are not acceptable to it. 2. That there is no other Being that can reward the honours paid to that Being, or punish men for indulging their passions. This is the ground of the maxim I have advanced, that the belief of the existence of GOD without the belief of a providence, cannot be an inducement to virtue, nor a curb to vice. But, will some say, May not men full of admiration for an excellent, holy, and happy being, that is honoured all over the world, propose it to themselves as the model of their lives, and resist their bad inclinations, and use their utmost endeavours to practise virtue in order to imitate it? I answer, they may do it, if they believe that this painful imitation will make them like that being, or procure them some other advantage of great value. But then their belief of the Divine existence will be attended with the belief of a providence: they will believe, either as the Siamefe and Chinese do, that nature has inseparably united, by a blind fatality, happiness with virtue, and misery with vice; and that the imitation of one Sommona-Codom will in time put them in a state like his; or they will believe that an intelligent legislator has designed rewards for those, who shall chuse the holy and happy life of the immortal gods for their pattern. At least,

WHETHER the admiration of an excellent Being, that can do neither good nor harm, may be of any use to make us virtuous.

VOL. V.

Z z

those great things, he left them in writing, that posterity might be benefitted by them. He says in those books, that being a god, he desired one day to manifest his divinity to men by some extraordinary prodigy (d). That immediately he found himself carried through the air on a throne shining with gold and precious stones, that came out of the earth in the very same place where he was; and that the angels at the same time coming down from Heaven paid him the honour and worship due to him (e). That ever since he aspired to be a god, he returned into the world five hundred and fifty times under different shapes; that in each new birth, he had always been the first, and as it were the prince of those animals under whose shapes he came into the world; that he had often given his life for his subjects, and that being an ape he delivered a town from a horrid monster which desolated it; that he had been a most potent king, and that seven days before he obtained the empire of the world, he removed, in imitation of a certain anchorite, with his wife and his two children, into remote solitudes, where he renounced the world and his passions (f) That he had gone all over the world teaching men what is good and evil, and the true religion, which he writ down to leave it to posterity. He had several disciples, who, in the quality of priests, were to imitate him in a most particular manner by wearing an habit like his, and observing the rules he prescribed to them, when at last he attained to the eighty second year of his age He was seized with a violent cholic of which he died. His soul ascended into the eighth Heaven [B]. We shall see below what is related of his brother [C].

least, they will hope that mankind will be so equitable as to admire their virtue, and to bestow glorious rewards upon it; and that, perhaps, some time or other they shall be deified. The glory of Miltiades had a great influence over Themistocles, tho' Themistocles expected nothing from Miltiades; I grant it: May not at this day the memory of the Alexanders and Cæsars have such a power over the passions of some men, as to make them undertake the most difficult things? And yet they are fully persuaded that those conquerors know not what passes upon earth, and can do neither good nor harm. I own all this; but did not Themistocles know that by imitating Miltiades, he would attain to the same glory he did? Could those who should now tread in the steps of Cæsar and Alexander, be ignorant that trophies, panegyrics, and the immortality of their name would be the price and glorious reward of their labours? And therefore all the examples of the power of admiration and imitation, that can be alleged, suppose the existence of a cause, which rewards the trouble of the admirer and the imitator; and consequently they are not contrary to my assertion. Here is another reflexion. The belief of the Divine existence, without a belief of a providence, ought not to be accounted an inducement to virtue, if whatever it can produce, may be produced by the mere idea of what is honest, and by the mere desire of being praised: but the mere idea of what is honest, and the mere desire of being praised, may produce whatever the admiration and imitation of the gods of Epicurus could effect. This is manifest if it be attentively considered. Therefore, &c. I would not take advantage of this, viz. That a follower of Epicurus could not flatter himself, that by imitating the virtues of the gods, he would be in time as happy as they were (10). That had been to no purpose, since Mr du Rondel does not suppose that Epicurus is also concerned in the objection. See the margin (11).

(10) Epicurus and his followers taught that the soul dies for ever with the body.

(11) I propose this only as a problem, which Mr du Rondel may examine, and I desire him to confute it as much as he will think fit, for the further instruction of my readers.

(12) Tachard, Voiege de Siam, book vi, pag. 275, Dutch Edit.

(13) Id. ibid. pag. 206.

(14) Id. ibid. pag. 208.

[B] His soul ascended into the eighth heaven. It is properly the paradise called Nyruppaam: the soul is no longer subject to pain and misery, and enjoys a perfect felicity; and therefore she will never be born again: this is what they call being annihilated. For they do not understand by that word the entire destruction of a thing, whereby it is reduced to nothing; but they only mean that it appears no longer upon earth, though it lives in heaven. As for his body it was burnt; and his bones, as they say, have been preserved to this present time. They are partly in the kingdom of Pegu, and partly in that of Siam. They ascribe a wonderful virtue to those bones, and affirm that they shine with a divine splendor (12). It may be inferred from these last words, that the worship which the Siamese pay to that god, is attended with the hopes of some advantage accruing from it.

[C] We shall see below what is related of his brother. His name was Thevathat (13). (14) He was always born anew with his brother Sommonokbodom, of

the same kind with him; but always inferior in dignity, because Sommonokbodom was the prince of the animals, whose figure he assumed. But Thevathat, tho' he found means to form a new sect, in which he engaged several kings, and several nations, who followed him, to be his imitators. This occasioned a schism, which divided the world into two parts, and gave birth to two religions, whereas before there was but one. Some became disciples to Thevathat, and others to Sommonokbodom. Thevathat, tho' the younger brother, finding himself supported by so many princes, who had undertook to defend him, made use of open force, as well as treachery, to destroy his brother, and invented the most horrid calumnies to blast his reputation; but he did not succeed in his designs. Nay, he was overcome more than once, when, in order to confirm his followers in his doctrine, he durst contend with his brother, who should work the greatest miracles. His ambition made him wish to be a god; but not being truly one, he was ignorant of many things, whereof his brother had a perfect knowledge; and because his pride did not permit him to hear Sommonokbodom, he did not learn of him what passed in paradise and in hell, nor the doctrine of transmigration, nor the changes which had happened and were to happen in all ages. The Siamese (17) believe that the doctrine of Thevathat, as a source of schism and division, has produced seven other sects, which have a great affinity one with another.

(17) Thevathat having done so many injuries to his brother, without any respect for the rights of nature, and for the deity itself, it was just he should be punished for it. Accordingly the writings of the Siamese mention his punishment; and Sommonokbodom also says in those books, that being made a god, he saw his impious brother in the deepest part of hell. I saw him, says he, overwhelmed with evils, and groaning under the weight of his misery. He was in the eighth abode, that is, in the place where the greatest malefactors are tormented, where he expiated, by a horrid punishment, all the sins he had committed, especially the injuries he had done me. Afterwards, explaining the punishment he inflicted upon Thevathat, he says he was fastened to a cross with large nails (19), which piercing his hands and his feet, gave him violent pain; that he had a crown of thorns on his head, that his body was full of wounds, and to complete his misery, the infernal fire burnt him without consuming him. He was moved with compassion at the sight of such a dreadful spectacle; he forgot all the injuries his brother had

(15) This story seems to be derived from the History of Cais and Abel.

(16) Tachard, ubi supra, pag. 209.

(17) Id. ibid. pag. 211.

(18) Id. ibid. pag. 212, 213.

(19) This makes them believe that Jesus Christ is the same with Thevathat, and what confirms them most in that opinion (these are Father Tachard's words, ubi supra, book vi, pag. 214.) is that we worship the image of the crucified Saviour, which does perfectly represent the punishment inflicted upon Thevathat.

* had done him, and he could not see him in that condition without resolving to come to his assistance. In order to it, he proposed to him to adore these three words, *Pphang, Thamang, Sangkhang*: words sacred and mysterious, for which the Siamese have a profound veneration; the first whereof signifies God, the second the word of God, and the third the imitator of God; promising him, that if he would accept such reasonable and easy terms, he would deliver him from all the torments to which he was condemned. *Thevathat* consented to adore the two first words, but utterly refused to adore the third, because it signified priest, or imitator of God, protesting that priests were sinful men, who deserved no respect. It is for a punishment of such a pride that he is under sufferings to this day, and will suffer in hell for the space of many years.

Judge by this whether the Siamese can say, without contradicting themselves, that he is a god who has no power. Do they not acknowledge that he can deliver from the most horrid torments of hell those, who accept the conditions he proposes to them? If you answer me, that this concerns the time when he was not yet in the eighth heaven; I will reply, that the example of *Thevathat* may make them afraid of being miserable, if they do not conform to the good pleasure and to the rules prescribed to them by *Somonokhodom*; and consequently, their worship is not free from self-interest. They fancy (20) that the Christians are *Thevathat's* disciples (21), and they are so afraid of being thrown into hell with *Thevathat*, if they follow his doctrine, that they cannot be persuaded to embrace Christianity.

(20) Tachard, *supra*, book 4, pag. 209.
(21) *Id. ibid.*, pag. 213.

SOPHRONIA, is the name that is given to a Roman lady, whom Eusebius commends for her courage and chastity. I cannot tell where they have found her name; for Eusebius does not name her either in the xivth chapter (a) of the viiith book of his Ecclesiastical History, or in the xxxivth chapter of the first book of Constantine's life. He only says that this lady was married to the governor of Rome, and that knowing that the soldiers whom Maxentius made use of to bring him the woman he intended to ravish, were already got into her house, with a permission extorted from her husband; she demanded a little time under pretence of dressing her self; and afterwards finding she was alone in her chamber, she thrust a sword into her breast, and shewed by this action, to that and the following ages, that nothing but Christian virtue is invincible and proof against death. This is Eusebius's account. He does not say that she asked her husband's leave, and GOD's pardon, for what she was going to do; nor that the Church has given a testimony of the truth of her martyrdom by the declaration of her holiness. They are meer glosses, which Moreri, being deceived by Charles Stephens [A], falsely ascribes to that Historian.

(a) Moreri quotes the 17th after Charles Stephens, and several other Dictionaries.

[A] Moreri, being deceived by Charles Stephens. The article of Sophronia not being very long in Charles Stephens, I shall set it down at length. 'Sophronia matrona Romana, altera Lucretia Christiana, cum vim Decii Principis videret se passuram, consentiente viro arrepto gladio seipsum transfixit, ac inter sanctas mulieres est relata. Euseb. lib. 8. cap. 17. - - - Sophronia, a Roman lady, another Christian Lucretia, perceiving that, with her husband's consent, she was to be ravished by Decius, she stabbed herself with a sword, and was numbered amongst the holy women.' Moreri had from thence, that Sophronia is called the Christian Lucretia; which is one fault, for he gives too large an extent to the words of the Latin Dictionary. The words *consentiente viro*, which ought to be referred to *passuram*, and not to *arrepto gladio*, was a trap for Moreri; a comma ill placed, which made him believe that this lady did not kill herself without asking her husband's permission to do it, caused his mistake. Perhaps the comma signifies nothing to the matter; for if you put one next to *passuram*, and one next to *viro*, as Lloyd and Hofman do, the ambiguity will be the same. An exact and careful writer would have placed *passuram* next to *viro*, and then the reader would not have been uncertain. I need not take notice of the other mistakes. I shall only say, that Moreri has not transcribed all the mistakes of

Charles Stephens; he has left out *Decii Principis*, and put the tyrant Maxentius in the room of Decius. Lloyd and Hofman have not corrected one syllable. I wonder Rivetus should say, that Eusebius tells us, that Sophronia having prayed to God upon her knees, as it were to sacrifice her chastity to JESUS CHRIST; killed herself in the presence of the tyrant Maxentius. Euseb. lib. 8. *Historia refert de Sophronia prefati Romanæ urbis uxore quod cum animadverteret maritum metu mortis perterritum, prodidisse pudicitiam suam Maxentio Tyranno, cum prius defixis genibus Deum orasset, tanquam pudicitiam suam Christo immolaturam, petens coram eo ferro transfixisse* (1). From whence I learn that he is also one of those, who quote from the modern writers, without consulting the originals. I had a better opinion of him. I was not surprised that Ravius Textor in his *Officina*, and Decimator in his *Sylva Vocabulorum*, had committed the same faults with Charles Stephens. Those authors did not think of verifying their quotations. Decimator seems to me more exact than all the rest as to the allusion to Lucretia; he does not say, as Moreri does, that Sophronia was called the Christian Lucretia; but that she might justly be called so: *Castitatis nomine celebris, ita ut altera Lucretia Christiana non immerito dici possit*.

(1) Andr. Rivet, in *Gens. Exercit. lxxiii*, Oper. Tom. 1, pag. 281. I have referred *coram eo* to Maxentius; perhaps it should be referred to maritus. Rivetus has committed a solecism in this place.

SORANUS (QUINTUS VALERIUS) flourished in the VIIth century of Rome (a). He was esteemed for his eloquence, but much more for his learning. He was the most learned man, that had been seen among the Latin authors. Though he was born near Rome (b), he had the country pronunciation [A], which doubtless did some prejudice to his eloquence. He had observed in his works a method, which Pliny followed

(a) See the remark [A], citation (a).

(b) See the same remark, citat. (4).

[A] The most learned man he had the country pronunciation.] The proof of all this is to be found in the IIId book of *Oratore*; where Cicero says, that the most agreeable pronunciation of the Greek tongue was that of the Athenians (1). They spoke better without any learning, than the most learned Asiatics. This is not to be understood as if their words had been better placed; it concerns only the tone of their voice, and their accent. Cicero says the same to the praise of the city of Rome: he observes that the most ignorant Roman surpassed in that respect the learned Soranus; learned, did I say, I should rather call him the

most learned man of that time. *Hanc dico suavitatem, quæ exit ex ore, quæ quidem ut apud Græcos Atticorum, sic in latino sermone hujus est urbis maxime propria Nostri minus student literis quam Latini, tamen ex istis quos nostis; urbanis, in quibus minimum est literarum, nemo est quin literatissimum togatorum omnium Q. Valerium Soranum lenitate vocis, atque ipso oris pressu facile vincat* (2). These words plainly insinuate that Soranus was then living; and therefore I had reason to say, that he flourished in the VIIth century of Rome; for Cicero supposes that the discourses, which make up his work *de Oratore*, were made in the year 662.

(2) *Id. ib.*

662. Many believe that this Soranus was a friend of Cicero, and understand the following passage of him : *Q. & D. Valerii Sorani, vicini & familiares mei non tam in dicendo admirabiles, quam docti & grævis literis & latinis* (3). What goes before, shews that those two Soranus's were not born at Rome, but in the Latium. I believe they were natives of Sora, a town of that country according to Pliny and Pto-

(3) Cícero, in
Bruto, pag. m.
283.

(4) See Corradus, in *Brutum Ciceronis*, pag. 284.

(5) Plinius, in
Praefat. in fine.

(6) Harduin. in
hunc locum
Plinij.

(7) Varro de
Lingua Latina,
lib. vi, pag. m.
71.

(8) Aulus Gellius, *lib. ii*, cap. x.

(9) Plinius, *lib.*
iii, cap. v, pa-
m. 330, 331.

(10) See the passage of Macbius in the remark [E].

(11) Valerius
denique Soranus
quod contra in-
dictum id eloq-
ausus foret ob
meritum profu-
næ vocis neci-
tum. *Solin. c.*
i, pag. 1.

(12) Servius,
lib. i, Georg
ver. 499.

(13) Vives in
August. de C
vitate Dei, l.
vii, cap. ix.

(14) Plut. Quæst. Rom.
pag. 278.

[B] *A method which Pliny followed.*] These are his words in his preface to Titus son of Vespasian: 'Quia occupationibus tuis publico bono parcendum erat, quod singulis continenter libris huic epistolæ subijunxi: summæque cura, ne per aliquos eos haberet, operam dedi. Tu per hoc & aliis præstabis nec perlegant: sed ut quicque desideraverit aliquid, id tantum querat & sciat quo loco inveniat. Hoc ante me fecit in litteris nostris Valerius Soranus, in quibus libris quos ἐπιστολῶν inscripsit (5). - - Because your time was to be saved for the public good, I have subjoined to this epistle the contents of each book, and endeavoured to spare you the pains of reading them over. And thereby others may by you be benefited; not being obliged to read them over: but as any thing is wanted, to look only for that, and know where to find it. This was done before me, by Valerius Soranus, in the books which he intitled, ἐπιστολῶν.' I must not forget the note of Father Hardouin: *Epistides scripserat, bonæst, ut Turnebus quidem interpretatur, de Grammaticæ libris: tanquam de mysteriis literarum & doctrinæ. Erat enim ἐπιστολῆς qui ad inspicendam sacra occultâ ad mittebant* (6). It is certain our Soranus wrote some grammatical books. See Varro (7), and Aulus Gellius (8).

[C] *To divulge a mystery . . . that he was punished with death upon that account.*] Pliny does not say in express terms that Soranus divulged the name of the tutelal god of Rome; but it may be inferred from his words; *Cuius (Romæ) nomen alterum dicere arcanum ceremoniarum nefas habetur: optimaque & salutaris fiducia aboluit enunciatum Valerius Soranus luitque max pœne*

(9). He says the city of Rome had two names : one that was known to every body ; and the other so mysterious that religion did not permit it should be revealed ; and that Soranus having divulged it, was immediately punished for it. It is not to be doubted, but that the mysterious name was the same with that of the tutelary god of the town, or at least, that it was looked upon as a thing that protected it (10). Solinus, who transcribed

Pliny, took the liberty to specify the punishment inflicted upon Soranus for his profanation: he says that he was condemned to death (11); but speaks only of the unknown and mysterious name of the city, and does not say it was the name of the tutelal god of Rome. I am going to quote two authors, who are more particular upon this point, and leave us not to the trouble of making inferences: *Pecrum nomen ejus numinis qui urbi Romae praesit, firi carcerem lege prohibetur, quod ausus quidam tribunus plebis evnitiare, in crucem levatus est* (12). This is all that I have to say.

or Soranus was tribune of the people; and that
 was crucified (13). They are obliged to add something
 of their own, for Servius names no body. The other
 passage, which I am to quote, is out of Plutarch
 διὰ τὸν Θωδῆν ἐκείνον ὁ καλίστα τὸν Ῥώμιον
 ζῆν προσέειπε καὶ φυλάττειν, εἴτε ἐν ἀρχῇ
 Σίγκια, καὶ ἔπειτα ἀπείρηται καὶ ζῆτει καὶ
 μαρτυρῇ; ταῦτ' ἐν τῇ ἀπορίᾳ ἐξήλθοις
 σιδημαίνων, ἰσορροπῇ Ὀυαλέων Σωκράτη
 λίσσας κακῶς διὰ τὸ ζῆσειν. Cur tutelam
 Romæ Deum, mafne fit an femina, dicere aut
 ere, ejusque nomen efferre nefas est? quod quidem
 interdictum à superstitione repetunt, narrantes V.
 rium Soranum tribu-

(14). - - - Why is it a crime to speak or ask, whether the tutelary god of Rome is male or female, and to pronounce his name? Which prohibition some ascribe to superstition, saying that Soranus miserably perished for disobedience.

ing his name. Note, that according to Plutarch, it was not allowed to inquire into the sex or the name of the tutelal god of Rome. Note also, that some authors find something more mysterious in Soranus's punishment; for they say, that as soon as he uttered that concealed name, he fell dead upon the place. They affirm (15) that this is to be found in Pliny, and several other writers. It is false that Pliny says so. We shall see in the remark [D] that, perhaps, Soranus's indifference was not the occasion of his death. Finally, take notice of a great mistake in Gyraldus. Having said, 1, (16) That Pliny and Solinus relate that Valerius Soranus was condemned to death for being so bold as to pronounce the occult name of Rome (17) ; 2, That Sempronius (18) wrote the same thing; he adds, that others affirm, that this Soranus was crucified, which occasioned the worship of the goddess Angerona, the patroness of Silence. *Alii in crucem sublatum tradunt, & PROPTEREA cultum Deam Angeronam silentii præfident* (19). Servius is the only author who mentions the crucifixion of that impious person who divulged that mystery; but neither he nor any other, hath observed that this punishment gave occasion to the worship of the goddess Angerona. It plainly appears from Pliny that this was a very ancient worship, grounded upon the mystery of the occult name of Rome. *Exemplum religionis: ANTIQVÆ ob hoc maxime silentium instituta. Namque Diva Angerona, &c* (20). Solinus expresses himself more clearly still: *Inter ANTIQVISSIMAS sane res religionis Sacellum colitur Angerona* (21). There is hardly any illusion more dangerous than that of the particle termed *casualis* by the Grammarians. They have occasioned horrid blunders in the most learned compilers and when a man goes about to give a different turn to what he transcribes, and to shorten it as much as he can, he will be apt to perplex and confound himself, unless he be very attentive. The learned Gyraldus was mistaken for want of duly considering Pliny's words.

[D] Perhaps he ought not to be distinguished from that *Quintus Valerius*, whom Pompey caused to be put to death. If I am not mistaken, Plutarch is the only author who informs us of this particular. He saw that Pompey being well informed of that man's leading, took him aside, and walked with him. Noting that Pompey was then in Sicily, and that very day judging the criminals, that is, those of Marius's party who were to be put to death. When he saw *Quintus Valerius* brought to the tribunal, he rose up to take course with him in private; but as soon as he knew of him what he desired to know, he ordered him to be killed. Plutarch relates this only upon the credit of

author, whom he mistrusts as to those things which
concerned the friends or enemies of Cæsar (2
Ταῖς δὲ Ὅπτις, ὁ Καίσαρος ἑταῖρος, πρὸς πάν-
τας φησὶ καὶ Κούριον Οὐαλερίον συγκαταριθ-
μεῖται. ἐπιστάμενον γὰρ ὡς ἐστὶ φιλοπόνη-
τος καὶ φιλομαθὴς ἐν ὀλίγοις ὁ Οὐαλερίος, ὡς ἦν
πρὸς αὐτὸν, ἐπιστάμενον καὶ συμπεριστατικὸν
αὐτὸν καὶ πυνδόμενον ἂν ἔχοντος καὶ μαζὸν ἄ-
σας ἐν τοῖς ὑπηρεταῖς ἐνδὺς ἀνελὼν ἀπαγαγόν-
τος. Addit C. Oppius Cæsaris familiaris secum Pompe-
tiæ etiam in V. Valerium extitisse: quum enim sciret bu-
nitatis & literarum inter paucos studiosum Valerium,
ædus ad ipsum est, defussisse illum & deambum-
per, ubi accepit & didicit ab eo quæ cuperet, imper-
hibitoris ut illud asserent eam & interficiat, imper-
MAY NOT one suppose, 1, That it was upon this o-
fession that our Soranus divulged the unknown name
the city of Rome? 2, That Oppius omitted this
ticular, not to afford a pretence to excuse Pompe-
For if it might have been alleged that Soranus dis-
vealed to him such a secret, he who caused him to
put to death might have been cleared, and his sever-
might have been looked upon as an act of devotion
and a holy zeal against prophane men. I affirm
thing, and leave it to the judgement of the Cr

(15) Hermolae
apud Gyraldum
de Poëtis, *Dis-*
logo vi, p. 192.
Edit. Lugd.
1606.

(16) Gyraldus,
Poët. Historia.
Dial. iv, pag.
192.

(17) Pliny does not say so.

(18) It were to be wished that Gyraldus had more clearly pressed what Sempronius here means; for Sempronius Tudinus, and Sempronius Afellius, who wrote books lived before Valerius Soranus mentioned by Cero.

; (19) Gyalda
ubi supra.

(20) Plin. *lib.*
cap. v, pag.
221.

(21) Solin.

(22). ὅταν περὶ Καίσαρος λαμῖν ἡ λων διακοταί, σφῶ δαί τις μετὰ εἰας. Cx Oppio qui Cæsarib vel amicis non tempe jungenda est. Plut Pompeio, 623. E.

par- Pompeio
672 E.

solidity in it [E]. It appears from two verses of Soranus, which are still extant, that he believed that God is the immanent cause of all things. That opinion does not differ from

I shall only say, that it is not to be imagined that Pompey had a mind to learn of him some political secrets, and some intrigues of Marius; for his desire of having a private discourse with him, was only grounded upon his knowing that he was a man of great learning. Plutarch observes it in express words. Now it is certain that the knowledge of the *Belles Lettres*, and the study of Antiquity enabled Soranus to discover to Pompey a secret of religion, an unknown law, an old ceremony; but not the most private intrigues of Marius's factions. On the other side, it is not improbable that, as things stood then, Pompey was willing to know the occult name of Rome. His party, which was that of Sylla, had lately taken that town. Was Pompey sure that the other party would never conquer it again? Did not Pompey see that the Republic would be exposed to civil wars? Was he not sensible of his own ambition? Could he think that the discovery of the name of the tutelar god would be of no use to him? However it be, if Quintus Valerius in Plutarch, and Soranus in Pliny are one and the same man, which is very likely, there is little reason to say that the profane indiscretion of the man, who divulged the unknown name of Rome, was immediately punished; for, according to Plutarch, he was punished as one of Marius's accomplices. It is not true that Plutarch calls him a Philosopher (24). Ludovicus Vives (25), Charles Stephens, Lloyd, and Hofman, are in the wrong to say so. Note, that Florus reckons the death of the Prætor Soranus among the cruel actions of Sylla's party. *Piget post hæc referre, says he (26), ludibrio habita fata Carbonis, fata Sorani prætoris, &c.* This might be of some use to those, who would prove that our Soranus was Prætor, and the same Valerius whom Pompey caused to be put to death.

[E] *The reason why the Romans concealed the name of their tutelar god, has little solidity in it.* They had called forth, on some occasions, the tutelar gods of other towns, and were afraid the like would be done to them. This was the reason why they were not willing that the name of their tutelar deity should be known. They hoped the ignorance of that name would secure his protection to them, as the Tyrians believed they might keep their gods from removing by loading them with chains. This is one of Plutarch's answers to the question above-mentioned (27). Πότερον, ὡς τῶν Ῥωμαίων τινὲς ἰσχυροῦσιν, ἐκλήσεις εἰσὶ καὶ γυνταίαι θεῶν; αἱς νομίζονται καὶ αὐτοὶ θεῶς τινὰς ἐκκεκλησάσαι παρὰ τῶν πολεμίων, καὶ μετὰ τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν, ἐφοβῶντο τὸ αὐτὸ παθεῖν ὡς ἑτέρον; ὥστερ ἐν τούτοις δεσμεύει ἀγῶμασι λύνεσθαι περιεκαλεῖν, ἔτεροι δὲ αἰεὶ ἐν ἑσπέρῳ ἐπὶ λατρίᾳ ἢ καθαρμῶν τινα περὶ μυστηρίων, ὥτως ὅσοι Ῥωμαῖοι τὸ ἀρρῆτον καὶ τὸ ἀγῶμα ἀσφαλεστέον εἶναι θεῶ καὶ θεσποτάτην ὀρεῖν. *An quia, ut nonnulli rerum Romanarum scriptores tradunt, carmina quædam sunt & præstigiæ quibus dii eliciuntur: quibus usi Romani cum putarent se quosdam hostium deos ad se traduxisse, covere vulerunt ne idem sibi ab aliis eveniret? Itaque sicut Tyrii (28)*

(28) See Quintus Curtius, lib. iv, cap. iv, num. 22, & ibi Frischmuller.

(29) Plin. lib. xlviii, cap. ii, pag. 559, 560.

is (30), that every town is under the protection of a god, and that the Romans perceiving that it was likely the towns they besieged, would be obliged to surrender, called forth their tutelar gods, whether they believed they could not take a town without it, or because they thought it an impious thing to make the gods prisoners. The other is, that for these reasons they concealed the name of the tutelar god of Rome, and the Latin name of that town. He adds, that the name of that deity was nevertheless seen in the books of some Antients: It is true they mentioned it differently; but as for the occult name of Rome, it was never known, no not to the most learned men; for the Romans took an effectual care to prevent their being treated as they had treated others, by calling forth the gods who protected them. *Propterea ipsi Romani & deum in cuius tutela urbi Roma est ut ipsius orbis Latinum nomen ignotum esse voluerunt, sed dei quidem nomen nonnullis antiquorum licet inter se lib. iii, cap. ix, diffidentium libris insitum: & ideo vetusta persequentibus quidquid de hoc putatur innuit . . . Ipsius vero urbis nomen etiam doctissimis ignotum est: carentibus Romanis ne quod sepe adversus urbes hostium fecisse se noverant, idem ipsi quoque hostili evocatione paterentur, si tutelæ suæ nomen divulgaretur (31).* I wonder Macrobius did not know what Pliny and Plutarch relate of Soranus. He knew it not, since he says the mysterious name of Rome was always unknown even to the most learned men. I wonder also at his distinction between the tutelar god of Rome, and the concealed name of that city, to which he ascribes likewise the same protection. But I wonder more still, that having said what I have just now mentioned, he should give us the formulæ of calling forth tutelar gods; for it appears by that formulæ that there was no necessity to know the name or the sex of the deities who protected a town. They called them forth without naming them, and with this clause, Whether you be a god or a goddess. *Est autem carmen huiusmodi, quo dii evocantur cum oppugnatione civitas cingitur. SI. DEUS. SI. DEA. EST. CUI. POPULUS. CIVITAS. QUE. KARTHAGINIENSIS. EST. IN. TUTELA. TE. QUE. MAXIME. ILLE. QUI. URBIS. HUIUS. POPOLI. QUE. TUTELAM. RECEPISTI. PRECOR. VENEROR. QUE. VENIAM. QUE. A. VOBIS. PETO. UT. VOS. POPULUM. CIVITATEM. QUE. KARTHAGINENSEM. DESERATIS. LOCA. TEMPLA. SACRA. URBEM. QUE. EORUM. RELINQUATIS. ABSQUE. HIS. ABSTATIS. &c (32).* Was not

I in the right to say that the reason why the Romans kept the name of their tutelar god secret, was not a solid one? They knew not the names, nor even the sex of the tutelar gods they called forth, and yet they called them forth; and therefore, what could it avail them that their enemies should not know the name of the god who was the protector of Rome, or the true name of that city? Could this prevent practising against the Romans what they had done against other towns? Macrobius in particular is less excusable than the other writers, since, in the very same page where he speaks as they do, he recites a formulæ of evocation, which confutes what he says. It is most certain that the conditional particle *si Deus, si Dea*, undeniably proves that they knew not the name of the god whom they called forth; for Varro affirms that they used those words, when they were afraid of mistaking the name of one deity for that of another. They made use of them when they offered sacrifices upon occasion of an earthquake; because they knew not the name of the god, who was the cause of such a calamity. Aulus Gellius is my author for it. *Propterea, that is, because the name of that god was unknown, veteres Romani . . . ubi terram movisset senserant, nuntiandum erat, ferias ejus rei causa edito imperabant; sed dei nomen, ita uti solet, cui servari ferias oporteret, statuere & edicere quiescebant; ne, alium pro alio nominando, falsa religione populum alligarent, eas ferias si quis polluisset, piaculoque ob hanc rem opus esset, hostium, SI. DEO. SI. DEAE. immolabat. idque ita ex decreto pontificum observatum esse M. Varro dicit: quantum & qua vi & per quem deorum dearamve terra tremaret incertum esset (33).*

Macrobius in particular is less excusable than the other writers, since, in the very same page where he speaks as they do, he recites a formulæ of evocation, which confutes what he says. It is most certain that the conditional particle *si Deus, si Dea*, undeniably proves that they knew not the name of the god whom they called forth; for Varro affirms that they used those words, when they were afraid of mistaking the name of one deity for that of another. They made use of them when they offered sacrifices upon occasion of an earthquake; because they knew not the name of the god, who was the cause of such a calamity. Aulus Gellius is my author for it. *Propterea, that is, because the name of that god was unknown, veteres Romani . . . ubi terram movisset senserant, nuntiandum erat, ferias ejus rei causa edito imperabant; sed dei nomen, ita uti solet, cui servari ferias oporteret, statuere & edicere quiescebant; ne, alium pro alio nominando, falsa religione populum alligarent, eas ferias si quis polluisset, piaculoque ob hanc rem opus esset, hostium, SI. DEO. SI. DEAE. immolabat. idque ita ex decreto pontificum observatum esse M. Varro dicit: quantum & qua vi & per quem deorum dearamve terra tremaret incertum esset (33).*

A a a

[F] That xxviii.

(30) Constat omnes urbes in aliquo Dei esse tutelâ, moremque Romanorum arcanum & multis ignotum fuisse, ut cum obsiderent urbem hostium eamque jam capi posse confiderent, certo carmine evocarent tutelares deos: quod aut aliter urbem capi posse non crederent, aut si posset nefas estimarent deos habere captivos. Macrobius, Saturnal. pag. m. 323.

(31) Id. ibid.

(32) Macrobius, ubi supra. He says he takes it from the fifth book Rerum conditarum, of Sammonicus Serenus, who had found it in a book of Furius.

(33) Aulus Gellius, lib. ii, cap.

VOL. V.

(c) In the remark [C].

(d) See the remark [A], citation (3).

from Spinozism [F]. I must also observe (c) why some think that he was tribune of the people. I make no doubt that he was related to D. VALERIUS SORANUS, who, as well as he, made himself more considerable for his learning, than for the beauty of his discourses (d).

[F] That opinion does not differ from Spinozism. I need only quote a passage of St Augustin to prove this: (34) 'Jovem ut Deus sit, & maximè ut rex deorum, non alium possunt estimare, quàm mundum: ut in diis cæteris secundum istos suis partibus regnet. In hanc sententiam etiam quodam versus Valerii Sorani exponit idem Varro, in eo libro, quem seorsum ab istis de cultu deorum scripsit, qui versus hi sunt.

(35) There is in the old manuscripts, as Lodericus Vives observes, *rerumque deumque*, and I find the same reading in the 11th chapter of the same book of St Augustin in my edition.

Jupiter omnipotens regum rex ipse, deusque (35). Progenitor, genitrixque deum, deus unus, & omnis.

Exponitur autem in eodem libro, ita ut eum marem existimarent, qui semen emitteret, feminam quæ acciperet: Jovemque esse mundum, & eum omnia, femina ex se emittere, & in se recipere, qua causa, inquit, scripsit Soranus: Jupiter progenitor genitrixque: nec minus cum causa unum & eundem omnia esse. Mundus enim unus, & in eo uno omnia sunt. . . . They think that Jupiter, as a god, and

especially as king of the gods, can be nothing else but the world, that he reigns by the other gods in their several respects: in this sense, the same Varro likewise explains some verses of Valerius Soranus, found in that book, which he wrote separately from his books concerning the worship of the gods. These are the verses:

Omnipotent Jove, king and god of kings,
Progenitor and progenitrix of the gods, one god, and containing all.

And in that book they are so explained, as if he was understood to be the male who emitted, and the female who received the seed: and as if Jupiter was understood to be the world, and the being who emitted seeds of all kinds, and who received them. For this reason, says he, Soranus wrote Jupiter Progenitor genitrixque; and that the world is nevertheless one and the same with it's cause: for the world is one, and in it are all things.

SOUBISE, a town in Saintonge. Many persons of quality had their name from it. In 1575, it fell to the house of Rohan by the marriage of Catherine de Parthenai, daughter and heiress of John de Parthenai-l'Archevesque, with Renatus de Rohan II of that name. This John de Parthenai, known by the name of Soubise, will be the subject of the following article.

SOUBISE (JOHN DE PARTHENAI LORD OF) is one of the heroes of the XVIth century among the Protestants of France. He began to learn their doctrine at the court of the Duke of Ferrara (a); when Renata of France, daughter of Lewis XII, and wife of that Duke, received there some preachers of the Reformed Religion, and embraced their opinions. Being returned into France, he laboured with great zeal [A] to propagate the truths he had learned; and Catherine de Medicis was like to become his profelyte [B]. In the very beginning of the crisis, which made the war unavoidable between the two religions in 1562, he was one of the most considerable associates of the Prince of Condé, who chose him to command at Lyons, when that great town, which had declared for the Cause, did not seem to be safe in the hands of the Baron des Adrets. Soubise wonderfully justified the choice that was made of him to keep such a place; for notwithstanding all the difficulties he went through, he preserved it, and gave a good account of it. He performed there many valiant and masterly actions (b). The Duke of Nemours besieged that town to no purpose, and the queen-mother endeavoured in vain to impose upon him by negotiations (c). He was very much suspected of having a hand in the murder of the Duke of Guise; and it appears that Poltrot laid many things to his charge in his depositions: nevertheless, it is the opinion of the most equitable writers of the Church of Rome [C], that he was not concerned in that abominable action. He had

(a) Varillas, Hist. de l'Hérésie, lib. x, towards the end.

(b) See Varillas, Hist. de Charles IX, tom. i, pag. 212, 213, Dutch edition; but see particularly, Besa, Hist. Eccles. book xi.

(c) Varillas, ibid. pag. 225.

(1) Besa, Hist. Eccles. lib. ii, ad ann. 1559, pag. 199.

(2) He means a minister, called Michael Mulot, who was above sixty years old.

(3) Varillas, Hist. de Charles IX, tom. i, pag. 60.

[A] He laboured with great zeal. The author of the history of the Reformed Churches, makes the following observation concerning the Reformation of the town of Soubise (1). 'As for the town of Soubise, the lord of that place, who was a man of an extraordinary piety, had so ordered it, that many people, living in his lands, were already very well instructed. Which that good old man (2) perceiving, he so earnestly laboured in the work of the Lord, that every body looked upon his labours as a miraculous thing. He never slept in the night, (because they durst not meet but in the night, and very secretly) and then went through all the adjacent places, being often obliged to make his escape into the woods, where he spent whole nights. In short, the lord did so effectually employ him in his work, that in a little time a great part of the people forsook the mass in the neighbouring country.'

[B] Catherine de Medicis was like to become his profelyte. I shall quote an author (3), who read a manuscript life of Soubise, wherein, doubtless, he found many particulars. 'The admiral, says he, was only mistaken in believing that Catherine de Medicis was a Calvinist in her heart; but any body else would have been deceived in it Soubise acquainted him with the long conferences he daily had with that prince's about Calvinism. He assured him that she was as well instructed in it as the Queen

of Navarre. He supposed at least, that she was no less inclined to it. . . . The Duchesse of Montpensier was always present at those conversations, and seemed to be so well persuaded of Soubise's discourses, that she opposed, as much as she could, the design of her husband, who intended to put into a nunnery their three last daughters. . . . And, indeed, the duchesse being at the point of death, when dissimulation can be of no use, sent for John Malot, a minister of Paris, and desired to receive the sacrament in the Calvinistical way, which was denied her.' Varillas informs us in another place (4), that Soubise, who left the queen at last, being weary of her delays, affirmed, that tho' she wanted courage to declare herself a Calvinist, she would not be forced to it. He was not much mistaken in thinking so, witness what she said (5), when she heard the false news that the Protestants had won the battle of Dreux, Well, we must then pray to GOD in French; to which I add, the great fondness she shewed to the friends of the new opinions. She would have quickly resolved to abjure Popery, if it had been worked, and to procure to Soubise the glory of a great converter. Varillas owns (6), that she sided with the Catholic party more out of necessity than out of choice.

[C] It is the opinion of the most equitable writers of the Church of Rome. Mr Le Laboureur made no scruple to publish these remarkable words. 'The Admiral

(4) Ibid. pag. 139.

(5) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. tom. v, pag. m. 72, ad. ann. 1562.

(6) Varillas, ubi supra, pag. 357.

- (d) Bera, Hist. Eccl. book iii, pag. 257.
- (e) Le Laboureur, Addit. à Caillien. Tom. i, pag. 378.
- (f) Le Laboureur, ibid. pag. 304.
- (g) Id. ibid. pag. 378.
- (h) Varillas, Charles IX, Tom. i, pag. 275.
- (i) D'Aubigné, Tom. i, p. 396.
- had been gentleman of the kings chamber (d), and was made knight of the order the seventh of December 1561 (e). He had commanded the army of Henry II, in Tuscany [D]; and to use Le Laboureur's words (f), he was a man of great conduct and experience. He died in 1566 (g), being about fifty-four years of age (b). He had married Antoinette Bouchard, eldest daughter of the house of Aubeterre. She was a lady very zealous for her religion [E]. They left but one daughter; viz. Catherine de Parthenai, whom I have mentioned in its proper place. The first husband she had, viz. the Baron du Pont in Bretagne, took the name of SOUBISE: it is he who makes a glorious figure in the most remarkable actions of the second and third civil wars. He was taken prisoner at the battle of Jarnac in 1569; but he dextrously made his escape (i). La Nouë being wounded at the siege of Fontenai-la-Comte the year following (k), Soubise commanded in chief, and made himself chief master of the place. In the same year he received two wounds at the siege of Saintes (l). He was killed during the Paris massacre [F], after he had defended himself like a lion. The ladies (m) were curious to see what ground there was for the action (n) that was brought against him. I speak of it in another place (o).

- 'miral de Chatillon, the Count de la Rouchefoucault, and the Sieurs de Soubise and Feuquieres had no hand in Poltrot's conspiracy. . . One cannot believe such a thing of men of their quality; and it is so ill proved by the interrogatories of the murderer, that it is plain, his only design in accusing them was to make the world believe, that some leaders of a faction that was actually in arms, had a hand in that plot (7).'
- [D] *The army of Henry II in Tuscany.* If we believe Brantome, he was brought into trouble when he had that employment. That Historian says (8), that as to the affair of Poltrot, *Mr de Soubise was by many accused of ingratitude; for being charged by the Siense with several things he had done in Tuscany, when he was employed there in King Henry's reign, the Duke of Guise interceded for him.* I cannot tell why Varillas amplifies and paraphrases those words in the following manner (9). *After the war of Siena, in which it was said that Soubise had been guilty of a misdemeanour, both as to the war, and the distribution of money, some accusations were brought against him by his enemies, tending to deprive him of his honour and life: but the Duke of Guise openly protested him.*
- [E] *A lady very zealous for her religion.* A report being spread that the Catholics designed to take her, to carry her to the gates of Lyons, and to threaten to stab her and her daughter in the sight of her husband, if he refused to surrender that place; Soubise sent to her Poltrot, who came back with some letters of that lady, wherein she intreated him to suffer them both to be killed, and to remain faithful to his party (10). She was a worthy wife of a man, who expressed an unsurmountable aversion for all separate treaties, and protested he would never sign none but such as should be already signed with the Prince of Condé's hand (11). She was likewise a worthy sister of the viscount d'Aubeterre, who forsook all for the Protestant religion, and submitted to a very hard life. Brantome speaks of him in the following manner (12): 'He was a refugee at Geneva, and a Button-maker by trade; for there was a law in that town, that every body should have a trade and live by it, tho' he were a gentleman or a lord. The said Aubeterre, tho' a man of a noble family, was a Button-maker: I saw him once, as I went through Geneva, very poor and miserable. Afterwards he was taken, during the conspiracy of Amboise, and condemned like the rest; but the duke of Guise, at the request of the Marechal de St André, procured him his pardon, and saved his life.' Some have said (13) that by the recommendation of the lady de Soubise, counsellor Fumée was set at liberty, when he ran the same danger as counsellor du Bourg; but others (14) ascribe it to the expedients suggested by Soubise to the Queen-mother, who had been kind to him long before. Catharina, they are Thuanus's words (15), in gratiam Joannis Partbenai Soubise reguli sibi percarit, et Fumee amicissimi sua commendatione apud judices illius causam non parum sublevari creditur. It is very likely d'Aubigné mistook the wife for the husband.
- [F] *Was killed during the Paris massacre.* Varillas says, that after Poltrot's attempt, Soubise went but once to court, which he left before he had been taken notice of, being afraid that the Guises were not persuaded of the truth of what was published, to invalidate the deposition of an assassin, who had been his domestic. If this be true, he would not have gone to the King of Navarre's wedding, or to the Parisian Vespers, if he had been living; and it would be a new proof that Soubise mentioned by d'Aubigné, was the Baron du Pont (16).

SOUBISE (BENJAMIN DE ROHAN, DUKE OF [A]) grand-son of the foregoing, and the son of Renatus de Rohan II of that name, and of Catherine de Parthenai vigorously seconded the enterprises of the Duke of Rohan his brother, both to relieve Rochelle, and to support the Protestant party in France. He had learned the art of war in Holland, under Prince Maurice, and he was one of the French gentlemen who threw themselves into Bergue (a), when the Spaniards besieged that place in the year 1606. He sustained the siege of St Jean d'Angely in 1621, against an army commanded by Lewis XIII in person; and when he surrendered the place, obtained an amnesty for what was passed, upon promise of obedience for the time to come [B]. Nevertheless he made himself master of Royan towards the latter end of the same year. In the month of February

[A] *Duke of Soubise.* I give him that title in imitation of the author who published the life of the Duke of Rohan in 1666. That writer only follows the common road. Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged, that the lordship of Soubise was never erected into a duchy, and that the Geographer du Val, who affirms it (1), does it without reason. It is an abuse that strangely prevails in the noble families of France, to annex sometimes one title, and sometimes another to an estate, without expecting letters of erection. Do not we see that the sons of dukes bear, under the title of marquisate, the name of the estates of which their fathers style themselves dukes? Nay, there are some estates that belong no longer to a family, and yet the

persons belonging to that family take the name of those estates; one calls himself Marquis, another Count, another Viscount or Baron, &c. of the same estate. Mr le Laboureur exclaims very justly against it (2).

[B] *Upon promise of obedience for the time to come.* The author who answered the Duke of Soubise's manifesto in 1625, pretends (3), that the duke asked the king's pardon when he came out of St Jean d'Angely, and that he swore to be for ever his most faithful subject, and servant; to bear arms no longer against his service, upon any pretence whatsoever; and to adhere no more to the associations and assemblies that should be made without his majesty's authority. He pretends also that the Protestant Historians took care not to insert in their Histories the

(1) In his book, intitled, *la France*, in the chapter of Xaintonge.

(b) Vraye Hist. des Troubles, lib. xiii.

(c) D'Aubigné, Tom. i, pag. 475.

(d) Id. ibid. pag. 546.

(e) It was a process about impotency.

(f) In the article QUELLENEC, and in the remark [C] of the article P A R T H E N A I.

(g) Memoirs, ubi supra.

(h) D'Aubigné, Tom. i, p. 123.

(i) La Planché, Hist. de Franç. II, pag. 147. Bera, Hist. Eccl. lib. iii, pag. 257.

(j) Thuanus, lib. xxiii, pag. m. 467.

(k) This is undeniable.

(l) Grotius, Ann. lib. xv.

(m) Addit. à Caillien. Tom. ii, pag. 793.

(n) Mercure Franç. Tom. xi, pag. 268.

(b) This event is placed in the year 1624, in the *Ministère du Card. de Richelieu*.

(c) Taken from several volumes of the *Mercurius Francicus*.

February 1622, he seized upon Olonne, and was so fully master of the country in the lower Poitou, that his parties went and made some prisoners within five leagues from Nantes. This good fortune was of short continuance, for he was so vigorously attacked in the isle of Rié [C], soon after he had subdued it, that all his forces were there scattered. He retired to Rochelle, where the inhabitants expressed some contempt and dissatisfaction against him; which moved him to go the sooner into England to ask for succours. The court of France being informed of it, he was declared guilty of high-treason the fifteenth of July 1622. He found means to fit out some ships, notwithstanding the refusal of his Britannic Majesty; but they were cast away at Plymouth. In the beginning of the year 1625 (b), he seized on the isle of Ré, and made an attempt upon Blavet or Port-Louis in Bretagne, in which he had but an imperfect success; for it was commonly his fate not to be very fortunate [D] in the vast projects he formed. He took the port and six men of war he found in it; the landing forces took the town; but meeting with some resistance in the fort, he re-embarked his troops, and went away, not without leaving behind him some ships that run a-ground [E]. One of those he took, called the Virgin Mary, carried eighty guns, and cost above two hundred thousand crowns. He had the mortification of being disowned by the Protestants, though it was not doubted that he had concerted every thing with the Duke of Rohan his brother, in the conferences he had with him at Castrès, during the autumn of the year 1624. He published a manifesto, which was ascribed to La Milletiere, who styled himself *intendant of the Church's Admiralty*; and while he waited a proper time to make a descent near Bourdeaux, he made himself formidable by taking several merchant-ships, and kept all the coast in awe from the mouth of the Garonne to the mouth of the Loire. He entered the Garonne the eleventh of June 1625 with a fleet of seventy-four sail, and making a descent into the Medoc, possessed himself of Castillon. After all, this undertaking signified but little; he was quickly obliged to return into the isle of Ré, from whence advancing some days after towards the fleet of the enemy's, he burnt the Dutch Admiral [F], which made the court hasten the preparations that were making to clear that coast. The Duke of Montmorency, Admiral of France, supported by the Dutch ships, beat Soubise's fleet. He was driven from the isle of Ré, and then from that of Oleron, and forced to retire into England (c). He was there very instrumental to procure to the Rochellers the succours that were sent to them; and when that town was taken, notwithstanding that assistance, he did not care to enjoy the benefit of the amnesty in France, but rather chose to stay in England, where he died without issue, and from whence

the oath taken by M. de Soubise, and by those that came out of St Jean d'Angeli with him, but that it is to be found in the registry of the Provostship of the Hôtel, and in the memoirs of the Sieur de Modene, great Provost of France, printed at Toulouse in the year 1621.

(4) Memoires, pag. 37, Dutch Edit.

[C] In the isle of Rié. Mr de Puységur has confounded that defeat with the loss which the Duke of Soubise sustained in the isle of Ré in the year 1625. After the siege of Montpellier, says he (4), there was no war against the Protestants for the space of four years. The king caused a fort to be built near Rochelle and then he went into the isle of Ré with his army commanded by the Prince of Condé. The Duke of Soubise, who had four thousand men in that island, was beaten. Thus you see how the resemblance of names occasions Anachronisms. The victory of the isle of Rié, wherein Lewis XIII was in person, was obtained before the siege of Montpellier; but neither he nor the Prince of Condé were present at that of Ré, which happened after that siege.

(5) Merc. Franc. Tom. ii, pag. 391.

(6) Ibid. pag. 382. See also the *Ministère du Cardinal de Richelieu*, at the year 1625, pag. 179, Dutch Edit.

(7) See the *Mercurius Franc.* Tom. viii, pag. 559.

[D] It was his fate not to be very fortunate. If this was the only thing charged upon him in the relations of the Roman Catholic writers, they could not be suspected of being too passionate; but they go so far as to accuse him of want of courage. It is too great an insult. They pretend that a great lord told the king, Sir, M. de Soubise having shewn your presence at Rié, and now that of your admiral in the isle of Ré, there is reason to believe that if he goes on, he will be, one day, the oldest captain in your kingdom (5). It is said in the same relations (6), that he did not engage in the fight of the isle of Ré, and that as soon as he saw the ill success of it, he hastily made his escape in a shallop, without his hat and his sword. Nay, we are told, that his captain of the guards having seen that sword, said it had certainly dropt from his belt, because he was sure he had not drawn it. The satires upon the defeat in the isle of Ré are still more injurious (7). He has been reproached with another thing very different from that, viz. That at his return from England, he made a gentleman belonging to him swear, that if he saw his ship ready to be taken, and if they could not make their escape, he would set the powder on fire to burn

them all, choosing to die in such a manner, rather than make their enemies triumph by their being made prisoners.

(8) But that the reader may have a better reason to mistrust the Histories published by the Catholic party, I shall mention a slander that looks like one of those calumnies, that are spread among the people to keep up their zeal by stirring their passions. It was given out (9), that when the inhabitants of Olonne desired to capitulate, Mr de Soubise answered them haughtily and impudently, that he would have them choose the most handsome maids they had, to be bestowed on his favourites, after he had satiated himself, or give him a hundred thousand crowns; that both conditions being rejected, he promised to exempt them from being plundered for twenty thousand crowns, eighty pieces of canon, and three ships, and that he plundered them, tho' they had granted him all his demands.

[E] Not without leaving behind him some ships that run a-ground. To shew the partiality of those relations, I shall set down here what a Catholic author (10) tells us about that attempt upon Blavet. He says that the Duke of Soubise with only three hundred soldiers and a hundred seamen, so vigorously attacked the large ship called the Virgin, that, after some resistance, he boarded her sword in hand, took her, and then all the rest. . . . And that the Port having been shut up with men, and with an iron chain and a large cable, he was confined in it three weeks; but the wind turning about, he made use of it, and caused the chain and the cable to be cut with hatchets, notwithstanding the fire that was made upon him, and went out with the king's ships, and possessed himself of the isle of Oleron. How come these passages that are glorious to him, to be omitted in the *Mercurius Francicus*?

[F] He burnt the Dutch Admiral. I have seen no author yet, that makes a solid answer to those, who say that the Duke of Soubise broke his word to the Dutch admiral. We are told (11) they had agreed to undertake nothing one against another, during the negotiations for a peace that were carrying on at the court; but that Soubise taking advantage of the promise the Admiral had made him, came up with him in half an hour's time by the help of the wind and tide, took

(8) Merc. Franc. Tom. ii, pag. 281.

(9) *Claudian Mirlingre Hist. de la Rebellion*, Tom. ii, pag. 23.

(10) The author of the History of the Duke of Rohan, printed at Paris 1666. I have said in another place that this History is ascribed to M. Fauvellet de Toc.

(11) *Ministère du Card. de Richelieu*, p. 177.

whence he endeavoured to prejudice the court of France as much as he could [G]. The name of SOUBISE continues still in the house of Rohan, in the person of FRANCIS DE ROHAN, son of HERCULES DE ROHAN Duke of Mombazon, which Francis de Rohan styles himself Prince of SOUBISE. He married the sixteenth of April 1663 Anne de Rohan, daughter of Henry Chabot and of Margaret de Rohan, heiress of the Duke of Rohan. He is captain of the Gendarmes, and has signalized himself on several occasions, for instance, at the battle of Senef, where he had his leg broke. The Princess of Soubise, his consort, was lady of honour to the late Queen of France, and has been accounted one of the greatest beauties of the court (d). She has been very much praised by the authors of that time, and no less admired for her virtue and wisdom than for her beauty. The news writers in Holland gave out that the Prince of Soubise was one of those, who laid down their commissions of lieutenants-general, because they were not comprehended in the promotion of the Marshals of France, that was made in March 1693.

The Abbot de SOUBISE, his son, distinguished himself during the course of his studies. He was made coadjutor of the bishopric of Strasburg some months ago (e). His elegy may be seen in the epistle dedicatory of the posthumous works of the Chevalier de Meré.

(d) See *Catin's Oeuvres Galantes*. Mr. Menage made some Greek verses upon that lady's being advised to bath herself in the sea, after she had been bitten by a dog. They are very fine verses, and may be seen at pag. 178, of his *Poems*, Edit. Amstel. 1687.

(e) I write this in May 1701. The Prince of Rohan, elder brother of this coadjutor, was made Field-Marshal, in 1702, and married the heiress of Ventadour, (*Mercure Galant*, January 1702, pag. 421, 422) widow of the Prince de Turenne killed at the battle of Steinkerk. *Ibid.* July 1701, pag. 345.

(12) Tom. xi, pag. 374.

took his ship, when he expected no such thing, and burnt it by means of two pinaces full of fire-works. It is further said in the *Mercure François* (12) that hostages had been given on both sides. It is likely the aggressor was not without an answer, when he was charged with unfaithfulness in that respect. The Catholic writer of the Duke of Rohan's life makes no mention of that reproach: he says that Soubise being informed that Manty, and Hautin, Admiral of Zealand, came upon him with forty ships, he went to meet them, sunk five of their ships, and killed above fifteen hundred men. I have just now read what the Protestant author, who took the fictitious name of Theophile Mi-

saëbe, published in Soubise's vindication (13). It is something, but I could desire a better discussion, and a more exact verification.

[G] To prejudice the court of France as much as he could. For it appears by a declaration of Lewis XIII, dated the eighth of June 1641 (14). That it was a year since some of those who had been sent by the Sieurs de Soubise and la Valette, to corrupt the fidelity of several Frenchmen, fell into his majesty's hands, and had confessed, that the said Soubise and la Valette . . . were treating with the king of Spain to make a descent into Bretagne and Aunis, or into the river of Bourdeaux.

(13) Apologie pour les Eglises Réformées de France, printed in 1625, chap. x.

(14) See Montreuil's Memoirs, pag. 366.

SOUCHES (LEWIS RATTUIT, COUNT DE) son of a gentleman of Rochelle [A] called John Rattuit Sieur de Barres, left France after the war of the Protestants, and went through Holland and Germany in his way to Sweden. He was no sooner arrived there but he had a prospect of being raised by the good offices of Count de la Gardie, who quickly procured him a regiment of Dragoons, and then a regiment of Foot. After he had served some years, he had a quarrel with his General (a), laid down his commission, and fought him; and intending to return into France by the way of Austria and Italy, he staid some days at Vienna; and because the Arch-Duke William, brother

(a) Called Stalhans.

[A] He was son of a gentleman of Rochelle. The author of the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary was sadly deceived by what he had heard in common discourse; when he affirmed that Count de Souches was the son of a Grocer of Rochelle. There is not any occasion, wherein a hear-say is more to be mistrusted, than when it concerns the birth of a person raised to great posts, whose ancestors are not mentioned in History. This silence proves only that they did not appear at court, or had no considerable employments in their provinces; but it is no proof that they were not gentlemen. And yet through I know not what base or malicious inclination to tell lies, people take delight in vilifying, as much as they can, the birth of a favourite, a minister of state, or a general of an army, who is the first of his family, that was raised to great preferments (1). Some say, his father was a Peasant, a Fisherman, or a Servant; others will have it, that he was the son of a Shoemaker, a Pedlar, or at most, of a Scrivener, or an Attorney's Clerk. They are sometimes in the right, and very often mistaken; and therefore prudence requires one should mistrust those common reports; for when the thing is narrowly examined, it commonly appears that this pretended son of a Pedlar, or Fisherman, is of a very noble family, but little known out of its district. However it be, here are the proofs of Count de Souches's nobility, as they have been communicated to me (2).

(1) See the remark [A] in the article TOUCHE, and the end of the remark [A] of the first article SFORZ A.

(2) They have been sent from Vienna to the Bookeller by Mr. . . . See the marginal note (b).

The sixth of August 1686, before Gabriel Beraudin Esq; lord of Grandjai, counsellor to the king, and his lieutenant-general in the Senechaussée, and presidial court of the city and government of Rochelle; at the request of M^{re} Amathée Huet, Knt. lord of Rivau, captain of the Marines, appeared fourteen of the most eminent persons of the country d'Aunis, whose names and offices are specified in the act whereof I have a copy, collated with the original at Vienna in Austria the 18th of September 1692, by Henry Castellani

d'Avister, sworn apostolical protonotary. The lieutenant-general in the Senechaussée of Rochelle above-named declares, that those fourteen persons all living and settled in Aunis have certified to all those, whom it may concern, that M^{re} Lewis Rattuit Count de Souches, was born a gentleman, being the son of John Rattuit, Esq; Sieur de Barres, and of the Lady Margaret de Bourdigale, and that they have good and certain knowledge, that the said late John Rattuit, father of the said late Lord Count de Souches, was descended from a noble family, and one of the most considerable in the city of Rochelle, where he and his predecessors made their abode, and kept their rank among other gentlemen, suitable to their noble extraction. In witness whereof they have signed this present declaration, and put to it the seal of their arms; which declaration we have received, and given a copy of it to the said lord at his request, for his use and service, which we have also signed, and for a greater approbation we have caused his majesty's seal to be put to it in this presidial chancery of the city of Rochelle. I need not name all those, who signed that act; it being sufficient to say that Mr. Millet, marshal de camp, governor of the principality of Chateaurnaud, and lieutenant-general in the government of Aunis; Mr. Arnou, intendant of the province; Mr. Gabaret, first Commadore; Mr. de Chastellailon, commander for the King at Rochelle, were some of those who certified it.

Here follows another attestation: I have a copy of it collated with the original at Vienna in Austria the 18th of September 1692, by the same Henry Castellani d'Avister above-mentioned. We whose names are under-written, attest and certify that we certainly know, that Mr. Lewis Rattuit de Souches is of a noble extraction both by the father's and mother's side, and of one of the most ancient families of this country, and that they have enjoyed the honours, privileges and exemptions granted by our kings to the

B b b

(b) Mr *** sent it from Vienna, whilst he was there Envoy Extraordinary of the United Provinces. He sent also the acts mentioned by me in the remark [A].

brother of the Emperor Ferdinand III proposed to him to serve in the Emperor's armies, he agreed to it, and accepted a regiment of Dragoons, that was vacant and proffered him. He made a great fortune in the service of his Imperial Majesty; for he was successively raised to the dignities of Gentleman of his Chamber, Counsellor of War and State, Field-Marshal, and Commander-General of the frontiers of Slavonia. He died in Moravia in the year 1682, being seventy-four years of age, and left children as we shall see below [B]. These are the contents of a memoir communicated to me, which comes from very good hands (b). I shall add to it a thing, which very much heightens the glory of Count de Souches, viz. that he was the principal cause of the long resistance of the town of Brin against the Swedes, who were forced to raise the siege upon that account. This proved of great service to the Emperor [C]. I shall take notice of some mistakes in Moreri's Dictionary [D], and make some observations on what concerns the Count

(3) Henry de Laval.

'the nobles and gentlemen of this kingdom, and that they always kept their rank among other gentlemen. In witness whereof we have signed the present attestation for his use and service. Done at Rochelle the 12th of March 1687.' This attestation was signed by eighteen persons: the first is the Bishop of Rochelle (3); the second Mr de Castellailon, Commander for the King in Aunis and at Rochelle; the third Mr Beraudin lieutenant-general of Rochelle. Amongst the others are Mr Villette Commodore, the Chevalier de Blenac, the Chevalier d'Arbouville, Captain of a Ship of War; Mr d'Ofmont Knight of Malta, &c. I add that I have seen the copy of a letter written by the Bailiff of la Vieuville from Paris the 29th of March 1699, to Count de la Tour, son-in-law to Count de Souches. He writes to him, that he has been very well pleased to find an opportunity to write to Malta what he had heard, being at Rochelle, of the family of Count de Souches, whose ancestors, says he, without much raising themselves in the war, have always enjoyed the privileges of nobility, and never done any thing derogatory to it.

Note, that Mr Menage observes that the name Souches is the name of a lordship belonging to the Count I speak of. He says the ancient name was Des-Oufches. I shall set down his words, which I take from a chapter, wherein he proves by several examples, that proper names are not always pronounced according to the ancient and true Orthography. 'Likewise they always say de Souches instead of Des-Oufches, speaking of the governor of Moravia, who commands now the Emperor's troops in Flanders. Souches is the name of that General's lordship, for his name is Rattuit. Rattuit is a family of the city of Rochelle, where that lord was born; and Oufche is an old French word, which signifies a garden inclosed with a hedge, and full of trees, under which they sow pulse, or hemp. And that French word is derived from the Latin *ulca*, which is to be found in *Gregorius Turonensis*, much in the same sense (4).'

(4) Menage, Observations sur la Langue Française, Tom. i, pag. 307, Paris 1675.

(5) See, above, the remark [A] of the article RECKHEIM.

(6) Taken from the Memoir, quoted in the margin of the text of this article, note (b).

(7) See John Cluverius's Universal History, in the Appendix, p. 759. Edit. of 1668.

[B] He left children as we shall see below. He was married twice, first to Anne Elizabeth Countess of Hoffkirk, and then to Anne Salome Countess of Aspermont and Reckheim (5). He had two sons and one daughter by his first wife. JOHN LEWIS, his eldest son, is still living, and is married to Eve Eleonora de Notthafft and Werenberg, Countess of the Empire, by whom he has had three daughters, viz. 1. LOUISA, lady of honour at the Emperor's court, and now the wife of Count de Horn. 2. CLAUDIA, lady of honour at the Emperor's court in her sister's room. 3. THERESA, a Carmelite Nun in Stiria. The second son of Count de Souches was called CHARLES. He was General of the Emperor's Infantry, and died of a wound he received at the battle of Salankemen in Hungary in the year 1691. He had lost his wife Marianne Countess de Bucham, by whom he left two sons, LEWIS and CHARLES-JOSEPH. The latter has been admitted Knight of Malta in the priory of Bohemia. The daughter of Count de Souches is married to Count Charles de la Tour, and has several children (6).

[C] He was the principal cause of the long resistance of the town of Brin . . . against the Swedes . . . which proved a great service to the Emperor. Torstenfon having beaten the Imperialists in February 1645, made himself master of several places in Moravia, and was so dreaded, that upon the news of his march the enemies raised the siege of Olmutz; and then he besieged Brin, the only strong place that was still for the Emperor in that province (7). The be-

sieged made such a vigorous defence, that his Imperial Majesty had time to settle his affairs which were in a very ill posture. He made a treaty with Ragotzki, Prince of Transylvania, and yielded to him seven lordships in Hungary: ninety churches were opened in his confederation, wherein the Protestants were to teach their doctrine publicly, and the privileges of the Hungarians were restored to them. This treaty seemed disadvantageous to the Catholics; but it proved more prejudicial to the Swedes: for the Emperor having removed this rub out of his way, relieved Brin, and forced Torstenfon to raise the siege. Then Lewis Count de Souches, a French gentleman, who had been the principal cause of its preservation, was made governor of it as a reward for so great a service (8). An Historian observes that Torstenfon lost more soldiers before that place, than he would have lost in a pitched battle: he adds that in the mean time the Emperor repaired his forces. *Longa illic difficultate obsidio, atque ad extremum irrita fuit. Ac satis constabat plus ibi militum, quam si justa acie depugnatum foret, Torstenfonis perissee. Interea Caesari spaciun datum reparandi vires, colligendique & confribendi novum exercitum, quem hosti opponeret* (9). Never was service more seasonable than that, and Count de Souches did certainly deserve to be rewarded for it. Note, that the town of Brin was also rewarded as it deserved; for the Emperor gave it the first rank among the towns of Moravia: that rank formerly belonged to the town of Olmutz, which was deprived of it by reason of their weak resistance against the Swedes. This observation is to be found in the voyage of Count de Brienne. *Cracovia relicta Vindobonam versus pergitur, per Silesiam, & Moraviam: ubi praeter Olomutium & Brinnum nihil notatu dignum: illud, fide Episcopali; hoc, obsidione quam adversus Suecos tam fortiter sustinuit, ut inde ob memoriam facti extiterit caput regionis, virtutis praemium; dignitate illa Olomutio sublata, nota recordis* (10).

[D] I shall take notice of some mistakes in Moreri's Dictionary (11). I. The first concerns the extraction of Count de Souches, and has been sufficiently confuted in the remark [A]. II. He should not have been called General of the Empire; he was only the Emperor's General. III. It is certain, from the memoir communicated to me, out of which I have composed the text of this article, that his father did not give him to a German gentleman, and that he entered not into the Emperor's service before he had fought that gentleman. IV. An exact Historian will take care not to say that this Count was defeated at the battle of Senef by the Prince of Condé, in the year 1674. For, properly speaking, that battle was neither won nor lost by either of the parties. The Allies, as well as the French, ascribed the victory to themselves, and caused *Te Deum* to be sung, and bonfires to be made: both did it out of policy, being fully convinced that there was no ground to boast of any advantage (12). The beginning of that bloody battle was advantageous to the French, and the end proved advantageous to their enemies. Many are of opinion that the Prince of Condé behaved himself like a great captain for some hours, and then like Orlando; but which Orlando, him of Boiardo or of Ariosto? Orlando Furioso, Roland the furious, Roland like Hercules in Seneca, Hercules furens, Hercules in a fury? Was it not a kind of Enthusiasm, and Delirium (13), say they, to leave the best troops so long exposed to the fire of the enemy well covered with hedges and hop-fields; I say, to leave them exposed to a perfect slaughter, which they could not avoid, and to sustain, as it were, with

(8) Lewis de Mai, Discours Historique & Politique sur les causes de la Guerre de Hongrie, pag. m. 283.

(9) Appendix Joh. Cluveri, pag. 759.

(10) Lud. Hen. Lomeni Brienne Comitibus narrat, pag. 54. Edit. 1662.

(11) See also the article LEUWENTZ.

(12) We went near Mons, where *Te Deum* was sung as it was at Paris; both parties pretended to have got the victory. For my own part I have always been of opinion that neither party had reason to boast of it. *Mémoires de Charpentier*, pag. 388, 389, Dutch Edit. This is perhaps the best thing that is in those Memoirs.

(13) Compare what is above, citation (17), of the second article of the second article folded

Count de Souches in Chavagnac's memoirs [E]. That book was reprinted in Holland in the year 1700, after the style had been mended in several places.

As it does not plainly enough appear in a passage which I have quoted (a) whether he was governor of Brin when that town resisted the Swedes, I shall produce another which will

(a) In the remark [C].

(14) *The battle of Senef was with respect to the French, as the picture mentioned by Horace, de Arte Poet. ver. 3. . . . ut turpiter arum Definat in pifem mulier formosa superne.* At the beginning, it were a smiling face of beauty, but it ended in blackness and horror.

(15) This addition is also to be found in Morel's Dictionary, printed at Paris in 1699.

(16) *Mercur Hollandicus, for the year 1674, pag. 451.*

(17) That is the Prince of Orange.

(18) *Mercur, ubi supra, pag. 452, 453.*

(19) It should not be, and Swis, but opposed to the Swis, or something like it; for it appears by the whole thread of the discourse, that the author means the Swis in the French army.

(20) *Ibid. pag. 457.*

(21) *Ibid. pag. 462, 463.*

(22) *Ibid. pag. 464.*

the thigh. The vigorous resistance of the Marquis de Grana, who was near the village with his battalion, has much contributed to the happy success of the battle; as well as the bravery of the battalions of the regiment of Souches commanded by the son of the said Count. How then can it be said that Count de Souches, by refusing to expose the Imperialists, occasioned the victory obtained by the French?

There are still three faults in the supplement to Morel's Dictionary, which ought to be corrected. VI. Count de Souches did not live fourscore years, but only seventy-four. VII. His son did not command the armies of the empire; he has been only employed in the Emperor's troops. VIII. He was not killed at Rhinfeld in 1678, but in Hungary in the year 1691.

[E] Upon what concerns Count de Souches in Chavagnac's Memoirs. He is there described (23) as the most silly and most cowardly man in the world; and after having mentioned whatever may induce one to think that he was a traitor, he nevertheless says, I do not think he was; but he was a malicious and ignorant man, and the greatest robber that ever lived (24). Many reasons convince me that these slanders ought not to be minded. 1. The author of those memoirs commends himself eternally. He pretends to have given all the counsels that have proved successful; if a thing does not succeed, it is because they would not believe him; he has frequently prevented great inconveniences; he takes upon him the boldest and the most laborious enterprises; in a word, every thing goes well, and always succeeds when he is concerned in it, and every thing goes ill without him. His commending himself so much, shews he had a great opinion of his merit, and was willing others should have the same. It appears from his own history that he was a haughty, ambitious, fantastical, and impatient man. From whence it may be inferred, that whoever was his enemy could not mis being slandered by him. I observe in the second place, that he was at variance with Count de Souches from the beginning of the campaign of 1674 (25); and that probably his rude way moved sometimes that General to make him sensible of his inferiority. Thus subaltern officers expose themselves to several mortifications, when they have not that deference for their General which they owe him. This irritated Count de Chavagnac more and more, and disposed him to speak ill of Count de Souches. Note, in the third place, that he loved to speak ill of Generals. He gives us a most wretched character of Count Montecuculi (26); and that with respect to the most fortunate, most glorious, and brightest campaign that can be found in the long life of that renowned General: I mean, the campaign of 1673, in which he disappointed all the designs of M. de Turenne, and destroyed by the taking only of one town (27), all the advantage the French had gotten in Holland in the year 1672. Can any body give credit to such slanders? Are they not contrary to the rules of probability? And therefore must we not conclude that what such a writer says of his enemies ought to be suspected? I omit many sharp and satirical stories, to be found in his memoirs against the chief officers of the imperial troops, which seem to proceed from a resentment, that made him unwilling to do them justice. For every body owns that the imperial armies have been above these hundred years one of the best schools of war, and that there are very few that form so many good officers. Note, in the fourth place, that he is often mistaken in his accounts, even when he does not design to speak ill of those with whom he was displeased. Consult the notes inserted in the Dutch edition, which concern what passed in Germany in the year 1675. The Marquis de *** who is the author of those notes, and who commanded one of the best French regiments in that year, contradicts him in several important points: If other officers would give themselves the trouble of criticizing him, doubtless they would find matter enough for it. In the fifth place, there are so many incredible things in what he says against Count de Souches, that this alone is sufficient to confute him. Souches, who had received

(23) See Chavagnac's Memoirs from page 390, to page 401, Dutch edition.

(24) *Ibid. pag. 401.*

(25) *Ibid. pag. 371.*

(26) *Ibid. from page 339, to page 358.*

(27) Bonn in the country of Cologne. He took it jointly with the Dutch troops, commanded by the Prince of Orange now King of England.

will put it out of doubt, and let us into the knowledge of some circumstances very much to the glory of that brave man [F]. It hath been falsely published in one of the pamphlets that appeared in Holland in the year 1702, concerning the insurrection in the Cevennes, that he was a native of that country.

(28) Mémoires
de Chavagnac,
pag. 372, 373.

(29) Ibid. pag.
374, 375.

(30) Ibid. pag.
372.

(31) Ibid. pag.
373.

(32) Ibid. pag.
374.

(33) Ibid.

(34) Ibid. pag.
373, 374.

(35) Dinant,
which he took
before his army
passed the Maefe
at Namur. See
the *Mercur* Hol-
landois, ubi ju-
pra, pag. 436.

orders from the Emperor not to pass the Maefe upon any pretence whatsoever, to act only between the Maefe and the Moselle, and to give four thousand horse, with a General, if the Allies wanted them, or dered me to stay in the camp, whilst he went and dined with all the Generals in the camp of the Spanish troops (28). . . . Souches decamped to go and besiege Mont-Olympe; but because the Prince of Orange demanded the four thousand horse which the Emperor had promised him, I was detached to command them; so that I went back and encamped in the suburb of Namur: I cannot tell what jealousy he had upon my account; but he himself came thither with his whole army. Every body who knew that the orders were positive, could not imagine what he meant; but he was not long unresolved, for he brought the army through Namur. Monterey and the Prince of Orange joined him, and asked him what good angel had moved him to pass the Maefe: He answered that he passed the Moselle and not the Maefe. I could not forbear laughing, and telling him that I pitied him, and that the Moselle was above fifteen leagues from thence. He told me that I was not a man of a sufficient capacity to teach him the country, and fell into a great passion against me. Caplières, our Commissary-General, and the Emperor's agent, came upon this, and asked him what was the matter. This gentleman, said he, uses me like a child, but I will complain of it to his Imperial Majesty. I told Caplières what was the subject of his discontent, and Caplières told him that I was in the right: Whereupon he grew angry again, and asked his guides what river we had passed: They told him it was the Maefe; which made him change his countenance, and cry out, I am undone (29). The falsity contained in those words is so plain and obvious, that one may perceive it on first reading, without any examination; but whoever considers the circumstances of the narrative, when, I say, one considers that this General brought his army into the country of Liège (30), that he went and dined in the camp of Count Monterey (31), which he could not do without passing the Maefe, that he went up again towards Charleville to form the siege of Mont-Olympe, a place situated on the Maefe (32), that he came again near Namur, another place standing on the Maefe (33), will think it impossible that he should have been ignorant of the situation of that river. The most stupid soldiers could not be ignorant of it, after so many marches and countermarches of that nature; how then can one believe that a General above sixty years old knew it not, he who had received an express order to act only between the Moselle and the Maefe (34). Whoever can believe such a thing must be more credulous than a child of four years of age. The absurdity of Chavagnac's narrative will be more evident, if it be considered that Count de Souches had raised himself to so high a post in the Emperor's court. He was a Frenchman, and this was an obstacle not easily to be removed in that court. He was a gentleman born; but his nobility not being attended with a title, and supported by the credit and wealth of his family, would hardly have been of greater use to him to become a General in the French armies, than if he had been a citizen's son: Much more was it insignificant to him in Germany. He had therefore no other way to raise himself but his valour, and the art of war; and he must needs have excelled in it to overcome all the obstacles which a mere French gentleman could meet with at the Emperor's court. We should therefore be very silly to believe that a General besieges and takes a town upon a river (35), and goes along that river for whole months, without knowing its name, nor those of the fortresses that are washed by it; without knowing, I say, that Namur, to which he hath several times approached, is situated upon the Maefe, and not upon the Moselle. Had he behaved himself in that manner, when he had a particular reason to be well informed of the situation of the Maefe, since he had been ordered not to serve beyond that river, he would have been

the most ridiculous man in the world; but we should be very near as ridiculous as he, should we believe that he thought he went over the Moselle, when his troops crossed the Maefe at Namur (36). We may therefore look upon this as one of those romances, which to some never appear too extravagant, when they intend to give out a singular thing, or to ridicule an enemy. I omit saying that it is not likely the Emperor gave express orders to Count de Souches not to pass the Maefe. Did not the Emperor design to do as much mischief to the enemy as ever he could? Why then should he have forbidden his General to join with the Dutch and the Spaniards, if such a conjunction was necessary to strike a greater blow? To which I add, that if Count de Souches had perceived that he had been surprised, he would have ordered his army to repass immediately. He would have chose rather to mend his fault in such a manner, than to expose himself to lose his head for having acted against the express orders of his Imperial Majesty. How comes it that Count de Chavagnac, having said that this General cried out, I am undone, forgets to tell us whether his fault was approved or excused? This was necessary in an accurate account; but the writer of those memoirs did not much trouble himself about it. All this confirms the suspicion that there are numberless falsehoods in this part of Count de Chavagnac's memoirs.

After all the observations I have made, the reader will be apt to give no credit to the satirical description he gives of Count de Souches's conduct before Oudenarde (37). I am willing to believe according to the most common opinion that this General would not follow the advice of the rest, nor take with them the necessary measures for the good success of that enterprise; but none can believe the extravagance and cowardly stupidity that he is taxed with in Chavagnac's memoirs. It is plain that author was angry when he wrote that passage. The reader perceives that his pen was guided by the resentment of some offence, and is confirmed in that opinion by considering the conduct of the Imperial court. The punishment inflicted upon Count de Souches was so slight and so disproportioned to what he deserved, were Chavagnac's memoirs true, that this very thing is sufficient to convince us that this author has much aggravated matters. I do not think the relations of Count de Souches need give themselves any trouble to justify him against the reflections of such an enemy (38), who knew not how to observe any appearance of probability or equity; for it is not to be thought that he was ignorant of the reasons on which the Count de Souches grounded his opinions and his conduct. Why did not he say something of the matter at least to console him? equity required it of him.

[F] I shall produce another passage, which will put it out of doubt, and let us into the knowledge of some circumstances very much to the glory of that brave man].

The Swedes took Crembs by storm, and laid siege to Brin. It was here their good fortune made a stand, gave time to the Imperialists to take breath, to take care of themselves, and of the people beyond the river, and to put themselves in a better posture. The commander in the place was Mr de Souche a Rocheller, who, upon some great discontent, had left the Swedes, whom he had served with a religious zeal, and affection, and had the post of a colonel, which he also enjoyed on the other side. Torstenfon, after a siege of three weeks, ordered the place to be summoned, and gave notice, that if they refused to surrender, they should have no quarter: He made answer, that neither would he demand, neither would he grant any. . . . Torstenfon, after having several times stormed the place, mined, fapped, and thrown a great number of grenades into it, was forced to retire. That siege lasted four months, cost the Swedes four thousand men, without reckoning the deserters, acquired immortal honour to the governor, or the favour of his Imperial Majesty, who being desirous to distinguish a man of so rare virtue, made him a Baron, raised his fortune, and gave him a place in the privy-council (39).

(36) To confirm all this, I add that if he had thought that he was passing the Moselle, when he went thro' Namur, he must have believed that he had not yet followed the order of sitting between the Maefe and the Moselle, or he must have thought that he was passing the Moselle to go towards Philipsburg or Nancy, which are monstrous suppositions.

(37) Chavagnac, Mémoires, pag. 390, & seq.

(38) Perhaps they apply to him what the Jesuit Boissier, above, citation (40), of the article SIX. TUS IV.

(39) Parival, Abrégé de l'Histoire de ce Siècle, de fer, Tom. i, pag. 401. Edit. de Bruffels 1658.

SOZOMENUS

SOZOMENUS (JOHN) a Civilian of Venice in the XVIIth century, was originally of the isle of Cyprus, from whence his ancestors retired when it fell under the power of the Turks (a). He hath given a new Latin translation of the ten books of Plato's Republic, which he has reduced to a continued discourse, being originally in the form of a dialogue. This renders the work clearer and shorter. That translation was printed at Venice in the year 1626 in 4to.

SPANHEIM (FREDERIC) professor of Divinity at Leyden, was a man of great merit. He was born at Amberg in the Upper Palatinate the first day of January 1600 (a); and very carefully bred up under the eye of a father, who was not only a learned man, but also very much esteemed at the Electoral Court [A]. After he had studied in the college of Amberg till the year 1613, he was sent the next year to the university of Heidelberg, which was then in a very flourishing condition, where he made so great a progress both in the languages and Philosophy, that it appeared he would one day prove a great man. He returned to his father's house in 1619, and soon after was sent to Geneva to study Divinity. The unhappy state of the Palatinate made him resolve to save his father the charges of his maintenance; and therefore he went into Dauphiné in the year 1621, and was three years in the house of the governor of Ambrun (b) in the quality of preceptor. He had twice a set conference about matters of controversy (c), which was an usual thing at that time, and came off gloriously. He returned to Geneva, and then went to Paris, where he found a kinsman, who was minister of Charenton [B], and dissuaded him from accepting the professorship of Philosophy at Lausanne, which the magistrates of Berne offered him. He took a journey into England for four months in 1625, and after he had made a further stay at Paris, he returned to Geneva, where he disputed for a chair of Philosophy in 1626, and carried it. The year following he married a gentlewoman originally of Poitou [C]. Some time after he was admitted minister, and in the year 1631, he succeeded Benedict Turretin in his professorship of Divinity which was vacant. He discharged the duties of those places both as an able, and an indefatigable man; so that his great reputation, spreading every where, made several universities desirous to have him, that by his means they might become more famous. That of Leyden succeeded best in their suit, for he accepted their offers: but the utmost endeavours were used to keep him at Geneva, and the marks of esteem and affection he received at his departure cannot be expressed. He took his degree of Doctor of Divinity at Basil, to comply with the use of the country he was going to; for neither at Geneva nor in the Protestant academies of France, the professors of Divinity were admitted doctors; it had been of no use to them. He set out from Geneva in the year 1642, after he had been professor of Divinity eleven years successively. He happened to be rector, when they celebrated the jubilee or the secular year of the Reformation, and he made a very fine oration upon that subject. He arrived at Leyden the third of October 1642, where he kept up, and even increased, the reputation he had got; but he died in May 1649. His great labours shortened his days. His lectures, his academical disputations, his sermons (d), the books he wrote, and several domestic cares, and several visits he made, did not hinder him from holding a great correspondence by way of letters. Besides, he was obliged to make visits to the Queen of Bohemia and the Prince of Orange; he was very much esteemed in those two courts. Queen Christina did him the honour to write to him, in order to let him know her great esteem for him, and how much she was pleased with the reading of his works. He published several

(a) See the Epistle Dedicatory of his translation of Plato de Republica.

(a) Ut ita annos cum seculo computaverit, qui lucem cum incluyente anno & seculo primam vidit. Heidanus, in Orat. fun. Fr. Spanheimi. He is mistaken in taking the year 1600, to be the first of the XVIIth century. It is the last of the XVIth. Many commit the same fault.

(b) John de Bonne, Baron de Vitrolle.

(c) First with Father Hugo, a Jesuit of Avignon, who preached the Lent Sermons at Ambrun, and then with a Franciscan of Naples.

(d) He was minister of the Walloon church at Leyden.

[A] He was born . . . of a father, who was not only a learned man, but also very much esteemed at the Electoral Court. His name was WIGAND SPANHEIM; he was Doctor of Divinity, and ecclesiastical counsellor to the Elector Palatine. He married Renata Toffan, daughter of Daniel Toffan, minister of Orleans, and then professor of Divinity at Heidelberg. Daniel Toffan had married Mary Couët, a Parisian, daughter of Philibert Couët, advocate in the parliament of Paris, who had fled to Orleans for her religion with her mother and two sisters in the year 1562. Toffan, in order to avoid the persecution, retired through several by-ways to Montargis, where his wife was brought to bed of a daughter, and Renata of France, Duchess of Ferrara, was her god-mother. That duchess, daughter of Lewis XII, being extremely zealous for the Reformed Religion, received at Montargis as many refugees as she could; but it is not true, as Heidanus will have it, that she kept there Daniel Toffan till the year 1575. We shall see in the article of TOSSAN in what year he retired to Montargis, and when he went away from thence. His daughter Renata (god-daughter of the Duchess of Ferrara) was married to Wigand Spanheim, and was the mother of our Frederic and of two daughters (1). Wigand was a very pious man, a learned Divine, and a good Philologist, as it appears from his letters to Christian Becman (2). He died in the year 1620,

having in his hands a letter of his son, which made him cry with joy. Freherus mentions (3) this particular as being taken from the funeral oration of Frederic Spanheim; but he is mistaken, for it is not there. *Letto affixus postquam literas à filio Geneva accepisset eas præ gaudio totas lacrymis conpersit, & tenaciter ambabus manibus retinuit, donec in Christo exspiravit A. 1620.*

[B] A kinsman, who was minister of Charenton. His name was Samuel Durant: I cannot tell in what degree he was related to him, for the Latin words of my author are ambiguous. *Humanissime à Samuele Durantio . . . cognato suo (erat enim Durantii mater soror aviae parentis ejus) exceptus est* (4). The ambiguity lies in the parenthesis. For it is uncertain whether the word *parentis* signifies there the father or the mother; besides, every man having two grand-mothers, we must look back into many families, in order to find the grand-mother of our Spanheim, sister to Durant's mother. The best of it is, that Durant left his whole library to our Frederic Spanheim (5).

[C] He married a gentlewoman originally of Poitou. Heidanus (6) calls her in Latin *Charlottam à Portu*, which I take to signify Charlotte du Port. She was the daughter of Peter du Port, Lord of Mouillepiep and Boiffaillon, counsellor to the king, and commissary for provisions in his majesty's armies, only son of Joachim du Port, a gentleman of Poitou, Lord of Mouillepiep.

(3) Theatre pag. 406.

(4) Heidanus, ibid. pag. 17.

(5) Id. ibid. pag. 18.

(6) Ibid. pag. 19.

(1) Ex Heidano, in Orat. funeb. Frid. Spanheim. pag. 6, 7.

(2) De Wigando Spanheimio nihil aliud mihi compertum est nisi singularis planè & exquisitæ pietatis hominem fuisse, nec Theologica solum sed & Philologica eruditione instructissimum, & linguarum Latine imprimis & Græcæ callentissimum. Id quod ex literis à Spanheimio quæ in operibus Philologici Christiani Becmanni . . . leguntur constat. Heidanus, Orat. funeb. pag. 7.

VOL. V. No. CXXIII.

C c c

several books [D]. He left seven children (e), whereof the two eldest are become very famous [E]. He was rigid in point of innovations [F], and in that respect, spared neither friends nor foes. He could not forbear writing against Amyrault, and did not live long enough to reply to him in the manner he intended. His adversaries boasted of it [G]. A man who cannot be suspected of flattery, hath bestowed upon him praises which will be seen below [H].

Mouillepiéd. The mother of Peter du Port, called Joan du Chêne, was the only daughter of Joseph du Chêne (Sieur de la Violette, Counsellor and physician to the king) and of Anne de Trie, daughter of Margaret Budé, whose father was the learned William Budé (Budæus) (7).

[D] He published several books. At the request of the Envoy of Guitavus Adolphus, at Geneva, he wrote a book intitled, *Le Soldat Suedois* (8), which sold very well. That book was quickly followed by the *Mercure Suisse* (9). He published in 1639, a *Commentaire Historique de la vie & de la mort de Messire Christofle Vicomte de Dhona*, at the widow's request: I shall speak of it hereafter. He published six years after, some memoirs upon the life and death of the most Serene Prince Louis Juliana, Electress Palatine, born Princess of Orange. He undertook that work, at the request of the Queen of Bohemia, all these books are anonymous (10). *Le Throne de Grace, de Jugement, & de Gloire*, are three sermons excessively long, and written in pretty old French, but they contain excellent things. The first was preached at Charenton. His *Dubia Evangelica*, in three parts, written at Geneva, on occasion of the objections dispersed among the students of Divinity, by one Antoine, who being a Christian, had turned Jew, is a good book. He composed his *Chamierus Contractus*, for the benefit of the students of Divinity, who could not conveniently make use of Chamierus's vast *Panstratia*. Whilst he lived at Leyden, he wrote against Amyrault's hypothesis *Exercitationes de gratia universali*, in three volumes, in 8vo. *Item Epistolam ad Gottierum de conciliatione gratia universali*. He also wrote a letter *ad Buchanannum de Controversiis Anglicanis*, and *Vindicia de Gratia universali* (11). It is a reply to M. Amyrault, which he could not finish, and it favours of a posthumous piece. The author I quote has omitted a letter, which M. Spanheim wrote to Prince Edward, when he changed his religion. Since he mentions a consolatory letter upon the death of an only son (12), he might also have mentioned this other letter. I must not forget M. Spanheim's speeches, which are very good, especially his funeral oration of Frederic Henry, Prince of Orange. See Balzac's letter of thanks to him, after he had read that oration (13).

(7) Heidanus, Orat. funeb. Fr. Spanheim. pag. 19, 20.
(8) Printed in 1633.
(9) Printed in 1634.
(10) The Epistle Dedicatory of the *Commentaire Historique*, is signed F. S. that is, Frederic Spanheim. He made use of the same signature in the Epistle Dedicatory of Geneva *restituta*. The Catalogue of the Bodleian Library, places those two books under the unknown name of F. S. If it be reprinted, these words may be added to it, *id est Fredericus Spanheimius*.

(11) Heidanus, in Orat. funeb. Spanheimii, pag. 38, & seq.

(12) He observes that it was translated out of French into Dutch and German.

(13) It is the 29th Letter among those that are at the end of the collection of his Letters to Contrart.

(14) He is professor of Philosophy at Berlin.

(15) A Physician of Geneva.

(16) See an Extract of it in the *Journal des Sçavans*, of the fourth of August 1698, pag. 551, & seq. Dutch Edit.

(17) EXERCITII SPANHEIMI.

(18) FRIDERICI SPANHEIMI.

(19) I write this the 26th of May 1701.

I have said that this Professor of Divinity, is the author of the *Commentaire Historique de la vie & de la mort de Messire Christofle Vicomte de Dhona*. But I must add, that the word Viscount he made use of, is very improper, and does not answer the title of Burggrave, which has been given to the illustrious family of DHONA for several ages. It is a nobler title than that of Viscount. See the *Nouveau Journal des Sçavans*, published at Berlin, by Mr Chauvin (14), in 1696: and look for the extract of the first and second volumes of Mr Manger's (15) *Bibliotheca Prætica*, dedicated to Count Alexander de Dhona, governor to the Electoral Prince of Brandenburg, where you will find some things very instructive concerning the Burggraves. This is not a proper place to enlarge upon the great merit of that count, and the glory of the house of Dhona. I shall only refer the reader to Moreri's Dictionary, and occasionally observe that a fault has crept into it; for instead of saying that Count Alexander's mother was Countess de Terrasserres Montbrun, it should be de Ferrasserres Montbrun. She was the only daughter of Count de Ferrasserres, Lieutenant-General in the French armies, and brother to Mr de St André Montbrun, who was General of the Venetians in Candia, and whose history was printed at Paris, in the year 1698 (16).

[E] He left seven children, whereof the two eldest are become very famous. The first (17) has a perfect knowledge of medals, and all sorts of literature: besides, his embassies give him a glorious rank among statesmen. He is a person of an extraordinary merit. The second (18) died within these few days (19), being Professor of Divinity at Leyden. He had been a long time in that employment, and was justly ac-

counted one of the most considerable men in the Reformed Church. He has written several books, which have procured him a great reputation. The Journalists have often made honourable mention of him. That of Paris, tho' it seldom speak of books written by Protestant ministers, yet has given large extracts of this learned man's Ecclesiastical History: you will find them in the twenty-eighth volume of the *Journal des Sçavans*. Whoever desires to be informed of the great learning of Mr Spanheim the eldest, need only read his book de *Præstantia & usu Numismatum*, which I have quoted before (20); the five letters he wrote to Mr Morel, a famous Antiquarian, and a great Medallist, which have been printed with the *Specimen universæ rei nummarie antiquæ*, published by the same Mr Morel at Leipzig, in 1695; his notes upon Callimachus, and Julian's Cæsars, and some other tracts, the titles whereof may be seen in Moreri's Dictionary of the Paris edition 1699; together, with a list of all his employments in the courts of princes (21), till he was sent the fourth time to the court of France after the peace of Ryfwic. He was at Paris from that time till the beginning of the year 1701, that is, till his Electoral Highness of Brandenburg became King of Prussia. He took then his audience of leave, because the change of the ceremonial was not yet regulated at the court of France. He is lately (22) gone into England by order of the new king, his matter. I shall observe by the by, that this new epoch of the royalty of Prussia will signalize the beginning of the XVIIIth century, and that there was in it a remarkable concurrence of circumstances; for about the same time that the Electress of Brandenburg was crowned Queen of Prussia, the Electress of Brunswic, her mother, daughter to the King of Bohemia, was named to succeed to the crown of England. Never have two princesses better deserved than these to fill a throne, or to renew the glory acquired by Queen Elizabeth.

[F] He was rigid in point of innovation. It was a maxim with him, that we ought to make war even against our own brethren, whenever they act against Orthodoxy: The neglect of little evils, said he, will sometimes occasion the greatest disorders. *Sæpe profitemur audivimus se licet mallet cum Ecclesiæ hostibus congressi, tamen & bellum illis etiam fratribus indicendum judicare, qui vel data opera, vel ex ignorantia & infirmitate periculis illam subruerent. Quod enim initio parvum videtur, id sæpe neglectum magna incendia dare in progressu. Cum cui quis semel patrocinium commodavit ei mordicus inhaeret, & sæpe error non detectus cum occultè serpant, placere incipit, & tandem pudor est retrahere quæ semel defunderis* (23). A hundred fine reasons may be alledged to maintain this common topic, and this great maxim; but, in order to persuade, they ought to be attended with choler. With such an ingredient they generally produce a conviction; but without it, they are weak, and are confuted by a hundred other fine maxims. Heidanus observes, that the person he praises, was a man of a fiery temper (24). That fire is a wonderful light to shew that the reasons alledged for toleration, are bad ones, and that those who cry out, *to arms, to arms, bella, horrida bella*, have well dived into the bottom of things. *Tros Rutulique suat, nullo discrimine babebo* (25); no matter tho' they be friends, allies, or relations; let us fall upon them, *per calcatum perge patrem* (26); this is the cause of truth.

[G] His adversaries boasted of it. See the passage quoted by Colomelius out of a book of M. Amyrault (27).

[H] A man . . . hath bestowed upon him praises which will be seen below. Sorbieri is the person I speak of: what he says of M. Spanheim deserves to be transcribed; it contains some particulars that will be acceptable to the curious; and besides, they belong to the design of this Dictionary. Barleus, says he (28), having made a funeral oration in verse, upon the death of the Prince of Orange, and Dr Spanheim having delivered one in prose, was very much displeased with the inequality of their reward; for, as Salmasius aversity

(20) In the text of the article ABDEKA.

(21) That list had already appeared in the Dutch edition of Moreri's Dictionary, down to the year 1693.

(22) I write this in May 1701.

(23) Heidan. in Orat. fun. Fr. Spanheim. p. 34.

(24) Oligotus, etiam ut ipse dicitur, fuit & subtilis cholera nonnulli habuit, quæ inter famulæ salubre momento locustebatur, at tunc fumo & adeo momento dispersgebatur. Ibid. pag. 33.

(25) Virgil. Æn. lib. 3, ver. 108.

(26) Ita apud illum prepotens erat amor virtutis ut nulla remittit iura, nullæ necessitudines, nullus necesse illum à defendenda illa avocanda possent. tere possent. Ibid. pag. 33.

(27) Colomelius in Gallia Orientali pag. 208.

(28) Sorbieri, Letter ixv, pag. 442, 443.

said, it was a great oversight to give the pay of a trooper to a foot-soldier, and that of a foot-soldier to a trooper. Barleus received but five hundred livres, and the other five hundred crowns. All that I can tell you of the latter, is what was said of him after his decease, viz. That Salmasius had killed him, and that Morus had been the dagger. It is a long story, and, to be short, I shall only tell you that Salmasius did not love the late Mr Spanheim, from a jealousy of merit and reputation for learning; that, in order to mortify him, he caused Mr Morus to be sent for into Holland, whom he only knew by his name, but he was the scourge and the aversion of his colleague; that the doctor left no stone unturned to prevent his coming, and that he died when he heard that his adversary was set out on his journey. However I must do this justice to

that learned German, even by Salmasius's confession, who was not prodigal of his praises, that he had a strong head, and full of learning; that he was fit for business, steady and dexterous, zealous and laborious. He read public lectures of Divinity four times in a week; and besides made private ones upon different subjects to his scholars; he heard the probation sermons of the students of Divinity; he preached in two languages, German and French; he visited the sick; he wrote a vast number of letters; he composed at the same time, two or three books upon quite different subjects; he assisted every Wednesday at his Highness's council, who sent for him to the Hague; he was rector of the university; and notwithstanding so many occupations, he kept an account of all the expenses of his house, that was full of boarders.

S P I F A M E (JAMES PAUL) Bishop of Nevers in the XVIth century, left his bishopric, and retired to Geneva, in order to profess the Reformed Religion. He went by the name of Monsieur de Passy (a), and at last he became minister, to have, as it is said, a more easy access into the councils, and a greater share in affairs (b). The parliament of Paris issued out a warrant against him in the year 1559 (c). He was very serviceable to the Protestant cause in Germany, whither the Prince of Condé sent him to justify his taking up arms (d). He published there the four letters which Catherine de Medicis had written to that prince, to recommend to him the welfare of the kingdom, and the interest of the king her son (e); he discovered many secrets, obtained great succours of the Princes of Germany (f), and harangued the Emperor at the Diet of Francfort in the year 1562, with so much force, that it proved one of the best manifestos of the Protestants (g). He caused the *Reisters* and *Lansquenets* to be recalled, and Count de Rocquendolfe, and other chiefs, who commanded them in the king's service, to be put to the ban of the empire (h). He made three speeches in that country. His end was not answerable to such a noble beginning (i); for he found himself involved in some crimes, for which he was beheaded at Geneva the twenty-third of March 1566 [A]. His birth, his parts, and his learning, might have raised him to the highest dignities in France, where he had quickly gone through several employments [B]. Nothing can be more absurd than what Moreri says, that Calvin caused him to be put to death [C]. Others ascribe his tragical end to Beza's jealousy [D], but cannot prove it. I have confuted in another

(c) Spondan. An-
nal. Eccle. ad
ann. 1559, num.
18. See also
Thuanus, lib.
xxii, pag. 453.

(d) Le Laboureur,
Addit. à Castelnau,
Tom. i,
pag. 796.

(e) Id. ibid.

(f) Id. ibid.
Tom. ii, pag. 29.

(g) You will
find his Oration
in Le Laboureur's
additions, ibid.
pag. 29.

(h) Id. ibid. pag.
42.

(i) Thuan. lib.
xxxiii, pag. 675.

(a) Le Labou-
reur, Addit. à
Castelnau, Tom.
ii, pag. 29.

(b) Id. ibid. pag.
53.

(1) Spon, Hi-
stoire de Geneve,
book iii, pag.
263, Utrecht
1685. See also
Mr Leti, Histo-
ria Genevrina,
Tom. iii, p. 162.

[A] . . . In some crimes for which he was beheaded at Geneva the twenty-third of March, 1566.] Mr Spon gives the following account of it (1): 'James Paul Spifame, Bishop of Nevers, having left his bishopric, and a yearly income of forty thousand livres, retired to Geneva, to profess the doctrine of the Protestants. He presented a petition to be made a citizen, which was granted him, and even was admitted into the councils of two hundred and of sixty. The magistrates, and the men of letters, had a great esteem for him on account of his learning. Some time after he was sent into France to serve there as a minister; but the magistrates of Geneva were informed that he privately endeavoured to get another bishopric. Wherefore at his return, his conduct was more narrowly observed, and his former life examined. It was found out that before his marriage he had a child by the woman he married, and left it should be accounted a bastard, he caused a false contract of marriage to be made and antedated, and a false seal to be put to it, that his son might inherit his estate, which was pretty considerable. For all these causes he was imprisoned, and having confessed the whole matter, he was beheaded in the place du Molard, with a great repentance of his faults, which he shewed by a fine discourse he made to the people upon the scaffold. Some will have it that those accusations were only a pretence to condemn him, but that he was really executed to gratify Catherine de Medicis, who had bribed the Syndics, being solicited to it by the Pope.' See the passage of Mr de Roccolles in the remark [E].

[B] His birth, his parts, and his learning, might have raised him . . . he had . . . gone through several employments.] 'He was of a noble family, originally come from Lucca, and settled at Paris in the year 1550, when BARTHOLOMEW SPIFAME was living, from whom are descended all those of that name, lords of Bisseaux, Granges, and Passy. His father was JOHN SPIFAME, Sieur de Passy, secretary to the king, and pay-master-general to the army; and his mother Jaquette Ruzé: he was the youngest of five brothers . . . The progress he made in learning procured him an office of counsellor in the

parliament of Paris; afterwards he became president of the inquests, master of the requests, and counsellor of state; and he shewed to great a capacity and learning in all his employments, that having devoted himself to the Church, there was no dignity above the great reputation he was in. From a canon of Paris, chancellor of the university, and an abbot of St Paul of Sens, he became great vicar of Charles Cardinal de Lorraine, Archbishop of Rheims, and in that quality, he was named by Henry II, to the bishopric of Nevers, of which he took possession in the year 1548 (2). . . . Being intoxicated with his learning and reputation, he followed the new opinions as some of the most learned prelates had done, and left the Romish Church to take a wife (3).

[C] Nothing can be more absurd than what Moreri says, that Calvin caused him to be put to death.] See with what rhetorical flourishes he adorned his Dictionary. Calvin, who was then the great Caliph of Geneva, the infamous receptacle of Heresy and Heretics, being acted by an intolerable vanity, thought that every body was to submit to him, and was not satisfied with the civility Spifame shewed him, and perhaps, having observed that Spifame repented of his Apostasy, he falsely accused him of some crimes, especially of being a meer spy at Geneva, and caused him to be beheaded to be revenged of him. This happened on the 25th of March 1565 (4). That passionate author might be confuted several ways; but I shall only use this chronological reason. Calvin died the 27th of May 1564, and Spifame was beheaded the 23d of March 1566, according to Mr Spon, who, in that respect, is a more credible author than those who place that execution on the 25th of March 1565 (5). Though we should prefer this date to that of Mr Spon, and suppose it agrees with the custom of beginning the year in January, it were still most certain, that Calvin died above nine months before this late Bishop of Nevers was executed.

[D] Others ascribe his death to Beza's jealousy.] Le Laboureur speaks of it as confidently as if he had some proofs for it. Beza, says he (6), who envied him mortally, did so narrowly observe him, when that man (7) was vexed to be reduced to a miserable and private life, that

(2) Le Labou-
reur, Addit. à
Castelnau, Tom.
ii, pag. 51, 52.

(3) Id. ibid. pag.
53.

(4) Moreri, at
the word Spi-
fame. This pas-
sage has been left
out in the Dutch
editions.

(5) Mr Le La-
boureur, Tom. ii,
pag. 53, is one
of them.

(6) Le Labou-
reur, ibid.

(7) Man refers to
Spifame. A good
author would not
have left so falla-
cious an equivoca-
tion.

SPIFAME.

196

(k) See the Nouvelles Lettres de la Critique Générale du Calvinisme de Mr Maimbourg, pag. 460, & seq.

(l) Catherineot, Calvinisme de Berri, pag. 3.

(m) Huber. Lanquetus, Epistola lxvii, lib. ii, pag. 197.

book (k) Maimbourg's reflexions, and therefore I need not do it again. One of those, who wrote against his History of Calvinism, wants to be rectified. He has given us several curious particulars concerning the true cause of that bishop's execution [E]. It is not true that Spifame wrote a book under the name of Peter Richer [F]. Some say he assisted at the council of Trent, and was afterwards minister of the communion in the town-house of (1). It is certain, that when the Reformed received the communion in the town-house of Bourges, towards the beginning of the year 1562, it was he who officiated. He went thither from Ifoudun, with a guard of 150 troopers (m). The author, who informs me of this, says, in a letter dated from Paris the eleventh of December 1561, that Spifame had been called by the Reformed Church of Lyons, to be their minister, and that four years before he had been accused of Lutheranism, for which he would have been put to death, had he not quickly fled to Geneva (n).

(n) Ibid. Epist. lxiv, suprad. lib. pag. 184.

that he made him suspected of keeping intelligence with Queen Catherine and the Catholics, and of intending to leave Geneva. He was imprisoned, tried, and beheaded the 25th of March 1565, and was the first victim of the liberty he had procured to that city (8). Beza, who was his enemy, not contented with his execution, made the following Latin verses against his memory, wherein he could not forbear reflecting upon him, concerning the maxims of his religion, for preferring a wife to a bishopric; and besides, he owns, that she was rather a concubine than a lawful wife. That author quotes ten Latin verses, which he ascribes to Beza, upon the death of James Spifame, with a cruel answer that was made to them likewise in Latin verse. I question whether it can be proved that the epigram of ten verses has been justly ascribed to Beza. It will not be improper to see what he answered to Claudius de Saintes, who had reproached him with some things relating to James Spifame: 'Spifamius mihi nunquam collega fuit, & cur ego illum odissem, à quo nunquam injuriam acceperam? num, sicut in alterius nomine ineptus ille tuus monitor mihi exprobrat, nequē veterer ne meis luminibus officeret? Atqui, neque hoc ille unquam cogitavit, opinor, neque (absit verbo invidia) causa ulla fuit cur id timerem. Ais tamen illi à me intentata vana crimina fuisse proditiōis, illiciti matrimonii, & stupri, quum longe gravius ipso in istis deliquissem. Quod si vana illa fuerunt, quomodo ille minus quam ego graviter deliquerit? an quod apud vos ista pro nihilo ducatur? At tu hominum vanissime, vide quam teipsum fallas. Num enim ego accusator, num subscriptor in iis fui quæ nunquam in illius causa in disceptationem venerunt? Nam de proditiōe vel stupro nulla quod sciam fuit mentio. Sciunt autem omnes ex hujus civitatis more qua quisque de causa damnatur. Nec de adulterio quaesitum est. De quo igitur dices? hoc verò tu ex me non audies, qui ne hæc quidem nisi à te coactus commemoro. Jure tamen damnatum fuisse si mihi non credis, ipsimet saltem credere te oportuit (9). . . . Spifame was never my colleague, and why should I hate him who never did me any injury? Is it, what your foolish monitor upbraids me with in the name of another person, because I am afraid lest he should eclipse my glory? But he never had so much as any thoughts of doing it, in my opinion, nor (to speak without envy) had I any ground to fear it. But you say that I have charged him with the vain crimes of treason, unlawful marriage, and fornication, when I am much more guilty of these crimes than Spifame. If these are vain crimes, how could he be more innocent of them than I am? Are they accounted trivial with you? But, most vain man, see how you deceive yourself. Could I accuse him of any thing, or could I subscribe to any thing which was never considered in his trial? For as to treason or fornication, in my knowledge there was no mention made of them. And every body knows, according to the custom of this city, for what crimes any man is condemned. Nor was he charged with adultery. With what then say you? But this you shall not know from me, who would not have mentioned these things, if you

(8) Theod. Beza, Apologia altera ad F. Claudium de Saintes, pag. 361.

had not forced me to it. But if you will not believe me, that he was justly condemned, you ought to believe himself. There are three things in this Latin passage. 1. That Spifame was not a man who pretended to be afraid of such a thing. 2. That Beza did not set up for an accuser of Spifame. 3. That Spifame was not accused either of adultery, or of fornication, or of treason. Mezerai is therefore to blame for saying that upon I know not what umbrage that was taken at him, at Geneva, he was accused of adultery, and beheaded for that pretended crime (10).

(10) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom. vi, towards the end, pag. 450.

[E] Rocolles wants to be rectified. He has given us some curious particulars about the true cause of that bishop's execution.] Spifame . . . having retired to Geneva could not be quiet. Having formed an intrigue with the counsellors of the Queen-mother, Catherine de Medicis, to get the Catholics restored in the town, and to enable the bishop to come into it with main force, in hopes of being provided with a new bishopric, better than that of Nevers, his treacherous practices were discovered by Grillon, Colonel of the regiment of guards, who gave notice of it to the agent of Geneva who attended the court. The agent took care to acquaint the magistrates of Geneva with it: whereupon Spifame was arrested; and the pretence on which he was brought to his trial, was that he kept a married woman, and not, as Maimbourg brutally says, that he had made a false contract, or false seals. Spifame not being guilty of any such crime; but adultery may be punished with death according to the law Julia de adulteriis. It was upon this just pretence that he was beheaded in the place du Molard, without mentioning his conspiracy, for fear of displeasing the court of France. And to prevent that court from concerning themselves for him, and sending an express to save his life, the council made a quick dispatch of his trial, which ended the third day after he had been arrested (11). You see here a severe reflexion upon Maimbourg without a cause; for that Jesuit goes upon the credit of a Protestant writer (12). The same author tells us that Spifame was condemned under pretence of adultery, which is not true. He takes no notice of a falsity in Maimbourg. The Prince of Condé, says he (13), employed Spifame in other things besides making sermons; for he sent him into Germany to demand the succours, which he could not obtain. It is certain he obtained them. Beza (14), d'Aubigné (15), Le Laboureur (16), and several others say so. And Maimbourg himself mentions above three hundred Reisters, and four thousand Lanquetus (17), whom the Prince of Condé received from Germany.

(11) Rocolles, l'Histoire véritable du Calvinisme, pag. 444, 445.

(12) Mr Spoc. See the remark [A].

(13) Maimbourg, Hist. du Calvinisme, lib. iv, pag. 285.

(14) Beza, Hist. des Eglises, book vi, pag. 33.

(15) D'Aubigné, Hist. Univ. Tom. i, book iii, ch. xii, pag. 226.

(16) Le Laboureur, Addit. aux Mémoires de Castelnau, Tom. ii, pag. 42. See the text of this article.

(17) Maimbourg, Hist. du Calvinisme, book iv, pag. 285.

[F] It is not true that Spifame wrote a book under the name of Peter Richer. Du Verdier Vau-Privas says (18), that James Spifame, who left his bishopric, wrote, under the name of Peter Richer, a confutation of the idle fancies and lies of Nicholas Durand, called the Chevalier de Villegaignon, in the year 1562, in 8vo. Moreri affirms the same thing. But I have shewed before (19) that Peter Richer is a real man, and not a fictitious name.

(18) Du Verdier, Biblioth. Franç. pag. 620.

(19) In the article of this Richer.

SPINA

SPINA (ALPHONSUS) a Spanish Jew being converted to the Christian religion became a Franciscan Friar, and was rector of the academy of Salamanca, and at last Bishop of Orense (a). He wrote a book intitled, *Fortalium Fidei contra Judæos, Saracenos, alioque Christiana Fidei inimicos* [A]. He tells us himself that he was composing it at Valladolid in the year 1458 (b).

(a) A city of Galicia.

[A] He wrote a book intitled *Fortalium Fidei*, &c. Some have been of opinion that a Dominican Friar, called William Totan, was the author of it; but they should only have said that he published a new edition of it, which is that of Lyons in 1511. The first is printed at Nuremberg in 1494, in 4to. The name of the author was not put to it, only it was said in the title, that it was composed *per quendam Doctorem eximium Ordinis Minorum anno 1459 in partibus Occidentis*. Mariana hath informed us, that it is a work of Francis Spina (1). Mr Wharton, who hath made an analysis of it (2), censures those who have ascribed it to Thomas Patriarche Barbarinfi. He might have censured those who attribute it to Bartholomew de Spina who lived in the XVIIth century. Selden and Mr Hoornbeeck give it, either to that Bartholomew, or to William Totan (3). Mr Hoornbeeck has been censured (4) for having

(1) Mariana, de Rebus Hispan. lib. xii, cap. xiii.

(2) Whart. Append. ad Cave de Script. Eccl. pag. 143.

(3) See Crenii, Animadv. Philol. & Hist. Part. xiii, pag. 87.

(4) Ibid. pag. 22.

said that this work was printed in the year 1490. He might also have been criticized for having said that this Bartholomew de Spina, was a Carmelite Friar of Cologne (5): he was a Dominican and a native of Pisa. Theophilus Raynaud affirms that 'this same Bartholomew hath set his name to the *Fortalium Fidei*, in order to appropriate the work to himself (6): but he does not name the edition where that is to be seen.

The opinion of Mr du Pin concerning the *Fortalium Fidei*, is as follows. 'It is a work which promises more in the title than is to be found in the body of the book; for it is not well done: there is nothing in it sufficiently examined, and he often brings very weak proofs, reasonings, and answers. Nevertheless there is some learning in it, and it may be of some use (7).'

(b) Fortalit. Fidei, lib. ii. Consider. vii, Hier. v, fol. 61, apud Hent. Wharton, Append. ad Cave de Script. Eccl. pag. 143.

(c) Hoornb. de convert. Judæis, in Prælog. p. 9.

(6) Theoph. Rayn. de malis ac bonis Libris, num. 272, pag. m. 166.

(7) Du Pin, Bibl. Tom. xii, pag. 100, Edit. of Holland.

(a) He is also called de L'Espine.

(b) In the article CHARPENTIER, remark [A].

SPINA (a) (JOHN DE) in Latin *Spinæus*, a Protestant minister in the XVIIth century, had been a Monk. I shall observe upon what occasion he forsook his order [A], and sided with the Protestants. He did many services to the cause. He was one of the deputies at the conference of Poissi: I have said in another place (b), that he was distinguished from the ministers that were called factious, and that he and du Rosier disputed with two Catholic doctors in the year 1566 (c). The Church of Rochelle desired him to be their minister in the year 1561, and sent some deputies to him at Fontenai le Comte (d); but the consequences of that deputation are not known. He wrote very edifying books [B], full of piety and good morality. He died at Saumur in 1594 (e). Anjou was his native country, as La Croix du Maine observes. He escaped the Paris massacre, because the murderers were too eager in running after a lady whom he accompanied, and killing her in the river (f). I do not think he was then seventy-eight years old, as it is affirmed in a marginal note of Varillas's History of Charles IX, of the Paris edition in 12mo 1684.

(c) In the article R. C. SIER, remark [B].

(d) Vincent, Recherches sur les commencemens de la Reformation de la Rochelle, p. 65.

(e) Id. ibid. pag. 68.

(f) Varillas, Hist. de Charles IX, Tom. ii, pag. m. 4. 8. See also Thuanus, lib. iii, pag. m. 1078.

[A] I shall observe upon what occasion he forsook his order. Mr Vincent's grandmother by his mother's side said, that John Rabec was taken at Chateau-Gontier, in Anjou, in her father's house. Mr de l'Espine, who was then a Carmelite, and was going to preach at Angers, happened to be in that house, where he was known and well beloved, as one who had a great reputation, though he was but a young man. He had been there some days with Rabec, without knowing him; but being well pleased with his conversation, he was very much concerned for his imprisonment: which moved him to pay him several visits in his prison, in order to dissuade him from the Reformed Religion, and bring him back to the Catholic. His visits had an effect quite contrary to his intention; for Rabec's arguments convinced him, and prevailed upon him by degrees. Besides, he was extremely moved with the admirable constancy Rabec expressed when he was burnt, and with the wonder GOD wrought in him; for though his tongue had been cut off, he sang at the place of execution with an audible voice, the LXXXIXth Psalm.

O GOD, the Gentiles do invade
Thine heritage, to spoil, &c.

As he was continually reflecting upon those things, he made no doubt that the doctrine, against which he had so much disputed with Rabec, was that which he ought to embrace. He therefore preached it at Angers above a year, though without openly professing it, and quitting his habit. He censured several abuses; and instead of insisting, as others of his profession did, upon Indulgences, Pilgrimages, and the Intercession of the Saints, he exhorted his hearers to repent, and to implore the Divine Grace through JESUS CHRIST. He was very much followed at first; but at last he was suspected, which made him think of removing. He went to Renata of France, Duchess of Ferrara, who was a Protestant and resided at Montargis. This is what Mr Vincent, a minister of Rochelle (1), heard his grandmother say several times. He observes, that she was twelve or thirteen years of age, when Mr de l'Espine and Rabec happened to meet at Chateau-Gontier, and that she died

(1) Vincent, Recherches sur les commencemens de la Reformation en la Ville de la Rochelle, pag. 65, & seq.

in the year 1624, being about 80 years old (2). This Chronology is not very exact; and indeed a great accuracy is seldom minded in such narratives. We read in Beza, that Rabec was arrested at Chateau-Gontier the first of August 1555, and that he suffered martyrdom the 24th of April 1556 (3). Mr Vincent's grandmother must therefore have been then younger than she said, or must have lived more years than her grandson gives her. Note, as he observes (4), that L'Espine had been an Augustin Monk, if we rely upon the preface of his tracts. Others say, he had been a Dominican (5). D'Aubigné (6) says he did not make an open profession of the Protestant religion, until the conference of Poissi.

(2) Id. ibid. pag. 68.

(3) Beza, Hist. Ecclesiast. book ii, pag. 108.

(4) Vincent, Recherches, &c.

(5) Varillas, Hist. de l'Herésie, book xxiiv, pag. m. 254.

(6) D'Aubigné, Hist. Univers. Tom. i, book ii, ch. xxv, pag. 146.

[B] He wrote very edifying books. Here follow the titles of them: *Traicté des tentations, & moiens d'y résister*, Lyons 1566, in 8vo. *Traicté consolatoire contre toutes afflictions, qui adviennent ordinairement aux fideles Chrestiens*, Lyons 1565, in 8vo. *Traicté pour offer la crainte de mort, & la faire desirer à l'homme fidele*, Lyons 1558, in 8vo. He published also some controversial pieces, among others, *Discours du vrai sacrifice & du vrai sacrificeur*, Lyons 1564. *Défense & Confirmation du Traicté du vrai sacrifice & sacrificeur à l'encontre des frivoles réponses & arguments de René Benoist Docteur en Theologie*, Geneva 1567, in 8vo (7). Some of his works were translated into Latin; for we have of him the following books in that tongue, *De tranquillitate animi libri 7. De justitia Christiana, de confessione peccatorum, de agrotis consolandis & de Providentia Dei*. He made an excellent Sermon at Rochelle in 1587, upon the LORD's Supper, which Mr Vincent intended to publish (8). Simon Goulart of Senlis published in 1591, a collection of excellent discourses made by John de l'Espine, to which, as he used to do, he added notes and summaries. They are the same seven books concerning the tranquillity of the mind, which, as has been said above, were translated into Latin (§).

(7) Taken from Du Verdier's, Bibliothèque Française, pag. 688.

(8) Vincent, Recherches, &c. pag. 69.

[§] The edition of Rochelle in 16mo printed by Jerom Haütin, 1594, hath an Epistle Dedicatory of Simon Goulart to Mr de la Nouë, dated in the year 1587. R. E. M. C. R. I. T.]

D d d

SPINOSA

V O L. V.

SPINOSA (JOHN DE) lived in the XVIth century. He was born at Belovado in the province of Rioja in the kingdom of Castile, and at fourteen years of age was taken into the house of the Marquis d'Alarcon. He became an able man, and shewed so much integrity, that the marquis conceived a particular affection and esteem for him, so far as to entrust him with the greatest secrets, and to consult him on the most important affairs. After the decease of that lord, Don Pero Gonzalez de Mendoça, his son-in-law, succeeded him in his offices, and was afterwards made Captain-General in Sicily by the Emperor Charles V. He made John de Spinosa secretary of the cyphers, and of state affairs, and was very well satisfied with his conduct; for when Barberouffe's fleet occupied all the streights of Messina, John de Spinosa was so fortunate and dexterous as to cross the Streights, and bring into Sicily the emperor's orders, and the money due to the soldiers. Some time after he quelled the mutiny of the troops in the kingdom of Naples. He followed the same Mendoça in the wars of Piedmont, and was his secretary; and after the death of that lord, he was sent twice to Venice for the affairs of the Milanese. That employment made him stay twelve years at Venice, and gave him occasion to discover some qualities, which procured him the approbation and the praises of the Venetians. He also received several marks of a particular esteem from the Emperors Charles V, and Ferdinand, and from Philip II. He commanded in some provinces of Lombardy under the Duke de la Cueva, governor of the Milanese, and General of the Spaniards in Italy. He had before commanded in a part of Abruzzo with great probity, where he caused two famous robbers to be punished [A]. He loved study, applied himself to it as much as his employments and journeys could permit him; and even wrote some pieces (a) [B].

(a) Taken from the preface which Jerome Serranus prefixed to the *Gynæceum*, of John de Spinosa, printed at Milan in 1580.

[A] Where he caused two famous robbers to be punished. One of them was so cruel, that he drank the blood of those whom he killed; the other added a horrid lewdness to his robberies and murders, for he ravished as many women as he could get. Here are the Spanish words of my author. 'Gouernò en Abbruzzo el estado de la valle Siciliana, dando de su integridad muy grandes fennales, con su pobreza: De su prudentia con diversos juizios, y sentencias notables: y de su justitia con la muerte de Prospera Camisola cruelissimo homicida, e, insolentissimo violador de mugeres, y de Entino de Baxan, atroce salteador de caminos, (y tan inhumano, que como fiera saluaje acostumbraua beuer la sangre de aquellos aquien por los bolques heria, o mataua: y con la cabeza de scachia diablo puesta por terror de los mal hechores, en una pica a las almenas; y su cuerpo en quatro partes, en los pafios mas peligrosos del estado (1). - - He governed in Abruzzo, in the Sicilian valley, and gave very great proofs of his integrity, notwithstanding his poverty; of his prudence by several remarkable sentences and punishments; and of his justice by putting to death Prospero Camisola, a most cruel murderer, and a most insolent ravisher of women, and Entino de Baxan, a notorious highway-man, (so inhuman that, like a wild beast, he used to drink the blood of those whom he wounded or murdered in the woods) he ordered his head to be placed on a pole for the terror of wicked men, his body to be quartered, and his quarters to be placed in the most suspicious roads of the country.'

(1) Hieronymus Serranus, in *Præfat. Dialogi* en laude de las *Mugeres*.

[B] And even wrote some pieces. I have only seen his *Gynæceum*, or his *Dialogo en laude de las Mugeres*. It was printed at Milan in 4to, in the year 1580, and dedicated by the author to Mary of Austria, daughter of the Emperor Charles V, and wife of the Emperor Maximilian II. Women are highly praised in that book, which is stuffed with examples and quotations; the choice whereof is none of the best. The author promised a second part, wherein he was to bestow encomiums upon several illustrious ladies of that age. I wish he had performed his promise, and that I might see his book. He wrote another book, intituled, *Micracanthos*, wherein he inserted the actions and memorable sayings of great men, and observed the tragical end of the wicked, that his book might teach his readers how to attain to glory, and how to avoid infamy. He inserted in it a digression concerning those, who take delight in speaking ill of a book. It will be thought to be good, if we judge of it by the following words. They are very judicious, and teach us how to make a difference between censures and flatteries, and then between censures that may be useful, and those that can be of no use. Pero contra aquellos que . . . quiescien por ventura en otras cosas tacharme: dextare por agora de hazer excusaciones, o, respuesta defensiva; refiriendome ala apologia que en el micracanthos tengo escrita. Donde suficientemente se tratta delas species de mal-

dicientes, y detractores: y dela reprehension que deue (exclusas todas las de mas) aceptar, y como obra saludable, y virtuosa, agradecerse. Alo qual remi tiendome, solamente dire agora, que fin delear contra los mal dicentes, y arrogantes burladores; mas venganza de aquella con que la scriptura los amenaza diziendo, *parata sunt derisoribus judicia*. † Prov. Salom. cap. xii. Y sin admitir por otra parte, las alabanzas enganno, fas delos aduladores: sperare gratamente con defeo, y humildad la correction delos buenos, y sabios varones. Teniendo para ello siempre en la memoria, aquellas divinas palabras del Ecclesiaste, que dizen, *† Melius est à sapiente corripi: quam stultorum adulatione decipi* (2). - - As for what relates to detraction, I shall not enter now upon that subject, but refer to what I have said in my *Micracanthos*, wherein I treat of the different species of slanderers and detractors, and of the reproofs that are to be thankfully received, as wholesome and virtuous. I shall only say as to slanderers and proud scoffers, that they shall meet with a due chastisement, as the Scripture threatens them, Judgments are prepared for scornful. And, on the other side, as we ought not to give ear to the deceitful praises of flatterers, so we must receive with gratitude, pleasure, and humility, the corrections of good and wise men, always remembering these divine words of Ecclesiastes, It is better to hear the rebuke of the wise, than for a man to hear the song of fools. Nicolas Antonio (3) never saw that *Micracanthos*; (3) See his *Bibl. Scri. tot. Hispanie*, at the word *Joannes de Epinosa*, Tom. i. pag. 521.

Nicolas Antonio (3) never saw that *Micracanthos*; add, that our Spinoza made a large collection of proverbs, and filled it with moral reflexions. He did not publish it, and gave his reasons for it in the second part of the *Micracanthos*. 'Ha escrito algunas otras obras. Entre las quales (allende de los *Dialogos* dichos): no es de poca importancia, la que yo he visto de mas de seismil proverbios vulgares que ha recogido, y parte dellos compuesto; (aunque no acabada de comentar, ni impresa; por las causas que in los posteros razonamientos de la segunda parte del *Micracanthos*, se dize) obra cierto de maravillosa Doctrina, y provecho, y muy agradable: (ainfi como las otras) por la copia, y diversidad de las materias, Todas ellas puramente aplicadas ala virtud (4). - - He wrote some other works; among which (besides the above-mentioned dialogues) the most considerable part which I have seen, contains more than six thousand proverbs, which he collected, and part of which he himself composed (tho' he did not finish his comments on them, nor publish them, for the reasons he gave in his last discourse in the second part of the *Micracanthos*), a work surely of wonderful doctrine, profitable, and very entertaining, (as well as his other works) by the copiousness and variety of matters which they contain. He employed them for the advancement of virtue.'

This author may be therefore added to those, who were mentioned in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* for the year 1686. I shall set down the passage, without minding the morose humour of those, who will

AUTHORS, who have written on Proverbs.

will not like it: I rather chuse to have a regard for those, who will be very well pleased with it. 'Mr Menage promises to publish an etymological treatise upon the French proverbs. There are few subjects that are so curious as that is, and that require a greater skill in the knowledge of history. There has been a vast number of proverbs in all languages. Didymus made a collection of them in ten books, which he dedicated to those, who had writ upon that subject. Aldus Manutius published something of Didymus's work with Tharraeus's proverbs, in the year 1505. But it is to be observed, that Greek and Latin proverbs are not so numerous, as Erasmus, and those who have collected what was omitted by him, would make us believe; for it is certain, and they have been sufficiently censured for it, that they took for a proverbial expression what was not so. Oudin made a pretty large collection of French proverbs, intituled, *Curiositez Françaises*, but he does not give their etymologies. The dialogues between a clown and a Philosopher have been often reprinted at Paris; they contain the origin of a considerable number of proverbs, sometimes right, and sometimes wrong. The edition of 1665 is intituled, *Les illustres Proverbes nouveaux & Historiques expliqués par diverses Questions curieuses & morales* 2 vol. in 12mo. Mr Furetiere, who has published a second case very satirical against several members of the French academy, pretends that the proverbs of his Universal Dictionary are not taken from that of the academy, and that in order to remove their meaness, he has enriched most of them by enquiring into their origin, or applying to them curious histories, and comparing them with the proverbs of other nations, such as Paquier, Belinghen, and other grave authors, have not thought unworthy of their pen (5). A good supplement might be made to this long passage. It might be said that Belinghen, mentioned by Furetiere, should have been called Fleury de Belinghen, which was his true name. I think he taught French in Holland. He published at the Hague in 1656, *L'Etymologie ou Explication des Proverbes François*, divided into three books by way of a dialogue. It is a book in 8vo of 303 pages. The *Premiers essais des Proverbes*, published by that author in 1653, having met with a good reception, he resolved to put out a second edition much larger, viz. that whose title I have just now mentioned. Mr de Brieux published at Caen the origins of some proverbs in the year 1672, in 12mo. If

(5) *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for February 1686, Art. iii. In the *Abstract of the Etymologies of the Italian tongue* written by Mr Menage, at the end of which there is an explication of several Italian Proverbs.

we go higher, we shall find at the end of Nicod's Dictionary (6) the *Explications morales d'aucuns Proverbes communs en la Langue Française*, with a translation of some French proverbs into Latin verse, by *Joannes Agidius Nucernensis*. You will find in Morhofius's *Polybistor* many things upon this subject; you will find there that Angelus Monofinius has treated at large of the Italian proverbs in a book printed at Venice in the year 1604, and (7) that Julius Varini wrote a book, intituled, *Scuola del Vago* (8), wherein the Italian proverbs are placed according to the order of human actions, and attended with some prudential precepts. You will see there that the alphabetical collection of Italian proverbs, made by Orland Perquet, is to be found in Gruterus's *Theaurus*, and that one Thomas Buoni, who is mentioned, published a collection of Italian proverbs, in two volumes (9). But you will not find there the *origine de vulgari Proverbia*, published by Aloysio Cinthio, at Venice, in the year 1526 (10). Morhofius had forgot the name of a modern author, who has collected the Italian proverbs, and is mentioned in the Journals (11): This new author is no other than Mr Menage. It does not appear that Morhofius was well acquainted with the writers of our French proverbs. He only mentions the collection of an anonymous author, and that of *Job. Agidius Nucernensis*, and the first edition of Belinghen's proverbs, and lastly, of one le Duc, who put out a book (12), intituled, *Proverbes en Rimes, ou Rimes en Proverbes*. Morhofius knew the collection of Spanish proverbs made by Ferdinand Nunez, Professor of Eloquence and of the Greek tongue at Salamanca, and the *Philosophia vulgar* of Juan de Mal Lara (13), and the *Medicina Española contenida en Proverbios vulgares de nuestra Lengua*, composed by Juan Soropán de Rieros. That *Philosophia vulgar* is a collection of a thousand proverbs, with their explication. I do not wonder he does not mention the book of our Spinoza; for it is lost. He does not forget the compilers of German, English, and Dutch proverbs. I know no author that mentions Polydore Virgil, who pretends to have broke the ice, both with respect to proverbs, and to the inventors of things. His treatise of proverbs came out in 1498, and was dedicated to Guido Ubaldio, Duke of Urbino (14). I have an edition of it revised and enlarged the fourth time. It was printed at Basil 1541, it contains 456 pages in 8vo.

(6) The edition I make use of is that of Paris 1606, in folio.
(7) Morhofius, *Polybistor*, lib. 1, cap. xxi, pag. 256.
(8) Printed at Verona 1642, in 12mo.
(9) Printed at Venice in 8vo, in the year 1604 and 1606.
(10) See Nicolas Antonio, *Bibl. Hisp. Tom. 1*, pag. 559.
(11) *Mentio etiam fit, 6 rectâ memini, in postremis Ephe- meridibus Galli- cis novi cujusdam autoris qui Pro- verbia Italica con- gesserit, cujus mihi nunc nomen excidit. Mor- bosi, Polybistor*, lib. 1, cap. xxi, pag. 256. The Journal des Sça- vants, 1686, pag. 164, Dutch E- dit. and the Nou- velles de la Rep. des Lettres, for the same year pag. 164, men- tion that collection of Mr Menage.

(12) Printed at Paris, 1665, in 12mo.
(13) It should be *Mallara*.
(14) See the E- pistle Dedicatory of the book of *Inventoribus Re- rum*, written by Polydore Virgil.

SPINOZA (BENEDICT DE) a Jew by birth, who forsook Judaism, and at last became an Atheist, was a native of Amsterdam. He was a systematical Atheist, and brought his Atheism into a new method, tho' the ground of his doctrine was the same with that of several antient and modern Philosophers, both in Europe and the Eastern countries, [A]. As for the latter, one needs only read what I have said

[A] He was a systematical Atheist, and brought his Atheism into a new method, tho' the ground of his new doctrine was the same with that of several antient and modern Philosophers, both in Europe and the eastern countries. I think he is the first who reduced Atheism into a system, and formed it into a body of doctrine, ordered and connected according to the manner of the Geometricians; but otherwise his opinion is not new. It has been believed long ago, that the whole universe is but one substance, and that God and the world are but one Being. Pietro della Valle mentions certain Mahometans, who call themselves *Ebl Elrabik*, or men of truth, men of certainty, who believe that there is nothing existent but the four elements, which are God, man, and every thing else (1). He also mentions the Zindikites, another Mahometan sect. They come near the Sadducees, and have their name from them. They do not believe a providence, nor the resurrection of the dead, as Giggious shews upon the word Zindik (2). . . . One of their opinions is, that whatever is seen, whatever is in the world, whatever hath been created is God (3). There have been such Heretics among Christians; for we find in the beginning of the XIIIth century, one David of Dinant, who made no distinction between God and the first matter. It is a mistake to say that he is the first who vented such a foolish doctrine (4). Does not Albertus Magnus mention a Philosopher, who had done the like?

A LIST of some persons who had the same opinion with Spinoza.

(1) See the article ABUMUS. LIMUS, remark [A].
(2) Belpier, Remarques curieuses sur Ricaut, Etat présent de l'Empire Ottoman, pag. 648.
(3) Pietro della Valle, pag. 394, of the mid Tom. apud Belpier, ib.
(4) Afferuit Deum esse materiam primam, quod nemo ante eum deliraverat. Theophr. Raynaud. Theol. Naturali. Distinct. vi, num. 6, pag. 563.

'Alexander Epicureus dixit Deum esse materiam, vel non esse extra ipsam, & omnia essentialiter esse Deum, & formas esse accidentia imaginata; & non habere veram entitatem, & ideo dixit omnia idem esse substantialiter, & hunc Deum appellavit aliquando Jovem, aliquando Apollinem, & aliquando Palladem; & formas esse peplum Palladis, & vestem Jovis; & neminem sapientum ajebat ad plenum revelare posse ea quæ latebant sub pepllo Palladis & sub veste Jovis (5). - - - Alexander the Epicurean held, that GOD was matter, or was not different from it, & that all things were essentially GOD, and that forms were imaginary accidents, and had no real entity, and therefore he said all things were substantially the same; and this GOD he called sometimes Jupiter, sometimes Apollo, and sometimes Pallas: and that forms were the robe of Pallas, and garment of Jupiter; and he asserted that none of the wise men could fully reveal what was concealed under the robe of Pallas, and the garment of Jupiter.' Some believe that this Alexander lived in Plutarch's time (6); others say XIIth, ad Phil. in express words, that he lived before David of Dinant. Secutus fuit Alexandrum qui fecit librum de materia, ubi probare conatur omnia esse unum in materia. This we find in the margin of the treatise, in which Thomas Aquinas confutes that monstrous and extravagant opinion (7). Perhaps, David of Dinant knew not that there was such a Philosopher of the Epicurean sect,

(5) Albertus in 1^a Phys. Tract. iii, cap. xiii, apud Pererium de communibus Principiis, lib. 2, cap. xli, pag. 309, 310.
(6) Is est, opinor, quos inter fideles Plutarchus II, symph. 3, Theophrastus, Dissertat. ad Phil. pag. 199.
(7) Ad lib. 1, Tomæ contra Gentil. cap. xvii, f. 23. ed. Lugd. A. 1586. Thomæ, ibid. p. 200.

Ζαὶ τῶν φυσικῶν παθῶν ἕκασον. Denique mundum
 ipsum animal esse negat (*Strato*) vultque naturam sequi
 temerarios fortunæ impetus, initium enim rebus dare
 spontaneam quandam naturæ vim, & sic deinceps ab
 eadem natura physicis motibus imponi nesciam (12). (12) Platonem
 — Finally, *Strato* denies that the world itself is an adversa Colo-
 — — — will have it, that nature obeys the casual tem, p. 1113.

animal, and will have it, that nature ooeily the *causa* impulse of fortune, for a certain spontaneous power of nature gives to things a beginning, and in like manner afterwards, an end it put by the same nature to Physical motions. This translation, which I have found in page 58 of Lefcaloperius's commentary upon Cicero de *Natura Deorum*, and to which I have added *anim* after *initium*, is better than that of Amyot, and that of Xylander: nevertheless, there is something

in it that does not suit the notion one ought to have of the opinion of that famous Philosopher, the greatest of all the Peripatetics (13). The words *temerarii fortune impetus* spoil the symmetry of his system; and we see that Lactantius distinguishes it from that of the Epicureans, and ascribes no chance to it. 'Qui nolunt, *jay* be (14), divina providentia factum esse mundum, aut principii inter se temeræ coeuntibus dicunt esse concretum, aut repente nasci. Natus vero (ut ait Socrates) habere

fura extitine. Natura vero (de deo) in se vim gignendi, & vivendi, fed em nec fenfum
habere ullum, nec figuram: ut intelligamus, omnia (14) Laetue.
quafi via sponte effe generata, nullo artifice, nec
auctore. Utrumque vanum, & impoffibile.
In the roba will not have the world to have been made

in divine providence, say, that is either produced from the fortuitous concourse of principles, or, on a sudden, exists by nature. But nature (as Strato says) has in itself the power of producing, and of living, but hath neither any sense nor figure: that we may understand all things to be produced spontaneously, without any artificer

'or author. But both these opinions are frivolous and absurd.' Note, that Seneca represents Plato's doctrine and that of Strato, as two opposite extremes: one of them deprived God of a body, and the other deprived him of a soul (15). I think I have read in Father Salier's book upon the species of the Eucharist,

(15) *Ego sic
aut Platonem
Respicimus*

that several antient Philosophers or Heretics taught the unity of all things ; but because I have not that book now, I only mention this by the by. Father Salier is a French Minimie. His book printed at Paris, in the year 1689, is intitled, *Historia Scholastica de speciebus Eucharistici, sive de formarum materialium na-*

The doctrine of the foul of the world, which was so common among the Antients, and made the principal part of the system of the Stoics is, at the bottom, the

—fame with that of Spinoza. Which would more clearly appear, if it had been explained by authors versed in Geometry; but because the books wherein it is mentioned, are written rather in a rhetorical than a dogmatical method; whereas Spinoza is a precise writer, and avoids the figurative style, which often hinders us

from having a just notion of a body of doctrine ; hence it is that we find several material differences between his system, and that of the foul of the world. If any one should maintain that Spinozism is more coherent, he should also maintain that it is not so orthodox : for the Stoics did not deprive God of his pro-

vidence; they re-united in him the knowledge of all things; whereas Spinoza ascribes to him only separated and very limited knowledge. Read these words of Seneca. 'Eundem quem nos Jovem intelligunt, custodem rectoremque universi, animum ac spiritum, mundi huius operis dominum, sacrificem, cui

nomen omne convenit. Vis illum fatum vocare?
 non errabis. Hic est, ex quo suspensa sunt omnia,
 causa causerum. Vis illum providentiam dicere?
 recte dices. Est enim, cujus consilio huic mundo
 providetur, ut inconcussus eat, et actus suos explicet.
 Vis illum naturam vocare? non errabis. Est enim

ex quo nata sunt omnia, cujus spiritui vivimus. Vis illum vocare mundum? non falleris. Ipse enim est, totum quod videmus, totus suis partibus inditus, & se sustinens vi sua (16). Quid est autem, cur non existimes in eo divini aliquid existere, qui Dei pars est? Totum hoc quoque sentimus, quod est in eo.

Original from

nat. a
god

(II) *Idem*, *Adem. Quæst.*
lib. ii. cap.

(13) Τῶν ἀ-
λων Περὶ τῶν
τικῶν ὁ παρὼν

(14) *Lactone*.
Ira Dei, cap. 1.
pag. 533.

n (15) Ego fer
t, aut Platonem
nt Peripateticu

fo
bal
he

If
co-

non (16) S
pars Quæst.
, & lib. ii,

Theology of a sect of the Chinese [B]. I have not been able to learn any particulars relating

(17) *Idem*, Epist. XCII, pag. m. 381.

Deus, & socii ejus sumus & membra (17). -- They mean the same Jupiter as we, the preserver and co-vernors of the universe, a mind and spirit, the Lord and artificer of this mundane fabric, to whom every appellation doth agree. Will you call him Fate? You will not be mistaken. It is he upon whom all things depend, the cause of causes. Will you name him Providence? You will be in the right. For it is by his whose care this world is so ordered that it goes on steadily, and exerts its operations. Will you give him the name of Nature? You mistake not. For it is he from whom all things receive their beginning, by whose spirit we live. Will you call him the World? You speak the truth. For he is all what you see, all diffused through all its parts, and supporting himself by his own power. Why therefore do not you believe that there is something divine in that which is a part of God? All that in which we are contained, is both one, and God, and we are his companions and members. Read also Cato's discourse in the ninth book of Lucan's *Pharalia*, especially these three verses:

Estne Dei sedes nisi terra, & pontus, & aer,
Et coelum & virtus? Superos quid quærimus ultra?
Juppiter est quodcunque vides, quodcunque mo-
veris (18).

(18) Lucan. *Pharal.* lib. ix, ver. 578.

Is not the seat of Jove, earth, sea, and air,
And heaven, and virtue? Where would we further trace
The god? Where'er we move, what'er we see
Is Jove.

animal
bottles

I shall observe, by the way, an absurdity of those, who maintain the system of the soul of the world. They say, that all the souls both of men and brutes, are particles of the soul of the world, which are re-united to their whole, by the death of the body: And to make us understand it, they compare animals to bottles full of water; floating upon the sea. If those bottles were broke, their water would be re-united to its whole; thus it is with particular souls, say they, when death destroys the organs in which they were shut up. Nay, some say that extasies, dreams, and intense meditations, re-unite a man's soul to the soul of the world, and that this is the reason why people foretell things to come by composing figures of Geomancy. *Nihil heic attingo de arte illa prophetica deque Geomantia, quibus ipse Fluddus quam plurimum tribuit. Etsi enim mens cogitando sic in seipsam colligit, ac veluti abstrahi possit, ut humanas res contempletur velut à quadam specula: attamen quod illa possit, quando hoc mortali circumvenitur corpore, ita utri animæ mundanae, ut sicut illa omnia cognoscit, ita ipsa particeps fiat cognitionis hujusmodi: quod illa item in hac extasi digitis regat ad exprimentum varia punctula, ex quibus effectus sive arbitrarius, sive fortuitos colligere liceat: hoc aut longe fallor, aut fabulam sapit* (19). ---- It is no difficult thing to perceive the falsity of this parallel. The matter of the bottles floating in the sea is an inclosure, which keeps the sea water from touching the water they are full of; but if there was a soul of the world, it would be dispersed through all the parts of the universe, and therefore nothing could prevent the union of the soul to its whole, and death could not produce that re-union. I shall set down a long passage of Bernier, whereby it will appear, that Spinozism is only a particular method of explaining a doctrine, which very much prevails in the East Indies.

(19) Gassendus, in *Examine Philosoph. Fluddanae*, num. 29, *Opusculum Tom. iii*, pag. 247.

You are not ignorant of the doctrine of many ancient philosophers concerning the great soul of the world, whereof they say our souls and those of Brutes are portions. Should we thoroughly examine Plato's and Aristotle's doctrine, perhaps we should find that it was their opinion. This is in a manner the universal doctrine of the Pendets, Pagans in the East Indies; and that very same doctrine constitutes to this day the cabala of the Soufys, and of the greatest part of the men of letters in Persia, and is explained in Persian verses very sublime and emphatical in their Goult-chez-raz, or parterre of mysteries; as it has been the doctrine of Flud, which our great Gassendus has so learnedly confuted, and that wherein most of our Chymists are bewildered. Now those Cabalists, or Indian Pendets, carry the extravagance farther than all those philosophers, and pretend that

VOL. V.

God, or that Supreme Being, which they call Achar, immutable, immovable, has not only produced or taken souls out of its own substance, but also whatever is material and corporeal in the universe, and that their production was not made in the way of efficient causes, but as a spider produces a cob-web out of its own bowels, and re-assumes it whenever it pleases. Creation therefore, say these imaginary doctors, is only an extraction or extension, which God makes of his own substance, of those webs which he draws, as it were, out of his own bowels, in the same manner as destruction is only his re-assuming that divine substance, those divine webs into himself; so that the last day of the world, which they call Maperlé, or Pralea, in which they believe there will be a general destruction of all things, will only be a general re-assuming of all those webs which God had thus emitted out of himself. And therefore, say they, there is nothing real and effective in any thing which we think we see, hear, smell, taste, or touch: this world is nothing but a kind of dream, and a meer illusion, because that multitude and great variety of things, that appear to us, are but one and the same thing, viz. God himself, as all our different numbers, ten, twenty, one hundred, a thousand, and so of others, are but one and the same unity repeated several times. But if you ask them a reason of such a fancy, and if you desire them to explain that emanation and return of substance, that extension, that apparent diversity, or how it comes to pass that God, who is not corporeal, but Biapex, as they own, and incorruptible, should nevertheless be divided into so many portions of bodies and souls; their answer consists only in comparisons, that God is like an immense ocean, in which many vials full of water should move; that those vials, wherever they should go, would be always in the same ocean, in the same water; and that if they should break, the waters contained in them would then be united to their whole, to that ocean of which they are portions. Or they will tell you, that it is with God as it is with light, which is the same all over the world, and yet appears a thousand ways different, according to the variety of the objects (20) on which it falls, or according to the different colours and figures of the glasses thro' which it is conveyed. They will answer you, I say, only with these comparisons, which have no proportion to God, and are only fit to cast a mist before the eyes of ignorant people; and no solid answer can be expected from them. If they be told that those vials would indeed be in the like water, but not in the same (21), and that there is indeed a like light all over the world, but not the same; and so with many other strong objections, with which they are perpetually confounded; they repeat still the same comparisons, and the same fine words, or, as the Soufys do, the fine poems of their Goult-chez-raz (22).

weath

god like
ocean

(20) There is here an error of the press in the original.

(21) Note, that the Spinozists make no better answer to the distinction between *same* and *like*.

(22) Bernier, *Suite des Mémoires sur l'Empire de grand Mogol*, pag. 208 & seq. Dutch Edit.

(23) Caramuel, *Philosophie Révisée*, lib. iii, §. iii, pag. 175.

It appears from the following passage that Peter Abelard is accused of asserting that all things are God, and that God is all things. *Primum elementorum concordiam esse Deum & materiam ex qua reliqua fierent, docuit Empedocles. . . . Hæc erat illius ætatis Theosophia, hæc notitia quæ de Causa principiæ habebatur. Jam tandem obsoleverat, & inter veterum somnia & phantasmata recensebatur. Eam inter veteris Philosophiæ parietinas & rudera revocavit Petrus Abailardus, ingenio audax, & famâ celebris: Sepultam cineribus invenit, & quasi Eurydicen Orpheus ab inferis tandem revocavit. Testor Vazquezium i. part. quest. 3. art. 8. numb. 28. & Smisingum de Deo tract. 1. disp. 2. quest. 2. numb. 54. Deum esse omnia, & omnia esse Deum, eum in omnia converti, omnia in eum transmutari asseruit, quia Empedocleæ, aut fortè Anaxagoricæ præventus Theosophiâ, distinguebat species secundum solam apparentiam, nempe quia aliquot Atomî in uno subjecto erant eductæ quæ latebant in alio (23). . . . Empedocles taught, that the first amicable conjunction of the elements was GOD and matter, of which the other beings were made. . . . This was the Theology of that age, this their opinion of the first cause. But at last it grew obsolete, and was reckoned amongst the dreams and chimeras of the antients. This among the ruins and rubbish of the antients was revived by Peter Abelard, a man*

E e c

relating to Spinoza's family; but there is ground to believe it was mean and inconsiderable

a man bold, and famous: he found it buried in ashes, and, as Orpheus did Eurydice, brought it back from hell. My authors are Vasquez and Smifungus. He asserted, that GOD was all things, and all things were GOD, that GOD was converted into all things, and all things transformed into God, because prepossessed with the Theology of Empedocles, or perhaps of Anaxagoras, he distinguished the species according to appearance only, namely, because some atoms appear in one subject which lay hid in another.

[B] What I say concerning the Theology of a set of the Chinese. The name of that sect is Foe Kia. It was established by royal authority among the Chinese in the year 65 of the Christian Era. Its first founder was a son of the King In san nam, and was at first called Xe, or Xe Kia (24); and afterwards when he was thirty years of age, Foe, that is, no man (25).

(24) The Japanese call him Xaca.

(25) See the *Alta Eruditor*, 1688, pag. 257, in the Extract of the book of Confucius, printed at Paris in the year 1687.

(26) Biblioth. Univers. Tom. vii, pag. 403, 404, in the Extract of the book of Confucius.

The Prolegomena of the Jesuits prefixed to Confucius's book published by them at Paris, treats of that founder at large. It is said there, that (26) having retired into a desert, as soon as he came to be nineteen years of age, and having put himself under the discipline of four Gymnosophists to learn Philosophy of them, he remained under their direction till the age of thirty years, when rising in the morning before break of day, and contemplating the planet Venus, that bare sight gave him immediately a perfect knowledge of the first principle; so that being full of a divine inspiration, or rather of pride and folly, he betook himself to instruct men, gave out himself as a god, and drew after him fourscore thousand disciples. . . . At seventy-nine years of age, being upon the point of death he declared to his disciples, that for the space of forty years that he had preached to the world, he had not told them the truth; that he had concealed it under the veil of metaphors and figures; but that it was time now to declare it to them. There is nothing, said he, to be inquired after, and on which one may place ones hopes, but nothingness and a vacuum.

* P. 29. Vacuum & inane, Cum huius in the Chinese Language.

(27) See, above, remark [E] of the article BION the Borythenite.

(28) *Acta Eruditor*, Lipsienf. 1688, pag. 257.

(29) Biblioth. Univers. Tom. vii, pag. 404, & seq. See also the remark [C], of the article JAPAN, and the Nouveaux Mémoires sur l'état présent de la Chine par le Père le Comte, Tom. ii, pag. 101, *Amst.* 1698.

His method was the reason why his disciples divided his doctrine into two parts: one is outward, and is that which is publicly preached and taught; the other is inward, which is carefully concealed from the vulgar, and discovered only to those that are initiated. The outward doctrine, which, as the Bonzes express it, 'is only like the wooden frame on which an arch is built, and that is afterwards removed, when the building is finished, consists 1. In teaching that there is a real difference between good and evil, justice and injustice: 2. That there is another life wherein men shall be punished or rewarded for what they have done in this world: 3. That happiness may be attained by thirty two figures and fourscore qualities. 4. That Foe or Xaca is a deity and the saviour of men, that he was born for their sake, out of compassion for the errors he saw them in, that he has expiated their sins, and that by virtue of his expiation they shall obtain salvation after death, and shall have a new and more happy birth in another world (29). They add to this five moral precepts, and six works of mercy, and threaten with damnation those who neglect those duties.

The inward doctrine, which is never imparted to the vulgar, because they ought to be kept to their duty by the fear of hell, and such like stories, as those Philosophers say, is however in their opinion, the solid and true one. It consists in laying down, as the principle and end of all things, a certain vacuum and real nothingness. They say, our first parents issued from that vacuum, and returned into it

when they died, and that it is so with all men, who are resolved into that principle by death; that men, all the elements, and all creatures, make part of that vacuum; and that therefore there is but one and the same substance, which is different in all particular beings only by figures and qualities, or an internal configuration, much like water, which is always essentially water, whether it has the form of snow, hail, rain, or ice (30). If it be a monstrous thing to assert that plants, brutes, and men are really the same thing, and to ground such an opinion upon this that all particular beings are not distinct from their principle (31), it is still more monstrous to say, that this principle has no thought, no power, no virtue. And yet, this is the doctrine of those Philosophers, they place the supreme perfection of that principle in its inaction, and absolute repose. Hoc autem principium cum doceant esse prorsus admirandum quid, purum, limpidum, infinitum, subtile, quod nec generari possit nec corrumpi, quod perfectio sit rerum omnium ipsamque summe perfectum & quietum negant tamen, corde, virtute, mente, potentia ulla instructum esse: imo hoc esse maxime Enudi. Lipp. proprium essentia ipsius, ut nihil agitet, nihil intelligat, appetat nihil (32). Spinoza was not so absurd: the only or sole substance he admits, is always acting, always thinking; and his most general abstractions could not enable him to divert it of action and thought. The foundations of his doctrine do not allow it.

Observe, by the by, that the followers of Foe teach Quietism; for they say that all those, who seek true happiness, ought to be so far absorbed by profound meditations, as to make no use of their intellect, and that they ought, through a perfect insensibility, to sink into the repose and inaction of the first principle; which is the true way of being perfectly like it and partaking of happiness. They further say, that those, who have attained to that state of quietude, may follow the usual course of life as to the outside, and teach others the doctrine commonly received. It is only in private and inwardly, that one ought to practise the contemplative institute of the beatific inaction. Quæcirca quisquis bene beatusque vivendi sit cupidus, huc assidue meditatione, suisque victoria erit oportere, ut principio suo quam simillimus, affectus omnes humanos domat ac prorsus extinguit, neque jam turbetur, vel angatur re ulla, sed æstatis prorsus inflat absorptus altissima contemplatione, sine ullo prorsus usu vel ratiocinio intellectus, divina illa quiete, qua nihil sit beatus, perfruatur: quam ubi nactus fuerit, communem vivendi modum & doctrinam tradit aliis, & ipsemet specie tenuis sequatur, clam vero sibi vacet ac veritati, & arcana illa quiete vitæque celestis instituto gaudeat (33). Those who were most intent upon this contemplation of the first principle, formed a new sect, called Fu guei Kia, that is, the sect of the idle or slothful, nihil agentium. Thus among Monks those, who pretend to the most strict observance, form new communities, or a new sect.

The greatest lords and the most illustrious persons suffered themselves to be so infatuated with this Quietism, that they believed insensibility to be the way to perfection and beatitude, and that the nearer a man came to the nature of a block or a stone, the greater progress he made, the more he was like the first principle, into which he was to return. It was not enough that the body should be without motion for several hours; the soul was also to be unmoveable, and destitute of all manner of sense. What I have said comes short of the Latin which follows: Optimates imperii & summos quosque viros hac infania adeo occupatos, ut quo quisque propius ad naturam saxi truncive accessisset, boras complures sine ullo corporis animique motu perfrerent, sine ullo vel sensuum usu vel potentiarum, eo proficiscerentur, propiorque & similior evasisset principio suo aërio, in quod aliquando reverfurus esset, putaretur (34). A follower of Confucius refuted the impertinences of that sect, and fully proved this maxim of Aristotle, that nothing can be made out of nothing (35), nevertheless they maintained and spread themselves, and there are many people to this day, who apply themselves to those vain contemplations (36). Did we not know the extravagances of our Quietists (37), we should be apt to think that the writers, who mention those speculative Chinese, neither well understood nor faithfully related what they say of them; but if we consider what

Pope
(30) Bibl. Universelle, Tom. vii, p. 406.

(31) Omnia, quæcumque existunt, vita, sensus, mens prædicta, quævis inter se vis & figura differant, intrinsece tamen eundem quid idem esse, quippe à principio suo in distincta. *Alta Eruditor*, 1688, pag. 258.

(32) *Ibid.*
Quietism taught and preached by some Chinese.

(33) *Alta Eruditor*, 1688, pag. 258. See also the remark [K] of the article BRACHMAN.

like stone

(34) *Ibid.*
(35) Copiole probans Aristotelis illud et nihil ex nihilo fieri.

(36) *Ibid.*
(37) See the remark [K] in the article BRACHMAN.

(a) Called *Francis Van der Ende*. Note, that Mr Kortholt, in the preface to the second edition of his father's book *de tribus Impostribus*, says that a young woman taught Spinoza Latin, and that she was afterwards married to Mr Kerkerling, who was her scholar at the same time with Spinoza.

able [C]. He learned the Latin tongue of a Physician (a) who taught it at Amsterdam, and applied himself early to the study of Divinity (b), and bestowed many years upon it: and afterwards he wholly devoted himself to the study of Philosophy. Having a Geometrical Genius, and being desirous to have a good reason for every thing, he quickly disliked the Doctrine of the Rabbins: so that the Jews easily perceived, he did not approve several articles of their religion; for he was against any constraint in matters of belief, and a great enemy to dissimulation, and therefore he freely declared his doubts and his opinions. It is said that the Jews offered to tolerate him, provided he would comply outwardly with their ceremonies, and even that they promised him a yearly pension; but he could not resolve upon such an hypocrisy. However, it was only by degrees that he left their synagogue; and perhaps he would not have broke with them so soon, had he not been treacherously attacked coming from a play, by a Jew, who gave him a thrust with a knife. The wound was slight but he believed the assassin designed to kill him. From that time he left them altogether, which was the reason of his excommunication. I have enquired into the circumstances of it, but have not been able to find them out (c). He wrote, in the Spanish tongue, an apology for his leaving the synagogue, which has not been printed. However it is known that he inserted several things in it, that have appeared since in his *Traëtatus Theologico-Politicus* (d), printed at Amsterdam (e) in the year 1670, a pernicious and execrable book, which contains all the seeds of the Atheism he plainly discovered in his *Opera Posthuma*. Mr Stoupp has no reason to insult the ministers of Holland for not answering the *Traëtatus Theologico-Politicus* [D]. What he says of him is not always true [E]. When

(b) See the 16th mark [F].

(c) Taken from a Memoir imparted to the Bookeller.

(d) See the book of Mr Van Til, minister and professor of Divinity at Dort, intitled, *Het Voorbif der Hidenen voor de Ongebovigen geest*. That book mentioned in the *Acta Erudit.* 1695, pag. 393.

(e) And not at Hamburg, as it is in the title page.

Spinoza

what passes among Christians, we cannot with reason disbelieve the extravagancies ascribed to the sect *Foë Kia*, or *Fu gui Kia*.

I am apt to believe either that the sense, which those men put upon *Cum bin*, is not exactly expressed, or that their notions are contradictory. They tell us that those words signify *emptiness* and *nothingness*, *vacuum* & *inane*; and in order to confute that sect, this axiom, Nothing can be made out of nothing, has been alledged against them; therefore those who alledged it, must have believed that, according to that sect, nothing is the principle of all Beings. I cannot believe that those Chinese take the word *nothing* in its proper signification, and I fancy they understand it, as people do, when they say that there is nothing in an empty trunk. We have seen that they ascribe some attributes to the first principle, which suppose that they conceive it as a liquid (38). And therefore it is likely they only divert it of the gross and sensible parts of matter. If it be so, the disciple of Confucius would be guilty of the sophism called *ignoratio elenchis*; for he would have understood by the word *nihil*, what has no existence; whereas his adversaries understood by it what has not the properties of sensible matter. I fancy they meant by that word, near the same as what the moderns mean by the word *space*; I say, the moderns, who being neither Cartesian nor Aristotelians, maintain that space is distinct from matter, and that its indivisible, unpalpable, penetrable, unmoveable, and infinite, extension is something real. The disciple of Confucius would have easily proved that such a thing cannot be the first principle, if it be besides destitute of activity, as the speculative Chinese will have it. An extension, tho' never so real, can produce no particular Being, unless it be moved; and if it be supposed that there is no mover, the production of the world will be equally impossible, whether there be an infinite extension, or nothing at all. Spinoza would not deny that position; but he does not admit of a first principle without action. The abstracted extension he gives it in general is only, properly speaking, the idea of space; but he adds motion to it, which may produce the varieties of matter.

[C] *His family . . . was poor and very inconsiderable.* It is well known that Spinoza would not have had a sufficient subsistence, if one of his friends had not left him by his will, wherewithal to maintain himself. The pension that the synagogue offered him, shews that he was not rich.

[D] *Mr Stoupp has no reason to insult the ministers of Holland for not answering the Traëtatus Theologico-Politicus.* He is the author of some letters, intitled, *La Religion des Hollandais*. That book was written at Utrecht in the year 1673, whilst the French were masters of it. Mr Stoupp was then lieutenant-colonel of a Swiss regiment. He raised himself afterwards so far as to be made a Brigadier, and would

have been promoted to higher offices, had he not been killed at the battle of Steinkerken (39). He had been formerly a minister, and had officiated in the French Church of the Savoy at London in Cromwell's time. He affected in the letters I speak of to make an odious description of the great number of sects that are in Holland. Here follows what he says of Spinozism. 'I should think that I have not mentioned all the religions of this country, if I should say nothing of a famous and learned man, who, as I have been assured, has many followers wholly devoted to his opinions. His name is Spinoza; he was born a Jew, and has not abjured the Jewish religion, nor embraced the Christian: and indeed he is a very bad Jew, and not a better Christian. He has published within these few years a Latin book intitled, *Traëtatus Theologico-Politicus*, wherein the chief thing he seems to aim at is, to destroy all religions, particularly the Jewish and the Christian, and to introduce Atheism, Libertinism, and a full liberty for all religions. He maintains that all of them have been invented for the public good, to the end that all citizens may live honestly and obey their magistrates, and practise virtue, not in hopes of any reward after death, but for the excellency of virtue itself, and the advantages that accrue in this very life to those who follow it. He does not openly declare in that book what he thinks of the Deity; he only gives some hints of it, and thereby discovers it, whereas in conversation he plainly declares that God is not an intelligent, and a most perfect and happy Being, as we fancy; but only the power of nature, diffused all over the world. Spinoza lives in this country; he has been some time at the Hague, where he was visited by all the curious, and even by some women of quality, who pretend to more wit than is allotted to their sex. His followers dare not discover themselves, because his book wholly overthrows the foundations of all religions, and has been condemned by a public decree of the States, and the sale of it is forbidden, tho' they sell it still publicly. Among all the Divines that are in this country, none has ventured to confute the opinions contained in that treatise. I am the more surprised at it, because the author discovers a great knowledge of the Hebrew tongue, of all the ceremonies of the Jewish religion, of all the customs of the Jews, and of Philosophy; and therefore those Divines cannot say that it is a book that deserves no answer. If they continue to be silent, it will be said that they have no charity, since they leave such a pernicious book unanswered, or that they approve the opinions of the author, or have not the courage and ability to confute them (40).'

The reader may be pleased to observe, that whereas in the first edition of this Dictionary, I quoted this passage, according to my own translation, from the Italian, in this I give it according to the words of the original,

(39) In the beginning of August, 1695.

(40) Religion des Hollandais, Let. ter III, pag. 65, & seq.

(38) *Parum, limpidum, subtilis*. See before the citation (32), *ærium*, see above, citation (34).

God not in all things

Spinoza betook himself to the study of Philosophy, he quickly grew out of conceit with the common systems, and was wonderfully pleased with that of Des Cartes (f). He felt so strong an inclination to inquire after truth [F], that he renounced the world in a manner, the better to succeed in that enquiry. Not contented to free himself from all

(41) Of whom I have spoken in citation (90) of the article R. A. M. U. S.

(42) The substance of what concerns Spinoza in that answer is as follows (43): 'I think Stoupp is mistaken, when he says, that Spinoza has not abjured the Jewish religion, since he has not only renounced the opinions of the Jews, having forsaken all their practices and ceremonies; but also eats and drinks every thing that is set before him, be it even swine's flesh, or wine come from the Pope's cellar, without enquiring whether it be *Cafker* or *Nefech*. It is true, he professes no other religion, and he seems to be very indifferent for all religions, unless God moves his heart. I shall not enquire whether he maintains all the opinions which Stoupe ascribes to him; and it had been more edifying if Stoupe had said nothing of it: let him justify himself, if he will. Neither shall I enquire whether he is the author of the book, intitled, *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*. However I am assured that he does not own it; and if we may believe the title-page, it has been printed at Hamburg, and not in these provinces. But suppose this wicked book had been printed in Holland; the States endeavoured to stifle it in its birth, they have condemned it, and have prohibited the sale of it by a public decree, as soon as it came out in their country, as Stoupe himself confesses, pag. 67. I know it has been sold in England, in Germany, and France, and even in Switzerland as well as in Holland; but I do not know whether it has been prohibited in those countries. The States, whilst I am writing this, express their piety by forbidding that book again, with many others of the same stamp.' As for what concerns the reproaches and complaints, that this book had not been confuted, the author answers, 1. (44), That since it has been printed at Hamburg, at least according to the title, Stoupp should rather complain of the Divines of that city, than of the Dutch. 2. (45) That since that pernicious book tends to the subversion of Christianity, the Roman Catholics and the Lutherans were no less obliged to confute it than the Reformed, and among the Reformed, the Divines of Germany, France, England, and Switzerland, should have done their duty in that respect as well as the Dutch Divines. 3. That Mr Stoupe may be blamed for the same thing. Why did he not answer it himself? 4. (46) That Spinoza's book is not more pernicious than his; for, if the first teaches Atheism openly, the other does it covertly: both of them show the same indifference for religion. An enemy, who attacks us privately, and under the appearance of friendship, is much more dangerous than an open enemy. It is necessary to cry out against a private enemy, that every body may know of it, whereas every body stands upon his guard against a professed enemy. Perhaps, this is the reason why the Divines of Holland and Switzerland have been of opinion that there was no necessity to make a speedy answer to Spinoza, believing that the horror of his doctrine is a sufficient confutation of it; the more, because there is nothing new in that treatise, what is contained in it having been a thousand times repeated by prophane men, and yet, thanks be to God, the Church has received no great harm by it. 5. (47), That he (John Brun) has written several remarks upon that execrable book, which, perhaps, he would have published, had not the war prevented it: 'Tho', says he, I think I have spent my time much better upon some other works: nay, I never took Spinoza's book to be so pernicious as the defamatory libel of Stoupe's. 6. (48) That, in fine, Spinoza's tract has been confuted in Holland by an excellent man, who was a very good Divine, and a great Philosopher, viz. by the late Mr Mansfeldt, Professor at Utrecht. Doubtless that confutation had been sooner published, had not the author been prevented by death. And I do not question that others would have confuted it long ago, had not Stoupe, and his accomplices, hindered it by this bloody war. I shall set down below (49)

(43) Pag. 158.

(44) Pag. 160.

(45) Ibid. pag. 161.

(46) Ibid. pag. 162.

(47) Brun, Veritable Religion des Hollandais, pag. 163.

(48) Ibid. pag. 164.

(49) In the remark [M].

the titles of some other answers to that book of Spinoza.

[E] What he says of him, is not always true.] Does he not say, that, according to Spinoza, religions have been invented to induce men to the practice of virtue, not in hopes of being rewarded in another world, but because virtue is an excellent thing in itself, and profitable in this life? Is it not certain that this Atheist had no such thoughts, and that he could not have argued thus without making himself ridiculous? All the religions in the world, both the true and the false ones, turn upon this great hinge, That there is an invisible Judge, who rewards and punishes after this life, as well the outward, as the inward actions of men. The great use of religion is supposed to derive from that; and if religion had been invented, this had been the chief motive of the contrivers of it. It is plain enough that in this life good actions do not generally procure temporal advantages to men, and that bad ones are the most usual and most effectual way to wealth and power; and therefore in order to inspire men with the love of virtue, and prevent their running into vice, it had been necessary to propose to them rewards and punishments after this life. This is the craft which the libertines ascribe to those, whom they pretend to have been the first contrivers of religion. This is what Spinoza should have believed, and doubtless he believed it; and therefore Mr Soupp did not understand him in that respect, but took him in the quite contrary sense to what he meant. I wonder this fault was left in the Supplement to Moren's Dictionary, in an article that bears Mr Simon's name. Note, that those who deny the immortality of the soul, and providence, as the Epicureans did, are those who maintain, that virtue ought to be followed by reason of its excellency, and because the practice of morality is attended in this life with so considerable advantages, that we have no reason to complain. Doubtless, this is the doctrine Spinoza would have taught, if he had been so bold as to dogmatize publicly.

[F] He found himself so strongly inclined to enquire after truth.] The proof of these words, and of several others in the text of this article, is to be found in the preface to the posthumous works of this author. 'Fuit ab ineunte ætate literis innutritus, & in adolescentiâ per multos annos in Theologiâ se exercuit; postquam verò eo ætatis pervenerat, in quâ ingenium maturefecit, & ad rerum naturas indagandas aptum redditur, se totum Philosophiæ dedit: quum autem nec preceptores, nec harum Scientiarum Auctores pro voto ei facerent fati, & ille tamen summo sciendi amore arderet, quid in hisce ingenii vires valeret, experiri decrevit. Ad hoc propositum urgent Scripta Philosophica Nobilissimi & summi Philosophi Renati des Cartes magno ei fuerant adiumento. Postquam igitur sese ab omnigenis occupationibus, & negotiorum curis, veritatis inquisitioni magnâ ex parte officientibus, liberasset, quò minus à familiaribus in suis turbaretur meditationibus, urbem Amstelædamum, in quâ natus, & educatus fuit, deferuit, atque primò Renoburgum, deinde Voorburgum, & tandem Hagam Comitibus habitatum concessit, ubi etiam IX Kalend. Martii anno supra millesimum & sexcentimum septuagesimo septimo ex Pthisi hanc vitam reliquit, postquam annum ætatis quadragesimum quartum excessisset. Nec tantum in veritate perquirendâ totus fuit, sed etiam se speciatim in Opticis & vitris, quæ Telescopiis ac Microscopiis inservire possent, tornandis, poliendisque exercuit; & nisi mors eum intempestiva rapuisset, (quid enim in his efficere potuerit, fati ostendit) præstantiora ab eo fuissent speranda. Licet verò se totum mundo subduxerit, & latuerit, plurimis tamen doctrinâ, & honore conficiis Viris ob eruditionem solidam, magnamque ingenii acumen innotuit: uti videre est ex Epistolis ad ipsum scriptis, & ipsius ad eas Responsionibus. Plurimum temporis in Naturâ rerum percrutandâ, inventis in ordinem redigendis, & amicis communicandis, minimum in animo recreando infumpsit: quin tantus veritatis expiscandæ in eo ardor exarsit,

all manner of business, he also left Amsterdam, because the visits of his friends too much interrupted his speculations, and retired into the country, where he meditated without any hindrance, and made Microscopes and Telescopes. He continued in the same course of life after he had settled at the Hague; and was so well pleased with meditating, and putting his meditations into order, and communicating them to his friends, that he spent very little time in any recreation, and was sometimes three whole months without stepping out of douts. Though he lived a very retired life, his name and his reputation flew every where. Free-thinkers resorted to him from all parts [G]. The Palatine court desired to have him, and offered him a professorship of Philosophy at Heidelberg [H]. But he refused it, as being an employment little consistent with his great desire of inquiring into truth without any interruption. He fell sick of a lingering disease, of which he died at the Hague, the twenty-first of February 1677, being somewhat above forty-four years of age (g). I have heard say that the Prince of Condé being at Utrecht in the year 1673, sent him word that he would be glad to see him (b). Those who have been

(g) Taken from the Preface of his Posthumous Works. See the remark [F].

(b) See the remark [G].

(50) Mr Fabricius, professor of Divinity at Heidelberg, and counsellor to the Elector Palatine, wrote that letter to Spinoza, by his master's order, the 16th of February 1673. The following letter is Spinoza's answer to Mr Fabricius. Note, that he was then known to be the author of the *Traité de Théologie-Politique*.

(51) Prefat. Oper. posthumor. B. D. S.

(52) See the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary, at the word Spinoza.

(53) See at the end of his *Opera Posthuma*, his abridgement of the Hebrew Grammar.

(54) Tam exactam linguæ Græcæ cognitionem non habeo, ut hanc Provinciam suscipere audeam. Spinoza, in *Traité de Théologie-Politique*, cap. x. sub fin. pag. 136.

(55) See the article HENAU, V. O. L. V.

he was at Utrecht. For I have been assured that the Prince of Condé, at his solicitation, sent for him from the Hague to Utrecht on purpose to discourse with him, and that Stoupe praised him very much, and was very familiar with him (56). Having more exactly informed myself in this matter, I learned that the Prince of Condé was returned to Utrecht before Spinoza left it, and that it is very true that he discoursed with that author.

[H] The Palatine court . . . offered him a professorship of Philosophy at Heidelberg. M. Chevreau says thereupon a thing that wants to be rectified. 'Being at the court of the Elector Palatine, says he (57), I gave a good character of Spinoza, though I then knew that Protestant Jew only by the first (58) and second parts of Des Cartes's Philosophy, printed at Amsterdam for John Rieuwertz in 1663. The Elector had that book; and after I had read some chapters of it to him, he resolved to call him to his university of Heidelberg to teach Philosophy, on condition that he should not dogmatize. Mr Fabricius, who was then professor of Divinity, was ordered to write to him and though Spinoza was not in very good circumstances, yet he refused to accept that honourable employment. The reasons of his refusal were enquired into; and I conjectured from some letters I received from the Hague and Amsterdam, that these words, on condition that he should not dogmatize, had frightened him'. M. Chevreau is mistaken as to the condition that he should not dogmatize, and Mr Bernard rightly observes that it had been a contradiction. These are his words, 'One may very well wonder, that since Spinoza was already so well known, the Elector should have been willing to entrust him with the care of teaching young people Philosophy, and much more to require from him that he should not dogmatize; for since his impious doctrine was built upon the grounds and principles of his Philosophy, how could he have taught Philosophy without infilling his poisonous errors? Such a proposal, together with the law imposed on him, implied a kind of contradiction (59)'. It is certain, that this condition was not required from him, and that Mr Chevreau is mistaken in that particular: We may easily prove it by the letter that was written to him. Mr Fabricius, who was ordered to write it, promised Spinoza a full liberty of philosophizing; of which, adds he, the Elector thinks you will not make an ill use to the prejudice of the religion by law established. If you come hither, you will live a pleasant life, and such as becomes a Philosopher. *Philosophandi LIBERTATEM habebis AMPLISSIMAM, quæ te ad publicæ stabilitatæ Religionem conturbandam non abusurum credit. . . . Hoc unum addo, te, si huc veneris, vitam Philosopho dignam cum voluptate transacturum, nisi præter spem & opinionem nostram alia omnia acciderent* (60). Spinoza answered, that if he had ever wished to be a Professor, he could not have wished for any other professorship than that which was offered him in the Palatine, especially on account of the liberty of philosophizing, which his Electoral Highness granted him. *Si unquam mihi desiderium fuisset alicujus facultatis professorum suscipiendi, hanc solum optare potuissem quæ mihi à Serenissimo Electore Palatino per te offertur, PRÆSENTIM O LIBERTATEM PHILOSOPHANDI quam Principi Clementissimus concedere dignatur* (61). I confess, that among other reasons for which he declares he does not find himself disposed to accept that professorship,

(56) Brun, veritable Religion des Hollandais, pag. 164.

(57) Chevreau, Tom. ii. pag. 99, 100. Dutch Edit.

(58) To speak like an orthodox, Mr Chevreau should have said, because I only knew that Protestant Jew by the first, &c.

(59) Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, for September, 1700, pag. 301.

(60) Epist. liii. Spinoza, pag. 562, Oper. posthumor.

(61) Ibid. Epist. lvi.

F f f

(1) Taken from the Memoir imparted to the Bookeller.

(4) Here is the title of that work: Renati Des Cartes Principiorum Philosophiæ Pars I, & II, more Geometrico demonstratæ per Benedictum de Spino-

acquainted with Spinoza, and the peasants of the villages where he lived a retired life for some time, do all say that he was a sociable, affable, honest, friendly, and a good moral man [1]. This is strange; but after all, it is not a more surprising thing than to see men live an ill life, though they be fully persuaded of the truth of the Gospel (i). Some will have it that he followed the maxim, *Nemo repente turpissimus*, and that he became an Atheist only by degrees, and that he was very far from being so in the year 1663, when he published the Geometrical demonstration of Des Cartes's principles (k). He appears as orthodox in that book upon the nature of God, as Des Cartes himself; but we must know that he did not then speak according to his persuasion [K]. There is ground to believe that the ill use he made of some maxims of that Philosopher, occasioned his Atheism. Some say that the pseudonymous piece *de Jure Ecclesiasticorum*, printed in 1665,

22 Antichristum. Antichristum ejusdem Cogitata Metaphysica, in quibus diffinitiones, que tam in parte Metaphysica generaliter, quam specialiter occurrunt, breviter explicantur.

(62) Ibid. pag. 563.

professorship, he says, he does not know within what bounds he must confine himself, that he might not seem to be a disturber of the religion established by law. *Cogito deinde, me nescire, quibus limitibus libertas ista philosophandi intercludi debeat, ne videatur publica stabilitatem Religionem perturbare velle* (62). But this does not prove that the condition mentioned by Mr Chevreau was required from him. This shews that even good authors are very apt to give a wrong account of a fact. Mr Chevreau should have been contented to say, that Spinoza was given in a civil manner to understand, that if he should impugn the principles of the Reformed Church, it would be taken amiss. Instead of which he uses a general proposition, importing a formal prohibition of dogmatizing: This is a perfect contradiction in the terms. However, it is certain that the clause inserted in the letter written to Spinoza, seemed very inconvenient to him: and this is what I meant to express in a general way, when I said, That he refused that professorship of Philosophy, being an employment little consistent with his great desire of inquiring after truth without any interruption; for he had reason to believe he should be continually interrupted, and that the divines of the Palatinate would make him lose a great deal of time in justifying to the prince what he should dictate to his scholars, or what he should say in his lectures. They would have found in them sometimes one thing directly contrary to the catechism of the country, and sometimes another indirectly contrary to it. Which would have occasioned many complaints and accusations: He knew not how far the thing would go, and therefore he could not be sure of living a quiet life; and though he had not fore-seen that it would make him lose a great deal of time, he was sensible that his meditations would be very much interrupted by the obligation he would be under of giving lectures at stated times, and by many other functions belonging to a professor. I desire my reader to join with this explanation, which has been published in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* (63).

(63) In December, 1700, pag. 689, 690.

(64) See the remark [7].

(65) Sebastian: he is professor of Poetry at Kiel, since the month of February 1701.

(66) Sebastianus Kortholtus, Præfat. Editionis 2. Tractatus Christiani Kortholti patris sui de tribus Impostoribus.

[1] He was a good moral man.] If you except what he told his intimate friends, who were very desirous to be his disciples, he said nothing in conversation but what was edifying. He never swore; he never spoke disrespectfully of God; he went sometimes to hear sermons, and exhorted others to go constantly to church (64). He did not care for wine, good cheer, or money. What he paid for his lodgings at a Painter's at the Hague was very inconsiderable. He minded nothing but study, in which he spent the greatest part of the night. He lived a perfect solitary life. It is true, he did not refuse the visits occasioned by his reputation; and that sometimes he visited considerable persons, not to talk of trifling things, or for his diversion, but to discourse of state-affairs. He understood them well, though he had no share in them, and guessed pretty right what course general affairs would take. I find all these particulars in a preface of Mr Kortholt (65), who in a journey he made to Holland, informed himself of Spinoza's life as well as he could. 'Vacavit interdum doctis & principibus viris, says he (66), quos non tam convenit, quam admitti, cum iisque de rebus civilibus sermones instituit. Politici enim nomen affectabat, & futura mente ac cogitatione sagaciter prospiciebat, qualia hospitibus suis haud rara prædixit Se professus est Christianum, & vel Reformatorem vel Lutheranorum certibus non modopse adfuit, sed & aliis auctor serpenumero & hortator extitit, ut templa frequentarent, domesticque verbi quosdam divini præcones maximopere commendavit. Nec unquam jusjurandum aut petulantia de Deo dictum ex ore Spinozæ

exiit: nec largiore usus est vino, & satis duriter vixit. Ideoque hospiti quavis anni parte LXXX, aureos Belgicos tantummodo percolavit, & summum CCCC, quotannis impendit. Auro plane non inhiabat. He sometimes passed his spare hours in conversing with learned and considerable men, whose company he rather admitted than desired, and with whom he talked of political affairs. For he loved the name of a Politician, and sagaciously pierced into futurity, and foretold his friends several events. He professed to be a Christian, and not only went himself to the churches of the Calvinists or Lutherans, but likewise frequently exhorted and encouraged others to go to church and greatly recommended some preachers to his domestics. Nor did ever an oath, or indecent expression concerning GOD, come from the mouth of Spinoza. He used wine very moderately, and lived an abstemious life. Thus he paid his landlord only eighty guilders in the quarter, and spent about 400 guilders yearly. He was certainly not covetous of money.

[K] He did not then speak according to his persuasion.] On the contrary, he believed then the same things which are to be found in his posthumous works, viz. That our souls are but modifications of the substance of God. This may be certainly inferred from the preface of the book, by any person who knows Spinoza's system. I shall set down the passage of that preface, wherein it is said, that having a scholar to whom he had promised to explain Des Cartes's Philosophy, he scrupled to depart ever so little from the opinions of that Philosopher, though he did not approve of them in several things, especially in what concerns the will, and human liberty. 'Cum Discipulum suum Cartesii Philosophiam docere promississet, religio ipsi fuit, ab ejus sententia latum unguem discedere, aut quid, quod ejus dogmatibus aut non responderet, aut contrarium esset, dictare. Quamobrem judicet nemo, illum hic, aut fus, aut tantum ea, quæ probat, docere. Quamvis enim quedam vera judicet, quedam de suis addita fateatur; multa tamen occurrunt, quæ tanquam falsa rejicit, & à quibus longè diveriam fovet sententiam. Cujus note inter alia, ut ex multis unum tantum in medium afferam, sunt, quæ de voluntate habentur. Schol. Prop. 15. part. 1. Principior. & cap. 12. part. 2. Appendic. quamvis satis magno molimine atque apparatu probata videantur: Neque enim eam distinctam ab intellectu, multò minus tali præditam esse libertate existimat. Etenim in his afferendis, ut ex *Dissertat. de Method. part. 4. & Meditat. 2.* aliisque locis liquet, tantum supponit, non probat Cartesius, mentem Humanam esse substantiam absolute cogitantem. Cum contrà author noster admittat quidem, in Rerum natura esse substantiam cogitantem: Attamen neget illam constituturam essentiam Mentis humanæ; sed statuat, eodem modo quo Extensio nullis limitibus determinata est, Cogitationem etiam nullis limitibus determinari: adeoque, quemadmodum corpus humanum non est absolute, sed tantum certo modo secundum leges naturæ extensæ per motum & quietem determinata extensio; sic etiam mentem five Animam humanam non esse absolute, sed tantum secundum leges naturæ cogitantis per ideas certo modo determinatam cogitationem: quæ necessario dari concluditur, ubi corpus humanum existere incipit. Ex quâ definitione, non difficile demonstratu esse putat, Voluntatem ab intellectu non distingui, multò minus eâ, quàm illi Cartesius adscribit, pollere libertate; quin imò ipsam affirmandi & negandi facultatem prorsus fictitiam (67). When he had promised to teach his disciple the Philosophy of Des Cartes, he religiously observed this rule, not to depart in the least from Des Cartes's

(67) Ludovico Meyer, Præfat. Renati Des Cartes, &c. Principiorum more Geometrico demonstrat. per Benedictum de Spinoza.

1665, was the fore-runner of the *Traſſatus Theologico-Politicus* [L]. All thoſe, who have confuted the *Traſſatus Theologico-Politicus*, have diſcovered in it the ſeeds of Atheiſm; but none has done it ſo clearly as Mr John Bredenburg [M]. It is not ſo eaſy to answer all the difficulties contained in that book, as utterly to deſtroy the ſyſtem

* Cartes's opinions, nor diſſate any thing which either was not agreeable, or was contrary to them. Therefore let no man think that he here teaches his own opinions, or even ſuch as he approves. For though he judges ſome things in this book to be true, and owns that he has added ſome of his own, yet it contains many tenets which he rejects as falſe, and which are very different from thoſe he entertains. Of this I ſhall give one inſtance among many, in what concerns the Will, though that ſeems to be copiouſly proved. For he does not believe the will to be diſtinct from the underſtanding, much leſs does he believe it to be endowed with ſuch a liberty. For it appears from ſeveral places in Des Cartes's books that in theſe aſſertions he only ſuppoſes that the human mind is an abſolutely thinking ſubſtance; but does not prove it. Whereas our author admits indeed that there is in nature a thinking ſubſtance: but he denies that it conſtitutes the eſſence of the human mind, and lays it down that Thought, like Extension, is not determined by any limits. Thus, as the human body is not extension abſolutely, but extension determined in a certain manner by motion and reſt, according to the laws of extended nature, after the ſame manner the human mind or ſoul is not thinking abſolutely, but thinking determined in a certain manner by ideas, according to the laws of thinking nature; which thinking is concluded neceſſarily to be in the human body when it begins to exiſt. From this definition it appeared to him not difficult to demonſtrate that the will is not diſtinct from the underſtanding, much leſs that it has that liberty which Des Cartes aſſigns to it; nay even that the faculty of affirming and denying is falſe.

(68) It is the ninth.

(69) Page 41, & ſeq.

(70) His book concerning conſcience.

(71) Journal de Hambourg, Monday the 26th of October, 1694, pag. 133.

(72) Called Regnier de Manſvelt. His book was printed at Amſterdam 1674, in 4to.

[L] The *ſeudonymus* piece de Jure Eccleſiaſticorum, which was printed in the year 1665, was the fore-runner, &c.] Mr Dartis inſerting in his journal ſome objections againſt a book of M. de la Placette (70), ſays that ſincere men, who deſpise the eccleſiaſtical authority, and at the ſame time ſo much the more raiſe the temporal one . . . do not obſerve that they fall into the firſt ſnare laid by Spinoza, to open the way to his impious doctrine. This conjecture is grounded upon the date of two books published by that pernicious man, one in 1665, and the other in 1670. The firſt is intitled, *Lucii Antiftii Conſtanti de jure Eccleſiaſticorum liber ſingularis* quo dicitur: *Quodcumque Divini humanique juris Eccleſiaſtici tribuitur, vel ipſi ſibi tribuunt, hoc aut falſe impieque illis tribui, aut non aliunde quam à ſuis, hoc eſt ejus Reipublice ſive Civitatis Prodiu, in qua ſunt conſtituti, accepiſſe.* The ſecond is his *Traſſatus Theologico-Politicus*, which made a much greater noiſe than the firſt. The ſtyle and the principles of thoſe two books are ſo like, that one needs only compare them together, to be fully convinced that they were written by the ſame author. And the bare reading of them is ſufficient to ſhow, that he has only diſcredited the authority of the Clergy in the firſt, and at the ſame time raiſed that of Kings and Magiſtrates, only to make way for the impious doctrines which he aſſerts in the ſecond (71).

[M] All thoſe, who have confuted the *Traſſatus Theologico-Politicus*, have diſcovered in it the ſeeds of Atheiſm . . . but none has done it ſo clearly as Mr John Bredenburg.] I have already mentioned the poſthumous answer of a profeſſor of Philoſophy in the univerſity of Utrecht (72). To which I add, that a Socinian called Francis Cuper, who died at Rotterdam in 1695, intitled his answer to that book of Spinoza, *Arcana Atheiſmi revelata, philoſophice & paradoxe reſutata.* It is a book in 4to, printed at Rotterdam, in 1676. Mr Yvon, a diſciple of Labadie, and miniſter of the Labadiſts, at Wiewert in Frieſland, confuted the ſame book of Spinoza, in a work which he intitled, *L'Impieſt convaincu*, and published it Amſterdam in 1681,

in 8vo. It is ſaid in the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary, 1. That Mr Huet, in his *Demonſtratio Evangelica*, and Mr Simon, in his book concerning the Inſpiration of the Sacred Writings, have confuted the impious ſyſtem contained in the *Traſſatus Theologico-Politicus*. 2. That this *Traſſatus* has alſo been tranſlated into French, and printed with this title, *Reſlexions curieuſes d'un Eſprit deſintereſſé ſur les matieres les plus importantes au ſalut tant public que particulier.* I add, that this tranſlation, printed in the year 1678, in 12mo, came out with two other titles (73), as it has been rightly obſerved in the catalogue of the library of the Archbiſhop of Reims, and that the Latin original has been reprinted in 8vo, with ſeveral odd and chimerical titles, as the Bookſellers thought fit, to deceive the public, and elude the prohibitions of the magiſtrates. I further add, that Father le Vaſſor (74) has very well confuted Spinoza, in his treatiſe concerning the true religion, printed at Paris, in the year 1688. See the *Journal de Sçavans* of the thirty-fiſt of January, 1689; the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, and the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans* of the ſame year. Mr Van Til, a miniſter of Dort, wrote very good books in Dutch, to maintain the Divinity and authority of the Scripture againſt that impious man (75). The paſſage I am going to quote out of Mr Saldenus, a miniſter at the Hague, will inform us of the names of ſome other writers againſt Spinoza. That miniſter does not approve that Spinoza ſhould be confuted in the vulgar tongue; he is afraid that perſons curious, and lovers of paradoxes, will learn by that means, what it were better for them never to know all their life. 'Neque deſuere, qui ſe abominandis ipſius Hypotheſibus (76) voce calamoque oppoſuerunt. Hos inter fuere, Batelerius (77), Manſveldius, Cuperus, Muſeus, &c. qui omnes an æque feliciter contra eum decertarint, non ſine ratione à quibuſdam dubitatur. Hos ſecutus poſtmodum eſt Guilielmus Blyenbergius (78), civis Dordracenus, qui idiomate etiam vernaculo confodere ipſum laboravit; licet nesciam, an conſilio fatiſ tuto; tum quod, quem oppugnat, Adverſarius Sermone illo non ſcripſerit, tum quod periculo vix careat, ne peſtilentiſſimum impudentiſſimi Novatoris venenum, quod ſub lingua ignota latere haſtenuſ plurimos poterat, Sermone vulgato in ipſum etiam vulgus, plus juſto fere curioſum, & in paradoxo proclive, proſperat tandem & tranſeat (79). Nor were there wanting men who both preached and wrote againſt his abominable tenets; among whom were Batelerius, Manſvelt, Cuper, Muſeus, &c. Some very reaſonably doubt whether all theſe writers attacked Spinoza with equal ſucceſs. After them appeared William Blyenberg, a citizen of Dort, who endeavoured to reſute him in Dutch; tho' I know not whether this was ſafely done, both becauſe the adverſary whom he attacked, wrote not in that language, and becauſe there is ſome danger, left the poiſonous venom of that impudent innovator, which, till then, might have lain hid from ſeveral people, in an unknown language, ſhould, by being brought into the common language, creep, and diſſuſe itſelf among the generality of people who are too curious and prone to embrace paradoxes.

An anonymous writer, who denoted his name by theſe initial letters, J. M. V. D. M. published a Latin letter at Utrecht, in the year 1671, againſt the *Traſſatus Theologico-Politicus*. As for thoſe, who have inſerted in ſome books, which they did not write deſignedly againſt that tract of Spinoza, ſeveral things whereby they confute his principles, I cannot name them all, they are ſo many: I ſhall only point out two famous profeſſors of Divinity, Mr Witzius, and Mr Majus, one in Holland, and the other in Germany, and Mr de la Mothe, a French miniſter at London.

I ſhall now ſpeak of Mr John Bredenburg. He was a citizen of Rotterdam, who published there a book in 1675, intitled, *Joannis Bredenburgii Enervatio Traſſatus Theologico-Politiici, una cum Demonſtratione, geometrico ordine diſpoſita, NATURAM NON ESSE DEUM, cujus eſſati contrario prædictus Traſſatus unice innititur*

(73) One of them is, *Traité des Ceremonies ſuperſtitieſes des Juifs tant anciens que modernes, and the other La clef du Sanctuaire.*

(74) He was then Father of the Oratory: He is turned Proteſtant ſince.

(75) See the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans*, for March 1696, Art. iii.

(76) See how he ſpeaks of the *Traſſatus Theologico-Politicus*, p. 23.

(77) He ſhould have ſaid Batelerius (Jacobus): his book was printed at Amſterdam 1674, and contains 103 pages in 12mo. It is intitled, *Vindiciæ Miraculorum per quæ divine Religionis & Fidei Chriſtiane Veritas olim confirmata fuit, adverſus profanum auctorem Traſſatus Theologico-Politiici.*

(78) I think he wrote againſt the Poſthumous Works, and not againſt the *Traſſatus Theologico-Politicus*.

(79) Saldenus, in *Oditi Theologici*, pag. 25.

system of his *Opera posthuma*; for it is the most absurd and monstrous hypothesis that can be imagined, and the most contrary to the most evident notions of our mind [N]. It seems as if providence punished in a particular manner the boldness of that

(80) It is a book in 4to, of 100 pages.

(81) He owns in his preface, that not being able to express himself in Latin, he had writ his book in Dutch and then had it translated into Latin.

(82) I have been informed just now, that Cuiper did always deny it, and that he always protested that he found the demonstration among the papers of the Sieur Hartshorn, whose heir he was.

(83) I have seen the tract published at Amsterdam, in 1684, intitled, Certamen Philosophicum pro veritate divinæ ac naturalis, adversus J. B. principia, &c. It is in Latin and Dutch.

(84) I have seen something of what he published in the same year under the name of *Latinae Sententiarum*. It is a book in Latin and Dutch.

(85) See his third Dialogue at the end, or the extract of it in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, for August 1684, Art. VI, p. m. 605.

(80) He set in a full light what Spinoza had endeavoured to wrap up and disguise, and made a solid confutation of it. The readers were surprised that a man, who was no professed scholar, and who had very little learning (81), should have been able to dive into all the principles of Spinoza, and to confute them so successfully, after he had represented them in their full strength, by a fair analysis. I have heard of a remarkable thing, viz. That this author having many times considered his answer, and the principle of his adversary, found, at last, that his principle might be brought to a demonstration. Whereupon he undertook to prove, that there is no other cause of all things, but a Being, which necessarily exists, and acts, by an immutable, unavoidable, and unalterable necessity. He followed the method of the Geometricians, and after he had drawn up his demonstration, he examined it all manner of ways; he endeavoured to find out the weak side of it, and could never think of any way to confute it, nor even to weaken it. Which made him very uneasy; he groaned, and sighed, he was angry with reason, and desired his most learned friends to help him to find out the fault of that demonstration. Nevertheless, he suffered no body to take a copy of it. Francis Cuiper transcribed it by stealth, tho' he had promised not to do it (82). That man, perhaps, moved by the mutual jealousy of authors, for he had writ against Spinoza, and had not been so successful as John Bredenburg, made use of that copy some time after to accuse him of Atheism. He published it in Dutch with some reflexions; Bredenburg defended himself in the same language: several pieces were published on both sides, which I have not read, for I do not understand Dutch. Orobio, a Jew, who was an able Physician (83), and Aubert de Verfe (84) engaged in that quarrel, and sided with Cuiper. They maintained that the author of the demonstration was a Spinozist, and consequently an Atheist. As far as I have been able to understand by what I have heard, the latter defended himself, by alleging the common distinction between faith and reason. He pretended that as the Protestants and the Catholics believe the mystery of the Trinity, tho' inconsistent with the light of nature, he believed free-will, tho' reason afforded him strong proofs that every thing happens by an unavoidable necessity, and consequently that there can be no religion. It is no easy thing to drive a man out of such an entrenchment. It may be said that he is not sincere, and that is impossible to believe, as a truth, what is contrary to a Geometrical demonstration: but can this be said without setting yourself up for a judge in a case, wherein incompetency may be objected against you? Have we a right to decide what passes in other mens hearts? Have we a sufficient knowledge of a man's soul, to be positive that such and such combinations cannot be found in it? Have we not many instances of absurd combinations, and such as come nearer to a contradiction than that which John Bredenburg alleged? For it ought to be observed that there is no contradiction between these two things: 1. Reason teaches me that this is false; 2. And yet I believe it, because I am persuaded that reason is not infallible, and because I had rather follow an inward sense, and the impressions of conscience, in short, the word of God, than a metaphysical demonstration. This is not believing, and disbelieving at the same time one and the same thing. Such a combination is impossible, and no man ought to be admitted to allege it for his vindication. However it be, the man I speak of made it appear that the sense of religion, and the hopes of another life prevailed in his soul against his demonstration; and I have been told that the marks he gave of it, during his last sickness, put his sincerity out of all doubt. The Abbot de Dangeau (85) speaks of some men, whose religion is in their mind, and not in their heart; they are persuaded of the truth of it, but their conscience is not affected with the love of God. I think it may likewise be said that there are some men, whose religion is in their heart, and not in their mind. They lose sight of it, when they make use of reason to come to the know-

ledge of it; it escapes the subtilties and sophisms of their Logic; they know not which way to turn whilst they proclaim the arguments *pro* and *con*: but when they leave off disputing, and mind only their inward sense, the instinct of conscience, the power of education, &c. they are persuaded that there is a religion, and conform their lives to it as much as human infirmities can permit. This was the case of Cicero: one can hardly doubt it who compares his other books with those of *Natura Deorum*, wherein he makes Cotta triumph over all the interlocutors, who maintained the existence of the gods.

Whoever desires to know the shifts and equivocations made use of by Spinoza to conceal his Atheism, needs only read Christian Kortholt's book *de tribus Impostoribus magnis* (86), printed at Kiel in 1680, in 12mo. The author has there collected several passages of Spinoza, and shown all the venom and artifice that lie in them. This is not the least curious part of the history and character of that Atheist. He quotes (87), among other things, his letter (88), wherein Spinoza complains that there was a report (89) that he had a book in the press to prove that there is no God.

[N] The most absurd and monstrous hypothesis . . . the most contrary to the most evident notions of our mind. He supposes (90) that there is but one substance in nature, and that this only substance is endowed with infinite attributes, and among others, with extension. In the universe are modifications of that substance, as it is extended; and that for instance, the souls of men are modifications of that substance, as it thinks: so that God, the necessary and most perfect Being, is the cause of all things that exist, but does not differ from them. There is but one Being, and one Nature, and that Being produces in itself, and by an immanent action, whatever goes by the name of creatures. He is at once both agent and patient, efficient cause, and subject; He produces nothing but what is his own modification. This is the most extravagant hypothesis that can be thought of. The most infamous things sung by the heathen Poets against Jupiter, and against Venus, do not come near the horrid notion Spinoza gives us of God. For the Poets did not ascribe to the gods all the crimes that are committed, all the infirmities of mankind; but, according to Spinoza, there is no other agent, nor other patient but God, with respect to physical and moral evil. Let us observe some of the absurdities of his system.

I. It is impossible that the universe should be the only substance; for whatever is extended must necessarily consist of parts, and whatever consists of parts must be compounded: and as the parts of extension do not subsist one in another, it necessarily follows that extension in general is not a substance, or that each part of extension is a particular substance, and distinct from all others. But, according to Spinoza, extension in general is the attribute of a substance. He owns, as all other Philosophers do, that the attribute of a substance does not really differ from that substance; and therefore he must acknowledge that extension in general is a substance: from whence it ought to be concluded, that each part of extension is a particular substance; which overthrows the foundation of the whole system of that author. He cannot say that extension in general is distinct from the substance of God; for should he say so, it would follow that this substance is in itself unextended: and therefore it could never have acquired the three dimensions but by creating them, since it is manifest that extension cannot proceed from an unextended subject, but by way of creation. But Spinoza did not believe that any thing could be made out of nothing. Again, it is manifest, that a substance unextended by its nature, can never become the subject of the three dimensions; for how could they be placed upon a mathematical point? They would therefore subsist without a subject; and therefore they would be a substance: so that if this author admitted a real distinction between the substance of God and extension in general, he would be obliged to say, that God is composed of two substances distinct one from another, viz. of his unextended being, and

(86) Viz. Edward Lord Herbert of Cherbury; Thomas Hobbes; and Benedict de Spinoza.

(87) Christ. Kortholt, de tribus Impostoribus, p. 171.

(88) Written to Mr. Oldenbourg, in 1675.

(89) See what is said in the *Opera posthuma*, where he complains of the report that he had a book in the press to prove that there is no God.

(90) See among his *Posthuma Works* the piece intitled *Ethica*.

THAT according to Spinoza, God and extension are the same thing.

that author, by blinding him to such a degree, that in order to avoid some difficulties, which

of extension. Thus he is obliged to acknowledge that extension and God are but one and the same thing; and besides, as he maintains that there is but one substance in the universe, he must needs teach that extension is a simple Being, and as much compounded as Mathematical points. But is not this a most ridiculous assertion, and contrary to our most distinct ideas? Is it more evident that the number one thousand is made up of a thousand units, than it is evident that a body of an hundred inches is made up of a hundred parts really distinct one from another, each of which has the extension of an inch?

THAT extension is composed of parts, each of which is a particular substance.

It were in vain to raise any objections against our imagination and our senses; for the most intellectual and the most immaterial notions discover to us, with the utmost evidence, that there is a most real distinction between things, one of which has a property, which the other has not. The school-men have been very successful in showing the characters and infallible signs of distinction. When, say they, we may affirm of one thing, what cannot be affirmed of another, those two things are distinct: things that may be separated one from another, either with respect to time, or with respect to place, are distinct. If we apply those characters to the twelve inches of the foot of extension, we shall find a true distinction between them. I can affirm of the fifth, that it is contiguous to the sixth, and I can deny it of the first and second, &c. I can remove the sixth to the place of the twelfth; and therefore it may be separated from the fifth. Note, that Spinoza cannot deny that the characters of distinction made use of by the school-men are very just; for it is by these characters he acknowledges that stones and animals are not the same modification of the infinite Being. He acknowledges therefore, will they say, that there is some difference between things. He must needs own it, for he was not so extravagant as to believe that there was no difference between him and the Jew, who gave him a stab with a knife; or to say, that his bed and his chamber were, in all respects, the same being with the Emperor of China. What did he say then? He taught, not that two trees are two parts of extension, but only two modifications. You will be surprised that he spent so many years in forging a new system, since one of the main pillars of it was to be the pretended difference between the word *part* and the word *modification*. Could he expect any advantage from this change of a word? What signifies it, whether he declines to use the word *part*, and substitutes the word *modification* in the room of it? Will the notions annexed to the word *part* vanish away? Will they not be applied to the word *modification*? Are the signs and characters of difference less real or evident, when matter is divided into modifications, than when it is divided into parts? Not at all. The idea of matter still remains the idea of a compound being, of a system of several substances. This will be fully proved by what I am going to say.

MODIFICATIONS inconsistent, require distinct subjects.

Modifications are beings, which cannot exist without the substance they modify; and therefore there ought to be a substance wherever there are modifications; nay, it must needs be multiplied in proportion as modifications inconsistent one with another are multiplied: so that wherever there are five or six such modifications, there are also five or six substances. It is evident, and no Spinozist can deny it, that the square and the circular figures cannot be in the same piece of wax. And therefore the substance modified by a square figure is not the same substance with that which is modified by the circular figure. When therefore I see a round table, and a square table, in a room, I may affirm that the extension, which is the subject of the round table, is a substance distinct from the extension, which is the subject of the other table; for otherwise the square figure and the round figure would be at the same time in one and the same subject; which is impossible. Iron and water, wine and wood, are incompatible; and therefore they require distinct subjects. The lower end of a stake driven into a river is not the same modification with the other end: It is surrounded with earth, whilst the other is surrounded with water; and therefore they have two contradictory

VOL. V.

attributes, viz. being surrounded with water, not being surrounded with water: and therefore the subject they modify must be at least two substances; for one only substance cannot be at the same time modified by an accident surrounded with water, and by an accident not surrounded with water. This shows that extension is made up of as many distinct substances as there are modifications.

II. If it be an absurd thing to say that God is extended, because, it is depriving him of his simplicity, and ascribing to him an infinite number of parts; what shall we say when we consider that this opinion reduces him to the condition of matter, the vilest of all beings, and such as most of the ancient Philosophers have placed immediately next to nothing. Matter is the stage of all sorts of changes, the field of battle of contrary causes, the subject of all corruptions, and of all generations; in a word, there is no being, whose nature is more inconsistent with the immutability of God. And yet the Spinozists maintain that it suffers no division; and the reason they alledge for it is the most frivolous and most silly cavilling in the world. They pretend that if matter was divided, one of its portions should be separated from others by empty spaces; which never happens. This is certainly a very wrong definition of division. We are as really separated from our friends, when the space that divides us is taken up by other men placed a breast, as if it was full of earth. And therefore when the Spinozists maintain, that matter reduced into ashes and smoke is not actually divided, they advance a thing quite contrary to our notions and manner of speaking. But what will they get, if we should lay aside the advantage we may draw from their wrong defining division? There will remain still many proofs of the mutability and corruptibility of the god of Spinoza. All men have a very clear idea of an immutable Being: They understand by that word a Being, which never acquires any thing new; which never loses what it is once possessed of; which is always the same, both with respect to its substance, and to the manner of its Being. The clearness of this idea enables us to apprehend most distinctly what a mutable Being is: It is not only a Being, whose existence may begin and have an end; but a Being, which always subsisting as to its substance, may successively acquire several modifications, and lose the accidents or forms which it once had. All the ancient Philosophers have acknowledged, that the continual series of generations and corruptions, which is observed in the world, neither produces nor destroys any portion of matter: hence it is, that they said that matter is ingenerable and incorruptible as to its substance, though it be the subject of all generations and all corruptions. The same matter which is fire now, was wood before; all its essential attributes remain the same under the form of wood; and under the form of fire: and therefore it loses and acquires nothing but accidents and modes, when wood is changed into fire, bread into flesh, flesh into earth, &c. And yet it is the most sensible and the most proper example that can be given of a mutable Being, and actually liable to all sorts of alterations and internal changes. I call them internal; for the different forms under which it exists are not like the different cloaths under which actors appear upon the stage. The bodies of those actors may subsist without any manner of change or alteration under a thousand different dresses: Cloth and linnen, silk and gold, are not united with the man that wears them; they are still foreign bodies, and outward ornaments; but the forms produced in matter are inwardly and penetratively united to it; it is their subject of inherence, and according to right Philosophy, there is no other distinction between them and matter, than what is to be found between modes and a thing modified. From whence it follows, that the god of the Spinozists is a Being actually changing, that goes continually through several states internally and really different one from another. It is not therefore the most perfect Being, *with whom there is no variability, neither shadow of turning* (91).

Note, that the Proteus mentioned by the Poets, their Theris, and their Vertumhus, who were images and examples of inconsistency, and which occasioned

G g g

THE immutability of God is inconsistent with the nature of extension. That matter is actually divided into parts.

matter
form

(91) Jan. i. 17.

which may perplex a Philosopher, he run himself into others infinitely more inexplicable, and

the proverbs whereby the oddest fickleness of men was denoted, would have been immutable gods, if the god of the Spinozists was immutable; for it was never pretended that there happened any alteration in their substance, but only new modifications.

(92) Horat.
Epist. I, lib. i,
ver. 90.

Quo teneam vultus mutantem Proteus nodo (92).

What charm can hold this varying Proteus fast. CREECH.

..... sæpe notatus

Cum tribus annellis, modo læva Priæcus inani,
Vixit inæqualis, clavum ut mutaret in horas:
Ædibus ex magnis subito se conderet, unde
Mundior exiret vix libertinus honeste.
Jam mæchus Romæ, jam mallet doctus Athenis
Vivere: Vertumanis, quotquot sunt, natus iniquis.

• Horat. Sat.
VII, lib. ii,
ver. 3.

Fop Priæcus with himself doth disagree,
Sometimes he wears no rings, and sometimes three.
He changes every hour his cloaths and gown,
Now takes the best house, now the worst in town,
And there he goes as natty as a clown.
Now studies hard at Athens, now he'll come,
And turn gallant, and follow vobores at Rome:
The most unsteady, fickle man on earth
As if Vertumna's self had rul'd his birth. CREECH.

See below remark [CC]. If any reader wants here something to entertain him, let him read these Verses of Virgil concerning Proteus.

Verum, ubi correptum manibus, vinclicque tenebis,
Tum variæ illudent species, atque ora ferarum:
Fiet enim subito sus horridus, atque tigris,
Squamosusque draco, & fulvâ cervice leæna:
Aut acrem flammæ sonitum dabit, atque ita vinculis
Excidet: aut in aquas tenues delapsus abibit.
Sed, quanto ille magis formas se vertet in omnes,
Tantò, nate, magis contende tenacia vincla:
Donec talis erit mutato corpore, qualem
Videris, incepto tegetet cum lumina fomno (93).

(93) Virgil.
Georg. lib. iv,
ver. 405. See
also Horace, Sat.
III, lib. ii. They
took it from
Homer, Odyss.
lib. iv.

Thus surely bound, yet be not over bold,
The slippery god will try to lose his hold.
And various forms assume, to cheat thy sight;
And with vain images of beasts affright.
With foamy tusks will seem a bristly boar,
Or imitate the lion's angry roar;
Break out in crackling flames to shun thy snares,
Or hiss a dragon, or a tyger stares:
Or with a snake, thy caution to betray,
In fleeting streams attempt to slide away.
But thou, the more he varies forms, beware
To strain his fetters with a stricter care.
Till tiring all his arts, he turns agen
To his true shape, in which he first was seen.

DRYDEN.

(94) Ovid. Me-
tam. lib. xi, Fab.
vii, ver. 221, &
seq.

(95) Id. ibid.
lib. xiv, Fab.
xvi, ver. 647,
& seq.

THAT God can-
not be the sub-
ject of inher-
ence of men's
thoughts, since
they are contrary
to one another.

As for what concerns Thetis see Ovid (94): See also the same Poet concerning Vertumnus (95), and besides consult the fourth book of Propertius in the second Elegy.

III. We shall see still more monstrous absurdities, if we consider the god of Spinoza as being the subject of all the modifications of thought. The combination of extension and thought, in one and the same substance, is already one great difficulty; for the question is not about a mixture like that of metals, or that of wine and water, which requires only a *juxta-position*: But the combination of thought and extension ought to be an identity; thought and extension are two attributes identified with substance. They are therefore identified among themselves, by the fundamental and essential rule of human Logic (96). I am sure that if Spinoza had found the same intricacy in another sect, he would

(96) Quæ sunt
idem uni ter-
tio, sunt idem inter
se.

have thought it unworthy of his attention; but he did not much trouble himself with it in his own cause: So true it is that the most disdainful censurers of other mens thoughts, are very indulgent to themselves. Doubtless, he derided the mystery of the Trinity, and wondered that so many people should speak of a nature terminated by three hypostases; and yet, properly speaking, he ascribed as many persons to the divine nature as there are men upon earth. He looked upon those as fools who believed Transubstantiation, and who say that a man may be in many places at one and the same time, may be alive in Paris, and dead at Rome, &c. and yet he maintains, that the extended substance, though but one and indivisible, is all at once every where, cold in one place, hot in another, melancholy in one place, merry in another, &c. This by the by: but mind what I am going to say. If there is any thing certain and undeniable in human knowledge, it is this proposition: *Opposita sunt quæ neque de se invicem, neque de eodem tercio secundum idem, ad idem, eodem modo atque tempore vere affirmari possunt*

(97). That is, two opposite terms cannot be truly affirmed of the same subject in the same respects, and at the same time. For instance, one cannot say without lying, *Peter is well, Peter is sick*: He denies that, and he affirms it: supposing, that the terms have always the same relation, and are taken in the same sense. The Spinozists destroy that idea, and falsify it in such a manner, that I do not know whence they can take the character of truth; for if such propositions were false, there is none that can be warranted to be true. And therefore it is vain to dispute with them; for if they deny this, they may as well deny any other reason alledged against them. I shall make it appear that this axiom (98) is very false in their system; and in order to it, I lay down first of all this undeniable maxim, that all the names that are given to a subject to signify what it does, or what it suffers, do properly and physically belong to its substance, and not to its accidents. When we say iron is hard, iron is heavy, it sinks into water, it cleaves wood, we do not pretend to say that its hardness is hard, that its heaviness is heavy, &c. This would be an impertinent way of speaking: we mean that the extended substance it is made of resists, is heavy, goes down into water, and cleaves wood. In like manner when we say that a man denies, affirms, is angry, is kind, praises, &c. we ascribe all those attributes to the substance of his soul, and not to his thoughts, as they are accidents or modifications. And therefore were it true, as Spinoza will have it, that men are modifications of God, we should speak falsely should we say, Peter denies this, he wills that, he affirms such a thing; for, according to that system, it is properly God who denies, who wills, who affirms, and consequently all the denominations, resulting from the thoughts of all men, do properly and physically belong to the substance of God. From whence it follows that God hates and loves, denies and affirms, the same things, at the same time, and according to all the conditions requisite, to make the rule I have mentioned concerning opposite terms false: for it cannot be denied, that according to all those conditions strictly taken, some men love and affirm what other men hate and deny. I go further still: the contradictory terms, to will and not to will, belong at the same time to different men according to all those conditions; and therefore according to Spinoza's system they belong to that sole and indivisible substance he calls God. It is therefore God who at the same time forms an act of will, and does not form it with respect to the same object. And therefore two contradictory terms are true of him; which overthrows the first principles in Metaphysics (99). I am not ignorant that in disputes concerning Transubstantiation, a cavil is made use of which might help the Spinozists. It is said that if Peter wills a thing at Rome, which he does not will at Paris, the contradictory terms to will and not to will, are not true with respect to him; for since it is supposed he wills at Rome, it were a lie to say he wills not. I leave them this vain subtilty, and I shall only say, that as a square circle is a contradiction, a substance is so too, when it loves and hates the same object at the same time. A square circle would be and would not be

(97) See Logica, Comin. in Crisp. x, Aristotelis de Predicamentis, pag. n. 275, and the Logic of Burgeff, lib. i, cap. xxii, p. n. 127.

(98) That is, the above-mentioned definition of opposite terms, citation (97).

all
things

(99) Duo contra-
dictoria non pos-
sunt esse simul
vera: de quibus
re vera est asser-
tio vel negatio.
See Aristotle's
Metaphysics, ch. iii, re,
of the fourth book.

and so obvious that any man of a right judgment must needs perceive them. They who complain that the authors who have undertaken to confute him, have not been successful, confound

be a circle; which is a plain contradiction: It would be a circle according to the supposition, and it would be no circle, since the circular figure is wholly inconsistent with the square figure. I say the same of a substance, that loves and hates the same thing: it loves, and does not love it; this is a downright contradiction: it loves it, according to the supposition; it does not love it, since hatred does essentially exclude love. Thus you see what it is to be over-nice.

Spinoza could not bear the least obscurity of Peripateticism, Judaism, or Christianity; and yet he heartily embraced an hypothesis, which reconciles two things so contrary to one another, as the square and the circular figures, and whereby an infinite number of inconsistent attributes, and all the variety and antipathy of the thoughts of mankind are made true and consistent at the same time in one and the same most simple and indivisible substance. We commonly say, *quod capitis tot sensus*, as many men so many minds; but according to Spinoza all the minds or thoughts of men are in one head. The bare relating of such things is a sufficient confutation of them, and clearly shews they are contradictory; for it is manifest either that nothing is impossible, no not that two and two should make twelve, or that there are in the universe as many substances as subjects, which cannot receive at the same time the same denominations.

ANOTHER proof of what has been said, taken from the wickedness of man's thoughts.

IV. But if it be, physically speaking, a prodigious absurdity, that a simple and only Being should be modified at the same time by the thoughts of all men, it is an execrable abomination, if it be considered with regard to morality. How then? shall not the infinite, the necessary, the most perfect Being be steady, constant, and immutable? Why do I say, immutable? it will not be one moment the same; its thoughts will continually succeed one another; the same odd mixture of passions and sentiments will never happen twice. This is hard to be digested; but here is something worse. This continual changeableness will be very uniform in this sense, that for one good thought the infinite Being will have a thousand foolish, extravagant, filthy, and abominable. It will produce in it self all the follies, idle fancies, lewd and unjust practices of mankind: it will be not only the efficient cause of them, but also the passive subject, the *subiectum inbecillitatis*: it will be united to them by the most intimate union that can be conceived; for it is a penetrative union, or rather a perfect identity, since the modification is not really distinct from the modified substance. Several great Philosophers not being able to apprehend how the most perfect Being can permit that man should be so wicked and so unhappy, have supposed two principles, the one good, and the other bad (100); but here is a Philosopher, who is pleased to make God himself the agent and patient, the cause and subject of all the crimes and miseries of men. If men hate and assassinate one another, if they form themselves into armies to kill one another, if the conquerors eat sometimes the conquered; it is a thing that may be apprehended, because it is supposed they are distinct one from another, and that *meum* and *tuum* produce contrary passions in them. But to affirm that men are only the modification of one and the same Being, that consequently God only acts, and that the same individual God being modified into Turks and Hungarians, there are wars and battles, is to advance a thing more monstrous and chimerical than all the deliriums of men shut up in mad-houses. Take particular notice, as I have said before, that modes do nothing, and that substances only act and suffer. This phrase, *the sweetness of honey pleases the palate*, is only true, as it signifies that the extended substance of which honey is made up pleases the palate. Thus according to Spinoza's system, whoever says, *the Germans have killed ten thousand Turks*, speaks improperly and falsely, unless he means GOD modified into Germans has killed GOD modified into ten thousand Turks: And therefore all the phrases made use of to express what men do one against another, have no other true sense but this, GOD hates himself; he asks favours of himself, and refuses them to himself; he persecutes himself, kills himself, eats himself (101), calumniates himself, executes himself, &c. This would be less incomprehensible, if Spinoza had represented God as a col-

lection of many distinct parts; but he reduces him to the most perfect simplicity, to an unity of substance, to indivisibility. And therefore he asserts the most infamous and the maddest extravagances that can be conceived, infinitely more ridiculous than those of the Poets concerning the gods of the Heathens. I wonder he either did not perceive them, or, if he did, how he persisted obstinately in his principle. A man of sense would rather chafe to grub up a piece of ground with his teeth and nails, than to cultivate such an offensive and absurd hypothesis.

V. Here follow two other objections. Some Philosophers have been so impious as to deny the being of a God; but they did not carry their extravagance so far, as to say, that if he did exist, he would not be perfectly happy. The greatest Sceptics among the Ancients said, that all men have an idea of God, according to which he is a living, happy, and incorruptible Being, of a perfect felicity, and susceptible of no evil. Κοινὴν ἀπόληψιν ἔχουσι πάντες ἄνθρωποι περὶ Θεοῦ, καθ' ἣν μακάριον τι ἐστὶ ζῶν καὶ ἀθάνατον, καὶ τέλειον ἐν εὐδαιμονίᾳ, καὶ παντὸς κακῆ ἀνεπίδεκτον: Communem anticipatam homines omnes habent de Deo notionem, ex qua est beatum quoddam animal, ab interitu alienum, in felicitate perfectum, in quod nullum possit malum cadere (102). Happiness was the most inseparable property contained in this idea: those who deprived him of power and the direction of the world, acknowledged his felicity and immortal beatitude.

ANOTHER proof of what has been said above, taken from man's misery.

(102) Sextus Empiricus adversus Mathematicos. lib. viii. §. ii.

Omnia enim per se Divum natura necesse est Immortali ævo summa cum pace fruatur, Semota ab nostris rebus sejunctaque longe; Nam privata dolore omni, privata periculis, Ipsa suis pollens opibus, nihil indiga nostri, Nec bene promeritis capitur, nec tangitur ira (103).

For whatsoe'er's divine must live in peace,
In undisturb'd and everlasting ease:
Not care for us, from fears and dangers free,
Sufficient to its own felicity:
Nought here below, nought in our power it needs;
Ne'er smiles at good, ne'er frowns at wicked deeds.

CREECH.

Those who made him subject to death, said at least, that he was happy all his life-time. It was, doubtless, a horrid extravagance not to ascribe immortality as well as happiness to the Divine nature. Plutarch does very well confute this absurdity of the Stoics: I shall set down his words somewhat at large, because they prove a thought, which I have advanced above, and because they confute the Spinozists; for his argument is inconsistent with the hypothesis, according to which God is subject to death, as to his parts or modalities, that he is, as it were, the matter of generations and corruptions, that he destroys his own modalities, that he supports himself with that destruction, &c. Καὶ ἴσως ἐνύχοι τις ἂν ἐθνεσι βαρβάρους καὶ ἀγροίους θεῶν μὴ νοήσει. θεῶν δὲ νοῶν, μὲν νοῶν δὲ ἀθάνατον μηδὲ αἰδίον, ἄνθρωποι εἰδὲ εἰς γίγνοντες. οἱ γὰρ ἀθεοὶ περισσασσομένης ἔτοι, θεοδωρεῖ, καὶ διαγόμεν, καὶ ἵπκωντες, ἐκ ἐτόλμησαν εἰπεῖν το θεῶν ὅτι ἀθάνατον εἶναι ἀλλ' ἐκ ἐπίστασαν ὡς ἐστὶ τι ἀθάνατον τῷ μὲν ἀθάνατον τὴν ὑπάρξιν μὴ ἀπολείποντες, τῷ θεῷ δὲ τὴν πρόληψιν φυλάττοντες. ἀλλὰ χρύσιον καὶ κλεάνθους ἐμπειληκότες (ὡς ἐπὶ εἰπεῖν) τῷ λόγῳ θεῶν τὸν ἑσπέρην, τὴν γῆν, τὸν αἶρα, τὴν θαλάσσαν, εἰδὲνα τὰν τοσούτων ἀθάνατον εἰδὲ αἰδίον ἀπολείπειν, πλὴν μόνον τῷ διδόντι εἰς ὃν πάντας καταλαίσκοντι τὸς ἄλλους. ὥς καὶ τὴν τὸ φθείρειν προσείπει τὸ φθείρειν καὶ μὴ ἐπισκίσειν. ἀσθενεία γὰρ τι καὶ τὸ μεταβάλλον εἰς ἕτερον φθείρεται, καὶ τὸ τοῖς ἄλλοις εἰς ἐαυτὸ φθείρεται τριβόμενον σάββα. Ac fieri sane potest, ut incidat aliquis in homines barbaros & feros, qui Deum esse nullum putent: deum esse qui existimet: sed eundem non securum interitus, non æternum, inventus est ne unus quidem homo. Certè qui athei appellantur quod negarent esse deos, Theodorus, Diagoras, Hippon: non aut sunt dicere deum esse interitui

(103) Lucretius, lib. i. ver. 57. The Epicureans ascribed to the gods whatsoever Homer ascribes to them in these words: so often repeated: Μῆναρ δὲ θεοὶ αἰὲν ἀθάνατοι. Beati Dii semper exstantes. --- The gods always happy.

(100) See the articles MANICHEES, MARCIONITES, PAULICIANS.

(101) The fable of Saturn, who devoured his own children, is infinitely less unreasonable than Spinoza's assertion.

confound things: they would have the difficulties, under which he sunk, wholly removed [O]; but they should be contented to see his hypothesis entirely overthrown, as

teritui obnoxium, sed non crediderunt aliquid esse ab interitu immune, ac talem naturam aliquam esse posse negantes, notitiam de deo reliquerunt in medio. Chrysippus verò & Cleanthes, cum implevisent (ut sic dicam) suis dictis cælum, terras, ærem, mare diis: nullum horum ab interitu liberum aut sempiternum statuerunt: solo Jove excepto; in quem reliquos omnes consumi putant; ut jam is perdat, quod nihilo est quam perire melius. Est enim imbecillitas ut pereundo in alium transire, ita interitu aliorum in se transeuntium nutriri atque servari (104). - - - And, indeed, we may

(104) Plutarch, *adversus Stoicos*, pag. 1075. A.

happen to meet with barbarous and savage men, who believe that there is no G O D. But there was never found any man, who believing that there was no G O D, did not at the same time believe him incorruptible and eternal. For those who are called Atheists, such as Theodorus, Diagoras, and Hyppo, did not dare to say that G O D was corruptible; they, indeed, believed that there was nothing exempt from corruption, while they denied that no Being was incorruptible, they determined nothing concerning G O D. But Chrysippus and Cleanthes, having filled (as one may say) the Heavens, the Earth, the Air, the Sea, with gods, affirmed that none of these gods was incorruptible or eternal: they excepted Jupiter only, into whom they thought that all the other gods were dissolved, and they made him decay, which is no better than perishing. For as it implies a weakness and defect in one Being to perish and be dissolved into another, so it implies a weakness and defect in that other Being to be nourished and preserved by the former dissolving into it. But tho' this doctrine of the Stoics was never so extravagant, it did not deprive the gods of happiness during their life. Perhaps the Spinozists are the only men, who have made the Deity subject to misery (105).

(105) Their predecessors, whom I have mentioned in the first remark, have not cleared and divided into the consequences of their principle, as Spinoza does.

But what misery? A misery so great, that he falls into despair, and would annihilate himself if he could; he endeavours to do it; he deprives himself of as many things as he can; he hangs himself, he throws himself headlong down a precipice, being no longer able to bear the terrible melancholy that consumes him. This is not declamation; it is an exact and Philosophical language: for if man is only a modification, he does nothing: it were an impertinent, ridiculous, and burlesque, expression to say, *Joy is merry, sadness is sad*: it is a phrase no less impertinent in Spinoza's system, to affirm, *man thinks, man afflicts himself, man bangs himself, &c.* All those propositions ought to be affirmed of the substance, whereof man is only a mode. How could Spinoza think that an independent and self-existent Being, endowed with infinite perfections, is subject to all the miseries incident to mankind? If some other Being forced it to vex itself, and to feel pain, it's striving to make it's self unhappy would be less surprizing; one might say, it must needs obey a stronger power; it is likely it torments itself with the gravel, the cholic, a fever, and madness, to avoid a greater evil. But it is the only Being in the universe, there is nothing that commands, exhorts, or intreats, it. It is it's own nature, will Spinoza say, that moves it under some circumstances, to give itself a great deal of vexation, and a very violent pain. But I will ask him whether he does not find something monstrous and unconceivable in such a fatality.

(106) You will find the sequel of these words of Cicero, in the remark [O], citation (112) of the article PYTHAGORAS.

THE system of Spinoza makes his whole conduct, and all his discourses ridiculous.

The strong reasons alledged against those, who maintained that our souls are a portion of G o d, are still more solid against Spinoza. It is objected against Pythagoras, in a piece of Cicero, that three palpable falsities result from that doctrine: 1, That the Divine Nature would be torn in pieces. 2, That it would be miserable whenever men are so. 3, That man's mind would be ignorant of nothing, since it would be G o d. *Nam Pythagoras qui censuit, &c.* (106).

VI. Were it not that I remember I do not write a book against that man, but only some short observations by the by, I could find many other absurdities in his system. I shall conclude with this. He engaged in an hypothesis, which makes all his labours ridiculous; and I am sure that every page of his Ethics affords a horrid piece of nonsense. First, I would fain know whom he has in view, when he rejects some doctrines, and proposes others. Does he design to teach some truths? Would he confute some errors? But how can he say that there are any errors among men? Are not the thoughts of the common Philoso-

phers, those of the Jews, those of the Christians, modes of the Infinite Being, as well as those of his Ethics? Are they not realities as necessary to the perfection of the universe, as all his speculations? Do they not arise from the necessary cause? How then can he pretend that they want to be rectified? In the second place, does he not say that the nature, whereof they are modalities, acts necessarily, and always follows it's course; that it can neither turn aside nor stop; and that being the only nature in the universe, no outward cause will ever stop or rectify it. And therefore nothing can be more needless than the instructions of this Philosopher. Does it become him, who is but the modification of a substance, to prescribe to the Infinite Being what it ought to do? Will that Being hear him? And if it should hear him, could it be the better for what he says? Does it not always act according to the whole extent of it's power, without knowing either whither it goes, or what it does? Such a man as Spinoza would set his mind at rest, if he reasoned well. If it be possible, would he say, for such a doctrine to take root, the necessity of nature will establish it without my book: if it be not possible, all my writings will be insignificant.

[O] They would have the difficulties, under which Spinoza sunk, wholly removed. I think it may be supposed that he run into these absurdities, because he could not apprehend either that matter is eternal, and different from G o d, or that it has been produced out of nothing, or that an Infinite Mind, perfectly free, and the Creator of all things, could produce such a work as the world. A matter that necessarily exists, and yet is destitute of activity, and subject to the power of another principle, is a thing that does not suit with reason. We see no affinity between those three qualities; such a combination is repugnant to the idea of order. A matter created out of nothing cannot be conceived, tho' we strive never so much to form an idea of an act of will, which changes into a real substance what was nothing before. This principle of the Antients, *ex nihilo, nihil fit*, - - - *Nothing is made of nothing*, offers itself continually to our imagination, and there appears with such evidence, that it stops us short, in case we have begun to frame any conception of creation. Lastly, that a G o d, infinitely good, infinitely holy, infinitely free, who could make creatures always holy, and always happy, should rather chuse to make them criminal, and eternally miserable, is a thing that shocks reason; and so much the more, because it cannot reconcile man's free-will

(107) That is, the liberty of the difference.

(107) with the quality of a Being created out of nothing. But unless those two things be reconciled, it cannot conceive how man deserves any punishment under a free, good, holy, and just Providence. These three inconveniences put Spinoza upon looking for a new system, wherein G o d should not be distinct from matter, and should act necessarily, and according to the whole extent of his power, not out of himself, but in himself. It results from this supposition, that this necessary cause, whose power is not limited, and whose actions are not directed by goodness, justice, and knowledge, but only by the infinite power of it's nature, must needs have modified itself according to all possible realities, so that errors and vices, pain and grief, being modalities as real as truth, virtue, and pleasure, all those things must have been in the universe. Spinoza hoped to resolve by that means the objections of the Manichees, against the one only principle. Those objections have no force but on the supposition that one only principle of all things acts by choice, and can act or forbear acting, and confines it's power according to the rules of goodness and equity, or according to the instinct of malice. This being supposed, the question is, if that one only principle be good, whence comes evil? If it be bad, whence comes good? *Deteriora velle, nostri fuerit fortasse defectus: posse vero contra innocentiam, quæ sceleratus quicque conceperit, inspiciente Deo, monstri simile est: unde haud injuria tuorum quidam familiarium quæfivit: Si quidem Deus, inquit, est, unde mala? bona vero unde, si non est (108)? - - - To have a will to do evil, is, perhaps, our defect: but for a villain, in the sight of God, to do against an innocent man whatever he devises, is a thing monstrous. From m. 11.*

(108) Boethius, de Consolat. Phil. Joseph. lib. 4. Proje 10, 12.

hence,

as has been done even by his weakest adversaries [P]. It must not be forgot that this impious

hence one of your friends asked, and not without reason, If there is a God, whence comes evil; and if there is no God, whence comes good? Spinoza would answer, my one only principle being able to do good and evil, and doing whatever it can do, good and evil must necessarily be in the world. But if you consider the three inconveniences he intended to avoid, and the extravagant and abominable consequences of his hypothesis, you will find that his choice is neither that of a good man, nor that of a man of parts. He lays aside some things, of which, the worst that can be said is, that the weakness of our reason does not allow us clearly to perceive the possibility of them; and he admits others, which are evidently impossible. There is a great difference between not comprehending the possibility of a thing, and comprehending the impossibility of it. Now see the injustice of the readers. They require from all those, who write against Spinoza, that they should remove the difficulties which perplexed him, and set in a clear light the truths he could not comprehend; and because they find no such thing in the writings of the Anti-Spinozists, they declare they have not succeeded. Is it not sufficient to overthrow the system of that Atheist Reason teaches us that custom ought to be maintained against innovators, unless they bring in better laws; and if their opinions were not better than those that are commonly received, they would deserve to be rejected, tho' they were not worse than the abuses they intend to suppress. It ought to be said to those men, submit to custom, or give us something better (109). Much more ought we to reject the system of the Spinozists, since in freeing us from some difficulties, it involves us in more inextricable perplexities. If the difficulties were equal on both sides, the common system should be preferred to the other, because, besides the privilege of possession it hath also this advantage, that it promises us a great happiness for the time to come, and affords us a thousand comforts in the miseries of this life. How great a satisfaction is it in our adversity to hope that God will hear our prayers, and that, if he does not hear them, he will however reward our patience, and indemnify us in a glorious manner? It is a great comfort to flatter one's self that other men will have some regard to the dictates of their conscience, and to the fear of God. Wherefore the common hypothesis is both truer and more agreeable than the atheistical (110). Therefore since the system of Spinoza is not liable to lesser objections than the Christian hypothesis, it were a sufficient reason to reject it. So that any author, who shews that Spinozism is obscure, and false in its first propositions, and perplexed with impenetrable and contradictory absurdities in its consequences, ought to pass for having very well confuted it, tho' he does not clearly resolve all the objections of Spinoza. The whole matter may be reduced to these few words. The common hypothesis, if compared with that of the Spinozists in those things that are clear, has a greater evidence: and if it be compared with the other in those things that are obscure; it appears less opposite to the light of reason. And besides, it promises us an infinite happiness after this life, and procures us a thousand comforts in this; whereas the other gives us no prospect of a future happiness, and deprives us of confidence in our prayers, and of the advantage we may expect from the remories of our neighbours: and therefore the common hypothesis is to be preferred to the other.

[P] As has been done even by his weakest adversaries. I shall not set up for a master of the ceremonies, to place those gentlemen in their higher or lower ranks, but shall only name those who are come to my knowledge (111). Mr Velthuyse (112) published a book against Spinoza in the year 1680. It is intitled, *Traictatus de cultu naturali, & origine moralitatis*. Four years after, the Sieur Aubert de Versé put out a book with this title, *L'impie convaincu, ou Dissertation contre Spinoza, dans laquelle l'on réfute les fondemens de son Athéisme* (113). Mr Poiret inserted in the second edition of his *Cogitationes de Deo, Anima & Malo* (114), a treatise, intitled, *Fundamenta Atheismi eversa, sive Specimen absurditatis Atheismi Spinoziani*. In the year 1690, a posthumous book of Mr Wittichius came out,

intituled, *Anti-Spinoza, sive Examen Ethices Benedicti de Spinoza, & Commentarius de Deo & ejus Attributis*. To which I add a Dutch piece, quoted by Mr Saldenus (115).

I add to these; 1. A Dutch book, published by the same Francis Cuper whom I have mentioned at the beginning of the remark [M]. This Dutch book is only a translation of what Henry Morus said in Latin against Spinoza in some passages of his works. It appeared very solid to Cuper, tho' his *Arcana Atheismi revelata* had been used with the utmost contempt by Henry Morus (116). 2. The book published at Paris in the year 1696, by Dom Francis Lami, a Benedictine. It is intitled, *Le nouvel Athéisme renversé, ou Réfutation du Systeme de Spinoza, tirée pour la plupart de la connoissance de la nature de l'homme*. You will find an extract of it in the *Journal des Savans* of the 28th of January 1697 (117). And you may see a just encomium upon it in the 101st page of the second part of the *Chevreana*, Dutch edition. 3. The work which Mr Jaquelot (118) caused to be printed at the Hague in 1697. It is intitled, *Dissertations sur l'Existence de Dieu, où l'on démontre cette vérité par l'Histoire Universelle de la première Antiquité du Monde, par la Réfutation du Systeme d'Epicure & de Spinoza, &c.* You will find a good extract of it in the *Histoire des Ouvrages des Savans* (119). 4. The book published by Mr Jens at Dort, in the year 1698. The title of it runs thus: *Examen Philosophicum sextæ divisionis Partis I Eth. Benedicti de Spinoza, sive Prodiromus Animadversionum super unico veterum & recentiorum Atheorum Argumento, nempe una substantia; ubi infirmitas & vanitas argumentorum pro ea evincitur. Accedunt quædam necdum propostia argumenta pro vera existentia Dei*. It is a book of sixty-six pages in 4to. The author is a Physician at Dort, and the father of Mr Jens, rector of the college of the same town, and a learned humanist, and a good critic, as appears from his *Lectiones Lucianæ*, printed at the Hague, in 8vo, in the year 1699. I must not forget the Dutch book, published by Mr Van Til, in the year 1696, an abstract of which may be seen in the *Acta Eruditorum Lipsienfium* (120). I shall speak below (121) of a Dutch piece, that is just come out.

You will find that the principles of Spinoza are overthrown in all those books; you will there find that from the very beginning of his work, he advances false propositions; and therefore, what he concludes from them afterwards can be of no force. Let him run as much as he pleases: what can he do by running much, if he loses his way from the first step he makes? Note, that his greatest admirers acknowledge, that if he had taught the doctrines laid to his charge, he would be an execrable man; but they pretend he has not been understood. 'Si igitur prædicti philosophi intentio vel opinio fuit naturam cum Deo hoc modo tam sædè confundere, judicio illum ab adversariis justè impetum atque condemnatum, imò & memoriam ejus in omne ævum execrandam esse: attamen quia de alicujus intentione solus potest judicare intus cordium perfricator Deus, nobis nihil aliud restat nisi ut judicemus de opinione quæ continetur in scriptis quæ memoratus vir in lucem emisit; & licet inter illius adversarios habeantur etiam perpicacissimi, puto tamen eos horum scriptorum verum sensum minimè affectos fuisse, quoniam in his nihil reperio nisi id quod abunde satis indicat hunc virum minimè confundere velle Deum & naturam: saltem ego ita judico ex ejus scriptis, quæ si alii melius intelligent, quæ dixi indicia sunt, patrocinium illius hominis in me suscipere nolo, peto duntaxat ut quod aliis licuit, id & mihi liceat, nempe ut exprimam quem puto horum scriptorum genuinum sensum esse (122). . . . If therefore it was the intention of this Philosopher to confound GOD and nature together, in so shameful a manner, or if his opinion comes no less bimself, in to that, I think he was justly attacked and condemned by his adversaries; nay, that his memory ought to be for ever execrable: but because GOD alone, who is the searcher of hearts, can judge of any man's intention, it only belongs to us, to judge of the opinions contained in the writings which this man has published; and though there are some among his adversaries of great penetration, yet I think they have not as all discovered the true

(115) Above citation (78). The author's name was Blyenberg; he was a merchant at Dort, who died in 1696.

(116) Oper Philosoph. Tom. i, pag. 600.

(117) Page 72, of the Dutch edition.

(118) He was minister of the church of Vally in Champagne, and is now minister at the Hague.

(119) For September 1696, Art. iii.

(120) Page 29; & seq. of the year 1696.

(121) In the remark [BB].

(122) Autor anonymus Specimenis Artis ratiocinandi naturalis & artificialis, pag. 113. Note that since the first edition of this Dictionary I have seen that Specimen Artis ratiocinandi, &c. with the author's name and picture. It is Mr Kuffelaar. That book is ascribed to Spinoza bimself, in Micraelius's Historia Ecclesiastica, pag. 2260, Edit. 1699. Micraelius thought that Spinoza was still living in the year 1684, which is not true.

(109) Sin melius quid habes, accersit, aut imperium fer. Horatius, Epistola V, lib. i, ver. 6.

(110) I have already said in the article SOCIETUS, (FAUSTUS), remark [J], that it is the interest of every one, that all authors be conscientious, and fear God.

(111) Note, that I speak only of those who have confuted the Posthumous Works of Spinoza.

(112) Being exhorted to it, and helped by the deceased Mr PAETS (of whom I spoke above, citation (12), of the article SANCTE-SIUS) to whom he dedicated it.

(113) See the Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, for October 1684, pag. 862.

(114) At Amsterdam 1685. See the same *Annuaire*, for April 1685, pag. 450.

V O L. V.

H h h

(1) See his 17th and 18th Letters.

impious man was not sensible of the unavoidable consequences of his system; for he laughed at the apparition of spirits (1), and there is no Philosopher, who has less reason to

‘true sense of his writings, because I find nothing in them, but what abundantly shows that he was far from confounding GOD and nature together. At least I judge so from his writings, which if others understand better than I do, I retract what I now say; I do not take it upon me to protect this man; I only ask that the liberty which is granted others, may likewise be granted me, which is that I may be allowed to explain what I take to be the genuine sense of these writings.’ These words taken from a book of one of his

(123) There is in the title *Hamburgi*, as in the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*.

followers, printed at Utrecht in 1684 (123), clearly shew that Spinoza has been so successfully confuted by his adversaries, that the only way of replying to them, is like that of the Janfenists against the Jesuits, viz. That his opinion is not such as it is supposed to be. This is the result of what his apologist says. And therefore in order to shew that his adversaries have attained a complete victory over him, we need only consider that he has in effect taught what is imputed to him, or that he contradicted himself wretchedly, and knew not what he said. He is accused of teaching that all particular beings are modifications of GOD. This is plainly his doctrine, since his fourteenth proposition runs thus: ‘Præter Deum nulla dari neque concipi potest substantia: ----- Besides GOD no substance can exist, nor be conceived: And he affirms in the fifteenth, ‘Quicquid est, in Deo est, & nihil sine Deo esse neque concipi potest: ----- Whatever exists is in GOD, and nothing can exist nor be conceived without GOD:’ which he proves by this reason, that every thing is a mode or a substance, and that modes can neither exist nor be conceived without a substance. When therefore an apologist speaks in this manner: were it true that Spinoza teaches that all particular beings are modes of the divine substance, I would not deny that his adversaries have obtained a complete victory over him; I only deny the fact, I do not believe that the doctrine they have very well confuted, is contained in his book: I say when an apologist speaks in such a manner, he had as good own that his hero has been defeated; for certainly the doctrine in question, is in Spinoza’s Ethics (124).

(124) The Apologist I have quoted (viz. Mr. Kuffeler) maintains with might and main, in the 14th page, that there can be but one substance in the universe.

SPINOZA knew not that the word *idem* is sometimes used for *simile*.

Here I must give an instance of the falsity of his former propositions; it will be of use to shew how easy it was to overthrow his system. His fifth proposition contains these words, ‘In rerum natura non possunt dari duæ aut plures substantiæ ejusdem nature seu attributi. ----- It is impossible that two or more substances of the same nature or attribute should exist.’ This is his *Argumentum Achillem*, and the most steady foundation he builds upon; but at the same time, it is such a wretched sophism, that no scholar, who has read what is called *parva logica*, or the five *Predicabilia Porphyrii*, could be perplexed with it. All those who teach school-Philosophy, begin with telling their scholars what *Genus*, *Species*, and *Individuum* are. This lecture is sufficient to put Spinoza to a stand. The following distinction will do the business: *Non possunt dari plures substantiæ ejusdem numero nature seu attributi, concedo; non possunt dari plures substantiæ ejusdem specie nature seu attributi, nego.* What could Spinoza say against this distinction? Must he not admit of it with respect to modifications? Is not man, according to his notion, a species of modification, and is not Socrates an individuum of that species? Would he have us maintain that Benedict Spinoza, and the Jew, who attempted to thrust a knife into his body, were not two modifications, but one only? This might be proved invincibly, if his proof for the unity of substance was a good one; but since it proves too much, for it proves that there is but one modification in the world, he ought to be one of the first to reject it. He ought therefore to know that the word *idem* signifies two things, *identity*, and *similitude*. We say, that such a one was born the same day as his father, and died the same day with his mother. With respect to a man born the first of March 1630, and who died the first of March 1610, whose father was born the tenth of February 1655, whose mother died the tenth of February 1655. The proposition would be true in the two senses of the word *same*. It would signify *like* in the first part of this proposition, but not in the second. Pythagoras and Aristotle, according

to Spinoza’s system (125), were two like modifications: each of them had the whole nature of a modification, and yet the one differed from the other. The same may be said of two substances: each of them has the whole nature, and all the attributes of substance, and yet they are not one only substance, but two. I shall set down what a Spaniard says against those, who, through a sophism like that of Spinoza, thought that the *Materia prima* did not differ from GOD. ‘Quis non obtruncat fuisse ullo tempore aliquos adeo desipientes, & in clarissima luce cæcipientes, qui Deum esse materiam primam & constantem asseverarent, & pugnaciter defenderent? At qua ratione tantum stultam & impiam opinionem confirmabant? Si materia prima & Deus (inquiunt) non sunt idem, ergo differunt inter se; quæcunque autem differunt, ea necesse est aliquo differre, quare composita esse oportet ex eo in quo conveniunt, & ex eo in quo differunt; cum igitur nec in Deo nec in materia prima ulla sit compositio, nulla quoque differentia inter ea esse poterit; quare necesse est esse unum & idem: Vide quàm levi argumento in tam gravem errorem seu potius amentiam inducitur, non intelligentes discrimen quod est inter differens & diversum, quod etiam traditur ab Aristotele 10. lib. *Metaphys. text.*

(125) Note, by the by, that by virtue of this principle, *Quæ sunt idem uni tertio, sunt idem inter se.* Spinoza cannot deny that Pythagoras and Aristotle were but one man. Erant enim idem uni tertio, nempe substantiæ Dei.

12. Differunt enim inter se, quæcunque in aliquo conveniunt & in aliquo distinguuntur; ut homo & leo conveniunt in genere, quia uterque est animal, & distinguuntur per proprias differentias, alter enim est rationis particeps, alter verò expers: Diversa autem sunt quæcunque seipsis distinguuntur, quoniam sunt simplicissima (126). ----- Who is not farprized that ever there were men so stupid and so blind amidst the clearest light, as constantly to affirm, and obstinately maintain, that GOD is the first matter (materia prima). But by what reason did they support so foolish and impious an opinion? If, say they, GOD and the first matter are not the same, therefore they differ from one another. But whatever things differ, must necessarily differ in some properties, and therefore they must be composed of those properties wherein they agree, and of those wherein they differ. But there being no composition either in GOD or the first matter, they cannot differ from one another, therefore they must be one and the same. Observe how slight an argument leads those men into so grievous an error, or rather madness, who do not understand the distinction between different and diverse, which Aristotle has mentioned. Those things are different from one another, which agree in some properties and are distinguished in others; as a man and a lion agree in their genus, both being animals; and are distinguished by their proper differences, one being rational the other not. But those things are diverse, which are distinguished from one another, because they are most simple. There are few notions in our mind clearer than that of identity. I grant that it is confounded, and very ill applied in the common language: Nations, rivers, &c. are accounted the same nations, and the same rivers during several ages; the body of a man is accounted the same body for the space of sixty years or more: but those popular and improper expressions do not deprive us of the certain rule of identity; they do not blot out of our minds this idea: A thing of which one may deny or affirm what cannot be denied, or affirmed of another thing, is distinct from that other thing. When all the attributes of time, place, &c. which belong to a thing, belong also to another thing, they are but one Being. But notwithstanding the clearness of these ideas, it would be difficult to say how many great Philosophers have erred in that point, and reduced all souls and intelligences (127) to unity, though they acknowledged that some were united to bodies, to which others were not united. This opinion was so common in Italy in the XVth century, that Pope Leo X, thought himself obliged to condemn it, and to threaten with severe penalties all those that should teach it (128). Here are the words of the bull, dated the nineteenth of December 1513. ‘Cum diebus nostris Zizaniz seminator nonnullos perniciosissimos errores in agro Domini seminare sit ausus, de natura præsertim animæ rationalis, quod videlicet mortalitas sit aut unica in cunctis hominibus; & nonnulli temere Philosophantes

(126) Benedict Pererius, de communibus Præcipuis lib. 1. cap. xii, p. n. 309.

(127) See the article CESALPINUS, remark [C], and compare what is said of the Scotch in the article A. BELARD. remark [C].

(128) Omnes heretici erroris adfessionibus in hæreticos, veluti damnatissimos hæreticos feminantes per omnia et deinceps beatissimas hereticos & infideles, Catholicam fidem labefactantes, vitandis fore penitentibus fore decrevimus. ----- We have decreed that all those who adhere to the restrictions of this kind of error should be punished and punished as heretics, as every heretic, and infidel, who defiles the Catholic Faith.

secundum

to deny it [2]. Spinoza ought to acknowledge that every part of nature thinks, and that man is not the most knowing and most intelligent modification of the universe; and therefore he must admit the existence of Demons. The dispute of his followers about miracles is a meer quibble [R], and a further proof of the unexactness of his notions

* secundum factum Philosophiam verum esse asserent:

* Contra hoc, sacro approbante concilio, damnamus & reprobamus omnes asserentes, Animam intellectivam mortalem esse aut unicam in cunctis hominibus; aut hoc in dubium vertentes: cum illa immortalis, & pro corporum quibus infunditur multitudinem singulariter multiplicabilis & multiplicata & multiplicanda sit. . . . *Whereas in our days a fewer of tares, has dared to sow some most pernicious errors in the field of GOD, especially concerning the nature of a rational soul; namely, that it is mortal, and that there is but one soul in all men, and some rashly philosophizing, have asserted this to be true, at least, according to Philosophy. In opposition to this, with the approbation of the holy council, we condemn and pronounce to be reprobate all those who assert that the intelligent soul is mortal, or that there is but one soul in all men; or those who call this in question: since the soul is immortal, and according to the multitude of bodies into which it is infused, may be particularly multiplied, it and must be multiplied.* This was lopping off a considerable branch of Spinozism. I must observe, that some Philosophers do strangely confound the idea of identity; for they maintain (129), that the parts of matter are not distinct before they be actually separated. Nothing can be more absurd.

[2] *There is no Philosopher who has left reason to deny the apparition of spirits.* I have said it in another place (130); when it is supposed that a most perfect mind has created all things out of nothing, without being determined to it by his nature, but by the free choice of his own good pleasure, the existence of angels may be denied (131). If it be asked, why such a Creator has not produced other spirits besides human souls? The answer will be, That such was his good pleasure, *sed pro ratione voluntas*: No reasonable reply can be made to this answer, unless the fact be proved, I mean, that there are angels. But when it is supposed, that the Creator did not act freely, and exhausted all his power without any choice or rule, and besides that thinking is one of his attributes, it is a ridiculous thing to assert, that there are no Demons. According to this system, it ought to be believed, that the thinking attribute of the Creator hath been modified, not only in the bodies of men, but also throughout the whole universe; and that besides the animals which we know, there is an infinite number of others which we know not, and which exceed us in knowledge and in malice, as much as we exceed in that respect dogs and oxen: For it were the most unreasonable thing in the world, to fancy that man's mind is the most perfect modification that an infinite Being, acting according to the whole extent of its power, could produce. We can conceive no natural connexion between the understanding and the brain; and therefore we ought to believe, that a creature without brain may as well think, as a creature organized as we are. What is it then that could move Spinoza to deny what is said of spirits (132)? Why did he believe that there is nothing in the world, that can excite in our machines the fight of a spectre, make a noise in a room, and produce all the magical phenomena mentioned in books? Was it because he believed that no Being can produce such effects unless it has as bulky a body as that of man; and that therefore the Demons could not subsist in the air, nor come into our houses, nor steal away from our sight? But such a thought would be ridiculous: the bulk of flesh of which we are made up, is rather an obstacle than a help to wit and power. I mean a mediate power, or the faculty of applying the most proper instruments for the production of great effects. The most surprising actions of men arise from that faculty; as it appears from thousands of examples. An Engineer as little as a dwarf, lean, and pale, performs more things than two thousand savages, stronger than Milo, are able to perform. An animate machine a thousand times smaller than an ant, might produce greater effects than an elephant; it might discover the insensible parts of plants and animals, and place itself upon the seat of the first springs of our brain, and open some valves, by which

means we might see phantoms, hear a noise, &c. (133). If Physicians knew the first fibres, and the first combinations of the parts in vegetables, minerals, and animals, they would also know the instruments proper to put them out of order, and might apply those instruments in such a manner as to place those parts in a new order, whereby good meat would be turned into poison, and poison into good meat. Such Physicians would be incomparably more knowing than Hippocrates; and were they little enough to get into the brain and the entrails, they might cure any body, and also produce whenever they pleased the most strange diseases that can be seen. The whole may be brought to this question, *Is it possible that an invisible modification should be more knowing and malicious than man?* If Spinoza denies it, he knows not the consequences of his hypothesis, and acts rashly and without principles. A man might make a long dissertation upon this subject, wherein he might prevent all Spinoza's subtleties and objections. Compare with this what I have observed in the articles of Lucretius (134), and in that of Hobbes (135.)

[R] *The disputes of the Spinozists about miracles is a meer quibble.* The common opinion of orthodox Divines is, That God produces miracles immediately, whether he makes use of creatures as agents or not. In either case, it undeniably appears that he is above nature; for if he produces something without employing other causes, he does not want the help of nature; and he never employs them in a miracle, but after he has diverted them from their usual course: And therefore he shews that they depend on his will, that he suspends their power when he pleases, or applies it in a different manner from their ordinary determination. The Cartesians, who make him the immediate cause of all the effects of nature, suppose, that when he works miracles, he does not observe the general laws he has established; he makes an exception, and applies bodies quite otherwise than he would do, if he followed the general laws. Whereupon they say, that if there were any general laws, whereby God had engaged to move bodies according to the desires of angels, and if an angel had desired that the waters of the Red-Sea should be divided, the passage of the Israelites would not be a miracle properly so called. This consequence, which necessarily arises from their principles, makes their definition of a miracle less convenient than it were to be wished, and therefore it were better for them to say, that all the effects, contrary to the general laws we know, are miracles; and by this means the plagues of Egypt, and such other extraordinary actions related in Scripture will be miracles, properly speaking. Now, in order to shew the insincerity, and the illusions of the Spinozists upon this head, we need only say, that when they deny the possibility of miracles, they alledge this reason, that God and nature are the same Being; so that if God did something against the laws of nature, he would act against himself; which is impossible. Speak plainly, and without any ambiguity: Say, that the laws of nature being not made by a free Legislator, who knew what he did, but being the action of a blind and necessary cause, nothing can happen that is contrary to those laws. If so, you alledge your own position against miracles: which is a *petitio principii*; but however, you speak plainly. Let us bring them off from this general reasoning and ask them what they think of the miracles mentioned in the Scripture. They will absolutely deny all those, which they cannot ascribe to a cunning trick. Not to insist upon their impudence in denying such facts, I shall only argue against them by their own principles. Do not you say that the power of nature is infinite? But would it be infinite, if there was nothing in the whole universe that could restore a dead man to life? Would it be infinite, if there was but one way of forming man, *viz.* that of ordinary generation? Do not you say that the knowledge of nature is infinite? You deny that divine understanding, in which we believe the knowledge of all possible Beings to be united; but by dispersing the knowledge, you do not deny

(133) Note, by the by, that nothing can be more improper than to inquire whether angels, when they appear, assume a living or dead body. They have no need of it. They need only move the Optic and Acoustic nerves, as they are moved by the light reflected from a human body, and by the air that comes out of the mouth of a man who speaks.

(134) Remark [F].

(135) Remark [N].

(129) Sir Keble Digby does also maintain it, if I am not mistaken.

(130) In the article RUGGERI, remark [D].

(131) I suppose that the authority of the Holy Scripture is laid aside, and that a man declares he only reasons like a Philosopher.

(132) See his letters lvi, lviii, &c.

mr cl

notions. It is said, he died fully persuaded of his Atheism, and that he took some precautions to conceal his inconstancy, if there should be occasion for it [S]. Had he reasoned consequentially, he would not have treated the fear of Hell as a chimerical thing [T]. His friends say that, out of modesty, he desired that no sect should go by his

deny its infinity. And therefore you ought to say that nature knows all things, much in the same manner as we say that man understands all languages: one man does not understand them all; but some understand one, and some another. Can you affirm that the universe contains nothing, which knows the construction of our bodies? If you can affirm it, you contradict yourself; you can say no longer that the knowledge of God is infinitely divided; the contrivance of our organs would be unknown to him. You must therefore acknowledge, if you argue consequentially that some modification knows it; you must acknowledge that it is very possible for nature to bring a dead man to life, and that your master confounded his ideas, and knew not the consequences of his principle, when he said (136) that if he could believe the resurrection of Lazarus, he would break his system to pieces, and willingly embrace the Christian Faith.

(136) I have been assured that he said so to his friends.

This is sufficient to show that the Spinozists contradict their own hypothesis, when they deny the possibility of miracles; I mean, (to avoid all ambiguity) the possibility of the facts mentioned in the Holy Scripture.

[S] He took some precautions to conceal his inconstancy, if there should be occasion for it. I mean he took care, that in case the approach of death, or the symptoms of his illness, should make him speak against his system, no suspected person should be witness of it. The case is this; or at least we find the following account of it in a printed book (137). Perhaps it will be said that

(137) *Pensées diverses sur les Comètes*, num. 181, pag. 565, 566. See the *Histoire des Ouvrages des Savans*, for March 1689, pag. 82.

(138) *The Pensées sur les Comètes* were printed in the year 1683.

*Voltaire
Diderot
D'Alembert*

Atheists are not greedy of praise? But what can any man do more than what was done by Spinoza, a little before he died? The thing is of a fresh date (138), and I have it from a great man, who had it from good hands. He was the greatest Atheist ever lived, and he grew so fond of certain philosophical principles, that the better to meditate upon them, he confined himself to a close retirement, renouncing all the pleasures and vanities of the world, and minding nothing but those abstruse meditations. Being upon the point of death, he sent for his landlady, and desired her not to suffer that any minister should see him in that condition. His reason for it was, as his friends said, that he had a mind to die without disputing, and was afraid that the weakness of his senses might make him say something inconsistent with his principles. That is, he was afraid it would be said in the world that his conscience, awakening at the sight of death, had damped his courage, and made him renounce his opinions. Can there be a more ridiculous and extravagant vanity, and a more foolish passion for a wrong notion of constancy?

(139) In the remark [H].

A Preface, which I have quoted above (139), and which contains some circumstances of the death of that Atheist, says nothing of this. I find in it that he told his landlady who was going to church, I hope you will return, God willing, and speak with me when the sermon is over (140). But he died quietly before his landlady returned, and no body saw him die but a Physician of Amsterdam (141). For the rest, we are told in that preface, that he was extremely desirous to immortalize his name, and would have willingly sacrificed his life for it, though, in order to obtain it, he had been torn in pieces by the mob. 'Auro plane non inhiabat, aliqui delata sibi Professoris munera aliquoties non respiciisset homo gloriæ avidior & nimis ambitiosus, qui vel cum Wittii amicis suis crudeliter dilacerari sublatius optavit, modo vita brevi gloriæ cursus foret sempiternus (142). - - - Surely he was not covetous, otherwise he would not have so often refused the Professorship which had been offered him, being a man desirous of glory and too ambitious, who would have wished to be cruelly torn to pieces with the De Witts, his friends, provided the shortness of his life was recompensed with immortal glory.'

(141) *Id. ibid.*

(142) *Id. ibid.*

[T] Had he reasoned consequentially, he would not have called the fear of Hell a chimerical thing. Those, who believe that the world is not the work of God, and is not directed by a Being simple, spiritual, and distinct from all bodies, must at least confess that there

are some things which are endowed with intelligence and will, and which are jealous of their power, which exercise authority over others, which command them to do some things, chastise them, use them harshly, and to revenge themselves severely. Is not the earth full of such things? Does not every man know it by experience? It would be a thing altogether unreasonable to fancy that all Beings of that nature are only upon earth, which is but one point if compared to the world. Must reason, wit, ambition, hatred, and cruelty, be upon earth rather than any where else? Why so? Can any reason good or bad be given for it? I do not think so. Our eyes induce us to believe that those vast spaces we call Heaven, which have such powerful and rapid motions, may as well form men as our earth, and deserve no less than the globe we inhabit to be divided into several dominions. We do not know what passes there; but if we consult only reason, it will appear very probable, or at least possible, that there are thinking Beings in those vast spaces, which extend their empire as well as their light to our globe. Our not seeing them is not a proof that we are unknown or indifferent to them: Perhaps we are part of their dominions: they make laws, which they reveal to us by the dictates of our conscience, and are very angry with those that transgress them. The possibility of it is sufficient to make Atheists uneasy; and nothing but denying the immortality of the soul can make them fearless. For thereby they would escape the vengeance of those spirits, which otherwise might be more dreadful than God himself. I explain myself more dreadfully than God himself. I explain myself more dreadfully than God himself. I explain myself more dreadfully than God himself.

There are some men, who believe a God, a Paradise, and a Hell; but they create illusions to themselves, and imagine that the infinite goodness of the most perfect Being does not permit him to torment his own work for ever. He is the father of all men, say they; and therefore he chastises like a father those who disobey him, and after he has made them sensible of their faults, he restores them to his favour in Heaven. Origen argued in that manner. Others suppose that God will annihilate the rebellious creatures, and will be appeased, and moved to compassion with a *quædam finem Rex Magne laborum* (143). What end of labour has your will decreed? They carry their illusion so far, as to think that the everlasting torments mentioned in the Scripture, are only comminatory. If such men were ignorant of the Being of a God, and by considering what passes in our world, should believe that there are Beings in other worlds, which concern themselves with mankind, they could not be easy when they come to die, unless they believed that the soul is mortal; for if they believed it to be immortal, they might be afraid of falling under the power of a cruel master, angry with them by reason of their actions; it would be to no purpose to hope to come off after having been tormented for some years. A limited Being may be destitute of all manner of moral perfection; it may be like our Phalaris and Neros, a sort of men who could have left an enemy in a dungeon for ever, had they been able to get an eternal authority. Will they hope that mischievous Beings will not last for ever? But how many Atheists pretend that the Sun had no beginning, and will have no end? This is what I meant, when I said that some Beings might appear more dreadful than God himself? A man may flatter himself, when he considers that God is infinitely good, and infinitely perfect; and he may fear every thing from an imperfect Being: he does not know whether its anger will not last for ever. Every body knows the choice of the prophet David (144).

*Handley
Prestley
Darwin*

Porter

(143) *Virg. Æneid. lib. 4. ver. 245.*

Wol

To apply what has been said to a Spinozist, let us remember that he is obliged by his principle to acknowledge the Immortality of the Soul; for he looks upon himself as the modification of a Being essentially thinking. Let us remember, that he cannot deny that some modifications are angry with others, put them to the torture, make their torments last as long as ever they can, send them to the galleys for life, and would make that punishment last for ever, if the death of one party or the other did not prevent it.

(144) Being in doubt either to be overcome by his enemies, or to be afflicted with a plague sent from God, he answered the Prophet Gad: I am in a great strait: Let us fall now into the hand of the Lord, (for his mercies are great) and let me not fall into the hand of man. 2 Sam. xiv. 14.

Tiberius,

his name [U]. It is not true that his followers are very numerous. Few people are suspected of adhering to his doctrine; and among those, who are suspected of it, few have studied it; and among the latter, few have understood it, and most of them are discouraged by the difficulties and impenetrable abstractions that attend it (m). But the thing is this: at all adventures those, who have little religion, and do not much scruple to own it, are called Spinozists. Thus in France all those who are thought not to believe the mysteries of the Gospel, are called Socinians, though most of them never read Socinus nor his followers. For the rest, the same thing happened to Spinoza, which inevitably happens to all those who frame impious systems; they secure themselves from some objections, but they lie open to others that are more perplexing. If they cannot be orthodox, if they are so fond of disputing, it were better for them not to dogmatize. But of all Atheistical systems, none is less capable of deceiving than that of Spinoza; for, as I have said before, it is contrary to the most distinct notions of our minds. Objections throng in upon him; and he can make no answers but what are more obscure than the assertions he should maintain (n): and therefore, his poison brings a remedy along with it. He would have been more formidable, had he used all his skill to clear an hypothesis, that is very much in vogue among the Chinese [X], and very different from that which I have mentioned in the second remark of this article. I have been just now

informed

(m) This is the reason why some are of opinion that he ought not to be refuted. See the *Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres*, for June 1684, Art. vi, pag. 70, 388, 389.

(n) Consult his Letters: you will see that his answers have seldom any relation to the state of the question.

(145) Spinoza, who made microscopes, should have believed that man is organized and animated in the foot, and that therefore Socrates was Socrates before his mother conceived him.

Tiberius, Caligula, and many others are examples of such modifications. Let us remember that a Spinozist makes himself ridiculous, if he does not acknowledge that the universe is full of ambitious, morose, jealous, and cruel, modifications; for since the earth is full of them, there is no reason to believe that the air and the heavens are not likewise full of them. Lastly, Let us remember, that the essence of human modifications does not consist in being clothed with a bulk of flesh. Socrates was Socrates the day of his conception, or soon after (145); whatever he had at that time may remain entire, when a mortal disease has put an end to the circulation of the blood, and the motion of the heart, in the matter wherewith it was enlarged: and therefore he is after his death the same modification as he was during his life, if we consider only what is essential to his person: death cannot therefore free him from the justice or caprice of his invisible persecutors. They may follow him wherever he goes, and torment him whatever visible form he may assume.

These considerations might be made use of to induce to the practice of virtue, even those who adhere to the impious doctrine of such sects; for it stands to reason that they should be chiefly afraid for having transgressed the laws revealed to their conscience. It is more likely that those invisible Beings would concern themselves with the punishment of such faults.

[U] His friends say, that, out of modesty, he desired that no sect should go by his name. I shall set down the words of the Preface of his *Opera Posthuma*, without curtailing them. 'Nomen Auctoris in libri fronte, & alibi literis duntaxat initialibus indicatum, non alia de causa, quam quia paulo ante obitum expresse petit, ne Nomen suum Ethicæ, cuius impressionem mandabat, præfigeretur; cur autem prohibuerit, nulla alia, ut quidem videtur, ratio est, quàm quia noluit; ut Disciplina ex ipso haberet vocabulum. Dicit etenim in Appendice quartæ partis Ethicæ capite vigesimo quinto, quod, qui alios consilio, aut rejuvare cupiunt, ut simul summo fruantur bono, minime studebunt, ut Disciplina ex ipso habeat vocabulum; sed insuper in tertiâ Ethicæ parte Affectuum Definit. XLIV. ubi quid sit ambitio explicat, eos, qui tale quid patrant, non obscure, ut Gloriæ cupidos, accusat. . . . The two initial letters only of the author's name were put to the book, because a little before his death he expressly desired, that his name should not be prefixed to his Ethics, which he had ordered to be printed. And why he did so, it seems no other reason can be given, but because he would not have the Doctrine called by his name. For he says in the twenty-fifth chapter of the Appendix to the fourth part of his Ethics, that those who would help others to the attainment of the supreme good, together with themselves, will not desire that their doctrine be called by their name; and where he is explaining what ambition is, he plainly taxes such as do this with being ambitious of glory.'

[X] He would have been more formidable, had he used all his skill to clear an hypothesis, that is very much in vogue among the Chinese. A Father of the Church owned a thing, which perhaps would not be excused at this day in a Philosopher, viz. that those,

who deny the Deity or a Providence, alledge probable reasons both for their cause, and against their adversaries. 'Deos nonnulli esse abnegant: profus dubitare se alii an sint uspiam dicunt: alii vero existere, neque humana curare: immo alii perhibent, & rebus interesse mortalium, & terrenas administrare rationes. Cum ergo hæc ita sint, neque aliter fiat, quin sit unum ex omnibus verum, pugnant tamen argumentis omnes, neque singulis deest id, quod probabiliter dicant, five cum suas res asserunt, five cum alienis opinionibus contradicunt (146). . . . Some deny that there are any gods: others say they doubt whether there are any: others that there are gods, but that they take no care of human affairs: and others affirm it, and say that they are concerned in human affairs, and administer them. Since therefore these things are so, and one of all these opinions must necessarily be true, yet each of them contradicts the other with arguments, and does not want something probable to advance in its favour, and in refutation of the contrary opinions.' If he was in the right, perhaps it were chiefly with respect to those, who suppose a great number of souls in the universe distinct one from another, each of which exists by itself, and acts by an inward and essential principle. They are more powerful one than another, &c. Herein consists the Atheism so generally spread among the Chinese. The author of the following passage tells us how he fancies they have by degrees obscured the true notions. (147) God, that most pure and perfect Being, is become at most the material soul of the whole world, or of its finest part, which is Heaven. His providence and his power became limited, tho' of a much greater extent than the power and prudence of men. . . . The Chinese doctrine hath always ascribed spirits to the four parts of the world, to the stars, mountains, rivers, plants, towns, and their ditches, houses, and their hearths, in a word to every thing. They do not say that all spirits are good; they acknowledge wicked ones, which they take to be the immediate cause of the evils and miseries incident to human life. . . . (148) And therefore as the soul of man was, in their opinion, the cause of all the vital actions of man; in like manner they ascribed a soul to the sun, to be the spring of its qualities and motion. And because, according to this principle, the souls, that are diffused every where, produced in all bodies the actions which appeared natural to those bodies, this was sufficient in their opinion to explain the whole economy of nature, and to supply the omnipotence and infinite providence, which they admitted in no spirit, no not in that of Heaven. It is true, that because it seems that man, using natural things for his nourishment and convenience, has some power over natural things; the ancient opinion of the Chinese, which ascribed in proportion a like power to all souls, supposed that the soul of Heaven could act upon nature with a prudence, and a power incomparably greater than the prudence and power of men. But at the same time, they acknowledged in the soul of every thing an inward power, independent by its own nature of the power of Heaven, and

(146) Arnobius adversus Gentes, lib. ii, pag. m. 82.

(147) Le Loubere, Relation de Siam, Tom. i, ch. xxiii, num. 2, pag. 503, 504. See above the citation (55) of the article MALHERBE, and the article SOMMONA-CODOM, remark [A].

(148) Le Loubere, ibid. num. iii, pag. 505, 506.

iii

VOL. V.

(o) See the remark [I].

(p) Vigneul Marville Melanges, Tom. ii, pag. 320, Dutch Edit.

(q) I understand by that word the defects, which do not proceed from Spinoza's asserting things contrary to the maxims which other Philosophers generally acknowledge to be true.

(r) See Wittichius's Anti-Spinoza, or the Extracts of them in the Acta Eruditor. 1690, pag. 346, & seq. and in the 2d volume of the Bibliothèque Universelle, pag. 323, & seq.

informed of a pretty curious particular, viz. That after he had forsaken Judaism, he publicly professed Christianity, and frequented the assemblies of the Mennonites, or those of the Arminians of Amsterdam (o). Nay he approved a confession of faith communicated to him by an intimate friend [Z].

What is said of him in the continuation of the Menagiana is so false [Z], that I wonder Menage's friends did not perceive it. Mr de Vigneul Marville would have advised them to leave it out, had he been concerned in the edition of that work; for he has acquainted the public, that there is reason to doubt of the truth of that fact (p). The reasons he alledges for his doubt are very reasonable: he would not have been too forward, had he positively denied the thing. I shall take notice of a mistake he has committed in the same page [AA]. I must say something concerning the objections I have proposed against the system of Spinoza. I might add a very large supplement to those objections, did I not perceive that they are already too long, considering the nature of my work: this is not a proper place to engage in a formal dispute; it is sufficient for my design to make some general observations in order to undermine the foundations of Spinozism, and to shew that it is a system grounded upon such a strange supposition, that it overthrows most of the common notions, which are the rule of Philosophical discussions. Whoever shews that this system is contrary to the most evident, and the most universal axioms we have had hitherto, does certainly go the right way to confute it, though perhaps it is not so proper to reclaim the old Spinozists, as if it was proved to them that the propositions of Spinoza are contrary to one another. They would be more sensible of their prejudices, were they forced to confess that he does not always agree with himself, that his proofs are wrong, that he does not prove what wants to be proved, that his conclusions are not just, &c. This method of confuting him by shewing the absolute defects (q) of his work, and the relative defects of its parts compared one with another, has been well managed by some of those who wrote against him (r). I have been just now

own horn
found

(149) See the anonymous book printed in the year 1690, at Amsterdam, and intitled, Philosophia eulgaris refutata

ignorant
of certain

acting sometimes against the designs of Heaven. Heaven governed nature as a potent king, whom the other souls were to obey, and they were generally forced to it; but some of them did sometimes exempt themselves from it. I confess, it is an absurd thing to suppose several eternal Beings, independent one of another, and of an unequal power; nevertheless, this supposition appeared true to Democritus, Epicurus, and several other great Philosophers. They admitted an infinite quantity of small bodies of different figure, uncreated, self-moving, &c. This opinion is still very common in the East (149). Those who admit the eternity of matter, are not more reasonable than if they admitted the eternity of an infinite number of atoms; for if there can be two Beings co-eternal and independent as to their existence, there may be a hundred thousand millions, and so in infinitum. Nay, they ought to say that the number of them is actually infinite; for matter, though never so small, contains distinct parts. And it is to be observed that all the Antients were ignorant of the creation of matter; for they never departed from the axiom, *ex nihilo nihil fit*. And therefore they were not sensible that it is an absurd thing, to acknowledge an infinity of substances co-eternal, and independent one of another as to existence. However absurd that Hypothesis may be, it is not liable to the frightful inconveniencies of Spinozism. It would account for many phenomena, by assigning to every thing an active principle, a more powerful one to some, and a less powerful to others; or if their power was equal, it might be said that those which prevail have a greater combination. I do not know whether any Socinian did ever say or believe, that the souls of men, not being made out of nothing, exist, and act of themselves. Their liberty of indifference would manifestly flow from thence.

[Y] He even approved a confession of faith communicated to him by an intimate friend. One Jarig Jellis, his intimate friend, being suspected of heterodoxy, thought himself obliged to publish a confession of his faith for his vindication. Having composed it, he sent it to Spinoza, and desired him to write to him his opinion of it. Spinoza made answer, that he had read it with pleasure, and found nothing in it that wanted to be altered. *Domine ac amice Clarissime: Scripta tua ad me missa cum voluptate perlegi, ac talia inveni ut nihil in illis mutare possim.* That confession of faith is in Dutch, and was printed in the year 1684 (150).

[Z] What is said of him in the continuation of the Menagiana is false. The story runs thus: 'I have heard that Spinoza died for fear of being sent to the Bastille. He came into France at the solicitation of

two persons of quality, who desired to see him. Mr de Pomponne was informed of it; and being a minister very zealous for religion, he did not think it proper to suffer Spinoza in France, where he might have done a great deal of mischief; and to prevent it, he resolved to send him to the Bastille. Spinoza having notice of it, made his escape in the disguise of a Cordelier; but I do not warrant the truth of this last circumstance. What is certain is, that many persons, who saw him, have told me that he was a little man, of a yellowish complexion, that he had something dismal in his looks, and some-

thing ominous in his face (151). The last part of this passage is, I believe, very true; for, be des that Spinoza was originally come from Portugal or Spain, as his name sufficiently shews, I have heard some persons, who had seen him, say the same thing of his complexion, as is related in the Menagiana. But the first part of this story is a wretched falsity: from whence one may judge how many lies are told in such assemblies as Mr Menage's *Mercuriales*, whereof there are many at Paris and in other cities.

[AA] I shall take notice of a fault Mr de Vigneul Marville has committed. 'The Jew, or rather the Atheist, mentioned by Huetius in the preface of his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, without naming him, who occasioned his writing that learned book, is the famous Benedict Spinoza, with whom he had some warm conversations about religion at Amsterdam (152). The Jew, with whom Huetius had some conferences at Amsterdam, is *Manasses Ben Israel*, whom he hath named in the Latin poem of his journey into Sweden.

(151) Sequel of the Menagiana, pag. 15, Edition of Holland.

(152) Vigneul Marville, Melanges, Tom. ii, pag. 320, Dutch Edit.

Altera lux spectare dedis mysteria gentis
Judææ, ductor Judæus & ipse Manasses.
Ast adducta secans dirus præputia culter
Dum tenet attentum, & sublata insania ritus,
Ecce abaci; quo inferre pii cælestia Mosis
Scripta solent, summo extremum limbum pede tango
Inscius; infueto cuncti fremuere tumultu:
Diffugio veritus damnosæ vulnera cultri (153).

Next morn the Jewish mysteries I view,
My guide Manasses Ben Israel the Jew:
The lengthen'd prepure now the dreadful steel
Cuts off, and now suspends in air, while all
The Israelites in noisy tumult brawl.
I gazing on, unthinking touch the chest,
Where holy Moses's sacred larv is plac'd:

(153) Petrus Daniel Huetius, Poem. pag. 53, 54, Edit. Utrecht, 1700.

Behold,

now informed that the author of a small Dutch book, printed within these few days [BB], makes use of it with great force and ability. But to speak of the supplement I design to give: it consists in an explanation of the objection I have grounded on the immutability of God [CC], and in the examination of this question, whether it be true, as I am told several

*Behold they start, and stare, and all around
Loud shouts and cries from every part resound.
All in a maze, dreading the bloody knife
And furious Jews, I ran away for life.*

That Jew is, I say, the Rabbin Manasses Ben Israel. The character Huetius gives of him in the preface of his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, does not agree with Benedict Spinoza, who never made a figure among the Jews; for he left them being very young, and after many contentions, which had made him odious. 'Unicum selegi de multis argumentum, says Mr Huetius (154), ex Prophetiarum eventu conflatum, quod propolui hoc opere, & quo olim ad retundendam Judaei cujusdam, viri acuti sane & subtilis, contumaciam usus sum. Cum enim essem Amstelodami, & Judaeorum, quorum magna est in locis frequentia, ritus ac mysteria penitus introspicere vellem, ad eum deductus sum, qui tum inter illos peritissimus, ac totius Judaicae disciplinae consultissimus habebatur. - - - Among many arguments I singled out one, taken from the fulfilling of Prophecies, which I have proposed in this work, and had long ago employed to beat down the contumacy of a certain Jew, a man of wit and subtilty. For when I was at Amsterdam, and was desirous narrowly to observe the rites and ceremonies of the Jews, who are very numerous in those parts, I was carried to him who, at that time, was accounted among them to be the most knowing and skillful in all the Jewish discipline.' You see he speaks of a remote time, and of the most famous Rabbin of Amsterdam: and it is to be observed, that this passage is to be found at the beginning of a large book in folio, which came out in the year 1678 (155), and whose composition and impression took up some years. I think that the time Huetius denotes by the word *olim*, is the year 1652, in which he travelled into Sweden; but if I was mistaken in this particular, it were still true that he means Manasses Ben Israel, who died in the year 1659, and not our Spinoza, who, as I said before, never kept a considerable rank in the synagogue.

[BB] The author of a small Dutch book, printed within these few days (156). He only calls himself N. N. Philalethes: the title of his book comes to this; *A demonstration of the weakness of Spinoza's argument, concerning the only one absolutely infinite substance*. He lays down as a fact: 1. That the whole system of Spinoza is grounded on this proposition: *That there is but one only substance, and that it is absolutely infinite*. 2. That from such a principle Spinoza drew this consequence, *That particular beings are only modifications of that absolutely infinite substance*. The author maintains that this principle, being contested by every body, should have been proved with all imaginable care, and yet that Spinoza gave no proof of it. I could give some extracts of that piece, for I have seen a French translation of it in manuscript; but because it is but a small book, and in all probability it will be printed in French or Latin, before my Dictionary comes out, it were a needless thing to enlarge upon it.

[CC] An explanation of the objection which I have grounded upon God's immutability. You will find that objection above in the remark [N], numb. II. I must confirm it, since some persons maintain that the weakness of it sufficiently appears, if it be considered that no alteration happens to the god of Spinoza, as being a substance infinite, necessary, &c. &c. Tho' the face of the whole world should change at every moment, tho' the earth should be reduced to dust, the sun darkened, and the sea become a luminous body, there will only be a change of modifications: the one only substance will always remain a substance infinite, extended, thinking, and so will all substantial or essential attributes. When they say this, they say nothing but what I have already confuted beforehand (157): but the better to shew their mistake, I must observe here that they dispute against me, as if I had maintained that, according to Spinoza, the Deity successively annihilates and

produces again. This is not what I object, when I say that he makes God subject to change, and divests him of his immutability. I do not confound, as they do, the notion of things, and the signification of words: by changing, I mean the same thing which all reasoning men have ever meant by that word: I do not mean the *annihilation* and total destruction of a thing, but it's passing through several states, the subject of the accidents it ceases to have, and of those it begins to acquire, remaining the same. The learned, and the illiterate, the Mythologists and the Philosophers, the Poets and the Naturalists, are agreed in this notion, and the signification of this word. The fabulous Metamorphoses, so much sung by Ovid, and the true generations explained by Philosophers, equally supposed the preservation of the substance, and kept it immutably as the successive subject of the old and new form. These notions have been only confounded by the unhappy disputes of Christian Divines: and yet it must be confessed that the most ignorant missionaries come into the right way again, when the question is no longer about the Eucharist. If you ask them, upon any other subject, what is meant by the change, conversion, transubstantiation, and transubstantiation of one thing into another; they will answer you, the meaning of it is, for instance, that wood becomes fire, that bread becomes blood, and blood flesh, and so on. They do not think then of the improper expressions consecrated to the controversy of the Eucharist, that the bread is converted and transubstantiated into the body of our Saviour. This way of speaking does by no means agree with the doctrine designed to be explained by it: it is as if one should say, that the air of a cask is transformed, changed, converted, and transubstantiated into the wine poured into the cask. The air goes somewhere else, and the wine succeeds it in the same place: one of them is not in the least metamorphosed into the other. Neither is the mystery of the Eucharist, as it is explained by the Roman Catholics, any metamorphosis: the bread is annihilated, as to its substance; the body of Christ takes the place of the bread, and is not the subject of inherence of the accidents of that which are preserved without their substance. But I repeat it again, this is the only case wherein the missionaries make a wrong use of the words *change*, *conversion*, or *transubstantiation*, of one Being into another: in all other things, they suppose, with the rest of mankind, 1. That it is essential to a transformation, that the subject of the forms, that are destroyed, should subsist under the new forms. 2. That tho' the subject be preserved, as to what is essential in it, yet it undergoes an internal change, properly so called, and inconsistent with an immutable Being. Let the Spinosophists therefore no longer imagine that they will be allowed to coin a new language, contrary to the ideas of all mankind. If they have any sincerity left, they must confess, that, according to their system, God is subject to all the vicissitudes, and all the revolutions, to which the *materia prima* of Aristotle is liable, in the system of the Peripatetics. But could any thing be more absurd than to maintain, that supposing Aristotle's doctrine, matter is a substance which never undergoes any change?

But in order to embarrass the Spinosophists, it is but deferring them to give a definition of change. They must define it in such manner, that either it will not differ from the total destruction of a subject, or that it will agree with that one only substance, which they call God. If they define it in the first manner, they will make themselves more ridiculous still than the transubstantiators; and if they define it in the second manner, they will give up the cause.

I add, that the reason they alledge to elude my objections, proves too much; for if it was a good one, they must needs teach that there never was, nor will be, any change in the world, and that all manner of change is impossible, whether great or small. Let us prove this consequence. The reason, say they, why God is immutable, is, because, as a substance, and an extension,

(154) Petrus Daniel Huetius, in *Prefat. Demonstrat. Evangelicae*, p. m. 3.

(155) The first edition of Huetius's *Demonstratio Evangelica* was published in 1678, though the year 1679, is in the title page.

(156) At Amsterdam for Bernard Vischer 1701.

(157) See number II, of the remark [N].

several persons pretend that I have not at all understood Spinoza's doctrine [D D]. It were a very strange thing, since I have only undertaken to confute the proposition, which

extension, he neither is nor can be subject to any change. He is an extended substance under the form of fire, as well as under the form of wood, which is converted into fire, and so with other things. I will prove to them by this very reason, that the modifications themselves are immutable. Man is, according to their system, a modification of God; they own that man is subject to change, since he is sometimes merry, and sometimes melancholy; sometimes he wills one thing, and sometimes he wills it not. This is no change, will I say; for he is as much a man when merry as when melancholy: the essential attributes of man remain immutably in him, whether he be willing to sell his house, or to keep it. Let us suppose the most inconstant man in the world, and such as might fitly apply to himself these verses of Horace:

Mea pugnat sententia fecum.
Quod petiit, spernit: repetit, quod nuper omisit.
Æstuat, & vitæ disconvenit ordine toto.
Diruit, ædificat, mutat quadrata rotundis (158).

(158) Horat.
Epist. I, lib. I,
ver. 97. See
also the passage
cited above citation
(92).

My mind is with itself at strife,
And disagrees in all the course of life;
And what it hated now, it now desires;
What now it throws away, it now admires;
Unsettled as the sea, or fleeting air,
It razes, builds, and changes round to square.

CREECH.

Or who might, more than any body else, be the true original of these verses of Mr Boileau.

Mais l'homme sans arrêt, dans sa course insensée,
Voltige incessamment de pensée en pensée,
Son cœur toujours flottant entre mille embarras,
Ne sait ni ce qu'il veut, ni ce qu'il ne veut pas
Ce qu'un jour il abhorre, en l'autre il le fouhaite.

Voilà l'Homme en effet. Il va du blanc au noir
Il condamne au matin ses sentimens du soir.
Importun à tout autre, à soi-même incommode,
Il change à tous momens d'esprit comme de mode;
Il tourne au moindre vent, il tombe au moindre choc.
Aujourd'hui dans un casque, & demain dans un
froc (159).

(159) Boileau,
Sat. VIII, ver.
35 & 49.

But flier man, in his inconstant course,
Is wilder'd, and oft strays from bad to worse:
Toss'd by a thousand gusts of wavering doubt,
His restless mind still rolls from thought to thought:
In each resolve unsteady and unfix'd,
And what he one day loathes, desires the next.

This is our image just: such is that vain,
That foolish, fickle, mothy creature man:
More changing than a weather cock, his head
Ne'er wakes with the same thoughts he went to bed.
Irksome to all beside, and ill at ease,
He neither others, nor himself can please:
Each minute round his whirling humours run,
Now he's a trooper, and a priest anon,
To day in buff, to morrow in a gown.

OLDHAM.

Let us suppose a man, who has sincerely professed all religions in less than two years: let us suppose that he is gone through all the conditions of human life; that he has been successively a merchant, a soldier, and a monk, and then a married man; that he divorced his wife, and then turned register, financier, and clergyman, &c. If the Spinozists tell him, you have been very inconstant: Why? will he say, you

are mistaken, I have never changed, I have been as constantly a man ever since I was born, as a mountain has been a mountain. What could they reply to that argument *ad hominem*? Is it not most evident that the whole essence of the human species remains in the man, whether he wills the same things, whether he hates to day, what he loved yesterday, and daily changes his inclinations?

But to make use of an example very proper for a country, the inhabitants whereof are used to the sea: let us suppose that a Spinozist, at his return from Batavia, should say that his voyage has been longer than usually, because the winds changed almost every day. He might be answered, You are mistaken, the winds never change. Indeed it may be said, that they blow sometimes from the North, sometimes from the South, &c. but they always retain the essence of wind; and therefore they do not change as they are winds, and remain as immutable as your one only substance of the world: for you say it is immutable, because it never changes its state as to its essential properties. No more does the wind change its state as it is wind, it always retains the whole nature and essence of it; and therefore it is as immutable as your Deity.

I go farther, and I say, that even when a man is burnt alive, no alteration happens to him. He was a modification of the divine nature when alive; and is he not so in the flames, or under the form of ashes? Could he lose the attributes that constitute a modification? Could he go through any change as he is a modification? If he changed in that respect, must it not be said that flame is not a mode of extension? Could Spinoza affirm it without contradicting himself, and destroying his own system? This is sufficient to shew that those are mistaken, who pretend I have not proved that this system makes God subject to change. My argument cannot be denied, without asserting that modifications themselves are immutable, and that no alterations happen in man's thoughts, nor in the disposition of matter; which is a most absurd thing, and contrary to the doctrines which the Spinozists are forced to acknowledge; for they dare not deny that the modifications of the infinite substance are subject to corruption and generation.

Let us desire of them to grant us, for a moment, by a *dato non concessio*, as the Logicians speak, that Socrates is a substance. They must then acknowledge, that each particular thought of Socrates is a modality of his substance. But is it not true, that Socrates passing from affirming to denying, changes his thought, and that it is a real internal change and properly so called? And yet Socrates remains still a substance, and an individuum of the human species, whether he affirms or denies, whether he wills or rejects a thing. And therefore, tho' he does not change as he is a man, he cannot be said to be immutable; and it may very well be said that he is mutable, and actually changes, because his modifications are not always the same. But let us grant to the Spinozists in our turn, by a *dato non concessio*, that Socrates is but a modification of the divine substance; let us grant, I say, that his relation to that substance is, as in the common opinion, the relation of Socrates's thoughts to the substance of Socrates. Since therefore the change of those thoughts is a good reason to maintain that Socrates is not an immutable Being, but rather an inconstant and mutable substance which very much varies, it ought to be concluded that the substance of God (160) does actually undergo a change and a variation, properly so called, whenever Socrates, one of its modifications changes his state. It is therefore a most evident truth, that for a Being actually and really to pass from one state into another, it is sufficient that it changes, as to its modifications: and if any thing further is required, to wit, that it should lose its essential attributes, annihilation, or a total destruction, would be grossly confounded with change or alteration. See the Margin (161).

[D D] Whether it be true, as I am told, several persons pretend that I have not at all understood Spinoza's doctrine. I have it from several hands; but no body could tell me the reasons of those who make such a judgment of my dispute. And therefore I can neither

(160) Now, the
Aristotle, de
Prædicam. cap.
v, reduces among
the properties of a
substance, to re-
main the same in
number and under
contrary qualities.
Máxime verò
substantie pro-
prium hoc esse
videtur, IDEM
NUMQUE
NUMERO per-
manens contri-
tiorum esse sub-
ceptivum.

(161) One may
see in the *Yezus*
Castellanensis,
pag. 127, & seq.
several remarks
upon what would
be sufficient to
infer the possi-
bility and neces-
sity of the
Divine nature,
if the Fathers had
taught what is
imposed to them.

which is the basis of his system, and which he has very clearly expressed. I have confined my self to the confutation of what he distinctly lays down as his first principle, viz. That God is the only substance that is in the universe, and that all other Beings are

precisely confute them, nor examine if I ought to yield to their reasons, for I know them not. All that I can do, is to justify myself in a general manner; and I think I may say, that if I have not understood the proposition I undertook to confute, it is not my fault. I would not be so positive, if I had writ a book against the whole system of Spinoza, examining it paragraph by paragraph. Doubtless I should not have always understood him; and it is not likely he himself understood every part of his doctrine, and could make all the consequences of his hypothesis intelligible. But since I have confined myself to (162) a single proposition, expressed in few words, which appear clear and precise, and are the foundation of the whole structure, I must have understood it, or it contains some ambiguities altogether unbecoming the founder of a system. However I need not be uneasy upon this account, both because the sense I put upon that proposition of Spinoza is the same his other adversaries have put upon it, and because the best answer his followers can make, is, that he has not been understood (163). Notwithstanding this charge, the last author who wrote against him (164), understands the proposition in question as I do; which shews that their accusation is looked upon as very ill grounded.

(162) See the remark [P].

(163) See the same remark.

(164) See the remark [BB].

But to be more particular, what I suppose in my objections amounts to this. I say, that Spinoza taught, 1. That there is but one only substance in the universe. 2. That this substance is God. 3. That all particular Beings, material extension, the sun, the moon, plants, beasts, and men, their motions, ideas, imaginations, and desires, are modifications of God. Now I ask the Spinozists, whether their master taught those things or not? If he taught them, it cannot be said that I have been guilty of the *Ignoratio Elenchi*, or of mistaking the state of the question; for my objections, suppose that this is his very doctrine, and attack it upon that supposition. I am therefore safe, and whoever says that I have undertaken to confute what I did not apprehend, is mistaken. If it be said that Spinoza does not teach the three things above mentioned, I ask why he expressed himself just as those would do, who should be extremely desirous to make the reader believe that they teach those three things? Is it a fair and laudable thing to use the common style, without annexing to the words the same ideas other men annexed to them, and without informing the reader of the new sense put upon them? But in order to discuss the matter, let us enquire wherein the mistake may lie. I cannot have been mistaken as to the word *substance*; for I have not confuted Spinoza upon that head; I have admitted what he supposes, that a thing cannot be a substance, unless it be independent of all causes, or have an eternal and necessary self-existence. I do not think I was mistaken in saying, that, according to Spinoza, God only has the nature of a substance; and therefore I believe that if there was any mistake in my objections, it would be only in putting a different sense upon the words *modalities*, *modifications*, *modes*, from that of Spinoza. But I repeat it again, If I was mistaken in it, it would be his fault: I understand those words as they have been always understood, or, at least, as they are understood by all the new Philosophers (165); and I had reason to believe he took them in that sense, because he gave no public notice that he used them in any other signification. It is the general doctrine of Philosophers, that the idea of Being contains two species under it, viz. substance and accident, and that a substance subsists by itself, *ens per se subsistens*, and that an accident subsists in another Being, *ens in alio*. They add, that subsisting by one's self, signifies only not depending upon a subject of inhesion; and because, according to their notions, this agrees with matter, angels, and human souls; they admit two sorts of substance, one of which is uncreated, and the other created; and they subdivide the created substance into two species. One of those two species is matter; the other our souls. As for accidents, they all believed before the wretched disputes, which have divided Christianity, that they do so essentially depend upon their subject of inhesion that they cannot subsist without it. This was their specific character, by this they were distinguished

(165) I use this restriction because of the difference there is between the doctrine of the modern peripatetics, and that of the Cartesians, Gassendists, &c. about the nature of accidents. It is a notable difference; but all comes to the same with respect to the objections against Spinoza.

from substance. The doctrine of Transubstantiation destroyed that notion, and forced the Philosophers to say, that an accident may subsist without a subject. They could not avoid saying so, since they believed, on the one hand, that after the consecration, the substance of the bread in the Eucharist subsisted no longer, and they saw, on the other hand, that all the accidents of the bread subsisted as before. Wherefore they admitted a real distinction between a substance and its accidents, and a mutual separability between those two sorts of Beings, by virtue of which, each of them could subsist without the other. But some of them maintained still that there are some accidents, whose distinction from their subject is not real, and which cannot subsist without it. They called those accidents modes (166). Des Cartes, Gassendus, and, in general, all those who have forsaken the scholastic Philosophy, deny that an accident can be separated from its subject, so as to subsist after its separation, and they give to all accidents the nature of those that were called modes, and use the terms of *mode*, *modality*, or *modification*, rather than that of accident. Now since Spinoza was a great Cartesian, it is reasonable to think that he put the same sense upon those words as Des Cartes did. If it be so, he understands by the modification of a substance only a manner of Being, which has the same relation to the substance, as figure, motion, rest, and situation have to matter; and pain, affirmation, love, &c. to the soul of man. For this is what the Cartesians call modes. They acknowledge no other modes; from whence it appears that they have kept the old notion of Aristotle, according to which, an accident is of such a nature, that it makes no part of its subject, and cannot exist without it, and the subject can lose it without losing its existence. *Ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ δὲ λείψω δὲ ἐν τινὶ μὴ ὡς μέρος ὑπάρχον, ἀδυνατῶν χωρὶς εἶναι τὸ ἐν ᾧ ἐστίν.* *Atque id in subiecto esse dico quod in aliquo quidem est: sed non uti pars: ut si autem seorsum ab eo in quo inest, fieri nequit* (167). All this agrees with roundness, motion, and rest, with respect to a stone, and likewise with pain, and affirmation with respect to the soul. If Spinoza annexed the same idea to what he calls modification of substance, my objections are certainly just; I have attacked him directly according to the true signification of his words, I have rightly understood his doctrine, and confuted it according to its true sense. In a word, there is no ground for the accusation I examine. But if he had the same notion of matter or extension, and of human souls, as Des Cartes had, and yet would not give the name of substance to extension, or to our souls, because he believed that a substance is a Being that depends upon no cause; I confess I have not rightly attacked him, but have ascribed to him an opinion which was none of his. This was what remains to be examined.

(166) Such as union, action, duration, and ubiquity.

(167) Aristot. de Prædicam. cap. ii.

Having once laid down, that a substance is what exists by itself, as independently upon any efficient cause, as upon any material one, or any subject of inhesion, he ought not to have said that matter and human souls are substances: and because, according to the common doctrine, he divided Being only into two species, viz. into substance, and modification of substance; he should have said that matter and human souls are only modifications of substance. No orthodox man will deny that, according to this definition of substance, there is but one substance in the world, and that this substance is God. Then the only thing that will remain to be known, is, whether he subdivides the modification of substance into two species. If he uses such a subdivision, and if he means by one of those two species, what the Cartesians and other Christian Philosophers call created substance, and by the other species what they call accident or mode, there will only be a dispute about words between him and them, and it will be a very easy thing to make his whole system orthodox, and to put an end to his sect: for a man is a Spinozist only because he believes that Spinoza has utterly destroyed the system of the Christian Philosophers, and the existence of an immaterial God, who governs all things with a perfect liberty. From whence we may conclude, by the by, that the Spinozists and their adversaries do perfectly agree about the sense of the word *modification of substance*. Both the

K k k

are only modifications of that substance. If we do not understand what he meant by it, it is doubtless, because he put a new sense upon his words, without giving notice of it to the reader. Which is an effectual way to become unintelligible by one's own fault. If there is any term that he took in a new sense, and unknown to Philosophers, it is in

one and the other believed that Spinoza meant by it, a Being of the same nature with what the Cartesians call modes, and that he never understood by that word a Being, which had the properties, or the nature of what we call created substance.

Those, who, by all means, would maintain, that I am mistaken, might suppose that Spinoza rejected only the name of substance given to Beings that depend upon another cause, as to their production, preservation, and operation, *in fieri, in esse, & in operari*, as they speak in the schools. They might say that tho' he retained all the reality of the thing, he avoided the word, because he believed that a Being so dependent upon its cause, could not be called *ens per se subsistens, subsistens by itself*, which is the definition of substance. I answer, as I have done above, that if it be so, there is only a dispute about words between him and other Philosophers, and that I shall willingly confess my mistake, if it appears that Spinoza was indeed a Cartesian; but only that he has been more nice than Des Cartes in the application of the word *substance*, and that all the impiety laid to his charge, lies only in a misunderstanding. He only meant (will they add) what is to be found in the books of Divines, *viz.* That the immensity of God fills up heaven and earth, and all imaginary spaces in infinitum (168), and consequently that his essence penetrates and locally surrounds all other Beings, so that it is in him we have life and motion (169), and that he has produced nothing out of himself; for since he fills up all spaces, he could not place any thing but in himself, there being nothing out of him. Besides, it is well known, that no Being can exist without him; and therefore it is true, that the properties of the Cartesian modes agree with what is called created substances. Those substances are in God, and cannot exist out of him and without him. It is therefore no wonder if Spinoza called them modifications; but on the other hand, he did not deny that there was a real distinction between them, and that each of them constituted a particular principle of actions or passions, in such a manner, that one of them does what the other does not; and that when one denies of one of them what is affirmed of the other, it is according to the rules of Logic, and no body can object to Spinoza, that it follows from his principles, that two contradictory propositions are true of one and the same subject at the same time.

All this signifies nothing; and in order to come directly to the point, a plain answer should be given to this precise question: does the true and proper character of modification agree to matter with respect to God; or does it not agree to it? Before you answer it, let me explain by some examples, what the proper character of modification is. It is to be in a subject in the same manner as motion is in matter, and thought in the soul of a man, and the form of a porrerger in the vessel called a porrerger. A thing cannot be a modification of the Divine substance, only because it subsists in the immensity of God, because it is penetrated by, and surrounded with it on all sides, because it exists by the power of God, and cannot exist without him, nor out of him; it is further requisite, that the Divine Substance should be its subject of inherence, just as, according to the common opinion, the human soul is the subject of inherence of sense and desire; pewter is the subject of inherence of the form of a porrerger, and matter is the subject of inherence of motion, rest, and figure. Answer now: and if you say that, according to Spinoza, the substance of God is not in such a manner the subject of inherence of that extension, of that motion, and of those human thoughts; I will confess that you make an orthodox Philosopher of him, that there was no ground to raise so many objections against him, and that he is only to blame for taking great pains to perplex a doctrine which every body knew, and to forge a new system built only upon the ambiguity of a word. If you say, that he believed that the substance of God is the subject of inherence of matter, and of all the varieties of extension and of thought, in the same sense as Des Cartes says that extension is the subject of

inherency of motion, and the soul of man the subject of inherency of sensations and passions, you grant all that I desire: It is in this sense I understood Spinoza, and all my objections are grounded upon it.

The result of what has been said, is a question of fact concerning the true sense of the word *modification* in the system of Spinoza. Must it be taken for the same thing, that is commonly called created substance, or must it be taken in the sense it has in the system of Des Cartes? I believe the last sense is the right; for in the other sense, Spinoza would have acknowledged some creatures distinct from the Divine Substance, and made either of nothing, or of a matter distinct from God. But it were an easy thing to prove by a great many passages of his books, that he admits neither of those two things. Extension, according to him, is an attribute of God; from whence it follows, that God is essentially, eternally, and necessarily, an extended substance, and that extension belongs to him as much as existence. The result of which is, that the particular varieties of extension, which make the sun, the earth, trees, the bodies of brutes, the bodies of men, &c. are in God, as the School-Philosophers suppose they are in the *materia prima*, or first matter. But if those Philosophers supposed that the first matter is a simple and one only substance, they would conclude that the sun and the earth are really the same substance. And therefore Spinoza must needs draw the same conclusion. If he does not say that the sun is composed of God's extension, he must acknowledge that the extension of the sun was made out of nothing; but he denies creation; and therefore he must say that the substance of God is the material cause of the sun, is what composes the sun, *subjectum ex quo*, and consequently that the sun is not distinct from God (170); but God himself, God entirely, since, according to his notion, God is not a Being composed of parts.

Let us suppose for a moment, that a mass of gold has the power to convert itself into plates, dishes, candlesticks, porrergers, &c. it will not be distinct from those plates, and dishes; and if it be further supposed, that this mass is simple and not made up of parts, it must certainly be entire in each plate, and in each candlestick; for if it was not entire in each of them, it would have divided itself into several pieces, and therefore it would be composed of parts, which is contrary to the supposition. These reciprocal and convertible propositions would then be true, *the candlestick is the mass of gold, the mass of gold is the candlestick. The candlestick is the whole mass of gold, the whole mass of gold is the candlestick.* This is an image of the God of Spinoza: He has the power to convert or to modify himself into an earth, a moon, a sea, a tree, &c. and he is absolutely one, and without any composition of parts; and therefore it may be affirmed that the earth is God, that the moon is God; that the earth is God entire, that the moon is so too; that God is the earth, that God is the moon; that God entire is the earth, that God entire is the moon.

There can be but three ways, according to which, the modifications of Spinoza are in God: but none of those ways is what the other Philosophers say of the created substance. It is in God, say they, as in its efficient and transitive cause; and consequently it is really and wholly distinct from God. But according to Spinoza, the creatures are in God, either as an effect in its material cause, or as an accident in its subject of inherence, or as the form of a candlestick in the pewter it is made of. The sun, the moon, the trees, as they are things that have three dimensions, are in God as in the material cause of which their extension is composed; and therefore there is an identity between God and the sun, &c. The same trees, as they have a form, whereby they are distinguished from a stone, are in God, as the form of a candlestick is in pewter. To be a candlestick is only a manner of being of the pewter. The motion of bodies, and the thoughts of men, are in God, as the accidents of the Peripatetics are in the created substance; they are entities inherent in their subject, which are not composed of it, and which make no part of it. See the margin (171).

extrin
blns
ga!

Ident

(170) Matter, as Aristotle says, Physic. lib. i, cap. ix, remains in the effect it produces, *αὐτὸ γὰρ αὐτῷ παραμένει*. It is not so in the case of the *quod rei cuiusque subjectum est primum ex quo inexistente in aliquid.*

(171) Observe this difference, that the accidents of the Peripatetics are really distinct from their subject of inherence, and that Spinoza cannot say so of the modifications of the Divine substance; for if they were distinct from it, without being composed of it, they would be made out of nothing. Spinoza would own it: he would not cavil about it, as the Peripatetics do, when they are told that accidents would be created, if they were distinct from the substance. See *Journ. de Trév. Juine 1702, pag. 480*, edition of Amsterdam.

I am

(a) The remark
[DD].

(b) They have
named to me
among others,
Mefieurs
Huygens, Leib-
niz, Newton,
Bernoulli, &
Fatio.

in all appearance the word *modification*. But whatever signification he takes it in, he cannot avoid being confounded, as may be seen in a remark of this article (a). Those who will carefully examine the objections I have proposed, will easily perceive that I have taken the word *modification* in the sense it ought to have, and that the consequences I have drawn, and the principles I have laid down to confute those consequences, do perfectly agree with the rules of reasoning. I do not know whether it be necessary to observe, that the side which I attack, and which always appeared to me very weak, is that which the Spinozists take the least care to defend [EE]. I shall conclude with this observation, that several persons have assured me that his doctrine, even considered without a relation to religion, appears very contemptible to the greatest Mathematicians of our days (b). This may be easily believed, if these two things be considered: first, that no man ought to be more fully persuaded of the multiplicity of substances, than those, who apply themselves to the consideration of extension; secondly, that most of those gentlemen admit a vacuum. But there is nothing more contrary to Spinoza's hypothesis, than to assert that all bodies do not touch one another; and there never were two systems more opposite than his and that of the Atomists. He agrees with Epicurus in rejecting Providence, but in all other things their systems are like fire and water.

I have just now been reading a letter (c) where it is said that *he lived for some time in the city of Ulm, that the magistrates made him depart from thence, because he there dispersed his pernicious doctrine, and because it was there also that he began to write his Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*. I very much question all this. The author of the letter adds that his father, whilst he continued a Protestant, was Spinoza's great friend, and that it was chiefly by his means that excellent genius renounced the sect of the Jews.

(c) It is inserted in the *Mercur Galant*, for the month of September 1702, and was written by an officer in the army of the Elector of Bavaria. That officer says, that he will speedily give in medals, the History of the Ottoman Empire, from its foundation, that it is a work wherein he has laboured two and twenty years, and that he will have it printed at Geneva. He also says that he designs to translate Quintus Curtius, into the Turkish language, which he has been desirous to do by some persons at Adrianople.

(172) Kuffeler, Specim. Artis ratiocinandi, pag. 222. Note, that he is very angry with Bienenburg, who said that Spinoza ascribed a material extension to God. Note also, that pag. 230, & seq. He confutes one Adrian Verwer, who had said something against the system of Spinoza.

I am not ignorant, that an apologist of Spinoza (172) maintains that this Philosopher does not ascribe a material extension to God, but only an intelligible extension, and such as falls not under our imagination. But if the extension of the bodies we see and imagine, is not the extension of God, whence comes it? How has it been made? If it has been produced out of nothing, Spinoza is an orthodox man, his new system signifies nothing. If it has been produced out of the intelligible extension of God, it is still a true creation; for the intelligible extension being but an idea, and not having really the three dimensions, cannot form the matter of the extension, which formally exists out of the understanding. Besides, if we distinguish two sorts of extension, one intelligible belonging to God, the other imaginable belonging to matter, we must also admit two subjects of those extensions distinct one from another; and then the unity of substance will be destroyed, and the whole structure of Spinoza falls to the ground. We may therefore say, that his apologist does not resolve the difficulty, and raises greater ones.

The Spinozists may take advantage of the doctrine of Transubstantiation; for if they consult the writings of the Spanish school-men, they will find many subtleties to answer something to the arguments of those, who say, that one and the same man cannot be a Mahometan in Turkey, and a Christian in France, sick at Rome, and well at Vienna; but perhaps they will at last find themselves obliged to compare their system with the mystery of the Trinity, to clear themselves from the contradictions that are objected to them. If they do not say that the modifications of the divine substance, Plato, Aristotle, that horse, that ape, this tree, this stone, are as many personalities, which tho' identified with the same substance, may be, each of them a particular and determined principle, and distinct from the other modifications; they will never be able to answer the objection grounded upon their overthrowing this principle, *Two contradictory terms cannot belong to the same subject at the same time*. Perhaps they will say some time or other, that as the three persons of the Trinity, without being distinct from the divine substance, as Divines teach, and without having any absolute attribute that is not the same in number in each of them, have nevertheless each of them some properties that may be denied of the others; so Spinoza may have admitted in the divine substance an infinite number of modalities or personalities, one of which does a thing, which the others do not. This will not be a true contradiction, since Divines acknowledge a virtual distinction, in ordine ad suscipiendam *prædicatam contradictoria*, with respect to the susceptibility of two terms that contradict one another. But, as the subtle Arriaga judiciously observes, speaking of

Metaphysical degrees (173), which some will have to be susceptible of two contradictory oppositions, that would be entirely to destroy Philosophy, to transfer to natural things what Revelation teaches us concerning the nature of God; for it would make way to prove that there is no real distinction between the creatures (174). *Dices quarto, dari distinctionem virtutalem inter animalitatem, & rationalitatem, equivalentem reali, quatenus, etiam si à parte rei sint idem, una tamen potest terminare cognitionem, altera vero non, quod est æquivalere duabus rebus distinctis; sicut, licet essentia divina sit idem realiter cum Paternitate, tamen essentie convenit communicari tribus personis, Paternitati vero non convenit ea communicatio. Respondet . . . explicare res creatas per hoc adeo difficile exemplum, est res faciles per difficillimas intelligere, præterquam quod, si ex divinis liceret argumentari ad creatas, etiam posset inferri, animalitatem posse produci, quin produceretur rationalitas. . . .* (175) *Imò etiam posset inferri res omnes creatas esse idem realiter inter se, & virtualiter, solum prædicatam distinctionem in ordine ad ea duo prædicata contradictoria, non licet ponere in creaturis similem distinctionem, cum neque creaturarum perfectio, neque ulla ratio efficax possit esse ad illam ponendam: imò potius (ut jam dixi) si semel poneretur, non esset ullum fundamentum ad distinguendas inter se realiter creaturas; & consequenter destrueretur tota Philosophia.* How much are we beholden to Spinoza! He deprives us as much as in him lies, of the most necessary of all principles; for if it was not certain that one and the same thing cannot be at the same time, such as it is, and not such as it is, all our meditations and reasonings would be insignificant. See what Averroës said (176).

[EE] The side which I attack . . . is that which the Spinozists take the least care to defend. I have attacked Spinoza's supposition, that extension is not a compounded Being, but one numerical substance; and I have pitched upon that part of his system, because I knew the Spinozists say the difficulties do not lie in that. They think they are much more perplexed, when they are asked how thought and extension can be united in one and the same substance. There is something odd in this; for if it be certain, according to our ideas, that thought and extension have no affinity one with another, it is still more evident that extension consists of parts really distinct one from another; and yet they are more sensible of the first difficulty than of the second, and call the latter a trifle if compared.

(173) So they call the attributes *ens, substantia, corpus, vivens, animal, rationalis*, which constitute the nature of a man. It is agreed that they are not distinct one from another, but that they really are one and the same entity.

(174) Arriaga, Disput. V. Logica, §. ii, num. 29, pag. m. 83.

(175) Id. ibid. Disput. V. Logica, §. ii, num. 29, pag. m. 83.

(176) Quo fit ut merito dicat Averroës hoc loco sine hoc pronuntio non modo possibile non esse philosophari, sed ne disputare quidem aut rationari. *Enchiridion in Metaphys. Aristotelis lib. iv. cap. iii, pag. m. 655.*

pared with the other. I thought therefore it was necessary to give them occasion to argue thus: if that side of our system can hardly be defended, which we took to be proof against all attacks, how shall we defend the weak sides of it?

SPON (CHARLES) a Physician of Lyons. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (a).

(a) For July 1684, Art. V.

SPON (JACOB) a Physician of Lyons, and an Antiquarian, son of the foregoing. See the same *Nouvelles* (a).

(a) For February 1686, Art. IX.

SPONDANUS (JOHN DE) son of a counsellor and secretary of Joan of Albret Queen of Navarre, was born at Maulcon de Soule in the country of Biscay in the year 1557 (a). He made so speedy a progress in the *Belles Lettres*, that he undertook to comment on Homer's Iliad and Odyssey, when he was twenty years of age [A]. He enjoyed considerable posts, that of Lieutenant-General to the Prefidial of Rochelle. He abjured and afterwards that of Master of the Requests to King Henry the IVth. He abjured the Reformed Religion in the year 1593, and immediately after published the declaration of his motives to that change [B]. A great many slanders were spread about against him [C]. He left the court a little after he had forsaken the Protestants, and hid himself among the mountains of Biscay. There he undertook to write a book of controversy, but,

(a) Petrus Frizonius in Vita Henrici Spondani, initio.

[A] He made so speedy a progress: . . . that he undertook to comment on the Iliad and Odyssey, when he was twenty years of age. This is what Frizonius observes; he adds, that Spondanus was the first who published such a commentary in Latin, 'Joannes Spondanus summo à naturâ instructus ingenio vir literatissimus, qui annos natus viginti Iliadem & Odysseam Homeri . . . Latine PRIMUS MORTALIUM commentatus (1). . . . 'John Spondanus, a man of great genius and learning, was the first who ever commented in Latin on the Iliad and Odyssey of Homer, at twenty years of age. If by this he meant, that when Spondanus was twenty years of age, he published that commentary, it would be a mistake, for the first edition was published at Basil in the year 1583, in folio. He dated the Epistle Dedicatory at Basil the twelfth of June in the same year. He had taken care of that edition himself (2), and was then twenty-six years old, but we may believe that he was only twenty when he began that work. He dedicated it to his Mecenas the King of Navarre, who was afterwards King of France. The second edition was also dedicated to that Prince by Sebastian Henric Petri, Bookseller at Basil in the year 1606. Florimond de Remond cannot be so easily excused as Frizonius, since he says that Spondanus published his Commentary on Homer when he was nineteen years of age. Here are his words, *In order to finish his work, he retired to the farthest extremity of this kingdom, to the mountains of Biscay, the place of his birth. There, amidst deserts and solitude, moved by the incredible zeal which he had, to bring back to the way of salvation those whom he had left in the paths of perdition, he undertook to answer a book which Theod. Beza had just published (as his masterpiece) concerning the Marks of the Church. For that purpose he employed the most serious hours of three or four months, bestowing the rest, as it were for his amusement, in finishing his translation of Seneca, which will soon be published, and in revising his Hesiod and Homer, whom that rare genius had commented upon and published, when he was nineteen years of age (3). Mr Moreri justly says that Spondanus's Commentaries on Homer are not esteemed (4). The author whom he quotes speaks of them with contempt; Notæ nullius momenti, quasque Casaubonus fuit vocavit (5). Notes of no importance, and such as Casaubon called trifling. Notwithstanding we may admire how so young an author acquired the learning which appears in that commentary.*

(1) Petrus Frizonius in Vita Henrici Spondani, initio.

(2) Id. ibid. pag. 3, cap. v.

(3) Florimond de Remond (or Remond, as he calls himself before his preface) Préface de la Réponse du Sr. de Sponde au Traicté des Marques de l'Eglise.

(4) Moreri knew not that he was brother to Henry Spondanus, Bishop of Pamiers.

(5) Bibliogr. Historic. Philologica Curiosa, folio D.

(6) See the Epitome of Gesner's Biblioth. pag. 498.

der to place his affairs on a better footing. During that time adds he, I have heard the reports which went concerning me. Some were sorry for me; because I left myself so unreasonably, and withdrew from my advancement near the King's person. Others laughed at me, as if my boasted conversion had only procured me a shameful retreat. . . . They afflicted me most, who published that I was going again to change, and to resume my former errors, that the Sorbonne of Paris had caused my declaration to be burnt, because said they, it contained several Mahometan impieties; and all the mountains resounded with this report. For my part, I know that the most considerable Doctors of that faculty had seen it, and approved it under their hand. However, I was very desirous to find a copy of it, that I might more clearly prove this report to be false (7). At last he recovered one, he revised the work, and gave it to be printed. The Antwerp edition of it by Arnault Coninx 1595 in 8vo, is that which I have used. I have not seen that of the year 1597 (8). Florimond de Remond is not exact, when he affirms that Spondanus, after he had published the reasons of his happy conversion . . . took the resolution to leave the court (9).

(7) Jean de Sponde, préface à sa Déclaration, pag. m. 7, 8.

(8) The author of the Notes on the Confession of Sanci, speaks of it, pag. 18, in the edition of 1699.

(9) Florimond de Remond, Préface, ubi supra.

[C] A great many slanders were spread about against him. You need only see the Epistle Dedicatory of the Confession of Sanci, and the notes added to it in the Amsterdam edition 1699: but as the book I am going to quote is much more scarce than that I have just mentioned, I shall give a long passage of it. 'His death, which was so happy and so peaceable, could not escape the malice of those, who, bearing his conversion impatiently, have dared to publish that he died in a miserable and desperate condition, and that his death, which followed his conversion, was the sentence of his condemnation, and a judgment of God upon him. This is entering very far into the secrets of the council of God. . . . It is truly a judgment of God, not upon Spondanus, but upon us. For it is a great sign of the wrath of God, when he takes off those who are useful and necessary to us, and who may promote the good and profit of the publick. And perhaps it was a particular providence of heaven which called him from among us, before he was encompassed with the torrents of abuse, which gathered on all hands to pour upon him. For let a man be ever so well armed with confidence; calumny will often strike home, and even innocence trembles at the approach of that monster, which Apelles represented in so lively a manner to the shame of the calumniator Antiphrisus. While he lived a Catholic, he looked on all these slanders with contempt: now he is in heaven, he pities and compassionates those who are the authors of them. I remember that one day when some person had shewn him on purpose the defamatory letters which were written against him: truly, said he, smiling, the author of them says not enough, if you consider his custom, but indeed too much, if you consider my innocence. It is his temper to revile with animosity, and it is mine to bear it with patience. Let him attack me, like an Huguenot, with

but wanting several helps, he removed to Bourdeaux, where he applied himself, with all his might, to compose that work (b), though the bad state of his health should have induced him to interrupt his labour. He died before he had finished it, on the eighteenth of March 1595. He was buried at Bourdeaux in the Cathedral Church of St Andrew

* with abuse, and I will defend myself, like a Catholic, with modesty (10).

(10) Idem.

REFLECTIONS on the slanders published against those who change their religion.

(11) Compare with this the remark of the article WEIDNERUS.

There is a great mistake in these last words; for they suppose that the spirit of modesty was peculiar to the Roman Catholics, and the spirit of satire to the Protestants. We must own that on both sides there prevailed a cruel custom of loading with infamy those who changed their Religion, and of employing all manner of abuse for that purpose (11). Their whole life was sifted, even back to their infancy; all the sins of their youth were brought together, every part of their behaviour was pried into; loose reports, facts which might be true, and such as could admit of a bad construction were all assembled and blended together, when minds full of suspicion and distrust examined them without mercy: and an infinite number of satires composed after this manner were dealt about in the world. We need not ask *cui bono*, to what purpose. For it is manifest enough that both sides proposed two or three considerable advantages by this proceeding. They hoped that the conduct of deserters would give no scandal, provided they represented these deserters as persons who had sold themselves to iniquity, and were void both of honour and conscience. By this they would prevent its being believed, that the uncertainty of the doctrines which they maintained, and the reasons alleged by the other side had prevailed with those deserters to abjure their religion. They would lessen the triumph of their adversaries, by maintaining that they had only gained profelytes who were ruined and infamous in their character. In short, by exposing to infamy those who had revolted, they proposed to raise a greater horror against revolting; and to frighten any who should think of apostatizing: it being probable that those who were afraid of satire, would not dare to lay themselves open to it by changing their Religion, when so many formidable examples might teach them that their party would fully execute this threatening.

Quid me commoritur (melius non tangere clamo)
Flebit & insignis tota cantabitur urbe (12).

(12) Horace, Sat. I, lib. ii, ver. 45.

For if he does, he shall repent the wrong:
The warning's fair, his vices shall be shown,
And life expos'd to all the cens'ring town.

CREECH.

But if the advantage was visible in those respects, the loss was not less visible on other accounts; and thus it is surprising that the foresight of the bad consequences of this repentment, did not temper it. Nothing could harden the adverse party in their errors more than the lash of these personal satires. Each side imagines that the followers of the other are slaves to a blind prejudice, and a passionate obstinacy. And does not each confirm the other in such an opinion, when they blacken the character of the man who has left them, and employ against him, not a modest, a civil, and charitable answer to the motives which he publishes, but a violent answer, and personal defaming invectives. That side which has won a profelyte gives no credit to the stories published by the side which he has left; but looks upon them as base calumnies, and thus they persuade themselves more and more, that nothing prevails on the other side but passion and obstinacy, without the least mixture of an evangelical temper. Surely to persecute a convert with libels, is the way to alienate him wholly. Perhaps he would have returned into the pale of the Church, had he been calmly and civilly admonished of his fault: his return would have been a triumph which might have been advantageously opposed to the victory which their enemies boasted of. But that advantage is lost, if they irritate this weak brother. He cannot but be very sensible of his innocence with regard to some points in the satires which defame him (13). From thence forward he conceives a bad opinion of his ancient brethren, and of the motive by which they act. If the truths which they divulge make him uneasy, the lies serve not a little to make him more so: he contracts a hatred against their

(13) They contain hearsays, conjectures, and the additions of Tale-tellers, &c.

persons, which disposes him to hate their opinions; so that he who was at first only an outward convert, now becomes one inwardly. Anger produces this effect. It is probable that Spondanus, possessed with this passion, by reason of the terrible calumnies which were spread about against him, banished every idea which might recommend to him his former religion. He grew a stanch Catholic out of a repentment against the Protestants (14). Du Perron's discourses could not so much confirm him in the Romish Religion as his own repentment.

It will be in vain to object to me in the words of the Psalmist, *Imple faciem eorum ignominia, quærent nomen tuum Domine*, --- Lord cover their face with reproach, and they will seek thy name (15): I will answer, that when we make this prayer, we ought to leave the issue of it to Providence, and not assign it to the pens of satirical writers. They are very unfit persons to bring back into the way of truth, those whom they defame for having turned aside from it. They have not well understood that an evangelical spirit is a fire which ought to enlighten and warm, but not to burn, calcinate, and stigmatize. We must say the same thing of this fire, that a Spanish author said of the fire of virtuous love, *Arde y no quema; alumbra y no daña; quema y no consume, resplende y no lastima, purifica y no abrasa; y aun calienta y no congoxa* (16). --- It glows, but scorches not; it enlightens, but burns not; it burns, but consumes not; it glitters, but dazzles not; it refines, without destroying; and though it be hot, yet it is not painful.

As to the profit which may arise from the art of being formidable by satire, it is a disputable point. I would not deny that when people observe that their failings are supported, while they appear zealous for their religion, but that, if they leave it, these failings will furnish matter for defamatory libels, they may be restrained from abjuring, by the fear of slander. A Satirist may strike with terror those who are not conscious of their innocence.

Ense velut stricto, quoties Lucilius ardens
Infremuit, rubet auditor cui frigida mens est
Criminibus, tacita sudant præcordia culpa (17).

(17) Joven. Sat. I, ver. 165.

But when Lucilius brandishes his pen,
And flutes in the face of guilty men,
A cold sweat stands in drops on every part.
And pain and anguish seize the vitious heart.

He may even alarm the mind of a good man, who is desirous of an honest fame. We know too well the power of calumny. The testimony of a good conscience does not secure us against the credulity of mankind. But after all, is it not a considerable advantage to keep weak members within the pale of the Church; and should we not imagine that the fear of slander will be but a weak barrier to those whom other passions animate to revolt, and who may depend upon being cordially received by the opposite party, and on being reputed by them as virtuous persons, and undeservedly caluminated (18). The change of Religion is a marvellous wash in the eye of converters. They may be said to claim the right of promising what God promises in the Bible: *Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool* (19). Note, that in order to weaken the strength of satires, the adverse party made them pass for an artifice, and at last pretended that this mine having taken air, had no effect. Let us quote a modern author.

* This declamation is not more serviceable to this author's (20) design, which is to blacken the reputation of all those who are converted, to the end, that the fear of being ranked among defamed persons might hinder others from turning Catholics. I own that when the Protestant party bethought themselves of this stratagem, some people at first were simple enough to be deceived by it, and to be kept in their errors for fear of losing their reputation. But that artifice is become entirely useless, because

(14) See the Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, September 1686, p. 1096.

(15) See the same Nouvelles, February 1685, Art. II, p. 151, of the second edition.

(16) Guevarra. See the preface of Scuderi, before the Poem of Alatic.

(18) See remark [M], of the article CAYET, at the end, and the words of Mr Dailé to Father Adam: As soon as that man (Mr Cottier) whom you have for some years continually blackened with the basest crimes, presented himself to you, he was cordially received. In a moment he is become whiter than the snow. Dailé, Réplique au Père Adam, Part. iii.

(19) Isaiah l. 28.

(20) That is Mr Jurieu.

(c) Jean de Spondan, Declaration des Motifs, &c. pag. m. 25.

(d) Id. *ibid.* pag. 28.

St Andrew and his book of Controversy was published imperfect [D]. There was subjoined to it a small book, intitled *Tumulus Joannis Spondani*, from whence I have taken some of the particulars which I have just mentioned. That author declares (c) that Spondanus passed his days, with great fatigue and misery, both in his studies, and in all his other public and private occupations; and (d) that his imprisonment at Orleans was the fourth which GOD had sent him during the Civil Wars. He was elder brother to HENRY SPONDANUS, who has continued the annals of Baronius.

* because all the world knows at this time that reasonable people, whether they be Catholics or Protestants, give no longer any credit to calumnies of this nature, since they have become general, and spare no body. Every body knows that he who returns to the Catholic religion thereby loses with the Protestants the character of a good man, and is as much despised by them as he was formerly valued (21). So that they who declaim on this head have the misfortune of being minded by no body, and of having lost their time in whetting satirical weapons which wound no body, and return upon themselves (22).

(21) You will see in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, August 1689, pag. 879, that he has changed something in that reflection. See also Cottib's Reply, pag. 309, 310, and what Mr. Daillé answers him in chap. xxii, of Part. ii.

(22) Brueys, Réfutation des Réponses faites à son Examen, pag. 299, 300, Dutch edition 1686.

(23) Daillé, Réponse à Adam & Cottib, Part. iii, ch. ix, vii, viii.

(24) *Idem.* pag. 144, 145.

(25) Brueys Réfutation, &c. pag. 312.

(26) See Father Veron, in the book intitled *L'Apôtre vicieux*.

The late Capuchin, Father Basile, who having turned Protestant, was defamed by the Catholics (26), defended himself among other means, by the esteem which had been always paid him in his order. See his *Mémoire confusé*, printed at Sedan in the year 1639.

[D] His book of Controversy was published imperfect. It is intitled, *Réponse au Traité des Marques de l'Eglise fait par Th. de Bens*. It contains 317 pages in 8vo, and was printed at Bourdeaux by Simon Mil-

langes in the year 1595, by the care of Florimond de Remond, who prefixed a preface to it, out of which I have already given some passages. Here are a few more; hardly had the author arrived at the middle of his work, when he found that he wanted several good books which were necessary to him. To have these books, and to converse with the learned, for he had there no conversation but with himself, he came to this town of Bourdeaux. As he laboured day and night with a marvellous ardor, and more than his health allowed. (For he had a weak and crazy body, but a strong and vigorous mind) the length of his watching, his assiduous bent upon books amidst the rigour and unusual severities of last winter, impaired his health; yet for all that he did not give over his undertaking. And when his friends told him the prejudice he did himself, by thus constantly poring upon books, and in a cold and rugged study, without giving any respite either to his body, or his mind; I must make haste, said he, for I foresee that the evening approaches, and that I must soon depart from my station. If I die, it will be honourably, with sword in hand, as a brave Christian champion ought to die. In short, his indisposition and his disease increasing with his labour, he was seized with a pleurisy, which soon conquered his weak and emaciated body. . . . His disease. . . . lasted only nine days. Towards the end of the preface we find the following words. 'Now reader, here thou hast his book: a book imperfect indeed, but which, however, shews the perfection of its writer. It is a great pity that it was not completed: and that what we have of it is not fully corrected, since it is only the plan of his first conceptions, which promised that the work would be divided into three books, and contain a series of arguments stronger and in a better order: to say nothing of the style, which is the last thing that is polished in a book. God knows whether Spondanus was ill furnished with style, for the embellishing what he had undertaken, he who seemed accomplished with all the ornaments of a perfect eloquence, as his writings testify, and who had a marvellous facility in giving a lively picture of his conceptions, so that hardly were there three words dashed out in three leaves of this work. I believe that in this respect he was inimitable. His capacity would have fully discovered itself in the book intitled *L'Idée des Religions*, which he designed to write; but death interrupted that, and several others of his projects for the defence of the Church (27).

(27) Florimond de Remond, Préface de la Réponse de Spondan au Traité des Marques de l'Eglise.

(a) Lætus, Compend. Hist. Univers. pag. m. 389.

(b) His name was Samuel Maciejowski.

(c) *Id.* *ibid.*

(d) Stanislaus Lubieniec, Hist. Reform. Polonica, lib. i, cap. v, pag. 31.

STANCARUS (FRANCIS) a native of Mantua, lived in the XVIth century. He was one of those, whose endeavours to establish the Reformed Religion in Poland proved most successful. He had been called to Cracow [A], to teach the Hebrew tongue (a); but when it was observed that he insinuated the doctrines of the Protestants in his lectures, he was complained of to the Bishop of Cracow (b), who had procured him that place; the Bishop being informed that he was a Heretic, had him imprisoned (c). He was released by the address or interest of some lords, and found a good place of refuge in the house of Nicolas Olefnicki (d), a gentleman, whose quality, merit, and courage, conspired to make him considerable (e). He proposed to him to put an end to the Romish worship, and to throw down the images; but Olefnicki having consulted

(1) Jo. Lætus Compend. Hist. Univers. pag. m. 389.

(2) Stanislaus Orichovius, in Chimeria, fol. 4, & 23.

[A] He had been called to Cracow. John Lætus affirms that the Bishop of Cracow himself called him thither to be professor of the Hebrew tongue. *A Maciejowski Episcopo Cracoviensi: evocatus erat ut linguam S. Cracovica doceret* (1). But others (2) say, that having been expelled from Italy as an Heretic, and not being able to settle in Germany, he went into Poland, where he was permitted to teach Hebrew in the col-

lege of Cracow, because they knew not what he was; they only knew that he understood that language. Those, who say this, being both his enemies, and the Bishop of Cracow's friends, may have omitted some circumstances. However, I believe that bishop did not send for him out of Italy, and that he knew nothing of his being qualified to teach Hebrew, till he saw him in Poland. See the remark [N].

[B] Olefnicki

consulted his friends, did not think it proper to be so hasty [B], and was contented to have the Sacrament administered in his castle with such ceremonies as Stancarus should think fit to appoint. Some time after, the first design of that Reformer was put in execution; the Monks, who officiated in the church of that place, were expelled, and the images were broke, and burnt to ashes (f). Olefnicki founded a Reformed Church at Pinczovia in the year 1550, whither he called several persons illustrious for their piety and learning (g). Stancarus set up there a noble school (h), and drew up fifty rules of Reformation for the Churches of Poland [C]. He was sent into Prussia some time after, and was Hebrew professor for a year at Königsberg (i). There arose violent quarrels between him and Osiander, the consequences whereof proved fatal for orthodoxy. Osiander taught that man is justified by the essential righteousness of God, and that JESUS CHRIST is our righteousness according to his divine nature. Stancarus being too eager to contradict, and departing from that error with too great a vehemence, run into the opposite extreme; for he maintained that JESUS CHRIST is our Mediator only according to his humane nature (k). It is said that he learned this doctrine from Peter Lombard, an author whom he much admired [D]. He attempted to establish it in Poland, but he met with some obstacles which he could not overcome.

(f) De hinc Monachos cenobio & imaginibus templo eiecit, quin & has frangi & comburi fecit (Olefnickus.) *Id. ibid. pag. 31.*

(g) *Id. ibid. pag. 33.*

(h) Lætus, ubi supra.

(i) Micælius, Syntagm. Hist. Eccles. pag. m. 866, 870.

(k) *Id. ibid. pag. 866.*

It

[B] Olefnicki . . . did not think it proper to be so hasty. A Roman Catholic gives the following account of it. 'Capit. errorem (Stancarus) instaurare Zwinglii, in idque operam dare, ut abduceret Olefnickum

a religione paterna & persuaderet illi religionem externam. Cujus ad præscriptum imagines è fano tolli, cenam pro usitata peregrinam institui, Sacra quæ Monachi in ejus oppidi fano religionibus vetustis administrabant, explodi jubet. Erat hoc fanum cum adjuncta Monachorum domo, munificentia Sbignei Olefnicki operose extructum ac liberaliter ditatum, quod profanare Stancarus properabat, cujus consilium cum Olefnicko videretur periculosum esse, ne quid inconsiderate faceret, vocat amicos ac in consilium adhibet, in quo, variatis sententiis, illa postremo vicit, ut imagines cum reliqua suppellectili falvæ in fano manerent: Monachi etiam veteri instituto sacra facerent: quod nihil earum rerum mutari tunc posset impune: adeffe Regem in proximo, Episcopum etiam Cracoviâ nondum discessisse, fore hæc rebus mutandis aliud tempus magis idoneum. In præsentia placere cenam institui, idque fieri in Arce privatim non in fano publicè, quod in oppido subiectum est arci. Secundum hanc sententiam permittunt Stancaro novæ cenæ modum prescribere, ac illius usum docere (3). - - - He began to renew the error of Zwinglius, and to labour to withdraw Olefnicki from the religion of his ancestors, and persuade him to embrace an extraneous religion. Accordingly he ordered the images to be taken out of the church, a foreign communion to be administered instead of the usual, and the religious worship, which the Monks performed in the church of that town after the ancient manner, to be abrogated. That church, with the neighbouring house of the Monks, which Stancarus bestowed to profane, was built with much labour, and liberally endowed by the munificence of Sbigneus Olefnicki. Olefnicki having thought his advice dangerous, that he might do nothing rashly, consulted his friends, who being of different opinions, it was resolved, at last, that the images, and other ornaments, should remain in the church untouched; that the Monks likewise should perform their religious worship after the ancient manner, because it was not safe at that time to change any of those things. That the king was at hand, and the bishop still in Cracow, and they hoped there would be a more convenient time to make a change in those things. For the present it was agreed that the communion should be administered privately in the castle, and not publicly in the church. According to this resolution, they allowed Stancarus to appoint the ceremonies which should be used in the new communion, and to teach the use of them.' Stancarus's temper may be known from these words. If he had not the gift of perseverance, it ought not to be ascribed to any lukewarmness: he was a very fiery man; his patron, who was a sword-man, threw water upon that great fire by the advice of some lay persons, who examined that affair. Take notice of a negligence of the Socinian writer, whom I have quoted. He relates the whole Latin passage to prove by the testimony of a Polish Annalist, that Stancarus caused the Monks to be turned out, and images to be thrown down; and yet it appears from the words of that Annalist, that no such thing was done: Lubienietzki betrays therefore his want of judgment. He might have found in

Spondanus what he should have quoted. (4) 'Adversus Stancarum prodiit Orichovii Roxolani elegans libellus titulo Chimæra . . . ubi ait . . . (5) 'eum Pinczoviam Cracoviensis municipii oppidum se contulisse, ibique punice incitatum furore in templum irruisse, imagines sanctorum sustulisse, memorias Martyrum delevisse, altaria evertisse, sacra profanasse, gazam ecclesiasticam diripuisse, denique facientes ex oppido exterminasse. - - - There appeared against Stancarus, a little book of Orichovius Roxolanus, intitled Chimæra . . . where says . . . that he went to Pinczovia, a town in the district of Cracow, where, being incited with a furious rage, he rushed into the churches, threw down the images, defaced the monuments of the martyrs, overthrew the altars, profaned the holy things, laid violent hands on the ecclesiastical treasury, and, in short, banished the priests out of the town.' See the remark [O].

[C] He drew up fifty rules of Reformation for the Churches of Poland. We should wrong him should we suppose that he was a sedentary Reformer, who keeping in his school at Pinczovia, sent his orders and his counsels every where. It is certain that he travelled into several parts to perform the work of the Reformation. Stancarus Ecclesias à papatu reformavit. L. Canones instaurandarum Ecclesiarum conscripsit (6). This proof being too weak, do not mind it, but hold by this. 'Stancarus . . . ad reformandas Ecclesias ab Anno 1553, magno studio incubuerat: in quam rem hortatu Jacobi Comitissæ Ostrorogii libros conscripserat. Cum enim ei, tunc Felici Crucigero & aliis piis viris, mota in ditione Cracoviensi persecutione . . . aliz sedes quietæ querendæ essent, in majorem Poloniam concesserat & Ostrorogii protectu tutus permanerat. A quo Anno 1553, dimissus in minorem Poloniam cum eodem illo Crucigero reverterat, & reformandis ab idololatria ecclesiis pro tempore operam dederat, favore Stanislaus Stadnicki, Hieronymi Philipovii, Nicolai Olefnicki & aliorum Patronorum Virorum Nobilissimorum & Generosissimorum fretus (7). - - - Stancarus laboured with great pains to reform the church, in the year 1553: and for this purpose he wrote some books at the persuasion of James Count Ostrorogski. For a persecution having arisen in the district of Cracow, and he, with Felix Cruciger, and other pious men, being obliged to settle in some safer place, came into the Greater Poland, and continued safe under the protection of Ostrorogski. In the same year having been sent into the Lesser Poland, he came back with Cruciger, and endeavoured to reform the church from idolatry, being supported by the favour of Stanislaus Stadnicki, Jeron Philipowski, Nicolaus Olefnicki, and other most noble, and most generous patrons.'

[D] It is said that he learned this doctrine from Peter Lombard, an author, whom he much admired. I have read the following passage long ago in Micælius. 'Hic homo tanti fecit Magistrum sententiarum ex cuius lacunis hauserat errorem, ut dicere non sit verius, unum Petrum Lombardum plus valere, quam C. Lutheros, CC. Melancthonos, CCC. Bullingeros, CCCC. Martyres & I. Calvinos: ex quibus omnibus, si in mortario contunderentur, non exprimeretur una uncia veræ theologiæ (8). - - - This man so much esteemed Peter Lombard, from whom he had im-

(4) Spondanus, ad ann. 1551, num. 22, pag. 538.

(5) Orichovius, in Chimæra, fol. m. 24, verso.

(6) Lætus, Compend. Hist. Univ. pag. m. 389.

(7) Stanislaus Lubienietzki, ubi supra, lib. ii, cap. vi, p. 116, 117.

(8) Micælius, Syntagm. Hist. Eccles. pag. 890.

(3) Orichovius, Annal. III, apud Stanislaus Lubienietzki, Hist. Reformat. Polonica, lib. i, cap. v, pag. 31, 32.

(22) Id. *ibid.*

bibed his error, that he was not afraid to say that Peter Lombard alone was worth more than one hundred Luthers, two hundred Melancthons, three hundred Bullingers, four hundred Martys, and five hundred Calvinus. Out of all whom, if they were pounded together in a mortar, there would not be extracted one ounce of true Divinity. Florimond de Remond (9), who mentions part of those things, and some others, quotes Stancarus's apology against the Divines of Zurich. I have consulted it, and in it found (10) Micraelius's words. Note, The author boasts that he took his doctrine from the holy Fathers, and not from Peter Lombard, who has only collected, says he, the authorities of the Fathers, and the doctrines of the Church.

(10) Folio k 5,
Edit. Cracoviensis
1562, in 8vo.

(12) *Acrites*
discussa fuit.
Stanisl. Lubien
cius, ubi supra,
pag. 117.

(13) Id. *ibid.*

(14) Id. *ibid.*

(15) *Id. ibid.*
118.

(16) It is attested by Calvin's Trinitarianism, pag. m. 682

(17) It is
252d letter

(18) Respo

controverfia
fcripti quæ

summissio

do causal.
hominem

non volui
dare. M.

lib. iv,

in the y

among
Zanaki

Apparatus:

nas, p

by C. C.

1

subject, that might afford many reflexions [H]. Stancarus lost all the glory of his first actions

(23) Stanisl. Lubiecius, ubi supra, pag. 118.

incidit (23). - - - Soon after, this opinion, as like wife that of Servetus, concerning the superiority of the Father, did not a little induce pious and learned men to examine this argument. Wherefore Andreas Lubiecius, senior, in his manuscript, de Synodis, had just reason to say, that the synod of Pinczovia, held in the year 1558, made way for the destruction of the doctrine of the Trinity. . . . And, indeed, it will evidently appear to every body, that by what followed in this synod of Pinczovia, a door was opened for the examining of opinions which had been commonly received. For in that same year Blandrata, being driven out of Geneva by the influence of Calvin, came to Pinczovia; where having had much discourse with Lismaninus upon this subject, and perceiving that the enemies of Stancarus had not been able to answer him, he so wrought upon him, that he also began to call the doctrine of the Trinity in question. For this reason Lismaninus came to be suspected of Arianism by the ministers, who stiffly maintained their inveterate errors. Calvin had been all along afraid that Stancarus's adversaries would run into another extreme, and saw, to his great grief, that his fear was not groundless. Here follows what he writes to the brethren of that country. 'Tabulam nuper in Polonia editam, quæ Christum & Spiritum sanctum alios à Patre deos facit, non sine acerbissimo merore inspexi. Pridem me hæc cura, non abs re anxium tenuit, ne fratres minus in Scriptura exercitatos abiret Stancari importunitas, ut vitandæ unius absurditatis causa, in aliam fœdiorum laberentur. Accidit ergo quod timui, ac tristi exemplo patefactum est quam noxia sit pestis contentio, ubi magis propositum est, adversarium vincere, quam bonam causam simpliciter tueri. Cæsium Stancari delirium meritò à fratribus Polonicis repudiatum est. Sed dum fidi ab una diaboli astutia cavent, obrepit alter impostor Blandrata Stancaro deterior: & hac occasione abusus est ad errorem non minus detestabilem spargendum

(24) Calvin. in Admonitione ad Fratres Polonos ne triplicem in Deo Essentiam pro tribus Personis imaginando tres sibi Deos fabricent. init. pag. 683; Tractatum Theolog.

(24). - - - It gave me great grief to find that there had been a treatise published in Poland, which makes 'Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost two distinct Gods from the Father. I was along ago in pain, and, not without reason, apprehensive, lest the troublesome spirit of Stancarus should pervert such brethren as were not well enough versed in the Scripture, and so far work upon them, that in order to avoid a less absurdity they should fall into a greater. What I feared is come to pass, and we have a melancholy proof how pernicious the plague of contention is, where people study more how to get the better of an adversary, than simply to defend a good cause. The gross conceit of Stancarus was justly rejected by the brethren in Poland. But while they were guarding themselves against one trick of the Devil, Blandrata, another impostor, worse than Stancarus, surprised them, and took hold of this opportunity to propagate an error no less detestable.' I shall set down a very fine passage of another letter he wrote to them in 1563, which shews the pernicious effects of disputes, and that God sends a curse upon the work of those, who dispute rather to triumph over their enemies, than for the sake of truth.

(25) Idem. pag. 686.

(25) Porro te terrimus hic error, qui apud vos grassatur, favorem obtinuit ex immodico contentiosis fervore. Nam cum Stancarus infusus Sophista, & rabula improbiſſimus commenta sua ingereret, Christum Mediatorem duntaxat esse, quatenus homo est, ideoque apud totam Trinitatem intercedere, optimum compendium quidam esse duxerunt, si responderent solum Patrem verè & propriè esse Deum. Ita effugium illud nimis cupidè multi arripuerunt, quòd ita putarent nullo negotio refutari Stancari ineptias. Sic ut veteri proverbio dicitur, nimium altercando veritas amissa fuit. Equidem non dubito quosdam inscitia vel inconsiderata facilitate lapsos esse: verum conjicere simul licet, nonnullos (26) astutè captasse occasionem, ut execrabile delirium, quod plausibile fore sperabant, simplicibus impudè obtruderent. That is, 'Furthermore, this pernicious error, that is spread among you, proceeds from too great a contention. For when Stancarus, that silly Sophist, and wicked babler, maintained that CHRIST is our Mediator only as he is man, and that therefore he intercedes with the whole Trinity; some were of opinion that the best way was to say, that the Father only is truly and properly God. Many were too fond of this subterfuge, because they fancied the

(26) He means Blandrata, Gentilis, John Paul Akiatus, whom he names soon after.

absurd notions of Stancarus would be easily confuted by that means. Thus, as the proverb has it, Truth has been lost by too much contending. I do not doubt that some have been misled through ignorance and inconsiderateness; but it is very likely others have cunningly waited for an occasion to set forth such an execrable doctrine without any danger, hoping it would be acceptable to the ignorant.' Beza does also acknowledge, that Trithemism and Arianism, which then revived in Poland, were occasioned by Stancarus's disputes (27).

[H] It is a subject that might afford many reflexions. I shall only make a few, and will begin with the complaints some make against learning. Were it not better to suppress the universities than to maintain so many professors in all faculties? They are the men, who give birth to Heresies, or bring up those, who spread and multiply erroneous doctrines. The people, that is, all those who are not called to explain matters of religion, preserve the faith, imparted to them, found and undefiled. Teach them that they must believe the Trinity, the Unity of the Divine Nature, the Incarnation, CHRIST's Mediation, &c. they will believe all those mysteries, without altering the purity of them, and raising any disturbance about them. But the Doctors take a contrary course: some are willing to distinguish themselves by subtle interpretations, and others will not suffer it. Which occasions disputes, that trouble the spring, and divide it into several muddy streams. The first division is quickly followed by a second, and so on: that fecundity, or rather contagion, is very surprising. In a little time you will hear of many sectaries, Apollinarists, Arians, Eutychians, Macedonians, Monothelites, Nestorians, Sabellians, &c. (28). If any one drew the genealogy of Heresies, it would appear that their descent is chiefly grounded upon these two causes. 1. The disputants are willing to keep at too great a distance from their adversaries; and therefore they run into another extreme. 2. The desire of getting the victory, makes them carry their objections so far, that they may be retorted against them, or favour a third party. What do they do to remedy that inconveniency? They yield the ground they are not able to defend, and have recourse to some new invention. This produces a quite different system, which another doctor will reform a-new, not finding it so exact as it should be, and so on. Another, who fancies that both parties have the advantage, and are worsted by turns, as they act offensively, or stand upon the defensive, thinks himself obliged to pitch upon another hypothesis. All these disorders appeared in the case of Stancarus. He fell out with his colleague Olander in the university of Konigsberg; and the better to oppose him, he ascribed to CHRIST's humanity what the other ascribed to the Divine Nature. When he removed from Konigsberg to Francfort upon the Oder (29), he found there an antagonist (30), who run into a new extreme, that he might the better contradict him; for it is said (31), that he taught that JESUS CHRIST, our justification and our mediator as he is God and man, died according to his divine nature. Stancarus returning into Poland maintained his opinion so warmly, and accused his adversaries so violently of favouring Arianism, that he gave many persons occasion to revive the sect of the Arians, and then that of the Samosatrenians. I believe they went upon this: 1. That the objections of the other ministers proved, that the sole humanity of CHRIST was not our mediation. 2. That his objections proved that a co-essential Son of God could not be a Mediator. They therefore took a medium between those extremes: they said that JESUS CHRIST, the Son of God, not co-essential, and clothed with our nature, was our Mediator as to his human nature, and as to the spiritual nature he had before he was born. These are the unhappy effects of Theological disputes, and Professors chairs.

There is another thing to be considered. If a professor advances a new opinion, and gives ground to believe that he does it to get some reputation, an antagonist immediately starts up, who maintains that it is an ill opinion. They grow hot by degrees, and at last hate one another in earnest. To colour their proceedings, which are so like human passions, the aggressor

(27) Beza, in Apologia altera ad Claudium de Xaintes, pag. 345, Tom. ii, Operum. See also what he says in Calvin's Life, ad ann. 1560, pag. 381, Tom. iii, Operum.

EXAMINATION of the complaints against the multitude of universities and professors.

(28) I follow an alphabetical order and not a chronological one.

(29) Melch. Adam. in Vit. Theol. German. pag. 234.

(30) Called Andreas Musculus.

(31) Staphylus, apud Prætorium, Voc. Stancarini, pag. m. 458.

(n) See the remark [I].

actions by the troubles he raised afterwards, indulging too much his vanity and subtilty (N). He published several pieces [I]. Some are strangely mistaken about the nature of his opinions, as I shall make it appear, when I observe Moreri's faults [K]. The books

for must say that the question is about a thing of great moment to the Church. He that is attacked must say the same, and shew that the opinion he has altered gives a great advantage to the enemies. When things are come to this pass, there is no going back; the superiors must intervene. But what is the usual effect of their decisions? an actual and virtual schism. No such thing would happen, if men were not over-fond of their own thoughts. For example, had Stancarus confessed, as he should have done, that his opinion was of little importance for the good of the Church, he would not have thought himself obliged in honour to maintain it; he would have been silent, as soon as he perceived that his assertion occasioned troubles. How many disorders might have been avoided in the world, if men had been contented to dispute about things necessary to salvation? At this rate Osiander and Stancarus had never writ two pages one against another. Is there any body among the people that follows either of those doctrines, when they put their trust in the death of CHRIST? Nay, do not those very Divines, who have most disputed about those questions, worship him without thinking of these distinctions between the human and Divine Nature?

Here is another consideration. In all countries where many persons are paid to explain a body of Divinity, some will doubtless be so rash as to start questions, which it were better to let alone (32), as land-marks that divide inheritances. The example of such men is much to be feared; for every body thinks he may do what is done by others, that have not more authority than himself: hence it is, that new disputes never arise more easily, than when they have been lately preceded by many others. This is what some say against the great number of universities.

I shall answer all those complaints in a few words. It is a most certain maxim that good things ought not to be suppressed, because some make an ill use them: and therefore since the improving of one's mind is very worthy of man, and the appointing of masters for that end is a good thing, it ought not to be abolished under pretence, that some learned men make an ill use of their knowledge to raise Theological disputes. To which I add, that the ill consequences of ignorance are still more to be feared. Ignorance would not prevent divisions: some men less ignorant than others, tho' they had never been in an university, would be so presumptuous and so vain as to fow new doctrines, and might establish them the more easily, because their hearers would be silly and ignorant.

I shall conclude with deploring the miserable condition of mankind. They cannot avoid one evil but by running into another: if you cure them of their ignorance, you expose them to scandalous disputes, and such as frequently shake and even overthrow the government.

[I] He published several pieces.] An Hebrew Grammar at Basil, 1546. An Exposition of St James's Epistle, with the conciliation of some passages of the Scripture, at Basil, 1547. This conciliation was taken almost word for word from Bullinger's commentaries (33); and therefore Stancarus may be placed in the catalogue of Plagiaries. *De decem captivitatibus Judæorum: De sanguine Zachariæ*, and several other tracts, the titles whereof may be seen in the epitome of Gesner's Bibliotheca. I shall only transcribe what follows: *De Trinitate, & Mediatore Domino nostro Jesu Christo, adversus Henricum Bullingerum, Petrum Martyrem, & Joannem Calvinum, & reliquos Tigurinos ac Genevensis Ecclesiæ Ministros, Ecclesiæ Dei perturbatores. De Trinitate, & Unitate Dei, deque Incarnatione & Mediatione Domini nostri Jesu Christi adversus Tritheistas, Arianos, Eutybianos, Macharianos, Cerinthianos, Ebionitas, & Photinianos. Opus novum de reformatione tum Doctrinæ Christianæ, tum veræ intelligentiæ Sacramentorum, cum matura consideratione & fundamento Scripturæ sanctæ & consilio SS. Patrum*, at Basil, 1547, in 8vo (34). It is observed in the epitome of Gesner's Bibliotheca, that Stancarus's book against the ministers of Zurich and Geneva is full of injurious words, and that it was confuted by Josias Simler. Here is an apostrophe of Stancarus: 'Conclusum est, ô Calvine, doctrinam tuam de filio Dei esse plane Arrianam, à

qua resiliis quam primum te oro atque obsecro, & has hæreses quam citius fieri potest retractas, & liberes Ecclesiæ Dei ab istis blasphemis quibus eam contaminasti (35). - - It is agreed, O Calvin, that your doctrine concerning the Son of GOD is plainly Arian, which I therefore beseech you to renounce as soon as possible. Make haste to abjure such heresies, and free the Church of GOD from those blasphemies with which you have defiled it.' He says, in another place, which he has demonstrated, that the Churches, called Reformed, were Arian and Eutybian. *Omnes Ecclesiæ quas vos appellatis reformatas per Evangelium filii Dei, Ariane & Eutybianæ sunt, nec hoc negari potest, ut supra demonstrativè probavi* (36). Andrew Jurgiewski, canon of Vilna, alleged those two passages in his *Bellum quinti Evangelii* (37). From whence it appears that Calvin and Stancarus gave one another the same hard words; each of them accused the other of being a blasphemer, and a disturber of the Church; and if Calvin blamed Stancarus's vanity, I make no doubt that the latter charged him with the same fault. 'Eft illud non absurdum modò, sed exitiale commentum, quo vir ille fastu turgidus & novitatis nimium cupidus orthodoxæ fidei principia labefactare conatus est. Dolendum sanè est, quòd hominem qui professe alioqui poterat, mater hæreseon ambitio ad nocendum impulit. Adeò enim frivola sunt quas obtendit rationes, ut satis appareat, nihil aliud quam acuti ingenii famam ab aliis dissentiendo captasse (38). . . . Utinam his moveretur Stancarus: quod tunc demum fore sperandum est, ubi ingenium, quod sua vanitate nimis in sublime elatum est, ad mansuetudinem & modestiam se flexerit (39). - - That is not only an absurd but a pernicious invention, by which this writer, puffed up with pride, and extravagantly fond of new opinions, has endeavoured to sap the fundamental principles of Orthodoxy. It is truly a pity that a man who was capable of doing good, should have been induced by ambition, the mother of Heresies, to do mischief. The reasons which he offers are so frivolous, that it is plain enough that in differing from other people he only hunted after the reputation of a penetrating wit. . . . I wish Stancarus could be prevailed upon by these things. Which we may then hope for, when his temper, too much swollen with self-conceit, shall be reduced to a due pitch of modesty and meekness.'

[K] Taking notice of Moreri's faults.] He says, 'That Stancarus being willing to oppose the errors of Osiander, who taught that the human nature of CHRIST is the cause of our justification, run into the contrary extrem, and wrote against the Divinity of CHRIST like an Arian.' He quotes *Florimond de Remond, Bellarmine, Onuphrius, and Gualtherius*. The first mistake of Moreri, is his saying that Osiander taught that the humanity of CHRIST is the cause of our justification; on the contrary, he should have said that Osiander believed that the essential justice of God, and that CHRIST, as he is God, are our justification. The second mistake, which unavoidably follows from the first, is his saying, that Stancarus taught that the Divinity of CHRIST is the cause of our justification; whereas his doctrine was diametrically opposite to that. Thirdly, Stancarus was so far from opposing the Divinity of CHRIST, like an Arian, that, on the contrary, the only reason why he grew so fond of his doctrine, was, because he pretended that the opposite opinion necessarily introduced Arianism. Sandius, who put into his catalogue of Antitrinitarians, as many men as ever he could, and sometimes under equivocal pretences, has omitted Stancarus; which plainly shews, that he did not in the least oppose the co-essential Divinity of CHRIST. Moreri is therefore grossly mistaken in point of fact. His wrong consequence is his fourth mistake. He falsely believed that Osiander ascribed our justification to the humanity of CHRIST. How then could he say, that Stancarus, contradicting Osiander, so far as to run into another extreme, opposed the Divinity of the Messiah? For it is a natural consequence of the direct opposition, which Moreri supposes between those two men, that Stancarus rigidly maintained the Divine Nature of the Mediator, as he did. Fifthly, The authors quoted by Moreri say the contrary to what he ascribes to them concerning Osiander's

(32) *Mis slyvi*
Kapavov
Αὐλνυτος γὰρ
ἀπαισῶν. Ne
move Camari-
nam, immota
enim melior.
Stephan. By-
zant. *Vox Ka-*
παισῶν.

(33) Epit. Bibl.
Gesneri, pag.
245.

(34) Taken from
the Epitome of
Gesner's Biblio-
theca, ibid.

(37) Andreas
Jurgiewicz, *Bel-*
lum quinti E-
vangeli, pag.
161, 162, Cica.
1595.

(38) Calvinus,
in *Responsio ad*
Frates Polonos,
pag. 682,
Tractat. Theo-
log.

(39) *Id. ibid.*, pag.
683.

books he writ against his antagonists are full of injurious words: he alledged for his justification the law of retaliation, the importance of the heresies he opposed, and even the example of the apostles (o). He gloried that he had been persecuted and condemned,

(o) See the Epistle Dedicatory to his answer to the Divines of Zurich and Geneva.

Osiander's error. I shall only prove it as to Father Gualterius, who has misled Moren. 'Franciscus Stancarus Mantuanus, says he (40), tucri cupiens, ut Osiandro (41) obfisteret, Jesu Christi humanitatem esse nostræ justificationis causam, in oppositum extremum eodem circiter tempore se præcipitem egit, Jesu Christi nimirum divinitatem Arianorum more impugnando: ejus enim erat opinio, Christum dominum esse justificatorem nostrum secundum solam humanitatem exclusâ divini natura. ----- About the same time Francis Stancarus of Mantua striving to maintain, in opposition to Osiander, that the human nature of JESUS CHRIST was the cause of our justification, fell into the contrary extreme, and attacked his Divinity like an Arian: for it was his opinion that our Lord JESUS CHRIST is the author of our justification only, as he is man, not as he is GOD.' You may plainly see in those words three mistakes of Moren, and another near as bad as the fourth. For though a man asserts, that JESUS CHRIST is our Mediator, and our justification, as he is man, and not as he is God, it does not follow that he favours Arianism: And therefore Gualterius made use of an *enim*, for, unworthy of an author, who should pretend to argue right. The greatest oversight lies in the matter of fact, that is, in his being ignorant that Stancarus ascribed the mediation of CHRIST to the human nature, because he believed that the contrary opinion favoured Arianism. If Gualterius had said that Stancarus revived the doctrine of Nestorius, there had been some appearance of truth in it, and he would have been a little more faithful in his quotation; for Florimond de Remond, quoted by that Jesuit, touches upon Nestorianism. Thus this author wrongly states the matter of fact, draws wrong consequences, and is not right in his quotation. He is more faithful in what he quotes out of Prateolus, for what he advances, is to be found in that author; but because the words of Prateolus are taken from Lindanus, it had been better to quote Lindanus, though an author of no authority, who had read nothing of Stancarus, and only goes upon the testimony of one Palladius (42). I dare say that there are few books that cast a greater blot upon the Church of Rome, than those which contain a catalogue of the heresies of the XVIth century. There are two great faults in those catalogues: The first is, That they are stuffed with a vast number of imaginary sects (43); the second is, That the authors of those libels transcribe one another, and it does not appear that any of them has read the books of the Heresiarchs they speak of. But though they be never so absurd in what they say of other pretended party leaders, I think their account of Stancarus shews their ignorance more than any other; since, on the one hand, they ascribe to him an heresy which he opposed, and where-with he continually charged his adversaries; and, on the other hand, the opinion, whereby he got many enemies among the Protestants, is a doctrine which the Roman Catholics maintain against the Protestant Divines. Read these words of the famous Turretin.

'An Christus sit mediator secundum utramque naturam? *affir. cont. Pontificis & Stancarus.* Quæstio hæc nobis intercedit cum Pontificiis qui ut facilius obtineant plures dari posse Mediatore, perpendunt Christum Mediatorem fuisse secundum naturam humanam tantum, ut post Lombard. lib. 3. dist. q. 19. l. 9. Thom. p. 3. q. 26. art. 2. Bell. contro. 1. de Christo lib. 5. c. 3. Becanus in Manu. lib. 3. cap. 2. & alii asserunt. Quos hic Stancarus sequitur (44). *Whether CHRIST be Mediator both as GOD and man?* We affirm it against the Roman Catholics and Stancarus. *This is a dispute between us and the Roman Catholics, who, in order to pave the way for the supposition of several mediators, pretend that JESUS CHRIST was mediator with respect to his human nature only, as Lombard . . . St Thomas, Bellarmin, Becanus, and others affirm: whom Stancarus follows here.* I have just now consulted the *Summa Theologica* of the Jesuit Becanus, and I find these words in it. 'Secunda conclusio. Christus secundum humanitatem est Mediator non secundum divi-

nitatem. *Eft contra Lutheranos & Calvinistas qui docent Mediatorem esse secundum utramque naturam (45).* ----- *The second conclusio.* CHRIST is mediator with respect to his human, not with respect to his Divine nature: *It is against the Lutherans and Calvinists, who maintain that he is mediator with respect to both.* He confutes their arguments; he quotes the Fathers for his opinion, and refers the reader to Vasques and Bellarmin.

Perhaps it will be asked whether the particular opinions of Stancarus ought to be accounted heretical. It is none of my business to decide the case. I shall only say, that in order to judge of the nature of a doctrine, one ought to know the principles and design of its author: For instance, Stancarus ought to be asked whether he denies the mediation of CHRIST, according to the Divine Nature, because he does not believe that he is both God and man; or whether he denies it, because he will acknowledge no inferiority in the Divine Nature of CHRIST, and is afraid it will make way for Arianism? If he alledges the first reason, he is a Samolatenian and a Socinian; but if he alledges only the second, it is quite another thing; he is an orthodox man as to the co-essential and consubstantial Divinity of CHRIST; and his error, at the worst, consists only in his supposing that the Mediation implies an inferiority inconsistent with the Divinity of the Eternal Word. Perhaps, the circumstances of the time, and that man's haughtiness, were the true reason why the ministers of Swisserland and Geneva exclaimed so much against him. The churches of Poland were then in such a condition, that nothing could be more prejudicial to them than such a dispute; and it was thought that Stancarus acted more out of vanity than out of zeal. Perhaps, his doctrine would not appear so pernicious at this present time; for since the objections of the Socinians have obliged some Protestant Divines to say, that CHRIST is not adorable, as he is Mediator; one would think they believe he is not Mediator, as he is GOD. He is certainly adorable, as he is God; and therefore if he ought not to be worshipped, as he is Mediator, it is because he is not Mediator, as he is GOD. ----- *Hinc nata quæstio de adoratione Christi qua mediatoris, circa quam in partes itum est aliis affirmantibus aliis negantibus . . . licet fatendum sit quæstionem hanc prout inter orthodoxos agitur problematicam esse, & minus principalem, de qua utrinque disputari potest salva fidei compage, imo & multum logomachiz involvat (46).* (46) Turretin. ----- *Hence sprung the question about the adoration of CHRIST as Mediator, upon which people have been divided, some chusing the affirmative, others the negative . . . although it must be confessed that the question, as it is handled by orthodox Divines, is problematical, Mr Jurieu, pag. 749. & seq.* *and not of the biggest importance, because one may dispute on either side with a safe conscience, and after all it is little more than a meer contention about words.*

As for the letter of the Ministers of Poland to the Divines of Strasburg (47), I think it ought to be observed that it was written by men, who had communicated Stancarus, and disputed with him upon several occasions. It is an usual thing to ascribe to a man the consequences which are thought to arise from his Doctrine, whether he owns them or not; for it is supposed he does not fairly disown them. And therefore prudence requires we should judge of the doctrine of that writer not by that letter, but by his own writings: I do not think they contain Sabellianism. However, read the following passage (48). 'Neque in eo solo substitit Stancari intemperies, quod doceret Christum Mediatorem esse juxta humanam tantum naturam; sed ultra progressus, quoque veram Personarum Trinitatem sustulit, unum Deum confusâ Trinitate, apud quem Christus homo mediator ageret, Trinomium, cum Sabellio imaginans, cæteras Ecclesias ut Arianas traduxit: quod patet ex litteris Ministrorum Polonorum, è Synodo Pincoviensis scriptis A. M. D. C. L. I. ad Theologos Argentinenfes, (quæ extat prima inter epistolas Zanchii) (49). ----- Præterquam de Deo & Christo, etiam alia in cæteros fidei articulos movit Stancarus non sana,

(40) Gualterius, in Tab. Chronogr. Sec. xvi, cap. xxi, pag. m. 797. He quotes Prateol. V. Stancariani Florim. lib. ii, de orig. hæref. cap. xvi, num. 1.

(41) He had just before faithfully explained the doctrine of Osiander.

(42) Lindanus, in Dubitatio, Dial. ii, pag. m. 127.

(43) See the article BEZANITES.

(44) Franciscus Turretinus, Institut. Theol. Elenctica, Part. ii, Loco xiv, pag. 411, Edit. Genov. 1682.

(45) Turretin, ubi supra, Quæst. xvi, pag. 539. See also Mr Sauro, Examen de la Théologie de Mr Jurieu, pag. 749. & seq.

(47) See the remark [F].

(48) Hoornbeek in Appar. ad Disput. Sociniana, pag. 29.

(49) Id. ibid. pag. 30.

(p) Stancarus, de Trinitate & Mediatore, adversus Tigurinos, folio 7, of the book F.

(q) It was printed at Cologne in 1563, in 8vo.

as St Athanasius was [L]. I know that he taught with great zeal, in Transylvania, but I do not know certainly, at what time (p). The book, intituled *Cbimara* (q), which Stanislaus Orichovius wrote against him, contains many reasons and hard words: as for his reasons, the only design of them is to prove, that his Polish Majesty ought to destroy that man, and all those who follow new opinions in the kingdom. Thus he thinks the arguments of Sectaries ought to be refuted. He confesses that he had married a wife being a priest, but he is silent with respect to the apostacy which Stancarus reproaches him with [M].

I shall

‘fana, de Justificatione, &c. quod video ex Respon-
sione Melanthonis, de controversiis Stancari scri-
pta, A. MDLIII. atque extat inter Melanthonis De-
clamationes, Tom. iv. — Neither did the fury of Stan-
carus stop here, viz. In teaching that CHRIST was
mediator with respect to his Human Nature only. He
went further, and took away the real Trinity of Per-
sons for, according to the confused notion of Sabellius,
he imagined one GOD under three different names,
with whom CHRIST, as man, acted the part of media-
tor. He accused the other Churches of Arianism; as it
appears by a letter of the Polish Ministers, written from
the Synod of Pinczovia in the year 1562, to the Di-
vines of Strasburg. (This letter is the first among the
Epistles of Zanchius) Besides his notions about
GOD and JESUS CHRIST, Stancarus had other
heterodox opinions, concerning Justification, &c. as I
find by an answer of Melancthon’s concerning the con-
troversies of Stancarus, written in the year 1553. It
is extant among the declamations of Melancthon, vol. iv.

(50) Melch. A-
dam, in Vita
Bullingeri, pag.
494.

Mind these words of Melchior Adam (50): ‘ita dif-
feruit (Stancarus) de duabus naturis ut non distinguere,
verum separare plerisque sit visus. — Stancarus dif-
feruit in such a manner upon the two Natures, that, in
the opinion of most people, he seemed not to distinguish but
to divide them.’ They plainly intimate that Stan-
carus’s enemies took the liberty to impute to him a
doctrine which he did not teach. Many thought that
he divided the two Natures of CHRIST. Which shews
that he did not actually divide them, and even that
such a division did not necessarily result from his
principles; for in both cases all his adversaries would
have accused him of Nestorius’s heresy. We may
therefore say, that Melchior Adam means the sense
which many put upon Stancarus’s doctrine. But there
is nothing more fallacious than to judge of a man’s
doctrine by the interpretations of his adversaries. For
a confirmation of what I say, I shall quote Stancarus
himself. The Divines of Zurich made use of these
words: ‘Videat Stancarus qui nostram sententiam
vult gravare suspitione hæreseos, ne ipse interea jure
convincatur Nestorianus à quo tam parum abest ut
difficillimum sit eum ab illo internoscere. — Let
Stancarus, who studies to brand our opinion with the
imputation of Heresy, take care lest we convict him of
being a Nestorian; for he comes so near it, that it is
hard to make any distinction.’ His answer was, ‘Cum
Tigurini non affirmant me esse Nestorianum, non
opus est ut me defendam; quod si etiam affirmarent,
cum non probent, sed simpliciter accusent, illis docti
viri non crederent, quia ipsimet Tigurini ignorant
prorsus quod fuerit dogma Nestorii, ut jam probabo.
Hoc tamen profiteor & coram Deo & hominibus
fateor me nihil negotii habere cum Nestorio, &
Nestorii doctrina (51). — Since the Divines of Zu-
rich do not affirm that I am a Nestorian, I have no
occasion to justify myself; if they should affirm it, so long
as they only laid such a thing to my charge without
proving it, the learned would not believe them; because
they themselves are utterly ignorant of what the opinion
of Nestorius was, as I shall presently make it appear.
I profess however, and acknowledge before GOD and
man, that I have nothing at all to do with Nestorius
or his doctrine.’ This protestation ought to make us
wary in the present case.

(51) Stancarus,
de Trinitate &
Mediatore adver-
sus Tigurinos, folio
6, verso, of the
book F.

(52) Orichovius,
in Chimera, apud
Spandauum, ad an-
nu. 1551. See the folio 78,
of that book of
Orichovius.

(53) Ibid. See
also Florim. de
Remond, lib. ii,
c. xv.

(54) Lladanus,
Prætorius, Gaudi-
ter.

We ought chiefly to mistrust Orichovius, who says
that Arius, Macedonius, Nestorius, and Aërius were
revived in Stancarus (52). What he imputes to him
with respect to the Eucharist (53) is so extravagant,
and even contradictory, that it ought to be looked upon
as a calumny. It does not appear that the Divines
of Zurich and Geneva exclaimed against Stancarus upon
this head. The writers of the catalogues of Hære-
tics (54), accuse him of teaching that the Lord’s Sup-
per is an earnest of the body of our Saviour. Is this

an opinion contrary to that of Zuinglius’s or Calvin’s
doctrine? They add, that he was infected with Rab-
binism. This accusation was only grounded upon his
skill in Rabbinical learning, and his mentioning some-
times the opinions of the Rabbins (55).

[L] He gloried that he had been persecuted and con-
demned, as St Athanasius was.] I have advised, says
he (56), seven times at least, Philip Melancthon,
Osiander and Felix, the Superintendent of the Polish
Churches, and the Ministers of Zurich and Geneva.
I have done it civilly, I dissembled their errors, the
way I took was to ask them whether they were still
orthodox as to the doctrines of the Trinity and In-
carnation. They all joined against me. The follow-
ing words contain a particular account of his com-
plaints. (57) Omnes insurrexerunt contra me. Alii
enim vitam meam quaesiverunt ut Melancthon (58)
per Joachimum Marchionem Brandenburgensem &
Electorem Imperii. Alii carceres præparaverunt
perpetuos mihi, nisi admonitus aufugissem, ut Osiander.
Alii expulerunt me à domo mea (59) & litem-
der. Poloniz & Russiz, ut nemo me reciperet, sed ex-
pelleret, ut Fœlix ille impius & hypocrita cum suis
Pinczovianis. Alii tam in Germania quam in Hun-
garia, Transylvania & Polonia minori multas Sy-
nodos celebraverunt contra me & fidem Catholicam
de Trinitate & mediatore, & multos libellos plenos
de blasphemis Arrianis & Eutychnianis, conviciis &
horrendis calumniis ediderunt, ut me tandem cum
pura doctrina catholicæ fidei perderent, at nihil
facere potuerunt, sicut, nec poterunt. Durum enim
est contra stimulum, unum Deum Trinitatem calci-
trare. Hoc enim modo Constantius Imperator Ar-
rianus cum Arrianis novem Concilia celebravit con-
tra D. Athanasium, quem miris modis afflixerunt,
proscriptionibus, exiliis, & persecutionibus, sed veri-
tas tandem vicit. — They all rose up against me; I
for some sought after my life, as Melancthon did by
means of Joachimus Marquis of Brandenburg, and sending I was
Electors of the Empire. Some, of whom Osiander was
one, designed a perpetual imprisonment for me, unless
I had been forewarned to make my escape. Others again
drove me out of my house, and writ letters to all the
Noblemen of the greater and lesser Poland and Russia, yet
that none should receive or entertain me, but drive me
away. Of this number was that impious hypocrite
Felix, together with his brethren of Pinczovia. Others
as well in Germany as in Hungary, Transylvania, and
the lesser Poland, held many Synods against me and the
Catholic faith concerning the Trinity and the Media-
tor, and published many libels full of Arian and Euty-
chian blasphemies, injurious words and horrible asper-
sions, in order to ruin me and the pure Catholic do-
ctrine at once. Nevertheless they could not prevail,
neither indeed shall they. For it is hard to kick against
the pricks, one GOD in Trinity. In this manner did
the Emperor Constantius, an Arian, hold nine councils
with the Arians against St Athanasius, whom they
miserably distressed by proscriptions, banishments, and
persecutions: but truth was victorious in the end.’ He
adds, That the Ministers of Zurich writ to those of
Poland in 1560, to expel him from their churches.
Take notice that he composed this work at Dubetz
in Russia, in the year 1561, and had it printed at
Cracow the year following. Stanislaus Matthew Stad-
nicki had sheltered him at Dubetz (60).

[M] Orichovius . . . confesses that he had married
a wife being a priest.] So far he confesses that his fault
was as great as Stancarus’s, who had also married be-
ing a priest; but in other respects he clears himself of
the sin whereof he accuses his adversary. He alleges
for his vindication, that he had kept within the pale
of the Church, and that he obtained from the sacerdo-
tal functions after his marriage. Thus he submitted to

(55) One of his
books is intitled,
de Rabinorum &
Anabaptistarum
falsis opinionibus.
Another is intit-
led, de Locutis,
juxta Scrip-
turam & Rabba-
nos. See the Episto-
la of Gieser’s Bala-
thea, pag. 145.

(56) Stancarus
de Trinitate &
Mediatore adver-
sus Tigurinos,
in the last leaf
but one of the
book [K].

(57) Ibid.

(58) This is
contrary to Me-
lancthon’s opi-
nion, that it
ought not to be
credited.

(59) In the E-
pistle Dedicatory
of the same book,
he speaks thus.
Expulsi sunt per
aliquos ex domo
mea (non omnes
damno) & ex
toto regno qua-
rentes in vobis fuit.
— Nevertheless
for some sought after my life, as Melancthon did by
means of Joachimus Marquis of Brandenburg, and sending I was
Electors of the Empire. Some, of whom Osiander was
one, designed a perpetual imprisonment for me, unless
I had been forewarned to make my escape. Others again
drove me out of my house, and writ letters to all the
Noblemen of the greater and lesser Poland and Russia, yet
that none should receive or entertain me, but drive me
away. Of this number was that impious hypocrite
Felix, together with his brethren of Pinczovia. Others
as well in Germany as in Hungary, Transylvania, and
the lesser Poland, held many Synods against me and the
Catholic faith concerning the Trinity and the Media-
tor, and published many libels full of Arian and Euty-
chian blasphemies, injurious words and horrible asper-
sions, in order to ruin me and the pure Catholic do-
ctrine at once. Nevertheless they could not prevail,
neither indeed shall they. For it is hard to kick against
the pricks, one GOD in Trinity. In this manner did
the Emperor Constantius, an Arian, hold nine councils
with the Arians against St Athanasius, whom they
miserably distressed by proscriptions, banishments, and
persecutions: but truth was victorious in the end.’ He
adds, That the Ministers of Zurich writ to those of
Poland in 1560, to expel him from their churches.
Take notice that he composed this work at Dubetz
in Russia, in the year 1561, and had it printed at
Cracow the year following. Stanislaus Matthew Stad-
nicki had sheltered him at Dubetz (60).

(60) See the E-
pistle Dedicatory
of this work.

I shall add something to what I have said already. Some authors say that he was at Villach (r) when the Bishop of Cracow sent for him in the beginning of the year 1550 [N], to teach the Hebrew tongue. They tell us that having escaped out of the prison to which that prelate had confined him (s), he retired to the house of Stanislaus Stadnicki at Dubieczko, and set up a school there, which was pretty flourishing during the life of Stanislaus; that after this patron's death he retired to the house of Jerom Philippow, and afterwards to the house of Nicholas Olefnicki at Pinczovia. I have quoted (t) a Polish author, who places the foundation of the Protestant church of Pinczovia in the year 1550; but Regenvolfcius places it in the year 1559 [O]. He observes that Stancarus was called from that place by Count Ostrorog to reform the churches of Great Poland, and that he had for a companion in this work Felix Cruciger (u). Take notice that Stancarus received the degree of Doctor of Physic at Basil, and that Sigismund Augustus naturalized him in Poland in the year 1569 (x). He died at Stobnitz on the twelfth of November 1574, aged seventy-three years. FRANCIS STANCARUS, his son, born on the second of October 1562, was minister of the church of Oxa till his death which happened on the twenty-eighth of March 1621 (y).

(r) A city of Carinthia.

(s) See the remark [O].

(t) In the body of the article, citation (g).

(u) Taken from Regenvolfcius, Hist. Eccles. Slavon. Provin. pag. 125, 126.

(x) Id. ibid. pag. 414.

(y) Id. ibid.

(61) Stanisl. Ori-
chovius, in Chi-
maria, fol. 5.

(62) Id. ibid.
fol. 6.

(63) See Simon
Starovolfcius, in
Elog. centum
Polonorum, pag.
78, 79.

(64) Adrianus
Regenvolfcius,
Hist. Eccles.
Slavonicarum
Provinciarum,
lib. i, cap. xv,
pag. 125.

to the holy canons, and underwent the penance imposed on married priests; but Stancarus married and forsook the church of Rome. (61) *De hoc tibi, atque concedo, me inter sacerdotes publicos, tantisper sacrificasse, quoad licuit, et quoad fas fuit: cum autem sacerdos duxisset uxorem, à sacrificio me funditus removi, et quod Canon jubet, in ordinem redegi, ita unus de multis factus, offero nunc Deo cor contritum et humilatum, quod ne desipiat Deus, supplex plebe in media posco. An ego te imitator arrogantem, atque contumacem? cui parum erat videri multos sacerdotes uxorem ducere, cum qua tibi connubii jus aliter non erat, nisi si à sacrificio, et à facris administrandis abstineres: ni etiam sacrilegio statas solenneque ceremonias sacerdotii pollueres, atque impiis in Ecclesiam introductis facris, omnia sacra vetera, una cum sacerdotio, ex Ecclesia exterminares.* (62) *Uxorem ego sacerdos, contra legem duxi: sed idem tamen ejus legis pœnam sustinui: abrogationem nempe sacerdotii. Hæc enim multa sola sequitur meum factum, legis atque Canonis præscripto. Cum factum, Stancare, in ducenda uxore, par sit nostrum, audi, quàm ipse facti conditio sit inter nos dispar: tibi enim, in diffensione, ac diffidio, per summum Ecclesie contemptum, uxor ducta est: mihi verò, summa voluntate, ac judicio ipse Ecclesie, hæc eadem est adjudicata. Quid ita? quia pœnam legis sustinui: et quod obedientem decuit, Canonis jussu, à facris me removi: tu contra, et pœnam legis contemnis, et facris te immiscuis. But we must not depend upon all that he says; he dissembles and suppresses what he thinks disadvantageous in the accusation. He does not confess that he had entirely broke with the church of Rome, and that he had disputed against it a long time. Nevertheless this is very true (63): he returned afterwards into the pale of that church; which was the reason why Stancarus called him an apostate. He shuns this blow without confessing any thing.*

[N] He was at Villach when the Bishop of Cracow sent for him . . . in the year 1550. I quote Regenvolfcius for my voucher in this fact. Absente Lismanino, says he (64), *ille idem Episcopus Cracov. Maciejovius, Franciscum Stancarum Mantuanum Italum, virum doctum, Villaco vocat, initio A. 1550, ad professionem literarum Hebraicarum in Academia Cracoviensi.*

[O] Regenvolfcius places it in the year 1559. This seems more probable; for if Stancarus, who was called to Cracow in the beginning of the year 1550, stopped at divers places after his flight before he went to Pinczovia, it is not easy to conceive how he could be at the house of Olefnicki in the year 1550. It therefore seems more reasonable to say that it was in the year 1559, when he urged him to drive out the Monks. *Ab hoc (Hieronymo Philippovio) Pinczoviam, ad Nicolaum Olefnitium, qui Pinczoviam, Monachis ejectis, puram religionem A. 1559 induxit* (65). But the same author confounds us, by affirming in another place, that Olefnicki drove out the Monks in the year 1550, and that he was accused of this to the king, as likewise for having afforded a retreat to Stancarus, of whose promotion he gives the following account. *Episcopus Cracoviensis . . . Franciscum Stancarum . . . trahi jubet in Castellum Lipoviec, ubi Episcopalis carcer est, quinto ab Urbe Cracovia miliarium. Sed ex eo, industria Georgii Nigri famuli sui, conciso in longas fascias: uno atque altero linteis, liberatus, Stanislao Lassocio subcamerario Lancienf, atque Andrea Tricefio, delabentem expectantibus; exceptus, venit in oppidum Dubieczko, ad Stanislaum Stadnicium, inde Pinczoviam ad Nicolaum Olefnicium* (66). *The Bishop of Cracow . . . ordered Francis Stancarus . . . to be carried to the castle of Lipoviec, where the episcopal prison is, five miles from the city of Cracow. Making his escape from thence by the contrivance of his servant George Nigier, who cut a pair of sheets in long pieces, and by the assistance of Stanislaus Lassocio and Andrew Tricefius, who received him as he slid down, he came to Stanislaus Stadnicki at Dubieczko, and from thence to Nicholas Olefnicki at Pinczovia.* He furnishes us with some hints to unravel these difficulties, for he observes (67) that Olefnicki was prevailed upon at last to dismiss Stancarus, and to re-call the Monks, upon condition that they would behave well, which they did not. They run away after, having been guilty of new disorders, upon which their monastery was converted into a school. We may therefore admit two Reformations established at different times in the city of Pinczovia, the one in the year 1550, and the other in the year 1559. The Historian is nevertheless blame-worthy for being so indistinct in his narratives.

(65) Id. ibid.
pag. 126.

(66) Id. ibid. pag.
128.

(67) Ib. p. 229.

STELLINGI. It is the name that those Saxons took to whom Lotharius the son of Lewis the Debonnaire granted leave to make profession of the Pagan Religion which Charlemagne had obliged their fathers to renounce. Du Tillet speaks of it; but he does it in much fewer words than an author that has quoted him [A].

[A] Du Tillet speaks of it, but he does it in much fewer words than an author that has quoted him. The Emperor Lotharius . . . turned monk at Pruina, to do penance for his sins, particularly for his disobedience to his father, and because in order to have succours against his brothers Lewis and Charles the Bald, he had restored to part of the Saxons, whom his grandfather, Charlemagne, had made Christians, their idolatrous worship, to which as soon as they were returned, they took the name of Stellingi, living in full liberty of conscience, and every man professing what religion he liked best (1). We shall see

how Peter de St Julien enlarges upon this. He had been inveighing against liberty of conscience, and, among other things, he had said (2), that those who ask it without any restriction, seem to aspire at the privileges of the Thelemites in Rabelais, who had caused this motto to be put upon the frontispiece of their temple, *Do what thou wilt*; and to this purpose, continues he (3), I remember to have read in the collections of the Recorder du Tillet; that the Emperor Lotharius by name, and son to Lewis the Debonnaire, finding himself greatly embarrassed, by reason of the wars he was carrying on against his brothers, required his

(1) Pierre de Saint Julien, Mélanges Paradoxaux, p. 199.

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) Id. ibid.

(1) Du Tillet, Recueil des Rois de France, pag. m. 45, See also Fauchet, Hist. de Charles le Chauve, ch. vii, folio m. 27.

VOL. V.

N n n

STEPHANUS.

234

Saxon subjects to succour him with men and money, which they refused to do, unless he would grant them a liberty of conscience. Lotharius, whose heart was more set upon victory than upon the interest of religion, did not then consider the importance of the Saxons demand, and, without any further reflexion, complied with it. Now these Saxons were so much addicted to Paganism and Idolatry, that tho' Charlemagne had so harassed and weakened them by a war of thirty-three years standing, that they had no other way left of saving their lives but by receiving baptism, they nevertheless submitted to it rather out of fear than devotion. Wherefore having now obtained a liberty of conscience, they plainly discovered that the Christian religion, which they had embraced through constraint, was not planted in their hearts, and could take no root there. It likewise happened that as all sects are accustomed to take their name from their author, or else to invent a new one for themselves, these Saxons called themselves *Stellingi*, and returned to their former idolatry. Afterwards the Emperor Lotharius, coming to a better way of thinking, was touched with a remorse of conscience, (as well for his disobedience and harshness to his father, as for having taken upon him to dispense the Saxons from their baptismal vows and engagements, and presumed to dispose of their consciences, which were not at all subject to his power and jurisdiction) and quitting the world, (where he had lived without either fearing God, or honouring his parents) turned Monk.

By comparing the words of Peter de Saint Julien with those of du Tillet, one may form a just idea of the liberty which many writers take of adding a hundred things to the testimony of the authors whom they quote.

It is not necessary to make any reflexions upon the maxims of Peter de Saint Julien (4): they have been confuted a thousand times over by the Advocates for Toleration (5).

(4) See the remark [F], of the article V. R. E. T.

(5) See the remark [F] of the article SANCTUS (CLAUDIVS)

STEPHANUS Byzantinus was an expert Grammarian, who lived in the Vth or VIth century. He composed a dictionary, wherein he inserted the Nouns Adjective derived from the Nouns Substantive of places, which served to denote the inhabitants of those Places [A]. This was attended with many observations borrowed from Mythology and History, which discovered the origin of cities and colonies, and their changes and differences, whereby the author equally shewed his exactness and learning. We have nothing left but a sorry abridgment of that work, which the Grammarian Hermolaus thought fit to make, and which he dedicated to the Emperor Justinian (a). Notwithstanding the injury this curious book has suffered by the ignorance of the abbreviator and transcribers, it has proved very useful to the learned, who thought that no ancient book did better deserve to be corrected and explained in a critical way. Sigonius, Casaubon, Scaliger, Salmassius, &c (b), took upon them to illustrate it; but it did not appear in Latin till 1678 [B]. That edition published at Amsterdam was followed by that of Leyden ten years after. The Dutch dispersed before-hand some sheets of those editions, which hindered Father Lubin from publishing this author, on whom he

(a) Suidas, in *Ερμολάου*.

(b) See Colomieu's *Bibliothèque Choisie*, pag. 46. & *supra* you will find the names of several authors, who have writ upon Stephanus.

[A] The nouns adjective . . . which served to denote the inhabitants of those places. The title, *περί πόλεων, de urbibus*, which is commonly given to that work, is neither that which the author, nor that which the abbreviator put to it. The true title of the book was *ἐθνικὰ*: hence Hermolaus intitled the abridgment he made of it, *ἐθνικὸν περίοικον*. But because several persons have undertaken, at several times, to abridge this abridgment, and to leave out even the name and the Epistle Dedicatory of the first abbreviator, it is no wonder if the ancient titles of the book are lost. In the room of which some formaters in learning have substituted this *περί πόλεων*, because they thought the main design of the author was to write a Geographical book. But they were mistaken, his real design was to write a Grammatical work, to explain the names derived from nations, cities, and provinces, just as if one should explain grammatically the words Parisian, Frenchman, Dutchman, &c. and shew the great variety that may be observed in the formation of these derivative terms (1). This is the opinion of those who have published Stephanus, as it is related in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*. This opinion might have been criticized upon; for there is no appearance that the principal design of this Grammarian was the explication of these derivative terms. It was probably the least part of his project, and only an accessory to his work. I own he is very careful to observe that sort of nouns, but takes up but little room, compared with the facts that he relates, and the testimonies he quotes; which would be more apparent if we had the whole work. There we should find a line or two in an article for the explanation of the noun adjective, derived from the name of a city, and sometimes whole pages in one article only. I believe, till I be better informed, that the title *ἐθνικὰ* implies all the observations that can be made upon a nation, a city, and a place, in as much as an author confines himself to the origin of places and Geographical history. See in the remark [C] the passage of Father Lubin. (2) What is very pleasant is, that when they cite the author of this book they call him *Stephanus de Urbibus*, whence it came to pass that many persons took *de Urbibus* to be the name of the author's family. Father Lubin had a mind to call

(1) *Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres*, for July 1684, *Art. iv*, pag. 435.

(2) *Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres*, *ibid.* pag. 486.

him *Stephen of the Cities* in his Geographical tables on Plutarch; but having consulted the gentlemen of the French academy, he could never make them approve his design. He seems to complain of their hardness in his *Geographical Mercury* (3). He was (3) *Pag. 64* much in the wrong to complain of it.

[B] It did not appear in Latin till the year 1678.]

There were three Greek editions, that of Aldus Manutius, that of the Junti, and that of Xylander; but tho' the last engaged to publish his Latin version forthwith, and tho' the continuator of Gesner's *Bibliotheca* affirmed, that the book of our Stephanus was published by Xylander in Greek and Latin, in 1568, it is certain it did not thus appear till the year I have mentioned. A Portuguese Jew, named Pinedo, published it at Amsterdam in 1678, with a Latin translation of his own making, and a commentary (4). Six years after, Mr Rijk, professor at Leyden, published the notes of Lucas Holstenius on that same book of Stephanus, which he had from Cardinal Francis Barberini. There was a new edition of Stephanus printed at Leyden in 1688, in Greek and Latin, as that of Pinedo: the Latin translation was made by Berkelius (5). This translator added to it a large and learned commentary. His remarks on the last letters are shorter, and not so learned, because he died before the work was printed. Mr Gronovius has much contributed to the amendment of this edition.

(4) See the judgment which Colomieu puts on it in his *Bibliothèque Choisie*, pag. 46.

(5) He was author of the catalog of Delit.

[C] Which hindered Father Lubin from publishing that author, on whom he had bestowed much pains. This disappointment vexed him, and made him inveigh against the Dutch. Here I shall transcribe the words of a Journalist. 'Having mentioned Father Lubin, I will not forget the indignation he has conceived against the Dutch, since he has been informed that they were printing *Stephanus de Urbibus*, with a Latin translation, and a commentary. If you consult the sixty-third page of his *Geographical Mercury*, you may see with what anger he speaks. The occasion of his grief is, that they have maliciously supplanted him, as he says, and deprived him of the fruit of his long studies. He had been ten years translating that book, and corrected the faults of the three editions, by the help of two Greek manuscripts of the king's library, which had been very obligingly lent him by Mr Cartavi; he had made some Geographical notes upon

had bestowed much pains [C]. The fragment of Stephanus [D] concerning Dodona, plainly shews, that Hermolaus left out a thousand good things; and because he adds sometimes something of his own, one cannot certainly tell whether Stephanus Byzantinus made profession of Christianity or not [E], for who knows whether the passages wherein he seems to speak like a Christian are his? Moreri deserves to be censured [F]. Father Lubin very justly observes that a great service would be done to the readers, if the Nouns adjectives of inhabitants were inserted in Geographical Dictionaries [G]. If I might advise, I would have them inserted in the second edition of Furetiere's Dictionary. Mr Colomiés (c) quotes some words of Scaliger, which appear very obscure to me [H].

(c) Colomiés, ubi supra, p. 49.

* upon it, filled up the chasms, and compared all the authorities of the authors cited with the originals that are extant. Those who saw his manuscripts were amazed at his great labour; when lo, the Dutch, all of a sudden, dispersed the first sheets of their edition over all Europe, that no Bookseller might undertake the printing of that book. This is certainly a severe blow for an author, and especially for a monk of the order of St Augustin, who was going to shew the world his great skill in the Greek tongue and critical learning, which people will not easily believe without plain proofs of it. It is so true, that people can hardly believe such a thing, that the Abbot Baudrand having informed the public, in his Dictionary, that *Stephanus de Urbibus* had been translated and adorned with very learned notes, by the R. F. Lubin; Pinedo writ on purpose to Paris to know the truth of it, and was answered, that Mr Baudrand had given it out in *fide parentum*, upon hearsay (6).*

(6) Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, ubi supra, pag. 487.

(7) At Leyden, 1674, in 8vo.

(8) That edition is in 4to.

[D] The fragment of Stephanus concerning Dodona.] It was taken from a very ancient manuscript, which was in the library of Mr Seguer, Chancellor of France. Tenuilius, professor in the illustrious school of Nismes, was the first that published it. He added to it a Latin translation, with notes. Berkelius made a second edition of it (7), which contained a new translation of his own, and some remarks. Pinedo made a third version of it, and published it at the end of his Stephanus with notes. Mr Grovionius made a fourth edition of it in 1681 (8), wherein the three preceding versions were to be seen: he added to it some learned dissertations.

[E] One cannot certainly tell whether Stephanus . . . made profession of Christianity.] The reflexion of a Journalist seems to me very proper to shew, what a little command the writers of these last ages have over their prejudices; for there is hardly any book wherein their unhandsome way of speaking of other religions does not discover what religion they profess. The reflexion is as follows. * Although Lucas Holstenius believed that Stephanus Byzantinus was a Christian, the thing is still disputable. There are the same difficulties concerning Ammianus Marcellinus: some say he was a Pagan, others maintain that he was not. I conclude from thence, that the writers of this age are infinitely more partial or conceited than the ancient. Are there any geographical or historical Dictionaries, or even Histories, that do not discover the partiality of the author for or against the Church of Rome? It will never be disputed in future ages, whether Moreri, the Abbot Baudrand, &c. were Roman Catholics or Protestants.

(9) Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres, ubi supra, pag. 486.

(10) See in Berkelius's preface, the passages which shew that Stephanus was a Christian.

(11) Berkelius, ibid.

* One may know the sect of a Grammarian by the very rudiments of a Grammar (9). If I was to give my opinion, I had rather say, that our Stephanus was a Christian (10), than that he was a Pagan, as a very learned man will have it; and had he always related the ridiculous opinions of the Heathens, without criticizing on them it would be no crime. Non est igitur audiendus Septimius Florens Christianus, quem non pudit Stephanum auctorem Ethnici appellare, in Commentariis suis ad Aristoph. Irenam p. 77. (11). -- We ought not therefore to believe Septimius Florens a Christian, who in his Commentaries on Aristophanes's Irena has not blushed to call Stephanus a Pagan writer.*

[F] Moreri deserves to be censured.] For he refers his reader to a book that was never published, and says nothing at all of Pinedo's edition. Father Lubin,

an Augustin, says he, has translated it into Latin, and hath added to it very learned remarks. See his translation. Would any man doubt, after the reading of these words, that Father Lubin's Stephanus has been actually published? I believe Moreri thought so, but however he deceived his readers. He had read in Mr Baudrand (12), 'Quod (opus Stephani) nunc Latinum reddidit, restituit, & notis illustravit doctissimus P. Augustinus Lubin Augustinianus. -- Which book of Geographicon, Stephanus is now turned into Latin, restored, and illustrated with very learned notes, by Father Lubin, an Augustin Friar.' He did not doubt, after such a testimony, that he might speak as positively as he did. Mr Baudrand made a good use of Pinedo's reflexion (13); he declared in his new edition, that Father Lubin's work was not yet printed (14). Such a clause should never be forgotten, by those who mention a work that is still in the author's study.

[G] Father Lubin had reason to believe, that a great service would be done, if the Nouns Adjectives of inhabitants were inserted . . .] Here follows the passage which I promised above. You will find in it, among other things, the author's thoughts about the design of Stephanus. The design of Stephanus de Urbibus was, says he (15), to teach his scholars the Greek History; and left in reading they should take the people of one city for that of another, he made it his business, speaking of cities, to observe τα εθνικά of them, which we may translate the familiar names (16) that are given to those people, derived from the name of the city where they dwell; for instance, ἀντιόχεια, τὸ εἰρηδὸν ἀντιόχεις ἀδυναί, ὁ πολιτὺς ἀδυναί. We have good reason to wish, that some learned man would undertake the same thing about Latin names of towns, adding to them the derivative name by which the inhabitants are called; as from Roma, Romanus, from Carthago, Carthaginensis. The same might be done in our own language, and it would not be unbecoming a man of parts to observe how the inhabitants of our cities and provinces are called, how an inhabitant of Bretagne is called a Breton, of Anjou an Angevin, of Paris a Parisian, and the like of others: the reading of our Histories would be more pleasant, and there would not be so many faults in our tongue; those derivative words should not be wanting in our Geographical Dictionaries.

(12) Ad Philipp. Ferrarii Alexandrini Lexicon Geographicon, Tomo ii, folio 357, citante Pinedo in Praefatione.

(13) Cum hujus scrutandi gratia ad amicum quendam literis dedissem, ille legende referripit, illud à Michaeli Antonio Baudrand dictum fuisse in fide parentum. -- Having writ to a friend for information, I received this pleasant answer from him that Michael Antony Baudrand had affirmed such a thing upon the faith of tradition. Pinedo, ibid.

(14) Eius opus notis nondum editis illustravit P. Augustinus Lubin. Baudrand Geograph. Tom. ii, pag. 444.

(15) Mercure Geographique, pag. 64.

(16) The word familiar seems here to be very improper.

(17) Colomiés, ubi supra, p. 49.

[H] Some words of Scaliger, which appear to me very obscure.] * Pinedo does not observe in his preface that Nicolas Sophianus had in his possession an entire Stephanus: Præter alios codices Græcos, says Scaliger in a letter to Gruterus, quos Nic. Sophianus habebat, erat & integer Stephanus cum toto K & Λ, quæ hodie imperfecta circumferri non ignoras (17). -- Besides other Greek manuscripts in the possession of Nicholas Sophianus, there was an entire Stephanus with the letters K and L whole, which, as you very well know, are now imperfect. I cannot apprehend what he means by an entire Dictionary, with the whole letters K and L; it is a riddle to me. Just as if one should say, that a man has read the whole New Testament, with the Gospel of St John and the Acts of the Apostles (§.).

[§.] If after the word Stephanus in the Scaligerana, one was to read nempe, to wit, the sense would be more distinct; but it is clear enough without that, and so great an exactness of expression is not necessary in such a familiar discourse as this, which perhaps after all belongs less to Scaliger than to those who compiled the Scaligerana. R. S. M. C. R. T.]

STEVIN. STIFELIUS.

STEVIN (SIMON) one of the best Mathematicians of the XVIth century, was born at Bruges, and settled in Holland, where he was also made Overfeer of the dikes (a). He was in high esteem with Maurice of Nassau Prince of Orange who loved and understood the Mathematics very well. The books which Stevin published met with a good reception [A]. He invented a kind of sailing chariots, which went very fast [B]. One of his best productions is his treatise upon Statics [C].

(a) Valer. Andr. Bibliotheca Belg. pag. 813.

(1) Valer. Andr. Bibliotheca Belg. pag. 813.

(2) See Vossius de Scient. Mathem. pag. m. 259, 285.

(3) See the second book of his *Sylva*, pag. 62, & seq. edition. Poëmatum 1617.

(4) At Leyden for Bonaventura and Abraham Elsevir.

[A] The books which Stevin published met with a good reception. He published a book of Arithmetic in French, in the year 1585, printed by Plantin at Antwerp in 8vo. *Problematum Geometricorum Libri V*, in the year 1585 in 4to (1), and divers other treatises in Flemish, most of which have been translated into Latin by Willebrord Snellius; but that on the finding out of harbours was translated by Grotius (2). The works of Stevin were collected and published in Latin in the year 1608, and in French in the year 1634, in the folio. Here follows a particular account of the titles according to the French edition. The work is divided into six volumes, the first of which contains his Arithmetic, that is, the computations of Vulgar or Arithmetical numbers: likewise Algebra with the equations of the five quantities. The six books of Algebra by Diophantus of Alexandria, the four first of which are translated by Simon Stevin, and the last two are done newly by Albert Girard, Samiolois. The practice of Arithmetic by Simon Stevin, containing the tables of Interest, Decimals; likewise a treatise of incommensurable quantities with the explication of the tenth book of Euclid. The second volume comprehends Cosmography, that is to say the doctrine of Triangles, Geography, and Astronomy. The third comprehends the practice of Geometry. The fourth the science of Weights or Statics. The fifth Opticks. The sixth Castrametation, Fortification by Sluices, and general Fortification. Observe that the 2d, 3d, 4th and 5th volumes are intitled *Mathematical Memoirs of Prince Maurice*, Grotius (3) made a fine poem upon this part of Stevin's works. The French translator's name was Albert Girard: he revised, corrected, and enlarged, the former editions. It is easy to distinguish what is his. About a year after his death his widow and eleven children dedicated to the States-General the Mathematical works of Stevin, which he had translated, and which were printed (4) in the year 1634, as I have already taken notice.

[B] He invented a kind of sailing chariots which went very fast. Valerius Andreas speaks of them in this manner. Inventor fuit Curruum velivolorum apud Batavos, quos ne equus quidem, licet celeritate ingenti præstans, longe spatio æquare possit. Ferunt enim sedentes in ejusmodi curru duarum horarum spatio leucas Hollandicas quatuor, videlicet Scævringâ Pettenum usque confecisse (5). He invented chariots with sails in Holland, which the swiftest horse could not long keep up with. For it is reported that people sitting in one of these chariots did in the space of two hours travel four Dutch leagues, viz. from Scævringâ to Patten. Vossius affirms the same thing (6). Grotius has writ a Poem intitled *Iter Curru veliferi* (7), which is a beautiful description of their method of sailing in those chariots.

[C] One of his best productions is his treatise upon Statics. Swertius affirms, that Stevin so thoroughly understood the Statics, that he could raise any burthen whatsoever with small strength and an easy machine whatsoever with small strength and an easy machine (8). Valerius Andreas makes use of the same words as Swertius; but he adds, that this instrument was called *Pantocrator*, - - all-sufficient, and he quotes Adrian of Rome, as a person who had given this testimony to Simon Stevin (9). We find in Vossius (10) an exact idea of Stevin's treatise upon Statics; but he calls the instrument by the name of *Pancratiuum*. Let us observe a gross error in Valerius Andreas: he says (11) that the method of finding out harbours is what they call Statics, a very noble and abstruse part of the Mathematics, and in a manner reared anew by Stevin, whose treatise on that subject is incomparable, and has been translated by Grotius. Certain it is, that Grotius put into Latin what Stevin had writ in Flemish on the art of finding out harbours. But this is no part of Statics. Stevin treats of that in the fifth book of his Geography. This book in the French translation is intitled *De Trouver-Port, ou la maniere de trouver les Havres* (12).

(5) Valer. Andr. ubi supra.

(6) Vossius, ubi supra, cap. lvi. num. 19, pag. 337.

(7) See Grotii Poemata, ubi supra, pag. 224.

(8) Adon rei ponderatus post fuit, et melius offerri illi posset pondus, quantumvis grave, quod non parva virtus et facili industria movere possit. Swert.

(9) Valer. Andr. pag. 877.

(10) Vossius, ubi supra, cap. lvi. num. 11, pag. 284, 285.

(11) Valer. Andr. ubi supra.

(12) See pag. 170, of the Mathematical Works of Stevin, Edit. of Leyden 1634.

STIFELIUS (MICHAEL) a Lutheran minister in the village of Holtzdorff near Wirtemberg, lived in the XVIth century. He persuaded his hearers that the end of the world would come on the third of October 1533 at ten in the morning. He had made this fine discovery by the computation of square numbers [A]; but he gave it out as a revelation from Heaven. A great number of country people suffered themselves to be so infatuated with this notion, that they neglected their work and spent their substance. The day appointed being come Stifelius got into the pulpit, and exhorted his hearers to be ready, for that the moment was at hand in which they were to ascend into Heaven with the same cloaths they had on. The hour passed, but nothing appeared of what they expected, and Stifelius himself began to be in doubt, when suddenly a storm arose which revived his hopes, and made him renew his exhortations: behold, said he, the prelude to the last judgment. The storm lasted but a short time, and the peasants that were assembled there soon perceived that the sky was clear. Upon this they grew angry with their minister, dragged him out of his pulpit, bound him, and carried him to Wirtemberg; where they accused him as an impostor, and insisted upon some reparation being made to them. It is said that their pretensions and complaints were declared void, and that Stifelius by the interest of Luther was re-established in his church. Hanard Garamer gives a pleasant account of this in the IXth Eclogue of his Bucolics (a). Tilman Bredenbach recites it intire (b), after having related the adventure in prose. I should not be very ready to believe these two authors, if I did not find it related

(a) He was a native of the country of Liege, and he taught the Greek tongue in the university of Ingolstadt. See Valerius Andreas's Bibliotheca Belgica, pag. 339.

(b) In the 32d chapter of the 7th book Sacrarum Collationum, pag. m. 707. It is from him that Florimond de Remond, Hist. de l'Herésie, liv. ii. ch. vii. num. 7, has taken it.

[A] He had made this fine discovery by the computation of square numbers. Others say that it was by the numeral letters of a passage of scripture. Ex supputatione quadratorum numerorum, tanquam ex divina revelatione, diem ultimi judicii futurum prædixit Anno 1533. 3. Octob. circa 10. diei horam. . . . Referunt nonnulli Stifelium collegisse, vaticinium suum ex verbis istis, *VIDebVnt In qVeM transfIXerVnt*, quorum literæ numerales continent

numerum 1533 (1). . . . He foretold, by the computation of square numbers, &c. . . . Others say that Stifelius collected that prophecy from these words, *VIDebVnt In qVeM transfIXerVnt* (they shall look upon him whom they have pierced) the numeral letters of which include the number 1533. Is it not a deplorable case, that the mind of man should be liable to such gross illusions, and that these should be so catching.

[B] If

related by an eminent Protestant Divine [B]. It is true he does not mention Luther nor the storm which roused the expectation of the auditory afresh. Spondanus tells this story with other circumstances [C]. I do not think that we ought to distinguish this Stifelius from him whose Arithmetical works were highly commended, and who died in the year 1567 [D], nor from him to whom Luther writ the letters of which I speak

[B] If I did not find it related by an eminent Protestant Divine.] It is Marcus Fridericus Wendelinus. He relates it in the sixteenth chapter of the second section of his Contemplations upon Physics. That chapter is intitled *De tempore excidii mundani*, and contains a long catalogue of false suppositions concerning the time of the end of the world. Wendelinus, who writ this in the year 1624, could not confute by the event all those of whom he speaks. He

(2) *Id. ibid. pag. 324.*

could not prove a falsehood (2) upon Philip Nicolai, who said that the world would come to an end in the year 1670; nor upon Ohander who had assigned the year 1689; nor upon him who assigned the year 1700, to confute whom Remacus writ a book on purpose. When Wendelinus composed that chapter, Germany was full of predictions about the end of the world, or the conclusion of the wars which at that time distressed Europe. *Si presentium temporum*, says he, *Prophecia de fine seculi liberet examinare, volumen satis spissum labor hic absumeret: Quod enim Germania nostra est antrum, quod de fine seculi, & presentium turbarum eventus vaticinia non spirat* (3)? He says that for three years before divers pamphlets were spread about, signifying that the golden age was to begin in the year 1624. He mentions one Nagelius, who had foretold surprising revolutions, and was a man of so great obstinacy, that however contrary an event proved to his predictions, he would still maintain that they were true. He always brought himself off by asking a further delay. *De anno, quem jam agimus, à Christo nato millesimum sexcentessimum vicesimum quartum, quot quæso per Orbem, intra triennii spaciū, chartæ volitarunt, quæ auri in eum seculi exordium coniecerunt? Inter Propheciae hujus famuliam ducit Paulus Nagelius, qui vaticiniis suis planè Propheciâ fiduciam promulgatis, multorum animos hæcenus suspensus tenuit; dum insignium mutationum momenta in Calendariis suis notavit. Scriptis etiam compluribus nescio quas visiones & arcanorum apocalypses prædicavit, tantâ animi fiducia, ut ne ab eventu quidem contraria monstrante, vaticiniorum suorum veritatem suspectam debere reddi contenderit. Saxonicis subinde, ad fidem impetrandam dilationibus sibi indultis. Mibi quidem, aliorum exemplo, virum illum exagitare non est animus; in quo unum hoc probò, quod seriâ vitæ nostræ emendatione imminentes penas effugere publicus parentis præco jubet. Attamen vitio, opinor, nemo mihi vertet, si majorem illi vel in arcanis revelandis sapientiam, vel in ignotis reticendis prudentiam exoptem* (4).

(3) *Id. ibid. pag. 326, 327.*

(4) *Id. ibid.*

What has been said will occasionally serve to shew the fanatic Nagelius in a proper light, and to prove that the story which Garamen has put into verse is not without a foundation, since Wendelinus relates it among several others which are very certain.

I make no doubt but Philip Camerarius, a Protestant writer, meant the same Stifelius in the following passage. It is very well known in our parts what the reasons were which a parson (5) of our time, a man of tolerable learning and a great Arithmetician, alledged, not with any ill design, as I think, but because he trusted too much to his numbers and calculations, grounded upon four words of one of the Evangelists, *Videbunt in quem pupugerunt*, from which he drew his computations, taking the six V. the two I. the D. and M. and out of these forming a cypher of years, to make his parishioners believe in an arithmetical sermon, with which he entertained them, that the end of the world was come, so as to assign the day and the hour. He so much insisted upon it, that many simpletons gave credit to him, and, as the custom of fools is, they resolved before every thing perished to live merrily, and so they spent their all in good eating and drinking. . . . When the day and hour fixed by him was near, those who had believed in his sermons met in a chapel, very devoutly expecting the end of the world; and that they might be the better prepared for it, he preached a new sermon to them, suited to this fancy of his. Before he had done, there arose a violent storm in

(5) *It is in the Latin quidam Parochus.*

the air with thunder and lightening, which was part of his prophecy. This made the poor creatures imagine that their hour for leaving the world was come. But soon after the storm ceased, and the sky appeared as it was before; upon which the miserable parishioners perceiving that the parson had imposed upon them, and that they had been foolishly induced by his persuasion to sit at table longer than it was convenient for them, enraged at such an affront, were preparing to fall foul upon him, with an intention to drub him soundly, nay marry to dispatch him upon the spot, if he had not quickly made his escape, and if some of them, more composed than the rest, had not mitigated their anger (6). Simon Goulart, Camerarius's French translator, observes in his additions that there were *some moderns who, laying down false principles, and making groundless suppositions, have presumed to fix the end of the world about the year 1696* (7). The event has shewn that they were mistaken.

(6) Camerarius, *Meditations Histor. Tom. i. livr. iii. chap. i. pag. 303, Lyon 1610.*

(7) *Id. ibid. pag. 308.*

Perhaps it will be asked whether it is better to follow Camerarius who puts down the year 1532, or Wendelinus who puts 1533, and who supposes that Stifelius made use of the word *transfixerunt*, and not of *pupugerunt*, in the passage of the Evangelist? I answer some people affirm that Stifelius had adopted both these calculations. See Spondanus's narrative in the following remark.

[C] Spondanus tells this story with other circumstances.] Michael Stifelius, says he (8), an apostate Monk, born at Esslingen, prophesied that the end of the world would come in the month of October 1532. He took Luther for that angel of the Revelation who flew through the midst of heaven, in order to preach the gospel to the inhabitants of the earth; and as for himself he fancied that he was the seventh angel, whose trumpet was to proclaim the end of the world.

(8) Spondan. *ad ann. 1533, num. 15.*

* Revelat. X.

He was not inclinable to proclaim this coming of Jesus CHRIST, but the express command of God obliged him to it. Having communicated his thoughts to Luther, he wrote a book wherein he declared that in the tenth month of the year 1533, on the second day of the forty-second week, at eight a clock of the morning, JESUS CHRIST would come upon earth to judge the world. He grounded his calculation upon those words, *JESUS NAZARENUS REX JUDEORUM*, and upon these *VIDEBUNT IN QUEM TRANSFIXERUNT*. The numeral letters of the first passage give 1532: those of the second 1533. The year 1532 being elapsed, he was so obstinately persuaded that his prediction would be accomplished in the year 1533, that he was amazed at Luther's advising him to have other thoughts, and at his not seeing a thing so evident. The 18th of October, which was St Luke's day, not proving to be the day of judgment, as he had positively affirmed it would, every body laughed at his predictions. Nevertheless though he was imprisoned at Wittenberg, he severely reprimanded Luther for exhorting him to be more wise, and to profit by the double experience of his mistake, and persisted all his life in the vain employment of changing his hypothesis by the superstitious virtue of numbers. He died in the year 1567, aged fourscore (9). Seneccerus, who was present at his death, says that he received it with signs of mockery. Luther, who held it rash in Stifelius to prefix a certain time, was nevertheless firmly persuaded that the end of the world was to come soon, and he always expected it after the vernal Equinox in the month of April about Easter-tide, when every thing that the winter had killed returns to life. He thought he had reason to believe that JESUS CHRIST would return at that time. So says Spondanus, but he brings no quotation to vouch for him. Mr Teissier and Moreri have erred about the cypher: for they quote Spondanus as having applied this fact to the year 1553.

(9) Permanet usque ad vitæ exitum (qui contigit anno Christi 1567 octogenario in suis subinde renovatis fatuitatibus ex numerorum vana superstitione. *Id. ibid.*

[D] I do not think that we ought to distinguish this Michael Stifelius from him whose arithmetical works were highly commended, and who died in the year 1567.] Quenstedt speaks of one Michael Stifelius born at Esslingen

Esslingen

What?
Luther?
!!!

(c) In the remarks [B] and [H] of the article BORE.

(d) Seckend. Hist. Luther. lib. ii, pag. 16.

(e) Id. ibid. pag. 34.

He was minister at Esslingen in the year 1525 (d). He was expelled that church, and retired into Austria, where he was preacher to a person of quality (e) to whom Luther recommended him as a learned, pious, modest, and diligent man (f). They were obliged to dismiss him in the year 1527 (g). He had been an Augustin-friar at Esslingen (b). He writ a Poem in the German tongue upon the conformity of Luther's doctrine with that of Jesus Christ (i). For the rest, he was not the only person that inspired the country people with indolence under pretext that the end of the world was near. Bredenbach tells us that one Campanus did the same thing in the country of Juliers [E].

(f) Id. ibid. lib. iii, pag. 112.

(g) Id. ibid.

(b) Idem, in Scholius ad I. lib. decem, num. 76.

(i) Id. ibid.

(10) Quenst. de Patria Illustr. pag. 164.

(11) Thuanus, lib. xli, pag. m. 832.

(12) Vossius, de Scientiis Mathematicis. pag. m. 317.

(13) Bucholc. Index Chronol. ad ann. 1567, pag. 620.

(14) Vossius, ubi supra, he quotes Vossius, Biblioth. Sel. lib. xiv, cap. iii, pag. 132. Edit. Rome.

(15) In Mathematicorum Chronologia, pag. 60.

(16) In the remarks [I] and [K] of article COMENIUS.

Esslingen upon the Neckar, a great Arithmetician, and pastor to some Evangelical Churches: 'Cujus libri Arithmetici, addi he, reconditiorum numerorum scientia referti in magno, uti debent, pretio inter doctos habentur (10). -- Whose arithmetical books are filled with a deeper knowledge of numbers, and on that account are deservedly in great esteem with the learned.' Thuanus makes use of the same words, speaking of the death of Stiffelius in the year 1567: a Pro-mann, as he observes, who had been a long time Professor in Saxony and Prussia, and who died at Iena in Thuringia, when he was four-score years of age (11). According to Vossius he died there at the age of fifty-eight (12); but I am more inclined to believe Bredenbach, who says that he died in that place on the 19th of April 1567, in the 81st year of his age, after having been minister to several churches in Saxony and Prussia (13). I do indeed believe that he was not a Professor, as Thuanus pretends; but a parson. However that be, his arithmetical works are called very exact by the same Bucholc. You will find in Vossius (14), 1, That Posselin has observed that Stiffelius's Arithmetic printed at Nuremberg, with a Preface by Melancthon, has the approbation of great men. 2, That in the opinion of Joseph Blancanus (15) the method in which Stiffelius has treated Algebra, and all the parts of Arithmetic, is an excellent one. Vossius places the edition of his complete Arithmetic in the year 1544, and observes that Stiffelius published a system of Arithmetic according to the Italian practice, a treatise of Algebra, and likewise an ecclesiastical computation in the German tongue.

You will observe that Wendelinus, Spondanus, &c. agree that the Stiffelius who foretold the end of the world was an excellent Arithmetician.

Apply here the reflexion which I made (16) upon the long life of Comenius.

[E] Bredenbach tells us that one Campanus did the same thing in the country of Juliers. He insinuates as if an artful fellow had encouraged this man in his whimsical notions, in order that he might purchase at a cheaper rate the lands of the credulous country people. I shall give the story compleat, and observe that it is taken from Lindanus, who is not a very authentic writer. 'Perluaserat Joannes Campanus miseris rusticis, non longe à fluvio Rura degentibus, quod vel hodie res ipsa loquitur, & testantur vicini, ne amplius austeri sese frangerent agriculturæ laboribus: non sese frustra duris vexarent, diutius fatigarent, enecarent, sodiendi, arandi, metendi sudoribus; instare diem judicii; brevi omnia inundationibus aquarum delenda: indulgentem genio igitur: molliter sese tractarent, suavius viverent, quod mihi fellæ supererat vitæ rusticæ, omnia prope diem certo certius peritura. Illi stolidi stolido ac deliro Prophetæ creduli suos vendunt agellos: qui illos

emit sensus non frustrâ sese illum aluisse Prophetam (17). -- John Campanus had persuaded the poor peasants near the river Rura, as the thing itself appears at this day, and as their neighbours testify, that they should no longer consume their strength by the rough labours of husbandry, nor harass, fatigue, and kill themselves to no purpose, by the heavy toils of digging, ploughing, and reaping; for that the day of judgment was at hand, and every thing was in a short time to be destroyed by a deluge of water. For this reason he exhorted them to make much of themselves, and to spend the poor remains of their country life in ease and pleasure, nothing being more certain than that all things were soon to perish. Those poor creatures giving credit to a simple and delirious prophet sold their lands: you may guess that the person who bought them did not keep that prophet for nothing.' He quotes afterwards an epigram of Martial upon a man, who had spent a very great estate in less than a year, because an Astrologer had foretold him that he was to die soon.

Dixerat astrologus peritum te cito, Munna,

Nec, puto, mentitus dixerat ille tibi.

Nam tu dum metuis, ne quid post fata relinquis,

Hausisti patrias luxuriosius opes.

Bisquæ tuum decies non toto tabuit anno:

Dic mihi, non hoc est, Munna, perire cito (18)? (18) Martial. Epigr. lxxvii, lib. ix.

Munna, th' Astrologer conjur'd well

Who did that you should perish soon foretell:

Since while you hasten'd to prevent your fate,

In luxury you spent your whole estate,

And were in less than one short twelve-month found

To have consum'd two hundred thousand pound.

Now, Munna, tell me, since the case is so,

Is this to perish very soon or no.

Compare with this the consequences of the great promises of Comenius (19), and these words of Camerarius: 'Nifeus, tyrant of Syracuse, did as much (20) a great while ago; for being told by a Soothsayer that the end of his life drew near, he spent all that he had upon feasts, loose women, and other debauches of the like nature. The same thing is said to have happened in our days to a rich man at Lyons, who having caused a calculation of his nativity to be made, and fancying that his death was certainly foretold, very rashly distributed all his wealth, as if he had had one foot already in the grave, so that he left himself nothing. But being deceived by the Astrologer, he was forced to beg charity for his subsistence, having lived to a great age, and much longer than he expected (21).'

(19) See the remarks [K], of the article COMENIUS.

(20) That is to say, as much as the peasants, of whom he had been just speaking, as we have seen in the remark [B].

(21) Camerarius, ubi supra, pag. 203.

STILPO, a native of Megara, was one of the most famous ancient Philosophers. He was either disciple of Euclid himself, or of some of Euclid's disciples; and acquired such a reputation by his eloquence, and the acuteness of his wit, that people left the other schools in crowds to go to Megara, in order to improve by his lectures (a). In a journey he made to Athens, trades-people left their shops to see him (b). Being jested upon by reason of that curiosity, he had an answer ready [A]. Some say he

(a) Diogen. Laertius, lib. ii, num. 113.

(b) Id. ibid. num. 119.

[A] Being jested upon by reason of that curiosity, he had an answer ready. Every body is eager to see you, said one to him, they admire you as a wild beast; such an eagerness is like that which people express to see a bear or an elephant. You are mistaken, answered he, they admire me as a true man. Θανμάσι σε ὡς ἀνθρώπου ἀληθινού. Admirantur te veluti belluam. Minime, inquit

ille, sed velut hominem verum (1). This thought was not unlike that of Diogenes the Cynic, who, with a lantern in his hand, looked for a man in such places where he saw most people. The men he saw having not a human reality and perfection, seemed to him counterfeit men; they had nothing of the man but the name. In this sense Stilpo, a true and real man, should have been accounted by the Athenians

(1) Diogenes Laertius, lib. vi, num. 119.

kept a mistress besides his lawful wife; but this is not certain [B]. He was naturally very much given to wine and women; and yet it did not appear that he made himself drunk, or that he lived a leud life: he had corrected the bad inclinations of his temper by the study of Philosophy [C]. The fear of the gods did not work that effect in him; for he is reckoned among Atheists, or among those Philosophers, who had little religion [D]. Some alledge, as a proof of his impiety, a thing which happened

nians a more scarce and admirable animal, for which trades-people should leave their work, than the most extraordinary beasts of the Indies.

[B] Some say that he kept a mistress. . . but this is not certain. Diogenes Laërtius says so only upon the credit of an inconsiderable author. Καὶ γυναῖκα ἡγάγετο, καὶ ἑταῖρην συνῆν Νικαρέτην, ὡς φησὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ Ὀνήτωρ. Ac præter uxorem quam duxerat, Nicarete etiam pellice utebatur, ut Oñetor ait (2). . . . Onetor says, that, besides a wife he had married, he likewise kept Nicarete, a concubine. Had there been any ground for this slander, Atheneus would not have forgot to mention it, since he makes it his business to cry down every body upon that account, especially the Poets, the Wits, and the Philosophers. But he only says that Nicarete, a courtesan, illustrious for her birth and learning, heard Stilpo's lectures. Would he not have added, that she was his concubine, if he had believed what Onetor says of it? Νικαρέτη δὲ ἡ Μεγαρίτις (3) ἐκ ἀγαθῆς ἡν ἑταίρα, ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναικὶ καὶ κατὰ παιδείαν ἐπὶ τῷ ἥν. ἡγεῖτο δὲ Στίλπονι τῷ φιλοσόφῳ. Megarensi quoque Nicarete non obfcura & ignobilis meretrix fuit, sed & natalium splendore, & doctrinâ perquam amabilis. Philosopho namque Stilponi operam dedit (4). See in the following remark the glorious testimony that was given to our Philosopher's perfect chastity.

[C] He had corrected the bad inclinations of his temper by the study of Philosophy. This we find in a passage of Cicero. 'Stilponem Megaricum philosophum, acutum sanè hominem, & probatum temporibus illis acceperimus. Hunc scribunt ipsius familiares & ebriolum, & mulierolum fuisse: neque hoc scribunt vituperantes, sed potiùs ad laudem: vitiosum enim naturam ab eo sic edomitam, & compressam esse doctrinâ, ut nemo unquam vinolentum illum, nemo in eo libidinis vestigium viderit (5). . . . We are told that Stilpo, of Megara, the Philosopher, was truly a man of parts, and had a very good character in those times. His acquaintances relate that he had a strong inclination for wine and women; nor do they write this in a censorious way, but rather as commending him: for he so curbed and subdued the vitious tendency of his nature, by the help of Philosophy, that no body ever saw him drunk, nor perceived in him the least symptom of leudness.' We shall see below the noble encomiums bestowed upon his virtue by Plutarch (6), and Athenæus (7).

[D] He is reckoned among Atheists, or among those Philosophers who had little religion. He spoke his thoughts too freely; so that he was banished, notwithstanding the subtleties wherewith he endeavoured to rectify his expressions in the Areopagus. I shall use La Mothe le Vayer's words, and at the same time correct them when there is occasion for it. Stilpo was more cautious; for being asked, at an improper time, by Crates, whether our prayers and worship are acceptable to the gods, he smartly answered, that such a question should not be asked in the street, but in private, and in a closet: which is the same answer that Dion (8) made to another, who asked him, whether or no there were any gods. The great Pontiff Cotta gave also the same answer to Velleius, who supposed that it was a very difficult thing to deny the existence of the gods. Credo, says he, si in concione quaeratur, sed in ejusmodi sermone & confessu facillimum. But Stilpo found himself much perplexed upon another occasion, being summoned to appear before the Areopagites for saying that the Minerva of Phidias was not a god: nevertheless he came off cunningly enough, by saying that she was a goddess, and not a god, making a distinction between male and female. Which made Theodorus ask him, as he was going from the court, whether he had seen Pallas under her petticoats, since he spoke so pertinently of her sex. Nevertheless he was banished for this freedom of speech (9). To satisfy every body, I shall relate the thing in the words of the original. Κράτην αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσαντες, εἰ οἱ θεοὶ χαίρουσι ταῖς προσκυνήσεσι καὶ θυγατρὶς φασὶν εἶναι,

Περὶ τούτων μὴ ἑρώτα, ἀνέστη, ἐν ᾧ δὲ, ἀλλὰ μόνον τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ βίωνα ἐρωτήθη[α] εἰ θεοὶ εἰσιν, εἰπαί,

Ὅσον ἀπ' ἐμῆ σκαδάσει δ' ἄλλον ταλαπείρειν πρὸς βου.

Quum rogasset illam Crates an Dii precatibus ac divinis honoribus gaudeant, Noli me inquit, fatue, in via de hisce rogare, sed solum ac seorsum. Hoc ipsum & Bionem interrogatum, an sint Dii, dixisse tradunt,

Tunc senex turbam à nobis propellere curas (10)?

Being asked by Crates, &c. . . . It is said that Bion, when the question was put to him, whether there was any gods, made the same answer;

Old man, why do you not remove the crowd,
That standeth near me?

Diogenes Laërtius means, without doubt, Bion the Borysthenite, one of the boldest Atheists mentioned by the Antients. The conformity of his thought, with that of Stilpo, is very disadvantageous to the latter. Cotta in Cicero was little more orthodox, since he found it no difficult thing to deny the existence of the gods, but when there was ground to be afraid of informers, and of the fury of the people. 'Queritur primum in ea quaestione quæ est de natura Deorum, sintne Dii, necne sint? Difficile est negare credo, si in concione quaeratur: sed in hujusmodi sermone & confessu facillimum (11). . . . In the question concerning the nature of the gods, the first thing to be asked is, Whether there are any gods or not? If such a question were put to one in a public assembly, I grant that it would be difficult to chuse the negative; but in a conversation and meeting like this there is nothing more easy.' Those men would have made a great alteration in the maxim mentioned by Balzac; De divinis etiam vera dicere periculosum est (12). . . . In religious matters it is even dangerous to speak the truth: they would have put in præcipue, above all, instead of etiam, even. They had been right in a certain sense; for the Pagans would not allow that the ideas of the unity and perfect simplicity of God should take place of their pernicious and ridiculous opinions concerning the Divine Nature (13).

Here follows an instance of the blindness of the Heathens. Can any thing be more strange than the opinion of the Athenians, otherwise an ingenious and learned nation, concerning the statues of their gods? Did they not fancy that the work of a sculptor became a God, as soon as it was consecrated to a deity? Did they not believe that Phidias's Minerva was the very goddess that sprang out of Jupiter's head? Doubtless they had such a foolish conceit, otherwise there had been no necessity for Stilpo to use such a distinction as he made to vindicate himself. His crime was this: he asked one day, whether Minerva, the daughter of Jupiter, was a god: he was answered, that she was. But, replied he, that Minerva is Phidias's work, and not Jupiter's daughter; and therefore she is not a god. Whereupon he was cited before the Areopagites, and did not deny what he had said: he pretended that he had expressed himself exactly; Minerva, said he, is not a god, but a goddess, for the gods are males. Ἐφ' ὃ καὶ εἰς Ἀρεῖον πάγον προσκλήθη[α], μὴ ἀνίστασθαι, πρόσκειν δ' ὁρῶν διακρίχθαι. μὴ γὰρ εἶναι αὐτὴν θεόν, ἀλλὰ θεῶν: θεοὶ δὲ εἶναι τὸς ἀρρενας. Qua ex re quum in Arium pagum pertrahus fuisset, nihil inficiatum servavit, imo recte se loquutum asseruisse: non enim deum esse, sed deam: deos quippe males esse (14). It is plain, that if the Pagans had made a real distinction between the statues and the gods to whom they were consecrated, there had been no necessity for Stilpo to alledge the difference between a god male and a god female, in order to justify himself.

This

(2) Id. ibid. num. 114.

(3) He had been speaking of another Nicarete, a courtesan, p. 593.

(4) Athen. lib. xiii, pag. 596.

(5) Cicero de Fato, cap. v.

(6) See the remark [H], at the end.

(7) See the remark [E].

(8) It should be Bion.

(9) La Mothe le Vayer, Dialogue de la diversité des Religions, pag. m. 358, 359. It is the last of the five Dialogues of Orestes Tiberi.

(10) Diog. Laërt. lib. ii, num. 117, pag. 148.

(11) Cicero, de Natura Deorum, lib. i, cap. xxvii.

(12) Balzac, Lettre III à Chapelain, liv. i, pag. m. 21.

(13) See, above, the words of Josephus, citation (116), of the article P Y-THAGORAS.

A STRANGE opinion of the Heathens concerning the statues of their gods.

trans substance

(14) Diog. Laërt. lib. ii, num. 116, pag. 148.

innovations of his Logic cannot be approved; he rejected the universals [H]: and tho' it

that though Tibullus procured her a husband when she was but fifteen years of age, having doubtless observed that she was in haste, yet he could not prevent her anticipating her marriage; and after she was married, she carried on her love intrigues so openly, that her husband, who was an honest gentleman, died of grief for it.

(26) Nouv. de la Rép. des Lettres, for June 1686, pag. n. 722.

She married another, and grew worse and worse (26). The author from whom I have these words, had been saying, That the scholars, who did what they pleased with her, called it commenting upon Cujas's works, and that some of them, out of respect to her father's memory, abstained from such an infamous commerce. It is said, That a colleague of Cujas was not so discreet, and that he caressed his daughter, even during her father's life. Paul Manutius was in the same case. He put his daughter into a convent, hoping by that means to free himself from the troublesome care of looking after her; but even after she had made her vows, she writ several letters to him one after another to let him know, that if he did not take her out of that confinement, she would steal away. That poor man made several journeys, and used so many solicitations, that he obtained from the Court of Rome the dispensation his daughter desired. She quickly got a husband, and though he was a very honest man, she gave up herself to all manner of dissoluteness. Her father did not sink under his grief, nor under the inconveniences occasioned from time to time by the remains of a venereal disease; but it made him very uneasy. Saceris in claustris jampridem concessa filia, ex dementia, ac furoris abrupta est impetu, ut inde se clam egressuram minaretur misero patri, nisi omni studio ipsam extrahere niteretur. Quod factum, ut is plurimum itinerum vexatione, morosaque apud Romanos judices prebensatione, æger animo, adfictusque corpore, tandem hujusmodi poculum, licet peramarum, tamen juxta necessitate questum exorbere sit coactus, inusitato exemplo virginem pluribus annis Deo dicatam, mundanis iterum angustiiis devovendi, quæ cum postea honesto conjugii nupta, prava se libidinis fœdatis indole, infelicitate pergerit, intestino in mœore corruptus, reliquum vitæ sollicita cogitatione traduxit. Quum vero etiam ei accesserint vetusta luis gallicæ inquinamenta, quibus alternatim vel temporum, vel locorum, vel vitæ labeatur mutatio, determinat propter vitæ conditionem fortius videri potuit, nisi comoderato semper, infractoque animo, eam se perferre singulis ostendisset (27). Some learned men have had a leud wife and a leud daughter at the same time. Barnabas Briffonius was one of them, if we believe Scalliger (28). Some others have been so deeply engaged in one half of that misfortune, that no mention is made of their daughters. Such was Paulus Perufinus, that learned man, so highly praised by Boccacio, and so well beloved by Robert, King of Naples. His wife made him a cuckold; and when he died, his finest writings were treacherously destroyed by his wife (29). I could give a list, whereto one might see great names, besides the learned of a low rank, 'quos fama obscura recondit. . . . who are lost in obscurity,' but I leave it to those who will undertake to carry on the subject which Pierius Valerianus began (30). It will not be amiss to put in one class, by themselves, all the learned, who have been unhappy by their marriage. All those men wanted our Stilpo's indifference.

(27) Joannes Imperialis, in Museo Historico, pag. 108.

(28) In Scaligeranis, Voc. Mirron.

(29) Quem librum maximo hujus operis incommodum Biellæ impudice conjugis crimine, eo defuncto, cum pluribus aliis ex libris ejusdem, perditum compertum. Boccaccio, de Genealogia Deor. lib. xvi, cap. vi, apud Vossium, de Hist. Lat. pag. 526.

(30) He wrote a book intitled, De Infelicitate Literatorum.

(31) Διότι δὲ τὸν πρῶτον λέγει, τὸν δεύτερον καὶ τὸν τρίτον. Quum esset disputator acerrimus, species quoque tollebat. Diogen. Laërt. ubi supra, num. 119.

(32) Apud Diogenem Laërt. lib. i.

V O L . V .

and therefore it is not what I shew you. Such a cavil would be groundless now-a-days; for the answer to Stilpo's question would be, It is a cabbage, and not it is cabbage. Is it not then likely that this Philosopher had no other design than to divert himself with cavils, grounded upon the turn of the expression? I believe he had another thought, and that he was altogether against universal terms, and what they call Predicables in the Aristotelian schools. There was something real in his objection; it was more than playing upon words. I think he meant that the species is not affirmed of individuals, and that therefore the species are a meer chimera. Man is not more this man than that man, and it does not signify John rather than Peter; and therefore it signifies no body. His meaning appears more clearly in Plutarch than in Diogenes Laërtius. We read in Plutarch that Colotes violently exclaimed against Stilpo, and accused him of overturning human life; for how could we live, said Colotes, if we were not allowed to call a man good, or a captain; and if we should say man is man, and then by itself good is good. Τραγωδία δὲ ἐπ' αὐτῷ τῷ Στίλπονι, καὶ τὸν βίον ἀναιρεῖσθαι οὖσι οὐκ αὐτῷ, λέγοντι ἕτερον εἶπερ μὴ καὶ ἡγορεῖσθαι. πῶς γὰρ βιωσόμεθα, μὴ λέγοντες ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθόν, μὴδὲ ἀνδρῶν πονηρὸν ἀλλὰ ἀνδρῶν ἀνδρῶν, καὶ χυρὶς ἀγὰθόν ἀγὰθόν, καὶ πονηρὸν πονηρὸν. Tragœdiam adversus Stilponem excitat, atque ab eo vitam tolli, quod dixisset, Alterum de altero non predicari. Quomodo enim, inquit, vivemus, si non dicamus hominem bonum, hominem imperatorem, sed hominem hominem scorsum, bonum bonum, dicem duces (33). It appears from this objection of Colotes, that Stilpo would not allow that a thing should be affirmed of another, but that every thing should be affirmed of itself, and that the attribute of a proposition should not reach farther than the subject. Here is the ground he went upon. That two things may be affirmed one of another, they ought to have the same nature; for in every affirmative and true proposition, the attribute and the subject are really the same. But man and good are not of the same nature; the definition of the one differs from the definition of the other; and therefore good and man cannot be joined together, one of them cannot be affirmed of the other. In like manner running cannot be attributed to a horse; it is an action, the definition whereof is not the same with that of a horse. Besides, should you affirm of a man that he is good, and of a horse that he runs, that is, should you affirm that good and man are the same thing, and that a horse and running are the same thing, how could you affirm that aliments and medicaments are good, and that lions and dogs run? Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ταυτὸν εἰσι τὸ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ἀγαθόν, καὶ τὸ ἵππου τὸ τρέχειν, πῶς καὶ σίτη καὶ φάρμακον τὸ ἀγαθόν; καὶ τὸ διὰ πάλιν λίοντος καὶ κυνὸς τὸ τρέχειν, καὶ ἡγορούμενον δ' ἕτερον, ἐκ ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθόν καὶ ἵππων τρέχειν λέγομεν. Nam si idem sunt homo & bonum, & equus ac currere, quod pacto bonum etiam de cibo & medicamento dicitur? rursumque currere de homine & cane? Ergo non recte dicemus de homine predicari bonum, de equo currere, cum diversa sint (34). These are logical subtilties, whereby all languages would be confounded, and all men would be obliged to be silent or to speak ridiculously; and yet a Sophist trained up in the art of disputing, and used to cavils about abstractions, would give a great deal of trouble to his adversaries, if he undertook to maintain Stilpo's opinion to the utmost. He would not be immediately silenced by the distinction of the attributes in concreto and in abstracto, and by the secundum id quod importat in obliquo, or in recto; it would be requisite to dispute a long time about this question, utrum universale maneat in actuali predicatione. These trifles, though contemptible in themselves, and such as cannot perplex a man of a solid judgment, might nevertheless carry a wrong-headed man into Spinozism: 'Hæ nugæ seria ducunt in mala. . . . These trifles bring on substantial evils.' For those who deny universal attributes, cannot admit any individual's that resemble one another. They must say, that two beings, of which the attribute of substance should be truly affirmed, would be one and the same substance; which is to say in equivalent terms, that there

(33) Plutarch. adversus Colotes, p. 1119, C.

(34) Plutarch. ibid, p. 1120, A.

it were supposed that he did it only to ridicule the Sophists, he should be blamed for his ill taste and his wrong subtilities.

Instead of improving one's judgment, they were only fit to spoil it. A courtesan rallied him about it [I], in answer to what he said to her by way of censure or rally. I must not forget a dream of his, which seems to signify that he was a priest, and which shews, that even in his sleep, he knew how to philosophize [K].

there is but one substance in the whole universe. Common sense agrees, in this point, with the most evident notions of Philosophy. A peasant does clearly conceive, without being mistaken, that the whole essence of man belongs to each man, and ought to be affirmed of each man, and yet that each man is distinct from all others. And therefore he clearly conceives that the same essence, which is affirmed of Peter is not affirmed of Paul; but that the essence, which is affirmed of the one, is like the essence which is affirmed of the other. The Sophists are pitifully mistaken in this point, with their *Universale formale à parte rei*. The most perplexing subtilities will never prevail over these notions in a man of solid parts; and whoever cannot resolve them, may justly laugh at them. I remember that in a public disputation, one of the opponents endeavoured to prove that there are no universals; he went about it thus: If there were universals, Genus's would have two species under them; but it is impossible: for a species cannot differ from another: I prove it. The difference of a species is altogether like the difference of another; therefore there are not two species. The consequence is right, and I am going to shew the truth of the antecedent by an example. Rationality, the specific difference of a man, does not at all differ from irrationality, the specific difference of a beast. Rationality does not really differ from the human soul; therefore it is a substance: Irrationality (35) does not really differ from a beast; therefore it is a substance. Thus rationality, as it is a substance, does not differ from irrationality. How then does it differ from it? Are there some entities of realities in it that are not in irrationality? But are those entities accidents or substances? If they are substances, they make no difference between rationality and irrationality. If they are accidents, they have the essence of being; but irrationality has it likewise, and therefore it perfectly resembles them; they cannot therefore make it differ from rationality. If it be said, that they differ from being, since they have the attribute of inherence, which being has not; I reply that inherence, is a being, and therefore cannot make an accident differ from being. And if you answer that inherence implies something else besides being, I repeat my instance: that other thing does necessarily contain the essence of being; it is therefore like being; and you will always have that objection in your way, though you should suppose in infinitum that the constitutive character of inherence contains something that has something besides being. This objection proves that being has not under it substance and accident, and that substance has not under it body and spirit, and consequently that there are no universals. *Quod erat probandum*. The respondent did not apprehend the difficulty; nor did the president apprehend it much better. The assembly did not apprehend it neither, and the opponent was like to be hissed. Doubtless it was the best way to silence him: His argument was altogether wrong; for it would prove that there is no difference between white and black, pain and pleasure.

If you consult Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, in that part of his work wherein he examines what concerns the unity of Being, you will see that the question about universals was surrounded with a thousand perplexing difficulties. He does not forget this objection: If being and unity are something, how can there be several beings besides that thing? How can there be more than one being? For what differs from being is nothing; and therefore we must conclude, as Parmenides did, that all beings are but one; because, if there were many, they would be different from being, that is, they would be nothing at all. *Εἰ δ' ἐστὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν καὶ αὐτὸ ὄν, ἀναγκαῖον ἑστάναι αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸ ὄν καὶ τὸ ἄν. ἢ γὰρ ἑτέρον τι καθόλου καθήγορεῖται, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα αὐτὰ. ἀλλὰ μὴν εἰ γ' ἔσται τὸ αὐτὸ ὄν καὶ αὐτὸ ἐν, πολλὴ ἀπορία πῶς ἔσται τι παρὰ ταῦτα ἑτέρον. λέγω δὲ πῶς ἔσται πλείον ἐνὸς τὰ ὄντα. τὸ γὰρ ἑτέρον τὸ ὄντ' ὅτι ἔστιν. ἔστω κατὰ τὸν Παρμενίδου συμβαίνειν ἀνάγκη*

λέγον ἐν ἀπαντα εἶναι τὰ ὄντα, καὶ τὸτο εἶναι το ὄν. *Quod si quid est ipsum unum, et ipsum ens, necesse est, eorum substantiam esse unum, et ens: non enim aliquid aliud universaliter predicatur, sed eadem ipsa. At vero si quid erit ipsum ens, et ipsum unum, magna dubitatio est, quomodo modo aliquid aliud præter hæc erit. Dico autem quomodo entia erunt plura uno. Quod enim aliud ab ens est, non est. Quare secundum Parmenidis rationem, necesse est accidere omnia entia esse unum, et hoc esse ens (36).* It does not appear that Aristotle was able to resolve that difficulty.

But to return to Stilpo. Colotes is blamed for two things: one is, that he exclaimed against the subtilities of that Philosopher, without resolving them categorically; the other is, that he pitched on a doctrine, in order to criticize upon it, which Stilpo advanced merely out of a witty conceit (37). and to ridicule the Sophists of that time, by giving them a bone to pick. Plutarch was the more exasperated at this choice of Colotes, because a great many fine things might have been said of Stilpo, of which Colotes did not speak one word. It will appear from the following passage of Plutarch, that Stilpo was a very honest man.

Μετὰ δὲ Σωκράτην καὶ Πλάτωνα προσμαχέσας Στίλπονι, καὶ τὰ μὲν ἀληθινὰ δόγματα καὶ τὰς λόγους τὰ ἀνδρῶς, οἷς αὐτὸν τε καὶ ἐκδοσμι καὶ πατρίδα καὶ φίλους, καὶ τὸν βασιλεῖον τὰς περὶ αὐτὸν σπουδάζοντας, ὅτε γίγναται, ἐδὲ ὅσον ἂν ὀρήνημα τῇ ψυχῇ μετὰ πρᾶσιν καὶ μετρίᾳ παθίας. ὡν δὲ καὶ τὸν καὶ χρωμένον πρὸς τὰς σοφιστὰς λογαρίων πρέσβας γέλωτι αὐτοῖς, ἐνὸς μνησθεῖς, καὶ μὴδὲν εἰπὼν πρὸς τὸτο, μὴδὲ λίσσας τὴν πεισανοτήτα, τραγῳδίας ἐτάγει τῇ Στίλπονι. Post Socratem & Platonem Stilpo oppugnatur. Hujus quidem vera decreta, & sermones, quibus seipsum, patriam, amicos regeisque ipsi operam navantes exornavit, tum animi elationem mansuetudini & affectuum mediocritati conjunctam, Colotes non retulit. Quas mediocritati conjunctam, Colotes non retulit. Quas vero jocans ille sophistis ridensque objicit sententias, harum unam allegans, cum neque refellisset neque solvisset ipse probabilitatem, tragediam adversus Stilponem excitat (38). --- Next to Socrates and Plato, he falls upon Stilpo. As for the solid opinions of that Philosopher, and his discourses, by which he has done honour to himself, to his country, to his friends, and to the kings who favoured him, Colotes takes no notice at all of these, nor of his other good qualities, such as his magnanimity, his gentleness, and his moderation. But from among the little objections which he makes to the Sophists by way of rally he calls out one, and without saying any thing that can shew the improbability of it, he abuses Stilpo in a tragical manner.

[I] A courtesan rallied him about it. Athenæus says, That Stilpo sitting at table with Glycera, upbraided her with corrupting young men. To which she answered, You are charged with the same fault, for people complain that you spoil their judgment with your needles and sophistical subtilities; and they add, that it signifies but little which way they are spoiled, whether it be by a Philosopher or a courtesan. Μὴδ' ἐν διαφύρειν ἐπιστρίβομενοι καὶ κακῶς παύσασιν ἢ μετὰ φιλοσόφου ἢ ἐν ἐλαίᾳ. Nihilque referre iis qui sic in miseriis incidunt ac perunt, an apud philosophum degant, an apud scortum (39). Athenæus had been saying that Courtezans took great pride in their learning, whereby they got the art of quick repartees and witty sayings; but Glycera's answer alleged by him, is no proper instance to shew the justness of their raileries. That courtesan defended herself by advancing a falsity; for there never was so great a corruption in ancient Greece, that people should have been as unwilling to see young men learn nothing but vain subtilities of a Philosopher, as to see them engaged in lewd practices with women.

[K] A dream of his... which shews that even in his sleep he knew how to philosophize. Plutarch will afford me the commentary I went upon these words. 'It is reported of Stilpo the Philosopher, that he thought he saw Neptune in his sleep, and that he seemed very much displeased with him, because he had not, as

(36) Aristot. *Metaphys.* lib. iii. cap. iv. pag. m. 663. C.

(37) Plutarch is perhaps mistaken in supposing this.

(38) Plut. *de Stoicis* pag. 1119. C.

(39) Athen. *lib. xiii.* pag. 54.

* was usual with his priests, sacrificed an ox in honour of him; not in the least daunted at the apparition, he thus boldly accented it. Neptune! What is this business you here complain of? You come hither like a child, and are angry with me, because I did not borrow money and run in debt to please you, and fill the city with the smell of roast meat, but privately sacri-

ficed to you in my own house, such ordinary victims as I could get. At this confident reply, Neptune smiled, and (as the story goes) reached him his hand, as an assurance of his good will to him, and told him, That for his sake he would send the Megarensians about dance of sea Loaches: that season (40).

(40) Plut. de profectu virtutis sentiendo, pag. 83.

STOFLE RUS (JOHN) a famous Mathematician and Astrologer, was born at Justingen, in Suabia, on the tenth of December 1452. Notwithstanding the meanness of his birth, he made so great a progress in his studies, that he was admired for it. He particularly minded those things, for which he was naturally best qualified; for being sensible that he had a genius for Mathematics, he applied himself to that science much more than to any other. He taught it at Tübingen with so good success, that he got a wonderful reputation. The books he published [A], kept up and increased the glory he had acquired by his lectures (a); but he did not succeed in the prognostications he had the boldness to publish. He foretold that there would be a great deluge in the year 1524, and struck a great terror all over Europe [B]: but he was confounded by

(a) Taken from Melchior Adam, in Vita Philosophorum, pag. 73, 74.

(1) At Oppenheim.

[A] The books he published. His *Kalendarium Romanum Magnum*, dedicated to the Emperor Maximilian, was printed (1) in 1518. He published his *Astro-nomical Tables* at Tübingen, the year before. He also published *Rationem compositionis Astrolabiorum; Cosmographicas aliquot descriptiones, de Sphaera Cosmographica, hoc est, de globi terrestri artificiosa structura; de duplici terrae projectione in planum, hoc est, quae ratione commodius chartae Cosmographicae, quas Mappa mundi vocant, designari queant*. A Latin commentary upon Proclus's sphere, and a German tract about the dimension by the astrolabe and the quadrant, and the calculation of conjunctions and oppositions, with a censure upon the ancient cycles, and the prediction of eclipses (2). Vossius says his Ephemerides begin with the year 1432, and end with the year 1525 (3); but according to Melchior Adam, they begin with the year 1532, and reach to the twenty years following. Vossius is more credible than Melchior Adam. Doubtless the latter took for the whole work what was only a continuation of it.

(2) Taken from Melchior Adam in Vita Philosophorum, p. 74.

(3) Vossius, de Scient. Mathem. pag. 136.

[B] Foretold there would be a great deluge in the year 1524, and struck a great terror all over Europe. Augustin Niphus perceiving the great amazement of the people after that prediction, published a book to shew that there was no reason to fear such a deluge. Cum statim à publicata Joan. Stoefferi Ephemeride diluvii istius praenuncia, Augustinus Niphus ut homines à gravi timore liberaret, quem ipsa omnibus incutebat, libellum *Juam de falsa diluvii prognosticatione Caroli V. obtulisset, non defuit, &c.* (4). Princes, and even learned men, were afraid of that calamity as well as the people; which was doubtless occasioned, in some measure, by the agreement of several Astrologers, in publishing such a prediction, among whom there were some of the best Astronomers. Cirvellus, professor of Divinity at Alcalá, put out a book in the vulgar tongue, wherein, without blaming in general the precautions that were used against the deluge, he was contented to blame those who made foolish expences upon that account: he proposed some expedients to preserve one's self from the inundation at a reasonable rate. Those, who had their houses near the sea, or near some rivers, left them, and sold their land and household-goods at a great loss. Simile falsi hujusmodi, & extremae dementiae prognosticii, fuisse illud mihi persuades, quo non vulgarij Ephemeridum confarinatores dumtaxat, sed ex Astronomis peritiores multi, supremam ex imaginaria quadam eluvione, cunctis mortalibus perniciem impendere contendebant; adeoque rumoribus istis, vulgarij hominum animos perterraverant, ut metus etiam ad superiores pervenerit. Nam Petrus Cirvellus Hispanorum omnium sui temporis doctissimus, cum Theologiae, in almo Complutensi Gymnasio, Lectoris munere fungeretur, & verò multos, ut ipsemet inquit, fluvii, vel mari finitimos populos, jam stupido metu perculsos, domicilia ac sedes mutare vidisset, ac praedia, suppellectilem, bonaque omnia, contra justum valorem sub actione distrahere, ac alia loca vel altitudine, vel siccitate magis secura requirere, sui officii esse putavit, in publica illa confectione, quam de nihilo excitare persuasum non habebat, Consilium vernaculo ac materno idiomate conscribere, ut passim ab omnibus legeretur, quo singulis mandaret, impendentes ejusmodi calamitatis praecavende: atque adeo ita rebus suis consulendi, ut minimum ab illa damnum reciperent (5). The great

(4) Naderus, in judicio de Augustino Nipho, pag. 48.

Chancellor of the Emperor Charles V, consulted Peter Martyr about that confection, who told him that the calamity would not be so dreadful as people fancied; but that those conjunctions of the planets would certainly occasion a great disorder. The Duke of Urbino stood in need of a good Philosopher, who proved to him, in a printed book, that the fear of such a flood was ill-grounded. Quod rumor ille non per Hispanias modo, sed longe lateque per Europam diffeminatus fuerit, testem sistere possum Petrum Martyrem, qui de illo à Caroli V. magno Cancellario percontatus, ipse hunc in modum ex Vallesio respondet Epistola 20. libri 34. Quid ego sentiam de pluviis, in initio anni quarti & vigesimi praedictis ab Astronomis interrogas, veras fore conjunctiones illas omnium Planetarum, & iidem locis scio, in materiis praecipue dispositis, & particularibus regionibus aliquid magni parituras arbitror; sed neque auium eorum sententias approbare, qui ore aperto absolute fore alluviem ita generalem vociferantur, ut neque mari, aut ulli terrarum parti, sit ignoscendum, quin horrenda sint incommoda perpeffurae, &c. Neque verò tantum Cancellarius ille sed ex eorum numero esse ostendit, quos vanissimus diluvii metus percellerat, sed Urbini Dux non prius ab eodem liberari potuit, quam Paulus de Middeburgo Forosempronienfis Episcopus, variis rationibus Mathematicis, & Philosophicis, quas postea typis commisit, ei liquido demonstrasset, inanem esse praesentem metum omnem, quem de futuro diluvio conceperat (6). Guido Rangone, General of the army at Florence, being afraid that the reasons alledged by Augustin Niphus, would remove the fear of Charles V, and make him neglect the necessary precautions, engaged a famous Physician to write against that book of Niphus, in order to oblige his Imperial Majesty to provide for his safety, and to appoint inspectors, who should view the ground in the provinces, and mark out the places where men and beasts would be less exposed to the waters of the flood. Non defuit Thomas quidam Philologus patria Rovennas, & celeberrima fama Medicus, qui è vestigio libellum alium de vera diluvii prognosticatione, ad eundem Imperatorem misit, cum praefatione, quam isthuc maxima parte referre, non alienum à proposito duxerim. Ne ex illo conventu tot fyderum in piscibus, disfortunium quoddam patereris, Guido Rangonus Rei Florentinae armorum generalis gubernator, me monuit, & excitavit, ut de futuro diluvio anni M D XXIII, exactam ad te compositionem dirigerimus; Quatenus amoto Suefani Philosophi, jam impresso errore, locis huic maximo diluvio subditis, & ab hoc ipso alienis, diligentius circumspicis, & annotatis, humanum genus & cetera viventia, vel tu ipse ad minus (nam ubi Imperatoris periculum, hic pro viribus & manu, & corpore, & ingenio utendum) ab eo disfortunato & horribili aspectu liberareris (-). Some other writers imitated that Physician. Quemadmodum contingit ali-

(6) Id. ibid. pag. 47, 48.

(7) Id. ibid. pag. 48.

the event. I shall mention several particulars relating to this, whereby it will appear that

rum in Piscibus MDXXIV diluvium futurum. Hunc enim veluti conceptis verbis, operi suo titulum fecit (8). . . . As it sometimes happens, that the blind lead the blind, there were others that imitated this blundering Philologer, among whom was Nicolas Perranzonus, who published at Ancona a prophecy concerning the true prognostication of the flood, together with the history of twenty inundations. I have likewise seen a small book of Michael de Petra Sancta, of the Order of Observators, Regent in the convent of Minerva; Doctor of Divinity, and Professor of Metaphysics in the college at Rome, written in defence of those Astrologers, who concluded, from the conjunction of the planets in the sign Pisces, in the year 1524, that there would be a flood. For this is almost, in express words, the title which he gives to his book. There was so great a terror in France, that many people were like to grow distracted upon that account. In Gallia parum absuit quin ad infaniam homines non paucos, periculi metu (diluvium) aegerit, quemadmodum apud Joannem Bozellum scriptorem Annalium Aquitanie; Claudium Duretium, cap. 27. libri de fluxu & refluxu maris; Spiritum Roterium ordinis sancti Dominici, & sacre apud Tolosates fidei quæsitorem; in refutatione doctrinæ ejusdem Astrologi; Augerium Ferrerium in libro quem scripsit adversus Rempubli- cam Bodini; Albertum Pigbium in Astrologiæ de- fensione ad Augustinum Niphum? Eustorgium à Bello loco Poetam vernaculum in Rythmis suis, mul- toque alios videre est (9). . . . In France, not a few were almost distracted with this fear, as may be seen in John Bozell, who writ the Annals of Aquitain; Claudius Duret, in the 27th chapter of his book on the ebbing and flowing of the sea; Spiritus Rotter, a Dominican Friar, and Inquisitor at Toulouse, in his confutation of the doctrine of a certain Astrologer; Augerius Ferrer, in a book which he writ against the Republic of Bodin; Albertus Pigbium, in his defence of Astrology to Augustinus Niphus, Eustorge de Beaulieu, a French Poet, in his rhymes; and many others. Read these words of Bodin (10). 'God has promised that there shall be no deluge for the time to come, and has performed his promise. For tho' the great con- junction of Saturn, Mars, and Jupiter, happened in the sign Pisces, in the year 1524, when all the Astro- logers of Europe, Asia, and Africa, foretold an uni- versal deluge, and many unbelievers built up arches to save themselves, and even President Auriol at Tou- louse, tho' they were told of God's promise and oath, that he would no more destroy men by a flood; that year was indeed attended with storms and great floods in many countries, but there hap- pened no deluge.' A writer, who animadverted upon Bodin, denied the fact as to Auriol; but the following reply was made to him, 'I think I have omitted nothing but what is frivolous and inconsi- derable, and deserves no answer. And, amongst others, what you say, pag. 47, that Auriol did not make a boat to avoid being destroyed by the deluge, which the Astrologers foretold, was to happen in the year 1524, but to go a fishing; and yet you tell us, that the boat stands upon four pillars: it is not usual to put boats upon pillars. But I have read a book written against Astrologers, by a Dominican, called Spiritus Roterus, an Inquisitor of the Faith, when he was at Toulouse, which was lent me by Raymund l'Estonat of Pamiers, who has settled in these parts, and told me how that Monk undertook to write that book against an Astrologer who was then at Toulouse, and pretended to tell one's fortune by the stars. That author says in that book, that Au- riol caused an arch to be built at Toulouse, in or- der to avoid the deluge; which he could know bet- ter than you, since you lived neither in the same place, nor at the same time with Auriol. As for what you say in the same page, that Bodin is very much to blame for saying that Auriol was a president, since he was only a doctor of the Canon-law, whom you call a bold, rich, and learned man; I confess that Bodin was mistaken in that point (11). The northern nations were not free from those alarms, as it appears from this passage. Mali istius impenden- tis metum ad extremum usque Septentrionem per- vasisse, testatur manifestè Cornelius Scæpperus Neopor-

tuenfis, cùm inter causas quibus fuit compulsus, ut librum adversus Astrologos de significationibus conjunctionum superiorum Planetarum anni MDXXIV conscriberet, eas potissimum enumerat. Adde me neque in Astrologiam scribere, sed in eos tantum, qui falsa prædicatione totum in se orbem converterant. Neque enim solum vulgo eam rem persuaserunt, sed summis etiam Regibus, & Principibus. Occurrunt quæ hæc de re me percunctatus est serenissimus Princeps D. Chri- stianus Danicæ, Suediæ, Norvegiæque Rex, occurrunt & crebra vulgi suspitiones, tandem mala sibi ominantis: quem autem hominum non impellerent hæc lacrymæ? quem non permoveret impostura, incitaret iniquitas (12)? (12) Naudæ, quem non permoveret impostura, incitaret iniquitas, ubi supra, p. 30. . . . Cornelius Scæpperus Neoportuensis plainly affirms, that the dread of this impending calamity had reached as far as the extremities of the North; since among the reasons which moved him to write a book against the Astrologers concerning what was signified by the con- junction of the planets in the year 1524, he chiefly insists upon the following. Add, says he, that I do not write against Astrology, but against those who had alarmed the whole world by their false prediction; for they not only persuaded the common people of it, but also kings and princes. I reflect upon the questions that were put to me on this head, by the most serene Prince, Christian King of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. I reflect upon the frequent sighs of the vulgar, so long kept in a fearful expectation of evils that were to come upon them. What man would not be roused by these tears? or who could be unmoved at the sight of so much fraud and in- equity?

We have seen what Bodin says, that rains and floods made a great devastation in several places, in the year of that pretended deluge; but some authors, who are more to be credited than he, affirm, that the month of February 1524, was, contrary to custom, very dry and clear. Now this was the time of the conjunction pointed out by the Astrologers for a deluge; so that one would think the extraor- dinary dryness of that month happened on purpose to confound those men. Cardan and Origanus were vexed that Stoflerus had brought such a disgrace upon their trade by a prognostication so contrary to the event. Read these words of the learned Gasendus.

Memorable certe est, quod in historiis, & ac om- nibus penè superioris sæculi libris legitur; cum Astrologi ob plures Conjunctiones magnas, & non- nullas mediocres in Aqueis Signis celebrandas, præ- dixissent mense Februario anni MDXXIV fore Dilu- vium generale, ac stragem tantam, quanta fuisset ante id tempus inaudita; adeo ut non paucis con- sternatis per Galliam, Hispaniam, Italiam, Germa- niamque animis, apparassent navigia, aut compor- tatis farinis, aliisque rebus necessariis, petissent loca editiora; contigisse tamen, ut totus Februarius se- renissimus, pulcherrimisque existeret; planè, ut si operata data comparatus fuisset vaticiniis Astrologo- rum refellendis (cùm sit alioquin insolitum, abire Februarium impluvium) quod ne ipsis quidem Car- dano †, & Origano ‡ dissimulare licuit; dolentibus † Lib. 7. cap. 34. ‡ Dissimulare licuit; illud de futuro Diluvio judicium fuisse non sine Astro- logiæ infamia à Stoflero prolatum (13). . . . It is certainly a memorable thing, which we read in every history, and almost in every book, of the last century; that whereas the Astrologers, on account of several great and some smaller conjunctions that were to happen in the watery signs, had foretold, that in the month of Fe- bruary 1524, there would be a general flood, and such a devastation as had been never heard of before that time; which so frightened numbers of people in France, Spain, Italy, and Germany, that some provided ships, others took with them a stock of meal, and other neces- saries, and fled to the mountains; nevertheless it so fell out that the whole month of February was ex- tremely clear and fine. One would think . . . &c. Take notice, that Bodin, a credulous man, and infatuated with Astrology, vindicates Stoflerus as well as he can; for, on one hand, he gives us to understand, that if there was not a second deluge in the year 1524, it was because God prevented it to perform his pro- mise; and, on the other hand, he enlarges upon the calamities wherewith Christendom was afflicted after the conjunction of the planets: and the better to mend

(8) Id. ibid. pag. 49.

(9) Id. ibid.

(10) Bodin, de la République, book 10, pag. m. 550.

(11) Renatus Herpin, Apologie pour la République de Jean Bodin, in the left page.

† Bozell in Annal. Aquit. Bodin. 4. de Rep. 2. Duret. de fluxu & refluxu mar. c. 27, &c.

‡ Lib. 7. cap. 34. ‡ Pat. in troch. 3.

(13) Gasendus, in Physicæ lib. 4. cap. 1. Opus. Tom. 1. pag. 179. col. 1.

that it is no easy matter to discredit Astrologers [C]; for notwithstanding this false prediction, they found afterwards a vast number of cullies. Some say he foretold that the end of the world would be in the year 1586. I believe they are mistaken [D]; and I cannot

(14) Bodin, de la République, liv. iv, pag. 553. speaks (14) of the war of the Boors in Germany, and of the league against the King of France, who was taken, and of the conquest of Rhodes by the Turks. That island had been subdued in the year 1522. I shall have occasion by and by to mention another fraud of that writer.

[C] I shall mention . . . several particulars, whereby it will appear that in it is no easy thing to discredit Astrologers.] I have mentioned, in the foregoing remark, several facts concerning the chimerical prediction of that pretended deluge; to which I add what follows: In the said year 1523, reckoning as they do in Aquitain, where the year begins in March upon Lady-day, and ends on the same day, all the provinces of France were extremely afraid of an universal deluge, because the Astronomers had foretold, that in the month of February of the said year, and in the beginning of the year 1524, according to their computation, (for they begin with the first day of January) there would be twenty conjunctions, great and small together, sixteen of which would possess watery signs, portending to the greatest part of the world, to climates, kingdoms, provinces, states, and dignities, and to all land and sea creatures, a certain change and alteration, such as our forefathers never saw, nor read in histories. Whereupon men and women were in great fear. Many removed from their low habitations, went into high places, provided themselves with meal, and other necessities, and made public processions and prayers, that God would take pity on his people; and yet there happened no such thing: on the contrary, the said month of February proved as fine as ever it was, and the months following finer than they had been ten years before. Whereby God made it appear that Astronomy is not a certain science; and whatever the planets may foretel, God is above it (15). The author from whom I have this passage, does not forget the chicaneries which the Astrologers alledged to cover their shame. 'However, says he (16), some Astrologers alledged in their vindication, that those conjunctions had produced their effect the year before, because there had been many great floods in several places, which had drowned houses and lands. Others said, that such conjunctions would not have their effect till ten years after, during which many great, dreadful, and detrimental, things would happen; which proved true, as will appear hereafter. For, that very same year 1523, in November, there was a little frost, which froze up the greatest part of the wheat, and most cabbages, and short-shanked apple-trees; and a good number of small treasurers, who consumed the public finances of France, were put out of their places; whereupon this distich was made in a bantering way.

L'an mil cinq cens vingt & quatre moins ung
Le Choux d'yver & Tresoriers tout ung.

The fifteen hundredth year and twenty three,
For Cabbages and Treasurers shall be.

How comes this author to reckon among the public calamities the turning out of the treasurers, who wasted the finances and devoured the people? He should rather have accounted it a happiness. As for what concerns the frost in the month of November, which he calls a small one, tho' he ascribes great effects to it, the same doubts arise in my mind, which I have proposed in the article BERQUIN (17). It is a remarkable thing that Beza should mention such a frost upon the year 1528, as a curse, which the execution of an innocent man brought upon the whole kingdom. Cunæus, Professor at Leyden, made an oration about climacterical years in 1638, when he left the Rectorship, wherein he mentioned the prediction of a new deluge in the year 1524 (18), and laughed at it. He added, that according to the testimony of Ludovicus Vives, that year proved as clear, happy, and plentiful, as ever

was seen (19). Vives does not precisely say all this; nevertheless his words are still more proper than Cunæus's to shew the falsity of the prediction. 'Illud quoque Noë diluvium non siderum commotionibus assignatur, sed ultioni numinis. Verum isti (astrologi) solita temeritate sub certum horoscopus reducunt eluvium illam orbis, & similem horoscopus contigisse ferunt anno vigesimo quarto, qui annus orbem fere totum infans istorum predictionibus terruit, quum nullus annus memoria eorum qui viverent aut mitior aut serenior fuerit, aut suis omnibus partibus tempestivior? Primum in tanta varietate, tamque incertis iis qui annales scribunt, quem annum possunt ipsi annotare quo diluvium contigerit? Ita non dicunt hoc evenisse, quia hic erat astrorum coitus: sed quia id contigerit, talem affirmant fuisse. Hoc verò non est ab experimentis scientiam colligere, sed ad tuendam temeritatem assertionis confingere sibi experimenta. Verum irriti istos natura, qui quo tempore natatoria in aquis omnia erant minati, serenissimi ut si quando antea fulserunt soles, & ver fuit omnium amenissimum (20). -- Noab's flood is not ascribed to the conjunction of the Planets, but to the vengeance of the Deity. Nevertheless those Astrologers with their usual impertinence account for that inundation of the world by a certain constellation, and pretend that the like constellation fell out in the year 1524, when they terrified the whole world with their mad predictions; whereas no year, as far as those that were then alive could remember, had been more mild, more serene, and more seasonable in all its parts. And first in so great a variety and doubtfulness of the Historians, to what year can they fix the deluge? Thus they do not say that this happened because the conjunction of the Planets was such, but they affirm that such was the conjunction of the Planets because this happened; which is not gathering knowledge from experiments, but feigning experiments to support an impertinent assertion. Nature sufficiently ridiculed them, because at the very time when their threatened inundation was to take place over all, the sun shone forth exceedingly bright, and there never was a more pleasant spring.' A learned German, who published some notes upon Cunæus's orations, quotes this passage of Ludovicus Vives, and says, that Cardan maintained that Stofflerus was mistaken for want of a sufficient skill in Physics. Cardan endeavours to shew, that the same position of the Planets which was to produce an inundation, according to Stofflerus, was really to produce fair weather (21); but this pretended justification of Astrology, by censuring those who do not well understand it, does not deserve to be minded upon this occasion.

[D] Some say he foretold that the end of the world would be in the year 1586. I believe they are mistaken.] I have here in view Mr Petit, Intendant of the Fortifications, who uses these words. 'Did not Stofflerus foretel, that, in the year 1524, there would be so great inundations, that if the world was not to be destroyed by fire, there would be then an universal deluge, by reason of the great conjunctions of the Planets in watery signs? Which frightened all Europe to that degree, that many people repaired to the mountains with all manner of provisions. Others provided barks and ships to avoid being drowned; and yet the month of February, in which all these things were to happen, proved extremely dry, to the shame of Astrologers. Did not he say likewise that in the year 1586, after an eclipse of the sun in May, and the conjunction of all the Planets, the world would be at end by the fury of winds and storms, which proved ridiculous (22). I believe one might boldly deny what he says in his second question, and affirm, that Stofflerus foretold no such thing for the year 1586. In the first place, his Ephemerides do not reach so far. In the second place, that year is not characterized by an eclipse of the sun in May, nor by the conjunction of all the Planets. I think I have found out what led that author into this mistake: he had read in Gassendus, next to what concerns the prediction of a deluge, an account of a prediction concerning the year 1186. Some time after, trusting too

(15) Jean Bouchet, Annales d'Aquitain, fol. m. 215, Nau-dreus and Gassendus call him wrong Boetellus in the passages above quoted, citations (9) and (13).

(16) Id. ibid.

(17) Remark [4].

(18) The Printers put 1504. That fault has been corrected in the Leipzig edition 1693.

(19) Proditum memorie Ludovicus Vives, auctor certissimus, reliquit, nullum annum aequè serenum, nullum aequè fastum, & ubertate notabilem fuisse. Cunæus, Orat. IV, pag. 78, Edit. Lipp. 1693.

else private

(20) Lud. Vives, de Veritate Fidei Christiane, lib. i, cap. x. Astrologers with their usual impertinence account for that inundation of the world by a certain constellation, and pretend that the like constellation fell out in the year 1524.

(21) Cardan. Aethor. Astrol. Regemans vii, Astror. xxxiv, apud Aug. Buchnerum in Orat. Cuneus, pag. 375.

(22) Petit, Dissertation sur la nature des Comètes, pag. 137.

(b) Melch. Adam, *ibid.* pag. 74.

(c) Omnibus libris instrumentis Stofleri incendio fortuito Tubingæ combustis, nihil illarum lucubra-

I cannot tell whether those are to be credited, who give out, that he made some predictions upon the year 1588 [E]. Authors are not agreed about the circumstances of his death: some say (b) he died of the plague at Blaubeurs, on the sixteenth of February 1531. Others will have it that he died of a wound in his head, which he received by the fall of a board in his closet: they add, that he foresaw that danger [F]. He had a great affection for Munster, his scholar; which proved very beneficial to the commonwealth of learning: for had he not suffered him to transcribe his writings, they had been lost for ever, when the originals were burnt (c). It is to be observed, that he

tionem evadit; nisi multa Mansternus descripta advenisset. Melch. Adam, ubi supra.

was

(23) Not in May, as Mr Petit says, but the 21st of April, Mr Petit, for want of attention, did not mind the word *Kal.* in Gassendus.

* Prefat. in Manil.

(24) Gassendus, ubi supra.

(25) Naudæus, ubi supra, pag. 45. Consult Cal-

vinius, *ad ann.* 1186, who observes that the Arabians in Spain gave notice of that conjunction.

Hinc prædixerunt: Tandem, inquit, erit ventus, ut pul-

vere repletur sit arboris & turres.

Inde sequitur hæc miracula: Veniet vir sapiens, Doctus

veritatis. Deinde orietur quidam ex Elam, qui magnas strages faciet. Sed nihil annatum est, quod evenit.

--- Hence they foretold that there should be a violent storm of wind, which would fill the trees and towers with dust; after which these mi-

racles should follow, viz. a wise man and the teacher of truth should come; and afterwards another man should arise out of Elam, and commit great havoc. . . .

But nothing of all that was foretold came to pass. He quotes Richardus: it is likely he meant Rigor-

dus.

(26) Bodin, ubi supra, pag. 557.

(27) Probably it is an error of the transcriber; for all authors place that eclipse on the 21st of April.

much to his memory, he thought that Gassendus upbraids Stofflerus with a second oversight; and on this supposition he set down 1586, instead of 1186. What will confirm my conjecture is, that the year 1186 has the two characters abovementioned, viz. an eclipse of the sun (23), and a conjunction of all the Planets, as it appears from these words of Gassendus. 'Simile vaticinium fuit, quod ex Rigordo Scaliger' refert, 'scribente Astrologos tantum portendisse exitum, à ventorum, tempestatumque vehementia, ob Planetas tam inferiores, quam superiores coituros mense Septembris anni MCLXXXVI: præeunte Solis defectione x1 Kal. Maii, ut rerum finem imminere à nemine dubitaretur; cum eventus tamen postea coaruerit ejusce Oraculi vanitatem (24). --- Like to this was the prophecy of which Scaliger gives an account taken from Rigordus. That author says, the Astrologers had foretold so great a destruction by the fury of winds and tempests, upon the conjunction of the higher and lower Planets, which was to happen in the month of September 1186, after an eclipse of the sun on the 21st of April, that no body doubted but the end of the world was at hand. Nevertheless the event showed how groundless the prediction was.' Naudæus observes that the weather proved very fine, instead of the dreadful storms foretold by the Astrologers. 'Vide fides apud Rigordum, quid anno Christi MCLXXXVI acciderit. Orientales Astrologi omnes, literis per totum orbem missis, tam securè quam si Regio diplomate res ipsa facta fuisset, edixerant, anno septimo post, qui fuit MCLXXXVI, Planetas omnes tam inferiores, quam superiores, in unum coituros ineunte Septembri, scilicet post Eclipsim factam x1 Kalend. Mai. Indequè tantum ex ventorum, & tempestatum violentia periculi securum, ut fermè rebus humanis, extremum finem imminere assererent. Quid igitur postea factum est, nisi ut mortales innumeros, qui per totum illud septennium, vitam sibi præ metu, & periculorum expectatione acerbam putaverant, ineunte termino ab Astrologis illis præstituto, molles potius Favonii, quam Aquilones, & blanda sedataque Autumni temperies, quam nubila vel perturbata exciperet (25)? --- Consult Rigordus touching what happened in the year 1179. The eastern Astrologers having sent letters all over the world, with as much confidence as if the royal signal had been annexed to them, proclaimed that in the seventh year after that, viz. the year 1186, there was to be a conjunction of all the upper and lower Planets towards the beginning of September, after an eclipse of the sun on the 21st of April. They affirmed that this would occasion such storms and winds, that the end of all things was very near at hand. What followed upon this? Nought else but that vast numbers of people, who had led an uneasy life for seven years through fear and the expectation of danger, when the term fixed by the Astrologers was come, were agreeably surprized with gentle Zephyrs, instead of north-winds, and with a mild and peaceable autumn, instead of clouds and tempestuous weather.' Bodin has been a prevaricator upon this occasion: he supposes the Astrologers did not foretell great winds, but great revolutions of state. He had a mind to save their honour by such a subterfuge; for take the history of the world where you will, you will find some revolutions within the space of fifteen or twenty years. We read also, says he (26), 'that in the year MCLXXXVI in September, the lower and upper Planets were in conjunction, when the eastern Astrologers by letters sent into all parts, as the Chronicles of Saint Denys has it, threatened all nations with a change of government, which proved true. But it must be confessed that the Historian is mistaken in saying that there was an eclipse of the sun the eleventh of April (27), and the fifth of that month an eclipse of the moon: which is naturally impossible.'

[E] I cannot tell whether those are to be credited who give out that he made some predictions upon the year 1588. A year which all Judicial Astrologers called a wonderful one, because they foresaw so many strange accidents, and so much confusion in natural causes, that they affirmed, that if the world was not then at an end, there would happen at least an universal change (28). The author of the Mercurius Gallo-Belgicus says, that Stofflerus found as many calamities in the prognostications for the year 1588, as Regiomontanus: which is as much as can be said. Joannes Regiomontanus, Mathematicus summus, aliquantò antequàm Romæ anno à partu Virginis 1475, ætatis suæ 42 in vivis esse defuit, prognosticum seu vaticinium in hanc ferè sententiam edidit:

Post mille expletos à partu virginis annos,

Et post quingentos rursus ab axe datos,

Octuagesimus octavus mirabilis annus

Ingruet, & secum tristitia fata trahet.

Si non hoc anno totus malè concidit orbis,

Si non in nihilum terra fretumque ruet;

Cuncta tamen mundi sursum ibunt atque deorsum

Imperia, & luctus undique grandis erit.

Eadem Joannes Stofflerus, insignis Astrologus, &

nostro seculo generosissimus Heros Henricus Rantz-

vius, in suo de annis climactericis & imperiorum pe-

riodis libello, vaticinatus est (29). --- John Regio-

montanus, a great Mathematician, some time before

his death, which happened at Rome in the year of Christ

1475, and in the 42d of his age, published a progn-

stic or prophecy almost to this purpose.

The year of Christ five hundred eighty eight

Shall bring, when added to a thousand more

Evils of an intolerable weight

Such as were never felt before.

For in that year if sea and earth and all

Do not into their antient nothing fall,

At least it will disturb the course of things,

And batch the fate of Empires and of Kings.

Strong fear shall ev'ry mortal heart confound,

And sorrow shall in ev'ry place abound.

John Stofflerus, a famous Astrologer, and in our days,

that illustrious hero Henry Rantzovius, in his treatise

on climacterical years and the periods of empires, fore-

told the same things. That author imitates Bodin, lest du 12.

for he falsifies History to save the honour of those d'Avic 1644.

Astrologers: he places (30) the execution of the Queen

of Scotland in the year 1588 (31). For the diversion

of the reader I shall set down a flight of Mr Petit, says

tendant of the Fortifications. Do not you think, says

he (32), after having quoted the four last verses of

Regiomontanus's prophecy, that it was word for word

the same Pragmatic with that of the Sieur Andreas (33),

only Regiomontanus is not so positive as to the year, and

does not so much contradict himself. That foolish fellow

(Andreas) says positively, that the world will be at an

end in two years time at farthest: and immediately after

he affirms, that all the powers will be destroyed, and

fall into the hands of the Turks; that is, after the

end of the world, and when there will be neither men

nor beasts. Would to GOD he might be the last beast,

and the last Astrological fool.

[F] Of a wound in his head, which he received by

the fall. . . . They add, that he foresaw that danger.

This I find in Seth Calvisius. 'Johan. Stofflerus,

says he (34). Justingenis, Mathematicus insignis,

certo die sibi periculum ruinæ imminere præviderat,

& quia ædes suas satis firmas noverat, convocat in

1531, pag. 215.

Museum suum viros creditos, quorum consuetudine

& fer-

(28) Persius, Hist. de Henri le Grand, pag. 94.

(29) Justenius Documenta Fritius, in Mercurio Gallo-Belgico, ad 1588, ad 1589, quod Wolstein, Lect. memorabil. Tom. II, pag. 1018. See above what [E] of the arch BRUSCHIUS.

(30) Ibid. apud eundem, Wd. f. 101.

(31) She was beheaded the eighth of February 1587, old style.

(32) Dicoen fu l'Eclipe de So-

l'Eclipe de So-

l'Eclipe de So-

l'Eclipe de So-

l'Eclipe de So-

l'Eclipe de So-

l'Eclipe de So-

l'Eclipe de So-

l'Eclipe de So-

l'Eclipe de So-

was one of those who went about the reformation of the calendar [G]; but this undertaking was not finished until a long time after his death.

(35) De morte eius sic non nemo, penes quem fides esto. . . . In this manner does somebody speak of his death. Let him answer for the truth of it. Vossius, in *Addit. Libri de Scient. Mathem.* pag. 450.

(36) He was Bishop of Poltornone in Italy.

(37) Henricus Wolphius, ubi infra, pag. 121.

(38) Henricus Wolphius, in *Tractatu de Tempore & ejus mutationibus*, pag. 129.

* & sermonibus recrearetur: orta inter sobria pocula disputatio: ad controversiam explicandam è superiori loco librum depromit: sed laxato clavo asser, in quo stabant libri, in caput ejus decidit, & insigne vulnus infelici feni infligit, ex quo mortuus est die 16 Febr. Tubingæ. . . . *John Stoflerus, of Tübingen, a famous Mathematician, foresaw that such a day he should be in great danger of having something fall upon his head; for which reason, as he knew that his own house was pretty firm, he got some learned men to bear him company in his study. While they were sitting over a moderate glass of wine, a small dispute arose, and he to decide the controversy took down a book from a higher place. But as the nail was loosened, the shelf on which the books stood fell upon his head, and gave the poor old man a grievous wound, of which he died at Tübingen on the 16th of February.* Vossius did not know that this particular is to be found in Calvius; for he mentions it only upon the credit of a somebody (35).

[G] He was one of those, who went about the reformation of the calendar. After the necessity of that reformation had been proposed in the council of Constance, some Astronomers considered how it might be effected. I need not name here those who began: I shall only say, that under the Pontificate of Leo X, two writers published their thoughts about it: one of them was Paul of Middleburg (36); and the other our John Stoflerus, who inscribed his propositions to the council of Lateran (37). I say nothing of Joannes Maria de Tholosanis, a Dominican, whose book de

emendatione Calendarii Romani was dedicated to the council of Trent. That Monk says, that Stoflerus proposed three expedients, one whereof was to leave out ten days, and this was pitched upon to put an end to that affair. Frater Joan. Maria de Tholosanis ordinis prædicatorum de emendatione Calendarii Romani cap. 3. ad Concilium Tridentinum sic scribit: Circa hujus æquinoctii reformationem reperiuntur variae formulæ: quarum tres ponit Joan. Stoflerus in suo Calendario propositione 39. Prima earum inter alias potissima est & facillima, secunda difficilis est, & gignens perturbationem magnam, & diffidum in ecclesiæ Dei per orbem diffusa. Ultima absque difficultate servari potest. Hæc ille. Secundam autem formulam vocat, qua nostri temporis correctores uti sunt, 10 dies eximentes ex uno mense (38). . . . Friar John Maria de Tholosanis, a Dominican Friar, in his treatise on the Correction of the Roman Calendar, writes thus: Several expedients have been offered for the reformation of this equinox; three of which John Stoflerus lays down in the 39th proposition of his Calendar. The first of these, which is the principal one, is very easy, the second hard, and fit to breed great disturbance and disension in the Church of God throughout the world. The last may be observed without any difficulty. Thus he. Now what he calls the second expedient is the same which the correctors of our time made use of, by leaving ten days out of one month.

STOUPPA, or STOU P, (JOHN NICOLAS) in Latin *Stupanus*, professor of Physic at Basil, was born in the country of the Grisons on the eleventh of December 1542. He was sent to Basil at fifteen years of age, and there obtained at the age of twenty seven the degree of Doctor in Physic. He succeeded Hospinianus as professor of Logic in the year 1575, and Theodore Zwingerus, as professor of Physic, in the year 1580. He died at Basil in the year 1621, aged seventy-nine years (a). It is of him, if I am not mistaken, that Francis Hotman speaks in a letter, which deserves to be quoted [A]. Among other works of his [B] we have a Latin translation of the

(a) Taken from the *Theatrum of Paul Freherus*, pag. 1344.

Neapolitan

[A] It is of him . . . that Francis Hotman speaks in a letter, which deserves to be quoted. It appears by that letter that a Professor of Basil, named Stupanus, had been Rector of the university in the year 1578, and that he maintained he did not know whether the Maf was a blasphemy, and that the like questions were of small importance to him. Idem ille bonus Typographus Perna, qui toties à Magistratu ob impios & execranda libellos à se impressos in carceres detrusus fuit, detestanda opera omnia Machiavelli ab eodem illo Stupano Latine conversa hic imprimit. Scis illa opera propter tam apertas in Mosem & Christum blasphemias ne in Italia quidem aut vendi licere. . . . Hæc tamen blasphemias & verborum portenta Basilæ cum Magnifico D. Rectoris privilegio & auctoritate promulgantur, latine conversa ab eo qui biennio ante illam Magnificam Rectoris personam gessit, diu mendiculus, pane pauperum & Senatus elemosyna educatus, nunc nuper opulentæ uxoris secundæ maritus: Qui mihi biennio ante Rectoratu fungens coram D. Wrtisio dicere ausus est, se nescire an Missa Papistica esset blasphemias: neque talia ad se pertinere (1). . . . That same honest Printer Perna, who has been so many times imprisoned by the magistrates on account of the wicked and execrable books put forth by him, is nevertheless printing here all the detestable works of Machiavel, turned into Latin by that same Stupanus. You know that these works, by reason of their open blasphemias against Moses & Jesus Christ, are not even allowed in Italy to be sold. . . . Nevertheless these blasphemias & strange words are printed at Basil with the privilege and authority of the most noble Rector, being turned into Latin by the person who filled that honourable post two years before. This man was originally a beggar, and had been brought up as a poor scholar by the charity of the Senate, but had lately married a rich second wife. While he was Rector two years before, he had the impudence to say before Wrtisius that he did not know whether the Popish Mass was blas-

phemias, and it was not his business to enquire about it.

In this manner does Francis Hotman speak of him in a letter to Rodolphus Gualtherus minister of Zurich, dated from Basil the 25th of December 1580. He had mentioned that dispute to him in a former letter of the 27th of September preceding, where he observes that his adversary did highly praise the conduct of the Elector Palatine for having driven a great number of Calvinist ministers out of his dominions. They were so many conspirators, as Stupanus said. He had prefixed a preface to a book that was corrected; nevertheless it was sold without any alteration to the Papists. Hotman communicated it to Gualtherus, to the end that he might be the better informed of Stupanus's religion. *Decertaveram aliquoties cum Stupano tunc (2) Rectore qui negabat se fidei, an Missa Papistica esset blasphemias. Contendebat res à Palatino factum, quod tot conspiratores (ut appellabat) ex ditione sua expulisset. Tandem cujusmodi fuerit meus Antagonista, ex inclusa ejus præfatione cognosce. Mutatum tandem fuit solum. Sed istud apud Papistas divenditur* (3). Hotman relates that as soon as he had heard these words of Stupanus, where he speaks with such indifference of the Mass, he went to three Professors, to consult with them how he might be soundly reprimanded before the Academical Senate. They answered him in such a manner as left him no room to hope, which grieved him very much. He committed the vengeance of such enormous profanity to God, and deplored the state of the university where the interest of religion was neglected in this manner. Quo audito accessi ad Zulcerum, Amerbachium, Zwingerum (4), sperans fore ut mihi daretur locus, illum (Stupanus) apud Collegium objurgandi. Nihil addo, quid responsi habuerim. Ego demisso vultu, Basileensem Religionem admirans & ad hæc nova prope obstupescens, tacitus domum redii, & tantæ profanitatis (ne quid acerbius dicam) ultionem Deo commisi. Nam quod se non ignorare arbitror, similis est aliis omnibus in rebus ad Religionem pertinentibus Academia istius ratio: Ad quam

(1) Francis Hotmanus, Epistola xcix, pag. 139. Edit. Amstel. 1700.

(2) It should be thus, and not as it is in the printed copy now; for it appears by the xcixth letter, that Stupanus had been rector two years before 1580.

(3) Hotman. Epist. xcviij pag. 135, 136.

(4) It should be read thus, and not Zwingerum, as in the printed copy.

Neapolitan History writ in Italian by Pandolphus Collenuccio. His son EMANUEL STOUPPA, Doctor of Physic, spoke the funeral Oration of Gasper Bauhinus, and published the *Lexicon Medicum Castellii* with additions, and the Aphorisms of Hippocrates ranged and illustrated in a new method, as also some other books (b). He was born in the year 1587, and died in 1664 (c). I believe that ANTONY STOUPPA, who writ some books, was of the same family [C].

(b) Vide Lindemann renovatum, pag. 259.

(c) König, pag. 783.

(5) Hotoman. Eminent, referre solet. Ego apud familiares meos Zwingium & Amerbachium non cesso tantam istam profanitatem execrari, sed responsum nihil aliud refero nisi quod ista negotia non ad se, sed ad Theologos pertinent (5). He had, not long after, some ground of consolation administered to him; because at the solicitation of the deputies of Zurich, they proceeded some length at Basle against Professor Stouppa (6). I do not know what the consequences of it were.

(6) Heri primum audiui Stouppam nostrum esse ce-latum, rogatus ut mihi quidam confirmarent Legatorum verborum. Id. ibid. pag. 138.

(7) Written in Italian by John Peter Contarino. The Latin translation was printed at Basle in the year 1573; in 4to.

[B] Among other works of his. These other works are *Oratio de Caeli secundi Curiosis Vita atque obitu*, are *Oratio de Caeli secundi Curiosis Vita atque obitu*, printed at Basle in the year 1576 in 4to; a Latin translation of the dialogues of Francis Patricius de ratione philosophiae legendae Historiae; another of some philosophical treatises of Alexander Piccolomini: and another of the war between Selim II and the Venetians (7). He also writ *de Holometri fabrica & usu instrumenti Geometrico olim ab Abele Fullonio invento, nunc*

verò ipsius Stoupani opera, Sermone Latino ita explicato, ut ad omnis generis dimensiones investigandas, & regiones describendas utilissimum simul, facillimumque esse queat. Accessit etiam Federi Delphini jucundissima Disputatio de Accessu maris & motu orbis Sphaerae, folio Basileae per Petrum Pernam 1577 (8), and a *Medicina Theorica* printed at Basle in the year 1614 in 8vo, and *bine Epistola Medicae* printed at Nuremberg in the year 1625 in 4to, with the *Cista Medica* of John Hornungus (9).

[C] Antony STOUPPA, who wrote some books, was of the same family. He was born in the country of the Grisons, was a Physician, and died of the plague at Basle in the year 1551 (10). He made additions to *Dispensatorium medicamentorum Nicolai Myrephi*, printed at Lyons in the year 1543. He translated into better Latin *Allobanzen Heli filii Ahenragel libri octo de judiciis astrorum*. That was printed at Basle in the year 1551 in folio (11).

(8) Taken from the Epitome of Biblioteka Gf. neri, pag. m. 477, col. 2.

(9) Lindemann renovatus, p. 631.

(10) Epitome Bibliot. Gf. neri, pag. m. 477, col. 2.

(11) Ibid.

STRIGELIUS (VICTORINUS) was born at Kaufbeir (a) the twenty-sixth of December 1524. He lost his father (b) in 1527, and was sent to Friburg in Brisgau, in the year 1538, to continue his studies. There he went through a course of Philosophy under John Zinckius, and left that place in 1542, to go to the university of Wittemberg, where he made it his business to inform himself of the opinion of the Protestants. He went to Luther's lectures, but more frequently to those of Philip Melanchthon. After he had taken his degree of Master of Philosophy in 1544, he betook himself to read private lectures, which procured him a great reputation, and he proved very useful to his scholars. He went on with this exercise till the war forced him to leave Wittemberg, and to go to Magdeburg, and then to Erford. The war being ended he went to Iena in 1548, where he married the year following; and being a widower two years after, he married again in 1553. He assisted at the conference of Eifenac in 1556 [A], and had a friendly dispute with Menius, upon a question concerning the necessity of good works, about which the divines were divided. He reduced that controversy to seven propositions, on which the whole dispute run. The conclusion was, that Menius engaged before the Elector of Saxony, and the whole assembly, not to depart from the doctrine contained in the seven propositions, which he acknowledged to be very consonant to the word of God. Afterwards Strigelius, pursuant to the prince's order, drew up a form of confession, to which all the divines subscribed. The year following he was attacked by Illyricus, and had a verbal dispute with him at Weimar [B]. The acts of the conference were published, but not faithfully, so that he complained that something had been left out (c). He was imprisoned [C] with two others in 1559, because they had disapproved some Theological Doctrines, and the piece which those of Weimar had published against those of Wittemberg. He was set at liberty three years after, and betook himself again to read lectures; but because

(a) It is an imperial city in Suabia, near the Alps. Melch. Adam, in Vit. Theolog. German. pag. 423.

(b) He was a native of Memmingen, and Physician to the Lords of Fröbenberg, Id. ibid.

(c) See the remark [E].

(1) Micraelius, Synt. Histor. Eccles. p. m. 766.

(2) Id. ib. p. 865.

(3) Id. ibid.

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) Thuan. lib. xlvii, pag. 941.

(6) It was held towards the latter end of 1568, and in the beginning of 1569.

(7) See the letters written to Goldastus, and published in 1688.

(8) Henr. Alting. Theol. Hist. pag. 298.

(9) Melch. Adam, in Vit. Theolog. German. pag. 420.

(10) Alting. ibid.

[A] He assisted at the conference of Eifenac in 1556. George Major, a Divine of Wittemberg, openly declared for the interim (1), and for the phrase inserted in it concerning the necessity of good works (2). Ambold ran into another extreme, for he maintained, that good works were pernicious to salvation (3). This was the fourth schism of the Lutherans (4). Such was the subject of the conference of Eifenac, in which our Strigelius acted the most considerable part. Thuanus (5) confounds the time and the place when he says that Strigelius assisted at the conference of Altemburg (6) in the year MDLXVIII, and MDLXIX. Boethadius (7) showed long ago that it is a mistake. [B] He was attacked by Illyricus, and had a verbal dispute with him at Weimar. They were both Professors in the university newly founded at Iena (8). Their dispute ran upon two points (9): first, Whether God creates a new substance, when he regenerates a sinner: secondly, Whether the Grace of the Holy Ghost leaves any liberty to man. Strigelius denied the first point, and affirmed the second. (10) Note, that Flacius Illyricus was a rigid assertor of Luther's doctrine of *servo arbitrio*. On the contrary, Strigelius approved the moderate expressions of Melanchthon:

and therefore he was looked upon as one of the leaders of the Synergists, that is, of those who acknowledge that man's will co-operates with Grace. This was the fifth schism of the Lutherans (11). According to Quenstedt, Strigelius was the incendiary and trumpeter of that war, *Belli synergistici, corporis & tuba* (12). I have mentioned in another place [13] the conference of Weimar: many authors place it not in the year 1557, as Melchior Adam and Hoornbeeck (14) do, nor in the year 1561, as Spondanus (15), but in the year 1560. And they are in the right; for I have now lying before me the Acts of that Conference printed in the year 1562, with this title: *Disputatio de originali peccato & libero arbitrio, inter Matthiam Flacium Illyricum & Victorinum Strigelium publice Vinariae per integram hebdomadam, praesentibus Illustriss. Saxoniae Principibus, Anno 1560 initio mensis Augusti habita*. It is a book of 394 pages in 4to. [C] He was imprisoned. Falling sick during his imprisonment he had leave to get himself carried to his wife, but upon condition that he should be at home as a prisoner. Several princes, and even the Emperor Maximilian, interceded for him, and obtained that he might be visited by his friends (16).

(11) Micraelius, Synt. pag. 865.

(12) Quenstedt, de Patris Vici. illustr. pag. 134.

(13) In the remark [C] of the article L. YRICUS.

(14) In Summa Controversiarum, pag. 127.

(15) Spondanus, ad. ann. 1560, tom. 3, pag. 602.

(16) Taken from Melchior Adam, ibid. pag. 421.

[D] He

he quickly perceived that the post he was in was not a safe one [D], he left Iēna, and did not regard the remonstrances which the university of that name writ to him to persuade him to return. He went to Leipzig, where he published notes upon the Pfalter. He obtained from the Elector the liberty of teaching in the university of Wittenberg, or in that of Leipzig, and chose to live in this last city. He began his lectures there on the first of March, 1563, and explained not only Divinity, but also Logic and Morals. He had carried his common-places as far as the article of the Eucharist, which he was to begin in February 1567; but the school door was shut against him, and they sent him word to leave off reading lectures. He applied himself to the Elector of Saxony for redress, and not obtaining the justice he expected, he yielded to the *Odium Theologicum* (d), - - *The Hatred of Divines*, and retired into the Palatinate. He hoped the Elector would take care of him, and he was not mistaken, for he was called to Heidelberg to be professor of Morality, and for some other employments. He worthily discharged the duties of those places till he died, which happened on the twenty-sixth of June 1569, after a very short sickness, according to his wishes (e). He was a good Philosopher and a good Divine, and he had an admirable talent of teaching youth. His life was attended with a thousand vexations; he was accused of heresy; he was defamed to the highest degree, anathematized, and exposed to penal laws [E]. This was the reason why

(d) Cessit impotentia Theologorum. Melch. Adam, *ibid.* pag. 423.

(e) Consecutus est quod sepe in votis habuit, videlicet ne difficult & productio morbi genere spiritum edere cogere. *Id. ibid.* pag. 425.

[D] He perceived . . . that the post he was in was not a safe one.] He thought he could not continue in it without endangering his conscience, his reputation, and his life. He perceived that the peace, such as it was, which the Divines of Iēna had concluded between him and his enemies, was ill observed: besides, he was warned by many credible persons, that he should use all possible diligence to avoid the snares, or rather the open violence, designed against him. His fear was not groundless, for he knew that Solomon advises us not to trust to an enemy, and to keep off from him; and he remembered Menander's saying, That reconciliations produce a wolf's friendship (17). When he answered the letter of the university of Iēna, he declared, That if his going away was not free from blame, it was rather to be ascribed to the inconveniences of the time and place, and the snares of false brethren, than to himself (18), and, in a word, that he had rather retire into the most dreadful solitude, than return to Iēna. (19) Paucis ut dicamus: summa propositi: ipse hæc fuit: *nolle se redire Iēnam: sed potius ita: rum quocunque Deus vocarit: etiam in ea loca mi- grandum esset:*

(17) *Id. ibid.* pag. 421, 422.

(18) *Id. ibid.* pag. 422.

(19) *Id. ibid.*

. . . Pigris ubi nulla campis
Arbor æstiva recreatur aura:
Quod latus mundi nebulæ, malusque
Jupiter urget (20).

(20) These verses are to be found in Horace, *Od. XXII*, lib. i.

--- To say all in a few words; the sum of his resolution was, that he would not return to Iēna; but would rather go wheresoever GOD should call him; although it were into those places,

. . . Where no sun appears,
Or wrapt in clouds or drown'd in tears;
Where woods with whirling tempests tost;
Where no relieving summer's breeze
Does murmur thro' the trees,
But all lies bound and fix'd in frost.

CREECH.

If we consider all those things, we shall be less surprised to see that the disputes of Divines are now a-days so scandalous. They were more scandalous still at that time. Take notice that Strigelius was dismissed by the Elector for not keeping his word, and raising unnecessary contentions (21). He answered that he had promised to be modest only upon condition of doing nothing contrary to truth and his conscience. *Strigelio contra affirmante se modestiam quidem promississe, sed duabus adjectis conditionibus salva veritate, & salva conscientia.* Those two conditions do certainly deserve to be understood, or expressly mentioned in all treaties: but they open a way for reviving old quarrels; and with those two pretences, one may break the bonds of any engagement.

(21) Quod violasset promissa, ac certamina movisset non necessaria. *Id. ibid.* pag. 424.

[E] His life was attended with a thousand vexations; he was accused of Heresy, he was defamed to the highest degree, anathematized, and exposed to the penal laws: Melancthon having considered Strigelius's nativity, said, That the stars threatened him with all manner of

assaults. 'De schemate ejus genethliaco, Melancthon, ubi id considerasset, ita ex siderum positu ratiocinatus fuit; fore, ut artibus innumeris oppugnaretur; non aliter,

Quam lapis æquoreis undique pulsus aquis (22).

(22) *Id. ibid.* pag. 417.

--- Melancthon, having considered his nativity, concluded from the position of the stars, that he should suffer an infinite number of assaults; no otherwise than

A rock that's buffeted on every side
By the rude billows . . .

Perhaps the man born under such malignant constellations, explained that prediction by these verses of Horace, when he found himself exposed to slanders, and school disputes:

. . . Instat fatum mihi triste, Sabella
Quod puerò cecinit, divinà motà anus urnā:
Hunc neque dira venena, nec hosticus auferet ens;
Nec laterum dolor, aut tussis, nec tarda podagra,
Garrulus hunc quando consumet cunque: loquaces,
Si sapiat, vitet, simulatque adoleverit ætas (23).

(23) Horatius, *Sat. IX*, lib. i, ver. 29.

For now the fatal hour, the time is come,
The midwife told me, when she read my doom;
She turn'd the sieve, and said, Nor sword, nor cough,
Nor poison, plague, nor charms, shall take him off:
Nor the catarrh; nor flux, nor pax destroy,
But an eternal tongue shall kill the boy,
And therefore would he have his life be long,
When grown a man avoid a talking tongue.

CREECH.

However it be, let us see how he describes his anguish (24): 'De meis rebus quid multa attinet scribere, cum non solum in veteri luto adhuc hæream; sed etiam ad reliquas molestias accedat truncea & mutilata editio disputationis inter me & hominem barbarum (25) agitata, & aliorum scriptorum: quibus fama mea atrocissime, apud eos, qui vitam & mores meos non penitus perpexerunt, læditur ac deformatur. Nam inter reliquas criminationes ipsa morte acerbiores tribuitur mihi impia & extrema levitas, vanitas, inconstantia, perfidia in negotio religionis, & pertinax odium veritatis. Ad hæc convicia, quorum molem vix una navis vehat, accedit fulmen injustæ condemnationis, quam Paulus vocat Anathema Maranatha. --- To what purpose should I write a great deal touching my own affairs; since I am not only still entangled in the old mire, but likewise to my other vexations I have a fresh misfortune added, viz. a lame and curtailed edition of the dispute between me and the Barbarian, and of my other books: by which means my reputation suffers grievously with those who are not thoroughly acquainted with my life and conversation. For, among other accusations more insupportable than death itself, I am charged with an

(24) Strigelius, *Epist. ad Wolfgangum à Kotteritz, apud Melchior. Adamum, ubi supra, pag. 420.* That letter was written in 1562.

(25) That is Flaccius Illyricus.

R. r. r.

(f) Taken from Melch. Adam, in Vitis Theolog. German. pag. 417, & seq.

why, like Melanchthon in a like case, he often begged of God that he would take him out of this world (f) [F]. I shall not give a catalogue of his works; it may be seen in Mr Teiffier (g). I must observe as a remarkable thing, that he made no scruple to use the thoughts and expressions of other writers [G]. It has been said, that he retracted

(g) Teiffier, Ab. dit. sur Elzevir, Tom. i, p. 324.

impious and unbounded levity, pride, fickleness, treachery in the point of religion, and an obstinate hatred to truth. Add to these reproaches, which would be more than a sufficient cargo for any one ship, the thunder-bolt of unjust condemnation, which St Paul calls Anathema Maranatha. He adds, that though the testimony of a good conscience serves him for a shield against the darts of calumny, yet he could not forbear being touched with the falsities published against him. His greatest grief was to have his hands tied, that is, to be forced by the circumstances of time and place to say nothing, though his silence made him suspected by several persons. Such is the fate of those, who are persecuted by enemies whose faction is uppermost, and supported by the secular power. Those enemies publish whatever they please, and lie impudently to conceal their shameful artifices, and their iniquity from the public. Those, who are calumniated by them, could not make a good defence without saying some things that would exasperate their common master, and expose them to new miseries. They are therefore silent; but such a conduct produces an ill effect: the enemy triumphs at it, and many people, hasty in their judgments, put a sinister interpretation upon it. There is nothing more advantageous, according to the notions of the world, than to be always for the strongest faction; and, on the contrary, nothing can be more disadvantageous, with respect to one's temporal interest, than to be for the party that is in the right, if it be inferior in credit and power. Multis etiam, they are Strigelius's words, meum silentium, quo has calumnias dissimulare cogor, suspectum est, perinde quasi mihi honesta oratio desit ad has labe & maculas deterendas. Sed boni viri, quibus conditio mea, tristis sane & luctuosa, notior est, non ignorant, quibus vinculis constrictus impediatur, quo minus vel causam ipsam explicare, vel innocentiam meam à moribus venenatissimis hominum vindicare possim (26). -- The silence in which I am obliged to pass by these reproaches is suspected by many; as if I wanted a solid defence against such foul imputations. But good men, that are acquainted with my sad and mournful condition, are not ignorant by what fetters I am bound up and hindered from justifying my cause, and clearing my innocence from the venomous attacks of men. All that I can do, says he, is to implore God's justice, and to cry out, as the prophet David did, O Lord God the avenger, O God the avenger; show thyself clearly. Exalt thyself, O Judge of the world, and render a reward to the proud (27). When he gave the reasons why he had left Leipzig, the chief he alleged was the injury done, not so much to himself, as to truth, by forbidding him to mention a doctrine that was dearer to him than his life (28). His second reason was, That no body offered to assist him, when his innocence was suppressed. The third, That he had received a threatening answer from the court; and lastly, That he was oppressed by the threatnings of the Divines, and the anathema's of the Preachers (29). But the better to know the unhappiness of his fate, and how unfortunate he was in being exposed to the injustice of a violent faction, and more still, in being too sensible of the injuries he received from them; it is sufficient to observe that he grew old before his time. He was worn out, and decrepit in body and mind at forty-four years of age. He complained of it some few months before he died, as it appears from these words, Cum ante annos decem & corpore & animo vigerem: nunc tot calamitatibus tum victus tum fractus, vix ægra membra traho, & animi alacritatem senescere comperio. Quare me omni cura & cogitatione præparo ad iter, quod ducit ex hujus vitæ miseriis ad æternam tranquillitatem (30). -- Whereas ten years ago I was vigorous both in mind and body, I am now so far subdued and broken with such a number of calamities, that I can scarce drag along my weary members, and I perceive a sensible decay in the cheerfulness of my mind. For which reason I am preparing myself with the utmost diligence and thought, for that journey which leadeth out of the miseries of this life to eternal tranquillity. A verse

of Virgil with a small alteration in it might have been applied to him (31).

[F] Like Melanchthon, in a like case, he often begged of GOD that he would take him out of this world. I desire to die, said Melanchthon (32); first, that I may enjoy the beatific vision; secondly, that I may be no longer exposed to the implacable hatred of Divines. Strigelius had the same thoughts: read these words of Melchior Adam. A Flacio Illyrico, & ejus manicularibus, objectum ei est crimen hæreses: quod gravissimè tulit: nominatim accusatus est; quod non rectè sentiret & doceret de ea parte doctrine; quæ appellatur, de libero arbitrio. Ab aliis verò aliorum infirmulatus est errorum: ut vita ejus perpetua fuerit pugna & dimicatio. Itaque ut Melanchthon ante mortem dixit: cupio ex hac vita migrare propter duas causas: primum ut fruar desiderato conspectu Filii DEI & cœlestis ecclesiæ: deinde ut liberer ab immanibus & implacabilibus odiis Theologorum: ita ipse easdem causas sæpe inter precandum usurpare solitus fuit: cum videret se hoc fato natum: ut omnis bus eorum telis, qui essent arguti cives sine virtute, vita & fama sua propostita esset (33). -- The crime of Heresy was objected to him by Flaccius Illyricus and his followers, which grieved him very much. He was chiefly accused by them of thinking and teaching amiss concerning what is called the doctrine of free-will. Others charged him with different errors, in such a manner that his life was a continued fight and struggle. Wherefore as Melanchthon said before his death, I wish to die for two reasons, &c. -- Strigelius frequently made use of the same reasons in his prayers, perceiving that he was born to this fate, that his life and reputation should be exposed as a mark to the darts of such men as had a great deal of wit but no virtue. If his father and mother had been witnesses of his great trouble, their grief for it would have proceeded from a cause very different from that which made Isaac and Rebecca uneasy. The latter were troubled to see how well their son agreed with strangers; but the former would have been afflicted at the war kindled between their son and his brethren, a war which grieved him no less than the alliance of strangers grieved Esau's mother. See the margin (34). It is to be observed that the Church, who is a good mother, bears her grief a little better than Rebecca: she is troubled to see her children at war, and is so used to it, that one would think it is become familiar to her. She bears prudently, and shews a greater or smaller degree of patience, according as people have more or less dexterity in huffing her. But what is most admirable is the patience of the people; it may be said that as in some countries they patiently bear all manner of taxes, they are every where no less tame with respect to controversies.

[G] He made no scruple to use the thoughts and expressions of other writers. In this respect he seemed to be for a community of goods; he did not think that in doing so he was a plagiarist, and he was very willing that other authors should deal with him as he dealt with them. If you find any thing in my books, said he, that fits you, you may freely use it; every thing is at your service. Cum Victorinus noster diu multumque versatus esset in lectione eorum Augustini, qui libros Aristotelis quasi in suum succum convertissent, illorum potius vestigia voluit, ubi & quantum posset, confectari, quam novam per omnia cudere versionem. Ac quidem ille vir & factus erat, & natus, ut si qua ei de re dicendum esset aut scribendum, & ipsi, quæ de eadem illa ipsa re alii etiam recentiores, & qui viverent adhuc, rectè tradidissent, in mentem venirent, non pueret hinc illum verba ab iis & sententias mutuari. Non enim hoc dicebat plagium esse literarium, sed ingenuam atque candidam doctis atque bonis viris dignam xοινωσιαν. Et faciat, inquit, aliquis idem; si se cum fructu hoc posse sperat, de meis quoque (35). -- As our Victorinus was extremely well versed in those authors who had thoroughly studied and digested the books of Aristotle, he rather chose to follow their footsteps, as much as possible, than to coin a translation that should be new.

(26) Strigel. apud Melch. Adam, in Vitis Theolog. German. pag. 421.

(27) Psalm xlv, ver. 1.

(28) Melch. Adam, in Vitis Theolog. pag. 424.

(29) Ad hæc omnia accesserunt minæ Theologorum & fulmina anathematum adversus ipsum in concionibus edita. Id. ibid.

(30) Melch. Adam, in Vitis Theolog. pag. 425.

(31) The 11th of the 11th book of the Æneid. Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

And here beyond the strength of age, except age itself.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

Let us say of Strigelius, Invalidus vires ultra lætæque senectæ.

retracted at his death; but I take it to be a meer story [H].

* new in every part. And indeed that man was so framed by nature, that when he was about to speak or write upon any subject, if any thing occurred to him which other modern writers, some of whom were then alive, had handsomely expressed, he was not ashamed to borrow words, and even sentences from them: for he did not think, &c. . . .

[H] It has been said that he retracted at his death, but I take it to be a meer story.] We are told that a gentleman, who studied at Heidelberg, met one day Strigelius in the street, and told him, Sir, some years ago you did not believe or teach the Calvinistical doctrines you teach now. I was your scholar at Jena, where you gave other instructions to your disciples. Strigelius made no answer, and went home, and finding himself very ill, most humbly intreated the Elector (36) to be so kind as to come to him, giving him to understand that he would impart to him some things relating to salvation. The Prince went to him, being

accompanied by Count George de Hundsracken. What I have taught hitherto at Heidelberg in favour of the Calvinists, said Strigelius to him, does not well agree with the word of God; but the doctrines, which the Lutherans have professed till now, are very true. The Elector having heard those words, went away in anger. Strigelius quickly expired with a groan (37). This story is taken from the relation of a journey to Constantinople, made by Gerlach, to whom Andreas Carolus (38), Abbot of St George, refers the reader, after having mentioned what you have just now read. He doubts whether one should say that Strigelius had an unconstant soul, rather than call it an unhappy one (39). He had called him before a weather-cock in point of religion, and a favourer of the Synergists and Zuinglians (40).

(37) Mox autem egrotans Victorinus animam (incontinentem dicam, an infelicem?) gemebundus exhalavit. Andr. Carolus, memorab. Ecclesiast. seculi xviij, pag. 49.

(38) Andr. Carolus, ibid.

(39) It seems in this place that he means a damned soul.

(40) Homo varius & versipellis tum Synergistis, tum Zuinglianis addictus. Id. ibid. pag. 34.

(36) It was Frederick III.

STROZZI (PHILIP) of an ancient and rich family of Florence (a), was one of those, who, after the death of Clement VII, most earnestly endeavoured to recover the liberty of their country, by expelling Alexander de Medicis. When he saw that their solicitations at the court of the Emperor Charles V [A] were insignificant, he took a shorter and more criminal method; which was to cause the pretended usurper to be assassinated [B]. He engaged a man in this plot who put it in execution; but the success of that enterprize was more fatal to the liberty of the Florentines, than the discovery

(a) See the remark [A], near the end.

[A] Their solicitations at the court of the Emperor Charles V.] There is something about this in Rabelais's letters. The Cardinals Salvati and Rodolphus went to Naples with our Strozzi in the year 1536, to engage the Emperor to set up again a republican government in Florence: they did not succeed in it. I hear their affairs have not had the success they hoped for, and that the Emperor told them peremptorily that he had, at theirs and the late Pope Clement's request, appointed Alexander de Medicis, Duke of the territories of Florence and Pisa, which he never thought of, and had never done, had it not been for them; that if he should depose him, it were acting the part of a juggler, doing and undoing; and that therefore they should resolve to acknowledge him for their Duke and Lord, and to obey him as vassals and subjects ought to do. As for the complaints they made against the Duke; he told them he should take cognizance of them upon the place (1). I shall add the following words out of the first letter (2). 'I hear that it is (3) about the affair of Florence, and the difference between Duke Alexander de Medicis and Philip Strozzi; whose estate the Duke designed to confiscate. It is no small estate, for next to the Fourques of Aulburg, he is accounted the richest merchant in Christendom. The Duke had appointed some men in that town to poison or kill him. Being informed of it he obtained the Pope's leave to bear arms, and he was commonly attended by thirty soldiers well armed. The Duke of Florence being informed that Strozzi and those Cardinals were gone to the Emperor, and that he offered him four hundred thousand ducats; if he would appoint some persons to inquire into the Duke's tyranny and wickedness, set out from Florence, appointed Cardinal Cibo governor in his absence, and arrived in that city (4) the day after Christmas.' In the thirteenth letter Rabelais says (5). 'That those Cardinals, and Strozzi, with his money, could not prevail with the Emperor, though they offered, in the name of all those that were banished from Florence, to give him a million of gold ready money, to finish La Rocqua, that was begun in Florence, and to keep a good garrison in it in the Emperor's name, and to pay him a hundred thousand ducats every year, provided he would get their estates and former liberty restored to them'. Afterwards the author mentions the honours that were done to the Duke of Florence by Charles V, and then he adds: (6) From that time the said Cardinals, the Bishop of Xaintes, and Strozzi have continued their solicitations; the Emperor has at last referred the thing till he comes to Florence And the Duke

has proceeded so cunningly in his tyranny, that the Florentines have protested to the Emperor nominis communitatis, that they desire to have no other Lord but him. It is certain he has severely punished the exiles.

Take notice that the author of the notes upon Rabelais's epistles, will not believe that Philip Strozzi was a merchant (7). But it is hardly conceivable how at that time a family of Florence could have got so much wealth without trading. However, if he was not a famous Banker, he deserved to be accounted one. The baron de Forquevaux gives him that title. 'Philip Strozzi, says he (8), and Bartholomew Valori, better Bankers than Captains, were forced at Montemurlo. He adds (9), 'That he was prodigiously rich for a citizen. Peter Strozzi, notwithstanding his losses and expences, had still four hundred thousand crowns in the banks of Venice and Lyons, that remained out of his father Philip's inheritance (10)'. He went to Francis I, at the camp of Marolles, with a troop of two hundred Arquebuziers on horseback, which had cost him above fifty thousand crowns (11). This I find in Brantome, who adds (12): 'He was vastly rich, and faved a great deal of money at Venice, where he kept for some time with Mr Strozzi, his son (13). That brave lord spent that vast estate in the service of our kings; for, as I have it from his son, and his antient servants, whereas he was worth above five hundred thousand crowns, when he came into the service of our kings, he did not leave twenty thousand crowns to his son when he died: that is spending to some purpose.' Here is another passage of Brantome, which fully confirms what I have quoted out of him. 'The king gave to Mr Strozzi, son of the Marechal of France, fifty thousand crowns as a reward for the office of Colonel-General of the infantry, with which he bought Breslaire in Poitou; and this is all that he and his father left of so great an estate as he brought into France: for I have heard many people say, That when he came thither, he had a million of gold in bank, or in goods and jewels, or in money, or books (14)'.

[B] Which was to cause the pretended usurper to be assassinated.] I should be very much to blame, should I think that I can comment upon this text more elegantly, by using my own words than by using Balzac's expressions; and therefore I shall make no alteration in the proof he affords me (15). 'Philip Strozzi, the husband of Clarice de Medicis, sister (16) to Pope Leo, not being able to bear the reign of Duke Alexander de Medicis, exhorted Laurence de Medicis, his cousin, to conspire against the life of his Duke Alexander, and to restore the liberty of his country,

(7) Observat. sur les Epitres de Rabelais, pag. 61.

(8) Francois de Pavie, Baron de Forquevaux, Vies de plusieurs grands Capitaines, pag. 379.

(9) Id. ibid. pag. 382.

(10) Ibid. pag. 383.

(11) Brantome, Capitaines Etrangers, Tom. II, pag. 287.

(12) Brantome, ibid. pag. 288.

(13) Philip Strozzi, Colonel-General of the French infantry, See Moreri, and Father Anselm, whom he transcribes. See also the following article.

(14) Idem, Brantome Memoir. des Capit. Francois, Tom. IV, pag. m. 311, 312.

(15) Balzac, Entretien, xxxiv, ch. vi, pag. m. 330.

(16) Balzac should have said niece.

(1) Rabelais, Letter viii, pag. 29.

(2) Idem, pag. 3, & seq.

(3) That is, that the Cardinals Salvati and Rodolphus were gone to the court of Charles V, at Naples.

(4) That is, at Rome.

(5) Rabelais, ibid. pag. 55.

(6) Id. ibid. pag. 56.

(b) He quotes there *Baron Forquevaux*: he should have said *Baron Forquevaux*.

discovery of the whole conspiracy would have been. The death of Alexander de Medicis made room for a successor better qualified than he was, to settle a new sovereignty. He beat the Malecontents: Strozzi was made a prisoner, and found no better expedient than to kill himself [C]. He had married Clarice de Medicis, nearly related to Leo X, by whom he had several children, and among others PETER STROZZI, Marechal of France, mentioned in Moreri's Dictionary (b). It is not true that the Nun, who wrote some Latin hymns, was that Marechal's sister [D].

(17) When Balzac writ this, Robert must have been dead a long time before.

(18) Balzac, *ibid.* p. 331, 332.

country. Laurence appeared willing to undertake such a dangerous enterprise; but he was afraid that his two daughters would run the hazard of losing their honour, because his estate would be confiscated. Philip told him that such a fear should not hinder him, and assured him that whatever the success of his enterprise might be, he would marry two of his sons to his two daughters. Which he did, for Laurence having made his escape after Duke Alexander's murder, without reaping any advantage from it, Philip religiously performed his promise, and gave Laodamia de Medicis to Peter Strozzi, who was since Marechal of France, and Magdalen to Robert Strozzi, who lately died at Rome (17).

[C] He found no other expedient than to kill himself. I shall still use Balzac's words (18). 'The same Philip, after the death of Duke Alexander opposed Cofmo, his successor, first great Duke of Tuscany. But having lost the battle of Marone, near Florence, he was made prisoner; and believing that his enemy would poison him or put him to an ignominious death, resolved to kill himself. Before he executed that strange resolution, he made his will, the original whereof I have seen at Rome, among the papers of the late Signor Pompey Frangipane, in which among other things, that man, whom the antients would have adored, orders and entreats his children to dig up his bones out of the place where they shall lie in Florence, and to get them transported to Venice; to the end, says he, that since he could not be so happy as to die in a free city, he may enjoy that blessing after his death, and his ashes may rest in peace out of the conqueror's domination. Afterwards he engraved upon the mantelpiece of the chimney with the very same point of the dagger wherewith he killed himself, this verse of Virgil,

Exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor.

Rise some avenger of our Libyan blood.

DRYDEN.

Which was faithfully executed by his children, who came into France to serve the king against the Emperor Charles V, who had founded the domination of the Medicis at Florence. I must not forget that the same Philip Strozzi, at the beginning of his will, expresses a great confidence in God's mercy, hoping he will forgive him for killing himself, since he did it like a man of honour to maintain his liberty; being of opinion that when a free man has lost it he may lawfully die. But the Gospel is contrary to such an opinion, and New Rome calls defpair what Old Rome called greatness of soul. She communicates now those whom she would have formerly deified.

Note, That one of the reasons that moved Strozzi to kill himself was the fear of exposing his friends to great dangers by what he might confess against his will upon the rack (19), which appears from a paper that was found in his chamber, wherein he (20) upbraided Cardinal Libo (21), a friend and trusty counsellor to the Duke, with his great cruelty, and exhorted him to fill himself with the blood he had so much thirsted after. As for me, added he, since I have not been able to help my friends in my lifetime, I will do them no prejudice after my death. A remarkable instance of human misery, says the Baron de Forquevaux, and of the uncertainty of the things of this world! Philip Strozzi, who a few months before was as much esteemed and honoured as any man in Italy, not only for his riches, that

were prodigious for a citizen, and for the antiquity of his family, which had continued in honour for several hundred years, but also for his agreeable conversation, magnificence, and liberality, for his learning, and his great knowledge and experience of the world, finds himself a captive in that very town whose liberty he designed to preserve, and is obliged to kill himself with his own hands to avoid the cruelty of his ungrateful fellow-citizens. It is allowed that he was a man of learning. 'Fortes non sunt, qui alicujus desiderii potiundi spe privati, aut calamitate oppressi, manus sibi intulerunt, qualis paucis annis ante Philippus Strozzius, opibus florens, literis non ineruditus, cætera felix, si sua forte contentus, partibus adversis non favisset (22). ---- Such are not truly brave who, upon some disappointment or calamity that oppresses them, take away their own life; as Philip Strozzi did a few years ago; a man of great riches, not unlearned, and happy in all other respects, if he had been contented with his own lot, and not favoured the opposite faction.'

[D] It is not true that the Nun, who wrote some Latin hymns, was that Marechal's sister. Brantome, who says so, is mistaken. He had a sister, says he (23), who is a Nun, and an Abbess in Italy, a very honest lady, and very well skilled in divine and human learning, especially in Latin Poetry. She wrote several fine hymns and spiritual canticles in Latin verse, which have been sung in the churches of Italy with great admiration and devotion: nay, I have heard say that they are sung still in some churches. Colomies knew not this mistake

of Brantome: he quotes him (24) to confirm what he had cited out of Thuanus in praise of Laurentia Strozzi, a Dominican Nun, who died in 1591, aged seventy-seven years, and whose hymns were printed at Paris ten years after (25). That Nun was not sister to Peter Strozzi, Marechal of France, as Colomies thought upon Brantome's credit: she was sister to Cyriacus Strozzi (26), professor of Philosophy and of the Greek tongue at Florence, and then professor at Bologna, and at last at Pisa, son of Zachary Strozzi, descended from the same ancestors with our Philip. There is more reason to say that Signor Flaminio's wife (27) was sister to Peter Strozzi, Marechal of France. Brantome speaks of her thus: 'She had also another sister, Signora Magdalen Strozzi, whom I saw at Rome in my younger years. She had married Signor Flaminio, Count of Anguilara, who commanded some galleys with the Prior of Capua, his brother-in-law. That Count was the son of that brave Count de Anguilara, who was killed in the service of King Francis I.' This Magdalen might very well be the same that is mentioned in the *Prejugés légitimes contre le Pape*, on occasion of the steel-box, containing among other relics our Saviour's prepuce. A devout lady, called Magdalen Strotia d'Astaba, (28) was commissioned to look over those precious treasures, and put them in order. When she came to the little bag wherein the prepuce was, she went about to untie the string of the bag; but her fingers grew stiff and without motion at three several times: Upon this they cried out a miracle, a miracle; and another person was appointed to open the bag, viz. Clarice, daughter of Madam Strotia, who was a virgin, and young enough to be sure of her virginity. For none but a virgin's fingers could touch that prepuce (29). Read the sequel of this passage in the original; it is a sharp satire and a pleasant ridicule upon many other things, besides the imprudence of those who write so many chimerical things about relics.

(19) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(20) *Id.* p. 382.

(21) It should be Libo.

(22) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(23) *Id.* p. 382.

(24) It should be Libo.

(25) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(26) *Id.* p. 382.

(27) It should be Libo.

(28) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(29) *Id.* p. 382.

(30) It should be Libo.

(31) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(32) *Id.* p. 382.

(33) It should be Libo.

(34) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(35) *Id.* p. 382.

(36) It should be Libo.

(37) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(38) *Id.* p. 382.

(39) It should be Libo.

(40) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(41) *Id.* p. 382.

(42) It should be Libo.

(43) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(44) *Id.* p. 382.

(45) It should be Libo.

(46) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(47) *Id.* p. 382.

(48) It should be Libo.

(49) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(50) *Id.* p. 382.

(51) It should be Libo.

(52) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(53) *Id.* p. 382.

(54) It should be Libo.

(55) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(56) *Id.* p. 382.

(57) It should be Libo.

(58) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(59) *Id.* p. 382.

(60) It should be Libo.

(61) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(62) *Id.* p. 382.

(63) It should be Libo.

(64) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(65) *Id.* p. 382.

(66) It should be Libo.

(67) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(68) *Id.* p. 382.

(69) It should be Libo.

(70) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(71) *Id.* p. 382.

(72) It should be Libo.

(73) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(74) *Id.* p. 382.

(75) It should be Libo.

(76) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(77) *Id.* p. 382.

(78) It should be Libo.

(79) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(80) *Id.* p. 382.

(81) It should be Libo.

(82) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(83) *Id.* p. 382.

(84) It should be Libo.

(85) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(86) *Id.* p. 382.

(87) It should be Libo.

(88) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(89) *Id.* p. 382.

(90) It should be Libo.

(91) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(92) *Id.* p. 382.

(93) It should be Libo.

(94) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(95) *Id.* p. 382.

(96) It should be Libo.

(97) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(98) *Id.* p. 382.

(99) It should be Libo.

(100) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(101) *Id.* p. 382.

(102) It should be Libo.

(103) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(104) *Id.* p. 382.

(105) It should be Libo.

(106) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(107) *Id.* p. 382.

(108) It should be Libo.

(109) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(110) *Id.* p. 382.

(111) It should be Libo.

(112) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(113) *Id.* p. 382.

(114) It should be Libo.

(115) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(116) *Id.* p. 382.

(117) It should be Libo.

(118) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(119) *Id.* p. 382.

(120) It should be Libo.

(121) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(122) *Id.* p. 382.

(123) It should be Libo.

(124) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(125) *Id.* p. 382.

(126) It should be Libo.

(127) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(128) *Id.* p. 382.

(129) It should be Libo.

(130) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(131) *Id.* p. 382.

(132) It should be Libo.

(133) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(134) *Id.* p. 382.

(135) It should be Libo.

(136) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(137) *Id.* p. 382.

(138) It should be Libo.

(139) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(140) *Id.* p. 382.

(141) It should be Libo.

(142) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(143) *Id.* p. 382.

(144) It should be Libo.

(145) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(146) *Id.* p. 382.

(147) It should be Libo.

(148) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(149) *Id.* p. 382.

(150) It should be Libo.

(151) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(152) *Id.* p. 382.

(153) It should be Libo.

(154) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(155) *Id.* p. 382.

(156) It should be Libo.

(157) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(158) *Id.* p. 382.

(159) It should be Libo.

(160) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(161) *Id.* p. 382.

(162) It should be Libo.

(163) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(164) *Id.* p. 382.

(165) It should be Libo.

(166) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(167) *Id.* p. 382.

(168) It should be Libo.

(169) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(170) *Id.* p. 382.

(171) It should be Libo.

(172) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(173) *Id.* p. 382.

(174) It should be Libo.

(175) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(176) *Id.* p. 382.

(177) It should be Libo.

(178) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(179) *Id.* p. 382.

(180) It should be Libo.

(181) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(182) *Id.* p. 382.

(183) It should be Libo.

(184) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(185) *Id.* p. 382.

(186) It should be Libo.

(187) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(188) *Id.* p. 382.

(189) It should be Libo.

(190) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(191) *Id.* p. 382.

(192) It should be Libo.

(193) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(194) *Id.* p. 382.

(195) It should be Libo.

(196) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(197) *Id.* p. 382.

(198) It should be Libo.

(199) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(200) *Id.* p. 382.

(201) It should be Libo.

(202) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(203) *Id.* p. 382.

(204) It should be Libo.

(205) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(206) *Id.* p. 382.

(207) It should be Libo.

(208) See the Baron de Forquevaux, p. 381.

(209) *Id.* p. 382.

(210) It should be Libo.

(211) See the Baron de Forquevaux,

(a) He was the son of Peter Strozz, Marshal of France.

STROZZI (PHILIP) grandson (a) of the foregoing. You will find in Moreri that he was born at Venice in 1541, and that he was brought into France at seven years of age. He was bred up with King Francis II, who was then Dauphin, and began to bear arms in Piedmont, under Marschal de Briffac (b). A fall of youth moved him to go into Piedmont, without telling his father of it. We shall see, below, the particulars of that mad prank [A], and I shall mention likewise the care that was taken of his studies [B]. He was a very brave man, and testified upon many occasions the utmost intrepidity (c). He was made Colonel-General of the French Infantry, after the decease of Mr Dandelot, in the year 1569 (d). It was he who did so well arm the Infantry, and brought in the use of large bored arquebuses (e). He resigned that office when they gave him the command of the army that was sent to the Tercera illes, to attempt the re-establishment of Don Antonio, King of Portugal [C]. That expedition proved very unfortunate; he lost his life in it [D] the twenty-sixth of July 1582, and was used by the enemies as an infamous pirate: several

(b) Anfelme, Hist. des grant Officiers, pag. 386.

(c) See Brantome in the Encomium upon Strozz, in the fourth volume of his Memoirs.

(d) Anfelme, ibid. See also Brantome, ibid. pag. 270.

(e) Brantome, ibid. pag. 239.

[A] We shall see . . . the particulars of that mad prank. 'Being but a boy, and bred up with the young King Francis II, who was then Dauphin, and hearing of the noble war that was made in Piedmont, he stole away only with two horses, and a Milan arquebuse at his saddle-bow, and went thither, having for his guide that special rogue John de Est, a German, who was lately hanged at Blois, having been made some years before Knight of the order of St Michael . . . That fellow advised him to steal some silver basons, cups, and ewers from his mother, in order to make his journey. When the Marschal, his father, came to know this, and what reason had moved him to it, he said, 'That if it had been for any thing else, and not for such a glorious design as that of going to the war, he would have hanged him; but that he forgave him, and would do so for the time to come, if he took more from him, provided it were upon such a noble account. Mr Strozz told me so himself. Afterwards when he saw him, though he was naturally very severe, he laughed at it before his mother, who desired he should be punished for it: however he gave him a severe reprimand (1).'

(1) Brantome, Mémoires des Capitaines Français, Tom. iv, pag. m. 303.

[B] I shall mention . . . the care that was taken of his studies. 'His father took care of his education, and particularly that he should be instructed in good learning; he himself had made a great proficiency in it: his son could not come near it; however he had learning enough. I have heard him say that one day his father asked him what he had done that morning. He told him that he had rid, plaid at tennis, and then breakfasted. Ah! unhappy young man, said his father, must you feed the body before you feed the soul? Do so no more; first of all fill your mind with good reading and study, and then deal with your body as you think fit. Such were the wise precepts which that father gave to his son, who made a good use of them; for he had as much knowledge as valour, tho' I believe that ever since he left his books to betake himself to the war, he did not bestow half an hour upon reading (2).'

(2) Id. ibid. pag. 304.

[C] He resigned that office, when they gave him the command of the army . . . to attempt the re-establishment of Don Antonio, King of Portugal. Varillas is mistaken as to the circumstances of this fact. I shall make it appear when I have set down Brantome's words. 'Not long before he undertook that voyage by the queen's order, he was desired and pressed to lay down his office of Colonel, being told that he could not be General of that Army, and Colonel in France. Such a proposal was unacceptable to him, and he was unwilling to comply with it. However, because the king had a mind to raise Mr d'Epemon, and to gratify him with that post, of which he was more ambitious than of any other, Mr Strozz was forced to resign it, to his great grief; for I know what he told me then: he added, that if he did not die in the enterprize, he would be preferred to a greater post than that was, and that none should ever dare to deprive him of it. The king gave him fifty thousand crowns as a reward, wherewith he purchased Breffuire in Poitou (3). It appears from the last words of this passage, that Varillas should not have said that Philip Strozz, going to the Tercera illes, had nothing to lose in France, since he was so far from having made any purchase in it, that he had spent the three millions his grandfather had left (4). That Historian is the more inexcusable, because he quotes

(3) Id. ibid. pag. 311.

(4) Varillas, Hist. de Henri III, liv. vi, pag. m. 234.

Brantome's encomium upon Philip Strozz. Let us see his other mistakes. 'The court had lately done Strozz the greatest injury he could receive, for King Henry III had deprived him without a cause, and even without a pretence, of his office of Colonel of the French infantry, to bestow it upon the Duke d'Epemon; and because all those that are out of favour grow contemptible, tho' their merit be never so great, it was not to be thought that the French, on board the Queen-Mother's fleet, would have a sufficient esteem for the General she had given them, since they knew that the court made so little account of him, that they had taken from him the most important post in the army, without making him any amends; which had never been practised in the foregoing reigns, nor in that of Henry III, before the prodigious fortune of the Duke d'Epemon (5). There are two things in this passage, the falsity whereof appears from the words of Brantome, above quoted. It is not true that Strozz was deprived of his office of Colonel without any pretence, and without making him any amends. I am contented with this criticism, tho' I might proceed farther in my observations against Varillas; for the history of the French monarchy may doubtless afford some examples of what he affirms to have never been practised.

(5) Id. ibid. pag. 155.

[D] That expedition proved unfortunate; he lost his life in it. The Marquis de Sainte Croix, who commanded the Spanish fleet, obtained a complete victory over the French; but he cast a blot upon his victory, by his cruel usage of the vanquished. A particular account of his cruelty may be seen in a book of Varillas (6), out of which I shall only take what concerns our Strozz. He was forced to surrender, after he had made a brave defence (7): ' (8) Binvile, a gentleman of Picardy, who wrote fifty years after three volumes des Vêrités Françaises (9) in Cardinal de Richelieu's vindication, with more eloquence and heat than any other apologist of that prime minister, relates from the deposition of the French, who made their escape from the expedition on the Tercera illes, that Strozz was wounded above his knee with the shot of an arquebuse, so that he could not stand; and that he was carried in that condition to the Marquis de Sainte Croix, who turned his head another way with disdain, that he might not see him; that being told he was the General of the French fleet, he ordered him to be removed, because he did but foul and poison his ship; that a Spanish soldier, in obedience to the marquis, made an end of Strozz, by giving him two stabs, and then they threw him into the sea. Other relations do not agree about these particulars; and tho' they own that Strozz had been wounded in the fight, so that he could not have recovered, and yet that the Marquis de Sainte Croix ordered they should make an end of him; they add, that he kept his corpse to have it hanged with the other prisoners, on whom he designed to inflict that punishment, under pretence that they were men whom no body would own, who came to make war with Spain in the Tercera illes, tho' that monarchy was at peace with that of France. Varillas should not have quoted Binvile, for that author says nothing in particular about Strozz: he only says (10), that the Marquis de Sainte Croix used him barbarously; and of all the facts he relates thereupon, there is none he grounds upon the testimony of the French, who returned from the Tercera illes. Varillas should have quoted Brantome, who expresses himself thus (11): When

(6) The History of Henry III.

(7) Varillas, ibid. pag. 145.

(8) Id. ibid. pag. 146.

(9) Moreri under the word Bartolomé (Charles) mentions the author of that book; he styles him Sieur de Binvile.

(10) Vêrités Françaises, Part. II, pag. 403. Edit. of Paris 1643, in 4to.

(11) Brant. ult. supra, 307.

St f

Mr Strozz

(f) Varillas, *Hist. de Henri III, book vi, pag. m. 142.*

(g) Brantome, *ubi supra, pag. 305.*

(b) *Id. ibid. pag. 310.*

several gentlemen, who had followed him, were delivered up to the executioner, like so many robbers on the sea, who had no commission for what they did [E]. He was extremely severe; which appeared when he ordered eight hundred women of pleasure, who followed the camp, to be thrown into the river Loire (f). His free discourse about religion occasioned a belief that he was little persuaded of the truth of Christianity; but Brantome affirms he was wronged in that respect, and that he was otherwise a very honest man (g) [F]. This testimony proceeding from a man, who acknowledges on the other hand (b) that Strozzio plaid him a trick of a most ungrateful friend, and that he had the reputation of being neither a bad enemy nor a good friend, is of great weight: for men offended upon such a nice account, do not use to conceal the other faults that are known to them, and do not say that this was the only one (i). It is affirmed that he gave great credit to Judicial Astrology, and that it proved very prejudicial to him in his last expedition [G].

Mr Strozzio 'saw the fleet, commanded by the Marquis de Sainte Croix, making towards him, he was so desirous of preventing him, that his ship being heavy, and a bad sailer, for it was a large Flanders hulk, he removed into a lighter ship, on which was Mr de Beaumont, lieutenant to Mr de Brissac, whose governor he had been, and without any farther delay came up to the admiral, and they fought a long while hand to hand; but being wounded in the thigh, near the knee, with a musket-shot, his men being discouraged, left off fighting: whereupon the Spaniards easily boarded him, and carried him to the Marquis de Sainte Croix, who seeing what a miserable condition he was in, said, he would only be a troublesome and offensive nuisance on board the ship; and ordered they should make an end of him; which was done by giving him two stabs, and then they threw him into the sea.' See the margin (12).

(12) You will find in d'Aubigné *Hist. Univ. Tom. ii, book v, ch. xxi, pag. 1160*, an account very different from this.

(13) Varillas should have said to the public place of Villa Franca: Villa Franca is a town, and not the name of the public place of a town.

(14) Varillas, *ubi supra, pag. 247.*

(15) Thuanus, *lib. lxxv, pag. m. 422, 423.*

[E] He was used as an infamous pirate: several gentlemen, who had followed him, were delivered up to the executioner as robbers on the sea, who had no commission for what they did. As soon as the Marquis de Sainte Croix landed in the island of St Michael, he caused about three-hundred French prisoners, among whom there were fifty-two gentlemen, to be brought into the public place, called Villa Franca (13). They were exposed, by his order, upon scaffolds to the public view, or rather to be laughed at by the people; and then they were sentenced to be hanged; as the interrupters of commerce, the enemies of the public peace, and favourers of rebels and pirates, who made bold to come from France in a body, to serve Don Antonio against Philip II, King of Spain, lawful heir of Portugal, notwithstanding the peace between the Spaniards and the French (14). Thuanus's words are more energetic. 'Tum per tubicinem capitivis fisti iussu, ex numero procerum xxviii numerati sunt, ex nobilitate circiter L, ex omni numero ccc, quos omnes ad mortem damnavit (Santacrucius) publico elogio, quod pacem inter Christianissimum & Catholicum reges juratam violassent; Antonio Crati Priori ad classem Indicam interceptam insidias struenti operam navassent; infulas R. Catholici, uti iam ad S. Michaelis insulam fecerant, prædaturi venissent; conferta pugna Catholici classem oppugnassent. Proinde tanquam publicæ tranquillitatis ac commercii perturbatores erga majestatem Catholicam perduelles ac piratæ infames utriusque Regis bono, sic Santacrucii sententia ferebat, criminalium causarum judici capite plectendi traduntur (15). . . . Then the prisoners being produced at a signal given by a trumpeter, were found to make in all three-hundred; among whom there were twenty-eight noblemen, and about fifty gentlemen. All these the Marquis de Sainte Croix condemned to death, having first caused a public declaration to be made, that they had broken the peace concluded between their Christian and Catholic Majesties; that they had assisted the Prior Antony Crates in his scheme for intercepting the West-India fleet; that they had come to plunder the islands of his Catholic Majesty, as they had already done to the island of St Michael; and that they had openly attacked his fleet. For which reasons, as enemies to the public peace and trade, as traitors to his Catholic Majesty, and as infamous pirates, they were delivered over, as the sentence run, for the good of both kingdoms, to the Judge of criminal causes, in order that they should be punished with death.' It is affirmed in some relations, that the Marquis having caused Strozzio to be put to death, kept his corpse, to have it hanged with the other prisoners, on whom he intended to inflict such a punishment (16).

Henry III required no satisfaction for that bloody affront, which ought to be reckoned one of the most shameful passages of his reign. The Historian Contestaglio . . . tho' he was a pensioner of Spain . . . owns that Strozzio acted in Henry the third's name, and had a patent for being General of that army (17). The author, from whom I have these words, adds, that the nobility and the soldiers who followed Strozzio, had engaged in that voyage by the most Christian King's special command; and that his majesty had declared to Pope Gregory XIII, by his ambassador, and Philip II, by Mr de Saint Goart, afterwards Marquis de Pisany, that he avowed that naval expedition, as being obliged, by ancient treaties, to protect the kingdom of Portugal. It was therefore an inexcusable baseness to express no repentment for such a breach of the laws of war, and such an ignominious punishment inflicted upon the French prisoners, as if they had been pirates and men whom no body would own. Those who blame the prince for giving too great a power to his favourites, do him no injustice; but they should blame him much more for being so weak as to approve all the fancies of his mother, an ambitious woman, who pretended to the crown of Portugal out of an intolerable vanity. She was one of those, who laid a claim to that kingdom (18), and made no scruple to produce ridiculous and chimerical pretensions, that the world might think her ancestors had been more illustrious than it was reported. Having made such a step out of meek vanity, she proceeded to warlike preparations in order to conquer Portugal; she sent a fleet into the Tercera islands, which had the ill success I have mentioned; she had the confusion to see that those who acted in her name, and by her son's authority, were used like pirates, and France was obliged to leave such an ignominious affront unpunished. That queen, who pretended to be so great a Politician, had a wrong notion of things, and will never serve for a proof that women are capable of governing. Could any thing be more imprudent and impertinent than to engage in such a war, when the kingdom was full of factions, and laboured under great distempers, the curing of which should have been the principal care of the court.

[F] His free discourse about religion occasioned a belief that he was little persuaded . . . but Brantome affirms, he was wronged in that respect, and that he was otherwise a very honest man. These last words are Brantome's: here follows what he adds. 'Most people

looked upon him as a man who had little religion; they might think so if they pleased, but they never founded the bottom of his soul. It was true, he was no biggot, no hypocrite, and no devourer of crucifixes, and that he little minded masses and sermons; but then he believed the main things which ought to be believed; and besides, he would not have wronged any body for any thing in the world. Indeed when he was in a merry mood, he would sometimes laugh at Purgatory and Hell; but no strokes should have been laid upon it, for he did certainly believe Hell-torments, tho' he laughed at the great dragon represented by Painters. To conclude, he said many things, which he might as well have let alone; but that was more out of mirth than out of any ill design. I have been familiarly conversant with him about thirty years, and I may say he was no impious man (19). It is in vain for Brantome to palliate the thing; what he says is sufficient to shew that Strozzio had infinitely more morality than religion.

[G] It is affirmed that he gave great credit to Judicial Astrology, and that it proved very prejudicial to him in his last expedition. Read these words of Varillas (20). 'The French plundered and burnt

(1) As honest a man as ever came from Florence: He had but one fault; he was the coldest friend that ever was seen. *Id. ibid. pag. 311.*

(16) Varillas, *ibid. pag. 146.* See also Thuanus, *ibid. pag. 423.*

(17) Vêitex, *de la France, ii, pag. 405.*

REFLECTION upon the conduct of Catherine de Médicis.

(18) See Mézerai in the fifth volume of his *Abbrégé Chronologique, pag. m. 238.*

free thinker

(19) *Id. ibid. pag. 146, f. 305.*

(20) Varillas, *ubi supra, pag. 137.*

the town of Aguna, and caused such a consternation through the whole isle of St Michael, that they would have made themselves masters of it on the same day, if they had pursued their victory; but it was Strozzi's fault as well as the Queen-mother's, his near relation, to be too much addicted to Judicial Astrology. He was persuaded that there were fortunate and unfortunate days for him, and he had made a kind of calendar, which he observed with all possible exactness. The day on which he had been fighting was marked in it with a black spot; which made a greater impression upon his mind than the

victory he had obtained. He fancied that if he pursued it, he should fall into the precipice his fate had prepared for him; and that his ill fortune began to favour him, the better to bring him to it. This was sufficient to stop him, tho' the circumstances were so favourable, that the citizens of the two chief towns of the isle of St Michael, had deserted them, and fled to the mountains, where they hoped to be more safe. There is no body, whom it more concerns to be free from such superstitions, than the General of an army. See above (21) what I have said concerning Pericles and Nicias.

(21) Remark [B], of the following article.

STURMIUS (JAMES) was born at Straßburg in the year 1489 [A], of one of the most noble families of that place, and made himself illustrious by the services he did to his country. He exercised the most considerable offices with great capacity and probity, and gloriously performed several deputations both in the diets of the empire, and at the courts of Vienna and England. He very much contributed to the alteration that was made in religion at Straßburg in the year 1528, and to the erection of the college that was opened ten years after (a), and to Sleidan's History [B]. He died at Straßburg on the thirtieth of October 1553 (b). He had been some years without receiving the sacrament, being offended at the disputes of Divines about the sense of these words, *this is my body*. See the remark [D] in the following article.

(a) See remark [B], of the following article.

(b) Taken from Melchior Adam, in *Vitis Jurific.* pag. 97, & seq.

- [A] He was born at Straßburg in the year 1489.] Melchior Adam places his birth in the year 1490 (1); but he mentions his epitaph (2) wherein it is placed in the year 1489. I rather chuse to follow the epitaph, then the narrative of that writer. It is said in Moreri's Dictionary, that our James Sturmius was born at Sleida, near Cologne, according to Verheiden. This is taken from Mr Teissier (3); but it is certain Verheiden does not say so, for he speaks of John Sturmius, and not of James. What Mr Teissier adds, *That Sturmius, after he had begun his studies at Liege, went on with them at Paris, and that he had the direction of the university of Straßburg, in the quality of Rector*, is a consequence of his first mistake, viz. of his falsely supposing that Verheiden speaks of James Sturmius. What follows is not better. He died, not eighty years old, as Verheiden says, but in his climacterical year (4). Verheiden does not deserve such a censure; he only says that John Sturmius died being above eighty years old (5), which is true. Thuanus is mistaken when he says that James Sturmius died in his climacterical year (6). His epitaph (7) imports, that he died in his sixty-fourth year. Note, that Pantaleon (8), who quotes Sleidan, tells us, that James Sturmius departed this life in his climacterical year sixty-three. Sleidan does not say so; on the contrary he observes that Sturmius lived above sixty-three years. I shall set down the whole passage, because it contains a just encomium upon the person, who makes the subject of this article. 'Octobris die penultimo, Jacobus Sturmius, vir longæ & prudentissimus & integerrimus, ac planè decus nobilitatis Germanicæ, propter eximias animi dotes & doctrinam insignem, à vita decedit Argentorati, cum ex febris quartana per tempus bimestre decubisset. Ætatis annum excefferat tertium & sexagesimum (9). --- On the thirtieth of October, James Sturmius, a man of the greatest prudence and integrity, and who was truly an honour to the German Nobility, by reason of his exquisite parts & uncommon learning, died at Straßburg; after

having been confined to his bed for two months by a Quartan Ague. He was past his sixty-third year.' See how dangerous it is to trust to quotations, that have not been compared with the original.

[B] He very much contributed . . . to Sleidan's history.] That Historian acknowledges it. 'Historiam nihil magis decet quam veritas atque candor. Ego certè, ne quid in ea parte posset in me desiderari, diligenter incubui: nec enim ex vano quicquam hausi, vel auditione levi, sed scribendi materiam mihi suppeditarunt acta, quæ studiosè collegi, de quorum fide nemo dubitare possit: Interventit etiam verè nobilis & præclari viri, Jacobi Sturmii, subfidium & opera, qui per annos amplius triginta verè satus in publicis & arduis negociis, maxima cum laude, quum sua me non dedignaretur amicitia, quæ fuit ipsius humanitas, dubitantem & hærentem aliquid quando in vadis atque scopulis, peritus ipse gubernator, subinde reduxit in viam æquabilem minimeque salebrosam, & majorem operis partem, ante mortem, quo sublatus interit, meo rogatu perlegit, & quorum oportuit, diligenter admonuit (10). --- Nothing is more becoming history than truth and candour. I for my part have been at all possible pains not to fail in this point; for I have taken nothing at random, nor upon slight hear-say, but have carefully collected my materials out of records, the authority of which cannot be doubted. I have likewise been greatly assisted by that noble and eminent person James Sturmius, who was himself employed for above thirty years in public and arduous affairs, and acquitted himself with great reputation. As he was pleased to honour me with his friendship, so when he found me sometimes wavering and entangled amidst rocks and shallows, like a skillful pilot he conducted me into an even and secure track. Before the sickness of which he died, he perused at my entreaty the greatest part of the work, and took pains to give me all necessary hints and admonitions.'

(10) Jo. Sleidanus, *Epist. Dedicat. Histon.* folio m. a. v.

STURMIUS (JOHN) was born at Sleida in Eifel (a) near Cologne (b) the first of October 1507. He studied first in his native country, with the sons of Count Manderscheid, whose receiver his father was. Afterwards he studied at Liege in St Jerom's college, and then he went to Louvain in 1524, where he spent five years, three in being instructed and two in instructing others; and his school-fellows were John Sleidan, Gonthier Andernac, Christopher Montius, Bartholomew Latomus, Andrew Vefalius, James Omphalius, and some others, who became famous, and had a great affection for him. He set up a Printing-house with Rudger Refcius, Greek-professor, and printed some Greek authors, beginning with Homer, and soon after he carried those editions to Paris in 1529 (c). What Melchior Adam says, is not true, that he was familiarly acquainted with Conrad Goclenius at Louvain [A]. He was very much esteemed

(a) See his Epistle Dedicatory in the second volume of Cicero's Orations.

(b) Melch. Adams in *Vitis Philophor.* pag. 343.

(c) Id. ibid.

[A] It is not true that he was familiarly acquainted with Conrad Goclenius.] Melchior Adam expresses himself thus: 'Ibidem (Lovanii) cum familiariter versatur cum Rudgero Refcio, & Conrado Goclenio, hominibus

(d) See the Catalogue of them in Telfier, Additions aux Eloges, Tom. II, pag. 117, 118, Edit. 1696.

(e) Taken from Melchior Adam, in Vita Philo-
sophor. pag. 342,
& seq.

poor for them [C]. He published several books (d), and lived till the third of March 1589, that is, eighty-one years, five months, and two days. Tho' he had lost his sight, he minded the public good (e). He was married three times (f), and left no children behind him. He had many troubles in his life-time, the greatest whereof was his being exposed to the persecutions of the Lutheran ministers. When he came to Straßburg he found a moderate Lutheranism, which he liked well enough, tho' he was of Zuinglius's opinion. The Lutheran ministers grew angry by degrees with those, who did not believe the Real Presence: he was displeased with their violent sermons, and it is said he abstained several years from the public exercises of religion [D]. He was pressed hard,

(f) See the remark [D].

(11) Micrael.
Hist. Eccl. pag.
570, Edit. 1699.

a Senator and a Syndic, founded the college, and that John, who taught the scholars, was made Rector of it for life. Anno 1568, *Argentinenſis ſchola, quam jam ante XXX annos Jacobus Sturmius, ſenator primarius & ſyndicus, adornari curaverat, privilegia à Maximiliano II accepit, & Johannes Sturmius, qui rationem inſtituendæ juventutis monſtraverat, perpetuus Rector eſt creatus. Noſtra demum ætate, A. 1621, juſ univerſitatis à Ferdinando II accepit* (11).

[C] He ran in debt, and grew poor for them.] Read theſe words of Melchior Adam. 'Cum domus illius optimo cuique dies ac noctes pateret, eſſetque velut commune quoddam exulum aſylum, peregrinorum ac pauperum hoſpitiū, quos omnes fovendo, alendo, foris domique juvando, facultates haud exiguas abſumſit: maxime Gallorum Evangelicorum ſalutem tuendo, in quam omnes ſuas divitias impendit, ipſeque cum ſuis egere maluit, quam communem cauſam deferere: animo laudabili & perpetua gratitudine digno' (12). ----- His houſe was open day and night to every honeſt man, being as it were a common ſanctuary for baniſhed people, and a place of entertainment for the poor and ſtrangers. He laid out very conſiderable ſums of money in ſupporting, cheriſhing, and aſſiſting thoſe at home and abroad; particularly in providing for the welfare of the French Proteſtants; for upon this he ſpent his whole eſtate, chuſing rather to be in want with his family than to deſert the common cauſe: of ſuch a commendable diſpoſition was he, and ſo worthy of a perpetual gratitude.' Sturmius being called *veſpertilio*, a bat, by Oſiander, answered, that perhaps it was an alluſion to the *veſpertilio* in the proverb, to ſignify that he was very much in debt (13). He does not deny that he was, but he maintains that he never abſconded to cheat his creditors, and that his debts, contracted upon a glorious account, were pre-judicial to no body (14); that he was the only ſufferer, and that for above ſixteen years (15) that he groaned under that yoke, and exhausted himſelf, by paying large intereſts, and contracting new debts to pay the old ones, not one creditor could be produced who had loſt one farthing by him. *Heus bone vir: quando ego unquam, fraudationis cauſa latitavi? vel potiùs, quando ego unquam latitavi? vel creditorem nomina, vel indicem produci: qui me fraudationis cauſa latitaſſe dicat, aut qui dicat, me latitaſſe, & quando latitarim: & quo tempore: & propter quem creditorem. Creditorem unum nomina: qui annos jam ſedecim uno nummo in hoc ære alieno fraudatum ſe à me verè poſſit dicere. Sedecim enim annos & eo amplius in hac miſeria verſor; unum creditorem produci, qui unius teruncii, mea cauſa, & meo nomine jaſturam ſeciſſe jure conqueratur, tametiſi graviſſimis uſuris & verſuris, tot jam annos exbauſtari* (16). Afterwards he declares that he has run in debt to maintain his Proteſtant brethren. *Cur non iſtud potiùs cogitavit innocentia & caritas, & ſimplicitas tua? Hic homo horum hominum Eccleſias defendit, propter quas eſt ære alieno oppreſſus, & propter quas omne æs ſuum, jam alienum eſt: & qui propter æs alienum, in extremam eſtatem deſectus eſt* (17). I do not think Oſiander alluded to that proverb. I believe he uſed the word *veſpertilio* only to reflect upon Sturmius for being neither a profeſſed Lutheran nor a profeſſed Calviniſt. Sturmius was ſenſible that it might be Oſiander's meaning, and vindicated himſelf in that reſpect (18).

(12) Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra, pag. 345.

(13) Sturmius, in IV Anti-Pappi, Part. III, pag. 148.

(14) Propter æs alienum nemini noxiū vexor. ob æs alienum honeſtiſſima de cauſa conſtat. Id. ibid.

(15) He ſpoke to in the year 1580.

(16) Sturmius, ubi ſupra, pag. 149.

(17) Id. ibid.

(18) Id. ibid. and pag. 150.

(19) Id. ibid. pag. 165.

(20) Id. ibid. pag. 166.

and kept off a long time from the ſermons and diſputes of your miniſters, I was preſent at the laſt public diſputation of Pappus; and becauſe I ſaid ſomething, which might have removed the perplexity the opponent had reduced him to, I raiſed a ſtorm againſt me, by which I have been almoſt overwhelmed: how then can you object to me that I have been twenty years without going to your ſermons? *Et mihi obijciſis viginti annorum neglectas conciones; cum una diſputatiuncula, cui vix interſui, me prope perdidit?* He mentions to him thoſe, who in the primitive Church, put off receiving baptiſm till the laſt moment of their lives; which ſhews that they were a long time without communicating. He alledges, James Sturmius, who had been ſeveral years without receiving the communion, and abſtained from it, by reaſon of the diſpute the miniſters had raiſed about the Eucharift. 'Quis Jacobo Sturmio fuit diligentior, in noſtræ urbis religione, & Senatus autoritate defendenda? Quàm multos annos ille vir ad menſam Domini non acceſſit? Quam quæſio ob cauſam aliam, quàm propter hoc Theologorum diſſidium? Idcircone aut Eccleſiam, aut Senatus autoritatem contemnit' (21). ----- What man in this city was more active in ſupporting our religion, and the authority of the ſenate, than James Sturmius? Nevertheleſs he abſtained many years from the holy communion, becauſe of the difference of Divines upon this point. But did he for that deſpiſe either the Church, or the authority of the ſenate? His other answers give ground to believe that Oſiander accuſed him of hindering his wife, his ſervants, and his boarders, from going to church. He calls it a falſity, and deſies his adverſary to produce a witneſs of his accuſation. I married, ſays he, my third wife ſeven years ago; I lived twenty years with the firſt (22), and as many years with the ſecond (23). No body can ſay that they have not conſtantly heard ſermons, and received the communion, and been very careful to give alms. I ſhall ſet down in Latin what concerns his ſervants. 'Tot jam annos, tot ſcribas & famulos, tot ancillas, tantam familiam habui: ex his unum aliquem bonum compares, qui dicat, ſe meo juſſu, aut me autore à concionibus, & à ſacra menſa abſuiſſe' (24). ----- I have had for ſo many years ſuch a numerous family of tranſcribers, ſootmen, and ſervant-maids. Now find one honeſt perſon among all theſe, who can ſay that he had my commands or authority, for not bearing ſermons and receiving the ſacrament. He names ſome of his boarders, and, among others, two grand-ſons of a ſiſter of Martin Luther, who, ſays he, will witneſs that I never re-proved them for hearing ſermons. Hitherto he has ſaid nothing that contains a formal denial of what was objected to him, that he had been twenty years without hearing any ſermon; but afterwards he calls it a lie, as you may ſee in theſe words: 'At viginti jam annos nullas conciones audiviſti: at ſi tu iſtud viginti annos affirmes, totos viginti annos mentieris, quod pace tua dictum velim. Quamobrem, inquis, non venis? tot jam annis. An non reſpondi? ſi John Sapidus, tu tot annos conciones tales haberes, cujuſmodi tu & Pappus ſæpe habetis: tot ego te etiam deinceps, audire nequeam, & cauſam quæris, quam tibi jam expoſui' (25). ----- But you ſay that I have heard no ſermons for twenty years. If you inſiſt upon its being twenty years, I muſt beg leave to tell you that it is a groſs falſhood. You aſk why I have not come to church for ſo many years? Have I not already answered you? If you were to preach for ſo many years in the manner that you and Pappus do, juſt ſo long would I reſuſe to bear you, and yet you aſk the reaſon, which I have already told you. To make this part of his answer coherent, we muſt ſuppoſe that he did not avoid all ſorts of ſermons in general; but only thoſe of ſuch rigid Lutherans as Pappus was.

(21) Id. ibid.

(22) Joana Ponderis. Id. ib. pag. 167. Melchior Adam, ubi ſupra, pag. 343, & 345, calls her *Jobanna Piſonia*, which doubtleſs made Mr Baillet, article lxxv, of the Anti call her *Joanne le Poi*. Melchior Adam, pag. 345, ſays ſhe was a native of Paris, and that ſhe died ſew years after her huſband had ſettled at Straßburg. Which cannot be, ſince he lived twenty years with him.

(23) Margarita Wigandia: ſhe was the daughter of the wife of John Sapidus, colleague of Sturmius: the only ſon ſhe had by him died a child. Melch. Adam, ibid.

(24) Sturmius ubi ſupra, pag. 167.

(25) Id. ibid.

and forced to declare himself, and was not the fit his place [E]. I have mentioned in another pl

Nevertheless it is certain that a Divine of the Confession of Augsburgh, has asserted that John Sturm was above twenty years without going to church and receiving the sacrament, and that he used to play at cards in sermon-time. *Venerabile Ministerium Argentoratense non ignorat, Sturmium ultra 20 annos nec templum frequentasse, nec sacra cœna usum. Retulit mihi M. Frideric. Rbodius, olim Superintendens Arnstadiensis in Thuringia, gravis Theologus, quique multos per annos Sturmii fuerat domesticus convictor, se illum vidisse nunquam in templo, sed plerumque ludo scæborum diebus Dominicus sub concionis tempore trivisse* (26). Mr Cre-

(26) Conradus Schlussemburg, in extrema, constante, christiana Responsione & Explicatione ad calumniosum Script. Christoph. Pelargi, apud Crenium, Animadvers. Philol. & Historic. Part. vi, pag. 142.

(27) Jo. Pappus, Defens. III, contra Sturmium, par. 118, apud Crenium, ubi supra, pag. 140.

(28) Id. ibid. apud Crenium, ibid. pag. 141.

(29) Sturmium, in Part. iii, Anti-Pappi IV, pag. 150.

(30) Id. ibid. pag. 169.

(31) Id. ibid.

(32) He speaks to Andreas Osiander a Divine of Tubingen.

nus, who affords me this curious passage, mentions another, which shews what John Pappus answered, being accused of never praying for the Reformed Churches of France. How could John Sturm, says he, hear me pray for them? I have served these ten years the church and university of Strasburgh, and he has never heard my lectures nor my sermons. *Tu vero audieris? Ecquam igitur scholam meam, aut concionem toto hoc decennio, quò in schola & Ecclesia jam ministro audivisti* (27)? Afterwards Pappus tells him what he begs of God, not only for the Protestants of France, but also for all persecuted Churches. 1. That the errors which their ministers teach them, be not imputed to them. 2. That God would be pleased to discover to them the truths they are ignorant of. 3. To strengthen them in their afflictions, and enable them to suffer them patiently, and not to relapse into Popish Idolatry. 4. To convert or restrain their persecutors. *Atqui ego quotidie, & in Ecclesia, & domi Deum precor, non modo pro Gallicanis, sed pro omnibus afflictis & persecutionem patientibus Ecclesiis: & ne nescias, hæc ipsis precor. 1. Ne Dominus ipsis errores, quibus inscientes imbuuntur à suis Doctoribus imputet, &c* (28).

I must not forget that Sturm was accused of flattering the Roman Catholics. If this accusation was grounded on his writing against them in a civil, and not in a passionate and injurious manner, it was very unjust. His moderation was very acceptable to his Popish adversaries; and Cardinal Sadolet, and John Cochlaeus writ very civilly against him (29). He asked (30) whether they would alledge as a proof, a piece of poetry, wherein he had lately congratulated the Bishop of Strasburgh upon his coming to town, and his agreement with the magistrates; and he maintained that it would be a very wrong reason, seeing the friendship established between that prelate and the magistrates, was a very proper subject for a congratulation; and he adds a particular reason, grounded upon the family of that prelate. He was Count of Manderfcheidt, related to those with whom our Sturm had learned the Latin tongue. He confessed that many illustrious persons of the Church of Rome had been his friends and his patrons, and he declared, that tho' we are displeased with the conduct of great men and princes in some respects, yet we ought to esteem their virtues and fine qualities. (31) 'In magnis autem viris & in Principibus, etiam si aliqua displiceant, tamen virtutes magnæ sunt confiderandæ, ut in Sadoletto, Bembo, Julio Phlegio, aliisque doctissimis viris. In Carolo V pater tuus (32), si meministi, quid improbarit, nosti: tamen quæ nobis non placebant in hoc Imperatore, ita non placebant, ut illi in ratione militari gloriam, & in victoriis æquitatem, & fortunam non adimeremus. --- Great men and princes, tho' they may displease us in some things, are nevertheless to be esteemed for their eminent virtues and good qualities; for example, Sadoletus, Bembo, Julius Phlegius, and other learned men. You remember, I suppose, what your father found fault with in Charles V: nevertheless those things which did not please us in that emperor, displeased us in such a manner, that we did not seek to strip him of his glory in war, of his moderation in victory, and of his good fortune.' To this example of Charles V he adds that of the Guises, pretending that the French Protestants did not scruple to acknowledge their valour, their parts, &c. It must be confessed that those maxims are very reasonable; but they are little practised by men transported with zeal, or of a fiery temper.

Calvin's Institution [F]. I shall take notice of some faults in Moreri [G].

- makes use of this turn, that Heaven declared him *emeritus* in the year 1583. 'Ufque ad annum Christi 1583 quo Deo placuit eundem rude donare (43) . . . Existimo autem D. Sturmium nostrum, rude, quo divinitus donatus est, contentum &c (44). . . . Till the year 1583, when it pleased G O D to discharge him as one that had served his time . . . Now I fancy that Sturmius was very well contented with this discharge, &c.' I take this from a letter, which contains a handsome parallel between Theophrastus and Sturmius. Here follows a passage that wants to be rectified. 'John Sturmius . . . having continued in his office till he was eighty years old and above, found himself no longer able to discharge the duties of it, and obtained from the magistrates of Straßburg, that his place should be filled up by Melchior Junius, his scholar (45).' It is not true that he exercised his office till he was eighty years of age and above; he lost it in 1583, which was the seventy-sixth year of his age. He desired no successor, because he was no longer able to continue in it; it was taken from him.

[F] I have mentioned, in another place (46), the encomium he bestowed upon Calvin's Institutions. And I said that this encomium concerns the edition of the year 1543, which is the third. I went upon two reasons: one is, that it is certain the second edition is that of the year 1539 (47); the other is that these words of Sturmius, 'Institutio Christianæ Religionis quam primo inchoatam, deinde locupletatam, hoc vero anno absolutam edidit; . . . The Institution of the Christian religion, which he first began, and afterwards enlarged; but the complete edition of it he published this year,' suit only with the third edition. But to conceal nothing, I ought to mention here what I have read in the second Anti-Pappus, viz. that Calvin being minister at Straßburg, enlarged his Institution, and published it in the same city, apud Wendelinum Rihelium, and that Sturmius prefixed to that book the judgment he made of it. *Ego meam sententiam in fronte ejus libri de Calvinis affixi* (48). Which does not agree with the third edition, viz. that of the year 1543, for Calvin was not at Straßburg that year; he returned to Geneva in September 1541. My conjecture is thus: Sturmius knowing that the book was reprinting at Straßburg in 1543, inserted some words, in his judgment, which shewed that it was a third edition. And therefore it is true that the words of Sturmius, which I have quoted in the article of CALVIN, (cit. 27.) concern the third edition, and consequently I have said nothing but what is true; but I think I should have observed that Sturmius had prefixed the same encomium (49) to the second edition, 1539. Let those who have this second edition, judge whether my conjecture be right or not.

[G] Some faults in Moreri. I. It is not true that Verheiden says that James Sturmius was born at Sleida near Cologne. See the remark [A] in the foregoing

article. II. It is not true that this Sturmius began his studies at Liege, and went on with them at Paris. III. And that he persuaded John Sleidan to write the history that made him so famous. See in the remark [B] of the foregoing article, how far he contributed to that history. IV. It is not true that John Sturmius persuaded him to undertake the establishment of an university at Straßburg: the only thing they had in view then was a school, or what they call in Holland and Germany an *illustrious school* (50), which is different from an university: however it be, John Sturmius did not advise such an establishment; for he was sent for from Paris for no other reason, but because they had already formed the project of that school, that is, they had resolved to introduce into the school that was already at Straßburg, and of which James Sturmius was one of the Curators, the best regulations, and the most proper method to promote study; and they thought, with great reason, that John Sturmius was a man well qualified both to teach and to have the direction of the school. V. Moreri should not have said, that the design of founding an university was happily executed; for, I repeat it again, nothing but a school was designed at that time. VI. He should therefore have said, not that John Sturmius had the foundation of that university confirmed by the emperor, but that he obtained from that prince, that the school should be erected into an university. VII. When Moreri says, that after the year 1566, John Sturmius performed . . . several embassies . . . and assisted at several conferences; he intimates that Sturmius had no such employment before that time, which is a mistake; for not to mention the other deputations that preceded the year 1566, it is certain that in 1540, he was sent to the conferences of Worms with Calvin, Capito, and Bucer (51). VIII. He did not lose his sight after he had taught at Straßburg for the space of fifty-one years. He began to teach there in 1538, and was deprived of his place in 1583, and therefore he taught but forty-five years. IX. If he had taught for the space of fifty-one years, and then if he had lost his sight, Moreri should not have distinguished between the time when he died, and the time when he lost his eyes: for the year 1589, in which he died, according to Moreri, and according to the truth, falls in with the fifty-first year since he began to teach in that city. X. Moreri should not have said that he died at eighty years of age; for he had said that Sturmius was born in the year 1507, and died in 1589. Judge whether Moreri had got the art of writing; how carelessly does he make use of Melchior Adam? I omit his calling James and John Sturmius's deputations, by the names of embassies. He should have known that an imperial city has, indeed, agents, residents, envoys, and deputies, but not ambassadors. He knew not that the Latin word *legatio* has a larger sense than the words *embassy* and *deputation*.

(43) Jo. Jacobus Grynaeus, Epist. IX, lib. i, pag. 151.
(44) Ibid. pag. 153.
(45) Thuanus, apud Teiffier, Addit. aux Élog. Tom. II, p. 116.
(46) In the article CALVIN, remark [F].
(47) This appears by a short Epistle of Calvin to the reader, dated at Straßburg, August 1, 1539.
(48) Sturmius, in Anti-Pappo secundo, p. 111.
(49) Except the words, which signify that it is the third edition.
(50) Note, that in the illustrious schools, they do not teach Grammar and Rhetoric; but they were taught in the school of Straßburg.
(51) See the second Anti-Pappus of Sturmius, pag. 114.

SÜETONIUS PAULINUS (CAIUS) Governor of Numidia, in the

- year of Rome 794, overcame the Mauri as far as mount Atlas (a); and was the first Roman captain, who went beyond that famous mountain (b). He writ a relation of that war (c). He was one of the best warriors in his time, and people did not scruple to say, that he contended with Corbulo for military glory (d). He performed very noble exploits in Britain (e) [A], where he commanded in the year 814, and 815; but having overcome the rebels, he punished them too severely for the devastations and slaughter they had

[A] He performed noble exploits in Britain. Emulation was no small help to him; for he endeavoured to equal the glory Corbulo had got by recovering Armenia. Sed tum Paullinus Suetonius obtinebat Britannus, scientia militiæ, & rumore populi, qui nemini sine æmulo fuit, Corbulonis concertator, receptæque Armeniæ decus æquare domitis perduellibus cupiens (1). Having observed that the isle of Mona (2) served the rebels for a shelter, he resolved to take it, and succeeded in his design with no great difficulty, though the multitude of the islanders, who expected him on the shore, and their wives dressed like furies, and their Druids lifting up their hands to heaven, and uttering imprecations, surprized the Roman soldiers by the novelty of the spectacle. He caused their sacred

groves to be cut down, in which the inhabitants sacrificed human victims (3), and settled garrisons; but whilst he was taken up with those things, he was informed that the Britons, under the conduct of the widow of Prasutagus, King of the Iceni, had risen up in arms, and committed great disorders. Whereupon he went over, and took such effectual measures to prevent the progress of those rebels, that he obtained over them a victory as remarkable as those of former times (4). It is said that about eighty thousand Britons were killed in that battle, and that the Romans sacrificed their prisoners, and to consult the gods by looking into the entrails of men. Id. ibid. cap. xxx. (4) Clara & antiquis victoriis par ea die laus potior.

(1) Tacit. Ann. lib. xiv, cap. xxx, ad ann. 814.

(2) It is thought to be that now called Anglesey.

(d) See the remark [A], at the beginning.

(e) That is to say England, according to the style now-a-days.

(3) Exciit luci, fœvis superstitionibus sacri; nam cruce captivo ad dolere aras, & hominum fibris confutere deos fas habebant. . . . He cut down the groves that were consecrated to their barbarous superstitions; for they held it lawful to

(f) See the remark [A].

(g) Tacit. Hist. lib. i. cap. lxxxvii.

(5) Lib. xiv, cap. xxix, & seq.

(6) In Epitome Dionis in Nerone, pag. m. 173, & seq.

(7) Tacitus, in Vita Agricola, cap. xvi.

(8) Tacitus, Annal. lib. xiv, cap. xxxviii.

(9) Mirabantur (hostes) quod dux & exercitus tanti belli confector servitii obdierent. . . . The enemies wondered to see a general and an army, who had finished such a glorious war, paying homage to a freedman. Id. ibid. cap. xxxix.

(10) Id. ibid. cap. xxxi.

(11) Id. ibid.

had made, and therefore he was succeeded by a he was consul in the year of Rome 819 [B], the troops of the Emperor Otho (g), and did not had got. The soldiers openly murmured at his maxims, which consisted in venturing nothing,

mans did not lose four hundred men, which was not quite so many as their wounded. Suetonius's courage and firmness, and his prudence and experience, appeared gloriously on that occasion. You will find a curious account of this in Tacitus's Annals (5), and in Xiphilinus (6). The vanquished were severely treated, which was the reason why many rebels remained in arms, fearing the consequences of their submission. 'Tenentibus arma plerisque, quos conscientia defectionis, & proprius ex Legato timor agitabat. Hic cum egregius cetera, arroganter in deditos, & ut suæ quoque injuriæ ultor, durius consuleret; missus Petronius Turpilianus tantumquam exorabilior, & delictis hostium novus, eoque poenitentiae mitior (7). . . . Most of them remained in arms, being terrified with the consciousness of their revolt, and particularly afraid of the General. In other respects he was a man of great worth; but as he treated arrogantly those who surrendered themselves, or rather, like a person who revenged his own quarrels, severely; Petronius Turpilianus was sent in his room, a man of a milder temper, and who, being a stranger to the faults of the enemies, was for that reason the better disposed to accept of their submissions.' These words of Tacitus want a supplement; we must add to them the account he gives in the fourteenth book of his Annals. There we find what happened before Turpilian succeeded Suetonius, viz. that Julius Claudivianus, who was Intendant in Britain after Suetonius's victory, fell out with that General, and cried him down as much as he could. He ascribed to him the ill successes, and imputed the good ones to the fortune of the Romans. He gave out that a General would quickly come, who would use clemency towards the vanquished, and he writ to the court, that the war would never be ended, unless Suetonius was recalled. *Julius Claudivianus successor Cato missus, & Suetonio discors, bonum publicum privatis similitudinibus impendebat: dispereratque novum Legatum opperendum esse, sine hostili ira & superbia victoris clementer deditis consulturum. Simul in Urbem mandabat, nulum praelio finem expectarent, nisi succederetur Suetonio: cujus adversa pravitate ipsius, prospera ad fortunam Reipub. referebat* (8). Nero hearing of this, sent Polyclethus, one of his freedmen, into Britain, looking upon him as a fit man to reconcile the governor and intendant of the province, and to make the rebels accept of a peace. This freedman appeared with great pomp, and Suetonius was obliged to make his court to him (9); however he kept his post, till it was thought proper to bestow it upon Turpilian. If any one, in order to excuse Suetonius's severity, should alledge the horrid barbarities the Britons exercised upon the Romans, it might be answered that the Britons did not do it till after they had suffered prodigious violences and extortions, and that therefore the Roman General should not have been so implacable towards the vanquished; for there is a vast difference between those, who rise up against a new master, whose yoke is pretty easy, and those who shake off a new domination the most tyrannical in the world. In the first case an insurrection attended with cruelty deserves a severe punishment; but in the second case, clemency ought quickly to succeed severity. Tacitus says (10), that after the death of a British King, who had made the Roman Emperor joint heir with his two daughters, his house and his estates were plundered, his widow was whipped, his two daughters were ravished, the chief persons of the country were turned out of their estates, and the King's relations reduced to the condition of slaves. The Roman colony at Camalodunum, made up of Veteran soldiers, seized every body's goods, and turned people out of the houses, being countenanced by the Roman soldier who hoped to have some time or other the same liberty of plundering the islanders. *In coloniam Camalodunum recens deducti, pellebant domibus, exturbabant agris, captivos, servos appellando: foventibus impotiam veteranorum militibus, similitudine vitæ, & ejusdem licentiæ* (11). These proceedings inspired t

circumspection, prevented his improving favourable opportunities [C], and afforded the enemies a sufficient time to take care of their affairs. The worst was that he ran away on the day of the general and decisive battle, and that he boasted to Vitellius that he had betrayed Otho [D], which probably was not true; but he was believed upon his word, and that saved his life. It has been said that the hopes he had of being made Emperor, moved him to advise that the war should be kept up between Otho and Vitellius; but Tacitus thinks he was too wise a man to have such thoughts

the other authors I have consulted, say, that our Suetonius Paulinus was Telestinus's colleague. You will find the same opinion in Vossius, and a fault in Chronology; for Vossius supposes that this consulship belongs to the year of Rome 811 (25). Father Hardouin (26) places it in the last year of Nero's life, and quotes the sixth book of Tacitus's Annals. He should have quoted the sixteenth, and remembered that Nero died the second year after the consulship of Suetonius and Telestinus. For the rest, Mr de Tillemont (27) supposes, as a thing undeniable, that Suetonius had been consul before he was sent into Britain; and the reason he goes upon, is, that all those who were sent thither had been consuls. I cannot tell whether he is in the right as to this last point, and the proof he takes from these words, *ututissimus consularium*, does not appear to me a convincing one; for perhaps the meaning of them is, that Suetonius was older than all those who had been consuls, tho' some of them had exercised the consulship before him; and therefore I do not absolutely condemn the common opinion, nor his neither. There may be some reasons on both sides: it were somewhat strange that Tacitus should never mention the consular quality of Suetonius, if it had belonged to him, when he commanded in Britain.

[C] His maxims, which consisted in venturing nothing . . . prevented his improving favourable opportunities.] Cæcina, General of Vitellius's troops, made use of a stratagem, which did not succeed, and was like to be fatal to him, because the Generals of Otho having discovered it, avoided the snare, and laid another which the enemy did not perceive. By this means they obtained a considerable advantage, but not such as it might have been, if Suetonius had been bolder and less cautious. Tacitus gives the following character of him. 'Signum pugnae non statim a Suetonio Paulino peditum. Cunctator natura, & cui cauta potius confilia cum ratione, quam prope ex casu placerent; compleri festas, aperiri campum, pendi aciem jubebat, satis cito incipi victoriam ratus, ubi provisum foret ne vincerentur. Ea cunctatione, spatium Vitellianis datum, in vineas nexu traducum impeditas refugendi: & modica silva adhærebat; unde rursus ausi promptissimos prætorianorum equitum interficere (28). . . . Paulinus did not presently give the signal of battle to the infantry. He was naturally slow, and preferred wary counsels grounded upon reason to such as proved successful by chance. He ordered the trenches to be filled up, the ground to be cleared, and the army to be drawn out. By that delay the troops of Vitellius had time given them to make a retreat into vineyards, which the knitting of the branches made difficult of access. There was likewise a small wood adjoining, from which they sallied out and slew the boldest of the Prætorian horse.' He rather chose to give his opinion according to the rules of prudence, than to obtain an advantage by meer chance. Had he not founded the retreat on that day, the whole army of Vitellius had been cut in pieces; at least it was the opinion of both parties: the reasons he gave of his conduct were not approved; and I think warriors would readily change the proverb, *Too much precaution is craft*, into this, *Too much precaution is an oversight*. Let us still hear Tacitus. 'Cæterum ea ubique formido fuit, apud fugientes, occurrantes, in acie, pro vallo, ut deleri cum universo exercitu Cæcinam potuisset, ni Suetonius Paulinus recepti cecinisset, utrisque in partibus perirebunt. Timuisse se Paulinus ferebat, tantum insuper laboris atque itineris; ne Vitellianus miles recens & castris festos aggrediretur, & percussis nullum retro subsidium foret. Apud paucos ea ducis ratio probata, in vulgus adverso rumore fuit (29). . . . There was so great a consternation among those who fled, & who they met one another in the field, or before the trenches, that, as it was generally believed by both

parties, Cæcina might have been cut off with his whole army, if Suetonius Paulinus had not founded a retreat. He gave out that he dreaded the great fatigue and journey which still remained to go through, and that he was apprehensive lest the troops of Vitellius should have sallied fresh out of their camp, and set upon his men when they were weary, who, if they had met with any repulse, were wholly destitute of all resource. This reason of Paulinus was approved by some few, but was not at all acceptable to the vulgar. But if on the one side Suetonius's circumspection proved sometimes prejudicial to Otho, it might on the other have prevented his ruin occasioned by the rashness of the other Generals. Suetonius was for protracting the war, and his opinion grounded upon very solid maxims (30), was also that of Marius Celsus, and Annius Gallus, his colleagues (31). But Titian, Otho's brother, and Proculus, Præfect of the Prætorium, who had the greatest interest with that emperor (32), advised the quite contrary, and brought things into the greatest danger. The following passage is to Suetonius's honour. 'Otho consultavit, trahi bellum, an fortunam experiri placeret. Tum Suetonius Paulinus, dignum fama sua ratus, quia nemo illa tempestate militaris rei callidior habebatur, de toto genere belli censere; festinationem hostibus, moram ipsis, utilem differuit (33). . . . Otho pronus ad decertandum; frater ejus Titianus, & præfectus prætorii Proculus, imperitia properantes, fortunam

trahi bellum, an fortunam experiri placeret. Tum Suetonius Paulinus, dignum fama sua ratus, quia nemo illa tempestate militaris rei callidior habebatur, de toto genere belli censere; festinationem hostibus, moram ipsis, utilem differuit (33). . . . Otho pronus ad decertandum; frater ejus Titianus, & præfectus prætorii Proculus, imperitia properantes, fortunam & deos & numen Ottonis adesse confilii, affore conatibus testabantur, neu quis obviam ire sententiam auderet, in adulationem concefferant (34). . . . Otho held a consultation whether it was better to spin out the war, or to try his fortune at once. Suetonius Paulinus thinking it worthy of his reputation in the military art, which no man in his days was thought to understand better, to give his opinion of the war in general, argued, that dispatch was for the interest of the enemy, delay for theirs. . . . Otho was inclined to a battle; his brother Titian, and Proculus, Præfect of the Prætorium, hurried on by ignorance, affirmed that good fortune, the gods, and the deity of Otho, favoured their counsels, and would prosper their undertakings; and lest any one should contradict their opinion, they gave into a strain of flattery. A battle being resolved upon, it was debated whether Otho should be there or not, and it passed in the negative; Suetonius and Celsus not daring to oppose it, lest they should be accused of exposing the prince to danger (35). They sent him therefore with very good troops into a safe place: which weakened the army, and discouraged the soldiers (36), and after that retreat Suetonius and Celsus had only the name of Generals (37); their counsels were not followed, every thing depended upon Proculus's fancy. It is therefore no great wonder if the battle was lost, and if Suetonius ran away and durst not return into the camp. But he cannot be excused for what I am going to relate; it is a downright infamy.

[D] He boasted to Vitellius that he had betrayed Otho.] The commanders of the victorious army, and those who had been vanquished, went to Vitellius at Lyons. He caused several captains of Otho's party to be put to death, and left Suetonius and Proculus in the uncertainty of the event. At last they were heard, and obtained their pardon, because they made him believe they had betrayed Otho, and gave an account of the measures they had taken to destroy him. Suetonius Paulinus, & Licinius Proculus, trifled with a squalid life: till they were heard, necessary magis defensionibus, quam bonis uterentur. Prædicationem ultro imputabant: spatium longi ante prælium itineris, fatigationem Othonianorum, permixtum vehiculis agmen, ac pleraque fortuita, fraudi suæ assignantes, & Vitellius credidit de perfidia, & fidem absoluit (38). Can any thing be more unworthy of the Roman name?

(25) Vossius, de Hist. Latin. lib. i, cap. xxvi, pag. m. 133.

(26) Hardouin, ubi supra.

(27) Tillemont, ubi supra.

(28) Tacitus, Histor. lib. ii, cap. xlv, ad ann. 812.

(29) Id. ibid. cap. xlvii.

(30) They may be seen in Tacitus, ibid. cap. xxxii.

(31) Ibid. cap. xxxvi.

(32) Id. ibid. lib. i, cap. lxxvii.

(33) Id. ibid. lib. ii, cap. xxxvi.

(34) Id. ibid. lib. ii, cap. xxxvii.

(35) Id. ibid. lib. ii, cap. xxxviii.

(36) Id. ibid. lib. ii, cap. xxxix.

(37) Id. ibid. lib. ii, cap. xl.

(38) Id. ibid. lib. ii, cap. xli.

[E] Tacitus

(f) In the remark [E] of the following article. thoughts [E]. We shall see below (i) that it father of Suetonius the Historian, and to say that

[E] Tacitus thinks he was too wise a man to have such thoughts.] He had read in some authors, that the armies of Otho and Vitellius, whether they were afraid of the war, or were disgusted at both emperors, whose infamy discovered itself daily, thought of coming to an agreement, and electing a new master, or intrusting the senate with that election, and that this was the reason why the commanders of Otho's troops, especially Paulinus, were for prolonging the war (39). Tacitus is willing to believe that some few men wished in their hearts the public peace and a good prince; but he cannot persuade himself that Suetonius, who was so prudent a man, could hope that in so corrupt an age, the soldiers, who had broke the peace to have a war, would can- guag- nor t their conte them fuit, tionei pacis ribus Lega rum Prin

(39) Ex eodem, ib. cap. xxxvii.

(a) Suidas, in Τράγωνα, calls him only a Grammarian, and mentions the titles of several grammatical books written by Suetonius.

S U E T O N I U S (CAIUS S U E T O N I U S son of Suetonius Lenis [A], flourished under th applied himself very much to study, and I think and Rhetoric (a). It is certain he pleaded some pleaded some real ones before the judges. Pliny: called *Scholastici* (b), a sort of men who never or by way of exercise (c), affirms in another

(1) Sueton. in Othone, cap. x.

[A] Son of Suetonius Lenis.] The proof of this is contained in the following passage. Interfuit huic bello pater meus Suetonius Lenis, tertiae decimae legionis Tribunus angusticlavus (1). - - My father Suetonius Lenis was present at this battle, being Tribune of the thirteenth legion, and an Angusticlavian. It appears also from these words, that Suetonius's father was Tribune of the thirteenth legion, and that he was at the battle of Bedriacum, in which Vitellius's troops defeated those of Otho. Had Muretus exactly remembered the passages of Tacitus, alledged by him, he would have made a better use of his critical learning. He found *Linus* with a little hole before it in a manuscript, whereupon he fancied that three letters were lost, and that instead of *Linus*, the true reading was *Paulinus*; from whence he inferred that Suetonius the Historian was the son of Suetonius Paulinus, who is the subject of the foregoing article. Vidi ego librum, qui cariem et tinea fenestrat, in quo post nomen Suetonius foramen erat exiguum: deinde sequebatur *linus*: et supra alia manu emendatum lenis: Omnino autem legendum est Paulinus; id enim ei verum cognomen fuit. Testem in eam rem laudabo Tacitum, qui fortis viri neque nomen, neque virtutem tacitam esse sivit. Ejus enim et saepe in annalibus, et in Agricola vita perhonorificam mentionem facit (2). He was so fond of his conjecture, that he did not mind the testimonies of Tacitus, which he made use of; for if he had considered them with attention, he might easily have perceived that they were wholly inconsistent with his critical observation; and he would have concluded that Suetonius, whose exploits are mentioned by Tacitus, could not be him who was only a Tribune in the war of Vitellius. To which I add, that according to the same Tacitus, in a work (3) not quoted by Muretus, Suetonius Paulinus was one of Otho's Generals during the same war, which utterly destroys Muretus's correction. These are very strange faults, and yet a Critic ought never to take notice of them in an insulting manner, being always mindful that he may want the same indulgence when he commits the like mistakes, which is unavoidable. Were I allowed to compare the inferior with the great, I would apply to myself the inference drawn by Liptius from this mistake of Muretus (4). Quid dicam? Non infector te vir elegantissime, sed bona fide haec scribis. Erras nimis. Suetonius ille Lenis, Tribunus fuit: noster belli dux. Ille angusticlavus, id est, nondum Senator, sed inter equites: Ille Consularis, nec tenue usquam vestigium confusionis ejus quam facis. Hoc mihi in transcurso monitum, non ut carpam (Fidem testor); sed ut claro sub exemplo doceam quam fallax haec Critica, & ignoscendum etiam nobis esse, si labimur interdum in proclivi ista via. - - - What shall I say? Far be it from me to insult so ingenious a man as you are. You write these things candidly, tho' your error is too plain: for that Suetonius Lenis was a Tribune; our's a General. The one was

(2) Muret. Variarum Lect. lib. xv, cap. xi, pag. 1144.

(3) The first and second book of Tacitus's History.

(4) Liptius, in Tacit. Histor. lib. ii, pag. m. 424.

procure him a delay, because a dream made him afraid of miscarrying in a cause at the bar. There was a long and very strict friendship between those two writers (e); and it proved advantageous to Suetonius, for Pliny did him great services. He procured him an office of Tribune (f), and then he had it bestowed upon another, at Suetonius's request. He obtained for the latter, whose wife was barren, the *jus trium liberorum*, that is, the privileges of those who have three children. That favour was seldom granted, and Pliny had not obtained it for his friend, had it not been for the great interest he had at the Imperial court, and for the earnest desire he expressed to obtain it (g). He was then (h) governor of Bithynia, under the empire of Trajan. Suetonius raised himself considerably afterwards, for he was secretary to the Emperor Hadrian; but he lost that office about the year 121, when several persons were put out of favour for not paying a due respect to the empress [B]. He wrote many books [C], most of which are lost. We have only his History of the first twelve Emperors, and part of his treatise concerning the illustrious Grammarians and Rhetoricians. That history is very much commended by our most learned Humanists [D]: he speaks much more of the Emperors than of the affairs of the Empire; and the diligence wherewith he has collected so many particulars concerning their actions and inclinations, cannot be sufficiently admired. He does not observe the order of time; and no History was ever more different from annals than this is. He reduces every thing to some general heads, and places together what relates to each head. He is very concise, and frequently touches upon

(e) *Id. lib. i. Epist. xxiv; lib. x. Epist. xcvi.*

(f) *Id. Epist. viii. lib. iii.*

(g) See the 95th and 96th Letters of the 10th book of Pliny.

(h) About the year 104.

the author of them believed that Suetonius Lenis, and Suetonius Paulinus are the same person. La Popeliere expresses himself thus: *Suetonius Lenis, the father of Tranquillus, wrote the life of the Emperor L. Otbo, and a book concerning the Prætors* (10). This is all false.

Note, That Suetonius taking the fir-name of Tranquillus, retained the whole sense of the fir-name *Lenis*, [Gentle] which his father had. But we do not know the reason which made him prefer the one to the other: perhaps he only consulted his ear, and *Tranquillus* sounded better to him.

[B] He lost that office when several persons were put out of favour for not paying a due respect to the empress. This is to be found only in a passage of Spartianus. *Septicio Claro præfetto prætorii, Et Suetonio Tranquillo Epistolæ magistro, multisque aliis qui apud Sabinam uxorem, injussu ejus, familiaribus se tunc egerrant quam reverentia domus aulicæ postulabat, successores dedit* (11). The sense of those words is thus represented by Mr de Tillemont: 'Adrian put out of favour many persons in England, for having behaved themselves too freely, without his order, towards the Empress Sabina, which is not farther explained in history. Suetonius Tranquillus, who doubtless is the Historian, lost his office of secretary, &c (12).'

This is very judicious: we shall see in the remark, wherein I take notice of Moreri's mistakes, that every body has not been so cautious as Mr de Tillemont.

[C] He wrote many books. I shall use still the expressions of the same writer (13). 'Suidas

ascribes to him several works, which concern that profession (14). Besides, he observes that he had

wrote a book about the Grecian games, two upon the shews of the Romans, two upon the laws and customs of Rome, one upon the life of Cicero, or upon his books *de Republica*, a catalogue of the illustrious men of Rome, and the eight books, still extant, of the history of the emperors. * He had

also writ three books of kings, of which St Paulinus made an abridgment in verse. † The book of the institution of Offices, quoted by Priscian, may be the book concerning the laws and customs of Rome.

The same Priscian quotes eight books of his concerning the Prætors. A book intituled, *De Rebus Variis*, is ascribed to him, wherein he treated of things that concern Grammar. ‡ It appears by several authors, who quote his works, that they have been very much esteemed even among the

Greeks. § Tertullian quotes his book concerning shews, * and St Jerome that of the illustrious men, in whose imitation he wrote his. It is likely that what is now extant of Suetonius concerning the illustrious Grammarians, Poets and Orators, made part of that work. He speaks of some Grecians, but they taught at Rome.

[D] That history of the first twelve emperors, is very much commended by our most learned Humanists. [It is a continued series of choice and curious facts, related succinctly without digressions, reflexions, and reasonings. There is in it a character of sincerity, which plainly shews that the author feared and hoped for nothing,

and that his pen was not directed by hatred or flattery. He represents abundance of vices, with all their deformity, without discovering any inclination to slander, and without omitting the good qualities of those whose crimes he describes (15). Which must needs please the judicious readers, who are extremely offended, when they observe that an author loves slandering, and relates wicked actions, not so much to perform the part of an Historian, as to satisfy his satirical humour. Many readers do not much care whether an Historian discovers such a humour, or appears free from it; it is enough for them if he be satirical; those men have doubtless wrong notions of things, and little honesty; but all things being otherwise alike, I think they would rather chuse a history, wherein wicked princes are ingenuously described, than one that may be suspected by reason of the author's malignity; and therefore they may agree with men of a good taste in approving Suetonius. He found the art of persuading the reader of his sincerity; which plainly shews that he is no passionate writer. Let us see what judgment has been made of him by some learned men: I begin with the eloquent Politian. 'Hæc singula ita Suetonius hic noster persecutus in sua Historia est, ut præter explicandi scientiam, qua mirifice est usus, etiam diligentiam nobis fidemque, & libertatem suam plane probaverit. Nulla in his libris suspicio est gratiæ, nulla similitudinis, nihil studio dictum, nihil suppressum metu, rebus ipsis data omnia, veritati in primis servitum est, ut plane appareat ad perpetuam magis possessionem (ut Thucydides ait) quam ad intuitum hoc opus, pugnamque præsentem comparatum est. Nam qui aut fœdis assentionibus, aut malignis obtestationibus, supra quam res ipsa postulet, quasi servire historiam cogunt, ii mihi haud minus eam dehonefata videntur, atque ii qui Herculem ipsum depingant, Lydiæ Omphalæ in muliebri & crocina tunicula famulantem (16). Hanc in primis captare Historicus laudem debet, ut libertate usus maxima in scribendo, ut neque assentioni quasi obnoxius, neque obtestationi quasi offensus, sed fidei servisse atque incorruptæ veritati existimetur, ne quid in eo servile, neve quid malignus deprehendatur, sic ut nec ullis conditionibus sollicitatus, neque mercedula cuiquam auctoratus, sed sui homo juris, rectus, atque intrepidus neutram in partem præponderet (17). Tantum abest, ut hic noster quicquam vel metu, vel studio adductus, rebus ipsis detraxerit, ut Nervæ etiam, Trajani, Adrianique suæ ætatis Imperatorum vitas tacere præoptaverit, quam aut periculose de viventibus male sentire, aut extollendo potentiores, parum videri liber (18). Every one of these things is so well executed by Suetonius in his history, that besides his deservings, he has likewise given us plain proofs of his diligence, veracity, and freedom. There is no room for any suspicion of partiality or ill-will in his books; nothing is said out of favour, nor suppressed out of fear: the facts themselves have engrossed his whole attention, and he has consulted truth in the first place; by which it appears that

(15) See Bodin. Method. Hist. cap. xv. pag. m. 65.

(16) Politianus, Prefat. in Suetonium, folio m. b. 3.

(17) *Id. ibid. folio b. 4.*

(18) *Id. ibid. folio b. 5.*

(10) La Popeliere, Histoire des Histoires, liv. vi. (and not v. as Vossius quotes it) pag. 344.

(11) *Ælius Spartian. in Vita Adriani, cap. xi, pag. m. 103, Tom. i. Historiæ Augustæ Scrip. tor.*

(12) Tillemont, Hist. des Emper. Tom. ii. pag. m. 418, ad ann. 121.

(13) *Id. ibid. pag. 426.*

(14) That is, that of a Grammarian.

* Aulon. Ep. 19, pag. 466.

† Suet. prol.

‡ Prol.

§ Tert. spec. c. 5. pag. 92. c.

** Hier. v. ill. pref. pag. 261. a.

upon customs and ordinances, so that those v
mentary, or hear it explained by a learned C
relating to antiquity. Some blame him for
actions and horrid debaucheries of Tiberius,
denied that the inquiries he made into those thi
a great deal of liberty to his pen; and therefo
the Emperors with the same freedom as they li
good morals, and great virtue (i). He made
to be intreated not to keep them so long in hi
that writer are those of Torrentius and Casau

(i) See the pas-
sage of Pliny in
the remark [E]
citation (31).

(A) See the re-
mark [F], cita-
tion (50).

'his work was framed (as Thucydides says) for a per-
'petual possession, not for a transitory view, or to serve
'a present purpose. For such persons as make history sub-
'servient to vile flattery, or spiteful detraction, beyond
'what the truth requires, do no less dishonour it than
'those who introduce Hercules himself in petticoats, per-
'forming the offices of a domestic drudge to Omphale, Queen
'of Lydia An Historian ought chiefly to aim at
'this commendation, viz. of being esteemed a most free
'and impartial writer, who neither flatters nor de-
'tracts, but strictly observes the laws of sincerity and
'truth. He must take care not to discover any thing servile
'or malicious, nor to give ground for suspecting that he is
'acted by an undue influence, or bound, as a hireling,
'to any one, but he must shew himself to be a man inde-
'pendent, upright, and undaunted, who is no ways bias-
'sed to either side. Our Historian was so far
'from being influenced by the motives of fear or favour,
'to detract any thing from the truth, that he rather chose
'not to write the lives of Nerva, Trajan, and Adrian,
'the emperors of his time, than to run any risque by speak-
'ing ill of the persons then alive, or to seem less free and
'impartial, by extolling his superiors.' I shall add the
following words of Lippius to this fine encomium.
'Suetonium Tranquillum non injuria commendo sæpe
'juventuti. Verba vides? Pura, tersa, propria.
'Filum totum orationis? Breve, nervosum. Rem
'ipsam? Utilis pariter & jucunda historia est: &
'quod mihi caput, plena moris & doctrinæ antiquæ.
'Quis obsecro, ritus publicus olim privatusque fuit,
'quem velut de industria non tangat? Quod munus,
'quis magistratus, quem non libet? Tangat & libet,
'dico. Non enim explicet: quod institutum ejus ve-
'luit & ratio scribendi. At viam tamen latam sternit
'ad indagandum: & aures atque animum imbuat au-
'ditione aliqua, imò cognitione (19). I very
'often recommend Suetonius Tranquillus to the youth, not
'without reason. If you examine his words, they are
'pure, neat, proper: if the whole thread of it's dis-
'course, it is short and nervous. If you consider his
'subject, it is both an useful and pleasant history: and
'which chiefly weighs with me, it is full of morality
'and antient learning. What rite is there either pub-
'lic or private which he does not purposely touch
'upon? What office or magistracy which he does
'not briefly mention? I say, touch upon, and briefly
'mention; for he does not fully explain them, because
'the design and method of his book hindered him from
'doing so. Nevertheless he opens a large field for
'enquiry, and communicates to the ears and mind some
'hints, or rather some degrees of knowledge.' One wit-
ness more: 'Suetonius vitas aliquot descripsit Au-
'gustorum. Fidem si spectes, nihil certius. Acumen
'scribentis si consideres, & prudentiam, nihil acutius
'nihil prudentius. Verborum, quantum satis est, ad
'hibet; copiam autem rejicit. Formulas fori & curia
'omnes servat in loquendo. Mirificus planè vir, &
'dignus qui ab omnibus ametur & legatur (20). . . .
'Suetonius has writ the lives of some of the Cæsars. A
'his veracity, there is nothing more certain than what
'he says. If you consider his wit and discretion, in the
'no man has exceeded him. The words that he mak-
'use of are as many as are sufficient, but he rejects a
'pious superfluity. He keeps up all the phrases of the
'Forum and the court in his style. In short, he is true
'an admirable writer, and deserves to be read and lik-
'ed by all. If any one desires a greater number of testi-
monies, he needs only read Hanckius in the first volun-
de Romanarum rerum scriptoribus, pag. 112, and 113
and in the second volume, pag. 287, and 288. S
also Sir Thomas-Pope Blount, pag. 104, of the *Censu*
celebriorum Autorum. But the reader ought also to fi-
here what the Antients have said of Suetonius's cand

(19) Joſtus Lip-
pius, Eleſtor.
lib. ii, cap. xviii,
pag. m. 811,
Tom. i, Oper.

(20) Franciſc.
Robortellus, in
Literis ad Jo.
Bapt. Campe-
gium, Tom. i,
de Populi Ro-
mani vita & vic-
tu præmiſſis.

with the notes of some learned Critics, in the edition of Utrecht 1672 (l). I have not seen the French translation of Suetonius, printed at Lyons in the year 1556, in 4to (m); and therefore I cannot say whether George de la Bouliere, who is the author of it, has been as cautious as Mr du Teil (n). The latter has left out whole chapters, and in many places

(m) Du Verdier Van-Privas, Bibl. Franc. pag. 446. La Croix du Maine, pag. 118, mentions only the edition of Lyons, 1569.

(n) The fourth edition of his translation of Suetonius, is that of Amsterdam, 1699.

* pridios & ejusmodi vitarum scriptores Suetonius emi-
neat, illâ se jactet in aulâ; hoc ceteris melior, quod
etatis beneficio, melius quàm illi latine loquitur: ad
Taciti quidem gloriam aspirare, aut se cum eo con-
ferre si voluerit, omnium eruditorum convicio vapu-
labit. Equidem quod ad me attinet, Suetonii lectio-
nem non minus quàm Catulli aut Martialis ado-
lescentibus perniciosam, etiam confirmata ætatis
viris periculofam putô (22). --- But it is said that
St Jerom commends Suetonius. An honourable testi-
mony, if he does so. For Jerom not only excelled in
piety, but likewise in learning and judgment. But how
does he commend him? He says that he writ the lives
of the Cæsars with the same freedom as they lived.
This is no great commendation, if it be any at all; for
my part I do not think it is any. For since the Cæsars
lived up to the height of looseness and debauchery, what
praise is it for any man to have equaled their crimes by
the immodesty of his description, and to have set before
the eyes of men, in bare-faced and obscene words, their
vile actions, which should rather have been buried in
perpetual oblivion. You find nothing more frequently
mentioned in Suetonius than Catamities, and the authors
of unnatural lusts; Sporus married to Nero, and Nero
to Doryphorus. He does not even forget the expressions
which they made use of in the middle of their crimes;
as if it concerned posterity to know these things, the
bare mention of which should have made not only the
author but the paper itself to blush. Nevertheless he
insists upon them so minutely and particularly, as if he
had a mind to teach them. We find nothing like this
in Tacitus. He either passes over such things, or he
hints at them in such a manner as shews his hatred
and abhorrence, but does not eagerly dwell upon them,
as the other does. Wherefore let Suetonius shine among
the Vopisci, the Spartiani, the Lampridii, and other
writers of lives of that sort; in this he is preferable
to them, that the age in which he lived gave him an
opportunity of writing a better Latin stile than they:
but if he should aspire to the glory of Tacitus, or dare
to compare himself with him, he would be censured by
all learned men. I for my part look upon the reading
of Suetonius to be no less hurtful to young people than
the reading of Catullus or Martial. Nay I think it
even dangerous to men of a ripe age. Take notice
that he opposes Tacitus to Suetonius, in order to shew
that Tacitus has deserved no blame, considering how
cautious he is either to suppress those filthy things,
or to mention them only in general, and with indig-
nation. Bodin made the same observation before
Muretus, to make it appear that Tacitus is more to
be commended than Suetonius, whom he otherwise
acknowledges to be less blameable than Lampridius.
Hoc fortassis improbari potest (Suetonius) quod scdis-
simas quasque principum libidines nimis studiosè con-
secatur quas Corn. Tacitus omisit. Sed in eo ge-
nere longe à Lampridio superatur, is enim tot por-
tentia novarum voluptatum ab Heliogabalo inventa
describit, ut non magis ea narrare, quàm unicuique
ad imitandum proponere videatur (23). --- In this
perhaps Suetonius is blame-worthy, viz. in following
too closely all the abominable lusts of princes, which
Tacitus has omitted. He is nevertheless far out-done by
Lampridius, who describes such a number of monstrous
and new pleasures brought in by Heliogabalus, that he
does not more seem to relate them than to propose them
for the imitation of every one. But Bodin and Mure-
tus did not consider what difference there is between
the author of an History of the Empire, and the
author of an History of the Emperors. The former
ought to touch but lightly upon the private actions of
a prince; he ought to say but little of kings, except
when they have an influence upon the general affairs
of the state. But those, who write the history of the
person of a monarch, ought chiefly to dwell on his
private actions. Which is the reason why Suetonius
thought himself more obliged than Tacitus to insist
upon the personal actions of the Emperors. Besides,
it may be affirmed that Tacitus did not take such a

VOL. V.

a method as the censurers of Suetonius ascribe to him.
He expresses the lewdness of that time in very plain
words, and perhaps he speaks as much of it in pro-
portion (24) as the other does. We might judge bet-
ter of it, if we had all his history of Caligula. What
Muretus says, that the public is not concerned to
know the particulars of the Emperors debauchery,
proves too much; for he may be answered that the
public is not concerned to know the particulars men-
tioned by Tacitus concerning Agrippina, who inticed
her own son to commit incest with her. What have
we to do, may one say to Muretus, with the ' lasciva
' oscula & prænuntias flagitii blanditias, --- quantas
' kistes and carresses that were the forerunners of the crime,'
which we read in Tacitus (25)? You must either con-
demn that Historian, or acquit Suetonius, and ac-
knowledge that they are only more or less faulty.
Note, that Erasmus, whose authority is as good as that
of Muretus, does not think that the description of the
lewdness of the Emperors, whose history has been writ-
ten by Suetonius, is unprofitable to the public. On
the contrary, he believes it may be a curb to wicked
princes, and that no tyrant could be at rest, should he
consider that his memory would be one day as execra-
ble as that of Caligula and Nero is at this Day. It
was for the public good that he put out an edition of
Suetonius, and of the other Historians, who give us a par-
ticular account of the abominable actions of the Roman
Emperors. I shall set down his own words, which repre-
sent his thoughts more fully and more emphatically
than I can do. Ex bonæ fidei scriptoribus super alias
innumeras, hæc præcipua capitur utilitas, quod non alia
res æque, vel bonorum regum animos ad res cum laude ge-
rendas accendit, vel Tyrannorum cupiditates cohibet ac
refrenat, dum utrique cernunt bonum literis suam vitam
omnem, mox in totius orbis, imo seculorum omnium Thea-
trum producendam, & quidquid nunc vel in abdito pa-
trant, vel ascito furo prætexunt, vel metu dissimulari
cogunt verius quàm ignorari, paucis post clarissima in luce
sub oculis omnium tradendum, cum jam metu pariter ac
spe libera posteritas, nec ullo corrupta studio, magno con-
sensu recte factis applaudit, parique libertate his diversa
explodit exhibilibique. Nec enim arbitror quenguam ty-
rannum, sic penitus omnem hominis sensum exuisse, ut
vitam sibi jucundam ducat, si norit suum nomen apud
posteror omnium ætatum ac nationum, tam invisum &
execrabile fore, quàm est Neronis, Caligulae, Helioga-
bali, Commodi, ad quorum mentionem, seu portentorum
verius quàm principum, nemo jam non desipit, non abo-
minatur, non detestatur (26). What Erasmus says may
be confirmed by the following example. The Empe-
ror Commodus caused a man, who had read the life
of Caligula, written by Suetonius, to be devoured by
beasts; and he used him thus, because he was born
the same day with Caligula (27). From whence it
may be inferred that he was more concerned for the
memory of Caligula, than for that of the other Em-
perors defamed by that Historian. But since he exer-
cised so great a cruelty upon a reader, by virtue of
his concern grounded on such frivolous reasons, it is
an easy matter to apprehend that he would not, for
any thing in the world, have been used as Suetonius
used Caligula; and therefore it is certain that tyrants
are not willing their infamous actions should be known.
Such an historian as Suetonius may therefore make
them uneasy, and afraid that, some time or other, their
memory will be as execrable as that of the Emperors,
whose debaucheries he lays open.

Politian maintained, many years before Erasmus,
that the leud and cruel actions described by Suetonius,
might inspire the reader with love for the contrary
virtues; and he alleged the conduct of the Lacedæ-
monians, who in order to make their children hate
drunkenness, took care to shew them drunken slaves.
Read his words, wherein you will find also that a
Musician, the better to instruct his scholars, would
have them hear very bad fingers. Sed neque aut ob-
scenitatis apud hunc quisquam, aut crudelitatis exempla
reformidet. Siquidem & Lacedæmonii (ut est apud
Plutarchum)

(l) Published by
Mr. Grævius.
It was reprinted
in 1691.

(24) That is,
considering that
he wrote the Hi-
story of the Ro-
man Empire,
and that Suetoni-
us wrote the me-
mories of the Em-
perors.

(25) Tacit. Ann.
nal. lib. xiv,
cap. ii.

(26) Erasmus.
Epist. Dedicat.
Suetonii, Dionis
Cassii, Spartiani,
Capitolini, Lam-
pridii, &c.
He dedicated that
work to Frederic,
Electors of Saxo-
ny, and to Prince
George, cousin
to that Elector.
The Epistle De-
dicatory is dated
from Antwerp
the fifth of
June 1537.

(27) Eum etiam
qui Tranquilli li-
brum vitam Ca-
ligulae continen-
tem legerat, fe-
ris obici jussit,
quia eundem diem
natus habuerat
quem & Caligula.
Lamprid. in
Commodo, cap. x.

places enervated Suetonius's phrases; for he was not bear the vivacity and strength of the description of the Emperor's debauchery. I must not forget!

Plutarchum) soliti etiam sunt per festos dies bene potos servos, atque ex eo parum sui compotes, quos illi Εἰλωτας vocabant, offendere inter convivio, atque illo pacto docere adulescentis, quantum in se mali ebrietas contineret. Et Thebanus Gismenias (28) bonos juxta malosque tibi- cines discipulis ostendens, Hoc modo, aiebat, canere oportet, illo non oportet. Videlicet collata vitii virtutes, magis aliquanto, quam si seorsum inspexeris, diluce-

(28) He should have said Gismenias.

(29) Politianus, ubi supra, fol. 5.

† Voff. Hist. Lat. lib. 1. c. 31. pag. 166.

(30) Tillemont, Hist. des Emper. Tom. II, p. 483.

J. Ruold. v. Plut. c. 28, pag. 51. 2.

(31) Tillemont, ibid. pag. 486. These are Pliny's words, Epist. xcv, lib. x. Suetonium Tranquillum, probissimum, honestissimum, eruditissimum virum, & mores ejus sequutus & studia, jam pridem, domine, in contubernium adsumsi: tantoque magis diligere cepi, quanto hunc propius inspe-

(32) See above the remark [C], of the article CALDERI-NUS.

(33) Politianus, ubi supra.

scunt (29). Mr de Tillemont is of Muretus's opinion. † Vossius quotes out of St Jerom, says he (30), that Suetonius is as loose and infamous in his narration, as the princes, whose history he writes, were in their lives; wherein he contradicts the praises bestowed upon him by Pliny †: and it may be said of him and Lampridius, that they teach the greatest crimes by relating them. I cannot grant him all the parts of this sentence of condemnation; for I am persuaded that Suetonius might write after such a manner, without contradicting the praises bestowed upon him by Pliny. Pliny says, That the more he knew him, the more he loved him, by reason of his probity, honesty, good conduct, application to study, and learning (31). The particular account Suetonius gives of the Emperors debauchery is no proof that he was a leud man, or that he took delight in describing leud actions, nor in general that there was any thing wanting to his probity and honesty. It shews only that he was a very ingenuous and sincere man, and that he believed an historian ought faithfully to relate all the truths he can find out: and those who are never so little qualified to judge of the character of an author by his way of writing, will be of opinion that Suetonius was only directed by his sincerity and natural ingenuity, and not by a desire of amusing or tickling his passions. Nay, it ought to be presumed, that he designed to punish vice as much as an historian can punish it, and to cast a blot upon the memory of those monstrous men, by transmitting it to future ages, attended with all the execration it deserves, and that he thought such a method might in time prevent the like brutishness. It is certain that he and Lampridius inspire a greater aversion and horror for the princes, whose abominable actions they have described, than the most precise and most grave writers can do. Lastly, I must observe that Mr de Tillemont did not make a right use of his judgment, when he undertook to invalidate the formal testimony of Pliny the younger, by loose and uncertain consequences. Let us stick to the testimony of one of the most honest men of that time. It were in vain to say that he bestowed this encomium upon Suetonius in a letter wherein he begged a favour for him. I know that in such cases it is a common thing to use flattery; but Pliny affirms in the same letter, that he and Suetonius had contracted a strict friendship long before: It was not a lie; for the truth of it appears from some other letters of Pliny. This great friendship and familiarity between Suetonius and Pliny had not lasted long, if Suetonius had not been such a Man as Pliny represents him to be. I add that there is no author extant that reflects in the least upon Suetonius's virtue; for we must not mind what Domitius Calde- rinus, a great romancer (32), says. Read this passage; 'Sinisteriora quædam de Suetonii moribus con- scitatur, Marii, nescio cujus, testimonium citans. Nos enim adulescentis ipsum meminimus audire Do- mitium, cum diceret habere se peculiarem Marii Rustici librum, quem cæteris incognitum secum de Gallia attulisset, qui tamen codex, ne extincto qui- dem illo, nunquam comparuit. Atque ego quidem studio incogniti mihi scriptoris incensus, etiam ad ip- sius Domitii parentis Benaci lacus accolæ accessi, om- nemque ejus librorum suppellectilem scrutatus, Marium certe hunc rusticum inveni nusquam (33). - - - He makes some harsh reflexions upon the morals of Suetonius, and quotes one Marius for his voucher: but who that Marius is I know not. We remember, indeed, in the days of our youth to have heard Domitius say, that he had a certain book of Marius Rusticus unknown to others, which he had brought with him from France: but it never appeared, not even after his death. I for my part had such a curiosity to see this unknown writer, that I was at the pains to go to the parents of Domitius,

this permission was not unlimited; he did not always permit such an usage, some persons were only allowed to treat the Empress in that manner, and he told them how far that permission might go. Those who lost their places did not keep within those bounds; which is the reason why the Historian made use of the words *injussa ejus*, which shew the true cause of their disgrace, and at the same time remove all suspicion of gallantry. Salmastius (43) perfectly unfolds this little mystery. What he says against those, who find love-intrigues in the matter, might have been confirmed by a reason, which he did not think of. Spartianus adds immediately after, that Sabina would have been divorced for her ill humour, if her husband had been a private person. *Uxorem etiam ut morosam et asperam dimissurus (ut ipse dicebat) si privatus fuisset* (44). He does not say one word of her unfaithfulness, and gallantry (45). From whence I conclude, that the deprived officers were only guilty of a blunt proceeding towards Sabina in her ill humour. Her vexation made her peevish and intolerable; but because the officers of the court knew that the Emperor despised her, and did not much care she should be respected, they scolded at her in their turn, and went so far in it without the Prince's approbation, that they lost his favour. The other particular, mentioned by Moreri, for which he quotes Spartianus, is really to be found in some manner in that author. *Sabina uxor non sine fabula veneni dati ab Adriano desuncta est* (46), that is, Sabina died, not without a report that she had been poisoned by Hadrian. Nevertheless Moreri is mistaken; for he will have it that the discovery of Sabina's gallantry was the cause of her being poisoned; which would be very false, though we should grant him that some love-intrigues were discovered when Suetonius was put out of favour. There were sixteen years between the depriving of that Secretary, and the death of the Empress (47).

(43) Salmastius, in Spart. Adr. ubi supra.

(44) Spart. ubi supra.

(45) This may serve to confute the fabulous story published by Brantome, against Sabina in the first volume of his *Dames Galantes*, pag. 218.

(46) Spartianus, in Adr. cap. xxiv, pag. 204.

(47) See Tillamont, ubi supra, pag. 418, & pag. 450.

I shall further examine Moreri's narrative. *That disgrace*, says he, *put Suetonius upon writing for the public; and he composed the lives of the twelve Cæsars. . . . Pliny the younger desired him to put off no longer the publication of that work, and told him he found it so perfect, that the further polishing of it would but spoil*

it. There are many faults in those words. IV. It cannot be proved that Suetonius's disgrace inspired him with the desire of writing for the public. V. And therefore it is a great piece of rashness to say in express words, that it moved him to write the History of the twelve Emperors; for since he composed many books, he might have writ when he was out of favour, and it cannot be concluded that he wrote precisely a certain book. VI. No body knows what books Pliny the younger desired him to publish. Why then does Moreri affirm that he desired him to publish the twelve Cæsars? VII. It cannot be said, without helping the letter, that *he found them perfect*. Which supposes that he declared he had read them; but this supposition does not well agree with these words: 'Pater, me videre titulum tuum; pater audire, describi, legi, vœnire volumina Tranquilli mei' (48). . . . *Suffer me to see your title, suffer the books of my friend Tranquillus to be heard and talked of, to be read and sold.* It is true he had been saying what Moreri quotes, 'Perfectum opus absolutum' que est; nec jam splendet lima, sed atteritur. . . . *The work is perfectly finished; nor will further polishing add to the beauties of it, on the contrary it will rather diminish them.* But how do we know but he said so like a friend? VIII. However it be, were it true that Suetonius did not write the lives of the twelve Cæsars till he was turned out of favour, Pliny the younger could not have complained of his slowness in publishing them (49); for doubtless he writ that letter to him under the Empire of Trajan. But Suetonius did not lose his place till the fourth or fifth year of Hadrian's reign. IX. Instead of Sicon Polemon, Moreri should have said Sicon Polenton.

Some of these mistakes of Moreri have been committed by la Mothe le Vayer, in his judgment upon the chief Historians (50). I wonder at it; for he was a much more learned man than Moreri, and had been directed in that work by Messieurs du Puy, and had the assistance of four great libraries, the King's, Thuanus's, their own (51), and that of Cardinal Mazarin. With such helps he should have writ an excellent book, and might even have avoided those four mistakes without them.

(48) Som & ipse in edendo hæsitator, tu mora tamen meam quoque constitutionem tarditatemque vicisti. . . . *I myself am tardy in publishing any thing, but you by your delay, have exceeded my slowness.* Id. ibid.

(49) The ad, the 3d, the 4th, and the 5th. Moreri had them from him.

(51) La Mothe le Vayer, *Præface to his Jugement sur les princip. Historiens.*

SULACHA (a) (SIMON) a Nestorian Monk, of the order of St Pacomus, withdrew his obedience to his patriarch, and united himself to the Church of Rome. Those who shook off the yoke as he did, made him their patriarch, and sent him to Rome, where Pope Julius III, confirmed his patriarchate in 1552 (b). Sulacha made his confession of faith at Rome, which was translated into Latin by Masius, with the letter those Nestorians wrote to Julius III, to desire him to confirm the election of Sulacha, and to ask his protection against a family, which had kept the patriarchate a long time (c). This was the subject of their division: several of them could not endure that this dignity should always remain in one family; and that family, which had enjoyed it above two hundred years, would not resign it. Simon Sulacha being returned into the East, established his patriarchal see at Caramit, a town of Mesopotamia, took the title of Patriarch of the Assyrians, and ordained several bishops and archbishops. The Turks put him to death at the solicitation of the Schismatics. They elected for his successor a Monk of St Pacomus, whose name was Hebed-Jesu (d). I have mentioned him under that name, and under that of Abdissi: see those articles. Father Paul (e) insinuates that the Court of Rome, out of policy, made a great noise of that embassy of the Nestorians, to support her reputation in Europe by chimera's. I shall relate in a remark what that Historian says [A].

(a) See the remark [A], in the article HEBED-JESU.

(b) Petrus Strozza, de Dogmate Caldeor. apud Aubert. Miræum, Polit. Eccl. lib. ii, cap. v.

(c) See the Histoire Critique du Levant, par le Sieur de Morisy, ch. viii.

(d) Strozza, apud Miræum, ubi supra.

(e) History of the Council of Trent, book v, at the beginning.

(1) F. Paul, History of the Council of Trent, book v, at the beginning.

[A] I shall relate . . . what that Historian says. We find in his work (1) that the Pope received with great magnificence the Patriarch sent to him by all the Churches between Euphrates and the Indies; that he caused him to be consecrated bishop; that he gave him the pallium with his own hands in a private Confistory; that he sent him back into his country, and had him accompanied by some Monks who understood Syriac; that at Rome, and all over Italy, the only talk was about the vast number of Christians that were in that country, and the great acquisitions the Holy See had made in it; that people discouraged particularly

of the great number of Churches at Muzal (2), a town which was said to be the ancient Assur, situate upon the Tigris, not far from Nineveh; that they reckoned the most famous towns under the jurisdiction of that Patriarch, such as Babylon, Tauris, Arbela where Darius was overcome by Alexander, Ecbatana, called by others Seleucia and Nisibis, and several provinces of Assyria and Persia; . . . that all those things were printed and read with great curiosity. There was doubtless more ostentation than truth in the matter; and it was a good piece of policy to make the names of those famous cities sound so high.

(2) The Confession of Faith of that Patriarch mentions 18, whereof 15 were possessed by the Nestorians, and 3 by the Jacobites. See F. Paul, ibid.

SULPICIA,

S U L P I C I A.

SULPICIA, or SULPITIA, a Roman lady, daughter of Sulpicius Paternus, and wife of Fulvius Flaccus, obtained a very great honour, when it was thought proper to seek out a remedy against the leudness observed among the women of Rome. The evil appeared so great that recourse was had to the assistance of Heaven, and to those religious helps which supply the want of human means. The books of the Sibyls were consulted, and upon the report of the consultants it was decreed by the senate that a statue should be consecrated to *Venus Verticordia*, that is, *Converter of hearts* [A], that women and maids might be more easily reclaimed from their leudness, and become chaste. It was ordered that a most virtuous woman should consecrate that statue of Venus; and at first a hundred women were chosen from all the rest, and then ten out of that hundred, and all of them unanimously nominated Sulpicia to perform that function: so that this lady was acknowledged to be the most chaste of all (a). I shall inquire

(a) Taken from Valerius Maximus, lib. viii, cap. xv. You will find his words in the remark [A].

[A] It was decreed by the Senate that a statue should be consecrated to *Venus Verticordia*. . . converter of hearts. This particular is to be found in several authors, but in none with so many circumstances as in Valerius Maximus. Merito, says he (1), *uirorum commemorationi Sulpitia, Ser. Paterni filia, Q. Fulvii Flacci uxor, adicitur. Quæ, cum senatus libris Sibyllinis per decem viros inspectis censuisset, ut Veneris Verticordie simulacrum consecraretur, quo facilius uirginum mulierumque mentes à libidine ad pudicitiam converterentur; & ex omnibus matronis centum, ex centum autem decem sorte ductæ, de sanctissima femina iudicium facerent, cunctis castitate prælata est.* Pliny says the same in fewer words, only he does not mention the cause of that consecration, nor the epithet of Venus. *Pudicissima femina semel, matronarum sententia, iudicata est Sulpicia Paterni filia, uxor Fulvii Flacci: electa ex centum præceptis (2), quæ simulacrum Veneris ex Sibyllinis libris dederat (3).* Solinus (4) transcribes Pliny, as he uses to do. Ovid says nothing of Sulpicia, and instead of a statue, he pretends that a temple was built to Venus Verticordia. He does not forget the cause of that new devotion; he says in express words that it was occasioned by the loss of chastity.

(1) Valerius Maximus, lib. viii, cap. xv, num. xii, pag. m. 738.

(2) That is, who had been already chosen. Read *præceptis*, and not *præcipuis* as there is in most editions. See *Salmafus* in *Sabinum*, pag. 54, and *Father Harduin*, in *Plin.* Tom. ii, pag. 56, and 124.

(3) Plin. lib. vii, cap. xxxv, pag. m. 56.

(4) Solin. cap. i, pag. m. 12.

(5) Ovid. Fastr. lib. iv, ver. 157.

Roma pudicitia proavorum tempore lapsa est:
Cumæam, veteres, consuluisse animum.
Templa jubet Veneri fieri: quibus ordine factis,
Inde Venus verfo nomina corde tenet (5).

Of old when Roman chastity was fled,
Our fathers, anxious for the marriage-bed,
At the Cumæan prophetess enquir'd,
To know what offering the gods requir'd.
She bid a temple to be rear'd anon
Unto the Paphian Queen of Love: which done,
Venus did straight acquire another name:
From working changes on the heart it came.

He is to blame for not having paid to Sulpicia the honour she deserved. The glory she acquired then, is so great, that he should not have been silent about it. The other ladies acknowledged that she surpassed them in chastity. Such an acknowledgment is as glorious to her, as it would be for a brave man, if a hundred brave men should confess that he had more courage than they. It is a rare thing, says Martial (6), to see any body that is willing to yield to others in point of wit. But it is still more rare among soldiers to find any that will yield to another in point of courage: nay, compliments are very scarce upon that head; and in general an honest man will seldom acknowledge that he has less honesty than another, and a virtuous woman that she is less chaste than others. Such a civility is as rare among virtuous women, as it is among gallant women to acknowledge that their rivals exceed them in beauty. However, civil words and compliments are far from being looked upon as judicial and solemn acknowledgments; for if the question was to chuse for an honourable function appointed by the magistrates, the most honest woman or the most honest man in a town, none would be willing that others should take advantage of the compliments they might have made them. Every one would revoke them, and enjoy the freedom of his judgment, and would think it a very hard thing publicly to acknowledge, that he is less worthy of be-

(6) Aurum & opes & rura frequens donabit amicis: Qui velit ingenio cedere rarus erit. Mart. Epig. xvi, lib. viii.

ing chosen for the appointed function; and therefore Sulpicia's virtue must needs have been very shining, since a hundred Roman ladies voted for her upon such an occasion. But perhaps it ought to be supposed that the Senate ordered that no lady should vote for herself. The circumstances of this fact are not clearly described by authors. Their meaning seems to be that a hundred Roman ladies were first of all chosen by lots, and then that ten of them were likewise chosen in the same manner, and that all of them acknowledged that Sulpicia deserved to consecrate the statue. The management of that affair seems to me intricate; for why did they cast lots twice, if they had a mind that the hundred women of the best reputation were first of all set apart, and then they drew lots, that ten of them should name the woman, who was to consecrate the statue, and it was ordered that none should name herself. Thus Sulpicia by the votes of ten ladies was preferred to a hundred women of the best reputation in the city; and yet none did formally declare that she was less chaste than Sulpicia. It had been a hard thing to require such an acknowledgment in such a conjuncture.

Perhaps it will be said that the senate did not make a right application; for, according to the doctrine of the Heathens, Venus equally preferred over unlawful and lawful love, and she had occasioned the prodigious leudness they intended to put a stop to. This objection is of no weight: the senate knew very well what they did, and for this very reason that Venus had occasioned such a disorder, it was necessary to have recourse to her; for, according to Cato's maxim, those who are the cause of great evils, ought to put an end to them. *Τὸν γὰρ αὐτὴν εἶναι καὶ ποιεῖν τὰ μέγιστα κακὰ καὶ πᾶσι.* Nam eorundem esse & facere magna mala & comprimere (7). The senate might expect that Venus being appealed by the consecration of that new statue, and acknowledged to be the mistress of hearts, would reclaim the fair sex, either by ceasing to inspire them with love, or by fixing it on lawful objects. The first method is not amiss; for how many people may use the complaint we read in an opera?

Mon cœur auroit encor sa premiere innocence,
S'il n'avoit jamais eu d'amour.

My heart had still been innocent,
Had it not been for love.

The second method is a very good one: the senate might have told Venus; inspire them with love, we are not against it; but let their love be lawful. Reclaim them from their ill courses; bring them back into the right way. They are like rivers that run out of their channels, and overflow the country; let those waters return into their channel; this we beg of you, as you are the goddesses *Verticordia*, . . . converter of hearts.

I have read in Pausanias, that Harmonia, Cadmus's wife, consecrated three statues to Venus at Thebes; the first to Venus *Urania*; the second to Venus *Pandemos*, and the third to Venus *Aprostrophia*. The first was for spiritual love, the second for bodily love, and the third was designed to prevent extravagant conjunctions, such as incest, &c. *Ἐξέλετο δὲ τῇ Ἀπρόστροφῃ τὰς ἐπὶ πρῶτῃ μίαν ἢ Ἀρμονίαν τὴν μὲν Οὐρανίαν ἐπὶ ἐρωτὶ καθαρῷ, καὶ ἀπηνάλαγμένῃ πρὸς σωματικὴν δῆμιον*

(7) Plutarch. in Cato's minor, pag. 184. D.

inquire into the date of this fact [B]; it has been too much neglected by authors.

ἡμῶν δὲ, ἐν ταῖς μίξαις τρίτῃ δὲ Ἀποστοφίαν, ἵνα ἐκιδύμιας τὴν ἀνδρῶν καὶ ἔργων ἀποστοφίαν τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνδρῶν. Cognomina imposed Harmonia Urania, purum significans, & corporum cupiditate vacantem amorem: Popularis, ob Venerios congressus: jam vero Apostrophiae numen coli instituit (id est Averfaticis) quo ab exlege cupiditate & incestis stupris hominum genus averteret (8). The Romans, you see, might have learned of other nations to honour Venus under the title of *Verticordia*; for there is no great difference between this title and that of *Apostrophia*: one implies the notion of a *Converter*, and the other that of a *Diffuader*, if I may be allowed to use such a word.

(8) Pausan. lib. ix, cap. xvi, pag. 742.

[B] I shall enquire into the date of this fact.] The ancient authors do continually afford new occasions to complain of their negligence in chronology. Tho' you examine the words of Ovid, Valerius Maximus, Pliny, and Solinus, never so narrowly, you will find nothing in them, whereby you may know at what time the consecration of that statue of Venus was performed. That time may be known from Julius Obse-

quens, who mentions (9) a certain prodigy, which happened under the consulship of Marcus Acilius and Caius Portius, that is, according to Sigonius's Fasti, in the year of Rome 639. The daughter of a Roman knight was thunder-struck, and it was found that her tongue was gone through that part of her body not proper to be named. The Soothsayers were consulted; their answer was, that the maids and the knights were threatened with infamy (10): which proved true; for three Vestals, who had love-intrigues with some Roman knights, were punished at the same time. It was then that a temple was built to Venus *Verticordia* (11). Note, that from the year of Rome 639, till Julius Caesar made himself master of the commonwealth, the corruption of manners, and particularly luxury, increased more and more; and therefore the statue consecrated by chaste Sulpicia, did no good. See the margin (12).

(9) Julius Obsequens, in *Libro de Prodigis*, num. 97, pag. 51.

(10) It is to be observed that this maid was on horseback when she was thunder-struck.

(11) Tres uno tempore virgines Vestales nobilissimae, cum aliquot equitibus Romanis, incesti penas subierunt. Aedes Veneri *Verticordiae* facta. *Id. ib.*

(12) The evil grew greater and greater from the time of Caesar, instead of growing less. See what I quote out of Seneca in the remark [H], of the article V A Y E R.

SULPITIUS (JOHN) firnamed *Verulanus*, because, if I am not mistaken, he was a native of *Verulum* (a), a town in the Campania di Roma, applied himself to the study of the *Belles Lettres* with good success. He flourished towards the end of the XVth century. His commentary upon Lucan's *Pharsalia* was pretty good for that time. He published Vegetius with two other tracts de *Re Militari* (b). He also published some Latin verses de *Moribus*, and *Praeludia Grammatica*. I think he ought not to be distinguished from Sulpitius, who taught in the college of Rome, under the pontificate of Innocent VIII, and who began to restore the use of Music upon the stage [A], so that he may be looked upon as the first author of Opera's. He is also the first who published Vitruvius.

(a) Veroli in Italian.

(b) Aeliani & Frontini. See Geſner's Bibl. fol. 457.

His

[A] Who began to restore the use of Music upon the stage.] I ingenuously confess that I should be ignorant of this particular, had I not read it in a book of the Jesuit Menetrier. I shall set down the whole passage (1). 'Thofe remains of Dramatic Music, which had been preserved in the church, served to restore it two hundred years ago; and Rome, which had in a manner lost it, to bestow upon the recitation and declamation of actors, what the Grecians bestowed upon singing and harmony, brought it upon the stage towards the year 1480, as I learned it from Sulpitius in the Epistle Dedicatory prefixed to his notes upon Vitruvius, which he presented to Cardinal Riari, Great Chamberlain of the Church, and nephew of Pope Sixtus IV. . . . Sulpitius praising the magnificence of that Cardinal, who had built stately palaces in and about Rome, begs of him that he would set up public theatres for Musical representations, of which this Sulpitius calls him the Restorer, having shown at Rome, a few years ago, what had not been in use there for many ages. He tells the Cardinal in that epistle, that Rome expects from him a theatre for such performances, because he has already given such an entertainment to the people upon a moveable theatre, set up in a public place, and at other times in the castle of St Angelo for the Pope's diversion, and in his palace for some Cardinals. Tu enim primus Tragediae quam nos juvenutem excitandi gratia & AGERE & CANTARE primi hoc ævo docuimus, (nam ejusmodi actionem jam multis sæculis Roma non viderat) in medio foro pulpitu ad quinque pedum altitudinem erectum pulcherrimè exornasti. Eandemque postquam in Hadriani mole Divo Innocentio spectante est acta, rursus intra tuos penates tamquam in media Circi cavea toto confesso, umbraculis tecto admissa populo, & pluribus tui ordinis spectatoribus honorificè excepisti. Tu etiam primus picturatae scenæ faciem, quàm Pomponiani (2) comædium agerent nostro sæculo ostendisti: quare à te Theatrum novum tota urbi magnis votis expectat.' Father Menetrier is mistaken, when he says that this Latin passage is taken from the Epistle Dedicatory of Sulpitius's notes upon Vitruvius. Mr du Francaſtel, keeper of the Mazarine Library, has been pleased to inform me of some things relating to the book, wherein that Epistle Dedicatory is to be found, VOL. V.

(1) Menetrier, des Représentations en Musique, pag. 155, 156. That book was printed at Paris, in 1681.

(2) That is the scholars of the academy or college of Pomponianus Letrus.

and thereby I know it is a Vitruvius (3) without any notes upon the text, and without any various readings. It is not paged, and has no signatures. Neither the time nor the place of the impression, nor the Printer's name, are to be found in it. There is no date in the advertisement to the reader, nor in the Epistle Dedicatory. That advertisement contains these words, among other things: 'Jo. Sulpitius Lectori salutem . . . Collatis multis id genus libris & im- primis uno nostri Delii manu factis accurate per- scripto, eum mihi laborem assumpsi ut quantum per plurimas occupationes meas fieri posset, redderem unum imprimendorum archetypum adeo emendatum, ut parvus labor cuivis alteri ejusdem rei studio re- linqueretur. Quod si fidelis ut spero librarius fuerit & cum his impressis scripti calamis conferentur, facile fides nostra & diligentia apparebit . . . Primus hoc in stadio curro & ad certamen via jam liberaliter strata reliquos inter se excito. . . . John Sulpitius to the reader. . . . Having collated several manuscripts of this kind, particularly that which my friend Delius wrote with exactness, I took upon me, as much as the multiplicity of my affairs would allow, to procure a copy for the press so correct, that there should be little trouble left for any other person that might set about the same thing. If the Printer should do justice, as I hope he will, when the manuscripts shall be compared with the printed copies, my diligence and fidelity will soon appear . . . I am the first who start in this course, and excite others to a mutual strife, having paved the way for them in such an ample manner.' The Epistle Dedicatory begins thus: 'Raphaelli Riario Cardinali Sanctæque Ro. Ecclesiæ Camerario, Jo. Sulpitius fœlicitatem. Quidquid curæ, studii, vigiliarum, & operæ in emendando & vulgando Vitruvio posui . . . tuz dedico amplitudini. . . . John Sulpitius to Cardinal Raphael Riari, Great Chamberlain of the Church, wishes happiness. Whatever pains, diligence, and labour, I have bestowed upon the correcting and publishing of Vitruvius . . . I dedicate it all to your Eminence.' Then follows the passage quoted by Father Menetrier. This edition of Vitruvius did not come out in the year 1480; for it was published under the Pontificate of Innocent VIII, who kept his see from the year 1484, till 1492. Here follow some words of the Epistle Dedicatory, whereby it appears that it was

(3) A very small folio.

Y y y

was

(c) Du Verdier,
Bibl. Franç.,
pag. 1000, calls
him Brohe.

His book *de Moribus* was translated into French verse by Peter Brocé (c) a native of Tournon on the Rhone. La Croix du Maine (d), from whom I learn this, places the printing of that translation in the year 1555, by Macé Bonhomme at Lyons, and he calls the author of the original, *John Sulpitius of S. Alban, named Verulanus*.

(4) I am beholden for all these passages to Mr du Francastel, keeper of the Mazarine library.

was written towards the last years of that Pontificate. 'Innocentius imposito bellis fine, Prætorio suburbano peracto, agilitatis certaminibus & equitum concursionibus, dotalibusque & sumptuariis legibus revocatis. . . . Tum floræ campus, tum Circus Flaminii lateribus aptissime sternitur . . . de Gymnasio nostro evertendo & magnifice construendo (quod utinam præoccupasses: ibi enim cotidiana omnium disciplinarum eduntur spectacula) prudentissimi Reformatores jam iniere consilium (4). . . . Pope Innocent having put an end to the war, finished his court by house, promoted games and tournaments, and repealed the dotal and sumptuary laws . . . Then the Campus Floræ, and the Circus Flaminii, were neatly paved with bricks. . . . Immediately after that, the wise Reformers resolved upon pulling down our academy, and building it up a-new in a magnificent manner (which I wish you had thought of before, because there all manner of sports and exercises are daily exhibited).'

From what has been said, I conclude that Father Menestrier does not well describe this work of Sulpitius; for he says they are notes upon Vitruvius, published about the year 1480.

Note, that this edition of Vitruvius is little known. The reader will be convinced of it by this extract of a letter, which Mr du Francastel has done me the honour to write to me. I infer it here the more willingly, because I am sure that those, who love the history of books, will find it very curious. 'To be better informed of the matter, I have read all the Prefaces, the Epistles Dedicatory, and other Prolegomena, prefixed to the Vitruvius of the Mazarine Library, that have been printed with and without commentaries, in Latin, Italian, and French. It is a surprising thing that none of them mentions this

Jo. Sulpitius, nor his edition, which must needs be the first. Nay, most Commentators and Editors pretend to be the first who have gone about it. Mr Perrault, who, in the Preface to his French translation of Vitruvius, mentions the names of those who have published, translated, or commented upon that author, says nothing of Sulpitius. I have seen the editions of Jocundus, Philander, Daniel Barbarus, Celsariano, and Caporali, besides that of Mr Perrault, which are in our library. I have found out another thing concerning one Hiero. *Advocatus Ambrosii J. Citi. F.* It is in a letter from *Joannes Britannicus Brixianus*, to that *Advocatus*, wherein he speaks to him thus: 'Fecisti tuâ industriâ, studio, & labore, ut Vitruvius de architectura, qui jam tot sæculis in lucem caput suum proferre non audebat, qui ex omni parte mancus, lacerus, mutilum se sentiebat, nunc politus, purus, integer huc & illuc gestiat meare, omnibus carus occurrat, omnibus gratus excipiat. . . . It is owing to your pains and industry, that Vitruvius, an Architect, who was so maimed and imperfect in every part, that, for many ages, he could not show his head, does now come forth fresh, uncorrupted, and entire; and is every where received with the greatest fondness and approbation. That letter is printed at Venice, in 1493. Having read the Vitruvius's, without finding any thing in them, whereby one may know who was this *Jo. Sulpitius*, I thought that if I should read all the prefaces, &c. of Verulanus's works, that are in our library, I might discover something in them, supposing he had made the notes in question; but it was to no purpose, for that author makes no mention of them in seven or eight books which I have seen (5).'

(5) A Letter of Mr du Francastel, written from Paris, the 11th of December 1699.

(a) Plutarch. in Crasso, pag. m. 556.

SURENA, General of the Parthians in the war against the Romans, commanded by Crassus in the year of Rome 701 (a), was for wealth, family, and authority, the second man in the kingdom, but for courage and prowess he was the first; neither was any one so large sized, or so well shaped. Whenever he travelled he had a thousand camels to carry his baggage, two hundred chariots full of concubines, a thousand compleatly armed men for his life-guards, and a great many more lightarmed, so that there were at least ten thousand of his servants and retinue. And the honour had long belonged to his family, that at the king's coronation he put the crown upon his head; and when King Orodes had been exiled, he brought him in: it was he that took the great city of Seleucia, was the first man that scaled the walls, and with his own hand beat off the defendants; and though at that time he was not above thirty years old, he was counted wise and discreet: wherein he had much the advantage of Crassus, who was easy to be imposed upon, first through his overweening confidence, and afterwards because he was dispirited and terrified by his calamities. Many stratagems were used against the Romans, and besides, the Parthians fought with great vigour. Surena (b) was the tallest and comeliest man in the army. And the sweetness of his looks, and effeminacy of his habit, could not promise so much manhood, as he really was master of; for his face was painted [A], and his hair parted, after the fashion of the Medes; whereas the other Parthians looked more terrible, with their hair shaggy, after the Scythian mode. The success of the battle was glorious to him;

(b) Id. *ibid.*, pag. 557.

[A] The sweetness of his looks, and effeminacy of his habit, could not promise so much manhood, as he really was master of; for his face was painted.] Generally speaking, those men, who pretend to be handsome, and who have recourse to art to set off the lustre of their complexion, and who often consult their glass, that the symmetry of their hair and curls may often charm women, are not fit for war. They are meer beaux and sparks; the assemblies of ladies, feasts, and balls, are the places where they signalize themselves: the fatigue of war does not agree with them; it requires men who are not afraid of being sun-burnt: bravery does rather inspire a desire of frightening the enemy with a martial look, than of pleasing women with a beautiful air. But here is an exception to that general rule: Surena shews himself a valiant man in battle, he performs all the duties of a General, with all imaginable vigour and application; and yet he paints, and is very careful of his hair; which puts me in

mind of a common topic very contrary to Cæsar's practice. It is a common maxim in war, that soldiers ought not to be permitted to enjoy the sweets of a delicious life, that it is the way to enervate them and make them lazy; and, among other instances, the fault of Hannibal, after the battle of Cannæ, is frequently alledged. He quartered his army in several places, where the soldiers used themselves to a voluptuous life, and wine, baths, good cheer and women, destroyed that martial vigour, which had made them so formidable. The delights of Capua were to him what the battle of Cannæ had been to the Romans (1). 'In hyberna Capuam concessit: ibi partem majorem hyemis exercitum in testis habuit, adversus omnia humana mala sæpe ac diu durantem, bonis inexpertum atque insuetum. itaque quos nulla mali vicerat vis, perdidere nimia bona ac voluptates immodice: & eo impenitus, quo avidius ex infolentia in eas se immerferant. somnus enim & vinum, & epulæ,

(1) Titus Livius, ubi infra, pag. 376. Florus, lib. ii, cap. vi.

him; but he cast a blot upon his glory by his perfidiousness, in demanding an interview with Crassus to conclude a treaty of peace (c). He was very civil to that Roman General, (c) *Id. ibid. pag. 562, 563.* he gave him his word, and assured him there was an agreement concluded between the Parthians,

(1) *Titus Livius, lib. xlii, pag. m. 362. See also pag. 377, where Marcellus encourages his soldiers, representing to them how the delights of Capua had enervated the soldiers of Hannibal.*

* & epulæ, & scorta balneaque, & otium consuetudine
* indies blandius, ita enervaverunt corpora animosque,
* ut magis deinde præteritæ eos victoriæ quàm præ-
* sentes tutarentur vires: majusque id peccatum ducis
* apud peritos artium militarium haberetur, quàm
* quod non ex Cannensi acie protinus ad urbem Ro-
* mam duxisset, illa enim cunctatio distulisse modò
* victoriam videri potuit: hic error vires ademisse ad
* vincendum. Itaque hercule, velut si cum alio exer-
* citu à Capua exiret, nihil usquam pristinæ disciplinæ
* tenuit. nam & redierunt plerique scortis impliciti:
* & ubi primum sub pellibus haberi cœpti sunt, via-
* que & alius militaris labor exceperit, tyronum modo
* corporibus animisque deficiebant: & deinde per
* omne æstivorum tempus magna pars sine commea-
* tibus ab signis dilabebantur: neque aliæ latebræ quam
* Capua defertoribus erant (2). - - - Hannibal with-
* drew to Capua, where he took his winter-quarters.
* There he lodged his soldiers in houses, for the greatest
* part of winter; those soldiers who had long been en-
*ured to all manner of hardships, and were unacquainted
* with ease and pleasure. But those men whom no hard-
* ships, no misery, could tame and subdue, were spoiled
* and undone by too much wealth, and immoderate plea-
* sures: and so much the rather, because, not having
* tasted pleasures before, they abandoned themselves
* wholly to them, and plunged in voluptuousness and de-
*bauchery. For sleeping on soft beds, wine and feast-
ing, worshipping and bathing, idleness and ease, which by
* habit grew daily more pleasant and delightful, enerv-
ated their bodies and minds to such a degree, that
* from thence forward the reputation of their former vi-
*ctories defended them more than their present strength:
* and men skilled in military affairs have judged Han-
*nibal their General more blameable for this action,
* than for not leading his army directly forward to
* Rome, after he had won the battle at Cannæ. For
* that they seemed only to defer the final victory for a
* time, whereas this error seemed to disable him from
* ever obtaining it. Thus he departed from Capua, as
* if he had led some other army; so little did they retain
* of their ancient discipline: for they not only returned
* from that city, most of them entangled and ensnared in
* the love of barlots, but so soon as they came again to
* lie abroad on the bare earth, under tents and pavilions
* covered with beastly hides, to march long journeys, and
* to resume their military hardships, their bodies became
* as tired, and their hearts as faint, as if they had
* been raw soldiers, newly come into the field: and all
* the time of their summer abode in the camp, many of
* them without licence or passport straggled away and
* deserted their colours; while these deserters had no
* other haunt, but Capua. The maxim grounded up-
*on such examples was neglected by Julius Cæsar; and
* he had no occasion to repent that he had not follow-
*ed it. He suffered his soldiers to plunge themselves
* into all manner of debauchery after a great victory,
* and used to say that they could fight stoutly, even
* when they were perfumed. *Nemquam post magnam
* pugnam atque victoriam, remisso officiorum munere, li-
* centiam omnem passim lascivendi permittebat: jaculare
* solitus, milites suos etiam unguentatos bene pugnare
* posse (3).*

(3) *Sueton. in
Cæsar, cap.
lxxvii.*

SOME examples
of voluptuous
men, and yet
very laborious.

(4) Remark
[d].

(5) *Vell. Pater-
culus, lib. ii, cap.
lxxviii.*

I think our Surena was one of those men, of whom
I have given two examples in the article of Henry
IV (4). They give up themselves to pleasures, and
entirely abstain from them, according to the sever-
est degree, when there is nothing to do; and ex-
tremely vigilant and laborious, when there is a neces-
sity for it. If we believe Velleius Paterculus, Mæce-
nas laboured very hard, when it was necessary; but
when there was no pressing business, he gave up him-
self to idleness, and lived as deliciously as the most
effeminate man can do. C. Mæcenat, vir ubi res
vigilantiam exigeret, sane exomnis, providens atque agendi
sciens: simul vero aliquid ex negotio remitti posset, otio
ac molliori pene ultra feminam fluens (5). What the
fame Historian says of Lucius Piso, though it falls
short of that, may yet serve for an example of the
character I here describe. 'De quo viro hoc omni-

* bus sentiendam ac prædicandum est, esse mores ejus
* vigore ac lenitate mixtissimos, & vix quemquam re-
* periri posse, qui aut otium validius diligit, aut faci-
* lius sufficiat negotio, & magis, quæ agenda sunt,
* curet sine ulla ostentatione agendi (6). - - - Concern-
* ing whom every one ought to think and say, that in his
* manners there is a perfect mixture of vigour and soft-
* ness, and that it is scarce possible to find any man who
* is either fonder of ease, or more capable of business,
* and assiduous without ostentation in doing what is ne-
* cessary to be done.' He says much the same thing of
Sentius Saturninus. 'Virum multiplicem in virtuti-
bus, navum, agilem, providum, militariumque offi-
ciorum patientem ac peritum pariter, sed eundem,
ubi negotia fecissent locum otio, liberaliter lauteque
eo abutentem; ita tamen, ut eum splendidum ac hi-
larem potius, quam luxuriosum aut desidem diceret
(7). - - - A man endowed with many virtues, labori-
ous, active, provident, who equally well understood civ-
il and discharged military offices. Nevertheless as often
as he had any respite from business, he mispent it, yet
in such a manner, that you would say he was rather
magnificent and gay, than luxurious and indolent.'

(6) *Id. ibid. cap.
xxviii.*

(7) *Id. ibid. cap.
xxviii.*

Tacitus mentions a General (8) of the same temper. It was he who contributed most to raise Vespasian to the throne. He was too voluptuous when he had nothing to do, and very active in time of business.

* Luxuria, industria, comitate, arrogantia, malis bo-
* nisque artibus mixtus: nimis voluptates cum vaca-
* ret: quotiens expedierat magnæ virtutes (9). - - - (9) *Tacit. Hist.
lib. i, cap. x.*
* A man in whom there was a mixture of good and bad
* qualities, luxury, diligence, arrogance, and courtesy.
* He was too voluptuous, &c.' See also what Tacitus
says of one Crispus Sallustius in the 30th chapter of
the third book of his Annals. Every body knows
that Demetrius was a dissolute man to the highest de-
gree; and yet in time of war that Prince gave over
his pleasures, and applied himself entirely to his great
enterprizes. Let us see how Plutarch relates the mat-
ter. He says (10) that Antigonus being incapable of
the fatigues of the war, by reason of his great age
and the bulk of his body, committed the management
of his greatest affairs to the Prince, his son, whose conduct
was admirably dextrous in military matters; and the old
King was induced to bear with those excessive liberties,
wherein he drowned himself in the time of peace, because
he observed him to be the most temperate and abstemious
person in the world, in the time of war and action. . . .
As for Demetrius, if he devoted himself to his pleasures
and luxury, he abandoned himself entirely to them; and
if the trumpet sounded to horse, he was no less assiduous
in the fatigues of war; he was, beyond all doubt, a
very great Captain, and most notably dextrous, not only
in his conduct, but in forming his levies, and raising an
army, and in making all the necessary preparations of
stores and magazines, the very muscles and nerves of
war, which he ever took care to provide in great abun-
dant (11). I shall add an observation of the same
author, attended with a fact relating to the matter I
treat of. 'Artaxerxes plainly proved that cowardice,
& effeminacy are the effects of a base vile nature,
& guided by erroneous notions, and not of niceness
& superfluous excesses, as most men suppose. For
notwithstanding his jewels of gold, his robe of state,
& the rest of his costly attire, worth no less than
twelve thousand talents, with which he was con-
stantly clad, his labours and toils were no less than
those of the meanest persons in his army. For
he marched himself the first on foot, having his
quiver slung over his shoulder, and his shield on
his arm; he led them through craggy mountains
& rugged ways; inasmuch that the soldiers
& observing his courage and unwearied strength,
took wing, and went the more swiftly along with
him, whose daily march was above two hundred
furlongs (12). I shall here apply an observation
that was made upon the Athenians. An author who
had described their luxury and softness, adds, and yet
they won the battle of Marathon. *Τοῖς τοῖς δὲ οἷς
τὴν ἐν Μαραθῶνι μάχην ἐνίκησαν. Εἰ ἐν τῷ μὲν
ἐσθρῶ, τὰ μὲν ἀπὸ πρὸς Μαραθῶνι νικητὲς διεσφύραν* (13).
One

(9) *Tacit. Hist.
lib. i, cap. x.*

(10) *Plut. in
Demetrius.*

(11) *Zozimus
speaks of Theo-
dorus in the like
strain.*

(12) *Plut. in Ar-
taxerxes.*

(13) *Elian. Var.
Hist. lib. iv,
cap. xxi.*

Parthians and the Romans, and that the only thing that remained to be done was to advance as far as the river to write it down. Crassus had a mind to send for a horse, but Surena told him that it was needless, since King Orodes gave him one. Crassus got on

One would think that when the Antients suppose that Bacchus did wonders on the day of the battle with the giants, their design is to give us to understand that those who seem only fit for dancing and amorous sports, will nevertheless shew their bravery in a battle.

Tu, cum parentis regna per arduum
Cohors Gigantum scanderet impia,
Rhetum retorfiti leonis
Unguib, horribilique mala:
Quamquam choreis aptior, & jocus,
Ludoque dictus, non sat idoneus
Pugnæ ferebaris: fed idem
Pacis eras, mediisque belli (14).

(14) Horat. Od.
xix, lib. ii.

When impious giants climb'd on high,
And dar'd to storm thy father's sky,
Thy single hand secur'd his crown:
You with a lion's dreadful jaws,
And frightful nails retriev'd the cause,
Bold Rhetus quell'd and sav'd the falling throne.
Too much more us'd to soft delight,
Unfit, unable for a fight
You once were thought, and doom'd to ease,
Yet when your heat and virtue rose,
What fury seiz'd your haughty foes?
How equally inclin'd to wars and peace?

I will not reckon the great Scipio among the voluptuous men who minded important affairs. I shall only say, that his great cares were attended with innocent recreations. The rigid and austere Cato did not approve of it; but he was too severe in his judgment about the difference that is between an effeminate life and gaiety. However it be, he openly complained of Scipio's behaviour, who, during the preparations for the expedition of Carthage, made merry in Sicily. Cato was to be his Quæstor; but he left him as soon as he perceived that his remonstrances were not acceptable to him. He returned from Sicily, and, together with Fabius, made a huge noise in the open senate against Scipio's lavishing of unspeakable sums, and his childish loitering away his time in wrestling-matches and comedies, as if he were not to make war, but holiday; so that he caused some of the tribunes of the people to be sent, by commission from the senate, to enquire into the truth of these allegations upon the spot, and, in case they found them true, to bring him back to Rome. But, on the contrary, Scipio shewed them the evident and certain promise of victory, in the prodigious provision he had made of all things necessary for the war; and that he only lived pleasantly with his friends, when there was nothing else to do; shewing also that he was not, by his liberality to his soldiers, the more negligent in things of consequence and moment (15).

(15) Plut. in
Catone majore,
pag. 338. See
also Livy, lib.
xxix, pag. m.
532.

(16) Valer. Max-
imus, lib. iii,
cap. vi, num. 1,
pag. m. 298,
299.

Maximus mentions this pretended remissness of Scipio, and says, among other things, that great souls launch forth with greater impetuosity when they have been at rest. Let us give the passage entire. 'P. Scipio, cum in Sicilia augendo, trajiciendoque in Africam exercitu opportunum quærendo gradum, Carthaginis ruinam animo voveret; inter consilia ac molitiones hujus tante rei operam gymnasio dedit, pallioque & crepidis usus est. Nec hac re segiores Pœnicis exercitibus manus intulit: sed nescio an ideo alacriores, quia vegeta & strenua ingenia, quo plus recessus sumunt, hoc vehementiores impetus edunt. Creditur etiam favorem eum sociorum uberiorem se adepturum existimasse, si victum eorum & solennes exercitationes comprobasset: Ad quas tum veniebat, cum multum ac diu fatigasset humeros, & cetera membra militari agitatione firmitatem suam probare coegisset, confitebaturque in his labor ejus, in illis remissio laboris (16). . . . Publius Scipio, while he was in Sicily, consulting how to augment his troops and transport them into Africa, where he meditated nothing less than the ruin of Carthage, did nevertheless, amidst his designs and preparations for this great

work, frequent the Academy, and make use of the gown and slippers. Nor did the Carthaginians find him at all more remiss upon this account, but rather brisker, because strong and resolute minds launch forth with so much the greater impetuosity as they have had a long ease and respite. I likewise fancy that he expected to ingratiate himself the more with the Allies, by seeming to approve of their way of living and their solemn exercises. But he did not come to these, before he had once heartily fatigued his shoulders, and tried the strength of his other members by military work. In these things consisted his labour, and in those his rest.'

It appears from the end of this passage that there was no effeminacy in Scipio's conduct, and that he only mixed some recreation with his most important cares and labours. All great men are not capable of such a variety; some despise pleasures, and love an uninterrupted gravity; others are not equal to this sort of variation, the chequering of great designs with dancing and drunkenness. Flaminius, one of the most illustrious persons of antient Rome, could not apprehend how a man can be capable of such a variety. Here follows what Plutarch says of him. 'At another time Dinocrates the Messenian, having been fuddled at a merry meeting in Rome, danced there in a woman's habit, and the next day addressed to Titus for assistance in his design to get Messina out of the Achæan hands. I shall (says he) consider of it, but cannot but wonder that you who are enterprising designs of that moment, can find leisure to revel and sing in your cups (17).'

Montagne makes very fine observations upon the capacity of the soul, whereby a man may turn his mind sometimes one way and sometimes another, and is able to do things that seem inconsistent. (17) Plut. in Q. Flamino, pag. 378.

(18) I am well pleased to see a General of an army at the foot of a breach he designs to attack, talking freely at dinner-time with his friends; and Brutus, against whom and against the Roman liberty, heaven and earth were combined, stealing some hours in the night, as he goes the rounds, to read Polybius. Little souls buried under the weight of affairs, know not how to extricate themselves; they know not how to lay them aside, and re-assume them. (18) Montagne, Essays, book. iii, in the last chapter, pag. m. 595.

. . . . ô fortes pejoraque passi,
Mecum sæpe viri, nunc vino pellite curas,
Cras ingens iterabimus æquor (19).

(19) Horat. Od.
vii, ver. 30,
lib. i.

. . . . Cheer, rouse your force,
For we have often suffer'd worse.
Drink briskly round, dispel all cloudy sorrow,
Drink round, we'll plow the deep to-morrow.

CREECH.

He alledges many examples upon that subject.

It were to be wished that the general rule in question were not liable to so many exceptions; for a young man well qualified for the war, who is given to drinking, gaming, and women, has something to answer to those who endeavour to reclaim him by representing to him the ill consequences of such a course. You will never be able to command an army, say they to him; such an employment is inconsistent with an unfurmoutable inclination for a voluptuous life. Why so? will he say: why should not I be in time like so many others, who have been debauched and laborious by turns, according to the posture of affairs? Surena painted, and was attended by many concubines. Was he a worse General for it? How many such examples does antient and modern History afford? Montgomery, who performed so many noble exploits in the XVth century, was extremely careless in his office, for he loved an easy life and gaming; but when he was once got into the saddle, he was the most valiant and careful captain that ever was seen (20). Many Generals avoid being surprized, and perform actions that require an extreme diligence, though they love drinking, and make long meals; and their enemies are often mistaken in the consequences they draw from it. Granvelle, Bishop of Arras, made

(20) Brantome
in his Encomium
upon the Prince
of Condé, Tom.
iii, of his Me-
moirs, pag. m.
234.

on horseback, and soon after they cut off his head. This perfidiousness was attended with insults and derision [B]: but Surena did not long enjoy the pleasure of the victory; for the King of the Parthians grew jealous of him, and caused him to be put to death (d).

(d) Plut. in
Crasso, p. 565.

made a very imprudent answer, as it appeared by the event. It (21) was represented to the Emperor Charles V, that Duke Maurice was not to be trusted; but *Granvelle answered that there was no occasion to suspect those great drinkers, because their heads being always clouded with thick vapours, were not clear enough to carry on a nice intrigue* (22). Maurice made it appear that he was more cunning than the Italians and Spaniards.

(21) The Duke of Alba represented it. See *Mémoires, ubi infra*.

(22) Melvil, *Mémoires*, p. 40.

A voluptuous young man, who considers the examples I have mentioned, grows more incorrigible, and exposes himself to great inconveniences. The best way is to follow the rule, without trusting to expectations.

[B] *This perfidiousness was attended with insults and derision.* Surena sent the head and the hand of Crassus to the King his master; but himself by his messengers scattered a report, That he was bringing Crassus alive to Seleucia, and made a ridiculous procession, which, by way of scorn, he called a triumph. For one Caius Patianus, who of all the prisoners was most like to Crassus, being put into the habit of a woman like the Barbarians, and instructed to take the title of Crassus, and Emperor, from those who spoke to him, was brought fitting upon his horse, preceded by a parcel of trumpeters and lictors upon their camels; the girdles and purples of the Romans were hung at the end of the bundles of rods, and the heads of the slain, fresh bleeding, at the end of the axes; after them followed the Seleucian minstrels, making abundance of scurrilous and abusive reflexions upon the effeminacy and cowardliness of Crassus, with a musical cadence: and this show was seen by every body. But Surena calling together the Senate of Seleucia, shewed to them a wanton book of Aristides, called his *Milesia*; neither was this a forgery, for it was found amongst the spoils of Rustius, and furnished Surena with sufficient matter of derision upon the profligate manners of the Romans, who were not able even in time of war to forbear such wanton writings and practices. But the Senate of Seleucia had reason to commend the wisdom of Æsop, who tells us that every man carries a wallet across his shoulder, putting into the pouch before the faults of others, and into the pouch behind his own, when they saw their General Surena had put the loose book of Aristides into the pouch before, and into that behind a long train of Parthian luxury, which he dragged after him in such a number of chariots filled with concubines, that he seemed to lead, as it were, an army of vipers, whose furious front appeared terrible, where nothing was seen but lances, javelins, bows, and steeds; but all ended in a train of wenchings, instruments of music, dancing, singing, and the whole night consumed with harlots in riotous banquets (23).

(23) Plut. in
Crasso, p. 564.

This conduct of Surena plainly shews that the Parthians deserved to be called Barbarians, as they were by the Greeks and Romans; for none but brutish people, who are incapable of civility, will treat an enemy in such a manner, much less an enemy overcome by a shameful treachery. Take notice that Plutarch blames that Rustius, who brought the lewd books of Aristides to the army. People are not now

so rigid; and if Boccaccio's novels, or La Fontaine's tales were found in the baggage of an officer, no notice would be taken of it. I do not think the most biting and the most burlesque news-writers would reflect upon him for it. Much less would they censure those, who should have a looking-glass among their things. But in Juvenal's time they were more severe in that respect: an Emperor was laughed at for having a looking-glass in the camp (24). It is true that glass did belong to a man who painted, and by reason of that circumstance, it afforded a better occasion for raileries and insults. I am sure the reader will excuse me for mentioning this particular, since it concerns a Roman like Surena in that part of effeminacy, who nevertheless showed a great courage (25); so that this is a new example to be added to those, which I have mentioned (26). Juvenal does very much exclaim against Otho's inequality.

(24) See, above, citation (41), of the article APULEIUS.

(25) See his Life in Suetonius, and Tacitus, *Hist. lib. ii.*

(26) In the foregoing remark.

Nimirum summi ducis est occidere Galbam,
Et curare cutem summi constantia civis:
Bebriaci campo spoliū affectare Palati,
Et pressum in faciem digitis extendere panem.
Quod nec in Assyrio pharetrata Semiramis orbe,
Mœsta nec Ætiaca fecit Cleopatra carina (27).

(27) Juven. Sat. II, ver. 104.

*Galba to kill he thought a General's part,
But as a courtier us'd the nicest art,
To keep his skin from tan: before the fight,
Would paint and set his soil'd complexion right:
A softness which Semiramis ne'er knew,
When once she had the field and foe in view,
Nor Egypt's Queen, when she from Ægium flew.*

T A T E.

The courage Otho expressed, when he killed himself, appeared the more admirable, because he took care to paint and trick up himself like a woman. Read these words of Suetonius. 'Munditium vero pene muliebrium: vulso corpore: galericulo capiti propter raritatem capillorum adaptato & annexo, ut nemo dignosceret. Quin & faciem quotidie rasitare, ac pane madido linere consuetum: idque instituisse à prima lanugine, ne barbatus umquam esset. Sacra etiam Idis sepe in lintea religioaque veste prophanam celebrasse. Per quæ factum putem ut mors ejus minime congruens vitæ, majori miraculo fuerit' (28). --- He imitated a female nicety in his dress. His body was plucked quite smooth; and, on account of his baldness, he had a perriwig, so well fitted to his head, and clapt on in such a manner, as not to be distinguished from his own hair. He shaved his face very close every day, and then laid moist bread upon it. This he began to do, as soon as he had any down upon his cheeks, to prevent his ever having a beard. He was frequently wont to celebrate the holy rites of Isis in public, having on a religious garment made of linen. For these reasons it came to pass, in my opinion, that his death being not at all suitable to his life, was reckoned so much the more strange and wonderful.

(28) Sueton. in Othone, cap. ult. pag. m. 642.

SURGIER (FRANCIS) a Friar in the monastery of Sainte Croix at Paris, was punished in the year 1595, for having preached in a seditious manner. He had stuffed one of his sermons with invectives, calling Queen Elizabeth frequently by the name of Jezabel, and upbraided with the name of Sectaries the Allies of that Queen [A]. The parliament of Paris, having caused him to be put in prison, condemned him to retract upon

[A] *He upbraided with the name of Sectaries the Allies of Queen Elizabeth.* It is impossible to describe sufficiently the ravings of the Roman Catholic bigots, who took upon them to decry Henry IV and his successor, for protecting the Protestants in Holland and Germany against the house of Austria. The books that were published against the alliance of France with the Protestant States are without number, and it is certain there was a great deal of oddness in the con-

VOL. V.

duct of that crown; for while it laboured to extirpate the Huguenots in its own dominions, it supported the Protestants elsewhere, and enabled them not only to keep their own ground, but likewise to aggrandize themselves. I have, in another place (1), taken notice of this contradiction, and I shall now confirm what I said there by a remarkable passage. I find it at the end of an observation concerning the letters which Pope Pius V writ into France, to condemn the treaties

(1) See the remarks [P] and [R], of the article FRANCIS I.

of

Z z z

upon his knees and bare-headed these rash and inconsiderate words, and to ask pardon of God, of the king, and of justice. They forbade him to preach till such time as the court had ordered otherwise, and prohibited him upon pain of death to spread about discourses that were injurious to the princes in alliance with his most Christian Majesty, or to say anything that tended to sedition. This was done privately in the court of criminal causes, and they shewed such indulgence to him, out of regard to his profession, and to the memory of his father, who had taught the institutes at Paris, and whose scholars several members of that court had been (a).

(a) Taken from
Thuanus, book
cxiv, pag. m.
702, ad ann.
1595.

(2) I believe that there is an error of the prefs here, and that we ought to read *Impiorum*, instead of *Imperiorum*.

of peace between the Roman Catholics and Heretics. Sed precipue tangunt Gallorum fœdera cum Exteris Patrocinium Genev. Unde Auctor lib. *Gesta Imperiorum* (2) per *Francos*, p. 8. adeo excañdefcit, & se comprehendere posse negat, quomodo cum *Christi-anismi* appellatione conveniat *Genevæ* protectio & Patrocinium susceptum jam ab a. millefimo quingentesimo septuagesimo nono, & semper continuatum ad hæc usque tempora. Quod monstrum, quod portentum, quæ Chimeræ? Quæ conventio lucis ad tenebras? quæ communicatio *Christi* cum *Belial*; quid arcæ Dei cum Dagon, quid Sioni cum Babilone? quid janititum cum impietate, quid *Christo* cum *Beelzebub*, quid *Christi-anismo* cum *Genevæ*? Tum Fœdus Gallorum Bel-gicum, de quo Idem pag. 10. Putabam fingi vix quidem posse *Christianissimi* nomine indignius, nec quidemquam *Christianismo* exitiarius, quam *Genevæ* tutelam & patrocinium, uti supra ostensum est: verum-tamen postea consideranti Fœdus *Hollandicum*, quod jam pridem Gallia studiosius excoluit, tanto illud perniciosius esse religioni visum est, quanto plures in Statibus illi *Hollandici* inesse *Genevæ* censit sentitque incredibili suo malo Ecclesia. De fœdere Gallo-Suevico, pag. 16. Ab Aquilone pandetur omne malum. Reviviscunt in uno Gothorum & Alarici & Genferici, (quem nunc Suecivæ vocant) Alarici & Genferici, qui rursus Imperium & Ecclesiam Dei miserrimè diripiunt, deformant, lacerant; non illi quidem à *Ruffino* & *Eudoxia* exorti, qui ambo postea hujus evocationis penas ultimi Numinis iustissimas dederunt; sed (qui credat?) à Gallia Christianissima animati facio fodere cum mortalium furiosissimo, consilio, pecunia, armis adjuți (3). But the leagues which the French have entered into with foreign Princes chiefly relate to the protection of Geneva. Upon which the author of a book called *Gesta Imper-*

(3) Hoornbeeck,
Disput. ad Bul-
lam Innocentii
X, pag. 265.

(a) See citation (94) of the article ERASMUS.

(b) See the Epitome of Gesner's Bibliothéque, pag. 362.

(1) La Croix du
Maine, Bibl.
Franç. p. 171.

(2) Hubert Suf-
fannæus, in Lu-
dorum Libris,
fol. 81, Edet.
Parif. 1538.

* Suff. annos 24
natus, cum hæc
scriberet.

S U S S A N N E A U (*a*) (H U B E R T) was born at Soissons in the year 1514 [*A*]. He distinguished himself by his Latin verses, and published some Grammatical tracts (*b*), that met with a good reception. He taught Philological learning at Turin, before he had a beard (*c*). He taught it also at Paris. He styles himself Doctor of Law and Physic.

[A] Was born at Soissons in the year 1514.] La Croix du Maine, who says he was born there (1), was better informed of the place than of the time of his birth. He pretends that he flourished in the year 1520; which is not true; for Sufanneau says he was only twenty-four years of age, in a book published by him in 1538. He speaks thus in his Poem upon the siege of Perone (2).

*Taurinum nuper studiis ignobilis oci
Furisque & legum florebat: ubi impiger artes
Ingenuas docui, Musarum gratus alumnis,
Tum cum nulla genas vestiret barba decoras:
Quæ nunc in floræ puberæ sedes hispida mento,
Ad quintum quinquam lustrum, mihi deficit annus.**

It appears from those verses that he taught the *Belles Lettres* at Turin. He was sent thither when the French had made themselves masters of Piedmont in the year 1536. He made no long stay in that country: it appears from the collection of the Latin

(a) In Latin
Sordivius.

riour per Francos falls into a violent passion, and says that he cannot understand, how the protection of Geneva, undertaken from the year 1579, and continued down without interruption to the present times, is consistent with the title of Most Christian. What a monstrous thing, what an absurdity, and what a chimera is this? For what agreement can there be between light and darkness? What communication can CHRIST have with Belial; the ark of GOD with Dagon, or Sion with Babylon? What has holiness to do with impiety, CHRIST with Beelzebub, or the most Christian Kings with Geneva? Next as to the league between the French and Dutch the same author says. I imagined that nothing could be conceived more unworthy of the title Most Christian, nor any thing more fatal to Christianity, than the protection of Geneva, as I have shewed above: but afterwards when I considered the league with the Dutch, which France has long cultivated with the utmost care, I took that to be so much the more destructive to religion, as the Church, to her incredible sorrow, sees many Geneva's arise out of the States of Holland. Concerning the league between the French and Swedes, he adds. All manner of evils shall come from the North. For in one King of the Goths and Vandals (now called King of Sweden) the Alarics and Genferics revive, and a second time miserably waste, disfigure, and tear to pieces the Kingdom and Church of GOD. Nor are these stirred up by Rufinus and Eudoxias, who both suffered the punishment of their crime by the just vengeance of the Deity: but (who would believe it?) they are set on by the most Christian country of France, and assisted with advice, arms, and money, a league being struck up with the most furious man alive.

Poems, which he published in 1538, that he had already begun again his public lectures upon the *Æneid* at Paris. This advertisement is to be found in the twenty-second leaf.

Fixit ab Italia Luteciam reversus.

Venit ab Italia Gallorum redditus oris
Hubertus, sacri maxima cura chori.
Qui cras doctiloqui repetet compendia vatis,
Unde tibi *Aeneas Aeneasque* canit.

Hubertus who is dear to the Muses is returned from Italy to France, and to-morrow resumes his lectures on the *Æneid*.

He observes, that in order to make himself more capable of explaining Virgil, he had been at Rome to examine the antient monuments of that place, and had sucked in the air of Mantua (3).

(3) Mox diversum
laute sacra
Mantua cepit,
Plenaque Virgi-
lii mens nova
menta fuit. *Saf-
san. Ludor. lib.
ii. fol. 22.*

SUTCLIFFE (*a*) (MATTHEW) an Englishman, and a Protestant Divine, flourished towards the latter end of the XVIIth century, and beginning of the XVIIIth. He published several controversial books, some in Latin, and others in English, and made it his chief business to confute Cardinal Bellarmin. He also wrote something against

against the Presbyterians. He did not put his name to a book which treats of the conformity of Popery and the Turkish Religion [A].

- [A] *A book, which treats of the conformity of Popery and the Turkish religion.* He published it at London in the year 1604. It is the confutation of a book printed at Antwerp in the year 1596 (1), and at Cologne in 1603, with this title, *Calvino-Turcismus, id est, Calvinistica perfidia cum Mabumetana collatio, & dilucida utriusque sectæ confutatio*. There is hardly any book more violent than this Calvino-Turcismus: it was the work of two English Catholics, who left their country: one of them was William Reynolds or Reginaldus, and the other William Gifford. The first died while he was composing it; the second put the last hand to it, and published it (2). The latter was a Priest, who had several times encouraged some assassins to kill Queen Elizabeth (3), and who was well beloved by the Flemish women (4). He had fled to Little. William Reynolds had been formerly a minister (5), and expressed a great zeal for the Protestant religion. Afterwards he turned Papist. He was brother to John Reynolds (6), Professor of Divinity at Oxford, who wrote excellent books against the Roman Catholics. I have mentioned in another (7) place what is reported of these two brothers, viz. that they were brought up out of their country, John in the Church of Rome, William in the Protestant religion, and that meeting together one day, they disputed with so great force, that both of them changed their religion. I very much doubt this (8). William was Professor of Divinity in the English college of Rheims. He is said to be the author of a very seditious book, dedicated to the Duke of Mayenne, and written according to the most furious maxims of the league, and in a most violent rage against Henry III. and the King of Navarre. My edition is that of Antwerp, apud Joannem Keerbergium 1592, in 8vo. Here is the title of that book. *De justa Reipub. Christianæ in Reges impio, & Hæreticos Autoritate; justissimaque Catholicorum ad Henricum Navarraum, & quemcunque hæreticum à regno Gallie repellendum con-*
- (1) Sutclivius knew not that edition.
(2) See the preface to the Calvino-Turcismus.
(3) Sutcliffe, ubi infra.
(4) Sacrificus, ut aiunt, comptus & calamiistratus, & apud mulieres Belgicas gratiosus. Sutclivius, in Pref. Turco-Papismi.
(5) Id. ibid.
(6) Rivetus, in Jesuita vapulante, cap. xi, num. 14, pag. 531, Tom. iii, Opera.
(7) In the Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, for July 1681, Art. vi, pag. 769.
(8) This seems to me inconsistent with a letter of John Reynolds to his brother, which is to be found in Whitaker's answer to a book of William Reynolds.

fæderatione. G. Guilelmo Rosseo Autore. Sutcliffe affirms (9) that William Reynolds wrote that book. Moreri (10) says so too, and quotes Pitæus, nay he adds that it is one of the best (11) performances of this writer. But others ascribe it either to William Gifford, or to John Boucher, or to a Jesuit, or to Gnebrard (12). The surest way is to ascribe it to the author of the Calvino-Turcismus. Boucher's book has another title, as you may see above in the remark [B] of the article BOUCHER.

The title of Sutcliffe's answer runs thus. 'De Turco-Papismo, hoc est, de Turcarum & Papistarum adversus Christi Ecclesiam & fidem conjuratione, eorumque in Religione & moribus consensione & similitudine; liber unus. Eidem præterea adjuncti sunt, de Turco-papistarum maledictis & calumniis, adversus Gulielmi Giffordii famosi Pontificum Rom. & Jebusitarum supparastastri volumen illud contumeliosissimum, quod ille Calvino-Turcismum inscripsit, libri quatuor. In quibus non tantum hujus hominis levissimi, sed etiam aliorum importunissimorum scurrarum adversus Orthodoxam Christi Ecclesiam continenter latrantium, malitia & petulantia reprimatur, hominumque piorum fama ab eorum calumniis vindicatur. --- Of the Mahometan Popery, or a treatise of the Conspiracy of the Turks and Papists against the Church and Faith of CHRIST, of their agreement and resemblance in religion and morals. To which are added four books concerning the slanders and calumnies of the Mahometan Papists, in answer to that most defamatory libel, intitled, Mahometan Calvinisme, written by William Gifford, a notorious and vile flatterer of the Popes and Jesuits. In which books are detected the malice and insence not only of this worthless man, but likewise of other busy slanderers, continually railing against the orthodox Church of CHRIST, and the reputation of pious men is vindicated from their calumnies.'

(9) Sutcliffe, in Pref. Turco-Papismi.

(10) Upon the word Reginaldus.

(11) The word best has been left out in the Dutch editions.

(12) See Placcius, de Pseudonym. pag. 249, 250, and the Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, for June 1684, Art. iii, and Decker's de Script. Adeptis, pag. 337, 339. Edit. 1686.



T A B O R

T.

(a) In Latin *Bu-
dissa*.



TABOR (JOHN OTTO) a famous German Civilian, was born at Bautzen (a) the capital of the Upper Lusatia, the third of December 1604. He went through his studies in Philosophy and Civil-Law at Leipzig; and before he was twenty years of age rendered himself capable of explaining to his comrades the Paratitles of Wefenbecius. He went from the university of Leipzig to that of Strasburgh, and afterwards made a journey to France at the time of the taking of Rochelle. He

was scarce returned home, when he undertook to travel into Italy, with two young gentlemen, as their governour; but there arose some obstacles to this journey. He was admitted Doctor of Law at Strasburgh November the 10th 1631. The wars of Germany deprived him of part of his patrimony, and reduced his birth-place to ashes, in the year 1634. Where he then discharged the office of advocate and syndic of the city. He was invited a few days after this disaster to succeed Joachim Clutenius, who had left vacant a professor of Law's chair at Strasburgh. He accepted of that professorship, and was soon after honoured with the chief post in the faculty of the Law. He continued in that city till the year 1656, though he had the offer of a great many very honourable employments from divers places; but about the end of this year he found himself more disposed to remove. The restoration of the peace, the regret of having lost a wife, with whom he had lived twenty-two years, the distaste he took against the place where he died, and some other discontents, to which persons of great merit are usually exposed (b), brought our Tabor to the country of Mecklenburgh, to be chancellor to the Duke. He soon quitted this post, to devote himself intirely to his books; but before he could regain the repose of his study, he was obliged to go to the court of Saxony, and to that of the Emperor, about some affairs of that duke. He retired to Gießen in 1659, and was there chancellor of the university, and counsellor to the Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt (c). Several reasons obliged him to remove again, which he did in 1667, in order to retire to Francfort, where his son was advocate. He was not exempt from troubles there any more than in other places. He died the twelfth of December 1674. He published at different times several books on law subjects, which had sold very well: this was the reason that the copies were grown very scarce; and therefore a professor of Leipzig, named Mylius, made a collection of them as exactly as he could, which he published in two volumes in folio (d) in the year 1688. Mr Praschius, an ancient Burgomaster at Ratibon, and son-in-law to Tabor, printed in 1675, a little piece containing an account of the life of his father-in-law (e) [A].

(b) Restituta pax,
erepta conjux,
de hinc innatum
loei tedium, tum
causae alie quae
infectari solent
magnas virtutes.
*Mausel. Jo. Ot-
ton. Taboris.*

(c) They give
him these quali-
ties in the title
of the new edi-
tion of his works.

(d) Lipsiae, apud
Joh. Frieder.
Gleditschium.

(e) It is intitled
*Mauselium Jo.
Otonis Taboris*,
J. C.

[A] Mr Praschius . . . printed . . . an account of the life of his father-in-law. In some respects there is no fault to be found with it for want of particulars; but in those things, concerning which the public might have most curiosity, the author has confined himself to general notions, and contents himself with telling us, 'Si tantas virtutes aliquo vitiorum confini olæsit, si in vita nonnunquam vel doctrina offendit, aut justam causam paulo acrius defendit, exemplo docuit illustri nihil in humanis rebus perfectum, aut superbie con-

cessum esse, quo maneat SOLI DEO GLORIA. . . .
'If he tarnished such great virtues with a tincture of vice, if he sometimes offended in his life or doctrine, or vindicated a just cause a little too warmly, he has proved, by an eminent example, that in human affairs there is no such thing as perfection, or room for pride, but a reservation of all GLORY TO GOD ALONE.' This is the conclusion of Mr Praschius's account, from which I have taken this article.

TABOUÉ, or TABOUET (JULIAN) in Latin *Tabætius*, would have deserved a place among the learned of the XVIth century, if he had not sullied by his ill actions all the merit of his eloquence, learning, and wit. He was born at Chantenai four leagues from Mans (a). [A].

(a) La Croix du
Maine, pag. 278.

[A] Note, that this affair of Taboué is not to be met with in all the editions of John Papon's Arrêts. I could not find it in the Latin edition, published at Geneva, *Sumptibus Samuelis Crispini*, in 1624, in folio, and in book XXIV, title I, page 734, you have these words; *Hanc ad rem notatu dignum est Arrestum Taboueti, supra, tit. de author. rer. judic. &c.* which shews that they who suppressed the Arrêt against Taboué, forgot to expunge the passage in book XXIV, where reference is made to this Arrêt.

Such oversights as these too frequently happen to those who undertake the correction of a work. They strike out certain things in one place, and leave elsewhere a quotation of the very same things. . . . See, concerning Taboué, the history of the Bishops of Mans, by Antony le Courvaissier, pag. 854, and correct his omissions; that of Thuanus, lib. XVII. pag. 357 (it is pag. 952 of du Rier's translation); Papon especially; and Menage's history Sablé.

TACFARINAS, General of the army in Africa against the Romans in the time of Tiberius, was by nation a Numidian (a). He served at first amongst the auxiliary troops of the Romans, and having deserted, got together a band of vagabonds and robbers, and betook himself to making incursions, and to plundering. Afterwards he disciplined this band of highwaymen, and divided them into companies, according to the art of war. At length he became General of the Muzulans, a potent nation near the deserts of Africa, and confederate with the Moors of the neighbourhood. These were commanded by Mazippa, and formed a flying camp, carrying fire and sword, and terror on all sides; whilst Tacfarinas, with the choicest of the troops, encamped after the manner of the Romans, and accustomed them to military discipline. The Cinithians, another considerable nation, entered in the same interests. Furius Camillus, Proconsul of Africa, informed of these motions, marched against the enemy, and put them to flight. This procured him the honour of a triumph (b). This happened in the year of Rome 770 (c). Tacfarinas renewed his robberies some time after, and laid siege to a castle where Decrius was commander, and defeated the garrison which went out to engage him in the open field. Decrius performed the part of a very brave and experienced warrior: the wounds he received, by one of which he lost an eye, did not hinder him from making head against the enemy till he was slain: his soldiers had betaken themselves to flight. The Proconsul Apronius punished them for their cowardice very severely, for he put every tenth man to death. This had such an effect, that five hundred soldiers, having charged the same troops of Tacfarinas, who were besieging a place, routed them. After this Tacfarinas resolved not to stand an engagement with the Romans; he detached his men into different places; and when he was pursued he betook himself to flight, and when the Romans retired, he charged them in the rear. But, having stopped in a camp, he was there beaten, and forced to fly into the deserts (d). This was for no long time, for he quickly after appeared again in the field; and this news being brought to Rome, they sent into Africa against him Junius Blæsus, uncle to Sejanus (e). This new Proconsul acquitted himself very well in his office (f) [A]; and yet Tacfarinas repaired his losses so well, that he had the boldness to send deputies to Tiberius to demand that he would assign him a country; otherwise he threatened him with a perpetual war. The Emperor was so provoked at this insolence, that he gave order to Junius Blæsus to take

(a) Tacit. Ann. lib. ii, cap. lii.

(b) Taken from Tacitus, ibid.

(c) It was the 17th of the Christian Æra.

(d) Ex eod. ibid. lib. iii, cap. xx, xxi.

(e) Id. ibid. cap. xxxii, xxxv.

(f) Id. ibid. cap. lxxiii.

Tacfarinas

[A] Junius Blæsus, uncle to Sejanus. This new Proconsul acquitted himself very well in his office.] The emperor acquainting the senate with Tacfarinas's new irruptions, exhorted them to make choice of a new Proconsul, very well skilled in war, and capable to undergo the fatigues of it (1). The senators referring this choice to the Emperor's care (2). This prince (3) gave them an oblique reprimand, for throwing all difficult affairs upon him, and named to them two persons, Manius Lepidus, and Junius Blæsus, that they might choose one of them to send into Africa. Lepidus desired that he might be excused from undertaking that employ; Junius spoke to the same purpose; but it was easy to perceive the difference of their language, and that Lepidus spoke his mind, but Blæsus did not. The reasons which Lepidus alledged were very well understood, as well as that which he did not alledge, and which was the chief, namely the superiority of Junius Blæsus, who was uncle to the favourite. Prudence required him not to be his competitor in this affair; and that it was better for him not to commit himself to the decision of the suffrages: so the proconsulship was confirmed to Blæsus, as if he had been the only person the emperor had named. I say nothing but what results from the words of Tacitus. 'Tum audita amborum verba, intentius excusante se Lepido, cum valetudinem corporis, ætatem liberum, nubilem filiam obtenderet: intelligeretque etiam quod silebat, avunculum esse Sejani Blæsum, atque eo prævalidum. Respondit Blæsus specie recusantis, sed neque eadem adseveratione; & consensu adulantium auditus est (4). - - - Then they were both heard, Lepidus with great earnestness excusing himself, under pretence of his infirm state of health, the age of his children, and a daughter just marriageable: what he thought proper not to mention was also understood, that Blæsus was the uncle of Sejanus, and therefore too powerful for him. Blæsus also made some sort of excuse, but not with that earnestness; and was favoured by all the court flatterers.' This uncle of the favourite is an example which proves, that the relations of a prime minister are sometimes very worthy of those offices, which are conferred upon them purely on account of their relation. He took the best way that could be thought of to subdue Tacfarinas (5), and we

read in Tacitus, that the triumphal honours, which were granted him, were truly deserved by him; and that Tiberius declared, that he granted them in consideration of Sejanus. Neque multo post Cæsar cum Junium Blæsum Proconsulem Africæ triumphis insignibus attolleret, dare id se dixit honori Sejani, cujus illa avunculus erat. At tamen res Blæsi dignæ decore tali fuerit (6). Note, that this emperor commanded the legions to honour Junius Blæsus with the title of Imperator. This title, conferred by the acclamations of the soldiers, was very glorious. This had been a custom in the wars of the Romans, in the time of the Republic; but it grew almost out of use under Augustus, and was entirely abolished under Tiberius; for Junius Blæsus was the last that was honoured with this salutation. This whole matter deserves to be related in Tacitus's own words. 'Tiberius pro confecto (Bello) interpretatus, id quoque Blæso tribuit, ut Imperator à legionibus salutaretur: prisco erga duces honore, qui bene gesta Re-publica gaudio & impetu victoris exercitus conclamabatur: erantque plures simul Imperatores, nec super ceterorum æqualitatem. Concessit quibusdam & Augustus id vocabulum; ac tunc Tiberius Blæso postremam (7). - - - Tiberius looking upon the war to be concluded, granted also to Blæsus that he should be saluted Imperator by the legions: an ancient honour paid to the General for his services to the Commonwealth, by the acclamations of a rejoicing and victorious army: and there were several who enjoyed this title at the same time, nor yet did this make any difference in their rank. Augustus had granted this title to some; and Tiberius had now bestowed it, for the last time, on Blæsus.' The first words of this passage inform us, that Tiberius thought the war with Tacfarinas to be ended, altho' Blæsus returned into Italy before he had crushed all the seeds which might revive it again (8). Tiberius, thinking the business was over, recalled the ninth legion out of Africa. Tacfarinas gave out, that they were drawn off out of necessity to a distant place, because some other nations were invading the Roman empire; and that therefore, it would be an easy matter to hem in those Roman troops that were left, provided that all those, who preferred their liberty before servitude, would readily re-unite their forces. He was joined and assisted by a great many people, and gave a great

(1) Tacit. ibid. cap. lxxiii, lxxvii.

(2) Id. ibid. cap. lxxv.

(3) Fratre ejus (Tacfarinatus) capto regressus est, prosperantibus tamen quam ex utilitate sociorum, relicta per quos resurgeret bellum. Id. ibid.

(1) Judicio patrum deligendum Proconsulem, gnarum militiæ, corpore validum, & bello succurrerum. Tacit. Ann. lib. iii, cap. xxxiii.

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) Id. ibid. cap. xxxv.

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) See Tacitus, ibid. cap. lxxv.

VOL. V.

A a a

great

Tacfarinas whatever it cost. This war was not ended till the year of Rome 777, and it was the Proconsul Dolabella, who finished it. The army of Tacfarinas was defeated; they endeavoured to take the General, but he chose rather to lose his life in a courageous defence than to fall alive into the hands of the Proconsul (g). The faults of the supplement to Moreri shall be observed below [B].

(g) Id. *ibid.* lib. iv, cap. xxiii, & seq.

(9) Ex eod. *ibid.* lib. iv, cap. xxiii, & seq.

(10) Id. *ibid.* cap. xxvi.

(11) Priores duces, ubi imperando triumphalia insignia sufficere res suas crederant, hostem omitebant. Jamque tres laureas in Urbe statuae, & adhuc raptabat Africam Tacfarinas. Id. *ibid.* cap. xxiii.

(12) This has been struck out in the Dutch editions.

(a) About the CIVth Olympiad.

(b) Taken from Plutarch, in Vita Agefilai.

(c) Theopompus, & Lycas Naukratites, apud Athenæum, lib. xiv, pag. 616.

(1) Athen. lib. xiv, pag. 616.

great deal of trouble to the new Pro-consul, Dolabella, who, at length, totally vanquished this enemy (9). He demanded the honour of a triumph, but could not obtain it; for Tiberius, out of complaisance to Sejanus, refused to consent to what might eclipse the glory of Junius Blæsus. This refusal added more to the glory of Dolabella, than to that of the uncle to the favourite. Tacitus took care not to suppress this remark. Dolabella petenti abnuvit triumphalia Tiberius Sejanus tribuens, ne Blæsi avunculi ejus laus obsoleceret. Sed neque Blæsus ideo inferior, & huic negatus honor gloriam intendit. Quippe minore exercitu, insignis captivos, cædem ducis, bellicque confecti famam deportarat (10). - - - Tiberius refused to Dolabella the triumphal honours, which he did in complement to Sejanus, that the honours paid to his uncle Blæsus might not be impaired. But neither was Blæsus on that account the more glorious; his rival being rather set above him by this very refusal. For with a smaller army, he had come off with the reputation of having taken many illustrious prisoners, killed the General, and finished the war. It was a great injustice, to refuse to Dolabella, who had concluded this war, what had been allowed to the half-conquerors of Tacfarinas (11).

[B] The faults of the Supplement to Moreri. He was in the wrong to say, I. That Tacfarinas was a slave. II. That he retired into Africa. III. That out of the robbers assembled by him, he formed a powerful army of Saracens (12). IV. That he caused himself to be proclaimed King. V. That he beat the Roman army, commanded by Decius, Pro-consul of Africa. VI. That he

wounded him in the eye. VII. That he was afterwards vanquished by Camillus. VIII. And that Tacitus relates all this in his second book. Here are eight capital errors, too many certainly for an article of ten lines, and which besides is so defective. Tacitus says nothing which can induce us to believe, that Tacfarinas was a slave, or that he had served out of Africa in the Roman army. It was in Africa that he bore arms for them, in all appearance; and by consequence he did not retire into Africa after he had deserted. As for this army of Saracens, I believe I am not mistaken in my conjectures, if, I say, that the word *Muzulani*, which Tacitus makes use of, made the continuator of Moreri think that Tacitus meant the Musulmans; and because the followers of Mahomet go by that name, and have also been known by that of Saracens, he fancied it was indifferent to say an army of Saracens, or an army of Musulmans. Tacitus does not speak of a Pro-consul named Decius, but of one Decrius, who commanded in a castle; the garison of which consisted of a cohort (13), which is here converted into an army of Romans, commanded by the Pro-consul Decius. Now, since Decrius was killed, Moreri's continuator should not have been contented to say, that Tacfarinas wounded him in the eye. Camillus's victory preceded this defeat of Decrius. He should have cited the second, third, and fourth books of Tacitus's Annals; for these words, *Tacitus, lib. 2.* refer you as readily to the second book of his History, as to the second book of his Annals: and after all, whatever second book you take, you will not find there all the things which you are told of Tacfarinas.

(13) Which was about 600 men.

TACHUS, King of Egypt, in the time of Artaxerxes Ochus (a). The government of the Persians was so odious to the Egyptians, that it was no hard matter for Tachus to cause an insurrection; but he stood in need of the succours of Greece, to maintain him in the dignity with which he was invested. He was not ignorant of the valour and experience of Agefilas, King of the Lacedæmonians; and therefore took him into his service. Agefilas, though above eighty years of age, did not refuse it. He raised troops with the money which he received from Tachus, and led them into Egypt, without considering that he might be blamed for accepting an employ so inferior to his rank and reputation. He was soon disgusted at Tachus, who, instead of giving him the command of his whole army, left him only the command of the foreigners, giving the dignity of Admiral to Chabrias the Athenian, and retaining to himself the character of Generalissimo. Agefilas waited a favourable opportunity to show his resentment, which soon offered itself, and he as readily embraced it. Neftanabus, a relation of Tachus, commanded part of the army; he drew them off from their obedience to Tachus, and procured himself to be chosen king by the Egyptians. This made him send ambassadors to King Agefilas, to desire him to joyn with him, and he failed not to make him magnificent promises. Tachus, on the other hand, did not forget any thing to retain him. Each of those competitors sent their deputies to Lacedæmon. Agefilas also sent some thither, but much more to recommend the interest of Neftanabus, than that of Tachus. He received full power, to act as he should think most expedient for the good of his own country, and he thought it more advantageous for the Lacedæmonians to abandon Tachus, than to support him; and so he went into the service of Neftanabus with the troops he commanded: which, as his historian has observed, deserves to be called no better than treason, howsoever it may be screened under the pretence of the public good. Tachus, being thus abandoned, fled where he could (b), and I do not believe that he is found any more in History. Some (c) say he retired into Persia. He must needs have been at a loss for a safe place of refuge, if he fled to a prince, who could not but look upon him as a ring leader of rebels. Athenæus assigns a very different cause of Agefilas's resentment from that which has been just given: but in this matter I should much sooner chuse to trust Plutarch than Athenæus [A].

[A] In this matter I should much sooner chuse to trust to Plutarch than Athenæus. The latter attributes the whole to a jest: he would have it (1), that Tachus, bantering Agefilas, upon seeing his small stature, said to him, *A mountain has been in travail, Jupiter has been in great fears about it, it has brought forth a mouse: ἀδινεν ὄρεα, ζεύς δ' ἐπολείτο, τὸ δ' ἔτρεν μῦν.* He adds, that Agefilas fell into a passion, and answered, *You shall one day find that I am a lion.* He was as good as his word; for an insurrection happening against Tachus, he saw himself abandoned by Agefilas, and

forced to fly into Persia. I see no probability in this. First, Plutarch, who gives a large account of the contempt which the Egyptians shewed Agefilas, upon observing his sorry equipage and mien, and finding his indifferent taste, by the choice he made of the presents that were sent him, doth not say, that Tachus used any such jest. He does indeed say, that the great concourse of people who went to the sea-side to see this great captain, so much celebrated by fame, applied to him the fable of the mountain that brought forth a mouse; but he doth not say, that Agefilas made any answer

answer to it, and Tachus was not there. The sharp saying, which Athenæus ascribes to this king of Lacedæmon, would no doubt have found a place among the apophthegms, which Plutarch has left us of this prince, had it been founded upon good authority. Besides, is it probable, that a man who had so much occasion for the assistance of Agefilaus, would be so imprudent as to exasperate him by so severe a jest? I do not deny, but that Plutarch has observed, that Tachus's vanity made Agefilaus uneasy. *Ἐπειτα τὴν ἀλλαν ὠλαζομένην καὶ κενόφρονον τὴν Αἰγυπτιῶν βαρύνοντα.* Deinde reliqua Ægyptii insolentia & vanitate fatigatus (2). But once more, this Historian would not have forgot in this place the story of the mountain, and the quick repartee of Agefilaus. I verily believe, that Athenæus's narrative ought to be reduced to this. It was told this king of the Lacedæmo-

nians, that the Egyptians, after they had seen him so little, of whom they had formed so great an idea, had mentioned the mountain that brought forth a mouse: he probably replied, *they shall soon see, the mouse they saw on the sea-shore fight like a lion.* He did not pretend to threaten Tachus, but to fill him with hopes. I have heard say, that some French Generals, being in Germany, and observing, that the Germans had no good opinion of some of their regiments, because the soldiers were not tall, large, stout, and well-clothed, encouraged them with these words; *You shall see these little, lean, and meagre soldiers, fall on like lions, and make those great giants truckle.* However that be, one may learn by this account of Athenæus, true or false, a very important lesson; which is, that princes should never offend any body with raileries (3): it may sometimes cost them dear.

(2) Plutarch, in Vita Agefilæ, pag. 617.

(3) See the Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, for the month of March 1684, pag. 47.

TACITUS (CAIUS (a) CORNELIUS) a Roman Historian, who flourished in the first century. We know nothing of his ancestors, and probably the dignity of his family began in his own person. His first employ is said to have been that of procurator to Vespasian in Gallia Belgica [A]. Being returned to Rome, he received from the Emperor Titus a more honourable post (b). He was Prætor under the empire of Domitian [B], and Consul under Nerva [C]. But all these dignities gave him but very little glory, compared with that which he procured to himself by the performances of his pen. His Annals, and his History [D] are something admirable, and one of the greatest efforts of the human mind; whether you consider the singularity of the style, or attend to the beauty of the thoughts, and to that happy pencil, with which he knew how

(a) Others give him the prænomens of Publius, and are blamed for it.

(b) See the remark [A].

[A] Of Procurator to Vespasian in Gallia Belgica. You will find these words in the life of Tacitus, composed by Justus Lipsius. 'Initium dignitatis illi sub Vespasiano fuit, à quo Plinio auctore, procurator datus Gallie Belgicæ rationes principis administravit. -- The beginning of his promotion was under Vespasian, by whom, as we have it from Pliny, being made procurator in Gallia Belgica, he had the care of that prince's revenues.' I shall cite below (1) what Pliny says, and we shall there see, that he makes no mention of Vespasian. Why then is he cited as an author who informs us, that this emperor gave Tacitus that employ? Is it because Tacitus exercised this office under the empire of Vespasian? But does this give a right to ascribe to authors what they never said? However it be, there is little doubt but that Tacitus enjoyed this employ under Vespasian; which is grounded upon this: 'Dignitatem nostram à Vespasiano inchoatam, à Tito auctam, à Domitiano longius provecitam non abnuerim. (2) -- I do not deny but that my advancement was begun by Vespasian, seconded by Titus, and carried to a far greater height by Domitian.' They are Tacitus's own words. We shall see below (3) whether this opinion be well founded or not.

(1) In the remark [K].

(2) Tacitus, Hist. lib. i, cap. i.

(3) In the remark [K].

(4) Lipsius, in Vita Taciti, confutes him for it.

(5) It was in the year 84, of Rome, according to Lipsius, or 840, according to Calvisius.

(6) Tacitus, Annal. lib. xi, cap. xi.

(7) 849 according to Calvisius.

(8) Plinius, Epist. i, lib. ii.

[B] He was Prætor under the Emperor Domitian. Vertranus places this prætorship under the ninth consulship of this emperor (4), but he should have placed it under the 14th; for it falls in with the time in which Domitian celebrated the secular games: Now it is certain, that he celebrated them when he was consul for the 14th time (5). Let us cite Tacitus. 'Is (Domitianus) quoque edidit ludos sæculares; iisque intensius assui sacerdotio quinquaginta præditi, ac tum prætor. Quod non jactantia refero, sed quia collegio quinquaginta antiquitus ea cura, & magistratus potissimum exsequebantur officia cærimoniarum (6). -- Domitian also solemnized the secular games; at which I gave a constant attendance in regard to my office, being one of the college of priests, and at the same time prætor. Which I do not mention out of vanity, but because antiently that college, and especially that magistracy had always the direction of the ceremonies.'

[C] . . . and Consul under Nerva. He was substituted in the place of Virginus Rufus, who died in his third consulship, in the year of Rome 850 (7), and he honoured him with a funeral oration. 'Laudatus est à consule Cornelio Tacito, nam hic supremæ felicitati ejus cumulus accessit, laudator eloquentissimus (8). -- His funeral oration was spoken by Cornelius Tacitus, his good fortune met with this finishing stroke, a most eloquent Orator.'

[D] His Annals and his History. He wrote the History before the Annals; for he refers us to his History in the eleventh book of the Annals; he refers us thither, I say, about some things concerning Do-

mitian. 'Utriusque Principis rationes prætermittito, factis narratis libris quibus res Imperatoris Domitiani composui (9). -- I omit the purposes of both these Princes, having sufficiently explained them in my work concerning the History of Domitian.' Now it is certain (10) that his History extended from the reign of Galba inclusively to the reign of Nerva exclusively. He designed a particular work for the reigns of Nerva and Trajan, and that was the business he reserved for his old age: but I believe he never was able to put his design in execution. 'Quod si vita suppeditet, principatum Divi Nervæ, & Imperium Trajani, uberius seculioremque materiam senectuti seposui: rara temporum felicitate, ubi sentire quæ velis, & quæ sentias dicere licet (11). -- But if my life will permit, I shall reserve the reigns of Nerva and Trajan, as a more copious and secure subject for my old age; as we enjoy that rare felicity to think what we please, and say what we think.' These words shew, that he began his History, after the death of the Emperor Nerva, and during the life of Trajan: and therefore he gives the title of *Divus* to the first, which he does not give to the second. We have now but five books of his History left, which is but a very small part of it; for they do not contain above a year and an half, when the whole work ought to contain about twenty-nine years. Those who number these five books, as the continuation of the Annals divided into sixteen books, are to blame; for the Annals ought to be considered as a separate work. The author composed them after he had finished his History (12), they began at the death of Augustus, and were continued to that of Nero. We have but part of them left, namely, the four first books, some pages of the fifth, all the sixth, from the eleventh to the fifteenth, and part of the sixteenth: The two last years of Nero, and part of the foregoing year are wanting. These were the last books of the work. The five first books were found in Germany, by a Receiver of Leo X. He carried them to that Pope, and received a gratification of 500 crowns. 'Corbeia, quod ad Vifurgim Monasterium est, à quæstore Pontificio fuere inventi, qui eos ad Leonem X. detulit, ac ævri loco quingentos accepit aureos (13). -- At the abbey of Corwey, which is a monastery on the Weser, they were found by one of the Pope's Receivers, who presented them to Leo X, and received from him a reward of 500 gold crowns.' Philip Berroaldus had orders to publish them (14). I remember to have heard the late Mr Faure, Doctor of Divinity of the Faculty of Paris, say, that Leo X having published a brief, by which he promised not only indulgences to those who should discover Tacitus's manuscripts, but also money, and honour (15); there was a German, who searched all the libraries, and at last found

(9) Tacitus, Annal. lib. xi, cap. xi.

(10) See Tacitus, at the beginning of his History.

(11) Tacitus, Hist. lib. i, cap. i.

(12) See the proofs which Lipsius gives of it in the preface to his Commentaries on Tacitus.

(13) Vossius, de Hist. Lat. lib. i, cap. xxx, pag. 159.

(14) They were printed at Rome, an. 1515.

(15) That is, that their names should be prefixed with an elegy to what they should find out.

how to paint the disguises and cheats of Politicians, and the weakness of the passions. Not but that he may be censured for the affectation of his language, and for his inquiring into the secret motives of actions [E], and construing them to be criminal; but it is a great compliment to his understanding, to remark the esteem which several princes have had for his works [F]. A modern author has passed this judgment on them: *Tertullian charges him with telling us a great many falsehoods. He was not only an enemy to the true religion; but it appears from several passages that he had none at all. His style is certainly very obscure; nay it is sometimes harsh, and has not all the purity of good authors in the Latin tongue. Nevertheless, his art of comprizing a great deal of sense in a few words; his vivacity*

found some books of the Annals in the monastery of Corwey. He went and presented them to the Pope, who received them with great pleasure, and asked him what recompence he desired. The German was content to be re-imburfed the charges he had been at in going to view those libraries, and in his journey to Rome. Leo thought that was too little, and gave him more; and in order to procure him both honour and profit, he would have had him take the care of publishing this Tacitus. But the German excused himself, on account of his wanting the necessary abilities (16).

(16) Note, that Mr Faure said, that he had read this Narrative in the preface to the first edition of these books of Tacitus. See an eulogy on Mr Faure in the *Journal des Savans*, November 16, 1693, pag. 673, Dutch edition.

[E] Not but that he may be censured for the affectation of his language, and for his enquiring into the secret motives of actions. Muretus has made three Orationes in answer to those who have criticized Tacitus. Their criticisms were too sharp, and unjust in some respects: Therefore it was no hard matter for the apologist, who was a good Orator, and a subtle Rhetorician, to elude them. You may see in those Orationes what Tacitus is censured for. You will find the same thing also in Strada's *Prolegomena* (18). He is one of the most formidable enemies of Tacitus: he thereby displeased Paganinus Gaudentius (19), who not only criticized (20) many places of his History of the Low-Countries; but also undertook to justify Tacitus. This Gaudentius was no very stout champion: he understood a little of many things, but nothing perfectly. *Magis literis tinctus quam imbutus . . . nihil in ingenio solidum, cum per artes & disciplinas peregrinaretur nulli penitus infensus* (21). . . . He was rather superficially than deeply learned. . . . his judgment was not solid enough to dwell long upon any thing in the course of his studies. In my opinion, Cardinal du Perron has too much despised Tacitus (22).

(17) The xvith, xviiith, and xviiiith, of the second volume, in the Leipzig edition 1672.

(18) Lib. 1, Proleg. II.

(19) Professor at Pisa. He was of the country of the Grisons, if I am not mistaken.

(20) See his book, *de Candore Politico*, printed at Pisa, ann. 1646.

(21) Octav. Ferrarius, in *Prolegomena* cui *Titulus*, *Literarum* finis.

(22) See the *Perroniana* at the word *Styles*.

(23) Anonymiana, pag. 7.

(24) Ibid. p. 9.

(25) That is to say, La Mothe le Vayer.

(26) This is to be understood in general. See citation (28).

(27) Anonymiana, pag. 10.

The book intitled, *Anonymiana, or Miscellanies of Poetry, Oratory, and Learning*, which was printed at Paris in 1700, contains a discourse which is not very much in favour of our Historian. This is the judgment the author passes upon his style (23): 'Tacitus's Latin is very good, but too obscure to express what he would write. His difficult and contracted style might be esteemed any where else but in a History, where the whole ought to be clear and well established; and where the distance of facts, their variety, their epochas, and their changes, continually controverted, render it obscure enough in itself, without being made more so by the style. . . . (24) It is a mistake to pretend, that Tacitus's way of writing is commendable: if some wines are esteemed for a little bitterness, it is because that is occasioned by some good quality; but a harsh and rough way of writing will never gain reputation in a History. It is so far from raising the mind to greater knowledge, as this learned man pretends (25), that it perplexes and discourages it. Will any one say, for example, that Cæsar would have excited more attention, if he had been more obscure, and less natural? Does not he raise the mind to his own thoughts, which in reading his History ought to be always the just bounds of ours? Whereas in an obscure manner of writing, the mind of the reader roves where it pleases, when it is not tired, and forms imaginations which frequently have no exactness or proportion to the things. Cæsar, by his clearness, never gives occasion to desire more light in the actions he describes. I could readily subscribe to this judgment; and, in my opinion, what the author adds concerning the other affectation of Tacitus, is no less judicious (26). (27) Tacitus was an able Politician, and a yet more judicious writer: he has drawn very just consequences from the transactions of the reigns, of which he wrote the History, and has formed maxims from them for the

well governing of a state. But if he has sometimes assigned to the actions and commotions of the republic their true principles, if he has rightly unravelled their causes, it must be owned, that he has often supplied with too much nicety and penetration, those actions which had none: so true is it, that men characterize themselves in whatever they do, and that the writing of History never is in the hands in which it ought to be, when those who undertake it, being ignorant of the true cause of an action, assign to it that cause which they imagine to be the least sensible, and most concealed from the eyes of the people. They often happen to represent that as a particular secret, in the breast of the Prince, which was a matter public to all the world: and this is a fault so familiar with Tacitus (28), that I dare venture to say, supported otherwise by a great many good reasons, that it is paying him too great a compliment to take him for a very exact Historian, who has written according to rules. . . . (29) He has made choice of the nicest actions, and the most susceptible of the delicacies of art: those reigns to which he has principally applied himself in his History, are no small proof of this. In that of Tiberius, which is without dispute his master-piece, and in which he has best succeeded, he found a kind of government more adapted to the character of his genius. He loved, as I have said, to unfold the intrigues of the cabinet, to assign their causes, to turn pretences into designs, and deceitful appearances into realities. A genius too subtle, who saw some mystery in all the actions of this Prince. A sincere deference of his designs to the judgment of the Senate, was sometimes a snare laid for their integrity; sometimes a nice way of becoming their master; and always the art of making them the accomplices of his designs, and of executing them without any reproach. When he punished the seditions; it was an effect of his natural diffidence of the citizens, or some slight marks of anger spread among the people, to dispose their minds for greater cruelties. Here the contrariety of humours of two Generals, is a secret method of crossing the fortune of a competitor, and the means to lessen him in the affection of the people. The honours conferred on those that deserved them, were gentle ways of removing a rival, or of destroying an enemy, and always fatal recompences. In a word, Policy has a hand in every thing, vice and virtue are there equally dangerous, and favours as fatal as disgraces. Tiberius is never natural, he does not do the most ordinary actions of other men without design. His repose is never without consequence, and his motions are always full of contrivances. The other things which I have read in this dissertation of the author of the *Anonymiana*, are more liable, in my opinion, to be contradicted.

[F] The esteem which many Princes have had for his works. Pope Paul III, wore out his Tacitus by much reading of it. Cosmo de Medicis, the first Great Duke of Florence, accounted the reading of him his greatest pleasure. Muretus tells us this in finer words. *Paulus III P. M. quo nullum sapienterem senem nostrum vidit ætas, Tacitum sæpe relegendo contriverat, neque ullum profanum scriptorem æque libenter legebat. Cosmus Medicus, qui primus Magnus Etruriæ Dux fuit, homo factus ad imperandum, qui eam, quæ vulgo fortuna dicitur, in consilio & prudentia consistere docuit, Taciti libros in deliciis habebat, eorumque lectione avidissime fruebatur. Neque non hodie multi aut Principum, aut eorum, qui de summis rebus à Principibus in consilium adhibentur, eundem studiofissime legunt, & quasi pro magistro quodam prudentiæ habent* (30). . . . Pope Paul III, the most learned man of our age, wore out his

(28) The author should not therefore have said, that he was thought a more judicious writer, than an able politician.

(29) Anonymiana, p. 16, & seq.

(30) Moret. O. rat. XVI. Fd. ii, pag. 343. Edit. Lips. 1672. See Oratorem.

Heinli, pag. 4. and the preface of Arms Antiquas; and Piquet, Let. i, pag. 443, & 444.

vivacity in painting out events; the sagacity with which he penetrates through the darkness of the corrupt heart of men; the force and superiority of genius, which appear throughout the whole, makes him looked upon at this day almost universally as the chief of Historians (c). There have been so many translations of him, and so many comments upon him [G], that they alone might compose a tolerable library. I shall take notice of some faults in Justus Lipsius [H], la Mothe le Vayer, and Moreri [I]; and you will find in my remarks,

(c) Tillemont, History of the Emperors, Tom. ii, Part. i, pag. 357, of the Bruffels edition.

his Tacitus by frequently reading him, nor did he meet with so much pleasure in perusing any other profane writer. Cosmo de Medicis, who was the first Great Duke of Tuscany, and formed for governing, who taught that what is commonly called Fortune, consists in council and prudence, held the works of Tacitus in high esteem, and read them with the greatest delight. And at this very day, there are several Princes, and privy-counsellors to Princes, who read him with great application, and regard him as a sort of Oracle in Politics. I shall subjoin to this Latin passage, one from Balzac. It is taken from a letter he wrote to d'Abancourt, the 4th of June 1643. 'Tacitus being become your's, my ill opinion of him can subsist no longer. I cannot hate a man whom you love; and, to tell you the truth, I do believe that he is become more agreeable, and less thorny, by passing through your hands. The best of all is, that you have not deified yourself by meddling with dirty matters, and that among those excrements of Policy, your Morality is preserved in its purity. A Stoic Philosopher of the last century, as you may call Justus Lipsius, had the same taste for him that you have. A great General, as you may call, the Marquis of Spinola, has also translated him into his mother tongue, though his translation has not been published; and I inform you of this as a secret which I learned from one of his most intimate confidants (31). Add to this a passage of Guy Patin: Cornelius Tacitus, who is a State-breviary, or the first or chief master of the Secrets of the Cabinet, and whom Mr de Balzac calls somewhere, the ancient original of modern Policy, says, speaking of Tiberius, &c (32). We must remember in this place the great zeal of Leo X: I have taken notice of it above (33).

Let us join Queen Christina to the examples I have already given. Mr Chanut says, that she made the Greek tongue only her diversion in spare hours; and that the reading of this language, and others, did not keep her from her serious studies, so she called, among others, Tacitus's history, some pages of which she read constantly every day. This author, who exercised the most learned, was very familiar to her (34).

[G] There have been so many versions of him, and so many comments upon him. Mr Amelot de la Houfflaie, who has translated the six first books of the Annals into French, has prefixed to his translation a critical discourse, where you may find the names of a great many persons, who have laboured on this writer. There you may see the judgment that is passed on their labours, and on Tacitus's style and morals. All this is very curious. But you must not suppose that this French translator speaks in general of all those who have written on Tacitus, or who have translated him into other languages; he only speaks of the principal ones. I wish Peter Andrew Canonheri had named the eleven Commentators that he points at in these words: Præter hos sunt undecim qui Tacitum notis & commentariis illustrarunt (35). - - - Besides these there are eleven who have illustrated Tacitus with notes and commentaries. He had just before given a long list of those, qui ex professio de jure status conscripserunt. That list contains eight pages in 4to. I know some persons of good judgment, who make a great account of the critical commentaries on Tacitus, such as is that of Justus Lipsius, and slight very much the political commentaries with which Italy has infatuated Germany: for since the Germans have seen the dissertations of Scipione Ammirato, translated into Latin by Christopher Pflugius, a gentleman of Misina, they have been a little too much inclined to comment on Tacitus's works after that manner. Not but that one may profit by their writings, chiefly by those of Boeclerus (36). That which Berneggerus composed on the same Historian, is intermixed with Literature and Politics. He has therefore intitled it, *Questiones Miscellaneæ*. The French did not bite at the hook, when John Baudouin

added to his translation of Tacitus (37), accompanied with notes, a translation of Scipione Ammirato.

[H] I shall take notice of some faults in Justus Lipsius.

I. I have already observed (38), that he makes Pliny say more than he should have done. II. He chafes rather to believe, that Tacitus was the first of his family who enjoyed any honours, and that this family was not very illustrious, than to believe, that his father had any office: and nevertheless, in another place, he understands of his father, what Pliny says of Cornelius Tacitus, a Roman knight, and procurator of the demesne in Gallia Belgica. Let us compare these two passages of Lipsius together. Here is the first. 'Pater avulque honores gesserint, & ad remp. accesserint, necne, ut re vetustâ & incertâ nihil adfirmem: prius à verò abest, ipsum primum jus imaginis & honores in familiam non nimis illustrem intulisse. Initium dignitatis illi sub Vespasiano fuit, à quo, Plinio auctore, procurator datus Gallie Belgicæ, rationes Principis administravit, quæ dignitas equestri ordini diu peculiaris fuit (39). - - - Whether his father and grandfather were honoured with any offices, or had any employments in the common-wealth, I cannot take upon me to determine, this being a point of great antiquity and uncertainty: it is most probable, that the grandeur and honours of his family, not before that time ever illustrious, were wholly owing to himself. His first advancement was under Vespasian, by whom, according to Pliny, he was made Procurator of Gallia Belgica, and had the care of that Prince's revenues, which was a dignity long peculiar to the equestrian order.' Here is the other, which serves for a commentary on these words of Tacitus: *Dignitatem nostram à Vespasiano inchoatam*; - - - Our dignity begun by Vespasian. How can this be, says Lipsius? 'Quomodo, quia Procurator sub illo Belgicæ? E Plinio id suspicere, sed suspicere tantum, imò verius id ceperis de hujus patre. Intellege ergo dignitatem ejus inchoatam à Vespasiano, quod ab eo laticlavus factus, & relatus in ordinem primum (40). - - - What, because he was under him Procurator of Gallia Belgica? This account of Pliny is to be suspected, nay, more than suspected, for it will be more truly understood of his father. The meaning therefore of his dignity being begun by Vespasian, is, that he made him a senator, and ranked him in that supreme order.' Lipsius will have it, in the first of these two passages, that Pliny says, that Tacitus was honoured with a commission by Vespasian; and in the other he will have it, that this is meant of Tacitus's father. According to this last case, this Historian had for his father a knight promoted by the Emperor to honourable employments; and that which to Lipsius did not appear likely, would nevertheless be very true. No body can deny, but that this office of Procurator was very honourable; they attributed to it, under the Emperor Claudius, the authority of Judicature, and that without appeal (41). Consult the learned Gutherius (42): and tho' Augustus had conferred this office on some freed-men (43). Tacitus did nevertheless look upon it as an appendage of knighthood; 'Utrumque avum procuratorem Cæsarum habuit (Agricola) quæ equestris nobilitas est (44). - - - Both Agricola's grandfathers were procurators under the Cæsars, which is an honour belonging to the equestrian order.' III. Lipsius asserts, that Tacitus being grown grey-headed at the bar, devoted his old age to the writing of history. *Historiæ scribendæ senex demum vacavit, cum reliquum ætatis in foro & causis orandis egisset*. But if it be so, how comes it, that Tacitus declares, that he undertakes to write a history which is to extend from the death of Nero to that of Domitian; and that he reserves for his old age the empire of Nerva and Trajan? *Quod si vita suppediet, principatum divi Nervæ, & imperium Trajani, uberiorem securioremque materiam senectuti seposui* (45). One may here apply to Lipsius the proverb, *Sorex suo indicio perit*, - - - He has betrayed himself. He tells us (46), that he has very nearly made

(37) Printed at Paris in 4to, ann. 1628.

(38) In the remark [A].

(39) Just. Lipsius in Vita Taciti in limine Commentar. ad Tacitum.

(40) Lipsius, in Tacit. Histor. lib. i, tit. pag. 451.

(41) Eodem anno sepius audita vox Principis, parum vim rerum habendam à procuratoribus suis judicaturum, ac si ipse statisset. Ac ne fortuito prolapsus videretur, Senatus quoque consulto cautum, plenius quam antea & uberius. Tacitus, Annal. lib. xii, cap. ix.

(42) Gutherius, de Officiis Domus Augustæ, lib. iii, cap. xxxiii.

(43) Dio, lib. lvi, pag. 506.

(44) Tacit. in Vita Agricolæ, cap. iv.

(45) Tacit. Histor. lib. i, cap. i.

(46) Lipsius, in Vita Taciti.

(31) Balzac's Letter to d'Abancourt. It is the sixth of book xii, and the sixth of the third part of the choice Letters, p. 128, Amsterdam edition, 1656.

(32) Patin, Letter cxcvi, pag. 171, Tom. ii.

(33) In the remark [D].

(34) See Baillet's Life of Des Cartes, Tom. ii, pag. 305.

(35) Petrus Andreas Canonheri, Philologus, Medicus, ac Sacre Theologie Doctor Romanus, in Dissertationibus Politicis ac Historicis variis in C. Cornelii Taciti Annalium Libris, pag. 66, Edit. Franc. 1610.

(36) I have seen a political Commentary, which he published anno 1643, on the fifteen first chapters of the first book of Tacitus's Annals, and a like Commentary which he published, anno 1648, on the History of the same author.

V O L. V.

B b b b

remarks, several particulars, which relate to the life of Tacitus. He married the daughter

out the year of Tacitus's nativity, which is thus: Pliny the younger, almost of the same age with Tacitus (47), was in his eighteenth year when his uncle died; that is to say, according to Lipsius, the second year of the reign of Titus. He was therefore born in the year of Rome 816; so that Tacitus being a little older than he, must have been born the last year of the Emperor Claudius, or rather, the first year of Nero. Whereupon, I say, that he was therefore but forty-four years of age when Trajan ascended the throne: and since nothing obliges us to put back the beginning of his work beyond the second, or the third year of this prince, it manifestly follows, that he was not old when he began to apply himself to it. It is certain, supposing that he undertook this work in his forty-fifth year, that it may be much better conceived that he had time to finish it, and afterwards to go about his Annals, which he carried on from the beginning of Tiberius's reign, to the death of Nero. And observe, that in writing his Annals, he proposed to himself a new enterprize when he should have finished them (48). Observe also, that his manner of writing required much time, every thing in it favours of pains, meditation, polishing, study, and the *sfina lente*. And lastly, observe, that the letters Pliny the younger wrote to him, either to intreat him to make mention of him, or to communicate to him some memoirs concerning the death of his uncle, *seem to be of the year 102 or 103* (49); that is, of the fifth or sixth year of Trajan. Now it is certain, that Tacitus was then writing his history; and since there is great likelihood that he was not far from the time when the fire of mount Vesuvius destroyed Pliny the Naturalist, in the first or second year of Titus, we may fairly judge, that he did not long defer the beginning of his work after the installation of Trajan. IV. Lipsius conjectures (50), that Tacitus's history contained twenty books. The ground he goes upon is this, that it contained an interval of twenty-one years; and that the five first books relate only the actions of a year and some months. This is a falsity in fact, and a prodigious forgetfulness of the rule of proportion. There are more than twenty-eight years between the death of Nero, and that of Domitian, which are the two boundaries of Tacitus's history: and no man that understands the Rule of Three would reason after this manner; If fifteen months take up five books, twenty-one years take up twenty books. Note, that the years that are lost of the history of Tacitus, are not at all, in the main, less fruitful in events, than those that are left. St Jerom says, that Tacitus composed the History of the Emperors, in thirty books, from Tiberius to the death of Domitian (51). This testimony can be of no use, because the History of Tacitus does not begin at the death of Augustus; and there is no likelihood that this work and his Annals contained but thirty books. So that St Jerom has not well expressed himself. See the margin (52).

(47) See Epistle xx, of the 7th book of Pliny.

(48) Sed aliorum exitus, simul cetera illius ætatis memorabo, si effectis in quæ tendi, plures ad curas vitam produxero. Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. iii, cap. xxiiv.

(49) Tillemont, History of the Emperors, Tom. ii, Part. i, pag. 350.

(50) Lipsius, in *Præfat.* Comment. ad Hist. Tacit.

(51) Hieronym. in Zachariam, lib. v, cap. xiv, apud Vossium de Hist. Lat. pag. 159.

(52) Note, that the book which we reckon the fifth in the History of Tacitus, is cited as the fifth by Tertullian, in *Libello de Spectaculis*.

(53) Lucan died under Nero.

The greatest part of these mistakes of Justus Lipsius are to be found in the writings of the most learned men, who have spoken of Tacitus historically. I excuse them: for who could believe, that so able a writer had committed them in a work very short, and framed in such a manner as to make us believe, that the author of it had very attentively weighed all his words? I do not think, that his conjecture concerning the year of Tacitus's nativity is amiss, which shews a gross error of Francis Garasse, who believed, that Lucan's *Pharsalia* is later than Tacitus's History (53). His words are these: The first objection 'may be of those who imagine, that God takes pleasure in our calamities, and is delighted to see us exposed to tempests, rebellions, and wars, as tho' we had a barbarous and revengeful God, who bathes himself in the blood of men. Such are, in some measure, the pompous objections, and atheistical sentences of Tacitus and of Lucan, who was, in his time, accounted the father of Atheists: for they say in express terms; *Tot Romanæ Republicæ clades manifestum est fuisse curæ Diis VINDICTAM, non fuisse SALUTEM: that is to say, by so many calamities, and by the divers disorders which have shaken the Republic of Rome, it plainly appears, that the gods take care to be revenged on us, and not to succour us. These*

are the words of Tacitus, in the first book of his History; and Lucan, who perhaps had it from him, as an aphorism, who borrows venom from the viper, says, in lofty terms.

Felix Roma quidem, civesque habitura superbos,
Si LIBERTATIS Superis tam cura fuisset,
Quàm VINDICTA placet, &c.

Rome, says he, would be the most happy city in the world, if GOD took as much care of our liberty, as he delights in revenge (54).

[I]n *la Mothe le Vayer, and Moreri*.] The first of these two authors says (55), that the twelve last years of Nero are wanting in Tacitus's Annals. This is false: the two last years, and part of the preceding, are only wanting: this is the first fault. The second, is to say, that this author's history reached to the happy government of Trajan. A new mistake: it ended at the death of Domitian. III. It is not true, that, according to the conjectures of Lipsius, we have lost ten books of Tacitus's history: for, according to his conjectures, this work comprehended twenty books; therefore, since there remain but five, we have lost fifteen, according to the opinion of this Critic. IV. This author should not have said (56), that there are at least twenty-one years from Galba to Nerva. This is a fault of Lipsius which I have refuted, and which Vossius has also committed (57). V. It is not to be wondered at, if Tacitus having imitated Thucydides, and both of them Demosthenes . . . the first has retained I know not what harshness or austerity, which has always been observed in the style of those two Grecians (58). These words of la Mothe le Vayer contain a prodigious anachronism; for Demosthenes was much later than Thucydides. VI. The Emperor Tacitus, in that supreme dignity of the world, wherein he was placed, did, nevertheless, about two hundred years after the death of this Historian, of whom we speak, glory in the name that was common to them both, esteeming himself honoured to have him for his ancestor, and to be taken for one of his posterity. He caused his statue to be set up in all libraries, and his works to be written out ten times every year; to the end that they might pass from hand to hand, and from age to age, as they have done even to ours (59). This account is not exact: it supposes, that this emperor reigned a certain number of years; for otherwise it would be absurd to say, that he caused such or such a thing to be done every year. However it is certain, that his reign lasted only about six months. Besides, this account supposes the event answered this emperor's intentions; that is, that the books of Tacitus did pass from age to age down to ours, according to the design of the Prince who caused them to be transcribed: and yet there remains with us but a very small part of them. I do not much wonder, that the care of this emperor should not have procured to us the preservation of all the works of his ancestor: for, considering the short duration of his empire, I believe the execution of his orders went but a very little way. However it be, here is what he ordered (60): 'Cornelium Tacitum, scriptorem historiarum Augustæ, quod parentem suum eundem diceret, in omnibus bibliothecis collocari jussit: & ne lectorum incuria deperiret, librum per annos singulos decies scribi publicitus in eicis (61) archiis jussit, & in bibliothecis poni. . . . He commanded that Cornelius Tacitus, the Historian of the Cæsars, because he owned him for his ancestor, should be placed in all the libraries: and that, to prevent his works from being lost by the negligence of his readers, they should be publicly transcribed ten times in every year, and put up in the libraries.' VII. La Mothe le Vayer concludes this chapter with these words: 'It is also well known, that Tacitus did not go about writing, till he was far advanced in years, after the empire of Nerva, and under that of Trajan, as we learn from himself (62).' Here are two faults: for, in the first place, the Historian speaks not one word of his age; and, in the second place, it is very wrong to conclude that he was an old man, because he composed his work under the empire of Trajan. See the preceding remark (63). VIII. The clamours of La Mothe le Vayer against two Civilians, who spoke

(54) Garasse, *Somme Theologique*, pag. 440, 441.

(55) La Mothe le Vayer, *Jugement on the principal Historians*, pag. 307, Tom. iii, Edit. in 12mo.

(56) *Ibid.* pag. 308.

(57) Vossius, de Hist. Lat. pag. 159.

(58) La Mothe le Vayer, *ubi supra*, pag. 209.

(59) *Ibid.* pag. 216.

(60) Vossius, in Tacito Imperatore, cap. x, pag. m. 618, 1/2, ii, *Scriptorum Hist. Augustæ*.

(61) This word is without doubt corrupted; the manuscripts vary much; Casaubon and Salmasius have not ventured to decide any thing.

(62) La Mothe le Vayer, *ubi supra*, pag. 219.

(63) Numero III.

daughter of Agricola, whose life he wrote. Several people believe he had a son, of whom Pliny relates a very extraordinary thing [K]. It is an idle fancy to pretend that Domitian

ill of Tacitus's Latin, appear to me very ill founded. He accounts those two persons, in this their delirium, more worthy of pity, than of an answer (64). He adds

(64) La Mothe le Vayer, ubi supra, pag. 209.

(65) Ibid. pag. 210.

(66) Ibid. pag. 212, 213.

(67) It is prefixed to the first volume of the Histories of Paul Jovius.

(68) Vossius, de Hist. Latin. pag. 160.

(69) Emil. Ferretus, in Castig. ad Tacitum, apud Petr. Andream Canonherium, Discurs. Polit. in C. Tacitum, pag. 2.

(70) Canonher. ibid. pag. 3.

(71) La Mothe le Vayer, ubi supra, pag. 209.

very much corrupted. He had therefore no reason to fall into so great a passion against Alciatus and Ferretus. He should not have exaggerated the clamours and invectives of Muretus (72). He neither spoke the truth, nor his own thoughts, when he said, that the cooks and mule-drivers of the ancient authors spoke, and understood the Latin tongue better, than the most learned among the Moderns, either speak or understand it. *Quorum coqui & muliones multo melius quam omnes nos Latine & intelligebant & loquebantur* (73). He would have been offended at this hyperbole, if another person had offered to include him in it; and there is no doubt but that he believed himself much more master of the Latin tongue than the common citizens of ancient Rome. He might be also in the right; for it is certain, that there are some foreigners, who without having seen France, speak and understand our tongue better than several Frenchmen: And I am sure, that Casaubon and Salmastius wrote better in Latin, than in their own tongue. If Mr de Tillemont (74) were to be treated at this time, as Alciatus was, there would appear a great deal of pedantry in such a censure. Balthasar Bonifacius, a great admirer of Tacitus, does nevertheless own, that his style is harsh. 'Stylus magis gravis quam elegans, asper enim parumque duriculus est, atque à Latine linguæ candore discedens (75). . . . His style is rather grave than elegant, being a little harsh and rough, and degenerating from the purity of the Latin tongue.' As for what concerns Mr Moreri, he may be blamed, first, for having a little too much exalted Tacitus's birth. II. For having asserted, that Tacitus was very old when he began his History under the empire of Trajan. III. And that the author himself observes it. He has avoided the over-sights of Charles Stephens; for he has not made this Historian flourish from the empire of Tiberius, the year of Rome 767, till the time of Vespasian, ann. 822 (76). He does not say that Tacitus, an illustrious Orator under Hadrian, lived to the time of the Vespasians, and that they promoted him to dignities, and that his History extends from Augustus to Hadrian (77). Lloyd and Hoffman have adopted all these last faults. I believe Charles Stephens copied them from Gesner (78), who had copied them from Volaterranus (79).

[K] A son, of whom Pliny relates a very extraordinary thing.] Here it is, according to Du Pinet's version. 'We read in the Chronicles, that at Salamis one named Euthymenes had a son, who in three years grew three cubits: he was very unwieldy and heavy both in motion and understanding, and yet he had got a downy beard, and a strong voice; but as soon as he was three years of age, he died suddenly with a contraction of the nerves. I have seen myself something like this, setting aside that he had no hair on the privities, in the son of Cornelius Tacitus, a Roman knight, and receiver and treasurer of Gallia Belgica.' I quote the old French version, on purpose to have an opportunity of observing, that some people pretend, that the translator did not well understand his original. These are the words of Pliny, in the edition of Father Hardouin. *Invenimus in monumentis Salamine Euthymenis filium, in tria cubita triennio adolevisse, incessu tardum, sensu hebetem, & jam puberem factum voce robusta, assumptum contractione membrorum subita, triennio circumcincto. Ipsi non pridem vidimus eadem ferme omnia, præter pubertatem, in filio Cornelii Taciti Equitis Romani, Belgicæ Gallie rationes procurantis* (80). This signifies, as some would have it, that the son of Euthymenes, having grown three cubits in three years, began immediately to decrease, and was consumed at the end of three years. He lived therefore six years. I shall not decide on these two versions: but that of du Pinet does not seem to me the worst (81). I insist more upon what follows. It can not be proved from this passage, that our Tacitus had an employ in Gaul; for it is not true that Pliny speaks of him. Let us remember, that Tacitus did not marry till after Agricola, his father-in-law, had been consul. Here is the proof of it. 'Consul egregie tum spei filiam juveni mihi despondet, ac post consulatum collocavit, & statim Britannicæ præpositus est' (82). . . .

(72) See the 17th oration of the 1st volume of Muretus.

(73) Muret. ibid. pag. m. 354. The Abbot Pichon, Præfat. in Tacit. in usum Delphini, says in like manner, that the censurers of Tacitus are rude & barbari, præ equione aut colono ipsius Taciti.

(74) See his words in the text of this article.

(75) These words are related as being of Balthasar Bonifacius in the Prolegomena to Tacitus in usum Delphini.

(76) Carol. Stephanus, in Diction. voce Cornelius.

(77) Id. ibid. voce Tacitus.

(78) Gesner, in Biblioth. voce Publius, folio 572, verso.

(79) Volaterranus lib. xx, circa init. pag. m. 717, 718.

(80) Plin. lib. vii, cap. xvi, pag. m. 35, 37. Vide Senecam de Consolatione ad Marciam, cap. xxiii, pag. 762.

(81) See Salmastius in Solinum, Tom. i, pag. 44.

(82) Tacit. in Vita Agricolæ, cap. ix.

Domitian banished him [L]; and perhaps it is another, to say that he lived eighty years [M].

'The Consul agreed to marry his daughter to me, a young lady of great hopes, which he accordingly did as soon as his consulship was finished, and was himself immediately after made Prefect of Britain.' The consulship of Agricola, according to the most probable opinion (83), falls in with the 77th year of Jesus Christ; we must therefore hold, that Tacitus married in the 78th.

(83) See Tillemont, note 3, on the History of Titus, pag. m. 853, 854.

(84) See ibid. note 4, pag. 855.

(85) Note, that Pliny, lib. x, cap. xlii, p. m. 435, shews that he began this work before the death of Agrippina.

(86) See the *Notæ & Emendationes* of Father Hardouin, on the seventh book of Pliny, num. 65, pag. 119.

(87) In his Commentary on those words of Pliny, pag. 37.

(88) This would make me doubt, whether he was the father of the Historian.

(89) Tillemont, ubi supra, Tom. ii, Part. i, pag. 348.

+ Rationatoris honore ulurus secundum.

It appears, that this child died, aged three years, without strength or sense. Pliny had seen him a long time before, *pridem*. And so Tacitus his father, who had some children, before the year 77, in which Pliny wrote, is not the Historian, as Vossius thinks *de Hist. Lat. lib. i, cap. xxx, pag. 158*.

(90) In the Life of Tacitus. But he judged better of the thing in his Commentary, in lib. i, Hist. init. See, above, citation (40).

(91) Balch. Bonifacius, de Scripturibus Historie Romanæ.

Now Pliny died in the 79th or 80th year (84). Consequently he could not have seen a son of Tacitus who had such an extraordinary growth at three years. I do not bid you to observe, that he makes mention of this prodigious growth in the seventh book of his Natural History, a work divided into 37 books: I have no design to infer from thence, that it is very probable he had seen this some years before he finished that work; for it may be answered me, that he probably revised it after he had finished it, and that he might every where make use of the time of that revision for the date of the whole piece. We find the same date in the fourth chapter of the fourteenth book, and in the second chapter of the twenty-eighth book. The author in these two places points at the 830th year of Rome, which is the 77th of the Christian Æra. This is enough to make my objection good. Besides he says that he had seen, a long time before, this extraordinary growth, *nos pridem vidimus* (85). I know very well, that Father Hardouin has corrected these words, and has put *non pridem vidimus*. I shall let this correction of his pass; it can do me no harm, for though it should be supposed, that Pliny wrote this chapter of his History a few days after he had seen this tall child, it is not possible, that this Roman knight, of whom he speaks, should be our Tacitus. And therefore I do confidently assert, that the reason for which this commentator reads *non pridem* instead of *nos pridem*, is frivolous; he goes upon the false supposition that Pliny means the Historian, of whom I am speaking (86). He applies to him (87) the inscription recited by Reinefius; but he should have taken notice, that it was made by Cornelius Verus Tacitus (88). Now no body ever put Verus among the names of Tacitus. He may have had for his father, they are the words of Mr de Tillemont (89), *Cornelius Tacitus, a Roman knight, intendant of Gallia Belgica, [that is probably] Cornelius Verus Tacitus, of whom there is an inscription found in the country of Juliers, made when he was going to exercise a second intendantship. [Thus he had been intendant of Gallia Belgica, and the Lower Germany where Juliers is.] This intendant had a son, of whom Pliny & the Naturalist relate something extraordinary, in taking notice, that he was dead at that time: [So that this is not the Historian.]* Those who from henceforward will attribute to Tacitus an employ in Gaul under Vespasian, will do well to look for better proofs than this passage of Pliny. How many learned men have been misled by it? Lippius (90) and Vossius are not the only persons. Nay, there are some, who might be censured, even though it could be reasonably pretended, that Pliny spoke of our Tacitus; for they suppose he had great military preferments, and that he governed the Lower Germany in the quality of Pro-consul. They even pretend that becoming at that time acquainted with the manners and laws of the Germans, he wrote concerning them, during his Pro-consulship the work we now have. 'Flourit diutissime in militari urbanaque disciplina & Proconsul Germaniam infirmior obtinuit, quo tempore Germanorum mores, instituta, ritus, tanta diligentia perscripsit, ut uni Tacito suam antiquitatem Germani acceptam ferant. . . . He enjoyed great posts a long time both civil and military, and obtained the Pro-consulship of the Lower Germany, at which time he wrote with so much accuracy concerning the manners, laws, and rites of the Germans, that the Germans owe the account of their antiquity to Tacitus alone.' This is what Bodin says, in his treatise concerning the method of History. Balthasar Bonifacius (91) has transcribed him without any alteration. Mr Pichon meant without doubt that Tacitus was governor of Gallia Belgica. This title is too

great. However it be, here is what he says, in his Epistle Dedicatory to his Tacitus IN USUM DEDICATO. PHINI. 'Hoc autem oportet esse Tibi TACITUM acceptiorem, quod olim in Gallia tua, & quidem Belgica, quæ maximè rectoris impatiens, obtinuit Imperium, & quod hic forsitan ea ipsa meditatus est, & usu didicit, quæ scriptis mandaret ac posteris relinqueret. . . . But Tacitus ought to be the more acceptable to you on this account, because he himself formerly obtained the government of this your kingdom of France, which of all others is a country the most impatient of a ruler; and because it is very probable that in this very place he studied and became master of those subjects, which he has left explained in his writings for posterity.'

[L] It is an idle fancy to pretend, that Domitian banished him. There are some who are not content with asserting this, but even compute the duration of this exile; they make it amount to ten years, and then conclude it by the efficacy of an intercession that wrought upon Domitian. This exile in general is not founded on any proof; and as to the duration of it, it is invincibly refuted by the words of Tacitus, mentioned above in the remark [B]. They are those wherein he tells us, that he exercised the Prætorship at Rome, when Domitian celebrated the secular games. They were celebrated in the seventh year of Domitian's reign, and after that time this Prince lived not quite eight years (92). We are beholden to Lippius for having observed, that this mistake owes its rise to a vulgar custom, which makes people fond of representing illustrious men under remarkable misfortunes. This error might also proceed from a wrong method of reasoning. It was concluded, that since Domitian set himself up as a persecutor of good men, he did not spare Tacitus, who was a man of honour, and in great reputation. These consequences are too vulgar, and authors ought not to draw them. 'Exulasse sub

Domitiano quidam tradiderunt, magis tamen ut opinor, pro more vulgi, qui magnis viris insignes casus adfingere amat, quam quod ejus rei certus auctor sit. Ego legendo non aliud comperio, quam abuisse eum aliquot annis ab urbe, idque eo ipso tempore quo Julius Agricola focer ejus mortem obierit coss. Pompejo Conlega, & Cor. Prisco, non tam exilii necessitate, ut arbitror, quam tadio temporum & cupidine otii. Nam quod iidem, ut omni ex parte tam anxia diligentia consuet, decennium in exilio egisse scribunt, ac demum exorato Domitiano restitutum, Latine ut loquar, inanis fabula est (93). . . . Some have said he was banished by Domitian, but more, in my opinion, in compliance with the vulgar notion, which loves to ascribe eminent misfortunes to eminent men, than out of any just authority for it. I could never in all my reading discover any thing surer, than that he was absent for some years from Rome, and that this happened at the time of Julius Agricola his father-in-law's death, in the consulship of Pompeius Conlega, and Cor. Priscus, not so much, I think, because he was forced to it, as from a dislike of the times, and a desire of ease. For what the same authors, are so busy to say, that his banishment continued ten years, and that at last he was pardoned by the favour of Domitian, is, to speak plainly, an idle tale.' I observe also, that, though this Historian (94) has described the tyranny of Domitian in the strongest colours, yet he has not in the least insinuated, that the storm fell upon him personally. On the contrary, he acknowledges, that he had some obligations to that Prince; and is afraid that he should be suspected of suppressing the truth by way of gratitude (95). A man who had been banished, would hardly have expressed himself after this manner.

[M] And it is perhaps another, to say that he lived eighty years. The testimony I am going to cite is of no great weight. 'Vixit annos 80 ut legitur in lib. 3. Thef. Histor. (96). . . . He lived 80 years, as we read in Thef. Histor. B. 3.'

(92) See Lippius, in Vita Taciti.

(93) Lippius.

(94) In Vita Agricola, cap. ii, pag. 44, 45.

(95) See the beginning of book i, of his History.

(96) Canonbadius, in Vita Corn. Taciti, lib. i. Dicitur saum Poliorum.

T A I S N I E R (JOHN) in Latin *Taisnerius*, was of Ath in Hainault (a). He was preceptor to the pages of Charles V, and followed this emperor in his expedition to Tunis. He read some Mathematical lectures at Rome and Ferrara; and after he had travelled a long time, he devoted himself entirely to the writing of books (b); but making choice of a subject very unworthy of a man of judgment, he lost all his reputation (c). He betook himself to Chiromancy; and though he had gained the credit of being very successful in it, nevertheless by the great bulk of his book [A], he tired those who were desirous to benefit themselves by his instructions. Many persons were so simple as to send him the picture of their hands, on purpose that he might tell them their fortunes (d). Consult Moreri's Dictionary and Bullart's *Academie*. They speak at large of our Taisnerius; but whether with that order and exactness that is necessary, is what I shall examine another time. There is nothing to be found in them, concerning his being a Plagiary [B], of which he has been accused.

(a) Valer. Andreas Desfilius, Bibl. Belg. pag. 570.

(b) Jacobus Philippus Tomafius, Elog. Viro-rum illustrium, pag. 161, 162, Edit. Patav. 1630.

(c) Bullart, Acad. des Sciences, Tom. II, pag. 288, 289.

(d) See the remark [A].

[A] He nevertheleſt tired by the great bulk of his book. Consult Jacobus Philippus Tomafius; there you will find these words: 'Uno volumine quacun- que Chiromantiam attingeret complexus est. At crescente illo in vastam molem factum est ut studen- tium animos defatigarit quos sibi proposuerat erudi- endos (1). - - - He comprized in one volume every thing relating to Chiromancy. But this swelling to a prodi- gious size, wearied out the patience of the persons for whose instruction he had compiled it.' If you would know the credit this man acquired by his Chiromantic Quackery, read this passage of the same author. 'Di- viniandi munere ex manuum lineis temperamenti signa, & animi characteres varios colligebat, & spre- tis geniturum laboriosis supputationibus, ignaras curiosorum mentes, rerum suarum sciscitantibus even- tus, vaticiniis circumducebat. Jamque Viri quoque gravissimi fide prædictionibus illius haberi ceptâ, ei typos manuum suarum lineis effigiarum undique demandabant, & ab ejusdem ore, ut de privatis rebus statuerent, pendebant (2). - - - By his art of Di- vination, he found out the several temperaments, and dispositions of the mind, from the lines on the hand, and despising the tedious method of calculating nativities, he drew after him by his predictions, the ignorant minds of such as were curious to know their fortunes. And now even the most serious persons also, from the credit his art had obtained, sent him from all parts the figures of their hands, with the lines marked upon them, and depended, for the conduct of their private affairs, on what he should pronounce.'

(1) Jacob. Phil-ippus Tomafius, Elog. pag. 162.

(2) Id. ibid. pag. 161.

[B] Concerning his being a Plagiary, of which he has been accused. It is pretended that he did not content himself to steal some thoughts, but that he appropriated to himself entire books, which others had published. Gabriel Naudæus reproaches him with this, with respect to a book of Bartholomew Cocles, concerning Physiognomy; and with respect to a book of Peter Peregrinus, concerning the loadstone. He de- fames him, as he deserves, for those thieveries com- mitted with such assurance. This was not committing petty-larceny, or adding the part of a pick-pocket in the Republic of Letters; but that of a corsair of Barbary: this case deserved immediate punishment on Parnassus. Let us see after what manner Gabriel Naudæus exercises justice. 'Inter recentiores qui artem ejusmodi (crisim Physiognomicam) scriptis explicarunt, potiores semper habe- re Augustinum Niphum, & Camillum Baldum, erudi- tissimos Aristotelis commentatores: Bartholomæumque Coclitum Bononiensem cujus integrum librum conva- savit, ac in suum opus mathematicum transtulit, Jo- annes Taisnerus, plagiarius insignis, & imprudentior longe Horatii Corniculâ, cum præterea tractatum editum de Magnete, à Petro Peregrino Gallo quondam editum, furto vendicavit. Quod equidem velut per transennam observandum esse duxi, ut suis bene de Republica literaria meritis honos asseratur, & ipse Taisnerus,

(3) Gabriel Nau- dæus, Bibliogra- phia Politica, pag. m. 62, 63.

Regali conspectus in auro nuper & ostro, Migret in obscuras furci mente tabernas (3). - - - Among the moderns who have wrote upon this Art (Judicial Physiognomy) you ought to esteem Augustinus Niphus; and Camillus Baldus the chief, those most learned Commentators on Aristotle: as also Bartholo- mæus Cocles of Bononia, whose whole book was pyrated, by Johannes Taisnerus, that notorious Plagiary, far more ridiculous than Horace's crow; having besides this stolen a whole treatise concerning the loadstone, written by

Petrus Peregrinus, a Frenchman. Which is indeed an observation I thought proper to make by the way, that those who have justly merited of the Republic of Learn- ing may have their due honours vindicated, and that even Taisnerus himself,

Who lately such a noble figure made, With stolen robes, may seek his native shade.

Thomafius was not ignorant of this public accusation, against Taisnerius; he has mentioned it in his list of Plagiaries (4): but he did not know, nor perhaps Naudæus neither, that in the year 1574, an Italian Mathematician, published severe reflexions, and a ter- rible invective against the same Plagiary. All that he has said about it deserves to be repeated in this place. It will furnish us both with some universal instructions, relating to these thieves, and some particulars con- cerning the person we are speaking of. Besides, the book from which I have taken all this is very scarce. 'Si hos non laudamus qui aliquid ab aliis sunt mu- tuati, quid de manifestis furibus dicemus, qui vel ipsa integra aliorum volumina sibi imprudentes ad- scribunt, & quasi steriles ac scelesti plagiarii, viven- tium filiorum (est enim haud dubiè legitima proles quicquid secundum ingenium longo studio concepit, & peperit) miserandas infligunt piis parentibus or- bitates, & se, summa cum jactantia, eorum operum auctores mentiuntur, quæ magna cum infamia rap- erunt, ut fecit impurissimus omnium Joannes Taisne- rus Hannonius. Qui opusculum nostrum, demon- strationis proportionum motuum localium contra Ari- stotelem, & alios philosophos, jamdiu antea à nobis editum, & iterum impressum Venetiis anno salutis 1554, ita integrum sibi desumpsit, ut nihil præter auctoris nomen immutaverit, quid enim mutavisset, qui nec percipere poterat, quæ in ea disputatione continerentur? Homo vanus ab omni mathematica facultate alienus, qui merito propter crassissimam ig- norantiam verebatur, ne vel aliqua Syllaba sublatâ, aut addita totius tractationis inficeretur substantia. Credit (ut opinor) me jam vita functum qui furti nunquam argui posse confidit, & non intellexit suam temeritatem, qui seipsum mille argumentis qualis effect prodidit; dum utre inflato inanior sese juris docto- rem, & simul etiam musici facelli rectorem asseruit, quasi jura docere sit musici, aut jurisperiti facellum regere, & dum de magnete, & motibus, tractatus emisit, nusquam in titulis se mathematicum nomi- navit, sed poetam, eo quod crediderit poetæ, aut musici, aut jurisperiti, esse de naturalibus motibus cor- porum differere. Debebat saltem & in hoc mentiri infamis impostor, ut se mathematicum in titulis prædicaret, ut in præfatione ad lectorem ejusdem usurpati opusculi fecit, dum se matheos publice legisse Ferrariæ, & alibi, trecentis, & pluribus audi- toribus prædicat, cujus numeri auditorum ne sextam quidem partem, quispiam vidit in Italia, in auditorio cujusvis (etiam primi nominis) mathematici: quis inquam hos infames laudaverit in Flaviam legem committentes? ac non potius juxta Constantini Cæ- saris sententiam, ad Celsum Aphricæ Vicarium re- scribentis, bestius subjiciendos censet (5). - - - If those for two persons in who borrow from others are not to be commended for it, what shall we say of direct thieves, who either ridi- culously assume to themselves the whole works of others, and like barren and wicked Plagiaries, basely rob the true parents of their living offspring. (for what favour the ingenious mind has by long study conceived and dicta, and after- wards under that of Joh. Baptista Benedictus.

(4) Thomafius, Mathematician, published severe reflexions, and a ter- rible invective against the same Plagiary. All that he has said about it deserves to be repeated in this place. It will furnish us both with some universal instructions, relating to these thieves, and some particulars con- cerning the person we are speaking of. Besides, the book from which I have taken all this is very scarce. (5) Jo. Baptista Benedictus, Pa- tricius Venetus, Philosophus, in Præfatione Libri de Gnomonum Umbrarumque solarium usu. This book was printed at Turin, ann. 1574. in folio. Passus says nothing of this author in his de Scientiis Ma- thematicis. He has been mistaken in the Oxford Cata- logue: there he is spoken of first under the name of Joh. Bap- tista de Bene- dictis, and after- wards under that of Joh. Baptista Benedictus.

Cccc

arrogance to be the authors of these works, which they have most infamously stolen, as was done by Johannes Taisnerius of the country of Hainault the most impudent of them all. He claimed to himself a work of mine, containing a demonstration of the proportions of local motions, against Aristotle and other Philosophers, which I had long since published, and the second edition of which was printed at Venice in the year 1554, and that so entirely, as to change no part of it, but just the name of the author; for what could he change, who did not so much as understand one word of that controversy? A vain wretch, so thoroughly unacquainted in Mathematicks, that he very justly apprehended from his gross ignorance that the taking away or adding the least syllable, would destroy the substance of the whole discourse. He believed, I suppose, that I was dead, and took it for granted, that no body could convict him of the Plagiarism, not being aware of his own rashness, which betrayed him in a thousand instances; while, more vainly puffed up than a blown bladder, he affirms himself to be a Doctor of Law, and at the same time also, a Master of Music in a Chapel, as if it were the business of a Musician to teach law, or of a Lawyer to regulate the choir of a chapel; and while he publishes discourses on the loadstone, and motion, he no where in the title page calls himself a Mathematician, but a Poet, as believing it to belong to a Poet, or Musician, or Lawyer, to treat of the natural motions of bodies. This infamous impostor ought at least to have framed a lie on the title page by calling himself Mathematician, as he has done in his preface to the reader before that prated work, where he pretends to have read Mathematick Lectures at Ferrara, and elsewhere to three hundred and more auditors, the sixth part of which number was never known in Italy to attend the audience of any Mathematician even of the greatest name. Who, I say, would commend these notorious offenders against the Flavian Law? And not rather rank them below brutes, according to the judgment of the Emperor Constantine, writing to Celsus his Lieutenant in Africa.

(a) Fieri non potest quin Deus certas de Almamone penas fumaret, quod scientiis philosophicis introductis Mahometanorum pietatem interpellaverit. Sephardim, in Commercio ad Torrai

TAKIDDIN, a Mahometan author. I shall mention but one thing relating to him; which is, that he said, the Caliph Almamon would be infallibly punished by God, for having disturbed the devotion of the Mussulmans, by the introduction of Philosophical studies (a). This thought has nothing singular in it. It has appeared in all the countries of the world and in all ages; and at this very day we find an infinite number of people complaining of Des Cartes, and other modern Philosophers of the first rank, as having occasioned the contempt which so many persons express for devotion, and the mysteries of Christianity. This might afford matter for a large commentary [4].

Perme, apud Pocockium, Notis in Specimen Histor. Arabum, pag. 166.

Of learning, who introduced

[A] This might afford matter for a large commentary.]

A thousand things might be said upon this subject, both as to the fact itself, and the reason for it. However I shall be short, for I have already more copy than I want to make an end of this volume. As to the matter of fact, I shall be content with saying, that Philosophers have been at all times suspected of having but little religion. The antique Rhetoricians after having said, that among probable propositions, some were grounded upon what generally happens, and others upon the common opinion, alledged immediately these two examples: Mothers love their children: Philosophers do not believe the existence of the gods. Probabile est id quod fere fieri solet, aut quod in opinione positum est. . . . In eo genere, quod fere solet fieri, probabile hujusmodi est: SI MATER est, diligit filium: SI AVARUS est, negligit jurandum. In eo autem, quod in opinione positum est, hujusmodi funt probabilia: Impiis apud inferos pœnas esse præparatas: Eos, qui philosophia de operam, non arbitrari deos esse (1). -- That is probable which is confirmed by general experience, or which is commonly believed. Among the first sort from general experience, are these examples following; A MOTHER loves her child; A MISER never regards an oath. Among the latter from common belief, are these: infernal punishments are prepared for the wicked; Philosophers do not believe there are any gods. Apuleius observes, that almost all the ancient Philosophers were accused either of denying the existence of the gods, or of applying themselves to Magic. Hæc ferme communi quodam errore imperitorum philosophis obijciuntur: ut partim eorum, qui corporum causas meras & simpliciter rimantur, irreligiosos putent, eosque aiant Deos abnuere; ut Anaxagoram, & Leucippum, & Democritum, & Epicurum, ceterosque rerum nature patronos: partim autem, qui providentiam mundi curiosius vigilant, & impensius Deos celebrant, eos verò vulgò Magos nominent: quasi facere etiam sciant, quæ sciant fieri: ut olim fuerit Epimenides, & Orpheus, & Pythagoras, & Othanes (2). -- These things are generally by the ignorant vulgar, objected against the Philosophers; that one part of them who are for enquiring into the first and simple causes of bodies are irreligious, and deny the being of the gods; as Anaxagoras, Leucippus, Democritus, Epicurus, and other patrons of nature: that the others who search more curiously into the conduct of providence in the world, and worship the gods with greatest zeal, are commonly styled Magicians; as if they themselves had found out how to do those things, which they find to be done; as formerly Epimenides, Orpheus, Pythagoras, and Othanes. Our Takkidin would not have delivered over to divine justice the great Al-

mamon, that protector of learning, who introduced the study of Philosophy, had he not observed the ill effect of that study. It had raised doubts in the minds of men; it had discovered to a great many people the fooleries of the Mahometan sect: and by that means the public worship, piety, and devotion, had laboured under a surprizing discouragement. Some learned men maintain, that the Arabian Philosophers professed only Mahometism outwardly, and laughed at the Alcoran in reality, because they found in it some things contrary to reason (3). A great many people are not to be beat out of the notion, that Des Cartes and Gassendus believed the real presence in the Eucharist, as little as the fabulous stories of old Greece. It is no less difficult to persuade the world, that the followers of those two great Philosophers are good Catholics; and that, if they were allowed to teach publicly their principles, they would not quickly undermine all the foundations of the Romish religion. The Protestants have not a better opinion of Des Cartes's doctrine. Generally speaking, the Cartesianes are suspected of irreligion, and their Philosophy is thought to be very dangerous to Christianity: so that, according to the opinion of a great many, the same persons, who have removed in our age the darkness which the schoolmen had spread all over Europe, have increased the number of freethinkers, and made way for Atheism, or Scepticism, or the disbelief of the greatest mysteries of Christianity. But irreligion is not only ascribed to the study of Philosophy, but also to Philology; for it is pretended, that Atheism never began to discover itself in France till the reign of Francis I. and that the first appearance of it in Italy, was when Philological learning was revived there. *The less foreign learning we have, says a Catholic writer, the greater submission we express for the Christian Faith; and the most learned ages, says Baronius, have often proved the most unbelieving. The Aladinists appeared only under the reign of Almanzor, who was the most learned monarch of his age; and I find no Atheists in France before the reign of Francis I. nor in Italy till after the taking of Constantinople, when Argyropolus, Theodorus Gaza, Georgius Trebizontinus, with the most celebrated men of Greece, retired to the Dukes of Florence (4).* It is certain, that most of the wits and learned Philologists, who shined in Italy, when the *Belles Lettres* began to revive there, after the taking of Constantinople, had but little religion. But, on the other hand, the restoration of the learned languages, and polite literature, made way for the Reformation; as the Monks, and their adherents clearly foresaw, who continually inveighed against Reuchlin, Erasmus, and the other scourges of ignorance. Thus whilst the Roman Catholics deplore the fatal consequences of the study of good literature, the Protestants

(3) Tostatus, in cap. xxviii. *Ex. Suppl. XX.* refert quod Philosophi inter Sacerdotes non recipientes propter hoc Alcoranum. Idem probat Ciceronem in *Disp. de Verit. Relig.* *Christi. ex Averro.* disputante contra destructiones Algazelii, & Avicennae, *Metaph. lib. 14.* *cap. vii.* *Annotationes ad Religionem Medici, lib. 1. §. xxi.* pag. m. 146. in hac verba, *Cum Philosophia paganismi*

(4) Clavigero de Sainte Honorine, *Dictionnaire de l'Usage des Livres Suspects, pag. 82.* *Note, ibid.* *I do not allege it but as says a matter of fact.*

Reſma, apud Pe-
cockium, Nervis
in Specimen Hi-
ſtor. Arabum,
pag. 166.

(3) Tofautus, in cap. xxiii. ex *Quest. XX.* referit quod Philosophi inter Sacerdotes non recipientes propter hoc Alcoranum. Idem probat Calixtus in *Reliq. de Verit. Religio. Christi.* ex Averrois, disputante contra destructiones Algezalis, et Avicennae. *Metaph. lib. ii. cap. vii.* Annotata ad Religionem Medicorum, lib. i. §. xxiij. pag. m. 145. in hoc verbo, Cum Philosophi pagani- bus.

(4) Clavigny de
Sainte Honorine,
Discernement &
Usage des Livres
suspects, pag.
82. Note, that
I do not allege
what he says as
matter of fact.

(1) Cicero, de
Inventione, lib. i,
fol. m. 29.

(2) Apuleius,
in *Apologia*, pag
291.

(c) See Mr. Yr-
rien's *Reflexions*,
Apologie pour
la Réformat.
pag. 66, & seq.
of the first vo-
lume in 4to. up-
on what Maim-
bourg had said,
Hist. du Calvin.
pag. 4, that the
course taken by
Francis I, to re-
ceive learning in
his kingdom...
proved, by a mis-
fortune he did
not foresee, an
occasion of bring-
ing in heresy into
his kingdom.

impus
in herba

have all the reason in the world to praise God for it (5). They are not so much beholden to the new Philosophy, which demonstratively overthrows Transubstantiation, and all its dependencies; because the same weapons are made use of against the most essential doctrines. In a word, no unhappy is the fate of man, that the knowledge which frees him from one evil, throws him into another. Drive away ignorance and barbarity, and you put an end to superstition, and the foolish credulity of the people, so profitable to their leaders, who afterwards employ their gain only to plunge themselves into idleness and debauchery: but by putting men in a capacity of discovering such disorders, you raise in them a desire of examining every thing; and at last they are so much for enquiring and scanning, that they find nothing that will satisfy their miserable reason.

However it be, I have heard some wise men say, that the too common affectation of charging the Philosophers with impiety, is very imprudent: for how great a scandal would it be for ignorant people, if they took the pains to consider it with due attention, to find that, according to the opinion of a great many Divines, there is but little religion among great Philosophers; and that devotion is chiefly to be found among the vulgar; and that those who have most carefully exa-

mined the marks of the divine authority of the holy scripture, are commonly less pious and devout than others (6). It was much more edifying to teach, with Plutarch (7), that Philosophy is a remedy for impiety and superstition; and, with Origen, that no man can be truly pious without Philosophy. *Omnino nec pium erga communem omnium Dominum esse absque Philosophia quemquam censebat* (8). The mixture of good and evil, that is to be found in all human things, appears on this occasion in a particular manner. The Arabian Philosophers came to know, by their Philosophy, that the Alcoran was a false Revelation; but on the contrary many Jews forsook their religion, and embraced the Pagan Philosophy, which discovered to them, as they pretended, that Moses had prescribed them need- less laws. *Multis e judæorum gente adeo peritula est opinio, quod, sub initia regni Saraceni ad Philosophiam Ethnicam defectionem fecerint, quod iis leges haud paucae inutiles & supervacaneæ viderentur* (9). - - - *This opinion was formerly so strongly maintained by a great many Jews, that about the beginning of the Saracen empire, they were drawn over to the Pagan Philosophy, by their looking upon several parts of the law as useless and superfluous.* He confirms this. Thus the same principle, which is sometimes service- able against error, is sometimes prejudicial to truth.

(6) Juriæ, apud Saurin, Examen de la Théolog.

(7) See Plutarch, de l'Idée & Of- fide, pag. 378.

(8) St Cyran quotes that pas- sage of St Grego- ry of Neocesarea, in Panegy. in his work against Father Garasse's *Somme Théologi-*

que, Tom. ii, cenici ad Philosophiam Ethnicam defectionem fecerint, quod iis leges haud paucae inutiles & supervacaneæ viderentur (9). - - -

(9) Joan. Spence- ras, de Legibus Hebræorum, lib. ii, cap. iii, §. 1, sub fin. pag. 225; Edit. Hag. 1686.

He confirms this by the testimony of Gulielmus Parisienfis, Lib. de Legibus, p. 3, 4.

T A L A U S, King of Argos, son of Abas or Bias, and grand-son of Lynceus one of the fifty sons-in-law of Danaus, lost his crown and his life by the plots of Amphiarus (a). His son Adrastus was forced to fly to Sicyon, where some say he married the daughter of King Polybius, and succeeded him. But others will have it, that he succeeded him, because his mother was the only daughter of Polybius. See the article of ADRASTUS. Some tell us, that he, whom Amphiarus dethroned and put to death, was Pronax the son of Talau. See the scholiast upon the ninth Nemean Ode of Pindar, wherein we are told upon what the pretensions of Amphiarus were grounded: namely that Melampus having cured the daughters of Proetus King of Argos, who were grown mad, received, as a reward, one half of the kingdom of Argos, which he divided between him and his brother Bias. But Melampus left behind him a son called Antiphates, who was Oicles's father, and Amphiarus's grand-father.

T A M I R A S, was sent for from Cilicia into the isle of Cyprus, to teach the art of the Haruspices or of divining by looking into the entrails of the sacrifices. The temple of Venus at Paphos was consecrated by Cinyras; and it was said, that this god- dess, conceived and born in the sea, had landed in that place; but application was made to this inhabitant of Cilicia for the establishment I have been mentioning. Things had been so ordered, that the descendants of Cinyras and Tamiras were to preside over the ceremonies; but, that the royal family might have some pre-eminence, the family of Tamiras quickly resigned their share to them [A]; so that from thence no other priest was consulted, but of the family of Cinyras (a).

[A] The family of Tamiras quickly resigned their share. This Orthography in Hesychius's manuscripts gave Nevertheless, Hesychius mentions certain Priests of the isle of Cyprus, called Ταμिरαδαι, Tamirade. Thamyras in Tacitus, ought to be read Tamiras (1).

(a) Schol. Pin- dari, in Od. VIII Pyth. & IX Nemea.

(a) Ex Tacito, Hist. lib. ii, cap. iii.

(1) Meursius, in Cypro, pag. 50.

(a) Taken from Livy, lib. i, pag. 23.

(b) Cum divitie jam animos fa- cerent, auxit docta in matri- monium Tana- quill, summo loco nata, & que haud facile iis, in quibus nata erat, humiliora inseret es, que innotuisset. Sper- nitibus Etrur- cia Locumonen- saule advena

T A N A Q U I L, the wife of Tarquinius Priscus King of Rome, was born at Tarquinii in Tuscan. Where she was married to Lucumon, the son of a person who fled thither, being expelled from Corinth his native place. Lucumon inheriting his father's whole estate, became a very rich man; and the family of Tanaquil being one of the noblest in the town, he hoped to raise himself to some dignities; but being a son of a foreigner, he met with great obstacles (a). Tanaquil, being provoked by the flight put upon her husband, and being unwilling to lose the rank she was born to resolved to leave Tarquinii, in hopes of advancing herself in some other place (b). She therefore represented to her husband that their best way was to go and settle at Rome, where men of merit, of whatsoever country they were, might hope for the noblest preferments. Lucumon followed her advice, and had preface of his great fortune before he got to Rome. That preface was explained to him by his wife [A], for she had great skill that way. He took the name of Tarquinius. He gained the esteem and affection of the

ortum, ferre in- dignitatem non potuit, oblitque ingenite erga patriam caritatis, dummodo virum honoratum vi- deret, consilium migrandi ab Tar- quinio cepit. Livius, ibid.

[A] That preface was explained to him by his wife. When they came to the Janiculum, an eagle lighted gently upon their chariot, and took off Lucumon's hat, and after having some time hovered over their chariot, with a great outcry, restored the hat very orderly to the same place. Tanaquil, sitting by her husband, embraced him, and assured him of very great fortune, explaining to him the circumstances of that

preface. Upon this they entered Rome, full of high expectations. *Ad Janiculum forte ventum erat: ibi ei carpento sedenti cum uxore, aquila suspensis demissa leniter alis pileum aufert: superque carpentum cum magno clau- gore volitans, rursus velut ministerio divinitus missa, capiti apte reponit: inde sublimis abiit. Accipisse id au- gurium lata dicitur Tanaquil; perita, ut vulgo Etrusci, caelestium prodigiorum mulier. Excessa & alta sperare complexa*

the Romans ; and insinuated himself into the king's favour in such a manner, that the offices he obtained from him enabled him to aspire to the crown, and to succeed in his ambitious design. He was killed in his palace in the thirty-eighth year of his reign. Tanaquil was not discouraged by this severe blow ; she managed things so dexterously, that she settled the crown upon Servius Tullius her son-in-law, whose good fortune she had foretold [B] long before (c). Her memory was in veneration at Rome for several ages ; her handiworks were preserved there [C], and great virtues were ascribed to her girdle

(c) Taken from
Liv. lib. i, pag.
m. 23.

complexa virum jubet: eam alitem ea regione carli &
ejus Dei nunciam venisse: circa summum culmen dominis
auspiciis fecisse: levasse humano superpositum capiti de-
cus, ut divinitus eidem redderet. Has spes cogitationesque
suum portantes, urbem ingressi sunt (1).

(1) Titus Livius,
lib. i, cap.
xxxiv, pag. m.
23. See also
Dionysius Hali-
carnassicus, lib.
iii, cap. lxx,
where the thing
is more particu-
larly related than
by Livy.

[E] She had foretold the good fortune of Servius Tullius. He was born and educated in the palace of King Tarquin. One day a fire was seen about his head whilst he slept: the great noise that was made at the sight of this prodigy, obliged that Prince to go and see what was the matter. Some body had a mind to throw water upon the fire, but Tanauquil prevented it, and ordered that the child should not be disturbed, till he awaked of himself. He awaked soon after, and the fire was no more seen. Then the Queen took her husband aside, and told him that this child would one day support the royal family in their adversity, and that he ought to be bred up as a person of high expectation. This advice was followed, great care was taken of the education of that child, who became so accomplished that none was thought more worthy of being the King's son-in-law. He succeeded.

(2) Taken from
Livv, *ibid.*

(3) A town of Italy, which was besieged, taken, ransacked, and burnt by Tarquinius Priscus. *Dionys. Halicarn. lib. iii, cap. lxxiii.*

(4) Τὴν δὲ Τα-
νακυλίδε τάτε
ἀλλὰ σοφὴν ἦ-
σαν, καὶ δὴ καὶ
τὰ μαντικὰ ὕ-
δατος χεῖρον
τυρρηνῶν ἐτι-
μαίνον, ἐλ-
πὴν πρὸς αὐ-
τὸν. Taniqui-
lem, uxorem,
& alioqui fa-
pientem, & di-
vinandi scientia
nulli Etruscorum
secundam, dixit
Dionys. Hali-
carn. lib. iv,
circa init. pag.
207.

(5) See Plutarch, in Vita Romuli, pag. 18.

(6) Taken from
Dionysius Hali-
carnasseus, lib.
iv. init.

Tarquinius accordingly (2). Some say, that Tarquin was the wife of Servius Tullius, who was killed in defending his principality of Corniculum (3). They add, that this woman was with child, and that she was known among the other women-slaves, regard to her quality. Tanaquil set her at liberty, and received her into her palace, where she was delivered of a boy. This is likely enough, but not wonderful enough for all sorts of Historians : for which reason some pretended that the birth of a King of Rome, of such a mean extraction, was to have some more mysterious in it. Therefore they supposed, that Ocrisia, widow of the Prince of Corniculum, was for some time a slave in Tanaquil's palace before she was made free ; and that while she was a slave she perceived in the chimney the figure of a man's privilege. She acquainted the King and Queen with it. When the King saw this prodigy he was amazed at it : the Queen, who was as well skilled in prefaces as in the best Augur in Etruria (4), told her husband, that it was decreed by fate, that a person of merit more than human, should be born in the palace ; and that the figure, which appeared in the chimney, was to be his father, and that the woman who should have to do with that figure, would be his mother. Tarquin being informed by some men well skilled in such things, that Tanaquil gave a right explication of that prodigy, resolved to make the woman, who had seen that member first, to lye with it : she was therefore dressed up like a bride, and brought into the chamber where that figure was. They left her alone, and she was enjoyed by some Genius, whether it was Vulcan, or the household god. That figure was never seen afterwards. Ocrisia was got with child, and brought to bed at the usual time (5). The same thing almost has been said of Romulus's mother (6). If there had not been Annalists at Rome a long time before Rhetoric was taught there, I should be apt to think, that the declamations which the Sophists put their scholars upon, had been converted into historical relations ; for it is very likely that the young Rhetoricians were allowed to feign whatever they had a mind to, in their Panegyric essays. The design of those fictions was to discover whether they had any invention, and whether they were able to turn and handle a commonplace with dexterity. They were therefore not blamed for their supposing a divine, miraculous, and very surprising origin. But this must have occasioned great abuses, if the most ingenious pieces of those young men had been preserved in the archives, and looked upon, some ages after, as historical relations. How do we know but that most of the antient fables owe their original to a custom of making Panegyrics upon the antient Heroes, on their festival days, and preserving those pieces that appeared to be the best.

See what will be said about Martyrologies, in the article VALERIUS.

[C] *Her valentius were preserved.*] Varro, contemporary with Cicero, affirms, that he had seen in Sangus's temple, Tanquil's distaff and spindle, with the wool upon it which she had been spinning; and that they kept in the temple of Fortune, a royal robe which he wrought, and Servius Tullius wore. Pliny, who relates it, adds, that this was the reason why the maids, who married, were followed by a person, who carried a distaff and a spindle, with wool and yarn upon them. He also says that this queen was the first who wove that sort of garment, which was given to young lads to wear, when they put on the *Toga Virilis*, and to maids when they married. Morelli has committed a gross mistake: he takes the *tirones* in Pliny to mean *new soldiers*, instead of understanding by that word the boys, who had lately left off the gown of childhood, the *prætexta*. Here follows the whole passage of Pliny (7). 'Lanam in colo & fuso Tanquilis, quæ in templo Fortunæ, in regali veste, quæ Servio Tulio

Pliny (7). 'Lanam in colo & fulo 1 Tanquilus, que
eadem Caia Cecilia (8) vocata est, in templo Sangi
durasse, prodente se, auctor est M. Varro : factam-
que ab ea toga regiam undulatum in sede Fortuna,
qua Ser. Tullius fuerat usus. Inde factum, ut nu-
bentes virgines comitaretur colus compta, & fusus
cum flamine. Ea prima texuit reftam tunica,
quales cum toga pura tirones induuntur, novaque
nuptæ. . . . We have M. Varro's authority, that
the diſſaft and ſpindle of Tanquil, who was alſo
called Caia Cecilia, was remaining in the temple
of Sanguis, where he himſelf met with them; and
that there was in the temple of Fortune a royal
robe made by her in a waving form, which Servius
Tullius had made uſe of. From rubence it came that
virgins, in their matrimonial ceremony, were attended
with a diſſaft full of wool, and a ſpindle of yarn. She
firſt of all wove the ſtrait veſt, which the young ladies
wear with the toga virilis, and brides on their wedding-day.' I do not know why Father Hardouin
prefers Plutarch's opinion to that of Varro, and Ver-
rius. ' Verius Plutarchus in quæſt. Rom. pag. 271.
uxorem ait fuiſſe (Caia) Ceciliam) aniam e Tarquinii liberis : eideſque in templo Sancti ſanctus priſcis
temporibus poſitam cum ſandalis & fuſo, quæ domo
actæ vitæ induſtrique argumento eſſent (9). . . . Plu-
tarch with greater truth affirms, that Caia Cecilia
was the wife of one of Tarquin's ſons : and that a ſtatue
had been of old erected in honour to her in the temple of
Sancus, with ſandals and a ſpindle, which were em-
blems of her induſtrious and domeſtic life.' It is more
reaſonable to think, that this Caia Cecilia, whoſe
ſtatue in braſs, with ſandals and ſpindle, were to be
ſeen in Sancus's temple, was the wife of the firſt Tar-
quin, than to think ſhe was the wife of one of Tar-
quin's ſons. I know Dionyſius Halicarſaſſeus ſup-
poſes (10) that the firſt Tarquin had a ſon, who was
married, and was the father of the two ſons-in-law of
Servius Tullius ; but neither he, nor any other Hiſto-
rian ſays one word concerning the merit of the woman,
who married that ſon of Tarquin. And yet ſhe muſt
have been very illuſtrious, if the Romans paid her the
honour mentioned by Plutarch. Was ſhe the wife of
one of the laſt Tarquin's ſons ? The Romans could
never have had ſuch a veneration for the daughter-in-
law of a tyrant, whom they had expelled with his
whole family, and whoſe memory was always ex-
ecrable to them ? Was ſhe the firſt wife of Tarquinus
Superbus ? I know very well ſhe was a good woman
(11), but her merit is not to be compared with that
of Tanquil. She never was queen at all, ſhe died
young, and therefore had not the opportunities of ſhew-
ing her excellencies, as Tanquil had, who lived a
long time on the throne. We may therefore ſay, that
the monuments preſerved in Sancus's temple, belonged
to that queen, and not to the wife of one of Tarquin's
ſons, and boldly affirm that Feſtus and Pliny, or rather
Verrius and Varro, have been more exact than
Plutarch ;

(7) Plin. lib. viii,
cap. xlviii, pag.
m. 228, 229.

(8) Festus observes, that Tannaquil, being at Rome, took the name of *Caia Cæcilia*. Her husband, to comply with the custom of the Romans, called himself *Lucius Tarquinius*, as *Dionysius Halicarnæensis* observes, *lib. iii. cap. lxxi.*

12- (9) *Hardinus*
in Plinius, *ibid.*

was (10) Lib. iv, cap.
of iv.

(11) *Idem*, Dionys. Halicarn.
ibid. cap. xxxiii,
pag. 823, Edit.
Lat. in 8vo,
1615.

(d) Notior est marito suo Tanaquil, illum inter multa regum nomina jam abscondit antiquitas, haec rara inter famulas virtus

girdle [D]. St Jerom observes, that Tarquin was not so well known as his wife (d). He adds, that the admirable virtue of that queen is too strongly impressed on the memory of all ages, ever to be forgotten. Yet it seems one might infer from some passages in ancient authors, that she was looked upon as a woman, who had been too imperious [E]. It is not true that she was alive when Tarquinius Superbus put his brother to death, nor that she was the mother of this Tarquin [F]. The Historian, who

altius saeculorum omnium memorie, quam ut excidere possit, infixit. Hieronym. adv. Jovinian.

shews

Plutarch; this may be placed among the mistakes of the latter, which are very numerous. Perhaps it will be objected to me, that those sandals, and that spindle, do not suit with a queen so intriguing as Tanaquil. The design of those monuments was to honour the memory of a woman, who seldom went abroad, and kept close to her distaff: but was this Tanaquil's character? I answer, that she was indeed an able queen, and a stateswoman, and that she shewed a great deal of conduct and resolution upon proper occasions; but this was no hindrance to her applying herself to her distaff and her needle, for her ordinary employments.

[D] Great virtues were ascribed to her girdle. If I had said that it was preserved in order to work miracles I should have expressed myself wrong; for the Romans had not recourse to this girdle as to a Moral cause, but as to a Physical one. They supposed that Tanaquil had found out excellent remedies against distempers, and that she had enclosed them in her girdle. And therefore those who got some scrapings of it, believed they should be cured by them, not because the soul of that queen would reward their faith, but because they had some particles of the remedies contained in that girdle. So that no exact parallel can be made between those who had recourse to Tanaquil's statue, in order to rub her girdle, and those who endeavour to obtain a piece of St Hubert's stole, or to have their beads touched by some relic. There is a great deal of credulity on both sides. I leave it those, who have leisure, to examine whether old Rome equalled the new in this respect; and to assist them a little in their enquiry, I shall relate the words of my author. 'Prædia Verius vocari ait ea remedia quæ Cæcia uxor Tarquinii Prisci invenisse existimatur, & immixtisse zonæ suæ qua præcincta statua ejus est in æde Sancti qui Deus Dius Fidius vocatur, ex qua zona periclitantes ramenta fumunt: ea vocari ait prædia quod mala prohibeant (12). - - - Verrius says, that those remedies are called prædia, which Cæcia Cæcia, the wife of Tarquinius Priscus, is supposed to have found out, and incorporated with her girdle, which is placed about her statue in the temple of Sancus, who is a god, known by the name of Dius Fidius; from which girdle those who are in any danger take some of the scrapings: he says they are called prædia, because they prevent ill accidents.' What Pliny relates of Pelops's rib, is much more miraculous. It was shewn as a remedy, Elide solebat offendi Pelopis costa quam eburneam affirmabant (13). - - - At Elis used to be shewn Pelops's rib, which they affirmed to be ivory. Here is a relic which wrought miracles among the Heathens: for Pliny had been saying, that certain members of some people have the virtue of curing distempers (14), he must therefore mean that this part of Pelops had that faculty. So that Charles Stephens is only to be blamed, for his making no distinction between what he infers from Pliny's words, and what Pliny himself says. Such a distinction ought never to be neglected: those, who take no care to observe it, occasion many authors to quote, as the words of an ancient writer, what is but a paraphrase, or a consequence drawn by some Modern. These are Charles Stephens's words (15): 'Ad quem quidem humerum (16) post ejusdem Pelopis mortem varia morborum sanabantur genera, & multiplicia edebantur miracula. Plin. libro decimo nono, capite tertio. - - - By which shoulder, after Pelops's death, various kinds of distempers were cured, and a great many miracles performed.' Lloyd and Hoffman have not rectified this passage in the least, nor even the false citation contained in it.

A French author, who lived in the XVIth century, tells a story which he would never have been able to prove. The Tarquins, says he (17), caused a statue to be erected in the middle of their palace, with only steps on, a distaff and a spindle, that those who should succeed their family, might imitate their assiduous dil-

gence, in minding domestic concerns, without stirring abroad. Thus you see how the passage I have cited from Pliny, concerning Tanaquil's statue, has been misrepresented. Every body takes upon him to alter some circumstance in what he quotes: by this means matters of fact are corrupted, and soon perverted by those who cite them.

[E] She was looked upon as a woman who had been too imperious.] This is what many persons infer from these words of Juvenal:

Consultis iſtericæ lento de funere matris,
Ante tamen de te TANAQUIL tua (18).
Your Tanaquil would from the quizzard know
Her mother's fate, but first when you're to go.

(18) Juvenal. Sat. VI, ver. 563.

And from these words of Aufonius:

.... Tanaquil tua nefciat iſtud.
Tu contemne alios (19).

(19) Aufon. Epist. xxiii, ver. 31.

If from your Tanaquil the tale you hide,
You're very safe from all the world beside.

This seems to signify, that the wives, who took too much upon themselves, were called Tanaquils. It is Scaliger's opinion. 'Uxorem sanctissimam Paulini, cujus meminit Ambrosius Epist. XXXVI vocat Tanaquilem Aufonius, ridens scilicet: quia ei erat addictus Paulinus. Et, ut ex eodem loco Ambrosii cognoscimus, videtur secutus uxoris consilium Paulinus in secessu Nolano. Quare vocat eam femininam Tanaquilem poeta noster: quia illis temporibus ita solerent uxores vocare, quæ imperabant maritis (20). - - - The pious wife of Paulinus, mentioned by Ambrosius, Epist. XXXVI, is, by Aufonius, by way of banter, called Tanaquil; because Paulinus was very obsequious to her. And from the same passage of Ambrosius we find, that Paulinus followed his wife's advice in his retirement to Nola. This was the reason of our Poets calling his wife Tanaquil; because that was the name commonly given in those days to wives who governed their husbands.' He confirms it by a passage in Sidonius Apollinaris, wherein Chilperic's wife, who had a great ascendancy over her husband, is called Tanaquil; she is also compared with Agrippina. Quod principaliter medetur afflictis, temperat Lucum monem nostrum Tanaquil sua, & aures mariti virofa susurrorum face complectas, opportunitate falsi sermonis eruderat, cujus studio factum scire vos par est, nihil interim quieti fratrum communium apud animum communis patroni juniorum Cybistrarum venena nocuisse, neque quicquam (Deo propitiante) nocitura; si modo, quandiu præfens potestas Lugdunensem Germaniam regit, nostrum suumque Germanicum præfens Agrippina moderetur (21). - - - Her principal care was to relieve the afflicted, and our Lucum was so far governed by his Tanaquil, that she guarded his ear against the venomous insinuations of subversers, by the sharpness of her discourse; nor is it amiss for you to know that it was owing to her, that the malice of the junior Cybistras was hindered from doing the brotherhood of Freres any ill, and by the favour of Heaven will always be hindered; so long as the present French government shall see the present Agrippina continue her ascendancy over her and our Germanicus. Here is a prince under his wife's direction; but because such a direction proved advantageous to his subjects, it is to Tanaquil's honour. It ought to be inferred from it, that if the first Tarquin was governed by his wife, it was no misfortune. Another Commentator upon Aufonius observes, that Paulinus was not well pleased to have his wife compared with a queen, ambitious, and addicted to Magic (22); he would have liked better to have had her compared with Lucretia (23).

[F] It is not true that she was living, when ... nor that she was the mother of this Tarquin.] The two daughters of Servius Tullius and of Tarquinia, the daughter

(20) Solig. in Aufon. Epist. xxiii, pag. 678.

(21) Sidon. Apollinar. Epist. vii, lib. v, pag. 338.

(22) Moleste tulisse videtur Paulinus in Epistola ad Aufonium prima & secunda: & Lucretie illi pudicissimæ matrone comparari maluit, quam isti Tanaquil, ambiciose mulieris, & sage. Vincit in Aufonium, Epistola xxiii, pag. 678.

(23) Nec Tanaquil mihi, sed Lucretia conjux, - - - Nor is my wife a Tanaquil, but a Lucretia, says he in another place.

(12) Sæxus Pompeius Festus, de verborum significacione, voce Prædia.

(13) Plinius, lib. xxviii, cap. 10, pag. m. 568.

(14) Quorundam partes medicæ sunt sicuti dicimus de Pyrrhi regis pollice.

(15) In Dictionario, voce Pelops.

(16) Pliny says costa, and not humerus; But he is the only author, who mentions the ivory rib of Pelops. All the rest speak of the shoulder.

Humeroque Pelops insignis eburneo. And Pelops for his ivory shoulder fun'd. Virgil. Georg. lib. iii, ver. 7.

(17) Franc. Tillet, of Tournai, in his Philogæne, p. 120, Paris 1578.

VOL. V. No. CXXVI.

shews the falsity of it, has been more successful in confuting his predecessors [G] than in avoiding

daughter of Tarquinius Priscus and of Tanaquil, were married to Lucius Tarquinius, and Aruns Tarquinius. Those two brothers were not like one another in any thing, any more than their two wives: one of them was an honest man, and the other a profligate: one of the Tullia's was an honest woman, and the other worthless. The latter was married to the honest man; and the other to the profligate. The wicked Tullia proposed to the wicked Tarquin to marry her: she promised him to make away with her husband, and made him promise her to kill his wife: and before they parted, they committed incest. *Ἀρμένιος δὲ χεῖλαι τὰς αἰρήσεις ὁ Ταρκύνιος, καὶ αὐτίκα δὲς αὐτῇ πύσεις, καὶ λαβὼν τὰ πρωτόλεια τῶν ἀνδρῶν γάμων, καὶ διαπραξάμενος, ἀπὸρχεσθαι. Libenter conditionem accepit Tarquinius, moxque data et accepta fide, ac delibato in-*

(24) Dionys. Halicarn. lib. iv, pag. 234, Edit. Lips. 1691.

(25) Livius, lib. i, pag. 29.

(26) Dionys. Halicarn. ubi supra.

(27) Idem, lib. iii, pag. 211.

(28) Idem, lib. iv, pag. 234.

(29) Id. ibid.

(30) Id. ibid. pag. 211.

cestarum nuptiarum fructu, abiit (24). Aruns Tarquinius was soon after poisoned by his wife, and the eldest Tullia by her husband; and then the two murderers were not long without marrying together; rather without the king's opposition, than with his consent, *magis non prohibente Servio quam approbante* (25). Fabius Pictor had said, in his Roman History, that Tanaquil buried Aruns Tarquinius. For which he is severely censured by Dionysius Halicarnassus (26), who shews, that Tanaquil must have been at that time 115 years old. Here is the proof of it. Tarquinius Priscus was at least twenty-five years of age, when he went to settle at Rome (27). It is very probable his wife was twenty. Now they came to Rome the first year of the reign of Ancus Martius, according to some Historians, or the eighth, according to others. Let us take the latter opinion; for if they did not come to Rome sooner, they did not certainly come later; since all the Historians are agreed, that Ancus Martius, in the ninth year of his reign, sent Tarquin against the Latins, in quality of General of the horse. Since therefore that prince reigned twenty-four years, it follows, that when he died Tarquin had attained his forty-second year, or thereabouts, and Tanaquil the thirty-seventh year of her age. To which if you add the thirty-eight years of this Tarquin's reign, you will find that he died at eighty years of age, and that he left Tanaquil seventy-five years old. Now Aruns died the fortieth year of the reign of Servius Tullius, who succeeded this Tarquin. *Ἐν ταῖς ἐνιαυτοῖς ἀναγραφαῖς κατὰ τὸν τεσσαρακοστὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τῆς Τυλλίας ἀρχῆς τὸν Ἀρύναν τελευτήσασθαι παραλέγεται. In annalibus invenimus anno regis Tullii quadragesimo defunctum Aruntem* (28). If therefore Tanaquil had been then alive, she must have been 115 years old. Nothing can be more exact than this computation of Dionysius Halicarnassus, nor more reasonable than the liberty he takes of censuring the negligence of Fabius Pictor. *Οὕτως ὀλίγον ἐστὶν ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις αὐτῷ τὸ περὶ τὴν ἔξτασιν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀτακτικῶς. Adeo parum laboris hic scriptor impendit perquirendæ veritati historice* (29). -- So little pains appears in the history of this author towards the discovering of truth. He proves the same Fabius Pictor, and several other Historians, guilty of the like carelessness, who affirm, that the two Tarquins, the sons-in-law of Servius Tullius, were the sons of King Tarquin. This was giving relations of things without regarding the absurdities that might follow from them. *Παταπασί γὰρ ἀπεικτικῶς καὶ βαθυμῶς οἱ συγγραφεῖς αὐτῶν ταύτην ἐξηγνοῦσιν τὴν ἱστορίαν, ὅθεν ἐξηλατότερος τῶν ἀναρτήσεων αὐτῆν ἀδυνάτων τὸ καὶ ἀτόπων. Omnino enim inconsiderate ac negligenter historiam hanc prodiderunt scriptores Latini, non excussis absurdis & impossibilibus quibus fides ipsorum elevetur* (30). -- For their writings have delivered this history altogether inconsiderately and rashly, not in the least examining whether impossibilities and absurdities lie against it. Let us see his proofs. Since Tanaquil was seventy-five years old, when she lost her husband, the youngest of her sons must have been at that time twenty-five years of age: for women leave off child-bearing, by that time they are fifty years old. The other son must have been twenty-seven years of age. Would they have been so silly as to suffer Tanaquil to deprive them of the crown, in favour of Servius Tullius? Would he have been so foolish and unnatural as to exclude them from it? All these absurdities are strongly represented by the author. He adds, that if Tarqui-

nus Superbus had been twenty-seven years of age, when Tarquinius Priscus was killed, he must have been above seventy when he dethroned his father-in-law, and above ninety-five when he was expelled from Rome, and about 110 when he left off making war in person with the Romans. And yet he is represented as a man, who was in the flower of his age, when he usurped the throne. He commanded at the siege of Ardea, when the Romans dethroned him. He endeavoured, for the space of fourteen years, to recover the throne, being present at several battles (31), and discharging all the functions of a General. Some Historians, being sensible of these absurdities, have supposed, that he was not the son of Tanaquil, but of one Gegania, the second wife of Tarquinius Priscus. But, besides that they have no proof for it, there being no monuments extant, wherein Gegania is mentioned, they involve themselves in several difficulties: they must advance, that Tarquinius Priscus being about eighty years of age, and having two daughters married, did, nevertheless, marry again, and had children by his second wife. These last objections of Dionysius Halicarnassus are not very strong: for it might be answered, that Gegania was married before Tarquin was extremely old, and that she would not have been the only woman that has born children by a husband about eighty years old: and that a king, who has only daughters, is willing, tho' he be never so old, if he finds himself not quite decayed, to try whether he can get sons. This Historian had forgot one of the strongest objections which he could have made use of; he does not take notice that, according to the general tradition, Tanaquil did so cunningly manage matters, after Tarquin's death, that she raised Servius Tullius to the throne. Which shows what is said of Gegania, to be fabulous and romantic. How surprising is it after all this, that Dionysius (32) should have found out but one author (33), who said that the two sons-in-law of Tullius were not the sons of the first Tarquin, but his grandsons. The opinion of this single author has been adopted by that great Historian. Livy was not so judicious; he rather chose to follow the crowd (34), and thereby involved himself in a great many difficulties, injurious to his memory. See Laurentius Valla's Dissertation upon that subject. One can hardly apprehend how to great a man as Livy should commit so many faults, in his account of the Tarquins. The greatest objections that can be raised against Dionysius Halicarnassus is this, that Tanaquil would not have endeavoured to place her son-in-law, Servius Tullius, on the throne, had she had two grandsons: but it may be answered, that they were in their cradle, and that the state of affairs required a successor, of an age that might enable him to reign vigorously, and by himself. She was obliged therefore to prefer her son-in-law to her grandsons.

[G] The Historian . . . has been more successful in confuting . . . than in avoiding mistakes himself.] He fell into his own snare; for he ascribes to Tanaquil a daughter, of whom it is no less absurd, that she should be the mother, than that Lucius Tarquinius, and Aruns, should be her sons. He pretends (35), that Brutus was the son of Tarquinia, the daughter of Tarquinius Priscus, and of Tanaquil; and says, that Brutus was very young, when his father and eldest brother were put to death, by order of Tarquinius Superbus. Let us turn his arguments against himself. If the mother of this Brutus was Tanaquil's daughter, she was twenty-five years of age, when her father was assassinated, and sixty-nine when Tarquinius Superbus usurped the crown. Brutus must then have been nineteen years of age at least. It is not likely that Tarquin put to death his brother-in-law, and his nephew, the same year he took away Servius Tullius's life. It is probable he had the policy to leave some intervals between his great crimes. We may therefore say, that Brutus was at least twenty years of age, when his father was put to death; but if he had been of that age, would he not have had an opportunity shewing his parts? Whoever undertakes to conceal a great courage, a noble soul, and a great design, under the outside of a fool, must needs be a man of a great genius to do it consistently. Brutus did admirably succeed in hiding those things, under the false appearance of stupidity. He therefore had a great address, and noble qualifications: these

(31) According to Livy, lib. ii, pag. 48, he drove his horse against the Roman Dictator, at the head of his army, and was wounded.

(32) Lib. iv, pag. 213.

(33) Lucius Plo Frugi.

(34) Hic L. Tarquinius, Prisci Tarquini regis filius nepos fuerit, periculum liquet: pluribus tamen auctoribus filium crediturum. Titus Livius, lib. i, pag. m, 29, A.

(35) Dionys. Halicarn. lib. iv, pag. 264.

avoiding mistakes himself.

these he must have discovered before his father's death ; and therefore would have had the same fate with his eldest brother : the tyrant would have destroyed them both, for fear they should revenge the death of their father. It must therefore be said, that Brutus had not yet discovered his natural endowments, consequently he was not nineteen years of age, when Tullius was dethroned. Let us allow him to be fifteen, as I have done in his article (36), according to which supposition he will appear to be born in the fifty-fourth year of his mother's life, which will destroy some of the objections of Dionysius Halicarnassensis.

(36) See the remark [D] in that article.

Laurentius Valla urges against Livy, the argument taken from the age of Tarquin's sons, as if that Historian had said, that Brutus and they were of the same age : but I do not find that Livy says so, nor that it can be inferred from Brutus's going with them to Delphi. This would prove a very strong argument against Dionysius Halicarnassensis, who tells us, that the marriage of Tarquin and Tullia falls in the fortieth year of Servius Tullius's reign (37) ; from whence it follows, that Tarquin's children were but two or three years of age, when their father usurped the throne. If therefore it was necessary for Brutus to be nearly of the same age, he must have been born in the 65th, or 66th year of his mother's life. I would not much insist upon this proof : for tho' that Historian informs us, that Tarquin would have Brutus to be bred up with his own children, it is not allowable to charge him with having pretended that they were not a great deal younger than Brutus. *Διατίθεσθαι τε μετὰ τῶν οἰκείων παίδων ἐπείτρεπε, ἢ διὰ τιμῆς, ὥς ἐκκαπίστο πρὸς τὴν πύλιν, οἷα δὴ συγγενῆς, ἀλλ' ἵνα γέλωτα παρέχῃ τοῖς μισοῦσιν, λέγων τε ἀνὴρα πολλὰ, καὶ πρᾶτον ὁμοῖα τοῖς κατ' ἀλλοθίων ἡλιθίοις. Verfarique inter liberos suos patiebatur, non bonoris causa, ut videri voluit, quasi cognatum ; sed ut ridiculis dictis fastidium oblectamento esset adolescentibus, quemadmodum solent veri fatui (38).* A youth of eighteen or twenty years may be placed with Princes of seven or eight years of age, to be their companion ; especially when such a familiarity, a vain piece of honour, is only designed for their diversion. In reality, it must of necessity be acknowledged, that they were younger than he ; for he had children old enough to engage in a conspiracy, when (39) the eldest of Tarquin's sons was not yet thirty years of age. I must take notice of a mistake in these four propositions of Dionysius Halicarnassensis : I. That if Tarquinius Superbus had been the son of the first Tarquin, he would have been twenty-seven years old, when the first Tarquin was killed. II. That Servius Tullius would have been only three years older than he. *Τετρί μόνον ἔτεσι διαίρεσιν προεσφύετο. Ἰν. Triennio tantum eorum alterum antecederet (40).* III. That Servius Tullius was forty years in possession of the crown, which was placed upon his head, after the death of the first Tarquin. IV. And that therefore, Tarquinius Superbus would have been about seventy years old, when Servius Tullius was dethroned. This is a very false consequence ; and rather than ascribe it to

(37) Dionys. Halicarn. lib. iv, pag. 234.

(38) Id. ibid. pag. 264.

(39) The year in which Tarquin was expelled. But he was expelled the 25th year of his reign and he began to reign four years after he married Tullia ; for Servius Tullius was dethroned the 44th year of his reign.

(40) Ibid. pag. 212.

the Historian, I should chuse to say, that the transcribers skipped the word *τέτταρα, quatuor* ; for he could not be ignorant that Servius Tullius reigned forty-four years.

Have you observed, said one to me the other day, that Henry Glareanus (41), having read Valla's Dissertation, and Dionysius's Arguments against Fabius Pictor's opinion, does nevertheless adopt that opinion ? It is upon this foot he has branched out the pedigree of the Tarquins. He makes the two sons-in-law of Servius Tullius to be the sons of the first Tarquin : he gives him also Brutus's mother for his daughter. I do not much wonder, that Stephen Pasquier (42) has committed the same fault (43), for, perhaps, he never heard of Valla's book, nor took any notice of the dispute of Dionysius Halicarnassensis against Fabius Pictor, and the other Roman Historians. I know Glareanus acknowledges, that the opinion of Dionysius is grounded on good reasons, *multis id ac dignis finis affructus argumentis*. Generally speaking, they are the same with those made use of by Laurentius Valla. However, I believe, with Glareanus, that he did not steal them from this ancient Historian : he had read the old authors : but after all, more learned men than he are not aware while they are composing, that such or such things are to be found in Plutarch, or Diodorus Siculus, &c. He protests, he knew not that Dionysius Halicarnassensis had made use of those arguments, and he is much more ingenuous than Perottus and Politian in acknowledging from what authors he takes what is not his own. *Nisi quis Dionysium*

ab eo non lectum, atque eum suapte hoc ingenio expicatum contendat, quod ipse fatetur in priore defensione adversus Benedictum Morandum quendam. Nam ut de Valla aliud suspicer ejus candor obstat. Liberè enim ac ingenuè ubique fateri solet, per quos profecerit, & unde habuerit quod scriperit : secus certè atque Perottus in suo cornu, aut in suis operibus Politianus, gloriolæ ac popularis auræ captatores, ut mihi quidem visum est, etsi bonæ literæ eis multum debent (44). -- Unless any one will insist that he had never read Dionysius, but had fished this out by his own ingenuity, as he confesses in a former defence against one Benedictus Morandus. For to suspect any thing else of Valla, his candor forbids. Since he freely and ingenuously every where owns the authors he is beholden to, and from whom he borrows what he writes : a conduct certainly very different from that of Perottus and Politian in their works, who seem to me to be ambitious of a little glory and popular applause, tho' otherwise the learned world is not a little indebted to them. I heard this person out patiently, and afterwards shewed him, that Glareanus declares plainly enough against Livy, and acquaints his readers, that he gives the genealogy of the Tarquins only according to the plan of that author. I farther alleged a very probable reason against those, who charge Valla with Plagiarism in this particular, viz. that he did not make use of an observation which might have strengthened his arguments, and was to be met with in Dionysius Halicarnassensis (45).

(41) Glareanus, in Annotationibus ad Librum I. T. Livii, pag. m. 40.

(42) In the 7th letter of the 9th book, pag. m. 546.

(43) Except that he says, pag. 548, that Brutus was Tarquin's cousin-german ; where-in he is mistaken.

(44) Glareanus, ubi supra.

(45) Dionysius Halicarnassensis shews, that Lucumon went to Rome the 8th year of Ancus's reign at the farthest ; from whence it follows, that he lived 16 years at Rome before he was a king. But Valla says he lived there only ten years.

TANDEMUS (a), an Heretic, who rose in Germany, under the Emperor Henry V, about the year 1124, and spread his errors particularly among the citizens of Antwerp. He was a lay-man, who had his tongue well hung, and in subtilty of wit, eloquence, and many other respects, exceeded the greatest scholars of his time. He was magnificent in his apparel [A], kept a good table, and was attended by three thousand armed men ; by whose means he brought about what the charms of his language could not effect. He had infatuated his followers to such a degree, that they drank the water in which he bathed himself, and preserved it as a relic. One may very well wonder, though perhaps it is no wonder at all, how he could seduce many people with doctrines and actions so shocking as his were. He maintained, that it was no sensual action, but rather a spiritual one, to lye with a maid in her mother's presence, and with a wife in the sight of her husband, and he himself practised that doctrine. He killed those whom he could not convince. He ascribed no virtue to the sacrament of the Eucharist, and acknowledged no distinction between lay-men, and those who had taken orders. A priest

(a) He is also called Tanchelinus.

[A] He was magnificent in his apparel. This is a killing blow for Moreri, who says (i), that Tandemus revived the Heresy of the Adamites. These had for

their distinguishing character the doctrine of nakedness : but no body observes, that Tandemus was for having every one to shew his whole body, as Adam and

(b) He was the founder of the order of the Premonstratensies.

priest he happened to meet with in a boat, gave him a blow on the head, which killed him. His errors were not quickly extirpated; but at length those erring people were brought back into the pale of the Church. Norbert (b) was the chief instrument of their conversion; and so moved both men and women that they brought back the hofts they had kept for the space of ten years in some holes or trunks (c).

(c) Prætorius, voce Tandemus, et Sigebertus.

and Eve did theirs before the Fall. On the contrary, ' & vestibus deauratis incedens (2). --- He went in (2) Prætorius in Elencho Heretico, voce Tandemus, et Sigebertus.

TAPHIANS. A people situate towards Acarnania, the same with the Teleboes. See the remarks in the article TELEBOES.

TAPPERUS (RUARDUS) a native of Enchuysen in Holland, lived in the XVIIth century. He studied Philosophy and Divinity at Louvain, where he was professor of Divinity thirty-nine years, and Dean of St Peter's Church about twenty-four years. He was also chancellor of the university. He followed sometimes the court of the Emperor Charles V, and was consulted by that prince upon several important occasions (a). Some say, that those avocations hindered him from thoroughly studying the doctrine of Grace [A], and that not having read St Augustin carefully, and being desirous of keeping at too great a distance from the Protestants, he approached too near Pelagianism [B]. He was deputed to the council of Trent as the Emperor's Divine, in the year 1551 (b), where he discovered a great capacity (c), and immediately upon his return, he set up for a party-leader against Michael Baius (d), who strictly adhered to St Augustin's doctrine on the articles of Predestination and Free-will. He died at Brussels the second of March 1559, at seventy-one years of age [C], and was buried at

(a) Valer. Andrezus, Biblioth. Belg. pag. 802.

(b) Opera Baili, Part. ii, pag. 191, Edit. 1696.

(c) Valer. Andr. Bibl. Belg. pag. 803.

(d) Opera Baili, ibid. pag. 207, 217.

(1) That is the university of Louvain.

[A] Those avocations hindered him from studying thoroughly the doctrine of Grace. ' He would never have departed from the common doctrine of the university (1), had not his attendance at court, and extraordinary occupations, deprived him of the time he ought to have spent in reading St Augustin, before he filled his head with the notions of a new Divinity. ' This is what I find in page 48 of a book printed in 1688, with this title, *Apologie Historique de deux Censures de Louvain & de Douay sur la matiere de la Grace*.

[B] Being desirous of keeping at too great a distance from the Protestants, he approached too near Pelagianism. ' The desire of being always, and in every thing, of a contrary opinion to the new Heretics, was a common temptation at that time, which made some great men depart from tradition. Tapperus was one of them. . . . Peter Soto, that learned Dominican, Confessor to Charles V . . . wrote a long and learned letter to Tapperus, wherein he shewed him, that he could not follow those new opinions, without running into Pelagianism (2). ' Soto was in the right to address him in these terms; for Tapperus taught, in express words, that man is able to do many good actions by the meer strength of nature, and without the assistance of Grace; *Sine Gratia ex viribus nature multa bona ab hominibus fieri posse* (3), and that the wicked and the infidels might glorify and worship God, and avoid sin, without any other assistance than that of nature. ' *Quod Impii & Infideles per solam naturæ legem, sicut Deum cognoscere, ita eum solum adorare & glorificare poterunt: & quod Impius & Infidelis solis naturæ talentis naturalibusque viribus relictus possit vitare peccata: quia, inquit, discernit inter multa licita atque illicita, ita pro tempore & loco potest non peccare, nolle fornicari, ex eo quod judicat illa esse illicita. OMNE ENIM QUOD MALUM ESSE NOVIT, ODISSE ATQUE ABOMINARI POTEST* (4). -- That the wicked, and the Infidels, by the law of nature only, as they were able know GOD, so might they worship and glorify him; and that a wicked man, or an Infidel, left only to his natural strength and talents, might avoid sin: because, says he, he can distinguish between the lawfulness and unlawfulness of a great many things, and consequently can, at the proper times, and occasions, avoid sinning, resolve against fornication, from his judging them to be unlawful. FOR EVERY THING WHICH HE KNOWS TO BE EVIL, HE MAY HATE AND ABOMINATE. ' He maintained, that a man would not be guilty of sin in not being converted, if he wanted the grace necessary for his conversion. ' Sic igitur deest gratia, quæ opus est, ut ad Deum cor converti pos-

(2) Gery, Apologie Histor. de Censures, p. 49.

(3) Ruard. Tapperus, in Art. vii, contra Protestant. apud Opera Mich. Baili, Part. ii, p. 218, Edit. 1696.

(4) Oper. Baili, ibid.

fit, NEC PECCATUM EST quod quis non convertitur; quia non potest pro tunc ad Deum converti, & necessario non convertitur, & per consequens non liberè (5). --- If therefore the grace be wanting, (5) that without which the heart cannot be converted towards GOD, NEITHER IS IT A SIN for one not to be converted; because it is not in his power at that time to be converted, and he is of necessity not converted, and consequently not of his own free will. ' Some other propositions of this nature, extracted out of Tapperus's book, may be seen in the new edition of Michael Baius's works, at page 218 of the second part.

[C] He died . . . the second of March 1559, and at seventy-one years of age (6). ' It will be said, perhaps, (6) This does not agree with his Apotheosis, where it is affirmed, that he died at the council. Would he have said so, if he had known, that Tapperus returned from Trent to Louvain in the year 1552? He found the first mistake in Valerius Andreas; but how came he not to find there also the correction of that mistake? The two Latin verses wherein the numeral letters point out the day and the year of that Doctor's decease, give us the year 1558. Moreri quotes them after Valerius Andreas, and therefore ought to have concluded from them, that 1559 was a fault of the press. Besides, Valerius Andreas observes, that Tapperus's Apotheosis was printed in the year 1558 (7). ' This is what may, I think, be objected to Moreri: but I have something to say in his vindication, as to the first head; for he was in the right to place Tapperus's death in the year 1559: and because the nature of his work did not oblige him to make any criticisms, he may be excused for keeping to the *Bibliotheca Belgica*, without entering upon the discussion of the faults. ' The author of that *Bibliotheca* is not exact enough, he confounds his reader, and throws him into disagreeable perplexities. He acquaints us, that the two verses mentioned by him, point out the year in which Tapperus died; but they point out the year 1558. I add, that the Apotheosis of that Doctor was printed in the year 1558, how can those things be reconciled with the year 1559, in which he says Tapperus died? Why does he not remove such a difficulty? Should he not have acquainted us, that the author of those two verses began the year at Easter? According to this reckoning, the second of March, 1558, mentioned by him, is, in effect, the second of March 1559. I think Valerius Andreas knew nothing of this solution. Note, That the author of Tapperus's Apotheosis (8) supposes, (8) Fol. m. A5 that Tapperus died after Charles V. ' It is certain that this Emperor died in September 1558: which proves, that

(7) It is certain, that the Book-seller, who printed that Apotheosis, put 1558, at the end of the advertisement to the reader.

at Louvain (e). He left his estate to the poor, and his books to the Faculty of Divinity (f). I will give the catalogue of his works [D], and some extracts of that doctor's Apotheosis [E]. His violent zeal against the Protestants did not prevent his declaring that

(e) Valer. Andr. ibid.

(f) Id. ibid.

that the second of March, on which Tapperus died, belongs to the following year, and that the Apotheosis was not printed till the year 1559 (g).

[D] *I shall give the catalogue of his works.* He published in two volumes in folio, at Louvain, 1555: *Explicationes in articulos circa Ecclesiastica dogmata hoc seculo controversa, à Facultate Theologica Academicæ Lovaniensis Caroli V. Imp. jussu collectas.* His *Orationes Theologicae una cum corollario de veris calamitatibus Belgii causis atque remediis*, were published by Lindanus at Cologne in the year 1577, in 8vo. An edition of his works in folio was printed in the same town, in the year 1582. The original of his treatise, *de Providentia Dei & Prædestinatione* is kept at Louvain; but it is written in fo bad a hand that no body could ever decypher it (10).

(E) . . . *And some extracts of his Apotheosis.* The edition I make use of is that of Basil 1567, in 8vo. The title of it runs thus (11). *D. Ruardus Tappart Enchiridion, hæreticæ pravitate primæ & postremæ per Belgicum inquisitorem, Cancellarii Academicæ Lovaniensis, Apotheosis: Gratiano vero autore: Lexe læstor fustissimam ecclesiasticorum tyrannidem, qua quid profecerint demonstrabit, nisi Deus avertat, totius tandem inferioris Germaniæ excidium: liber ante octo annos primum editus fuit, sed ita ut omnia ista, quæ nunc præsentibus motibus gliscent, tanquam in speculo ostenderit. Tum igitur est collatis omnibus inter se, judicium facere quàm nihil autorem præfagientem fessierit.* It is a dialogue between Tapperus, a Genius, and St Peter. We find in it, that Tapperus aspired to the bishopric of Louvain (12). That when he delivered, in the same town, a panegyric upon Maximilian King of Bohemia, that prince silenced him with these words; *I have heard what he will say, as well as what he has already said; that he had an extreme aversion to those who talked of permitting the clergy to marry, and exhorted the latter to beg of God, that he would be pleased to deliver them from the temptation of the flesh by some dreams; or, if such a remedy was not sufficient, to be prudent, when they could not be chaste: Ad castitatem servandum, vitandumque conjugium solæ nostris orgiis initiatis horti ut quoties sentirent desiderio humanitatis intumuisse venas, orarent Deum, ut ab ea imbecillitate liberaret ipsos per somnia, & nocturnas palutianculas. Si ne hoc quidem profecisset, quod non possent casti, facerent caute, nec admitterent ullo pacto in animos suos flagitiosam cogitationem de conjugio sacerdotum: That his first exploit against the sectaries, was to cause John Vordenas to be burnt at the Hague, who maintained, that he had done well to marry, though he was a priest: That the city of Antwerp, for fear of losing their trade, did not approve that the heretics should be persecuted; and that he advised the King of Spain to order it to be burnt, that the other towns might be terrified by such a severe punishment: That he was deputed to Trent, where he spoke first as being the eldest of his colleagues: That the Spaniards themselves laughed at his speech: That he lost a great many books in his return to Louvain: That, after his return, he and his colleagues caused all the translations of the scripture to be condemned, except the Vulgar: That they endeavoured to destroy all the works of Erasmus, but could not succeed in it, being thwarted by the President of Brabant, and the Bishop of Arras: That Sleidan's history proved a most pernicious poison, which every body greedily swallowed: That it was translated into all sorts of languages: That the emperor commended that Historian for his faithfulness, and was surprised to find in it so many hidden truths (13). That it could not be put into the Index of prohibited books, before it had been read over and over by every body: 'Tunc demum (si diis placet) Sleydani nomen ridiculè adjectum est catalogo nostro, cum omnes (inquam) ut ungues suos tenerent, aut potius satietate nauferent. Ante nihil impetrari potuit (14). . . . Then at last (as Heaven would have it) Sleidan's name was ridiculously added to our Index, when every body, I say, had got him by heart, or rather were grown tired with him. Before this nothing could be obtained.' That the great care taken to get the books of the Protestants*

condemned, was not sufficient to prevent the artifices of the Bookfellers: That by altering or leaving out the names of the authors, many dangerous books were put off, and the Inquisitors imposed upon; and that it fell out sometimes, that they condemned a book, which they had before approved of. *Quamquam ne sic quidem cavere potuimus quin typographi, homines verisutissimi imposuerint nobis: mutatis auctorum nominibus, vel omisiss, vel inversis, vel etiam Græcè reditis quæ erant Latina, & è contrâ: ut sæpe coacti simus quæ antè approbaveramus, ea damnare post, vix auri prosteri apud regem nostram simplicitatem. Nam ex titulis librorum æstimanda nobis omnia erant, cum non vacaret perlagere quæ intus erant, quorum quedam ita etiam erant obscura & ingeniosa (qua fraude semper hæretici abundarunt) ut quid scriberetur, non assequeremur. Ad quem modum turpiter nos decipit Philippi Melancthonis libellus de Theologia Christiana, qui titulo Hippophili Melangei passim senatorum, præsidum, & nostrorum etiam Bæcalauorum manibus tritus est: donec amici, qui in Germania adhuc synceri erant, admonuerunt, ut habita synodo consuleremus lexica nostra, fore enim ut idem esse Philippum & Hippophilum deprehenderemus (15). . . . Idem accidit in Cælii Secundi de providentia libello quidem non magno, sed pestilentissimo: quem ille nebula tum primum innotescens Areneum inscriperat. Nos enim rati esse poeticum, aut grammaticum figmentum, non ante officiebamus fucum quàm omnia exemplaria essent Lovanii distracta. Taceo de Hutteno, Calvino, Urbano Rhegio, & aliis (prò dolor) multis, quos nobis oscitantibus nescio quibus titulis, ex metamorphosi opinor Ovidiana petitis, insinuaverunt (16). . . .*

Alto even all this care was not sufficient to prevent the Bookfellers, who are a very cunning sort of people, from imposing upon us: by changing authors names, omitting, transposing, or even translating into Greek what was Latin, & vice versa; so that we were often forced to condemn what we had before approved, and scarce durst own our simplicity before the king. For all the judgment we could be able to make, was only from the titles of the books, as we had not time enough to read their contents, and there were some of them so obscurely and artfully contrived, the Heretics being always ready at this sort of deceit, that we could not be certain what subject was treated of. We were basely imposed upon in this manner by Philip Melancthon's book de Theologia Christiana, which, under the name of Hippophilus Melangeus, passed every where currently thro' the hands of our senators, presidents, and even the bachelors of our university, till some of our orthodox friends in Germany, advised us to call a synod, in order to consult our Lexicons, for that we should find Philippus and Hippophilus to mean the same thing. . . . The like imposition happened in regard to Cælius Secundus's book concerning Providence, not great indeed, but very pernicious: which the vile author then first appearing intitled Areneus. We believing it to be some poetical or grammatical fiction, did not discover the cheat, till all the copies brought to Louvain, were sold off. I omit Hutten, Calvin, Urban Regius and others, alas too many, whose works they sold under our noses, by I know not what titles borrowed: I think from Ovid's Metamorphosis.' Afterwards Tapperus tells us, that he forced several students in Louvain to recant, and pay a fine: That he caused some women of good families were by his order buried alive (17). That he persecuted Perlevald, a Rhetorician, who spoke ill of the inquisitors: That, fearing this accused person would prove his innocence, since he was favoured by several people, he brought against him a charge of Sodomy, which deprived him of most of his protectors (18). That he privately condemned him to perpetual imprisonment; but, that in order to avoid the charges of maintaining this prisoner, or the odium of having let him starve, he delivered him to a gentleman, who interceded for him: That afterwards he forced that gentleman to answer for the guilt of that intercession, and condemned him to forfeit his whole

The Inquisitors
Comple

(15) Ibid.
D a verso.

(16) Ibid. fol. 3 verso.

have been
confiscated
rect

(17) Mulieres primarias & optimas in urbe prognatas terra obruentes (ut videtur) curavi. Ibid. fol. E verso.

(18) Homini caeco & deformi masculi amoris infamiam affixi, statimque oculus Euro à favore causæ plerisque deterrui. Ibid.

(9) It is said in the title of the edition of 1567, that this work had been printed eight years before.

(10) Taken from Valerius Andreas, ubi supra, pag. 303. See also Puffendorf, Apparatus, Tom. ii, pag. 316.

(11) You will find the title of the first edition at the end of this remark.

(12) Episcopatum Lovaniensem spectasti. Atque circa init. But how can this be, will some say, since Louvain is not an episcopal town? The answer is, that the abbots of Aftrem, St Bernard, and Tongerlo, who opposed the erection of the new bishoprics, endeavoured to reduce them to one only, which was to be at Louvain. See Brandt, in his History of the Reformation, Tom. i, p. 239.

(13) Ipse Cælius delectatus lectione obdormit & cretissimarum rerum narratione, & commendabat veritatem. Apud Ruardus Tappart, folio D verso.

(14) Ibid.

VOL. V.

E e e

TAPPERUS.

294

(g) Poffev. in Appar. Tom. ii, pag. 358.

(b) Id. ibid.

that what is said in the sixth chapter of St John's Gospel does not concern the Lord's Supper, though the Fathers have applied the words of this Evangelist to that mystery in their sermons (g). This opinion of his was confuted (b). He esteemed Faustus Regienfis to be orthodox [F]. Lindanus bestowed singular praises upon him, and believes, that Tapperus was endowed with the gift of prophecy [G].

whole estate. I omit a long account of the proceedings against Angelus Emphilius, a Paris divine. Fraud and violence had here an equal share. It is observed, and in the preamble to that account, that Bartholomew Latinus compared the Christian Church to a bear's cub, which could not receive its true shape, till it had been licked for many ages: *Perinde ac si religionem Christianam urfa aliqua peperisset, quam non una mater tamen lambendo detergeret atque efformaret, sed mille quingentorum annorum somnia* (19). Here follows a reflexion of the author of the Apotheosis. 'O cæci! Christi lex æterna est, nec eget maturatione temporum, ut stabilitatem consequatur. Alioqui primis ecclesiæ membris magna fuisset injuria facta, si quid ad illorum institutionem defuisset ejus percipiendi edentula ista mundi senectæ demum capax fuisset. . . . O ye blind! The law of Christ is eternal, and it wants not to be ripened by time to gain its perfections. Otherwise the first members of the Church must have suffered great hardship, if any had been wanting in their institution, which the toothless old age of the world might afterwards have been capable of perceiving.'

Let us here, by the way, take notice of the fate of the controversies. At that time the objections of the Protestants forced Latomus to maintain, that the beginning of Christianity was a chaos, which had been continually saying, that things should be brought to the first institution; and that whatever was not prescribed in the scripture should be abolished. What course did he take to answer them? He bethought himself of this hypothesis, that the Church had attained to perfection only by degrees. The above-mentioned reflexion, which was the Protestants reply, is the foundation of a book which the Bishop of Meaux wrote against them, an hundred and forty years after (21). What course did M. Jurieu take to answer him? He revived Latomus's hypothesis (22). What an exchange is this?

Note, it is supposed, that Tapperus confessed he had performed the part of a midwife in a boat, without knowing what he did, and without having heard that children came into the world in that manner; believing still what his mother had told him, that they came out of the parley-bed. 'Ecce auditus vagitus est (ut sit verbo veritas) nescio quo loco Dii talem terris avertite pestem: ego inde prodire infantes putarem? Mater mihi persuaserat apud nos e proximis arundinetis dari mulieribus (23). Behold I heard a squalling (you will pardon the expression) I know not from what quarter Ye gods avert so dreadful a scene: could I have ever believed children to come from thence My mother had persuaded me that women had them from among the reeds.' Note also, that, though he is made to confess, that he felt, since that time, the motions of lust, and looked upon his servant-maids, with some sort of temptation (24). Yet he is not contradicted, when he protests, that he had never lain with a woman, nor even saluted any (25). He did not come off with being instrumental in the delivery of one: For at his coming out of the boat, he was surrounded by a great number of country women, who hurried him into a tavern, and forced him to be god-father to the child, and to pay the reckoning. He had not one penny left, when he had paid for the entertainment that was made at his cost: 'Emunctus sum omni pecunia: nec potui redimere ubi navem appulsemus quin fierem compater hominis quem nunquam vidi. Pertrahebant me in diversorium palustres mulierculæ bibacillimæ, vocatus sacrificus æque sobrius omnes certatim pascabantur tanti compatri largitate nunquam nudior, nec sordidior redii do-

mum (26). I was cheated of all my money: nor could I get ashore again, without becoming gossip to the child of a man I never saw. I was dragged to a tavern by some drunken jades who belonged to the sens, the priest was called, who was no soberer they all fell to as if for a wager, at the cost of my god-fatherhood I never got home in a poorer or dirtier condition.' His exploits against the Anabaptists are not forgotten in the Apotheosis, nor his pernicious maxims, or methods of inquisition. Take notice, that Valerius Andreas confesses, that this piece does very well discover Tapperus's conduct. 'Cæterum, sicut be (27), Apotheosis R. Tapperi scriptis Henr. Geldorpius, editam ann. 1558 in 4to. Verum fannus & scommatibus plena genium auctoris sui prodit: ex qua alioqui summi illius viri ACTA DILUCIDE PATENT. But Henry Geldorpius wrote Tapperus's Apotheosis, published in the year 1558, in 4to. But the satire and banter it is full of, shows the genius of its author; tho' otherwise that great man's ACTIONS ARE TRULY EXPOSED in it.

This article being ready to be sent to the press, I met with a copy of the first edition of the Apotheosis. I shall set down the title of it, that it may be compared with the title of the second. *Clariss. Theologi D. Ruardi Tappart Enchiridion, hereticæ pravitate primarii & generalis inquisitionis, cancellarii celeberrimæ academici Lovanienfis, pridem inconfutabili suorum luctu laureo auctore. Reperies in hoc scripto, lektor, non parum multa scitu dignissima, & paucis hactenus cognita inquisitionum hereticæ pravitate consilia atque secreta: quæ omnibus tandem cognoscenda proponi, in primis interesse reipublicæ duximus.*

[F] He believed Faustus Regienfis to be orthodox.] He quoted him, 'calling him an venerable man: Whereupon, being informed by one of his brethren, that Faustus had been condemned, as being full of errors; he was very much surprized at it, and could not believe it; as Eitius relates in a Theological discourse, pronounced at Douay, in 1609. He had it from the doctor himself, who gave that information to Tapperus (28). Here is another authority for it: Ut quantum Pelagianis faverit, neminem lateret, Faustum regiensem episcopum, qui Semipelagianorum fuit antesignanus, & cujus libri à sancto Gelasio papa in concilio Romano à Catholicorum albo deleti sunt, passim commendat & inter patres adducit (29). That all the world might know how much he favoured Pelagianism, he every where commands and ranks among the Fathers Faustus Bishop of Reggio, who was the leader of the Semipelagians, and whose works were struck out of the catholic list by St Gelasius the Pope, in a council at Rome.

[G] Lindanus bestowed singular praises (30) upon him, and believed that Tapperus was endowed with the gift of prophecy.] These are his words: 'Hoc ipsum certe tam vita, quam voce, cum apud nos mortalis ageret, magis præ se ferebat, disertè tantum non prophetans, quæ modò peccatorum nostrorum causa Belgici patimur, sicuti & his ipsius orationibus perspicue prædixisse cernitur (31). This very thing most certainly he more evidently pointed out while he continued with us in this mortal state, both by his life and doctrine, almost expressly prophesying what we in Holland have suffered for the sake of our sins, which from these very orations he appears to have clearly foretold.' There was no need of being a very great prophet, to foretel, that the conduct of the Roman Catholics against the new religion, would occasion great disorders; and that a civil war would be the consequence of their tiring out the patience of the Protestants.

(26) Ibid. fol. G 2 verso.

(27) Valer. Andr. ubi supra, pag. 303.

(28) Gery, Apol. des Centures, pag. 50.

(29) Opera Mich. Baii, Part. ii, pag. 218, 219.

(30) Ornamentum hujus seculi nostri singulari fabricata perpetue exemplum, inviolatum castitatis & ejus virginis speculorum, prudentie norma, eximie pietatis in pauperes specimen, juvenis frequentioribus assidue mo-deste regula, temperantie amplexus, tolerantie, patientie, charitatis Christianæ, omnia denique virtutis magister abolu-tissimus. Lindanus.

(31) Lindanus, in Prefat. Oratorum Theolog. Ruardi Tapperi, pag. 26. He has A Prophetarum vacuus plethique piis viris crederetur: alie non videretur qui cum spiritu prophetie divinitus prædium fuisse pronuntiavit.

bear's cub

(19) Ibid. folio E 3.

gradually perfect

(20) Ne vacillarent argumenta Latomii quum rudem indigestamque molem vocat primitivam Ecclesiam. Ibid.

(21) See the Preface to his Histoire des Variations.

(22) See his Pastoral Letters, wherein he describes the doctrine of the ancient Fathers.

valerius from persley

(23) Apotheosis fol. G 2.

(24) Ab eo die nunquam carui nescio quo pruritu, nec equis oculis aspexi famulas meas. Ibid.

(25) Ibid. fol. G verso. See below, citation (31), the passage of Lindanus.

TARPA

TARPA (SPURIUS METIUS, or MÆCIUS) was a Licencer, or a Critic, of the Poems, that were to be recited on the Stage. He had four colleagues, and it was necessary that one of them should approve those pieces before they were produced in public [A]. In order to it, the Poets were appointed to meet in the temple of Apollo Palatinus, where they read their works, and then the Critics passed their judgment upon them. Good judges were not always pleased with Tarpa's judgment, as appears from a passage of Cicero; which may be seen at the end of the last remark of this article. However it is true, that Horace, who was no flatterer, says nothing of that Critic but what is more in his favour than to his prejudice [B].

[A] *It was necessary that one of them should approve those pieces, before they were produced in public.* This particular is to be found in one of the scholiasts upon Horace, on these words of the tenth satire of the first book.

... Hæc ego ludo
Quæ nec in æde sonent certantia iudice Tarpa,
Nec redeant iterum atque iterum spectata theatris.

*These lines shall ne'er before the audience come,
From Tarpa's judgment to receive their doom,
Nor shall they entertain the stage of Rome.*

* Metius Tarpa, says he, fuit iudex criticus, auditor assiduus poematum & poetarum in æde Apollinis seu Musarum, quo convenire poetæ solebant suæ scripta recitare, quæ nisi à Tarpa aut alio critico, qui numero erant quinque, probarentur, in scenam non deferbantur. --- Metius Tarpa, says he, was a critical judge, a constant hearer of the poems and poets in the temple of Apollo, or of the Muses, whither the poets used to assemble to recite their works, which unless they were approved by Tarpa, or some other critic, there being five in number, were not admitted on the Stage. This office might be compared with that of the censors of books, in the countries where there is an inquisition. It was very troublesome, both because so many readers were to be heard, and because the censors were exposed to a double danger: For the pieces, which they rejected, made the authors very angry with them, *genus irritabile vatum* (1); and those, that were approved, might not please the people, or persons of judgment.

[B] Horace . . . says nothing of that Critic, but what is more in his favour, than to his prejudice.] Horace

mentions him again in his *de Arte Poetica* *. And * Ver. 386. here are some of his words.

Si quid tamen olim
Scripseris, in Meti descendat iudicis aures
Et patris, & nostras.

*If you have wrote some piece in poetry,
Read it to Tarpa, to your fire, and me.*

Vossius (2) after having observed, that Achilles Statius (2) Vossius, de (3) confesses he does not remember to have read any thing concerning that Metius Tarpa any where, except in the tenth satire of the first book of Horace, says, that he is also mentioned in the tenth satire of the first book, and repeats what Horace says there about Tarpa. This is plainly the effect of a great absence of mind. Vossius remembered, that Horace mentions this Critic twice; in the tenth satire of the first book, and in his *de Arte Poetica*; But he forgot, that the passage known to Statius was that of the tenth satire; which is the reason why he refers him to it. I do not know whether he perceived that mistake when the book was printed off; for, tho' there are many things in his *Adenda* which he desires to be inserted in the page, where Achilles Statius is mentioned, and though the passage concerning Metius, in Horace *de Arte Poetica*, is one of those things; yet the reader is not told, that there is any correction to be made in that page. Here is the passage of Cicero, which I have promised to set down: 'Reliquas partes diei tu consumebas his delectationibus quas tibi ipse ad arbitrium tuum comparas: nobis autem erant ea perpetienda quæ scilicet Sp. Mæcius . . . probavisset (4). --- The remaining part of the day you employed in such diversions as you had been pleased to prepare; but we were forced to bear those which Metius Tarpa had approved.'

(1) Horat. Epist. ii, lib. ii, ver. 105.

(3) Notis ad Hor. Sat. X lib. i.

(4) Cicero, Epist. i, lib. vii, ad Famil.

TARRUNTIUS (a) (LUCIUS) surnamed *Firmanus*, because he was a native of *Firmum*, a town of Italy, in the country of the Picentini, flourished at the same time with Cicero, and was one of his friends (b). He was a Mathematical Philosopher (c); I mean, that he pretended to a great skill in Judicial Astrology. He would be little known, had he not drawn up two Horoscopes, mentioned by the ancients, one was that of Romulus, the other that of Rome [A]. Those Horoscopes were retrograde, and

(a) Some call him *Tarruntius*, being deceived by the Greek word *Tarruntius*. See Salmasius, in Solin. pag. 15.

WE

(b) See the remark [A], citation (2).

(c) See the remark [C], citation (11), and the remark [A], citation (1).

[A] One was the Horoscope of Romulus, the other that of Rome.] Plutarch gives the following account of it. Varro, who was the most learned of the Romans in history, had a particular friend named Tarruntius, who being both a great Philosopher and Mathematician, applied himself out of curiosity to draw horoscopes by the means of Astronomical tables, and was esteemed the most eminent in his time. He proposed to him to find the day and hour of the birth of Romulus, from the known actions of his life, as the solution of Geometrical problems is performed by analysis from the data first laid down; for he maintained, that the same art which from a given nativity could predict the life which was to follow, might, and ought, with stronger reason, from a known life, exactly determine the nativity which had preceded. Tarruntius performed what Varro requested. After having considered the inclinations and actions of Romulus, the time of his life, and manner of his death, and compared all these accidents together, he very positively pronounced, that he was conceived the first year of the II^d Olympiad, the twenty-third day of the month which the Egyptians call *Choiak* *, about the third hour of the day, at which there was a total eclipse of the sun;

* December.

that he was born the twenty-first day of the month. That †, about sun-rising; and that the foundation of Rome was laid by him the ninth day of the month called *Pharmouthi* †, between the second and third hour; for these people pretend that there is a certain time fixed, which governs the fortune of cities, as well as that of men, and that by the position and different aspect of the stars may be discovered the first moment of their foundation (1). Cicero relates more particularly what concerns the Horoscope of the city of Rome, and very justly laughs at it. L. quidem Tarruntius Firmanus familiaris noster, in primis Chaldaicis rationibus eruditus, urbis etiam nostræ natalem diem repetebat ab iis Parilibus, quibus eam à Romulo conditam accepimus: Romamque in iugo quum esset Luna, natam esse dicebat, nec ejus fata canere dubitabat. O vim maximam erroris, etiam ne urbis natalis dies, ad vim stellarum & lunæ pertinebat? Fac in puero referre ex qua affectione cœli primum spiritum duxerit, num hoc in latere, aut in cœmento, ex quibus urbs effecta est, potuit valere (2)? --- Lucius Tarruntius Firmanus, indeed my very good friend, eminently skilled in the Chaldean Astrology, searched back for the birth-day even of our city, from the circumstances with which we have been

(1) Plutarch, in the Life of Romulus.

(2) Cicero, de Divinat. lib. ii, cap. xlviii.

we find scarce any examples of them; for there are very few Astrologers, who pretend to find out the moment of any person's birth, from the consideration of his adventures [B]. Tarruntius, at Varro's request, took that course, and boldly gave his answer as to the hour of the birth. There is reason to believe that he is quoted by Pliny [C].

'been told it was formed by Romulus: and declared that it was begun when the moon was in Libra nor did he scruple to predict its fortune. O the strength of error, to suppose that even the birth of cities can have any relation to the influence of the moon and stars! if we grant that in the case of a child, it may be of some consequence, under what disposition of the Heavens it draws its first breath; can this have any influence over brick and mortar, the materials of a city?' We may observe a considerable difference between the account of Cicero and that of Plutarch.

According to Cicero, Rome was founded on the day of the Palilia, that is the 21st of April, and therefore of the Palilia, that is the 21st of April, and therefore Tarruntius followed the common opinion (3): but according to Plutarch, he did not follow it; for he placed the foundation of that city on the ninth day of an Egyptian month (4), which day, according to some learned Chronologers (5), answered to the fourth of October. Some (6) Chronologers conjecture, that the year which the inhabitants of Alba, and Romulus made use of, was out of order; that the month of April corresponded with the Autumn; and that after King Numa had given a new form to the Roman year, the festival of Pales, which was celebrated the twenty-first of April, corresponded with the Spring. According to this conjecture, it might be true at the same time, that Rome was founded the twenty-first of April, of the year of the Albans, and the ninth of an Egyptian month, which corresponded with the month of October. However, Varro would not have exactly followed his friend Tarruntius, if he had said positively that Romulus began to build Rome the twenty-first of April, that is, in the Spring. Note also, that Plutarch does not tell us in what year the city of Rome was founded, according to Tarruntius. However, it is said that this Astrologer fixed on the third year of the VIth Olympiad. I take this opinion to be grounded upon Tarruntius's placing the conception of Romulus in the first year of the IIId Olympiad; and upon a supposition, that, according to the common opinion, he said, that Romulus built the city of Rome at eighteen years of age. Besides, it is supposed that Varro followed Tarruntius's opinion; which is a further reason why it is commonly believed, that he placed the foundation of that city in the third year of the VIth Olympiad.

I shall observe, by the way, that Dionysius Halicarnassus, after many Chronological computations, fixed upon the first year of the VIIth Olympiad for the epoch of the foundation of Rome (7). Father Labbe therefore expresses himself very ill, when he says (8), that some ascribe that epoch to Dionysius Halicarnassus. An eminent Divine (9) tells us, that he was followed therein by Tarruntius and Velleius Paterculus; but that Varro had pitched upon an epoch later by two years, that is the fourth year of the VIIth Olympiad. He must give me leave to observe three or four things. I. Tarruntius wrote before Dionysius Halicarnassus; for it appears from the manner in which Cicero speaks of the Horoscope of Rome that Tarruntius was then dead; and we know that Dionysius Halicarnassus composed his History after he had resided twenty years at Rome (10): now he came thither soon after the entire defeat of Marc Antony. II. Tarruntius's opinion does not agree with that of Dionysius; for, as we have already seen, he placed the foundation of Rome in the third year of the VIth Olympiad. III. Velleius Paterculus places it in the same year (11); and therefore does not follow the opinion of Dionysius Halicarnassus. IV. The most learned Chronologers ascribe the same hypothesis both to Varro and Tarruntius, and therefore Varro's epoch is not later by two (12) years than that of Dionysius.

[B] There are very few Astrologers, who pretend to find out the moment of any person's birth, from the consideration of his adventures. I do not understand what reason Mr Dacier could have to say; that it is always the surest way to draw retrograde Horoscopes; for an Astrologer may boldly infer from known actions the time of the conception and birth. Who will contradict him (13)? I answer, that there is nothing more easy

than to contradict him. In most families the birth-day of each person is well known; and as for men of note, one may easily learn their nativity, by having recourse to the public monuments. So that a mistaken Astrologer would be quickly convicted of his error; which is the reason why those cheats will not venture upon it. They may safely determine at what hour a modern king was born, for they know it and may read it in History; and therefore they are not contented about such things. I shall occasionally take notice of a mistake of Amyot, which Mr Dacier has not avoided. Plutarch says there was an eclipse of the sun on the day that Rome began to be built. Σύ-ροδον ἐκλείπειν ἐν αὐτῇ γενέσθαι σελήνης πρὸς ἡλίον (14). Xylander is wrong in translating those Greek words thus: *quo subiens solis orbem luna deficit*. Amyot has not been more successful, on which day, Mr Dacier says he, *there was an eclipse of the moon*. Mr Dacier renders it, *and that there was an eclipse of the moon*. There is no obscurity in the original; it expresses a conjunction of the sun and moon. Now that is a time when the moon cannot be eclipsed, and the only one when the sun can be eclipsed. An observation should have been made upon the parenthesis, immediately following the Greek words, just now quoted out of Plutarch. That parenthesis runs thus: (ὅν ἔπει τριτὴ τῆς ἐκείνης οὐρανιας ἐκλείψεως εἰδέναι καὶ Ἀντίμαχον οἰόνται τὸν Θίων ἱστορεῖν) that is, it is thought, that the Poet Antimachus, a native of the Isle of Teos, saw that eclipse of the sun, which happened in the third year of the VIth Olympiad.

The whole note of Mr Dacier (15) amounts to this, that the Poet Antimachus, mentioned by Plutarch, is the same, whom others will have to be a Clarian or a Colophonian, and who lived in Plato's time. If this note was right, Plutarch must have been grossly mistaken; for how could Antimachus, cotemporary with Plato, observe an eclipse so long before he was born? To justify that Historian it must either be supposed, that he speaks of an Antimachus different from him, who was cotemporary with Plato; or that he only remarks in his parenthesis, that Antimachus, cotemporary with Plato, speaks of an eclipse, which is the same with that of the third year of the VIth Olympiad. It is certain this is not the sense of his Greek text. Father Labbe perhaps had been more in the right to censure Plutarch upon this account, than upon some other things. He observes (16), after Petavius, that not only in the month Pharmutbi, but also in the whole Julian year 3961 of the Julian period, there was no eclipse of the sun, that might have been observed in Asia, much less in Italy, by that Poet Antimachus of Teos. And then he adds: 'Plutarch is mistaken in this; for having said that Tarruntius affirmed that Rome was built when the sun and moon were in conjunction, he adds, of his own head, that this new moon was a true eclipsic one.' This censure is false in some respects; for Plutarch does not say, that Tarruntius affirmed that the sun was eclipsed on the day of the foundation of Rome. Tarruntius says this only of the day of Romulus's conception. And therefore Petavius (17) should not have affirmed, that Tarruntius said to both with respect to that day, and that of the foundation of Rome.

[C] There is reason to believe that he is quoted by Pliny. It is in most editions, 'L. Arruntio qui Grace de astris scripsit, Cæfare Dictatore qui item (18). -- Lucius Arruntius who wrote in Greek about the stars, Cæsar the Dictator who did the same.' (18) Plin. lib. i, cap. i. Which might make one think that Pliny speaks of L. Arruntius, a celebrated Historian; but because the best manuscripts have it, *L. Tarruntio*, it is easy to guess at the true reading; which is, *Lucio Tarruntio* (19). There is a quite contrary mistake in Solinus's (20) manuscripts, where we find *L. Arruntius* instead of *L. Tarruntius* (20); for it is plain Solinus speaks of the Mathematician, who drew up the Horoscope of Rome at Varro's request. 'Ibi Romulus manifestavit qui autem ante tertiam plenam: sicut Lucius Tarruntius prodidit Mathematicorum nobilissimus (21). -- There Romulus

(3) See, below, citation (21), what I quote out of Solinus, who ascribes also to Tarruntius the common opinion.

(4) According to Xylander, Amyot, and Mr Dacier, the month Pharmutbi answered to the month of April. But Petavius is of a different opinion. See the next citation.

(5) Petavius, in Rationario Temporum, Part. ii, lib. iii, cap. ii, pag. m. 157.

(6) See Father Labbe's French Chronology, Tom. i, in the introduction, ch. iii, num. 5.

(7) Dionys. Halic. lib. i, pag. m. 60.

(8) Labbe, Chronol. Française, in the introduction, ch. iii, num. 5.

(9) Jaquetot, de l'Existence de Dieu, pag. 11.

(10) Dionys. Halicarn. lib. i, pag. m. 6.

(11) Sexta Olympiade post duos & viginti annos quam prima constituta fuerat Romulus. . . . Roman urbem Palilibus in Palatio condidit. Vell. Paterculus, lib. i, cap. viii.

(12) He should have said three years.

(13) Dacier, remarks upon the Life of Romulus, pag. m. 178.

(14) Plutarch. in Romulo, pag. 24.

(15) Dacier, Remarques sur la Vie de Romulus, pag. 178.

(16) Labbe, ubi supra, num. 6.

(17) See his Rationarium Temporum, Part. ii, lib. iii, cap. ii, pag. m. 159, where he refers to the 48th chapter of the ninth book of his work de Doctrina Temporum.

(18) Plin. lib. i, pag. 2, Edit. Romul.

(19) See Vossius, de Scient. Mathematicis, pag. 447.

(20) Vossius, ibid. See also Solinus, lib. i, pag. 15.

(21) Solin. lib. i, pag. 2, Edit. Romul.

- * *Romulus refused, who very auspiciously laid the foundation of the walls at eighteen years of age, on the eleventh of the Kalends of May, between the second and third hour: as Lucius Tarruntius, the Prince of Astro-*
- * *logers, has discovered.* Note, that Pliny places our Tarruntius before Cæsar; which confirms what I have said, that this Astrologer lived before Dionysius Halicarnæus.

TARTAGLIA (NICOLAS) a native of Brescia in Italy, lived in the XVth century. The poverty of his parents did not prevent his becoming very illustrious (a). He distinguished himself extremely by his knowledge in Mathematics, and composed among other works [A], a large treatise on numbers and measures, divided into six parts, which gained him a very great reputation. He taught in Milan, and frequently disputed there with the famous Cardan [B], who did not find his account in it (b). He was afterwards called to Brescia, and there explained Euclid, but he had so many reasons to be dissatisfied with his country, that he quitted it, and retired to Venice where he was very much esteemed. He there met with persons of generosity: and received large presents from the Senators and Ambassadors. Some of his books were dedicated to Henry VIII, King of England, and others to Francis Donato, Doge of Venice (c). He died at Venice towards the end of the year 1557, if we believe Thuanus (d) [C]. I shall take notice of a French translation of his Arithmetic, and shall mention some encomiums bestowed upon him by the translator [D]. I shall also correct a mistake in Thuanus [E].

(a) Ghilini Teatro, Tom. ii, pag. 200.

(b) Leonardo Cozzando, Libreria Bresciana, pag. 271.

(c) Ibid.

(d) Thuanus, lib. xix, circa fin.

[A] He composed among other works. You will find the title of his works in Vossius (1), Ghilini (2), Mr Teiffier (3), and in Cozzando (4), &c. which I shall therefore omit. Note, that Tartaglia wrote in his mother-tongue.

[B] He frequently disputed with . . . Cardan. Thuanus has not expressed this very clearly: and his translator has made it still more obscure. Hieronymi Cardani emulationes varias questionis ingeniose pertrahavit (5): that is to say, according to the translation given by Mr Teiffier, he has, in imitation of Cardan, ingeniously treated a great many different questions (6). This was not a bare emulation, much less an imitation only, but a direct quarrel. See Cozzando, at page 271 of his *Libreria Bresciana nuovamente aperta*, printed at Brescia in the year 1685 in 12mo.

[C] He died . . . towards the end of the year 1557, if we believe Thuanus. This date is refuted by two Italian authors, Ghilini (7), and Cozzando (8), who assure us that he flourished about the year 1560. Paulus Freherus (9), falsely charges Ghilini with saying that he died that year. Mr Konig (10) places his death in the year 1566.

[D] I shall take notice of the French translation of his Arithmetic, and shall mention some encomiums bestowed upon him by the translator. William Gosselin has translated out of Italian into French, Tartaglia's Arithmetic divided into two parts, whereof the first part contains seventeen books, and the second eleven. These are the two first parts of his great work on numbers and measures. This translation was printed at Paris by Gilles Beys in the year 1578 (11) in 8vo, and dedicated by the author to Margaret of France, Queen of Navarre. The Epistle Dedicatory of the first part is dated from the college of Cambray in Paris the second of November 1577; and that of the second the twelfth of the same month. The first of those two epistles tells us that the Queen loved Mathematics, and that on this account she had retained Mr Gosselin, the author's father, as one of her household. She is exhorted to embrace with the same fondness all the other parts of Mathematics, as she had done Astronomy and Astrology.

The translator's Preface deserves to be considered. He says that *Luke du Bourg, an Italian Fryar, and Stephen de Ville-Franche, a Frenchman, have opened a way for us to Arithmetic*; 'however the Italian in my opinion has greatly surpassed the Frenchman, as well in his practical rules, as in his treatise of irrational numbers, and of this divine Algebra; after these two masters who flourished much about the same time, have followed disciples and scholars without number, who like little rivulets have all their original from these two fountains, but yet fall much short of the depth of their spring heads, either for the want of capacity, or sufficient application.' He names some of the principal writers who have treated of Arithmetic, and distinguishes them by their native countries (12): but he is mistaken in placing Tonifal among the French, for he was an Englishman. He affirms that several of the moderns have decked themselves with the spoils of Tartaglia; that he himself would not follow their example, nor rob him of the honour due to him; that it is Tartaglia who has dispelled our wretched ignorance, and introduced such a method of practice, that the whole world cannot possibly produce one shorter and easier; that he is an author, in comparison with whom that great Mathematician, Luke Paccioli (13), is no more than a wart compared with a mountain . . .; that Friar Luke, Pisano (14), and Ville-Franche, have opened the door, but committed a great many errors, and falsities; and that Nicolas Tartaglia has entered, put all their inventions into form, given a colour to the gross out-lines they drew and projected; and lastly, made an infinite improvement of their discoveries, laid open their falsities, and introduced truth. He pretends that 'all the succeeding Arithmeticians, have only translated word for word the rules of the Italian authors, and principally of Tartaglia, and published them under their own name; and, what is worse to prevent this from being discovered, they have inverted the whole order of our author's work, tho' they have stole only the most common things, with which they have stuffed their writings very confusedly; which is the reason that we have at present in French only pieces of Arithmetic, which have their practical rules borrowed from Italian ingenuity, the order only, or rather the disorder, is French, the obscurity is French, the clearness Italian; and this was absolutely necessary; for it would have been too notorious a thing to have seen the method, rules, examples, and brevity, of an author published under another's name: so that we are obliged to confess, to our shame, that the knowledge of this science is hitherto ingrossed in the hands of strangers.' He concludes with shewing what he has added new to this translation, and which consists, among other things, in the demonstrations he has invented, or borrowed from Peter Nunes a Spaniard.

Here is an instance of sincerity: he frankly confesses the inferiority of the French, their Plagiarism, the superiority of the Italians, &c. but he finds in this sincerity, disadvantageous to his country, his own particular advantage: he raised himself by this means above the level of others.

[E] I shall . . . correct a mistake in Thuanus. We read at the end of the nineteenth book of that Historian these words: *Qui (Tartalea) multa in eo genere a Luca Brugenfi Monacho solertissime inventa illustravit, multa correxit.* That is to say, according to the translation of Du Rier, *Tartaglia has explained a great many things which Luke of Bruges a Monk had ingeniously invented, and has corrected a great many of them* (15). I am inclined to believe that Thuanus had written *Brugenfi*, and that the Printer had changed the word to *Brugenfi*. This mistake occasioned the translator to put *Luke de Bruges* in his translation; and this might induce us to believe that the mathematical writings of this author have been corrected by Tartaglia. Nothing is more false. The author whose inventions he has adjusted, was a Franciscan Friar, called Lucas Paccioli, and a native of Borgo di S. Sepolcro, a town in Italy, called in Latin *Burgum*, or *Burgus sancti Sepulchri*. There was printed at Venice in 1509, a collection of his mathematical works in Italian, in folio. He has translated into Italian the books of Euclid (16).

(13) This is the same with Friar Luke.

(14) It is Leonardus Pisanus, who should have been named before Friar Luke. For the latter has taken several things from the former.

(15) See Teiffier, Addit. aux Eloges, Tom. i, pag. 120.

(16) See Gellner's Epitome, pag. 549.

He has published in the same language a volume of Arithmetic, in which he has inserted a treatise of Algebra, which is partly that of Leonardus Pisanus, the first of the moderns who has written on Algebra, but whose work was in Latin, and never yet printed (17).

(17) Blancanus, in Mathematicorum Chronologia, pag. 59.

TASSO (TORQUATO) an Italian Poet, one of the greatest wits of the XVIIth century. See his life written by the Abbot Decharmes. It is a very curious piece (a), and may be easily met with. I have collected a great many faults committed by several authors in speaking of this Italian author; but I am obliged to reserve them to another opportunity. You will find an abridgment of the life of this great Poet prefixed to his Moral Treatises, translated into French by Baudouin (b).

(b) They were printed at Paris in the year 1632, in 8vo.

(a) Printed at Paris in the year 1690, and reprinted in Holland. See the *Histoire des Ouvrages des Savants*, for December 1690, pag. 160.

TAVEAU (RENATA) only daughter and heiress of Leon Taveau, Baron of Mortemart (a), Lord of Lussac &c (b), was married to Francis de Rochechouart Lord of Tonnai-Charente in the XVIIth century. She lived a holy life, and as she was exhausted with a long exercise of prayers and penitence, she fell into so strong a trance that every body believed her dead, and she was accordingly buried: one of her domestics having observed that she was put in her coffin with a diamond ring of great value upon her finger, got into the vault in the night to steal it, and found her alive She lived to have children afterwards. She had a very great share in the good graces of Catherine de Medicis (c); but she forfeited them by an incident which deserves to be related [A]. She was mother of Renatus de Rochechouart Baron of Mortemart, great-grandfather of the Marshal de Vivonne [B].

(a) Anselme, Palais d'Honneur, pag. 582.

(b) Mercure Galant, of October 1702, pag. 107.

(c) Ibid.

[A] She forfeited the good graces of Catherine de Medicis by an incident which deserves to be related. The first occasion of her disgrace with that Princess was this: happening to be one day with her in the church of St John en Greve at a sermon of Menot, the famous Franciscan, she laid hold of the disposition which she found the Queen was put into by this discourse of Menot, which was extremely strong and pathetic, upon the irregularities of the Great, and gave her some good advice upon the conduct of the ladies of her court, and upon the inclination she had for Astrology. The Queen who had shed a great many tears at this sermon (to the great surprise of the audience, because it was not at all usual to see her shed tears upon such subjects) received her advice kindly at the time that her spirits were terrified with the truths this bold Franciscan had been pronouncing; but these ideas of terror being by degrees dissipated, the advice of the Lady de Mortemart was no longer seasonable, and she was sent away to Poitou (to which place she was banished) to bestow it upon some persons of more scrupulous consciences (1).

(1) Mercure Galant, October 1702, pag. 108, &c.

[B] She was mother of Renatus de Rochechouart . . . great-grandfather of the Marshal de Vivonne. Who in 1570 married Jane de Saulx, daughter of Gaspard, Lord of Tavannes, Marshal of France, and of Frances de la Baume Montreuil, who was so learned, and so perfect a mistress of the holy scriptures, that she had the honour to convert a famous Rabbi whom she overcame in a regular disputation (2). Let her therefore be placed from henceforth in the catalogue of learned women. Renatus de Rochechouart was father of Gaspard de Rochechouart, Marquis de Mortemart, who married Louisa de Maura, a lady of great virtue and beauty (3). She was daughter and heiress of Charles Count de Maure (4), and of Diana Descars who was esteemed one of the finest wits of the XVIIth century (5). Gaspard de Rochechouart was father of Gabriel, in favour of whom the Marquisate of Mortemart was erected in Duché-Pairie, and who was the first gentleman of the King's bed-chamber, and governor of Paris, and died in 1673, father of Marshal Vivonne, and of Madam de Montelpan, Madam de Thianges, and the Abbess of Fontevraud (6).

(2) Id. Ibid. pag. 106.

(3) Ibid. pag. 105.

(4) Le Port Anselme, Palais d'Honneur, pag. 524.

(5) Mercure Galant, October 1702, pag. 105.

(6) Ibid. pag. 103, 104.

(a) It appears from his Print prefixed to the first volume of his Travels, that he was 74 years old in 1679.

(b) Tavernier, Preface to the first volume of his Travels.

(c) See the title of the same volume.

(d) Mercure Galant, for February 1690. The author is mistaken, when he says that Tavernier was 89 years old in July 1689.

TAVERNIER (JOHN BAPTIST) Baron d'Aubonne [A], one of the greatest travellers of the XVIIth century, was born at Paris in the year 1605 (a). His natural inclination to travel was very much increased by what he daily saw and heard in his father's house [B]. He began so early to gratify that passion, that at twenty-two years of age he had seen the finest countries in Europe; as, France, England, the Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland, Poland, Hungary, and Italy (b). He travelled six times into Turkey, Persia, and the East-Indies, during the space of forty years, and by all the different routes it was possible to take (c). He was making a seventh journey when he died at Moscow in July 1689 (d). He had got a great estate by dealing in jewels; and yet he found himself in low circumstances towards the latter end of his life, by reason of the misconduct of one of his nephews, who had in the Levant the direction of a cargo made in France, amounting to two hundred twenty-two thousand livres prime cost; which ought to have produced above a million (e). It is thought he undertook his last journey in hopes of making up that loss. He had collected a great many observations (f); but he had never learned either to speak or write good French, and therefore the relations he has given us were drawn up by another hand [C]. In one of them he speaks very

(f) Some of which are mere fables, which they made him believe to impose upon his simplicity. See Doctor Giv: Francesco Genelli Carris, pag. 138, 139, of the second Tome of his *Giro del Mondo*, printed at Naples in the year 1699, in 12mo.

(1) Eldest son to Mr du Quefne the greatest seaman that ever was in France.

[A] Baron d'Aubonne. Being made noble by the King of France, he bought that Barony, situated in that part of the Canton of Bern called *le pais de Vaud*, near the lake of Geneva. He was obliged to part with it, either to pay his debts, or to make the necessary preparations for his last voyage into the East Indies. Mr du Quefne (1) bought it, and retired thither after the revocation of the edict of Nantes. He is still in possession of it, and resides there, preferring that retirement to the great employments he might have pretended to by changing his religion.

[B] By what he daily saw and heard in his father's house. His father, a native of Antwerp, settled at Paris, where he had a great trade in Geographical maps. The curious, who bought them of him every day, used to discourse very much of foreign countries. His hearing all those discourses, and seeing so many maps, increased in young Tavernier his inclination for travelling.

[C] The relations he has given us were drawn up by another hand. They appeared (2) in two volumes in the year 1679, and contain his six voyages. After this

(2) At Paris in 4to, they have been reprinted in Holland in 12mo.

ill of the Dutch (g). In some others he shews himself a down-right Plagiary [D]. He was grievously abused in a book intitled *l'Esprit de Mr Arnauld*: and it is thought he would have made his application to the Civil or Ecclesiastical courts of Holland, in order to have satisfaction for that affront, had he not considered that his adversary would have sheltered himself under the pretence of having done it to vindicate the country and religion. Those, who approved this reason of his patience, wondered that he did not pay some author to revenge him [E]. Mr Chappuzeau, who was abused in the same book upon

(g) See the remark [C].

this he published an account of the Seraglio, and some particular tracts, viz. an account of Japan and the kingdom of Tunquin; the History of the conduct of the Dutch in Asia, &c (3). It is in this last tract that he violently inveighs against the Directors of the East India company: and it is but just to observe, that he declares at the very beginning, that he does not blame the conduct of the Dutch in general (4); on the contrary he commends them very much. *What I say, adds he, does not concern the States-General, for whom I have a due respect: I speak only of private men, for whom I am not obliged to have any regard, since they have been so unjust to me upon several occasions.* If you desire to know who put his memoirs into order, you need only read the following words of Mr Chappuzeau (5). 'At his return in the year 1668, having a great estate, he (6) thought fit to buy the Barony of d'Aubonne in the Canton of Bern: to that end he came to Geneva, and lodged for some time in my house. Our friendship was then renewed, but upon a very heavy condition; which was, to give a form to his chaos, as you rightly call the confused memoirs of his six voyages; which he had taken partly from one Father Raphael a Capuchin, who had been a long time at Ispahan. For above two years, I amused him with hopes of taking my pen in hand for him; but at last losing all manner of patience, and meeting with me at Paris, whither I went upon private occasions; how unwilling soever I was for a great many reasons to grant him his request, as several of my friends can testify, he at last found means to engage me in that work by a superior power. For this purpose he made use of the interest of the first President de Lamoignon, who having spoke to the King about it, as he gave me to understand, told me, that his majesty desired to see Tavernier's voyages; and that, since he could not find any body else, whose assistance he could ask in this work, I should not put him off any longer. Mr de Lamoignon, and Mr de Baviile his son, loved to hear him tell stories of his voyages; and the first being besides curious of medals, had received a great many from Tavernier, as the latter often told me, which obliged him in gratitude to espouse his interest. Thus, Sir, if you knew how much I was mortified, not to say put to the rack, for above a year that this wretched work lasted, by the bluntness of the husband, and the ridiculous humour of the wife, doubtless you would not have been so cruel as to insult me about a thing which I did in spite of myself, terribly against my will, and without any profit. This is what a great many honest men can still witness. Besides, I must acquaint you, Sir, that when I came to that chapter, relating to the conduct of the Dutch in Asia, the friends to whom Mr Tavernier communicated his memoirs, which he generally trusted to his memory, and dictated to me in bad French, having nothing in writing but what he had from the Capuchin, did whatever they could to dissuade him from harping upon that string. I did the same, and when I saw that neither they nor I could prevail upon the man, whom you have well described, I told him plainly, that he might look for some body else to write down such a discourse. After the high encomium, I had bestowed upon the Dutch nation, with no less gratitude, than justice, twenty years before, in the first volume of my *Europe vivante*, which has been printed twice in French, and translated into the German language: after all these encomiums, I say, so sincere and so well-grounded, should I have been so base as to contradict myself, and be guilty of such a shameful complaisance? Upon my refusal, therefore, which occasioned our falling out for some days, and was like to have occasioned our falling out for ever, Mr Tavernier made his application to Mr de la Chapelle, Secretary to Mr de Lamoignon

before-mentioned. This Secretary undertook to write for him; and it is he, who, after my return to Geneva, wrote the third volume of Tavernier's relations, which contains the History of Japan; and wherein, either out of imprudence or malice he introduces a Protestant speaking the language of a Roman Catholic. I can easily prove that I was at Geneva with my family, and not at Paris, when that volume was written and printed.'

It will not be improper to acquaint the reader, that the Jesuits complained of Tavernier's relations (7). See what Mr. Arnauld has said to them by way of answer (8).

[D] In some others he shews himself a downright Plagiary.] Dr Hyde (9) having quoted a long passage of the relation of that author, informs us (10), that Tavernier took it, like a downright plagiary, out of a book printed at Lyons, in the year 1671, in 8vo, and written by a person who had been thirty years in Persia. 'Sciendum est Tavernierum ad initia Plagiarum hocce de Gavris paragraphum (& forte multa alia) defumpisse ex alio itineraio Gallico ed. Lyons 1671, in 8vo, cujus autor est P. G. D. C. i. e. Pater Gabriel de Chinon, qui 30 annos in Persia transegit (11). --- It is to be observed that Tavernier, like an errant Plagiary, has stolen what he says of the Gavris, pag. 545. (and perhaps a great many other things) out of a French book of travels published at Lyons 1671, in 8vo, whose authors name is P. G. D. C. that is, Father Gabriel de Chinon, who lived 30 years in Persia.'

[E] They wondered that he did not pay some author to revenge him.] Although Tavernier did not write the books that came out under his name, yet he was obliged to look upon himself as the author, and to act accordingly in regard to those who would criticize him. I mean, that regularly, and according to the laws of the commonwealth of learning, he ought to use no other weapon but pen against pen. The censuring of a book, is, properly speaking, an action brought against an author before his true judges. He is summoned to appear before the public to be told, either that he argues wrong, or that he understands certain things in a wrong sense. He is therefore cited before a lawful tribunal; for it belongs to the public to give judgment on such sort of accusations, both in the first and last instances. He ought not therefore to appeal to other judges. This would be too plainly betraying his own weakness; this would be changing the order of things, and endeavouring to supply his want of knowledge by the favour he hopes his intriguing may procure him before the tribunal of the magistrates (12). But I except out of this rule those authors, who are wounded in their reputation: For if a critic is not contented to censure a wrong version, a false principle, a wrong consequence, an unfaithful quotation, &c. if he will also charge a blot in the family, a robbery, an adultery, a state-crime, &c. it is very allowable to bring him before the secular Judges. The accused person, let him be never so learned, may without appearing to mistrust his pen, very well remove the cause from one tribunal to another, and declining the jurisdiction of the publick, have recourse to the magistrates and the laws established by sovereigns against defamatory libels. I do not say that he is obliged to have recourse to them; for he may be contented with the short way of giving the lie, in imitation of Father Valerian (13): He may with a *mentis impudentissime*, -- *thou art a most impudent liar*, confound his accusers, and fully justify himself, unless they make out their accusations. So that every author, struck with this thunder-bolt of honest Father Valerian, will be accounted a public calumniator by all equitable judges, if he does not clearly prove the scandalous facts he has broached against the honour of his neighbour. His silence is a full vindication of those whom he accuses, *ad hoc non probante absolvitur reus*, if the prosecutor brings no proof

(7) In the the ad volume of the *Defense des nouveaux Chrétiens*.

(8) At the end of the third volume of the *Morale Pratique*.

(9) Hyde, de Religione veterum Perfarum, in Appendice, pag. 535, & seq.

(10) Id. ibid.

(11) Id. ibid.

(12) Compare what shall be said in the remarks of the article THOMAS.

(13) See the article MAGNI, remark [C].

(3) At Paris in 4to, in the year 1681, reprinted in Holland, in 12mo.

(4) Tavernier, Histoire de la conduite des Hollandais en Asie, ch. i, pag. 241, of the third volume of his relations, Dutch edition.

(5) Défense du Sr. Samuel Chappuzeau contre une Satire intitulée l'Esprit de Mr Arnauld, pag. 7.

(6) That is to say, Mr Tavernier.

his account, has not been altogether true. I was treated there with civility and kindness. See what a difference the thing is curious enough.

(14) See the Entretiens sur la Cabale Chimerique, pag. 202, & seq.

(15) See, above, remark [C], citation (4).

(16) Chappu-
zeau, Défense
&c. pag. 8.

Cabale chimérique (18).

(18) Pag. 201,
& seq.

(19) It consists of two letters of which contain but ten pages in 4to, in two columns. I have set down above, citation (5), the title of this pamphlet.

(a) Taken from a public Thesis maintained at Wittemberg the 31st of March, 1688, intituled. *Memoria Job. Tauleri restaurata, &c.* composed by Georgius Friedericus Heupelius Argentoratensis.

[A] *So many different opinions about the year in which he died.* According to some (1) he died in the year 1355. Others (2) will have it that it was the 15th July 1379. Others (3) are of opinion that he departed this life in the year 1380.

[B] *He wrote several books.*] He wrote them in his mother-tongue: The most considerable were translated into Latin by Surius, and published at Cologne, in the year 1548, in the following order. *Historia vite & conversationis Joannis Tauler. Conciones de tempore. Conciones de Sanctis. De veris virtutibus, institutionibusque divinis. Epistolæ devotionem, divinumque amorem spirantes. Prophetiæ de plagis nostri temporis. Cantica quedam spiritalia animæ Deum impendendi amanti. De*

(3) Stratemannus, Theatr. Histor. Eccles. pag. 847, apud Georg. Frideric. Heupelium, in Memoria J. Tauleri restaurata pag. ult.

novem rubris sive gradibus Christianæ perfectionis. Speculum lucidissimum & exemplar Domini nostri J. Christi. Convivium M. Eckardi jucundum & pium. Colloquium Theologi & Mendici. Oratio fidelis præparatoria ad mortem. Præparationes quatuor notabiles ad mortem sed mortem. Notabiles alia ad mortem silem præparatio. De decem cæcitatibus, & quatuordecim divini amoris radicibus libellus. Note, that all the works, are collections out of Taulerus, and intermixed with the writings of some other authors (4). Note also, that the work intituled, Sermones quibus explanatio evangeliorum quæ diebus Dominicis ac festis sanctorum enarrari solent, comprehendi- was printed at Augsburg, in folio, in the year 1508, at

(4) Taken from
Father Labbe,
Differt. de Scrip-
tor Eccl. Tom. i,
pag. 608, 609.

concerning which there are different opinions: they are blamed by some Catholics, and commended by some Protestants [C]. It cannot be denied that he corrupts several of his readers by leading them into Fanaticism [D]. We shall see below the character which a man

Basil in 1521 and 1522 in folio, at Francfort in 1681 in 4to, and that the Augsborg edition does not contain all the sermons that are to be found in the other editions (5). Some will have it, that Taulerus is the author of a book intitled, *Theologia Germanica*, printed in 1518, 1519, 1520, 1528, 1681, &c. No body doubts that the person who translated it into Latin, under the name of *Johannes Theophilus*, was Sebastian Castalio. Many are of opinion, that Taulerus is not the author of that book: For, say they, he is quoted in it, and the author styles himself priest and warden of the order of the Knights of the Teutonic order, in their house at Francfort (6). James Thomafius has made a collection of several encomiums bestowed upon that book (7). But see particularly the Preface to the French edition (8) of *Theologia Germanica*, and the letter concerning mythical authors at the end of that edition. You will find in the preface many particulars concerning the book translated into Latin by Castalio, and the following passage may be seen in the letter. 'Taulerus wrote in old German, which is rarely to be met with. Surius made a Latin translation of it, printed several times at Paris, and at Cologne, till the year 1615, which now serves instead of the original. There are many German editions of it, published both by the Roman Catholics and the Protestants: The Flemings have also printed it several times; but the old Flemish edition of Francfort in 1565, is altered, as well as that which M. Serrarius published at Hoorn, about forty years ago, though otherwise the latter contains more pieces of the author than any other. The best is that of Antwerp 1685: However, his institutions, his letters, and his exercises upon the passion, are wanting in it; but they are to be found by themselves, the two first with this title *Medulla Animæ*, of which there is an old French edition, but inferior to a new and very fine translation, both of his Institutions, printed at Paris in 1668, and of his Exercises upon the passion, printed in the same place the next year, with the Exercises of the pious Eschius, upon the purgative, illuminative, and unitive life, thereunto subjoined. Father Mabillon, in the catalogue inserted at the end of his *Traité des Etudes Monastiques*, places Taulerus's works among the spiritual books, translated into French. I never saw his Sermons among his works, though they are the most considerable part of them: And I am sure that this treatise concerning the poor life of *Jesus Christ* is much less to be found there, since it is wanting in Surius's Latin translation, and is only to be found in German and Flemish (9).

[C] They are blamed by some Catholics, and commended by some Protestants. Eccius said that Taulerus was a doating man, suspected of heresy, and one who ought always to have remained in obscurity. Vocavit Eccius Taulerum somniantem, hæreses arguit, & ut prorsus lateret, & nunquam in monasteria involare optavit (10). Blofius vigorously opposed this censure. 'Eccius strenue se opposuit Ludovicus Blofius Abbas Lætiensis qui Taulerum Catholicæ fidei integerrimum cultorem appellavit, dixit ea quæ scripsit sana & plane divinæ esse, optavitque in nomine domini, ut Taulerus ubique gentium cognitus esset, & à pluribus diligentissime legeretur: addit minus circumspexit Eccium, Taulerum nondum satis à se lectum damnavisse (11). - - - Eccius was strenuously opposed by the Abbot Ludovicus Blofius, who called Taulerus a most hearty maintainer of the Catholic Faith, and said, that his writings were not only sound but even divine, and wished in God's name, that Taulerus were known all over the world, and most diligently read: he adds, that Eccius had been too hasty and condemned Taulerus before he had sufficiently read him.' This judgment of Blofius Possivien mentions and approves (12). Spondanus takes Taulerus's part, and says he foretold Wickliff's heresies, and praises Blofius his apologist. Cujus (Tauleri) extant sermones, & alii tractatus unionem divini spiritus referentes: prædixitque hæreses contra Sacramenta & Dogmata Ecclesiæ Catholicæ brevi ab Wickliffe orituræ. Contra cujus obtractatores apologiam scripsit Ludovicus Blofius, VOL. V.

recenter ejusdem Spiritus Sancti devotissimus discipulus (13). - - - Taulerus's sermons are extant and other treatises, which seem as if inspired; he also foretold the heresies which Wickliff should soon broach against the sacraments, and the doctrines of the Catholic Church. His apology, in answer to those who censured him, was written by Ludovicus Blofius, a later and most zealous disciple of the same holy Spirit. Sixtus Senensis highly commends the devotion of our Dominican (14). I have read in Hottinger (15), that some Catholics call Taulerus an Herefiarch, and say that several people doubted of his salvation; but an apparition removed their doubts. Luther was one of those, who bestowed great encomiums upon Taulerus. Hunc doctorem, says he (16), scio quidem ignotum esse Scholis Theologorum, ideoque forte contemptibilem, sed ego plus in eo (licet totus Germanorum vernacula sit conscriptus) reperi Theologiæ solidæ & synceræ quam in universis omnium universitatibus Scholasticis Doctoribus reperiuntur, aut reperiiri possunt in suis sententiis. - - - This doctor, says he, I know is not taken notice of in the schools of Divinity, and therefore perhaps despised, but I have found more solid and sound Divinity in him, though all his works are written only in the German language, than in all the scholastic doctors the universities ever produced, or than can be found in their opinions. Let us see what he wrote to Spalatius (17). 'Si te delectat puram solidam antiquæ simillimam Theologiam legere in Germanica lingua effusam, sermones Joh. Tauleri prædicatoriæ professionis comparare tibi potes. Neque enim ego vel in Latina vel in nostra lingua Theologiam vidi salubriorem, & cum evangelio consonantior. - - - If you like to read pure solid Divinity, such as the primitive was, expressed in the German tongue, you may consult the sermons of Job. Taulerus, that famous preacher. Nor have I, either in the Latin or our own tongue, met with sounder Divinity, or more agreeable to the Gospel.' Luther's encomiums upon Taulerus have been prefixed more than once to the works of that mystical Divine (18). Some affect to say, that Luther spoke of him in this manner, either before he made his attack against Popery, or during the first years of his reformation, and afterwards grew more reserved in praising that writer. Post illa tempora ubi B. viro datum fuit tenebras papales magis magisque superare, & negotium cum novis prophetis intercessit in Taulero ejusque Theologia commendandis capiti esse parior (19). Nay, they quote a sermon, wherein he censures him for a pernicious doctrine, namely, that we ought not to pray to God. 'Taulerus exemplo nescio quo docere vult esse à precibus desistendum: sed hac doctrina nihil est perniciosius: nimis enim ad intermittendas preces jam antea propensi sumus (20). - - - Taulerus, I know not by whose example, teacheth, that we ought to desist from praying: but nothing is more pernicious than this doctrine: for we are too apt already to forget our prayers.' However it be, Michael Neander, Nicolas Hunnius, Dorſcheus, Quenstedt, Spener, Arndius (21), and some other Lutherans, have bestowed fine encomiums upon Taulerus; and Flavius Illyricus places him among the witnesses of the truth (22). Let us conclude this remark with the words of a modern Mystic. 'Every good man that knows him must needs like and approve him. Hence it is, that the wisest Protestants, Dr Arndius, Dr Mullerus, and many others, without excepting Luther and Melancthon, have commended him no less than the Roman Catholics, as may be seen at the beginning of the German edition of his Sermons, procured by the pious Arndius, and also before that of all the works of this author which was published by the famous Dr Spener, and re-printed several times (23) at Francfort.'

[D] It cannot be denied that he corrupts several of his readers, by leading them into Fanaticism. Beza despised him very much: Sainte Aldegonde looked upon him as an Enthusiast: Voëtius took him only for a man, who, without being a downright Enthusiast, said many things that made way for the Enthusiasm of some sectaries (24). Here follows a passage of Hoornbeek: 'Fuerunt sub Papatu, qui vel inficii, vel imprudentes

(5) Georg. Friedricus Heupelius, in Memoria J. Tauleri restaurata, fol. B.

(6) Ex cod. ibid.

(7) Thomaf. Schedasma Histor. de Philosoph. Gentili, Gnoſticorum, Heretic, & Theologia Myſtica, pag. 75; apud eund. ibid.

(8) Amsterdam 1700, printed by Henry Wetſſſin.

(9) Lettre touchant les Auteurs Myſtiques, pag. 12, 13.

(10) Georg. Fried. Heupelius, folio B verso. He cites Possivien. Appar. Sac. Tom. 1.

(11) Id. ibid.

(12) Id. ibid.

(13) Spondanus, ad ann. 1355, num. 17.

(14) Sixtus Senensis, lib. iv, Biblioth. Sanctæ, pag. 336, Edit. Colon. 1626, apud Heupelium, ubi supra, fol. B. 2.

(15) Hottinger, ubi supra: He cites Bæovius and Chrif. 1355. S. 21, 22.

(16) Luther. Tom. 1, Latin. Jenenſ. pag. 86, 6, apud Heupelium, folio B verso.

(17) Idem, Tom. 1. Epist. Epistol. xxiii, ad Spalat. A. 1516. dat. pag. 32. fac. 4, apud Heupelium, ibid.

(18) Christoph. Henric. Loebner, in brevi Judicio Theologico de Libello Germanico. That piece of Loebner was printed at Iena in 1681.

(19) Id. ibid. fol. A. 3.

(20) Luther. in Concion. domi publico habitis, Dominica Re. minific. Edit. Wankeliana, pag. 645, apud Loebnerum, ibid. folio A. 2 verso.

(21) See the same Heupelius, fol. ult.

(22) Lettre touchant les Auteurs Myſtiques, pag. 11.

(23) In 1680, and 1693, &c.

(24) See the same Heupelius, fol. B. 2.

a man well skilled in these matters gives of him [E]. We should do him wrong, did we not distinguish him from those mystical men, who have taught in Christianity something like the errors of the Eastern Philosophers [F], which I have mentioned in the article of Spinoza (b).

(b) See remark [A], of the article SPINOZA.

viam multam straverunt Enthusiasticis illis, sua Theologia mystica, quemadmodum loquantur, & libellis pietatis, quibus terminis & phrasibus duris, mysticis & allegoricis, tum inspirationis, tum deificationis, &c. utebantur, & ab aliis pro enthusiasmis suis habitibus vel acceptis postea fuerunt. Quales, Johannes de Schoonhoven, Job. Taulerus, quem inter Pontificios, Eckius; inter nostros Maraxius carpunt: defendit autem Lud. Blofius, singulari pro eo apologia (25). There were some under the Papacy, who either ignorantly, or imprudently, very much paved the way for those Enthusiasts, by their mystical Divinity, as it was called, and by books of piety, wherein were used the baroque mystical and allegorical terms and phrases of inspiration, deification, &c. which were afterwards borrowed and received by others in their Enthusiasms. Such as Johannes de Schoonhoven, Joh. Taulerus, who has been censured by Eckius, among the Roman Catholics, and by St. Aldegonde among us: but he is vindicated by Lud. Blofius in a particular apology. Nicolas Hunnius, and some other Lutherans, had the same opinion of Taulerus. Ex quibus & permultis similibus . . . proclive est iudicium ferre, an non Taulerus per se, minimum per accidens, Schwencfeldianorum, Anabaptistarum, & Weigelianorum mensis aniam dederit (26). . . . From which, and a great many others of the like kind . . . it is easy to judge, whether Taulerus of himself, and not at all by accident, has not given a handle to the fictions of the Schwencfeldians, the Anabaptists, and the Weigelians. Heupelius, so often quoted by me, reduces his whole disputation to these two propositions: 1. That Taulerus deserves to be recommended to the students in Divinity. 2. That he ought to be read with caution; for, says he, there are some false doctrines in his works, and some phrases that seem to favour the Enthusiasts and Quietists. Quod non solum haud pauci in eo reperiuntur errores approbati, qui in sermonibus edit. Francof. 1621, & 1681, diligenter sunt annotati, sed etiam non raro dictionibus & formulis loquendi utatur, quae videntur Enthusiasticis nominatim Weigelianis, & quos non ita pridem D. Michael de Molinos in Italia exclaustravit, Quietistis favere (27).

(25) Hoornbeek, Summa Controv. lib. vi, pag. m. 408.

(26) Nicolas Hunnius, in Confider. novae Paracelli. & Weigel. Theol. apud Heupelium, ibid. fol. B 3.

(27) Heupelius, ibid.

(28) That is, Taulerus.

(29) Lettre sur les Auteurs Mystiques, pag. 11, 22.

[E] The character, which a man, well-skilled in these matters, gives of him. The character of that mystical author (28), in my opinion, is this, That the soul, by the mortification of her passion, and vices, by the practice of virtue, by the denial and renunciation of herself, of her desires, of her will, self-love, and of her whole activity, and of all created beings, should return into her internal state, looking for God there, and finding him at last, who manifests himself there, by the birth of his divine Word, and the inspiration of his holy Spirit: and that afterwards, by a lasting and continual introversion, she should continue in that state of interiority, in which God may work in her his will, his wonders, and his special direction; of which nevertheless that author speaks but generally (29). These are the words of the author of the new edition of the Theologia Germanica.

[F] Something like the errors of the Eastern Philosophers. It is surprising that these mystical Christians, and these Heathen Philosophers, should have had so exactly the same notions, that one would think they had agreed among themselves to vent the same follies, some in the east, and some in the west. What a wonderful concert there is between people who never saw, and never heard of one another! I am going to cite a passage, which will shew us that some mystical men have taught the transformation of all things into God, and an identification, which would reduce the Creator and the creatures to a kind of nothingness, that is, to an eternal inaction. This is very like the Nireupan of the Siamese (30). These mystical men supposed the doctrine of the Trinity, and ascribed the whole action to the three Persons, and so they believed that the divine Essence itself did nothing; and that when the soul is transformed into God's Essence, and raises herself above the three Persons, she enjoys as great a rest

(30) See, above, the remark [A], of the article SOMMONA-CODOM.

as if she were annihilated. Ruysbroch shall be my witness. Itaque, says he (31), ne quis aliquo implicetur ac seducatur errore, diligenter falsos hosce Prophetas, me eos depingente, animadvertat. Qui primi generis sunt, Dei essentiam se esse ajunt supra divinitatis personas, adeoque se esse ociofos, ac si non essent: quandoquidem Dei essentia non agit, sed Spiritus Sanctus operatur. Putant ergo se ipso Sancto Spiritu esse superiores, & se neque ipso, neque ejus gratia habere opus: dicunt enim non modo nullam creaturam, sed nec ipsum quidem Deum quicquam eis vel conferre vel auferre posse. Quidam etiam ejus sunt sententiae, ut animas suas ex Dei substantia creatas affirmant, cumque mortui fuerint, rursum se futuros esse id quod antea fuerant: perinde ut scyphus aquae haustus ex fonte, si in ipsum fontem refundatur, idem est quod fuit prius. Ajunt praeterea, si quis per coelum omne pervagetur, nullum eum neque angelorum, neque animarum, neque ordinum, neque gloriae, neque praemiorum discrimen distinctionemque reperturum; siquidem nihil illic, nisi simplicem quandam beatamque essentiam, omni actione vacantem, esse arbitrantur: Addunt his, post extremum judicii diem omnes omnino homines, malos aequae ac bonos, & simul Deum ipsum, non nisi unam eandemque Dei essentiam, quae in omnem eternitatem abique ulla actione semper ocio vacatura sit, esse futuros. Atque eam ob rem nihil neque scire, neque cognoscere, neque velle, nec amare, nec cogitare, non gratias agere, non laudare, sed nec desiderare, nec habere volunt. Nam supra Deum & sine Deo esse, nec in ulla re Deum quaerere nec invenire, atque demum ab omnibus prorsus immunes esse volunt. Et hoc ipsi perfectam appellant spiritus paupertatem. Verum ejuscemodi paupertas in caelo minime invenitur, neque in Deo, neque in angelis, neque in sanctis, sed nec in hominibus bonis toto orbe terrarum. Itaque non nisi diabolica & tartarea paupertas est. . . . Therefore, says he, let every one in order to prevent their being seduced and led away into error, diligently attend to my description of these false prophets. Those of the first kind affirm themselves to be the divine Essence, superior to the persons of the Divinity, and therefore to be unactive as if they were not in being; because the Divine Essence is at rest, and the Holy Ghost only operates. They hold themselves therefore to be superior to the Holy Ghost itself, and to be in no want either of the Holy Ghost, or of it's influence: for they say that not only no creature, but not even GOD himself can add to, or take from them in any respect. Some also have embraced such an opinion, that they affirm their souls to be created out of the divine substance, and that after death they are again to return from whence they came, as a glass of water taken out of a fountain, if it is poured again into the fountain, is the same with what it was formerly. They say moreover, that if any one was to traverse the whole Heavens, he would find no difference nor distinction among angels, souls, orders, glories, or rewards; for that they believe nothing to be there but a certain simple and happy essence, void of all action: they add farther, that after the day of judgment, all men universally, the bad as well as the good, together with GOD himself, will make up only one and the same divine Essence, which will enjoy an absolute rest and inaction to all eternity. And for this reason, that they will neither know, understand, will, love, think, return thanks for, nor praise, nor so much as desire, or have any thing. For they will have themselves to be superior to and independent of GOD, and in no respect wanting to seek or to find GOD, but, in short, absolutely exempt from all things. And this they call a perfect poverty of spirit. But this sort of poverty is not to be met with, neither in GOD, nor in the angels, nor in the saints, nor even in good men, any where upon the face of the earth, therefore this poverty is only diabolical and hellish. Our Taulerus always differs from these doaters, and very solidly confutes those who fancy they are only a meer passive instrument in the hand of GOD (32).

(31) Ruysbrochius, in Libro de vera Contemplat. cap. xix, pag. 445. apud Glib. Voetium, in Exercitiis Focatis, cap. iii, pag. 36.

Hartley

(32) See the 2^d page of Taulerus, quoted by Voetius, ubi supra, pag. 78, 79.

TAURELLUS (NICOLAS) a Physician, and a Philosopher, was born at Montbelliard, the twenty-sixth of November 1547. He was admitted Master of Philosophy at Tübingen in the year 1565, and when the magistrates of Nuremberg founded an university at Altdorf, in the year 1581, they gave him the professorship in Physic (a). He discharged it with great ability: but because he departed from the opinions commonly received, he had some enemies, and fell out with the Divines. Those of Heidelberg cried him down as an Atheist [A]. He died at Altdorf in September 1606 (b). It was a time of pestilence; and as soon as he saw that one of his servant-maids had got the plague, he left his house in the night-time, but came home again soon after, and died the same day (c). He published some books which made a noise [B].

He was a little man; hence it was that a Poet, alluding to the word *Taurellus*, a diminutive of *Taurus*, bestowed this encomium upon him, that he was *Taurellus* in body, but *Taurus* in mind, *Corpore Taurellus, Taurus es ingenio*. It is one of the verses of an elegy, that was made in his praise when he was admitted to the degree of Doctor of Physic in the university of Basil (d).

(a) Taken from Melchior Adam, in *Vitis Medicorum*, pag. 403.

(b) *Id. ibid.*

(c) Paulus Freherus, in *Theatro Virorum illustrium*, pag. 1320.

(d) Taken from Scappius in *Scaligeri Hypobol.* fol. 196, verso.

(1) Giff. Voëtius, *Disput. Select. Tom. i.*, pag. 200.

(2) That letter is dated from Heidelberg the 26th of August 1610. It is the 149 among those published by the Remonstrants in the edition of the year 1684.

[A] The Divines of Heidelberg cried him down as an Atheist. Giffertus Voëtius tells us what was the occasion of it. He puts the question to him (1). 'Cur Theologi Heidelbergenses ante annos aliquot Nicol. Taurellum Philosophum non ignobilem dixerint Atheum Medicum, in Literis (2) ad Deputatos Synodi Holland. super libro & causâ Conr. Vorstii perscriptis? Et an non falcem miserint in alienam messem, & indignè traduxerint istius aliorumque similium magnorum virorum inventa ad illustrandam & perficiendam Philosophiam. . . . Why did the Heidelberg Divines, some years ago call Nicolas Taurellus, that eminent Philosopher, an Atheistical Physician, in their Letters to the Deputies of the Dutch synod, written on the occasion of the book and cause of Vorstius? And did they not meddle in a matter no way belonging to them, and unworthily traduce him, and other great mens inventions, towards illustrating and improving Philosophy?' And he answers it thus: 'Arbitror eus respectisse paradoxa non pauca quæ imprimis Compendio Metaphysico, & Triumpho Philosophiæ infargit; & ad divina ac Theologica passim applicat; quibus limites communes hodiernæ Christianissimæ Theologiæ transiliri, & dogmata nonnulla conquassari, atque adeo Scepticis, Libertinis, aliiisque fanaticis & secundi generis Atheis causam nimis tradi non immerito metuendum est. De intentione illius viri nolumus judicare, nec cætera ejus inquirimus. Aliter etiam judicamus de ingeniosis ipsius disputationibus, in naturalibus contra Piccolomineum, Cæsalpinum, alioque physicos: ubi omnem libertatem Socraticam tollere nolumus: nec theologi hoc fori est, sed medici, physici, mathematici: quomodo vice versa, metaphysica, pneumatologica, & theologica naturalia non tam, nedum solius physico-medici & mathematici fori sunt, quam theologi. Videant ergo juniores, ut cum judicio legant philosophemata ejus, quæ naturalia transcendunt. . . . I imagine they had an eye to the several paradoxes, which he has advanced, especially in his Compendium Metaphysicum, and Triumphus Philosophiæ; and has every where applied to Divine and Theological subjects: which there is too much reason to fear may be made use of in modern Christianity to break through the usual bounds of Divinity, to sap the foundation of some of it's doctrines, and consequently to make too great concessions to Sceptics, Libertines, and other Fanatics, and Atheists of the second rate. I shall form no judgment as to his invention, nor enquire into other particulars of him. I have a quite different opinion of him as to his ingenious disquisitions in Natural Philosophy, against Piccolomineus, Cæsalpinus, and other Natura-

lists: in which I am for allowing the freedom of Sacrales: nor does this regard Divinity, but Physic, Natural Philosophy, and Mathematics: as, on the contrary, Metaphysic, Pneumatology, and Natural Theology, belong not so properly, much less solely, to Physic, Natural Philosophy, and Mathematics, as to Divinity. Let therefore the young readers persevere with candor his Philosophical reflexions, which are above nature.' Tho' that famous author would not plainly condemn the Heidelberg Divines, he gives us room to believe that they were too hasty. Such accusations ought to be very rarely preferred. It appears, on the other hand, that he does justice to that professor, who was certainly a man of great parts, and a subtle disputant. I have quoted, in another place (3), a passage wherein it is said, that the same Divine charged him with Atheism: but I must observe here, that the terms of the original are not so strong: he only calls him an assertor of paradoxes, *Assertio paradoxorum* Taurelli (4).

[B] He published some books which made a noise. A Method of Prognostics in Physic; notes upon the works of Arnaldus à Villanova: *Disquisitiones Physicæ de mundo contra Piccolomineum: Disquisitiones Physicæ & Metaphysicæ de celo adversus eundem: Alpes cæcæ*, it is a book against Cæsalpinus: *de infiniti continui sectione: de rerum æternitate*. I have quoted in another place (5) a book, wherein he advances a particular opinion, concerning the souls of beasts. See the titles inserted in a passage out of Voëtius, in the foregoing remark.

He had begun a book *de Usis per se subsistentibus*, some pieces whereof were printed after his death, with a new edition of the tract *de Cælo & Mundo*. Picart, his colleague, took care of that edition at Amberg, in 1611, in 8vo. It appears from these fragments that Taurellus understood very well the nature of substance, and wherein it is distinguished from accidents. It is somewhat strange that the liberty he took to confute Aristotle should have exposed him so much to the hatred of Divines: for he principally confuted the doctrines of Aristotle that are contrary to religion. This we may see particularly in a book of his, printed at Marburg, in 1604, in 8vo, and intitled, *De Rerum æternitate: Nicolai Taurelli Noricorum Academia Professoris, Metaphysicæ Universalis partes quatuor. In quibus placita Aristotelis, Vallisii, Piccolominei, Cæsalpini, Societatis Conimbricensis, aliorumque discutuntur, examinantur atque refutantur*. He therein clearly and solidly confutes Aristotle's opinion, concerning the eternity of the world. He was certainly one of the best Metaphysicians of that age.

(3) In the article of GORLÆUS.

(4) Voëtius, in *Theologico-Philosophica Corollaria*.

(5) In the article SENNERTUS.

TAUVRY (DANIEL), Doctor of Physic, of the Faculty at Paris, was born at Laval, and there maintained a general Thesis in Philosophy at ten years of age. He was Physician of the Faculty at Angers, at the age of fifteen. He composed several works in Anatomy, and Physic [A], and was an illustrious member of the Royal Academy of Sciences. He died at Paris the first of March 1701, at thirty-two years of age (a).

(a) *Mercurius Galant*, for March 1701.

(1) See the next Journal des Savans, 1690, pag. 548, Dutch edition.

(2) *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, March 1702, pag. 357.

[A] He composed several works in Anatomy and Physic. That which is intitled, *Nouvelle Anatomie raisonnée*, was printed at Paris in 1690 in 12mo (1): it has been translated into English (2). His new practice in acute Diseases, and in those which depend upon the fermentation of liquids, was published at

Paris in 1698, in two volumes in 12mo. See the *Journal des Savans* of the fourteenth of July, 1698. In the same place was published, in 1699, a new edition of the *Traité des Médicaments*, which he had revised, corrected, and enlarged. The tenth *Journal des Savans* of the same year takes notice of it (3).

(3) Pag. 189, Dutch Edition.

TECMESSA

(g) *Apud Ser-
vium*, in *Æneid*
lib. i, ver. 619.
where instead of
Theomissam read
Tecmessam, and
instead of Turi-
facen read Eury
facen.

TECMESSA, the daughter of a Phrygian Prince [A], was made a prisoner when the Grecians ravaged all the countries adjacent to Troy. Ajax liked her so well that he made her his concubine. She forgot, by degrees, the fall of her family, and that he made her his concubine. She forgot, by degrees, the fall of her family, and that he conceived such an affection for Ajax, who promised to make her a queen (a), that she was extremely afflicted at his death [B]. He had by her a son called Euryfaces, who reigned in Salamis, after the decease of Telamon, Ajax's father. Teucer, the second son of Telamon, had a mind to return into Salamis, after he had settled in the isle of Cyprus; but Euryfaces prevented him (b). The Athenians had a particular veneration for Ajax and his son. Pausanias says (c) that the honours, which had been decreed to them, continued even to his time, and that there was still to be seen at Athens an altar of Euryfaces. We find in Plutarch (d) the privileges granted to the tribe of Æantides, and the encomiums on that tribe. I find nothing concerning the other son of Ajax, mentioned by Dictys Cretensis, whom he calls Achantides (e). His mother's name was Glaucia. He was put into Teucer's hands, as well as Euryfaces, when the Grecians took shipping in order to go home (f). Some have said (g) that Telamon grew angry with Teucer, because he did not bring back with him Tecmessa and Euryfaces. He embarked on board a vessel which made more haste than the rest. Pausanias observes (b) that Ajax's posterity was not very illustrious, and the private life of Ajax is the reason he gives for it; this, I think, is a false reason [C], I do not believe that, Lescalooperius had any grounds for saying, that Julius Cæsar composed a tragedy intitled, *Tecmessa* [D].

(1) Lib. ii.

[A] *A daughter of a Phrygian Prince.*] Dictys Cretenfis (1) calls him Teuthrantes. He ſays, that Ajax killed him *ſolitario certamine*. Every body will tranſlate theſe words as he thinks fit, and perhaps ſome readers will underſtand them of a duel. Afterwards Ajax took, plundered, and burnt the town of that Phrygian, whoſe daughter, Tecmeſſa, was carried away, with the reſt of the booty, and adjudged to Ajax, when the booty was divided. *Poſt paucos dies expugnata atque incenſa civitate magnam vim prædæ abſtrahit, abducent Tecmeſſam filiam regis. . . . Ac deinde Ajax ob egregia laborum ſacina Teuthrantis filiam Tecmeſſam concedunt.* If we believe Horace, the captive won Ajax's heart by her beauty (2). Sophocles (3) does not agree with Dictys in every particular : for he ſays, that Tecmeſſa's father was already dead (4); that his dominions were laid waſte by Ajax : and that it was his widow, who was killed when the town was taken. Tecmeſſa ſpeaks to Ajax in theſe words :

*Was by his cap-
tive's beauty won*
Horat. Od. IV,
lib. ii.

(3) In Ajace.

(4) He calls him
Telcutas.

(5) Here is what the Scholiast says upon that word.
 Ὡς τῆς ἰδίας θανάτῳ τῆς αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ ἄλλὰ, ἀντὶ τῆς δέ. See Camerarius's notes upon that place.

Σὺ γάρ με πατρίδ' ἤϊψωσας δορὶ
καὶ μητέρ' ἄλλ' ἢ μοῖρα (5) τὸν φύσαντά με
καθεῖλεν ἄδ' εὐ θανασίμους οἰκίητας.

Tu enim mihi patriam vastasti bello,
Matrem sustulisti, mors vero patrem
Abripuit ad manes qui apud inferos sunt.

*My country wretched by your sword was made,
My mother murder'd, while my father's shade,
Far from your reach had been by death convey'd.*

[B] *Extremely afflicted at his death.*] Sophocles and Quintus Calaber furnish her with very moving expressions. The first supposes that she used many entreaties to prevent his killing himself; that she begged of him not to leave her exposed to a thousand misfortunes by his death, and that she pressed it by reminding him of the pleasures he had enjoyed with her.

Ἄνδρὶ τοι χρεὼν
Μνήμην προσεῖναι, τερπνὸν εἴ τι πᾶσι παῖσι.

Decet enim virum
Memorem esse, si quid illi suave accidit (6).

*With ev'ry man who bears a grateful mind,
Each single pleasure must remembrance find.*

The scholiast observes upon this, that Tecmessa puts Ajax in mind of what had passed between them in bed, and that she does it modestly, and like a chaste woman (7). and not so bluntly as Hecuba in Euripides.

man (7), and not to blunty as Hecuba in Euripides' *Oedipus at Colonus* (*μαστεικτικὰ εἰσάγει τὴν ἑκάβην λέγουσαν Πά τας φίλας δ' αὖτ' ὑφ' ὤμων διέζεις ἀνάξ;* 'H τῶν ἐν ὤμῳ πάλαιον ἀσπασμάτων γὰρ τὴν' ἔχει παῖς ἐμὴ, κείνη δ' ἐγώ; What will my daughter get by the amorous embraces she will afford you in her bed? The French lady is more nice than that of Athens. The most excellent pieces of Racine would be huffed at for such a plainness).

[C] *This, I think, is a false reason.*] I will not object to Pausanias, that he says (8) Ajax succeeded his grand-father by the mother's side, who was King of Megara (9): I would readily agree with him, that Ajax lived always in a private capacity, because he died before his father Telamon: But I deny that this can be the reason why his descendants were less illustrious than those of Teucer, the second son of Telamon: These latter reigned in the isle of Cyprus till Evagoras at least, and the more some descendants of Telamon made a great figure for many ages. Why? Because Teucer reigned; but because Ajax did not reign, his descendants were not very illustrious. This is Pausanias's way of arguing. I repeat it again, this is a false way of reasoning; for Euryfaces, Ajax's son, succeeded to the kingdom of Salamis after the death of Telamon, just the same as if he had been a king's son (10). But here is the reason why his descendants did not make a great figure in the world. He had a son called Philæus, who gave away the kingdom of Salamis in order to be made a citizen of Athens: This we find in Pausanias (11). From that time the posterity of Ajax, being divested of sovereign authority, could not possibly shine like that of the other son of Telamon. They had in the person of Miltiades, descended from that son of Euryfaces, all the lustre that a family, not possessed of a kingdom, can have; but after all, they did not sway the scepter as Teucer's posterity did. I must observe, that Philæus, who, according to Pausanias, was Euryfaces's son, and Ajax's grand-son, was Ajax's son, according to Herodotus (12). He was, according to the same Historian, the stem of the Athenian Æcides, from whom Miltiades descended. Plutarch (13) will have it, that Philæus and Euryfaces, both Ajax's sons, resigned the property of the isle of Salamis to the Athenians, in order to be made citizens of Athens. He adds, that Euryfaces resided at Brauron in Attica, and Philæus at Melita (14); and that Philæus gave his name to the Philaides, a people of Attica, from whom Pifistratus derived his original. Stephanus Byzantinus ranks the Philaides under the tribe called Ægeides (15), and says, that Philæus, from whom that people had their name, was the son of Ajax and Lydice, the daughter of Caronus, the son of Lapithus.

son of Laphetus.

[D] *Æsculapierus says, that Julius Cæsar composed a tragedy intitled Tecmeffa.* This Jesuit observes, that the Romans inserted the vowel *u* in several Greek words; which was practised to the time of Julius Cæsar, who was the first author of a tragedy, intitled, Tecmeffa. These are his words. "In Alcumeffa, Alcmæmon, Tecmeffa, Hercules, Æsculapierus, & aliis ejusmodi Grecis nominibus, vocalis *u* a prefixis Latinis interjecta est, non tantum ubi carmen egeret, ut ait ille; sed ubique passim, quod ita mos ferret, etiam in solutâ oratione. Atque ille mos tenuit usque ad Julium Cæsarem, qui Tragediam de Tecmeffa primus scripsisse fertur, & ita pronunciari jussisse. Itaque post Tecmeffam ceptum est dici, uti hodieque dicimus, Alcmæna, & Alcmæon: verum Hercules & Æsculapierus prævaluerunt, & adhuc italicarum retineant vocalem (16). -- In *Alcumæna, Al-*

(16) *Lefcopæ- rios, Comen- tarius in Cicero- de Nat. Deor. lib. iii. cap. 63.*

(b) Lib. ii, pag.

S (8) Lib. i. par.

(9) His name

le- (10) Justin. *Le*

the (11) Lib. i,

(12). (12) Lib. vi,

ices. (10) In Vita

d at
and (24) It was

his where and
other building

s the faces, according

Tom. II, 443.

level- (15) Mr
of *ibid.* pag.

Alcu- scription,

en exi- tribe cal
Oeneides

le mos
iam de

verum (16) L

ena, Al- de Nat

* *Alcumæon, Tecmessa, Hercules, Æsculapius, and other Greek words of that kind, the vowel u was inserted by the ancient Latins, not only where it was required in verse, but every where throughout; because it was customary, even in prose. And this custom continued down to Julius Cæsar, who is said to be the first writer of a tragedy on Tecmessa, and to have directed the word to be so pronounced. Therefore after Tecmessa, it became the fashion to pronounce, as we now do, Alcmena and Alcmaeon: But Hercules and Æsculapius kept their ground, and yet retain the inter-placed vowel.* The Grammarian Victorinus, was contented to say, that Julius Cæsar began to contract those words. If Lescalperius

had read the book of one of his brethren, he would there have found the following passage: 'Scribit Victorinus, lib. i. veteres nunquam c, & m conjunxisse, usque ad Julium Cæsarem, qui primus Alcmaeon, Alcmena, Tecmessa, quos prius Alcumæon, Tecmestam Alcumæonem scribebant (17). --- Vi- (17) Martines, del Rio Syntag- m together, till the time of Julius Cæsar, who first wrote Alcmaeon, Alcmena, Tecmessa, which before were written Alcumæon, Alcmena, and Tecmessa.' I do not think Suetonius would have forgot this dramatic piece of Julius Cæsar, if there had been any such.

TE L A M O N, the son of Æacus and Endeis [A], is one of the principal heroes of fabulous History. He had two brothers, namely Peleus and Phocus; but the latter was his brother only by the father's side (a). There arose such a jealousy between Phocus and the two others, that they plotted to kill him. They took their time as they were playing together at quoits. Some say, that Peleus killed Phocus, by throwing his quoit at his head (b); others say Telamon did it (c): and it is generally agreed that he who did not kill him, was nevertheless an accomplice in that action (d). Æacus thought so [B], for he drove out Peleus (e), as well as Telamon. The latter retired into the isle of Salamis, where Cychreus reigned, who gave him in marriage his daughter Glaucæ, and made him his successor (f). Others say, that having no children he adopted Telamon for his heir (g). However it is certain, that Telamon reigned in the isle of Salamis. After the death of Glaucæ, he married Peribœa, the daughter of Alcatheus, son of Pelops, and King of Megara [C]. From this marriage issued Ajax [D] that

[A] *The son of Æacus and Endeis.* The children of Telamon had a divine original by several descents. Æacus was Jupiter's son. Endeis was the daughter of the centaur Chiron, son of Saturn. Peribœa, the wife of Telamon, and the mother of Ajax, was the daughter of Alcatheus. The latter was the son of Pelops, whose father was Tantalus, the son of Jupiter.

[B] *Æacus thought so.* It will not be improper to mention what Pausanias says of it (1). Some time after the flight of those two brothers, Telamon sent a deputy to Æacus, to assure him that the murder had been committed thro' inadvertency. Æacus, returned answer, that he should take care not to come into the island; but that, if he had a mind to justify himself, he might speak on board a ship, or upon some bank which he should erect for that end. Telamon pitched upon the last expedient, and erected a bank near the port, where he pleaded his cause; but not being judged innocent, he retired again.

[C] *He married Peribœa the daughter of Alcatheus, King of Megara.* Though the account which Plutarch (2) had borrowed from Ætæades, concerning Telamon, is come down to us miserably imperfect; yet one may perceive he meant to say, that Telamon, having too much sported with Peribœa, thought it proper to make his escape. The father of this young woman, discovering the affair, and thinking that one of his subjects had debauched her, ordered one of his guards to throw her into the sea. The guard, moved with compassion, chose rather to sell her: The ship on board which she was, landed at Salamis, where Telamon bought Peribœa, who was brought to bed of Ajax. A learned man (3) is of opinion, that instead of *Εὐβοία*, we ought to read *Μεγαρά* in that passage of Plutarch, since most authors are agreed, that Ajax's mother was the daughter of Alcatheus, King of Megara. They are not so unanimous as to the name of that lady: Some call her Peribœa (4), and others Eriboea (5). It is plain this difference proceeds only from the fault of some transcriber, who left out, or added a letter to the name of Ajax's mother. Those who transcribed his copy, retained that fault, which occasioned a different reading; and afterwards authors followed the copy they had bought. The name Melibœa, which Ajax's mother yet bears in Athenæus, proceeds from the same cause. That author says, she was married to Theseus in due form (6). He names some other women, whom Theseus took by force; he names two other wives of that prince who are mentioned by Hesiod; and at last he says, that, according to Pherecydes, he had also another wife called Pherebœa. Those four women ought to be reduced to one; Peribœa, Eriboea, Melibœa, and Pherebœa, are four names of one and the same woman, which have been multiplied by the fault of the transcribers. If The-

seus's polygamy was not more certain, with respect to other women, than as to Melibœa, mentioned by Athenæus, and Pherebœa, mentioned by Pherecydes, I should positively assert, that he was a Monogamist, even according to the rigid sense of Tertullian. There is more difficulty in what follows. Ajax's mother was the lawful wife of Theseus; but when? Was it after Telamon's death, or before he married Telamon? If the first, it must be said, that Theseus survived the destruction of Troy, which is false; and that he had a very extravagant desire of marrying, since he pitched upon so old a woman, which is very improbable. It is better therefore to say, that he married Peribœa before her marriage with Telamon. But then, what shall we do with the story, mentioned by Plutarch? Instead of a young woman, whom Telamon thought he had debauched, we should say that he took up only with another man's leavings, either with a widow or a divorced wife. Nothing of this quadrates with Plutarch's narrative, nor can it be supported from other authors. It appears by a passage in Pindar (7), that Telamon was married to Peribœa, when Hercules desired him to follow him in his expedition against Laomedon. At this rate Theseus must needs have divorced his wife somewhat early. However it be, we ought to remember, that Peribœa was one of the virgins, whom the Athenians were obliged to deliver to Minos (8). Theseus was delivered to him at the same time, and boldly opposed Minos's attempt upon Peribœa's honour. This may make us believe, that Theseus fell in love with the maid during his voyage, for she was very handsome; and that he married her soon after. I cannot tell whether he contained himself till after his return; for the heroes of Greece were very dangerous fellow-travellers for a maid, they got children apace. They were very well qualified to preserve the fair sex from the violence of a fierce tyrant: but women ran no less danger in the hands of such deliverers; and it was never more necessary than in respect to them to ask this question, 'Sed quis custodiet ipsos custodes (9)? --- But who, I pray, the guards themselves shall guard?' Let us see how Theseus spoke to Minos. 'Dicitur cum Theseus Cretam ad Minos cum septem virginibus & sex pueris venisset, Minoæ de virginibus Peribœam quandam nomine, candore corporis inductum comprimere voluisse, quod cum Theseus se passurum negaret, ut qui Neptuni filius esset, & valeret contra tyrannum pro virginis incolumitate decertare, &c. (10). --- It is said that when Theseus was come to Crete with seven virgins and six youths, Minos charmed with the beauty of one of the virgins named Peribœa, would have debauched her, which Theseus declaring he would not suffer, as being the son of Neptune, and able to encounter with Minos in defence of the maid, &c.' Hyginus tells us afterwards

(a) Apollodor. lib. iii, pag. m. 230.

(b) Pausan. lib. ii, pag. 72. Note, that according to Diodorus Siculus, Peleus did it inadvertently.

(c) Apollod. ubi supra, Plutarch. in Parall. cap. xav.

(d) Apollodor. ibid.

(e) He reigned in the isle of Ægina.

(f) Diodor. Sicul. lib. vi, cap. x.

(g) Apollodor. ibid.

(1) Lib. ii, pag. 72.

(2) In Parallellis, pag. 312, num. 27.

(3) Meurice, upon Ovid's Epistles, pag. 275.

(4) Apollodor. lib. iii, Pausanias, lib. i, pag. 15, & 40.

(5) Sophocles, in Ajax. Pindar. Isthm. Od. VI. Diodor. Siculus, lib. iv. Hyginus, cap. xcvii.

(6) Νεφέλας δ' αὐτὸν γάμους Μελίβοιαν τῆς Αἰγύπτου γυναῖκα. Τῆσιν αὖτε ἰλίου conjugem fu- λῆ Μελίβοιαν Αἰγυπτίας matrem. Ister, lib. iv. Rerum Attic. apud Athen. lib. xiii, pag. 557.

(7) Isthm. Od. VI.

(8) Pausanias, lib. i, pag. 15. See also pag. 40, where he concludes from Peribœa's being sent to Minos, that Megara made in former times part of the state of Athens. Diodorus Siculus says Alcatheus was an Athenian.

(9) Juven. Sat. VI, ver. 345.

(10) Hygin. Poët. Astron. lib. ii, cap. v.

TELAMON. TELEBOÆ.

(b) Apollod. Bibl.
lib. iii, pag. 72.

(c) Pindar. Nem.
Od. III.

(d) Id. *ibid.* Od.
IV, & Ithm.
Od. VI.

(f) Apollon. &
Valer. Flaccus,
Argon. *passim*.

(m) Pausan. lib.
i, pag. 34.

(n) It was at
Aulis in the isle
of Eubœa.

(o) See the article
TEUCER.

great warrior; of whom I speak in its proper place. We are told of a third wife of Telamon, by whom he had a son named Teucer. This wife was Hefione the daughter of Laomedon King of Troy, and sister of Priam (b). That marriage happened in this manner. Telamon followed Hercules, when Laomedon was to be punished for refusing to pay Hercules what he had promised him. His capital city was taken by storm; and because Telamon was the first who scaled the walls of Troy, Hercules presented him with Hefione. Telamon signalized himself on several other occasions while he attended upon that General, as in the war with the Amazons (i), in that with the Meropes, and in the fight with the giant Alcyoneus (k). He was in the expedition of the Argonauts (l), and if he did not go to the siege of Troy, probably it was only old age that prevented him. He sent thither his two sons. Even in Pausanias's time they shewed, near the port of Salamis, the rock on which he sat (m), that he might view as far as possible, the ship on which they embarked to go to the general rendezvous of the Grecian fleet (n). He was still alive when the Grecians returned from Troy. He was doubtless very sorry for the death of his son Ajax; but he appeared more displeased that Teucer, his other son, had not prevented or revenged it (o). He would not receive him; but repulsed him with a disgrace. It has been observed of him, as well as of his brother Peleus, that he had a son who surpassed him (p). See the fate of Ajax's descendants in the article ΤΕΜΕΣΣΑ, and that of ΤΕΥΚΕΡ's posterity in the article of that name.

(p) Vincens ut
Ajax
Frateritē Tela-
monem, ut Pele-
us Achilleus.
You'll be out done,
Like Telamon,
and Peleus, by a
son.
Juvenal. Sat.
XIV, ver. 213.

wards how Theseus proved his divine original. It is a curious thing: there never was so difficult a proof of one's nobility.

[D] From this marriage issued Ajax. I think Dares Phrygius is the only author, who says, that Hefione, the daughter of Laomedon, was Ajax's mother, and that Ajax and Hector, by reason of their kindred, after they had fought stoutly together, were very civil, and made presents to one another. The generality of authors are of a quite different opinion, viz. that Peribœa or Eriboea, was the mother of Ajax, and Hefione the mother of Teucer. I do not regard the supposition of Sophocles (11), that Ajax's mother was alive, when that unfortunate Prince killed himself; for a Poet does not pretend to much exactness in writing a Tragedy: besides that Telamon might have been married at the same time both to Peribœa

and Hefione. It is certain Sophocles (12) says, that Teucer was a bastard, born of a woman who had been taken captive in the war. This was Hefione, as Servius informs us. 'Ejus (Laomedontis) filia Hefione, says he (13), belli jure sublata, comiti Telamoni tradita est qui primus ascenderat murum, unde Teucer natus est, nam Ajacem ex alia constat esse procreatum. - - Laomedon's daughter Hefione, says he, taken captive by the rights of war, was given to his companion Telamon, who first had scaled the wall, by whom he had Teucer, for it is certain he had Ajax by another.' The scholiast upon these words of Homer's Iliad (14), καὶ ὅς γε γόζον παρ' ἑνὸς τε (14) In *Æn.* lib. i, ver. 619. *spurius licet existentem*, says, that Hefione, a prisoner of war, was given to Telamon, who had Teucer by her; and that this Trojan original was the reason why the child bore that name.

TELEBOÆ, a people who inhabited an island in the neighbourhood of Acarnania, who perhaps had been long since forgotten, had it not been for the great relation they indirectly bore to the birth of Hercules; but by virtue of that relation they are become known in the very lowest forms of the schools. Is there any school-boy who does not know that Alcmena conceived Hercules, whilst Amphytrion, her husband, was making war with the Teleboæ, &c? The reason why he made war with them, is, that Alcmena had promised to marry the man, who should go to war with them. But in order to know why she hated that people, the matter must be traced a little higher. Mestor, the son of Perseus, had by his marriage with Lysidice (a), a daughter named Hippothoe, whom Neptune stole and carried away into the islands called Echinades (b), where she had a son by him, whose name was Taphius [A]. This Taphius settled a colony in Taphos, and named the inhabitants Teleboæ [B], because of the great way he thought

(a) The daughter of Pelops, (and of Hippodamia) Apoll. lib. ii, pag. 97.

(b) They are now called *Curzolari*. And are situated at the entrance of the gulph of Lepanto.

[A] A son, whose name was Taphius. We read in the scholiast upon Apollonius (1), that the son of Neptune and Hippothoe, was called Pterelaus, and that he had two sons, namely Teleboas, and Taphus, who went to Electryon and demanded of him the estate of their grand-mother Hippothoe; and not being able to bring him to reason, they had recourse to force, and killed a great many people. By this account we get a whole generation, and therefore this account is rather to be received. It is shocking to find in Apollodorus, that Electryon was attacked by the great-grand-sons of the daughter of his brother Mestor. There is another thing in Apollodorus, concerning Taphius, which is not well cleared up. This author says (2), that Taphius reigned at Mycenæ with Electryon, when the six sons of Pterelaus went to Electryon and demanded of him Mestor's kingdom for their grand-father by their mother's side. This grand-father was Taphius himself, who reigned at Mycenæ with Electryon: Electryon had no other kingdom; and therefore what kingdom could they demand of him for Taphius? Observe carefully, that, according to the scholiast upon Apollonius (3), the whole kingdom of Perseus was possessed in common, after his death, by his four sons, Alcæus, Sthenelus, Mestor, and Electryon. Agreeably to this account, no just claim could be made to Mestor's kingdom, in favour of Taphius,

(2) Pag. 99.

(3) Ubi supra.

since Taphius was already in possession of it. However it be, we read in this scholiast that Taphius, the son of Pterelaus, called the isle of Taphos by his name; and that his brother Teleboas gave his to the people I am speaking of in this article, whose chief habitation was in the isle of Taphos. This is one of their Etymologies: I have already mentioned another; the rest may be seen below. It is certain, that the same people were indifferently called *Taphii* and *Teleboæ* (4). [B] And called the inhabitants Teleboæ. Stephanus in Odyss. lib. i.

Byzantinus informs us, that the country of the Teleboæ, or Telebois, was part of Acarnania, and had its name from Teleboas, being formerly called *Taphion*. Aristotle (5) says partly the same thing, since he tells us, that the Teleboæ were possessed of part of Acarnania. He says also (6), that one Lelex, a native of Leucas, had a daughter, whose son, called Teleboas, had twenty-two sons of that same name. What I have just now been citing out of Stephanus Byzantinus, is directly contrary to Strabo (7), who affirms, that the isles of the Taphians, one of which was called Taphos, were originally called the isles of the Teleboæ. He adds, that Amphytrion subdued them, and gave them to Cephalus an Athenian fugitive, who helped him to conquer them. Some have thought, that the isle of Cephalonia was then given to Cephalus, who called it by that name (8), and became afterwards

(4) See Eustath. in Odyss. lib. i.

(5) In Acarnanum Republic, lib. vii, pag. 222.

(6) In Locadum Republic, lib. vii, pag. 222.

(7) Lib. x, pag. 316.

(8) Ibid. pag. 314.

thought he had gone (c). He had a son called Pterelaus, who was the father of six sons, and one daughter. These six sons going to Mycenæ to demand Mestor's kingdom, could obtain nothing from Electryon King of Mycenæ the son of Perseus, and brother of Mestor. It was for this reason they plundered his country. The sons of Electryon, endeavouring to repel force by force were all killed. Their father was preparing to revenge their death, when he was killed by a very strange accident (d). His daughter Alcmena was forced to retire to Thebes; and not being willing to leave the death of her brothers unpunished [C], she promised to marry the person, who should revenge it. Amphitryon offered himself to do it, and assembling all the troops he was able, made a descent upon the country of the Teleboæ. He laid waste some of their islands, but could not take Taphos; till Comætho, who fell in love with him, had plucked off the golden hair from her father Pterelaus [D], which made him immortal. Amphitryon did not keep those conquests for himself, but left them to Cephalus and Eleus, who had affixed

(c) Τηλεβοῶν ἐκλάσεν τὴν χώραν τῆς μυκηνῆς ἰσθμῶς. Teleboas vocavit, id est quod procul à patria ierit. Apollod. ibid.

(d) See the article of AMPHITRYON.

(9) Ibid. pag. 317.

(10) Ibid. pag. 315, 317. See the article LEUCAS.

(11) Strabo, pag. 316.

(12) Ἀνδρᾶς ἀμφίτρωνος τοῦ ἐκτρυῶνος.

(13) Schol. Apollon. in lib. i, ver. 247. See also Eulath. in lib. i, Odyss.

(14) Tacitus, Annal. lib. iv, cap. lxxvii.

(15) Virgil, Æneid. lib. vii, ver. 734.

(16) And Lipsum in Tacit. Annal. lib. iv, cap. lxxvii.

(17) Silv. V, lib. iii, ver. 100.

wards master of Acarnania (9). He was the first who tried the leap of Leucas (10). We read, that the Teleboæ were great robbers (11). See the proofs of it in Bochart's *Geographia Sacra*, book i. chap. xxiii. and the remark [F] of this article. I shall set down the words of the scholiast of Apollonius on a passage wherein that Poet calls the same people Teleboæ and Taphii. It is in the 747th verse of the first book.

The isle of Taphos is one of the Echinades: it was inhabited by the Teleboæ, who before lived in Acarnania; they were great robbers: (12) they went into the kingdom of Argos to carry off the oxen of Electryon, father of Alcmena. There happened an engagement, in which Electryon, and his sons were killed. Wherefore Alcmena declared that her person should be the reward of him, who should revenge Electryon; and because Amphitryon undertook it, she married him. It is commonly said in our Dictionaries, that Amphitryon revenged the death of Alcmena's brother. This is a fault, for the lost several brothers; and in Apollodorus it is the revenging her brothers, which the demands of him who would be her husband. In the scholiast upon Apollonius she desires the revenging her father. Some miscopying, some error of the Press, might be the occasion, that instead of *pateris*, the authors whom Charles Stephens copies wrote *fratris*; and this fault still continues. Here follow two Etymologies. Τηλεβοῶν ἐν οἱ τὰ βῆσι, ἵτοι ὅτι τῆς οἰκίας ἀπὸ ἀργύρου τὰ βῆσι ἀπὸ ἡλίου ἢ ἀπὸ Τηλεβῶν τὸ Πτερέλα τὸ βασιλικὸς οὖν (13). - - The Taphians therefore were called Teleboans, because they were persons living a great way off, who carried away the oxen from the Argives: or from Teleboas the son of King Pterelaus. Lloyd ascribes several things to the scholiast upon Apollonius which I do not meet with. 1. That Herodotus says, that Perseus left four sons. He should have said Herodotus. 2. That one of them was called Alarus: he should have said Alæus. 3. That another was said Nestor: he should have said Mestor. 4. That Electryon was bound for a sum of money for Hippothoe: the scholiast says no such thing. 5. That Alcmena married Amphitryon, a very powerful Theban lord: the scholiast could not call him a Theban; among his words was not a Theban. 6. That the kingdom of the Teleboæ, which was given to Cephalus, devolved to Ulysses by right of inheritance: I find nothing of this in the scholiast. See Lloyd at the word Taphiæ. His article is the same with that of Charles Stephens. It must not be forgot, that the Teleboæ settled in an island of Great Greece, in that island which Tiberius's retreat made so famous. This we find in Tacitus: 'Græcos ea tenuisse, Capreaeque Telebois habitatas fama tradit (14). - - They say that the Greeks possessed that country, and that the island Caprea was inhabited by the Teleboans.' Virgil says the same thing (15). And so do Aufonius, and Statius.

Quem generasse Telon Sebethide Nympha
Pertur, Teleboum Capreas cum regna teneret.

'Tis said Sebethis him to Telon bore,
While he the Teleboan crown in Caprea wore.

These are Virgil's words. As for Aufonius, he expresses himself thus: 'Virideque reluctant Teleboæ' (16). - - And Teleboan groves resound. He speaks of the isle of Caprea. And as Statius (17) he describes that isle in this manner.

Seu tibi Bacchei vineta madentia Gauri,

2

Teleboumque domos, trepidis ubi dulcia nautis
Lumina noctivagæ tollit Pharus æmula lunæ.

Or where mount Gaurus sam'd for vines is shown,
And Teleboan shores, by sailors known,
Whose pharus, lantern, emulates the moon.

[C] To leave the death of her brothers unpunished.]

It has been shewn in the foregoing remark, that the singular number ought not to be used here, and that some authors, contrary to Apollodorus's account, say, that Electryon was killed with his sons; so that Alcmena mentioned her father and not her brothers, when she demanded that her future husband should be the instrument of her revenge.

[D] From her father Pterelaus.] Plautus supposes, that Amphitryon killed Pterelaus with his own hand (18); and that he had for his share of the booty the golden cup of that Prince (19). Poets are allowed to suppose such things, though they be ever so false. But as to the rest, I do not think that the learned Mrs le Fevre had any grounds for charging Plautus with a small anachronism. It is certain, says the (20), that Pterelaus was not cotemporary with Amphitryon, since he was the son of Taphius, who was the son of a niece of Alcæus, father of Amphitryon; and consequently the cousin-german of Amphitryon was Pterelaus's grandmother. This genealogy is taken out of Apollodorus: I have already said, that this author is not so clear as the scholiast upon Apollonius. Nevertheless Plautus ought not to be censured upon this head; for since Apollodorus says, that Pterelaus was alive when Amphitryon went to attack him, Plautus does not advance of his own head that those two Princes lived at the same time; he might find it in historical monuments. It is not he therefore who is guilty of that Anachronism. It is much more surprizing, that the sons of Pterelaus should make war with Electryon, Amphitryon's uncle by the mother's side, as we read in Apollodorus.

Let us say something of Pterelaus's cup. Jupiter made a present of it to Alcmena; and afterwards when the true Amphitryon looked for it among his things, to know whether it had been given to his wife, as she affirmed, it occasioned a very surprizing and diverting incident in Plautus's Comedy. This was not wholly the invention of the Poet; for (21) Charon of Lampacus an Historian, who lived in the LXXVth Olympiad, that is, 478 years before Christ, said, that the cup bestowed upon Alcmena, was still to be seen in his time in the Academy; that it was long, somewhat hollowed in the middle, with the edges a little turned down. As Charon's works are lost, I have consulted Athenæus, who quotes him, and this is what I have met with in that author (22). He says Charon of Lampacus affirmed, in his book of Frontiers, that the cup, which Jupiter presented to Alcmena, when he put on the form of Amphitryon, was still to be seen in his time at Lacedæmon. I do not find that Charon left a description of that cup: it is Macrobius who has described it (23), building upon what Pherecydes had said (24), that the vessel which Jupiter presented to Alcmena, was a Carcæsum. Athenæus tells us, that Pherecydes, and Herodorus of Heraclea said so; and mentions Calixenus's description of the Carcæsum. There is no room to doubt that Macrobius took from Athenæus what he says of it, and his words ought to be corrected by those of that Greek author, as Calaubon observes. Here follow Macrobius's words. 'Plautus infuctum nomen reliquit, ait que

(18) Ipseque Amphitruo Regem Pterelam sua obruncat manu. Plaut. Amphitru. Act. I, Scen. I, ver. 93.

(19) Post ob virtutem hero Amphitruoni est patera donata aurea. Qui Pterela potitate Rex solitu f. Ibid. ver. 104.

(20) Remarks upon the Amphitryon, pag. 251.

(21) They are Mrs le Fevre's words, ubi supra, pag. 276.

If you compare them with the words of Macrobius, you will see whether the hath rendered them well.

OBSERVATIONS on the cup of Pterelaus.

(22) Lib. xi, pag. 475.

(23) Meminit carcæsi Pherecydes in libris historiæ, aitque Jovem Alcmenæ precium concubitus carcæsum aureum dono dedisse. - - Pherecydes in his Historical Works, mentions the Carcæsum, and says that Jupiter presented a golden one to Alcmena, in return for her favours. Macrobius, Saturn. lib. v, cap. xxi.

(24) Apud Athen. pag. 474.

affisted him in that war. This is what we find in Apollodorus (e). What I have met with in other authors, that may serve to rectify or explain him, or to give a more distinct account of this matter, may be seen in the remarks. I shall there make some observations upon some passages of Plautus's *Amphitryon* [E], and upon Mrs

que in fabula Amphitryone pateram datam : cum
longe utriusque poculi figura diversa sit : patera enim
ut et ipsum nomen indicio est, planum ac patens
est : carchesium vero procerum & circa medium par-
tem compressum, ansatum mediocriter, ansis a sum-
mo ad infimum pertinentibus (25). --- *Plautus in
his Amphitryon expressis it by an improper name, and
says the present was a patera, whereas the figure of
these two sorts of cups was quite different : for the pa-
tera, as the name itself imports, is spreading and open :
but the carchesium is tall, and compressed about the
middle, moderately banded, the handles reaching from
the top quite down to the bottom.* Now see the text
of Athenæus. Καλλιξένῳ ἐν τοῖς περὶ
Ἀλεξάνδρειας ὁμοῖν, ὅτι ποσειδών ἐστὶν ἐπιμέλειας
συνεργήσαν ἐῖς μίσην ἐπαικάς, ὅτα ἔχον μέγας
ταυτὸν μὲν κατικοντά.
Calixenus Rhodius tradit
in suis libris de Alexandria, carchesium esse poculum
oblongum, in medio leniter compressum, auribus utrin-
que ad fundum usque descendentibus. --- *Calixenus
the Rhodian in his books of Alexandria, describes the
carchesium to be an oblong cup, moderately compressed
about the middle, with handles on both sides descending
quite down to the bottom.* It is plain the adverb *medi-
ocriter* in Macrobius, refers to *compressum*, and not to
ansatum. A transcriber who thinks that an adverb
belongs to a certain adjective, makes no difficulty to
put it either before, or after that adjective. No body
thinks there is any harm in writing *ansatum medi-
ocriter*, rather than *mediocriter ansatum*. But sometimes
it is of great importance, not to take such a liberty ;
for instance, when the adverb does not belong to *an-*
satum.

... Viſitis hoſtibus legiones reveniunt domum,
Duello extincto maximo, atque internecatis hoſtibus,
Qui multa Thebano populo objecerunt acerba funera.
Id vi & virtute militum victum atque expugnatum
opidum 'ſt,
Imperio atque auspicio heri mei Amphitruonis ma-
xime.

*The conqu'ring troops return in triumph home,
The war extinguisht, and the foes cut off,
Who slew so many of our Theban people.
The town was taken by the soldiers' valour,
By my victorious lord Amphyrion's orders.
He cheer'd his men with presents and with spoils,
And fix'd King Creon on the Theban throne.*

This is perverting History ; for authors are agreed, that Amphitryon undertook this expedition only to punish the Teleboæ, who had killed Alcmena's father, or at least her brothers. He could not marry Alcmena without revenging her of the Teleboæ. This was the occasion of the war, in which Creon engaged merely out of complaisance to Amphitryon, or in acknowledgment of some service he had received from him (28). This historical fact might have afforded many ornaments, if the Poet had been willing to improve it. He has debased the rank of his hero : he represents him as only commanding the troops of another Prince, in a war undertaken for the interest of that Prince ; whereas, according to History, Amphitryon acted in chief for his own interests, and had with him none but auxiliary troops, whose commanders he rewarded with the countries he conquered. II. Plautus makes the troops take shipping in the port of Eubœa, which he calls Perficus by a too licentious anticipation. But this is not the worst : it is a great deal more shocking that he does not find a port

more convenient for people, who were to fail towards the isles called Echinades. Bless us, what a round about course must be taken to go thither from the isle of Eubœa! III. The lying-in of Alcmena is an ill-contrived incident, which obliges the Poet entirely to overthrow tradition. All those, who have mentioned Hercules's birth, suppose, that Jupiter in the shape of Amphytrion, lay with Alcmena a whole night which he took care to make longer than others. Plautus should have built upon this ground, and adorned and embellished it; but he should not have supposed a second visit. Jupiter should not have returned to his post, under the same shape the night before the lying-in. This is not only contrary to tradition, but also shocking to the hearers and readers. It is no longer gallantry but brutality (29) : a woman, ready to be delivered of two boys, is not a fit object to be produced upon the stage; much less ought the greatest of the gods to be represented so enamoured with such an object, that the usual length of the night is not sufficient for him to satisfy his passion. If the charms he found in the embraces of that lady made him wish for a second interview, he should not have put it off till the day before her lying in. So great a forbearance exceeds probability. This objection cannot be got over; for to say, that Plautus makes his play last nine months, would be running into greater difficulties, and appearing ignorant of these words of Mercury :

HODIE illa pariet filios geminos duos (30).

TO DAY shall she be brought to bed with twins.

This *bodie* refers to the same day that he turned out Sofia in the first scene. IV. I do not approve what some say, that Alcmena's delivery without pain is too plainly contrary to what we are told by the Greeks of Juno's artifices: it is a thing, say they, which ought not to be supposed, without an extreme necessity. A Poet, who takes the death of Polyxena for the subject of his tragedy, may be allowed to alter a great many things in the tradition: but if he should suppose, that Achilles did not desire to have her sacrificed to him, if he should trample upon the capital facts of that History, he would offend against the rules. But of what service is it to Plautus to make Alcmena feel no pain?

Dum hæc aguntur, interea uxorem tuam
Neque gementem, neque plorantem nostrum quis-
quam audivimus.

Ita profecto sine dolore peperit (31).

While these things pass'd, your wife
By none of us was heard to cry or groan.
So very free from pain was she delivered.

This seems to me a weak objection; for it was necessary, in order to unravel the plot, that there should appear something miraculous in Alcmena's delivery. Her chastity was to be justified, and a jealous husband was to be pacified; and therefore there was a necessity for the Poet to intertix Jupiter in the case. He was allowed therefore, nay, he was obliged, to lay aside what was faid of Lucina.

Quin nunc quoque frigidus artus
Dum loquor horror habet, parque est meminisse
doloris.

Septem ego per noctes totidem cruciata diebus,
Fessa malis tendensque ad cælum brachia, magno
Lucinam ad nexos partus clamore vocabam,
Illa quidem venit, sed præcorrupta, meumque
Quæ donare caput Junoni vellet iniquæ (32).

*Cold chills my limbs while I the tale pursue,
And now methinks I feel my pangs anew.*

(29) See above, the article ALC-MENA, remark [D],

(30) Aa. i,
Scen. ii,

(31) Act, v,
Scen. I.

(32) *Alcmena*,
apud Ovidium.
Metamorph.
lib. ix, ver. 290.
See also Pausa-
nias, lib. ix,
pag. 290.

Mrs le Fevre's notes [F].

Seven days and nights amidst incessant throes,
 Fatigu'd with ill I lay, nor knew repose;
 When lifting high my hands, in shrieks I pray'd,
 Implo'r'd the gods, and call'd Lucina's aid.
 She came, but prejudic'd, to give my fate
 A sacrifice to vengeful Juno's hate.

GAY.

And ravaged Acbaia, Etolia, & Phocis,
 Scouring the Ionian, Ægean, and Cretan seas
 With most audacious piracy.

Mrs le Fevre (38) charges him with having altered the history in this point: 'for Electryon was not killed by his enemies. It was Amphitryon himself who killed him by accident, as he was throwing his club at an ox.' I confess, that Plautus departs from Apollodorus in this; but there are some authors who have said, that Electryon was killed by the Teleboæ (39). I shall conclude with this remark: ' (40) I have pitched upon Amphitryon, because it is one of the finest pieces of Plautus; and it was so highly esteemed by the Antients, that in Dioclesian's reign it was still acted in times of a public calamity to appease Jupiter's anger. Arnobius says in his seventh book; *Poenit animos Jupiter, si Amphitryo fuerit actus, pronuntiatusque Plautinus?* - - - *What, will Jupiter be appeased, if Plautus's Amphitryon be acted?* I do not believe Arnobius means that the Heathens pitched upon a time of a public calamity, such as an irruption of Barbarians, a plague, or a famine, to act Amphitryon: but this seems to me to be his meaning. He thinks it wrong that the Pagans should make the solemnity of their public games, one of their religious performances; and that they should consecrate those games to a deity. He asks the reason of this conduct, and supposes the answer to be, that the celebration of those games was a means to be reconciled with the gods, and to make them forget the offences they might have received. Whereupon he asks, by way of reply, *Whether Jupiter ceases to be in an ill humour when Plautus's Amphitryon is acted?* It is certain, that the institution of the public games was owing to some public calamity, and to a design of worshipping, for the future, in a solemn manner, the deity whose anger they dreaded: but afterwards the anniversary celebration was not confined to the time of a public calamity: those games were exhibited in time of plenty, as well as in time of scarcity; nay, they were carried on with much greater expence of every kind during the prosperity of the State, than during its adversity.

(33) Confer above, remark [D].

(34) Notes, pag. 310.

(35) He says she was the daughter of Perseus, and that Amphitryon was the son of Alceus, son of Perseus.

(36) See the article GORGOPHON, remark [A].

[F] And upon Mrs le Fevre's notes (33).] She was of opinion (34), that Plautus made use of the word *Nepos* to signify nephew in this passage of the fourth scene of the fourth act. 'Ego idem ille sum Amphitruo, Gorgophones nepos, Imperator Thebanorum. - - - I am that same Amphitryon the nephew of Gorgophone, commander of the Thebans.' I cannot readily come into this opinion. It is true, that, according to the genealogy mentioned by Apollodorus, this was the sole degree of kindred between Gorgophone and Amphitryon (35): but, since Plautus has not followed Apollodorus in some things, we ought to suppose that he had consulted some other genealogies, wherein he found that Gorgophone was Amphitryon's grand-mother. There is more sense in boasting of being the grand-son of an illustrious lady, than in boasting of being her nephew: it is therefore probable, that the Poet took the thing in the most advantageous sense (36). I proceed to another fact: He has supposed, that the Teleboæ destroyed Electryon. I shall quote the whole passage, which contains a proof of what has been said above concerning the robberies of that nation.

Ego idem latrones hostes bello & virtute contudi.
 Electryonem perdidit, nostræ & germanos conjugis,
 Achaïam, Etoliam, Phocidem, per freta Ionium
 & Ægeum, & Creticum:
 Vagati, vi vortebant piratica (37).

(37) Act IV, Scen. IV, ver. 54.

I too have triumph'd o'er those villain robbers;
 Who kill'd Electryon, and my spouse's brothers;

TELLIER (MICHAEL LE) Chancellor of France, died the thirtieth of October 1685. See his elogium in Moreri's Dictionary. He left behind him two sons, one of whom has been very famous all over Europe, under the name of Marquis De Louvois [A]. The other is one of the most illustrious prelates of the Gallican Church for his learning, and for the vigour wherewith he has always maintained the rights and privileges of his dignity (a) and checked the attempts of the Monks in his diocese [B]. He is Archbishop of Rheims, and has collected one of the finest libraries in France. See the catalogue of it, which he published in the year 1693 (b). He continues to enrich it every day (c) with all all sorts of books, and all the curious have a free access to that noble magazine of learning (§ a).

(a) See the Memoirs published by him, about the Cardinals sitting in parliament; and against the election of Cambray into a metropolis.

(b) Under the title of Bibliotheca Telleriana, in folio.

(c) I write this in June 1701.

[A] Under the name of Marquis de Louvois.] He died at Versailles the sixteenth of July 1691, in his fifty-first year. He was Minister and Secretary of State, and had several employments. It is impossible to bestow a finer elogium on him, than by saying, that all Europe was persuaded, his death would be more advantageous to the allies, than the gaining of a complete victory, and the conquest of two or three towns. Mr de Barbesieux, one of his sons, succeeded him in the office of Secretary of State, and died the fifth of January, 1701. The Abbot de Louvois, another of his sons, is a great lover of learning. He was admired, in his younger years, by the answers he made to the difficulties he proposed to him about Homer, in the presence of a great number of persons. Read this passage of the continuation of the Menagiana. *The Abbot de L. . . who, tho' so young, shows so great a skill in the Greek tongue, has been pleased to quote me upon that subject, and to praise me for the application of those two verses in an illustrious assembly, that was held at his house not long ago, in the presence of the most learned men in the kingdom, who proposed to him some difficulties upon Homer, which he answered with a wonderful presence of mind. One of the most considerable was proposed by the Abbot Faydit, viz. whether Homer had mentioned the Jews in his Iliad or his Odyssey. He answered, that he had made no mention of them, and*

that the word *Ιουδαῖοι* was not to be found in Homer, &c (1). You may see in the original what was further urged by the Abbot Faydit, and the reply made to him. See also Mr Coufin concerning the Philosophical thesis maintained by that Abbé on the twenty-fourth of August, 1692 (2), and concerning the *Actus Vespertinus*, or his disputation in the Sorbonne before Savans, of September 8, 1692, he was admitted Doctor of Divinity, on the seventeenth of March, 1700 (3).

I need not acquaint the reader, that the book published in Holland, in the year 1695, with this title, (3) *Idem, Apud Testament politique du Marquis de Louvois*, is a supposititious piece: but every body does not know that the author of that piece lives at Paris, and is a Roman Catholic.

[B] And checked the attempts of the Monks in his diocese.] I could give several instances of it; but I shall only refer the reader to what I have said in the remark [N] of the article of FRANCIS of ASSISI, and in the remark [M] of the article MARIANA. See also the *Lettres Historiques* for July 1697.

[(§ a)] This library was soon made up of the spoils of those which several Protestants in Paris and Champaign were forced to leave behind them on the revocation of the edict of Nantes. To be convinced that this is its proper epoch, we need only run over the *Bibliotheca Telleriana*,

(1) Suite du Menagiana, pag. 294, Dutch Edition.
 (2) Journal des Savans, of September 8, 1692, pag. 623, Dutch Edition.
 (3) Idem, Apud Testament politique du Marquis de Louvois, 5, 1700, pag. 271.

Telleriana, the main part of this fine library consisting of any other than those sort of books, which the Protestants in France, whether men of letters, or only curious persons, took care to purchase. REM. CRIT.]

- (a) Ptolemy, lib. v, cap. iii. calls it Τελμύσσος. Strabo, lib. xiv, pag. m. 457, and Stephanus Byzantinus, Τελμύσσος.
- (b) Quæ Lyciam finit urbs Telmessus. Plin. lib. v, cap. xxvii. Mela, lib. i, cap. xv. Vide ibi H. Vossium.
- (c) Livius, lib. xxxvii.
- (d) Strabo, pag. 458.
- (e) Sub Apollinis arula quæ Telmessi apud opidum visitur, Telmessum esse conditum vatem, non scriptis constantibus indicatur? Arnobius, lib. vi, pag. 193. See *Suidas*, voce Τελμύσσος.
- (f) Dionys. in Originibus, apud Suidam, ibid.
- (g) Idem, Dionys. ibid.
- (h) In voce Τελμύσσος. It is called there Τελμύσσος.

[A] Every body there was born a diviner. I do not define the reader to take this on my authority, and therefore I shall quote a considerable Historian for it. Τὸν δὲ (Γέρδιον) ἐκπλαγύνθη τῇ ὁρῇ, ἵεναι κοινῶς ὅλην τὴν Δεῖν παρὰ τὴν Τελμύσσος τὴν μάντιν. εἶναι γὰρ τὴν Τελμύσσος σοφὴν τὰ δὲ αὐτῇ ἐγγείσθαι, καὶ οἷόν τι ἀπὸ γένους δεδιδόσθαι αὐτοῖς καὶ γυναῖξιν καὶ παῖσιν τὴν μαντείαν. Gordium speculaculo attonitum, Telmissenses vates communicande rei causa adisse, (esse enim Telmissenses peritissimos prodigiorum interpretes, & vaticinandi scientiam ipsi pariter atque uxoris & liberis ab ortu infusam esse) (1). Pliny (2) seems to say, that the town of Telmessus, which he calls most religious, had been one of the principal seats of Magic; he does not scruple to join it with Thessaly in that respect. But there never was a country more cried down for witchcraft than Thessaly.

(1) Arrian. de Exped. Alexandri, lib. ii, p. m. 85, 86.

(2) Nec postea quisquam dixit quoniam modo venisset Telmessum religiosissimam urbem, quando transfisset ad Thessalias urbes. Plin. lib. xxx, cap. i. Father Harduin, going upon the authority of good manuscripts, reads matres instead of urbes.

(3) Lib. vi, ver. 451: vide Harduinum in Pinium, Tom. iv, pag. 771.

(4) Lib. xi, cap. vii.

(5) See Grævius's Justin, pag. 230.

Somnia, terrores magicos, miracula, fagas,
Nocturnos lemures, portentaque THESSALA rides?

Dreams, witchcraft, miracles, do you despise,
Hobgoblins, and THESSALIAN prodigies?

Horace, who speaks thus in the second epistle of the second book, frequently uses the like expression; and it appears from Lucan (3), that Thessala, or Thessalis, without any addition, denoted a witch. If the thing be rightly considered, the passage of Pliny expresses the character of the Telmessians, as fully as the passage of Arrian. See what I shall quote out of Cicero hereafter.

[B] It was thither Gordius went to know the meaning of a prodigy, which made him uneasy. This story is to be found in Justin (4), if we change the usual reading, and instead of vicinæ urbis, read Telmessi urbis, or Telmessiæ urbis, according to the correction of the most able Critics (5). The passage runs thus: 'Gordius cum in his regionibus bubus conductis araret, aves eum omnis generis circumvolare ceperunt. Profectus ad consulendos augures vicinæ urbis, obviam in porta habuit virginem eximie pulchritudinis; percontatus eam quem potissimum augurem consuleret, illa audita causa consulendi, gnara artis ex disciplina parentum, regnum ei portendit, respondit,

'polliceturque se & matrimonii & spei sociam. Tam pulchra conditio, prima regni felicitas videbatur. --- While Gordius was plowing in this country with bired oxen, birds of all kinds began to gather and fly round him. Upon this, going to consult the Augurs of a neighbouring town, he met in the gate a beautiful virgin; she, being asked who was the most able Augur he could apply to, and hearing the question he had to propose, as she understood the art herself, by the instruction of her parents, answered, That a kingdom was portended to him, and promised to become his wife and partner of his good fortune. So agreeable an offer seemed to be an earnest of his royalty. What strongly confirms this correction is, that Arrian (6), relating this adventure of Gordius, says, in express terms, that Gordius applied himself to the diviners of the town of Telmessus. What follows in Arrian does not agree in all the circumstances with Justin's narrative; but this is of no great moment to the matter now in question. I omit not, however, to observe, that the translator of Arrian has thrust in *Telmiffenium* in a wrong place. It was not to the assembly of the inhabitants of Telmessus that the chariot carried Midas, attended by his father and mother, but to that of the Phrygians.

[C] Cicero thought that the reason why the inhabitants of Telmessus . . . became such great observers of prodigies, was, because they inhabited a country which produced several extraordinary things. To prove this, I shall set down two passages of Cicero not far from one another. The first runs thus: 'Licet videre & genera quædam & nationes huic scientiæ deditas. Telmessus in Caria est, qua in urbe excellit Aruspicum disciplina. --- We may see certain families, and nations, addicted to this science. Telmessus in Caria is a place famous for the teaching of Augury.' This is the other: 'Tum Caria tota præcipueque Telmessenses quos ante dixi, quod agros uberissimos maximeque fertiles incolunt, in quibus multa propter fecunditatem fingi gignique possunt, in ostentis animadvertendis diligentes fuerunt (7). --- The whole country (7) of Caria, and particularly the Telmessians, whom I de Divinat. have before-mentioned, because of their inhabiting in a most plentiful and fertile region, in which, by reason of its fruitfulness, many extraordinary things might be invented and produced, were great observers of prodigies.' As Telmessus was situated on the borders of Lycia,

of Dodona with a fellow-traveller, who founded a town, whose inhabitants were all divines. There is a great presumption, that the like virtue was bestowed upon Telmessus, both for him and those, who should build about the altar he erected by the direction of the oracle. We ought to believe that this altar was in the temple of Apollo Telmessus (i). The inhabitants of Telmessus had in particular a very great faith in dreams [D]. Aristander, a native of this town, and one of the most able diviners of his time (k), wrote a book upon that subject. Probably it was he who negotiated a treaty between his country and Alexander. Arrian has mentioned this treaty in his first book. I do not think the town of Termessus ought to be confounded with that of Telmessus [E]: it is better in my opinion, to distinguish them into two towns, and to preserve the name of Telmessus [F] to that which is situate on the frontiers of Lycia.

Lycia, it must be very near Caria; which is the reason why Cicero places it in this last province. Stephanus Byzantinus places it there also; but he adds, that Philo and Strabo place it in Lycia, and that it is a frontier town to those two countries.

[D] The inhabitants of Telmessus had very great faith in dreams. This we find in Tertullian, *Telmissenses*, says he (8), *nulla somnia evacuunt, imbecillitatem conjectationis incusant*. The meaning of which seems to be, that the inhabitants of Telmessus believe that all dreams signify something; that none of them is vain; and that the imperfection of our knowledge is the cause why we do not understand the signification of each dream.

[E] I do not think the town of Termessus ought to be confounded with that of Telmessus. Strabo so plainly distinguishes them from one another, that he leaves no room for any doubt about it. His way of describing the situation of Termessus (9), shews that it was a town of Pisidia, near the defile, by which they went over Mount Taurus in the way to Mylias; and therefore Alexander resolving to clear that passage, which was commanded by the town of Termessus, caused it to be demolished. As for what relates to Telmessus (10), that Geographer places it at the entrance into Lycia on this side of the river Xanthus, and even on this side of Phaelis, a sea-town, which he places near Mount Solymus, and Termessus, a town of Pisidia, says he (11). I shall confirm this by the authority of Arrian. After he had mentioned Alexander's entering Lycia, he says (12), that this conqueror got the town of Telmessus by a treaty; that afterwards he passed the Xanthus; that he took the town of that name, and several others which surrendered to him; that he advanced towards the province of Mylias; that he secured the place, from whence he sent part of his troops to Perga over the mountains, and marched with the rest along the sea; that he advanced as far as Sida; that he went back to Aspendus, because the inhabitants of that place had not performed their promise; that he forced them to surrender; that he went to Perga, and from thence into Phrygia; but the town of Telmessus, inhabited by Barbarians, who were by nation Pisidians, being in his way, he was obliged to take it; that it proved no easy thing, because that town stood upon a steep hill, and the inhabitants had possessed themselves of a neighbouring hill, so that they were masters of the straight or defile between those two hills. This is the very town, which Strabo calls Termessus; and it is manifest Arrian speaks of two different towns, when he says (13), that his hero concluded a treaty with Telmessus when he entered Lycia; and (14) that he besieged Telmessus as

he was marching from Perga towards Phrygia. All that remains to be known, is, whether those two towns ought to be called Telmessus, as they are in Arrian, or whether that of Lycia ought to go by the name of Termessus, and that of Pisidia by the name of Telmessus, as in Strabo, Stephanus Byzantinus, and Suidas: for the opinion of some learned men, who reduce them both to one town, under the name either of Termessus or Telmessus, cannot be maintained. Bochart (15), who reads Telmessus in Strabo for Termessus, may be confuted by a medal (16), which has on the one side ΤΕΡΜΗΣΣΕΩΝ, and on the other ΣΟΛΥΜΟΝΣ: which plainly shews, that the town of Pisidia, called Τερμεσσοί by Strabo, is rightly named; for since the hill on the promontory of Termessus, was called Solymus, and the Termessians were also called Solymi (17), it is plain, that the people who have this great affinity with the Solymi, ought to bear the name expressed in the medal: but it is the name of the Termessians; and therefore Bochart is in the wrong to read *Telmissus* and *Telmissenses* in that passage of Strabo; and thus one of his etymologies comes to nothing. He says that Cafaubon found in the manuscripts Τελμισσῶς, instead of Τερμεσσοί. These ought to be corrected by the medal. He adds, that Eustathius, quoting Strabo, writes Τελμισσοί; but he might have found in Salmassius, that Eustathius should not have made use of that name (18), and that besides he very much misunderstood the passage he quoted (19).

[F] It is better . . . to preserve the name of Telmessus. As there are a great many medals (20) with the inscription ΤΕΡΜΗΣΣΕΩΝ, what remains to be known is, whether the town of Lycia, which makes the subject of this article, ought to be called *Telmessus*. I am of opinion, with submission to better judgment, that it ought to be called *Telmessus*; for otherwise we must look upon as corrupted, not only the passages already mentioned (21) of Polybius, Arrian, Aristides, St Gregory Nazianzen, Cicero, and Livy, but also many others of Plutarch, Aelian, Lucian, Ptolemy, Stephanus Byzantinus, Pliny, Pomponius Mela, Tertullian, Arnobius, &c. All those places, where Aristander, the Soothsayer, is named of *Telmessus* would, in that case, be faulty. This would be going too far. It is therefore better to admit of two names; that of Termessus for the town of Pisidia, and that of Telmessus for the town of Lycia, where all the people were so liable to be inspired. Correct with Salmassius the passage of Arrian, wherein the town of Pisidia is called Τελμισσοί. Male and Arrianum Τελμισσοί vocatur quæ est Τερμεσσοί (22). The town Termessus is very falsely in Arrian called Telmissus.

TENEDOS, an island in the Ægean sea, near the continent of Asia, over against Troy. Some say (a) it was uninhabited, and called Leucophrys, before Tenes, the son of Cygnus, landed upon it. It was he therefore who first brought inhabitants into that island. He reigned over them with so much equity, that great honours were paid to him in his life-time, and after his death he was placed among the gods, as I shall relate when I come to speak of him. He built a town, and it was from him the island was called *Tenedos* (b). In process of time the people rather chose to say, that he did not bring thither the first colony; but that he landed there as it were by a miracle [A], and that the inhabitants immediately expressed so great a respect for a man, who was so manifestly

(1) In the article TENES.
(2) Variarum lib. i, cap. xii.
[A] As it were by a miracle. His father being imposed upon by his wife's calumnies, put him into a chest, and threw him into the sea. I shall speak of him hereafter (1). I do not find in the authors I have consulted, the circumstances of his preservation; but I find in Muretus (2) that Neptune, Tenes's grand-

father, came to the assistance of his grand-son; and that the chest, being carried to the isle of Leucophrys, was opened by the inhabitants, who no sooner discovered what it contained, but they made Tenes king, &c.

[B] The

(i) Τελμισσοί, ἐν Ἰαπυγίᾳ Ἰαθόν, ἔθ' αὖ Ἀπὸλλωνος Τελμισσοί, ἱερὸν. Telmissus in Cariam venit, ubi Apollinis Telmissii templum. Stephanus Byzantius, in Τελμισσοί.
(k) See his article.

(15) Bochart, Geograph. Sacra. lib. i, cap. vi.

(16) Apud Ezechiel. Spanhem. de Usu & Præf. Numism. pag. 477, 478.

(17) Τῆς γὰρ Τερμεσσοῦ, ἁπλῶς ὁ ὑπερκείμενος λόφος καλεῖται Σόλυμοι, καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ οἱ Τερμεσσοὶ Σόλυμοι καλοῦνται. Et sine tumultu qui sunt Termessus sum pæet promontorium, Solymus appellatur: ipsi Termessii vocantur, Solymi. Strabo, lib. xiii, pag. 433.

(18) Male Τελμισσοί vocat Eustathius. Salm. Exercit. Plinian. p. 784.

(19) Mira hæc supponit Eustathius in Strabonis verbis referenda. Ibid.

(20) Spanhem. ubi supra.

(21) Id. Ibid. pag. 478.

(22) Salmass. ubi supra.

(a) Diodorus, Siculus, lib. vii, cap. xvi. Servius in Æn. lib. ii, ver. 21.

(b) Quasi Τενεδος, id est, Tenedi sedes. Stephanus in Τενεδος.

T E N E D O S.

312

(c) See Diodorus Siculus, *ibid.*

(d) Plut. *Quest. Gr.* pag. 297. Pausanias, *lib. x*, pag. 330.

(e) See the article TENES.

(f) Antiphanes, *apud Athen. lib. i*, cap. xxii. See also Julius Pollux, *lib. vi*, cap. x, and Eustathius in *Iliad. A.*

festly protected by the gods, and afterwards so great an admiration of his noble qualities, that they made him their king (c). Thus we see how all nations have ascribed something marvellous to their old traditions. However it be, what is related of Tenes, could not have happened before the time of Priam, since Tenes lost his life when Achilles ravaged Tenedos, during the Trojan war (d). That island was then particularly consecrated to Apollo *Smintheus* [B]. It was behind that island the Greeks concealed their fleet, when they made a shew of giving over their enterprise; and it is this has made Tenedos more famous, than any thing else [C], and even to this day makes it known all over the world. Nevertheless that island was remarkable upon several better accounts. The administration of justice was very severe there (e): the best origanum in the world grew there (f): the most curious earthen vessels were made there (g): the grapes, and ears of corn, and figure of Ceres, that appear on its medals (b), testify that it abounded with wine and corn, as it does to this day [D]: and the women of that island were the most beautiful in all the world [E]. I say nothing of the singularity of their cray-fish [F]. It was at Tenedos, according to some, that Paris landed after the rape of Helen

(g) Plutarchus, *init. Tractat. de vitando zere alieno*, pag. 828, 8^a Scholiast. Aristoph. in *Nubib. Act. IV*, *Scene III.*

(b) Vide Spanhem. *Epist. ad Laurent. Bege-*

[B] *The island was particularly consecrated to Apollo Smintheus.* Homer plainly intimates it, when he puts this prayer in the mouth of the Priest Chryses:

ΚΛῦθί μιν ἀργυρότοξ' ὅς χεύσιν ἀμφιβέβηκας
κίλλαν τε ζᾶδ' ἔην, Τενέδοιό τε ἴφι ἀνάσσεις
Σμινθεύ.

Audi me argenteum arcum gerens, qui Chrysaetueris
Cillanque valde divinam, Tenedoque fortiter imperas
Smintheu (3).

(3) Homer. *Iliad. lib. i*, ver. 37.

*O Smytheus! sprung from fair Latona's line,
Thou guardian power of Cilla the Divine,
Thou source of light, whom Tenedos adores
And whose bright presence gilds thy Chrysa's shores.*

MR POPE.

(4) Lib. xiii, pag. 415.

(5) *Id. ibid.*

Strabo (4) has confirmed from this passage what he had been saying, that there was a temple of Apollo Smintheus in the isle of Tenedos. There were the like temples in some other neighbouring towns (5); and the common opinion is, that Apollo was worshipped under that title, because he had killed the rats, which destroyed the fruits of the earth. His statue in the temple of Chrysa had a rat under its feet. According to the dialect of that country, *σμινθεύ* signified a rat. Some other reasons have been alledged, besides those which I have mentioned: See the learned collections of Cuperus upon this subject in his ancient monuments (6).

(6) *Ad calcem Harpocratis, Edit. 1687*, pag. 212.

Est in conspectu Tenedos notissima fama
Insula, dives opum, Priami dum regna manebant,
Nunc tantum sinus & statio malefida carinis.
Huc se provecti deserto in litore condunt (7).

(7) *Æneid. lib. ii*, ver. 21.

*In sight of Troy lies Tenedos, an isle,
(While Fortune did on Priam's empire smile)
Renown'd for wealth, but since a faithless bay,
Where ships expos'd to wind and weather lay,
There was their fleet conceal'd.*

DRYDEN.

Et jam Argiva Phalanx instructis navibus ibat
A Tenedo, tacite per amica silentia lunæ (8).

(8) *Ibid. ver.* 254.

*The Grecians had embark'd their naval powers
From Tenedos, and sought our well-known shores.
Safe under covert of the silent night*

DRYDEN.

The beginning and ending of the story of the wooden horse are more taking to school-boys than any other

part of that Romance, and consequently make more lasting impressions.

[D] *As it does to this day.* Mr Spon, who has been there, assures us (9), that the isle of Tenedos is fruitful in good vines, wherewith it supplies Constantinople, and that its Muscadine grapes are excellent; that there is game in abundance, especially hares and partridges. Sir George Wheeler, his fellow-traveller, says (10), it abounds with corn and wine, especially of the Muscadine kind, the greatest part whereof is exported to Constantinople. See the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary.

[E] *The women of that island were the most beautiful in all the world.* One may very well wonder that a thing of this nature should not be mentioned by several authors. Athenæus, who had read so much, and who quotes so many writers, would have quoted some other author besides Nymphodorus, had he known of any other, who had made the same observation. However it be, these are his words: Καὶ Νυμφόδωρος δ' ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀσίας περίπλῳ, καλλίστας φησὶ γυναῖκας τῶν πανταχὺ γυναικῶν ἐν Τενέδῳ τῇ τρωϊκῇ νήσῳ. Nymphodorus autem in *Asie circumnavigatione Tenedias feminas* (ea Trojæ vicina insula est) omnes alias ubivis terrarum mulieres pulcritudine superare tradit (11). . . . *Nymphodorus in his voyage round Asia says, that the most beautiful women in all the world are born in Tenedos, an island in the neighbourhood of Troy.* A witness who has made or described the tour of Asia, is of great authority, and more to be credited than a hundred, who never travelled or studied Geographical History. Though Theophrastus does not affirm what Nymphodorus advances, yet his testimony may be alledged; because he says (12), that among the Barbarians there were judges appointed to inquire into the prudence and housewifery of women, in order to declare which of them exceeded the rest in these respects; there were likewise certain judges in the isles of Tenedos and Lesbos, who did the same thing in relation to the beauty of women: For it was thought that the very gifts of fortune and nature ought to be honoured and respected. Those judges of Tenedos had a very nice office. The gods themselves refused it; and it had been well for Paris if he had imitated them: he paid dear for his ingenious contrivance (13), and for the possession of Helen, whom he obtained as a reward for his sentence. But that fabulous story made no great impression; for there were some persons, who desired to judge of beauty, not only in Lesbos and Tenedos, but also in a town of Peloponnesus, where there was every year a dispute about beauty, and she who overcame her competitors, carried the prize (14). This custom continued down to Athenæus's time. Such an emulation was excusable in women; but it is very strange that men should also have contended for the prize of beauty (15).

[F] *The singularity of their cray-fish.* Their shell represented an ax; for which reason, according to Plutarch (16), the inhabitants of Tenedos consecrated an ax in the temple of Delphi. I should rather think that they consecrated it, because the forms observed in their tribunals, which occasioned the Proverb about the ax of Tenedos (17), induced them to pitch upon an ax for the arms of their country. It appears by their medals, that it was their constant symbol (18). Suidas mentions those cray-fish of Tenedos, and says they were to be found in a brook in that part of the country

(11) Athen. *lib. xiii*, pag. 609.

(12) *Apud Athen.* pag. 610.

(13) He made the three goddesses pull off their shifts.

(14) Nicias, in Arcadice, *apud Athen.* p. 609.

(15) Theophrastus, *apud Athen.* *ibid.*, says it was practised at Elis.

(16) De Pythie Oraculis, pag. 399.

(17) See hereafter the remark [H], and the article TENES.

(18) Vide Ex. Spanhem. *Epist. ad Laur. Bege-*

(7) In portum
Tenedon perve-
nit, ubi Helenam
maestam alloquio
mitigavit. *Dares
Phryg. de Excid.
Trojae.*

(8) Pausanias,
lib. x, pag. 330.

(1) In Verrem,
lib. iii.

Helen, and with his careffes foothed her uneafiness (i) [G]. The inhabitants of Tenedos finding themselves too weak to preserve their independency, submitted to the city of Alexandria situated in Troas (k). They were rich in Cicero's time, as appears from his orations (l). Their cause concerning their immunities was determined at Rome with too great rigour [H]. Cicero protected them, but he was not sufficiently seconded. That island is about ten leagues round, and lies not above two leagues and a half from the continent of Asia (m). The Turks have a fortress there, which is only a tower, with a rampart defended by about fifteen pieces of cannon. The Venetians made themselves masters of it, during the war of Candia; but the Turks retook it by means of a tun of Sequins, with which they corrupted the commander (n). Aristotle wrote a book concerning the republic of the Tenedians (o). Zoilus composed a panegyric upon them, wherein he has published a great falsity, namely that the river Alpheus had its source in the isle of Tenedos (p). That island was often mentioned in the Gazettes, whilst the Venetians were in possession of Chio, which they took in the year 1694.

(m) Wheeler, Voyage, pag. 103. Strabo, lib. xiii, pag. 415, says it is 80 Stadia in compass, and the canal that divides it from Asia, 40.

(n) Spon, Voyage, Tom. i, pag. 153, Dutch Edit.

(o) Stephan. in Tenedos.

(p) Strabo, lib. vi, pag. 187.

(19) In Tenedo-
sios ἐννήγιοτος.

(20) Geograph.
Sac. Part. ii,
lib. i, cap. ix.

(21) Josephus
Ikanus, Anglus,
who lived in the
XIIIth century.
See his Dares
Phrygius de bello
Trojano, lib. iii,
pag. m. 52, 53.

(22) See the re-
mark [L], in
the article H E-
LENA.

(23) Hec faciles
emere toros, do-
nuere rebelles
Amplexus, epi-
gere fidem, non
jam oscula red-
dit.

Non reddenda
negat Helene,
sed pectore toto
lacumbens, gre-
mum solvit, pre-
mit ore laten-
tem

Furatur Vene-
rem, jamque ex-
pirante Dione
Confusa secretos
tristatur purpura
motus.
Proh scelus, &c.

country called Asferina (19). Bochart (20) rightly observes it should be read *Asseior*, and not *Asseiora*, because Plutarch says in express words, that the cray-fish of Tenedos, whose shell was like an ax, were to be found in a place called *Asseior*. Besides, according to Hesychius, the first inhabitants of that island were called *Asseior*, a name that might very well proceed from the place, which afforded those cray-fish. This conjecture of Bochart, and the corrections he makes in that passage of Suidas, are a great deal better than all his imaginary Etymologies, fluffed with Hebrew, to derive the Tenedians from Phenicia.

[G] He foothed her uneafiness. Nothing can be more modest than the words of the pretended Dares Phrygius, 'alloquio mitigavit. - - he foothed with his conversation.' The author, who wrote a Paraphrase upon him in verse (21), did not confine himself within such narrow bounds: he has carried the thing as far as it can go, leaving nothing to be supplied by the imagination of the readers. It is true he leaves two stumbling-blocks in their way. One is, that he supposes Paris did not enjoy Helen till he had landed in the isle of Tenedos; which is neither likely, nor consistent with the Iliad, where the isle of Cranae, less distant than Tenedos from the place, where the rape was committed, is made the scene of the last favour (22). The second difficulty is taken from the rich presents Paris is obliged to make, in order to obtain his wishes. This is contrary to decorum, in the opinion of those, who know the character of Helen: the author was sensible of it, and therefore he breaks out into an exclamation immediately after the verses, wherein he describes the presents and the enjoyment (23).

Proh scelus! an tantis potuisti pessima votis
Indulisse moras? expectabatque voluptas
Emptorem? O teneri miranda potentia sexus!

Præcipitem in lucrum suspendit femina luxum,
Nec nisi conducto dignatur gaudia risu.

For shame! how could'st thou, wretched fair, thus lay
Such cold demurrers in thy lover's way?
What, must he stay till every kiss be bought?
To what strange power will thy sex be brought!
While thus, for lucre, you each wish restrain;
And even grudge a smile, except for gain.

[H] Their cause concerning their immunities was determined at Rome, with too great rigour. This is what Cicero wrote about it to his brother. 'Tenediorum igitur libertas securi Tenedia præcisa est, cum eos præter me & Bibulum & Calidium & Favonium nemo defenderet (24). - - The liberty therefore of the island of Tenedos, was cut off with the ax of Tenedos, since it met with no other patrons besides Bibulus, Calidius, Favonius, and myself.' The proverbial expression of Cicero may be explained by Pausanias or Stephanus Byzantinus. Τενιδίω πέλκευς ἐπὶ τῶν νητοὶ πικρῶς ἢ καὶ μᾶλλον συνήμους ἀποκοτ[ή]ντων τὰ ζητήματα, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πράγματα. Tenedia Securus, de iis qui vel asperè vel etiam magis concisè abscedunt quæstiones & alias res (25). - - The ax of Tenedos is applicable to those who either with much severity, or little formality cut off questions and other matters. Pausanias having said that Tened cut with an ax the rope, wherewith the ship of his father Cygnus was fastened, adds, Ἐπὶ τῷ μὲν ἐς τὴν ἀντιμῆνυσιν εὐρεῖς λίγισται καθέστηκεν ὡς ὁ δαίνα ὅστις δὴ Τενεδίῳ πέλκευι τόδε τι ἀποκόψας. Ex eo in Proverbiis consuetudinem venit ut quidquid quis præfracte negaret, id Tenedia bipenni præcidisse dicatur (26). - - From thence it became a common Proverb, whenever any thing was precipitately rejected, to say it lib. x, pag. 330. was cut off with the ax of Tenedos.

(24) Cicero ad Q. fratrem, lib. ii.

(25) Steph. Byzant. voce Tenedos.

(26) Plutarch. Quest. Græc. num. 28, pag. 207, calli bim Mulpus.

TENES or TENNES, the son of Cygnus, gave his name to the isle of Tenedos, where he landed, when his father exposed him in a chest to the mercy of the sea. Cygnus used him with that severity, because he had been too credulous in believing his wife, the step-mother of Tenes (A). She complained that Tenes had ravished her (B), and alledged the false evidence of a piper (a). This occasioned the law, that was observed in the isle of Tenedos, that no man of that profession should be admitted into

(1) Lib. x, pag. 329.

[A] His wife, the step-mother of Tenes. We read in Pausanias (1) that Cygnus, the son of Neptune, reigned at Colonæ in Troas, and that he had two sons by Proclea, the daughter of Clytius, and sister to Calator, who was killed at the siege of Troy by Ajax, as it is mentioned in the Iliad. Those two children of Cygnus were, a son named Tenes, and a daughter named Hemitheia. After the death of their mother, Cygnus married Philonome the daughter of Craugafus. This Philonome accused Tenes of having attempted to ravish her, whereas she on the contrary fell in love with Tenes, who refused to comply with her desires. This therefore is an example, which may be added to those of Theïsus and Constantine. Muretus has collected some others in the 12th chapter of the first book of his *Varie Lectiones*. See the article FAUSTA.

[B] She complained that Tenes had ravished her. I follow my author, who says, καταμαρτυρήσαντο.

V O L. V.

αὐλητῶν τινα βιάζεσθαι ταύτην. A certain Piper witnessing against him that she had been ravished. But as we have only some fragments of that work of Heraclides, which favour entirely of the carelessness and precipitation of a writer who wants to huddle up an abridgment, there is no doubt but some words are wanting in this place. A wife does not use to complain to her husband that she has been ravished; she is content to tell him that such a thing has been designed. Though Stephanus Byzantinus has gone through the hands of a most terrible abbreviator, he does nevertheless inform us, that Philonome, Cygnus's wife, complained only of Tenes's ill design, and that the evidence of the Piper went no farther. Τὴν γὰρ αὐλητὴν ἡ φιλονόμη πρὸς Κύκνον ἡγάγεε μαρτυρῶντα ὅτι Τέννης αὐτὴν ἠθέλει βιάσασθαι. Tibicinem enim Philonome ad Cygnum duxit, qui testabatur Tenem voluisse Philonome vim inferre (2). Pausanias makes no mention

(2) Steph. Byzant. in voce Tenedos.

(b) See the remark [H].

(c) See the remark [H]. in the article TENEDOS.

(d) Ex Heraclide de Politia.

(e) Suidas in T. s. 13. 04. 200. 200.

(f) Apud Suidam, in voce sequenti.

(g) See Erasmus in the Proverbia, Tenedia bipennis. Tenedius homo. Tenedius patronus. Tenedius Tibicen.

(h) Pafanias, lib. x, pag. 330.

into the temple. Tenes, who probably was the author of that law (b), extremely proper to perpetuate the just hatred he had conceived against that false witness, shewed himself worthy of commanding by some other laws, which he enacted, and caused to be executed without any distinction of persons. He condemned adulterers to be beheaded; and being asked, what should be done to his son, who had been guilty of that crime, he answered, *let the law be put in execution*. Upon this occasion some medals were stamped [C], having on one side the figure of an ax, and on the other the faces of a man and a woman upon the same neck. This likewise, and what shall be said below, was the reason why the ax of Tenedos became a proverb (c), to denote a great severity (d). Tenes ordered another thing very remarkable, namely that there should always stand behind the judge, a man holding an ax, in order to cut off the head of any one, who should be convicted of falsity (e). Others say he ordered that the executioner, with his ax lifted up, should stand behind the accusers, in order to put immediately to death those who should be found guilty of a false accusation [D]. Aristotle, says in general (f) that the King of Tenedos administering justice with an ax, made a quick dispatch of those, who had wronged any body. It is no wonder after this if the proverb, *he is a man of Tenedos* (g), denoted a man, whose looks struck terror. Tenes extended his inflexibility even to his father. Cygnus having discovered his wife's calumny, was desirous of repairing the injury he had done his son, and made a voyage to the isle of Tenedos, to give him satisfaction (h). He fastened his ship to a tree or a rock, but Tenes in a passion rudely cut the ropes with his ax. We are not told what became of Cygnus after this rough action

mention of that evidence: he will have it that Cygnus gave credit to the bare complaints of Philonome; but he observes that the complained one of the ill designs of her son-in-law. *Ψεύδεται πρὸς τὸν ἀνδρᾶ ὡς αὐτῇ μὲν ἐκ ἐβέλυσσεν. τὸν δὲ αὐτῇ Τένυν συγγένειαν* (3); that is, *she falsely complained to her husband, that Tenes attempted to lie with her against her will*. The Latin translation of Romulus Amateus seems to me to go beyond the original, *quod ille invitam et repugnantem confuturare conatus esset*. The Latin words signify great endeavours; but the Greek may be understood only of a bare solicitation.

[C] Upon this occasion some medals were stamped. Mr Beger (4) has published one stamped at Tenedos having on one side two faces upon one and the same neck, and on the other an ax between a lyre and a bunch of grapes. Those two faces represent a man and a woman. This author pretends, that the design of this medal was to denote the union, which ought to be between married people. The medal of Tenes, mentioned by the Antients (5) was not stamped with such an intent; but rather to denote the capital punishment of a man and a woman, who had committed adultery, and to be a perpetual monument of the execution of the law upon Tenes's own son. It will be proper to see the answer a learned man gave to Mr Beger (6). What creates the greatest difficulty, is, that there are some medals of Tenedos, on which one of the faces represents an old man, and the other a young woman; on others, the two faces represent young people, &c. Those variations make it probable, that all these medals were not stamped agreeably to the first intent; but some for one purpose, and others for another: unless it should be said that as often as the law was put in execution, a new medal was stamped, and that the two heads upon one neck differed either as to the age or some other ornaments, according to the personal qualities of those, who had been punished. It would be no very great wonder if an old beard had been found in the fact with a young woman.

[D] That the executioner, with his ax lifted up, should stand behind the accusers, in order to put immediately to death those who were guilty of a false accusation. Suidas affirms this: *Ἐνομοθέτης, λέγει ὅτι, τοῖς τὰ ψεύδῃ κατηγοροῦσιν ὀπίσθεν παρὰ τὸν δῆμον ἀνέστην ὡς ἐλεγχέειν αὐτοὺς πειράσθαι ἀναρπείσθαι*. Legem tulit ut carnifex securum sublatam tenens à tergo astaret illis qui falsa crimina objicerent, ut convicti ex tempore occiderentur. . . . He made a law, that the executioner, with his ax lifted up, should stand behind those who brought false accusations, that as soon as they were convicted they might be put to death. This puts me in mind of a maxim which has been commented upon by a French Civilian of the XVIth century. It imports, that a man, who goes about to oppose the prevailing religion, and which has been regularly established for many ages, ought not to be heard, but upon this condition, that he shall be punished with death, if he

does not convince others, that his private opinion is more certain than the opinion of the public. *Qui antiqua, legitima, atque ordinaria sacra audent in contrarium adducere, cum non audendum esse, nisi periculo sui capitis, si non persuadeat veritatem esse suam sententiam* (8). Upon this occasion he alleges a very remarkable example from Josephus, in the sixth chapter of the thirteenth book of his Jewish Antiquities. The Jews, and the Samaritans having a quarrel in the city of Alexandria about this question, Whether the temple of Jerusalem was to be preferred to that of Garizim; the cause was brought before the council of the King of Egypt (9), and before the cause was argued, it was determined, that the advocates of the party cast should be condemned to death. The advocate of the Jews spoke first (10), and so clearly proved the justice of his cause, that he obtained such a sentence as he desired; so that Sabeus and Theodotus, the two Advocates of the Samaritans, were condemned to lose their lives. The same Civilian alleges (11) Zaleucus's law, by virtue of which, whoever proposed any innovation, was to do it with a rope about his neck, that in case he should not prevail to have the old customs abolished, he might be hanged upon the spot: and he concludes with wishing that the same law were to be observed in France. He fancies that the factions and troubles, occasioned by innovations in the kingdom of France, would have been prevented by that means. *Quibus omnino rationibus atque conditionibus si nos, praefertim hoc tempore uteremur, quo is demum nihil scire & illiberalis esse dicitur, cui non placent absurdissima quaeque, modò recentissima: non ita plane res incertae essent ac turbulenta, neque tam multi multarum patrium, factionum, opinionum auctores evaderent: cum suo saltem periculo ea differant amare, colere, pacem patriamque, leges ac magistratus, quae odio sanè prosequuntur* (12). . . . If we were to make use of the same methods and conditions at this time, when every person is esteemed to be entirely ignorant and unpolite, who does not relish the most absurd notions, provided they are but new; we should not have that uncertainty and confusion in things, nor would so many set up for heads of parties, factions, and opinions: since from their own danger, at least, they would learn to respect and reverence peace and their country, the laws and the magistrates, those things for which they now discover the most inveterate hatred. It is plain he would have had the disputes between the Romish priests and the Protestants determined like that of Alexandria: but was there in France in a tribunal like that of the King of Egypt? the latter was composed of men, who were neither Jews nor Samaritans; and therefore the contending parties might expect a decision without any partiality. Luther and Calvin, and their followers, could not have the same expectations, since the same persons must have been both judges and parties. Consequently neither Zaleucus's law, nor that of the King of Tenedos, can be extended to matters of religion.

[E] W

action [E]; but we read that the father and the son were killed by Achilles, during the Trojan war: the first, when the Grecians landed (i), the second, when Achilles went to ravage the isle of Tenedos (k). Tenes came to the assistance of his dear sister [F] Hemitheia, who was pursued by Achilles; but he only got his death by it. This action was attended with many consequences [G]. He was honoured as a god in the isle of Tenedos [H]. See the article of that island.

[E] *We are not told what became of Cygnus.* As I have only followed Pausanias's narrative, I leave the account of that voyage very imperfect. It is plain, the principal design of that author was to describe statues and pictures, and that he did not always consider whether the stories he mentioned, by the way, were lame or not. He makes Cygnus land in the isle of Tenedos, and fasten his ship to a tree or a great stone, and then Tenes to come and cut the cable. This is all. He should at least have told us, whether the son permitted his father to live in Tenedos, or to go home. This adventure is better related by Conon (13), tho' we have but an abstract of his book. Cygnus, says he, fastened his ship, but did not land; he desired his son to forget what was past, but he desired it on board his ship. Tenes cut the cables with his hatchet to prevent his landing. We may easily see what became of Cygnus; he went home again.

[F] *His dear sister.* It is not without reason that I use this epithet, since Hemitheia was so concerned at her brother's misfortune, that Cygnus shut her up in the same chest, in which he committed his son to the mercy of the sea (14). What Suidas says of her is still more in her commendation, for he tells us that she voluntarily resolved to run the same hazard with her brother (15). It was very reasonable, that Tenes should expose his life to prevent such a sister from being ravished; and yet he died in so just a cause; and it is pretended, that Hemitheia was swallowed up by the earth; and that it was this only that put a stop to Achilles's attempts (16). The remedy was somewhat violent; and few people would think it more supportable than the evil itself. Hemitheia was very handsome (17).

[G] *His death was attended with many consequences.* When Achilles came to know that it was Tenes whom he had killed, he was sorry for it, and took care to get him buried. He killed a servant sent him from Thetis, because he had not justly executed Thetis's orders. She had not only strictly charged her son to take care not to kill Tenes, but besides she had enjoined that servant to put Achilles in mind of her orders, when there should be occasion for it, lest he should disobey his mother through inadvertency. Plutarch (18) gives no other reason for this care of Thetis, but that Tenes was beloved of Apollo: but others say, that he was his son, and that Cygnus was only his reputed father (19). Now, according to the Destinies, Achilles was to die as soon as he should kill one of Apollo's

sons. As for the rest. The inhabitants of Tenedos conceived so great an indignation against Achilles, that they ordered that no body should mention his name in the temple of Tenes. They also prohibited all Pipers from entering into it (20). Diodorus Siculus (21) does not say, those two prohibitions concerned the temple of Tenes, tho' he observes, that the inhabitants of Tenedos built a temple to him, and worshipped him as a god. He tells us that Tenes himself ordered that the pipers should not enter into the temple. He adds, that the temple which was re-built, when Achilles had destroyed the town, was that, in which it was not lawful to mention the name of Achilles. He, and Plutarch are therefore of a quite contrary opinion as to the place, which those two prohibitions concerned. It is certain, that no temple was built to Tenes during his life.

[H] *He was honoured as a god in the isle of Tenedos.* I have just now quoted two authors who say so. Cicero may be added for a third: 'Jam vero, says he (22), in Græcia multos habent ex hominibus Deos, Alabandum Alabandi, Tenedi Tenem. . . . And now in Greece there are men worshipped as gods, Alabandus by the Alabandi, and Tenes by those of Tenedos.' He was one of the deities that Verres stole. 'Tenedo, prætereo pecuniam quam eripuit, Tenem ipsum qui apud Tenedios sanctissimus deus habetur, qui urbem illam dicitur condidisse, cujus ex nomine Tenedus nominatur, hunc, inquam, ipsum Tenem pulcherrimè factum, quem quondam in comitio vidistis, abstulit magnò cum gemitu civitatis (23). . . . I pass over his extortions at Tenedos, where he seized even Tenes himself, who among that people is revered with divine honours, and is said to have built that city, which is called Tenedus, after his name, this very Tenes, I say, a most beautiful statue, which you have formerly seen in the Comitium, he carried away to the great grief of the inhabitants.' We may infer from thence, that the ancient deity of Tenedos, namely, Apollo Smintheus, was, in a manner, forgotten, after Tenes was placed in the number of the gods: for it was not objected to Verres, that he had made an attempt upon the statue of this Apollo; which plainly shews that it was not worth taking away, as that of Tenes was. Men seem to act in point of religion, as they do in point of friendship. None but the wife and the rational prefer old friends to new ones. The generality behave like coquets; the last comers are the most acceptable. In like manner the new saints makes the old ones forgotten. This has been complained of by some grave writers.

T E O S, one of the twelve cities of Ionia, acknowledged Athamas for its first founder (a) [A]. This Athamas, the grand-son of another Athamas, the son of Æolus, conducted a colony of Orchomenians to Teos, to which, in process of time, were added some other colonies of Athenians and Bœotians. Herodotus says (b), that Teos was in the middle of Ionia; and that this was the reason why Thales advised the Ionians to make it the seat of their general assemblies. Strabo, who places it in a peninsula, is not so faulty as Pliny (c), who calls it an island, for it is certain that Teos stood on the south side of the isthmus (d) over against Clazomenæ [B], which was on the north side. The inhabitants of Teos not being able to hold out any longer against the troops

(13) Apud Ptolemaum, p. 437.

(14) Conon, ubi supra.

(15) 'Ελευσίνης δὲ τῆς Ἡμιθέας θυγατρὸς ἡρώδης τῶ δὲ θεῶν ἱερέως: καὶ αὐτὴν Ἡμιθέα ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ περικύβητι οὐκ ἔλαβεν ἑαυτὴν ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ἀπορίας.

(16) Tzetzes in Lycophr.

(17) Plutarch. Quæst. Græc. 29.

(18) Id. ibid.

(19) Tzetzes in Lycophr.

(a) Pausanias, lib. vii, pag. 208. Strabo, lib. xiv, circa init.

(1) In Theophrasto Geographicis, voce Teos.

(i) Ovidius, Metam. lib. xii.

(k) Plutarch. Quæst. Græc. pag. 297.

(20) Plutarch, ubi supra.

(21) Lib. vi, cap. xvi.

(22) Cicero, de Natura Deorum, lib. iii, cap. xvi.

(23) Idem, in Verrem, lib. iii.

(b) Lib. v, cap. clxx.

(c) Lib. i, cap. xxvi.

(d) Strabo, ibid. Pompon. Mela, lib. i, cap. xvi, & ibid. lib. vii, cap. xvi.

name. 3. He thought the native country of Anacreon was not called Teos, when that Poet called it Athamantida. Charles Stephens has fallen into the same mistakes.

[B] *Teos stood on the south side of the isthmus over against Clazomenæ.* Here follows a passage of Pomponius Mela (2), which we must examine. 'Super angustias, hinc Teos, illinc Clazomenæ, & quia terga jungunt confinio adnexa maris, diversis frontibus diversa maria prospectant. . . . On the straits are situated Teos on this side, Clazomenæ on the other; which two places, as the back parts of them are almost joined by their nearness to the shore, have in their fronts the different prospect of two opposite seas.' Pincianus makes the

(2) Lib. i, cap. xvi.

(b) Stephanus,
in Tíros.

(i) Strabo, ubi
supra, & lib.
xiii, pag. 419.

(4) In Melam,
pag. 85.

(5) Ita ut à tergo mare habeant vicinum cui adnexæ sunt, à fronte diversaria prospectant. Teos enim adversa fronte prospectat mare in quo sitæ sunt Claromenæ (Jo says Salmastus instead of saying Clazomenæ) et finum Smyrnenum illæ contra Teon respiciunt et finum cui iuncta est Teos

(8) Strabo, *lib.*
xii, *pag. m.* 374;
375, mentions
it, but does not
say it was in
Paphlagonia.

(2) *In Vita sua*,
lib. i, pag. m.
1172.

mo mancipatus fuerat, & tunc an adhuc in vivis esset, incertum erat. . . . From Muretus he understood the misfortune of Scipio Tetti, the Neapolitan, a person otherwise, as he said, extremely learned, who being informed against for some heterodox opinions of the Deity, was condemned to the galleys, and whether he was then alive or not was uncertain. Thuanus speaks of the time when he was at Rome (3), and of the frequent conversations he had with Muretus. What we read in the Thuanus has a relation to this: 'The Inquisition was very severe under the Pontificate of Sixtus V. Muretus told me, we do not know what becomes of the people here. I am amazed, when I rise in the morning, and hear that such a one is not to be found, and yet none dares speak of it. The Inquisition made a quick dispatch of them.' There is a

(3) That is, the year 1574.

A MISTAKE

A MISTAKE
by **THEODORE**

de Apollodorus, which was published at Rome by Benedictus Ægius in the year 1555 [B]. He was very much esteemed by the learned [C].

slip of memory in this passage. Muretus died soon after the election of Sixtus V, in 1585, and Thuanus was in France all that year; he could not therefore learn any thing from Muretus in that Pope's reign. I believe I should not be mistaken, if I were to advance, that Thuanus remembering on the one hand what Muretus had told him concerning the executions of the Inquisition; and knowing on the other hand, that Sixtus V was very severe, confounded the time in which Muretus spoke to him, with the time when Sixtus V was Pope. People do not use to be so exact in conversation, and the memory is not then so intent as to make one avoid anachronisms.

[B] He is the author of the treatise de Apollodorus, which was published at Rome by Benedictus Ægius, in the year 1555 (4).] He added it to his edition of Apollodorus, whole book he translated into Latin, and added notes to it, wherein he often mentions Tetti. He gives him the character of a very honest and learned man. 'Sic habet exemplar Scipionis Tetti Neapolitani, viri nobilissimi & summæ doctrinæ & modestiæ & humanitatis incredibilis (5). ---- Thus it is in the copy of Scipio Tetti, the Neapolitan, a person of considerable rank, and superior learning, and of incredible modesty and humanity.' Mr Baillet makes mention of him in his *Jugemens des Savans*, part II, chap. X, of the *Prejudices of Precipitation*. 'Scipio Tetti, says he, a Neapolitan, bestowed several years upon his small tract de Apollodorus, before he was sent to the galleys. It is a work only of two sheets; but the public, which approved of it, thought that neither the smallness of the piece, nor the length of the time employed in composing it, nor the author's misfortune, ought to make it suffer in their esteem.' Co-

lomiés (6) thought that Tetti had only written that tract, and a catalogue of manuscripts published by Father Labbe (7); but he should have known, that the same Father ascribes to him (8) *Bibliotheca scolastica instructissima Latine, Gallice, Italice, Hispanice, Anglicè, & Græcè*, printed at London, in the year 1618, in 8vo. Nicodemo knew nothing of it, but what he found in Father Labbe.

[C] He was very much esteemed by the learned.] He himself informs us, that he had contracted friendships with several illustrious persons. 'Testes, says he (9), 'consequi nostrum utriusque laborum celeberrimi rerum antiquarum conservatores, nedom rei litterariæ acerrimi patroni ac defensores, Achilles Maffæus, Gentilisque Delphinus. Testes amici alii literis & ingenio præstantissimi Carus Hannibal, Baptista Sigicellus, Antonius Augustinus, Alexandri duo, Picolominus & Corvinus, Marcus Cafalius. Testes item alii quos longum esset enumerare. Denique & Fulvius Ursinus juvenis imprimis honestus & ornatus, & supra quam par sit ejus ætati Latine & Græcè eruditus. ---- Achilles Maffæus, and Gentilis Delphinus, those eminent preservers of Antiquity, as well as strenuous patrons and defenders of learning in general, are ready to give their testimony to both my works. So are others of my friends, who are also distinguished for their great parts and erudition: Carus Hannibal, Baptista Sigicellus, Antonius Augustinus, the two Alexanders, Picolominus, and Corvinus, and Marcus Cafalius. So are others, whom it would be tedious to enumerate. Lastly, so is Fulvius Ursinus, a young gentleman of great figure and politeness, and learned in Latin and Greek, far beyond what is usual at his age.'

TETRIX, was a native of the isle of Crete, and went with a fleet to the Peloponnesus. He landed at the promontory called Tænarium, and there built a town. He made his residence near a place called Ψυχρομετρίον, by reason of the ceremonies which were performed there to appease the Manes. It was hither the priests of Delphos sent him who had killed the Poet Archilochus [A].

[A] It was hither the priests of Delphos sent him, who had killed the Poet Archilochus.] Plutarch, from whom I have taken this whole article, expresses himself in this manner (1): 'Ἐκελευσθη πορευθῆναι ἐπὶ τὴν τῷ Τετρίῳ οἰκίαν ἰδεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν τῷ Ἀρχιλόχῳ ψυχρὴν. He was ordered to go to Tetric's habitation, in order to appease the soul of Archilochus. According to Suidas, he was ordered to go to Tænarium, where Tetric was buried, and there to offer a propitiatory sacrifice to the soul of the son of Telephus (2). Goriopius

Becanus (3), who consulted no other author but Suidas, falsely imagined that Tetric was Archilochus himself. If he had consulted Plutarch, he would have avoided that mistake, nor would he have made use of Archilochus's words (4) against a man, who had abused him, Τετρίῳ τῷ πρὸς συνείληφας; Cicadam ala apprehendisti. -- You have got a grasshopper by the wing. See the remark [C] of the article ARCHILOCHUS.

TEUCER, the son of Telamon and of Hecione sister of Priam (a), went with twelve ships to the siege of Troy (b), where he gave noble proofs of his courage; but he did not revenge the affront put upon his brother Ajax (c), nor prevent his killing himself (d). This made him so odious to Telamon [A], that he received an order from him

(c) Teucer non receptus à patre Telamone ob segnitiam non vindictæ fratris injuriæ, Cyprum appellus cognomine patris sue Salamina constituit. *Vell. Paternus*, init. (d) Ἐδύσθη ἀπὸ τῆς Σαλαμῖνος ὡς μὴ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ Ἰάντῃ καλῶς ἐπαγορευόμενον ὄφ' αὐτοῦ. Ejectum Salamine eo quod Ajaxem fratrem manus sui illaturum minime prohibuisset. *Schol. Æsch.* in *Perth.*

(1) See in *Servius*, in *Æneid*, lib. i, ver. 619, all the reasons that are given for Telamon's anger.

(2) Agamemnon in the eighth book of the *Iliad*, ver. 284, tells him, that Telamon had carefully bred him up, though he was a bastard.

(3) De *Oratore*, lib. ii, fol. 80.

[A] This made him so odious to Telamon (1).] Sophocles brings in Teucer foretelling that misfortune, and foreseeing that his father would call him bastard (2) and coward, and even accuse him of having deceitfully contributed to the death of his brother, in hopes of being the only heir; and that he would turn him out of his house. He observes, that Telamon never laughed, no, not in a time of mirth; and that he would, with much more reason, be angry and peevish, hearing, in his old age, of the unhappy death of his son. Cicero, without doubt, admired the verses, wherein Pacuvius represents the reception Teucer met with from his father; for these are his words (3): 'Quid potest esse tam fictum quam verus, quam scena, quam fabulæ? Tamen in hoc genere sæpe ipse vidi quum ex persona mihi ardere oculi hominis Histrionis viderentur spondalia illa, dicentis,

VOL. V.

Segregare abs te ausus, aut sine illo Salamina ingredi, Neque paternum aspectum es veritus.

Nunquam illum aspectum dicebat, quin mihi Telamon iratus furere luctu filii videretur. Ut ille inflexa ad miserabilem sonum voce,

Quem ætate exacta indigem
Liberum lacerasti, orbasti, extinxisti, neque fratris necis,
Neque gnati ejus parvi qui tibi in tutelam est traditus.

Flens ac lugens dicere videbatur? Quæ si ille Histrion quotidie cum ageret, tamen recte agere sine dolore non poterat, quid Pacuvium putabis in scribendo leni animo ac remisso fuisse?

L 111

Wbat

(6) Mélang. Historiq. pag. 91.

(7) In Novæ Bibliothecæ MSS. Supplementis.

(8) In Bibliothecæ Bibliothecarum.

(9) In Tractatu de Apollodorus.

(4) Compare this with the citation (B), of the first article APOLLODORUS.

(5) Ægidius Spolietinus, Notæ in Apollodorus, pag. 41, apud Nicodemum, Bibliotheca Neapolitana, pag. 228.

(1) De his qui ferò à nomine penitunt, pag. 560.

(2) He was Archilochus's father.

(3) Orig. Antwerp. lib. iv, apud Schottum, Bibliothecæ Hispan. pag. 378.

(4) Apud Lucianum, in Pseudolog.

(5) See the remark [D] of the article TELAMON.

(6) Hygin. cap. scvii.

him not to set foot in Salamina. Upon this he went to seek his fortune; and having landed in the isle of Cyprus, he there built a town to which he gave the name of his father's kingdom from whence he had been excluded, I mean he called it Salamina [B]. When he heard of Telamon's death, he went to take possession of his kingdom; but Euryfaces, Ajax's son, prevented him. This resistance raised in him a desire of turning adventurer: he sailed towards the coasts of Spain, and having landed in the place where new Carthage was built, he went as far as Gallicia, and there he settled. Justin affirms it (e), but it is more probable that Teucer settled in the isle of Cyprus [C]. He built a temple to Jupiter in Salamina, and instituted a human sacrifice to that deity [D]. That cruel sacrifice was not abolished till the time of the Emperor Hadrian. Teucer's posterity reigned there for several ages. Pausanias (f) says they reigned there till the time of Evagoras; but he is not exact, for they reigned there much longer [E]. They reigned also in Cilicia, as I have shewn in the article of Ajax, the son of Teucer. There is a passage in Pausanias (g) which gives room to believe, that Teucer married a daughter of Cinyras. He was assisted by the King of the Tyrians, to secure his new dominions. Virgil says so (h); and Servius, his commentator, does not deny that it was the opinion of several

(e) Justin. lib. xlvii, cap. iii.

(f) Lib. ii, pag. 71.

(g) Lib. i, p. 3.

(h) Æn. lib. i, ver. 620.

'What is so full of fiction as Poetry, and representations
'on the stage? Yet in some of these, I have seen the
'actors eyes all on fire at the pronouncing these lines;

How durst thou part from him, and thus without him
Return, and fearless view thy father's face?

'At the expressing these words, thy father's face, I never
'could forbear imagining I saw Telamon in a rage,
'storming for the loss of his son; then changing his tone to
'the piteous, at these lines;

Whose grey hairs thou in sorrow now hast steep'd,
By tearing from me thus my dear, dear son;
Whilst thou, inhuman, neither mourn'st thy brother,
Nor tho' thy ward, weep'st o'er his infant child.

'With what tears and heart-breaking did he seem to
'speak them? But if the player, who daily acted this
'part, could not act it without shewing so great a de-
'gree of concern, do you think Pacuvius could be unaf-
'fected and unmoved at the writing of it?

(4) Euripides in
Helen mentions
that oracle.

[B] I mean, he called it Salamina.] An oracle of
Apollo (4) had promised him that the new Salamina,
to be built by him, would be no less famous than the
other:

Certus enim promissit Apollo
Ambiguum tellure nova Salamina futuram (5).

(c) Horat. Od.
VII, lib. i, ver.
28.

For by Apollo's oracle we're told,
A future Salamin shall match the old.

The place where Horace says this, is very well
known, because it is part of a drinking song.

Teucer Salamina patremque
Cum fugeret, tamen uda Lyæo
Tempora populea fertur vinxisse corona,
Sic tristes affatus amicos;
Quò nos cunque feret melior fortuna parente,
Ibimus o focii, comitesque:
Nil desperandum Teucro duce & auspice Teucro.

O fortes pejoraeque passi
Mecum sæpe viri, nunc vino pellite curas,
Cras ingens iterabimus æquor.

When Teucer from old dad and country fled,
He fill'd his glass, and to his comrades said,
Cheer up, brave boys, a touchy fire ne'er heed,
We'll go where kinder fortune's pleas'd to lead.
Teucer's companions no despair can seize:

We've seen, brave boys, much harder times than these.
A fart for care, let's drink about to day,
To-morrow we'll weigh anchor, and away.

Teucer does not say in Horace, where he would build
the new Salamin; but he declares in Euripides that he
would build it in the isle of Cyprus: and all the
Historians observe that he built it there, except Meffala

Corvinus, who is reproved for it by Meursius.
'Itaque manifestus est error Meffala Corvini, qui in
'Sidonia conditam à Teucro dicit lib. de Augusti pro-
'genie. Teucer qui patria profugus in Sidonia alteram
'Salamina condidit (6). - - - Meffala Corvinus there-
'fore is manifestly in the wrong, who says in his book
'de Augusti Progenie, that Teucer built it in Sidonia.
'Teucer, who being banished his country, built an-
'other Salamina in Sidonia.'

[C] It is more probable that Teucer settled in the isle
of Cyprus.] If he had fixed his quarters in Spain, Ascle-
piades of Myrlea, who taught Grammar in that coun-
try, would not have forgot to say so in his description
of the nations, who inhabited it, since he has been so
careful to observe (7), that some of them who bore
arms under Teucer, settled in Gallicia. His silence
is, in this case, a very good proof.

[D] He instituted a human sacrifice to this deity.]
Tacitus, who mentions the construction of that temple,
says nothing of that sacrifice: 'Et Jovi Salaminio (7) Apud Stra-
'Teucer, Telamonis patris ira profugus (8). - - - And bonem, lib. iii,
'to Salaminian Jupiter, Teucer, who was expelled his pag. 108.
'country by his enraged father.' It is Lactantius who (8) Tacitus, An-
informs us of this. 'Apud Cypri, says he (9), Sala- nal. lib. iii.
'minem humanam hostiam Jovi Teucrus immolavit,
'idque sacrificium posteris tradidit, quod est nuper (9) Laet. Di-
'Hadriano imperante sublatum. - - - At Salamin, in vin. Inst. lib. i,
'Cyprus, Teucer offered a human sacrifice, to Jupiter, cap. xxi.
'and enjoined it to be observed by posterity; nor has
'it ceased till lately in the reign of Hadrian.' What
puzzles me most in this matter, is, that Porphyrius
(10) De Absti-
(10), who owns that men were sacrificed in Salamin for nentia, lib. ii.
a long time, does not say that any men were sacrificed Eusebius, de
to Jupiter; and that he tells us, this custom was sup- Præpar. Evang.
pressed under the reign of Diphilus, co-temporary with lib. iv, cap. xvi.
Seleucus the Theologian. That Prince ordered, that, St Cyril, in Ju-
for the time to come, an ox should be sacrificed instead lianum, lib. iv,
of a man. This sacrifice was offered to Agraule, the quære the verbi-
daughter of Cecrops, and of the Nymph Agraulis. passage of Porphy-
[E] For they reigned there much longer.] It appears rius, i. c. Meur-
from one of Isocrates's orations, that it was not without sius, in Cypri,
interruption; for he introduces Nicocles, who, after pag. 61.
having said that Teucer, the founder of their family, had built Salamina, adds, that his father Evagoras had recovered the kingdom which had been lost by others; and that he had so ordered things, that not only Salamina was no longer tyrannized by the Phœnicians, but also that this town had the same kings, to whom the kingdom did at first belong. Thus Teucer's posterity were upon the throne after the death of Evagoras. It is certain that his son Nicocles reigned at Salamina: some (11) say, that Demonius also reigned in that town, and that he was his son. Isocrates inscribes some orations to them. We find also one Nicocreon, the king of Salamina, a descendant of Teucer (12). The learned Meursius takes him to be the same man, to whom Ptolemy gave the government of Cyprus (13), in the first year of the CXVIIth Olympiad, sixty-two years after the death of Evagoras (14). He has no other authority for this than a passage of Antoninus Liberalis. An authority which must in consequence be a bad one, since the Greeks did not apply their Metamorphoses to an age so far distant from the fabulous times as that of Alexander's successors. The Nicocreon therefore mentioned by Antoninus Liberalis is not the same with that of Ptolemy. I omit taking notice that

(6) Meursius, in Cypri, pag. 58. In the foregoing page, he corrects Acron, who says upon the VIIIth Ode, of the first book of Horace, that one of the two Salamina's was in Thraciæ regione, (he should have said in Asiæ regione) and the other in the isle of Cyprus.

(7) Apud Stra- bonem, lib. iii, pag. 108.

(8) Tacitus, An- nal. lib. iii.

(9) Laet. Di- vin. Inst. lib. i, cap. xxi.

(10) De Absti- nentia, lib. ii. Eusebius, de Præpar. Evang. lib. iv, cap. xvi. St Cyril, in Ju- lianum, lib. iv, quære the verbi- passage of Porphy- rius, i. c. Meur- sius, in Cypri, pag. 61.

(11) See Meur- sius in Cypri, pag. 113.

(12) Antoninus Liberalis, Me- tamorphos. cap. xxxix.

(13) Diodorus Siculus, lib. xxi.

(14) See Meur- sius, in Cypri, lib. ii, cap. xxi, & xv.

several writers. Others said that Teucer made himself master of the country without any such assistance. Homer makes him the best archer in the Græcian army (i).

(i) Τροίης θ' ἔδ' ἀνέστη Τεγεόων, ἀνὰ δὲ δὲ καὶ ἐν γαλήνῃ δαίμων. Teucerque qui praestantissimus Achivorum arte sagittandi, strenuus autem & in saturni pugna. *Homer. Iliad. lib. xiii, ver. 313.* See also lib. viii, ver. 266, & seq. & *Horat. Ode IX, lib. iv.*

that Nicocreon reigned before the Olympiad, mentioned by Meurfius (15), notwithstanding which the King of Egypt might have given him the government in question.

(15) He acted a tragedy before Alexander, *Plut. in Alexandr. pag. 681.* Iocrates dined at his house, *idem in Iocrate.*

TEXERA (JOSEPH) a Portuguese Friar of the Dominican order in the XVIth century, was confessor to Don Antonio King of Portugal, and having followed him into France, he settled there and was made Almoner and Preacher to the king. He was confessor of Charlotte Catherine de la Trimoille Princess of Condé, and to the Prince of Condé her son. He published some books [A], and died in the year 1601 (a). He declared from the pulpit, that we are bound in duty to love all men of whatsoever religion, sect, or nation, they be, even the Castilians (b). This discovered his strong hatred against the prince (c) who had conquered Portugal from the unfortunate Don Antonio. One of his books was refuted by order of the King of Spain [B].

(a) König, *Bibl. pag. 796.*

(b) *Traité Paroquetique par un Pelerin Espagnol, folio 114, Edit. of Aux, 1596.*

(c) Philip II, King of Spain.

[A] He published some books.] His *Compendium de Portugallia ortu, regni initii, rebusque à regibus gestis*, was printed at Paris in the year 1582 in 4to. This book was refuted by Duardus Nonius Leo, a Portuguese Civilian, in reply to which Texera afterwards wrote, *Consultatio nugarum Duardi Nonii Leonis & aliorum qui Portugallia regnum Philippo Castelle Regi jure hereditario obvenisse contendunt, & Antonii veri Portugallia Regis jus vellicare.* This work was printed in the year 1592. I find in the catalogue of Thuanus's library (1), *Jos. Texera, Suite d'un Discours intitulé, Adventure, &c. touchant Don Sebastien Roy de Portugal, 1602 in 8vo.* There was printed at Paris in 1590, and at Leyden in 1592, *Josephi Texera Exegetis genealogica arboris gentilitis Henrici IV Gallorum Regis.* The author composed another work on the genealogy of the Prince of Condé in 1596, and published a second edition of it enlarged, in the year 1598, in 12mo. It was intitled, *Rerum ab Henrico Borbonii Francie Protoprincipis majoribus gestarum, Epitome: ejusdemque Henrici Genealogie explicatio à divo Ludovico per Borbonios atque ab Imbaldo Trimollio ad utrumque dicti Henrici parentem repetita.* He has added to it an account of the ceremonies observed by the Prince of Condé, upon her abjuring Calvinism before the Pope's Legate at Rouen the 28th of December 1596. He observes one thing which I am going to mention, because it may serve as a supplement to a fact which I have related in the article BOTERO (2), and which has afforded some mirth to Protestants.

(1) Pag. 336, of the 2d Part.

(2) See the remark [C], of the art. BOTERO, and the remark [K], of the article HENRY IV.

One of these ceremonies was, that the Prince being upon her knees, the Legate and Bishops who accompanied him repeated the Psalm *Miserere*, and after that the Psalm *Deus miseretur nostri*: they repeated them alternately, he one verse, and they another: at every verse the legate repeated, he softly touched her shoulders with his wand. The Constable's lady who was next the Prince not being able to turn away her head ever so little by reason of the crowd, was hit every time by the wand over the face. The Legate perceiving it broke off the end of his wand. Almost every body then present believed this to be part of the ceremonial: Joseph Texera was also of that opinion; but the Legate undeceived him. *Interea vero dum illustrius Dominus Legatus suum versiculum recitaret, ad quemlibet leviter contingebat cum virgula spatulas Domine Principisse eam absolvendo. Hic animadvertendum est, quod, cum illustrissima Domina Comestabilis esset D. Principisse proxima, ita in angustias redacta fuerit, ut nec se movere loco, nec caput inclinare, aut avertere posset. Unde accidit, ut plus illic, quam alie omnes mereretur: quia scilicet, cum dicti psalmi recitarentur antiphanatim, ut dictum est, ab illustrissimo D. Legato & clero praesente, & ad quemque versiculum D. Legatus ipsam Principissam scipiunculo, vel virgula tangeret in humeris, juxta ritum & constitutionem Ecclesie*

cum in spatulam sinistram deflenderet, simul caput & vultum multis vicibus Domine Comestabilis contingebat. Quod advertens ipse D. Legatus, abruptis punctum virgulae versus cupidem: quod fere omnes putabamus hoc animadvertisse fuisse partem aliquam hujusce ceremonie. Sed ego rescivi ex ore ipsius Illustrissimi D. Legati veritatem rei. Hæc diximus, ne quis deinceps in eo ballucinetur ubi veritatem resciscat (3). No particular can more justly deserve to be set right than this; for it might easily deceive the spectators: they might well imagine that such a circumstance not being taken notice of in the Rubric, might signify something of a mystery, some new and very singular case. Men of speculation and wit might very well vie with one another in saying a thousand chimerical things upon this subject.

[B] One of his books was refuted by order of the King of Spain.] I have quoted a book which has been translated out of Spanish into French by one Dralymont, who subjoins some notes to the original. This is one of his notes. 'A Jew whose name was Duard Nonnes de Leon', contrary to the laws of Portugal, which shut the door of public honours and dignities, (that is to say, against all those who descend from the Jews) was preferred by the Catholic King to be a privy-counsellor, in recompence for his having written against Joseph Texera, a Portuguese preaching Fryar (a person at this day very much renowned all over Europe, and well known to all Princes in that part of the world, as well ecclesiastical as temporal; and particularly in France, where the greatest men in the kingdom, and all persons of quality esteem and regard him, on account of his polite conversation, his excellent morals, and extraordinary doctrine, as being one of the most accomplished masters in the knowledge of History, and Genealogy, that can be met with, as his writings and common conversation sufficiently testify) a book by way of answer, which is not only scurrilous, but also full of heretical and rash propositions. I am very much surprized at the patience of this Fryar, considering how deeply read and experienced he was in History, and how conversant in affairs of state, and jealous of his own reputation, that he should not, so far as I know, put pen to paper (4), and write not only against the errors and falsities of that Jew, but also against his Catholic Majesty: since it was he who commanded that false and scurrilous book to be written, (as his said Majesty confesses in the licence he gave for the printing it in the year 1590) and who authorized the said Jew to publish a piece of the genealogy of the Kings of Portugal, translated by him into Spanish, out of another in Latin, which he composed by his order: and which is the answer I have been just now mentioning (5).

(3) Texera, de Conversione Catholice Catharine Principisse Condæ, pag. 26, 27.

(4) Duard Nonnes, liv. des Censures, &c.

(5) I am surprized at this; for we have seen in the preceding remark, that a refutation of this Jew's book was published by Texera in the year 1592.

(6) *Traité Paroquetique par un Pelerin Espagnol battu du temps & percuté de la fortune, fol. 51, verso, & 52, Edit. of Aux, 1597.* Note this parenthetical treatise was reprinted in the year 1641, under the title of *Fuora Villaco, ibat is to say, The liberty of Portugal, &c.*

THAIS,

(a) See the remark [A], towards the end.

THAIS, a Greek courtesan, followed Alexander's army, and occasioned the destruction of Persepolis [A]. She was so well beloved by Ptolemy King of Egypt, that he married her (a). There is no good authority for saying, that Menander was one of her galants. This is what I am going to examine, in animadverting on Moreri's mistakes [B]. The name of that courtesan was commonly given in comedies, and other pieces

[A] She occasioned the destruction of Persepolis.] Mr Guillet rightly observes that Thais formed that design out of a principle of ambition. She proposed to burn the royal palace of Persepolis, and plainly told him that she longed to set fire to it first; that it might be said in time to come all the world over, that the Athenian women, who followed Alexander into Persia, had revenged the burning of Athens by Xerxes. Her beauty and eloquence gave success to her ambition, and the royal palace was burnt that very night (1). The thing is related more at large in the following words.

(1) Guillet, Athenes ancienne & nouvelle, pag. 291.

After this, as he was making preparation for a farther march after Darius, he one day resolved to make merry, and to divert himself with an entertainment, where his courtiers had prevailed with him so far as to permit every man to bring his mistress along with him, among whom, the most celebrated was Thais an Athenian, Ptolemy's mistress, who after the decease of Alexander, was King of Egypt. This Thais sometimes cunningly praised Alexander, sometimes joked with and rallied him, agreeably enough to the manner of her country, but much above her character or condition, telling him that she found herself that day fully recompensed for the pains she had taken in following his camp all over Asia, by the favour she then enjoyed of diverting herself at pleasure in the stately palace of the Persian monarchs: but that she should be much more delighted to burn by way of sport, and make a bonfire of the court of Xerxes, who had set fire to the city of Athens, by lighting it up with her own hand in his presence, and before the face of so brave a Prince as Alexander: that it might be recorded to posterity, that the women who followed Alexander's camp, had taken a sharper revenge on the Persians for the former sufferings and affronts of Greece, than all his commanders could do by sea or land. She had no sooner made the proposal, but she was seconded by Alexander's courtiers, with clapping of hands, and great acclamations of joy, commending what she said to the skies, and pressing the King to put it in execution. Alexander giving way to their persuasions, started from his seat, and with a chaplet of flowers on his head, and a lighted torch in his hand, led the way, and his courtiers followed him in the same manner, dancing, and making a great noise about the palace (2).

(2) Plutarch, in the Life of Alexander, pag. 687, of the Francfort edition 1620.

(3) Diod. Sicul. lib. xvii, cap. lxxii.

Diodorus Siculus observes (3) that Thais set fire to the royal palace, next to the King, and that all the houses round it were burnt down. He calls her *εταίρα*, a word that may be rendered a courtesan. Note that, according to Plutarch nothing was burnt but the royal palace: but according to Quintus Curtius, the whole city was consumed to ashes, and never afterwards rebuilt. I wonder he does not mention the finest passage of Thais's speech: he does not make her say any thing that discovers her ambition of having it said in future ages, that she and her companions had contributed more to revenge her country than their greatest Captains. 'De die inibat convivia (Alexander) quibus feminae intererant: non quidem quas violari nefas esset; quippe pellices licentius quam decebat cum armato vivere adfuetæ. Ex his una Thais & ipsa temulentia, maximam apud omnes Græcorum initium gratiam adfermat, si regiam Persarum jussisset incendi, expectare hoc eos, quorum urbes barbari deleverant. Ebrio scorto de tanta re ferente sententiam, unus & alter, & ipsi mero onerati, adfuerunt, rex quoque fuit avidior, quam patientior: quin igitur ulciscimur Græciam, & urbi faces subdimus. Omnes incalescent mero: itaque surgunt temulentum ad incendendam urbem; cui armati pepercerant. Primus rex ignem regie iniecit; tum convivæ & ministri pellicæque. Multa cedro ædificata erat regia: quæ celeriter igne concepto, late fudit incendium. Quod ubi exercitus, qui haud procul ab urbe tendebat, conspexit; fortuitum ratus, ad opem ferendam concurrunt. Sed ut ad vestibulum regie ventum est; vident regem ipsum adhuc adgre-

rentem faces. Omnia igitur, quam portaverant aqua, aridam materiam in incendium jacere ceperunt. Hunc exitum habuit regia totius Orientis... ac ne longa quidem ætate, quæ excidium ejus sequuta est, refurxerit (4). -- Alexander spent the day in feasting, to which the women were admitted, not modest ones, whom it was unlawful to violate, but courtesans who used to live after a licentious manner in the camp. One of those whose name was Thais, and she very much in drink, cried out to the King, that he would very greatly oblige all the Greeks if he would order the Persian palace to be burnt; that they expected this from him, since their cities had been so served by those Barbarians. This drunken courtesan, thus declaring her mind on so important an affair, was applauded first by one and then another, all of them overcharged with drink; and the King too with greater warmth than prudence replied; Well then let us revenge our country, and set fire to the city. They were all inflamed with wine; and therefore rose up to burn the city now they were in drink, which they had spared when they were in arms. The King first set fire to the palace, then the guests, the courtiers, and courtesans. Great part of the palace was built with cedar, which quickly taking fire, spread the flames all around. The army which was encamped not far from the city seeing the fire, thinking it to be accidental, came to give their assistance. But when they were advanced to the entrance into the palace, they found the King himself still holding out his torch. So that throwing away the water they had brought, they began to heap on dry fuel to increase the fire. Thus fell the palace of the whole East... and though it is so long a time since that destruction happened, it has not been rebuilt. Observe that not only it does not appear from those two accounts that Thais was at that entertainment in the quality of Alexander's mistress; but it appears on the contrary, that she had not that character. Quintus Curtius says only, that she was one of the concubines, who followed the army (5). (5) This last expresses the whole force of Quintus Curtius's words.

Yet it is a very common opinion, that she was one of Alexander's mistresses; but this opinion may be false, though it be favoured by a passage in Athenæus. This author says, that Alexander had that courtesan with him; and that after his death she married Ptolemy, King of Egypt, by whom she had two sons and one daughter, called Irene, who was the wife of Eunostus, King of Solis (6) in the isle of Cyprus. (6) Thus the Greek words of Athenæus Εὐνόστου ἡ βασιλίστις ἡ Εὐνοῦ βασιλίστις τῆς Κύπρου τῆς ἡμετέρας βασιλίστις ought to be translated, and not as Dilechamps renders them, Solonia Eunosti regis Cypriorum. -- Solis Eunosti, King of Cyprus. Cypriorum uxor fuit (7). -- Thais the Athenian, courtesan, went along with Alexander, and is said by Cleitarchus to have been the principal cause of his burning the palace of Persepolis. After the death of Alexander, she was married to Ptolemy, who first obtained the kingdom of Egypt; and had children by him, Leontiscus and Lagus, sons; and Eirene a daughter, who was married to Solon Eunostus King of Cyprus.

[B] In animadverting on Moreri's mistakes.] I. He says she was a native of Alexandria, and that going to Athens all the youth of that country flocked to her. This falsity is confuted in the following quotation (8): 'Do not suffer your selves to be led into an error by what is said in five or six sorry historical Dictionaries, that Thais

(8) Guillet, Athenes ancienne, pag. 291.

THAIS. THALES.

321

pieces of Poetry, to ladies of pleasure (b). It is said, that Paphnutius who flourished in the IVth century, converted in Alexandria, a famous courtesan, called THAIS [C].

(b) See Juvenal, Sat. III, ver. 93, where he says an melior cum Thaidia fuffinet? and Martial in several places.

Thais was a native of Alexandria. There was so short an interval between the time when Alexander laid the foundation of that city of Egypt, and the time when he burnt Persepolis, that Thais could not have seen the burning of that town, unless she had been quickly snatched away among the first-born of Alexandria, and transported in her cradle: For you know that after the battle of Arbela, fought in the same year that Alexandria was built, in Oriente victoris magis quam passibus omnia peragrabat Alexander. . . . In the east Alexander over-ran every place rather with victories than marches. But without refining upon Chronology, Plutarch and Athenæus say she was born at Athens (9). II. Moreri adds, that the Poet Menander had made her famous by his verses, which was the reason why she was called Menandrian. This is taken from Charles Stephens's Dictionary, and cannot be so well confuted as Guillet's paraphrase upon it. It was there, says he (10), speaking of Athens, that Thais had an intrigue with Menander, that famous Poet, who was so tender-hearted, and so much given to love, that he committed extraordinary follies for his mistress. I alledge against this what Plutarch tells us (11), that Thais was Ptolemy's concubine during Alexander's expedition, and what Athenæus observes, that she was married to the same Ptolemy after the death of that conqueror. This is a plain proof, that, if she had an intrigue with Menander, it was before this expedition. Nay, it is probable, that she was Ptolemy's mistress some time before the war of Asia: it is probable, I say, that this great Macedonian Lord had got her from Athens, and kept her in his house for some time, before the breaking out of the war against Darius. Now this expedition of Alexander began when Menander was not above eight years of age (12). It is impossible therefore that he should be in love with Thais before the Persian war. In what time then shall we place this amour, since after the death of Alexander, she married the King of Egypt, I mean the same Ptolemy whom she had followed every where, whilst that conqueror was subduing Asia? I have another argument to alledge against this amour. I believe there is no better proof for it than these verses of Propertius,

Turba Menandreæ fuerat nec Thaidos olim
Tanta, in qua populus lufit Erichthonius (13);

Not such a crowd Menander's Thais led,
Altho' all Athens sought her wanton bed.

THALES, one of the seven wise men of Greece. Moreri speaks of him at large. I add, that this Philosopher believed, that the world was the work of GOD, and that GOD knew the most secret thoughts of men [A]. Some say, that he was married; but others affirm this to be false, and that he got rid of the persecutions of his mother on this subject,

[A] Thales believed that the world was the work of GOD, and that GOD knew the most secret thoughts of men. I mention this as I find it in Diogenes Laërtius, without affirming, that it was really the opinion of that Philosopher. The three following Apophthegms are ascribed to him among others. 1. GOD is the most ancient thing of all, for he is uncreated. 2. The world is the finest thing of all, for it is GOD's work. Πρεσβύτατον τῶν ὄντων, θεός, ἀγίννητον γὰρ. καλλίστον, κόσμος. ποιῆμα γὰρ θεοῦ. Antiquissimum eorum omnium quæ sunt, deus; ingenitum enim. Pulcherrimum, mundus; à deo enim factus est (1). 3. So far are they who commit sin, from being able to conceal it from GOD, that they cannot so much as prevent his knowing their thoughts. Ἡρώτης τις αὐτὸν εἰ λήθοι θεὸς ἀνθρώπων ἀδικεῖν. Ἀλλ' ἐν δὲ διανομένῳ. εἶπεν. Interrogatus, latere ne deus homo male agens: Ne cogitans quidem, inquit (2). Valerius Maximus relates the same thing with regard to the third sentence. Mirifice etiam Thales. Nam interrogatus, an facta hominum Deos fallerent: Nec cogitata, inquit. Ut non solum manus, sed etiam mentes puras habere VOL. V. No. CXXVII.

(1) Diogenes Laërtius, lib. i, num. 35.

(2) Id. ibid. num. 36.

or these, wherein the same Poet has included some advices of a bawd,

Non te Medæ delectent probra sequacis,
Nempe tulit fastus ausa rogare prior:
Sed potius mundi Thais pretiosa Menandri,
Cum ferit astutus Comica mœcha Getas (14);

(14) Id. lib. iv, Eleg. V.

To shun Medea's fondness be advised,
For asking first she justly was despit'd,
Menander's Thais shows a wiser way,
When she cajoles her cullies in the play.

or upon this inscription of Martial, under Menander's Thais,

Hæc primum juvenum lascivos lufit amores,
Nec Glycere, vere Thais amica fuit (15).

(15) Martial. Epigr. clxxxvii, lib. xiv.

This play first draws the scenes of wanton loves,
Thais, not Glycera, the mistress proves.

But it is certain, that Menander's Thais, mentioned by those two Latin Poets, signifies a Comedy of Menander, intitled Thais, and not the Courtesan, who occasioned the burning of Persepolis. Consult the observations of Gronovius the father (16). I would not be understood to deny, that our Thais was, in the Poet's mind, the original of the comedy that went by her name; but this does not prove, that there was any love intrigue between Menander and the Courtesan who is the subject of this article.

(16) Upon the Ecclesiastical Writers, in the second chapter, pag. 25, & seq.

[C] It is said that Paphnutius . . . converted in Alexandria a . . . THAIS. Charles Stephens, and several Lexicographers after him, have mentioned this conversion: they all quote Volaterranus, who relates it in this manner. Paphnutius, says he (17), going incognito to Thais of Alexandria (18), was never satisfied that the place she carried him to was private enough; and at last being told by her, that none but GOD could know what passed between them in the place they were in, he took from thence an occasion to exhort her to fear GOD, who sees and punishes the most private actions. She was so sensibly moved with his exhortation, that she gave over her trade, and became a holy woman.

(17) Volaterr. lib. xx, circa init. pag. m. 718.

(18) Thaidis nomen nobilitatum in primis à Thaidæ Alexandria. Id. ibid.

vellemus; cum secretis cogitationibus nostris celeste numen adesse credidisset (3). . . . It was an admirable saying of Thales, who when he was asked, if the actions of men could escape the knowledge of GOD, replied, no not even their thoughts. So then we ought not only to have our hands pure, but also our minds; when we are satisfied that GOD is present even to our most secret thoughts. Valerius Maximus's interpretation of this saying, to wit, that it was intended to inculcate such a faith in the presence of GOD to our most secret thoughts, as might oblige men to preserve their hearts pure as well as their hands, does very well agree with a passage of Cicero, concerning the same Thales. If you carefully examine the sequel of Cicero's argument, you will find, that the ground of the maxim of this ancient Grecian sage, was the moral advantage that men might derive from it: Melius græci atque nostri, qui ut augerent pietatem in deos, easdem illos urbes quas nos incolere volunt. Affert enim hæc opinio religionem utilem civitatibus. Siquidem & illud bene dictum est à Pythagora doctissimo viro, tum maxime pietatem & religionem

(3) Valerius Maximus, lib. vii, cap. ii, num. 8. Ext. pag. m. 602.

subject, by telling her when he was young, that *it was too soon*, and when he was growing old, that *it was too late* (a). Some will have it that he believed living and dying to be the same thing; and that being asked why then he did not dye, he returned an answer, which others ascribe to Pyrrho (b). An old woman bantered him very merrily, for going abroad with her to look at the stars, and falling into a ditch [B]. It is thought he lived above ninety years [C].

Those,

(a) Diog. Laërt. lib. i, num. 26.
(b) See the article PYRRHO, citation (37).
(4) Cicero, de Legibus, lib. ii, fol. 334, B.
ligionem verari in animis, cum rebus divinis operam daremus: & quod Thales qui sapientissimus inter septem fuit, homines existimare oportere deos omnia cernere, deorum omnia esse plena: fore enim omnes castiores, veluti quo infans esset maxime religiofus (4). - - - *It was a better thought both of the Grecians and Romans, to suppose the gods to inhabit the same cities with themselves, in order to promote piety towards them. For this opinion infers that religion is useful to cities. It was an excellent saying of that most learned Philosopher Pythagoras, that piety and religion were then the most impressed on our minds, when we were actually worshipping the gods; as also of Thales, who was the wisest of the seven, that we ought to believe the gods see every thing, that every thing is full of the Deity: for by this means all men would become more virtuous, and even an infant would grow religious.* Here I desire you would observe the difference which appears between Cicero and Diogenes Laërtius. The latter says absolutely, that, according to Thales, the world was animated and full of Genii: τὸν κόσμον ἐμψυχον καὶ δαιμόνων πλήρη, *animatum mundum ac demonibus plenum* (5); but Cicero seems to restrain Thales's words; for he says, that, according to that Philosopher, it was proper or necessary for men to believe that every thing was full of gods. Aristotle thought, that perhaps Thales meant only what others understood by asserting, that all Beings have one soul: καὶ ἐν τῷ ὅλῳ δὲ τινες αὐτὴν (ψυχὴν) μεμικχάσαι φασίν. ὅθεν ἴσως καὶ Θαλῆς ὧνδεν πάντα πλήρη δέων εἶναι. Sunt & qui in toto universo permiscam ipsam (animam) inquit esse. Quocirca forsitan & Thales omnia plena deorum esse putavit (6). - - - *And some say that the soul is infused throughout the whole Universe. From whence very probably Thales derived his opinion. That all things are full of gods. Here follow some other variations. Plutarch does not suppose that Thales alledged the reason abovementioned, why the world is the most beautiful of all things: he says, that Thales being to resolve this question, Which is the most beautiful of all Beings? Answered, the world; for every thing that is regular, is part of the world. Τὴν καλλίστην ἡ κόσμος πᾶν γὰρ τὸ κατὰ τάξιν, τότε μέγας ἐστίν. Quid pulcherrimum? Mundus. omnes enim ejus partes ordine aptæ sunt (7). As for the answer to the question, whether God knows the wicked actions of men, some ascribe it not to Thales, but to Pittacus. See Theon in the fifth chapter of his Progygnasmata, page 69 and 77, of the Leyden edition 1626.*

*one
soul in
all*

(6) Aristot. de Anima, lib. i, cap. v.

(7) Plut. in Convivio septem Sapient. pag. 153, C.

(8) In the remark [D], of the article ANAXAGORAS.

(9) Diog. Laërt. lib. i, num. 34.

cellor excuses him, and sometimes banters him, for not seeing in the stars his wife's gallantry.
Saturnus procul est, jamque olim cæcus, ut ajunt, Nec propè discernens à puero lapidem.
Luna verecundis formosa incedit ocellis,
Nec nisi virgineum virgo videre potest.
Jupiter Europam, Martem Venus, & Venerem Mars,
Daphnen Sol, Herfen Mercurius recolit.
Hinc factum, Astrologe, est, tua cum caput uxor amantes,
Sidera significent ut nihil inde tibi.
Saturn who blinks far off, is soon beguill'd, As when a stone was giv'n him for a child, The charming moon preserves so chaste a sight, She lends to no immodest all her light. Jove with Europa, Mars with Venus toys, Sol Daphne, Herfe Mercury employs. Hence when the conjurer's wife receives her lover, The stars, so taken up, can ne'er discover.
You see he alledges some reasons why the planets cannot discover to that Astrologer his domestic misfortune: but here are some other verses, wherein he pretends that since the stars see every thing, they ought to have acquainted their votary with his wife's unlawful amours.
Altra tibi æthereo pandunt sese omnia vati,
Omnes & quæ sint fata futura monent.
Omnibus ast uxor quod se tua publicat, id te Altra, licet videant omnia, nulla monent.
While all the stars their saw'rite prophet shew, Each future fact that passes here below. His wife's conjunction with each amorous spark, The stars, which all things see, ne'er once remark.
As there are some Astrologers every where, who are not more exempt from that misfortune, than men of other professions, a French author, who was acquainted with some of them, has presented them with a French translation of the first verses of Sir Thomas More. These are his words (10). *Now if this man (10) De Verbis (11), intent upon a high contemplation, and pretending to great knowledge, did not see what was before him, you may be sure he is not the only faulty man in this respect. Several Astrologers are like him; for, though they pretend to foretel the fate of other men, they cannot foretel their own, witness some of that Profession in our whom he had time, who are extremely jealous, and something been saying, that more, you know what I mean, with due respect to the one day, as he Ladies. Upon these I formerly wrote the following epigram, in imitation of the Latin one of Sir Thomas fell into a ditch. More.*

Tu cognois astrologue estoilles etherées,
Dont à chacun predis futures destinees;
Mais de ce que ta femme est à plusieurs commune,
Par les astres n'en peux cognoistre chose aucune,
Saturne est trop loingtain, aveugle est en apres,
Le blanc d'entre le noir ne discernant de pres.
Ayant les yeux honteux la Lune fait son cours,
Puis la vierge ne veut voir lascives amours.
Les autres affaire ont, Mars sa Venus regarde,
Venus Mars, Jupiter à Europe prent garde.
Ainsi donc tu ne peux ta femme apercevoir,
Quand son amant l'embrasse, & moins tes cornes voir.

See what I quote out of the Menagiana (12).
[C] It is thought he lived above ninety years.] He was born in the first year of the XXXVth Olympiad, and

(12) They say of a man, who fell into a ditch, as he was gazing upon the stars, Qui fuit Astrologus, nunc Gometra fuit. - - - The Astrologer becomes a Gometra. Menagiana, pag. 33.

Those, who are not unacquainted with the doctrine of the most ancient Philosophers of Greece, cannot be ignorant that he asserted, that water was the principle of all bodies, which compose the Universe. A great many reflexions might be made on this supposition [D]. I shall cite a passage, which will inform us; that he made very fine discoveries

(13) Apollodorus, in *Chronica*, argues wrong when he says *Τελευτήσαι γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς πεντηκοντῆς ἐτῶν Ὀλυμπιάδου*: quinquagesima QUINQUE & octava Olympiade esse defunctum (14);

(14) Diog. Laërt. *ibid.*

(15) In *Notis ad hunc locum* Laërtii.

(16) With this *Observationum selectarum ad Rem Litterariam spectantium* Tomus I. Mr. Thomasius pro-

ffer of the *Civil-Law* at Hall, was pleased to send me a copy of it; for which I express my acknowledgments in this place. He has a great share in the pieces which make up this collection.

(17) See above, citation (42), of the article OVID.

SEVERAL significations of the word *Chaos*.

and died in the LVIIIth Olympiad (13). This makes at least ninety two years. So that Diogenes Laërtius argues wrong when he says *Τελευτήσαι γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς πεντηκοντῆς ἐτῶν Ὀλυμπιάδου*: quinquagesima QUINQUE & octava Olympiade esse defunctum (14); -- For that he died in the LVIIIth Olympiad; and yet Aldobrandinus (15) approves the computation of that author, and admits the 90 years assigned to the life of Thales by Diogenes Laërtius. Moreri is wrong in his calculation; he would have it, that Thales, who was born in the XXXVth Olympiad, died in the 58th about the year of Rome 209, in the 95th year of his age. The year of Rome 209, is the last of the LVIIIth Olympiad; but which way soever you reckon, you will never find ninety-five years in the hypothesis of that writer.

[D] He asserted that water was the principle of all bodies. . . . A great many reflexions might be made on this supposition. There is very good reason to believe, that he was not the first, who advanced this doctrine; and that he borrowed it from the Egyptians, or the most ancient Greek Poets. See the dissertation de dogmate Thaletis, quod aqua sit principium omnium rerum, printed with some others at Hall in Saxony in the year 1700 (16). Some authors say, that the chaos of Hesiod is, at the bottom, the same principle, which Thales called water: this I can hardly believe; for the water of Thales must needs have been considered as an homogeneous thing, whereas the chaos must have been considered as an odd mixture of all sorts of principles. Ovid gives us that notion of it, at the beginning of his *Metamorphoses* (17): and when the other Poets speak of a certain infernal chaos, they mean a dark and dreadful place, wholly destitute of the beauty that is to be seen in things well ordered, or altogether wanting the simplicity of a first principle.

Di, quibus imperium est animarum, umbræque silentes,
Et chaos, & Phlegethon, loca nocte tacentia late (18).

(18) Virgil. *Æn.* lib. vi, ver. 265.

Ye realms, yet unreveal'd to human sight
Ye gods, who rule the regions of the night.

DRYDEN.

The Commentator Servius understands by the word *chaos* in these two verses, the first principles as they were in the confusion of the elements. But perhaps he is too subtil, for it is likely Virgil intended to speak only of hell in general, or of part of it. These words of Ovid ought to be understood in the same sense:

Per ego hæc plena timoris,
Per chaos hoc ingens, vastique silentia regni
Eurydice oro, properata retexite fata (19).

(19) Ovidius, *Metam.* lib. x, ver. 29.

Now, by the horrors which these realms surround;
By the vast chaos of these depths profound;
By the sad silence which eternal reigns
O'er all the waste of these wide stretching plains
Let me again Eurydice receive,
Let fate her quick-spun thread of life re-weave.

CONGREVE.

It is Orpheus who addresses the prayer to Pluto and Proserpine. Consult Mr Grævius's notes upon Hesiod (20), wherein he proves, that the word *chaos* very frequently signifies hell. I know that another sense has been put upon the chaos, which was, according to Hesiod, the first of all Beings: It has been said, that this chaos signifies the place wherein all bodies lay placed. Simplicius (21) tells us, that this was a very common interpretation. It is mentioned by Sextus Empiricus: *Εἶναι γὰρ φασὶ Χάος τὸν τόπον ἀπὸ τοῦ χαρητὶκὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ γινομένων*. Dicunt enim Chaos esse locum, eo quod comprehendat illa quæ in ipso sunt (22). -- For they say that chaos is place, because of its comprehending every thing contained in it. But, according to this sense, it is im-

(20) Pag. 115, of the Amsterd. edition 1701.

(21) Simplicius in Aristotel. *Phys.* lib. iv, Sc. Petit, *Miscell. Observat.* pag. 52.

(22) Sext. Empiricus, *Pyrrh. Hypotypos.* lib. iii, cap. xvi.

possible that Thales should have taught the same doctrine with Hesiod; for water must necessarily require place no less than other bodies; and therefore place must have existed before water, and consequently water could not be the first principle. I do not believe that Hesiod ever dreamed of what is ascribed to him: And certainly, by the word *chaos*, he did not understand the space or the place which contains bodies. Doubtless, he meant by it the state of confusion all things were in, before the earth, the sea, the air, the heavens, &c. obtained their proper situation. He did not pretend therefore to speak of space, which, if it be distinguished from matter, is necessarily and intirely homogeneous, and incapable of being the subject of the formation of any element, or any mixed body. This shews, that the water of Thales was not space, though otherwise he must have regarded it as a whole perfectly homogeneous in *actu*, but heterogeneous in *potentia*. I make use of a distinction very famous in the schools of the Peripatetics; by which I mean, that, according to Thales, water considered in itself, and before the particular formation of all bodies, ought to be actually water in each of its parts, and yet capable of becoming air, fire, earth; and then a tree, metal, blood, wine, bone, &c. according to the several degrees of rarefaction and condensation through which it goes. They are in the wrong who object that there would be no difference in bodies, if there was but one sole material principle. This objection can be of no force but against those, who should suppose, that this sole principle is immutable: But if they suppose, that it is susceptible of several qualities successively, like the *matter prima* of Aristotle, there is no body but may arise from it. The objection proposed by Lactantius, either against Thales, or against Heraclitus, who admitted only fire for the principle of all things, is not a good one: Fire, says he (23), cannot be produced from water, nor can water proceed from fire. He is mistaken: Any particular body may proceed from fire, from water, or from earth, provided there be some causes that know how to modify matter according to its alterability, or mutability. But we must observe, by the by, that neither Thales, nor Heraclitus, nor any of the ancient Philosophers, who took only one of the four vulgar elements for the general principle of all bodies, have equalled Aristotle in penetration of mind: They did not consider that not one of the four elements is matter in general, and that they are a kind of determined matter. This is the reason why Aristotle, who was more judicious than all of them, has pitched upon matter, in general, for the first principle of all things.

The great difficulty in Thales's Hypothesis is, that he has not said how water began to alter, and to put on the particular forms of air, fire, earth, &c. Was it rarified, was it condensed by its own virtue? Did that virtue arise all of a sudden in the beginning of the world, or did it always exist in water? One cannot apprehend how water could come by that virtue, if it had not been always in it; and how it could have been from all eternity without condensation and rarefaction, if that virtue had been always in it. Some are of opinion, that Thales supposed God to be the efficient cause, which produced all particular bodies out of water. They alledge two passages of Cicero (24), and one of Lactantius (25). But as to Lactantius he is no new evidence, but a copier only of Cicero: And as to Cicero, the reasons urged against him (26), are so strong, that his testimony cannot be depended upon. If any should alledge the words of Diogenes Laërtius, before quoted (27), I answer, that Plutarch does not make use of them, when he mentions the same answer made by Thales. If it be replied, that Plutarch and Diogenes Laërtius agree in another point, *viz.* that Thales giving a reason why God is the most ancient of all things, alledged that God was not made, or had no beginning; I answer, that this is not a positive proof that he ascribed to God the generation of the world. Have there not been Philosophers, who, tho' they acknowledged on the one hand the existence of the gods,

(23) Heraclitus ex igne nata esse omnia dixit, Thales Milesius ex aqua. Uterque vidit aliquid: sed erravit tamen uterque: quod alterutrum si solum fuisset, neque aqua nasci ex igne potuisset, neque rursus ignis ex aqua. Lactant. lib. ii, cap. ix, pag. m. 122.

how was ign to alter

(24) You will find them above, citations (82), and (84), of the article ANAXAGORAS.

(25) Lactant. lib. i, cap. v, pag. m. 14.

(26) See them in the remarks [D] and [F], of the article ANAXAGORAS.

(27) Citat. (1), yet

bodies transmutal

coveries in Astronomy, and that in particular he was so well pleased with having found out the proportion which the sun's diameter [E] bears to the circle it describes round the earth, that having communicated it to a person, who offered him any reward which he should

yet denied, on the other, that the gods had made the world? If it be further replied, that Thales attributed to the gods a knowledge of the most secret thoughts of men; I answer, I. That it is not certain he said so, since some writers ascribe that saying to Pittacus (28): II. That he might have believed, that the gods concern themselves with our affairs, and know our secret thoughts; but it does not follow from thence, that he ascribed to them the production of the world (29), or that he did not believe, that they themselves proceeded from water, as from their first cause and principle: III. That the true philosophical opinions of Thales, the Naturalist, ought not to be looked for in the conversation of Thales, one of the seven wise men of Greece. He might have said a great many things under this last character, which he did not say in his school of Philosophy. He mentioned only water, when he explained the formation of the world, as a Naturalist; he did not add the power of God to that of water. But when he looked upon himself as a Sage, whose sententious discourses should tend to promote virtue, and would be spread among the people, he thought himself obliged to conform to Theological notions: Take notice, that the opinions of the Heathen Philosophers were so incoherent, and so little just, that from their hypothesis concerning the existence of God, it did not follow, that he had a share in the production and government of the world; and that, from their hypothesis concerning his Providence, it did not follow, that he had disentangled the chaos, or formed the universe. They were allowed to say, that the gods governed the world, tho' they had been produced and formed out of the chaos, as well as bodies. When a man believes, that human souls are formed of the most subtle parts of blood, he may say, that Jupiter, Venus, and Mercury, have been produced out of the most subtle parts of the chaos. Now, as the soul governs the body, which it has not made, and whereof it is but a kind of distilled water (30); and as we govern beasts, and even some men, who are not produced by us; so the gods govern the world which they have not made, and which has made them of it's most refined parts.

(28) See, above, the remark [A].

(29) See remark [G], of the article JUPITER.

(30) That is according to the hypothesis of the Heathens.

(31) See the first volume of Observations selectarum ad Rem Litterariam spectantium, printed at Hall, in the year 1700, pag. 445, & seq.

(32) In the remark [A].

(33) Observ. ad Rem Litterariam, Tom. I, pag. 448.

(34) Ibid. pag. 450.

St Augustin, who where, &c.' Anaxagoras, Aristotle, and the Stoics (35), are guilty of the third degree. Anaxagoram & duos ejus socios (Diogenem Apolloniatem & Archelaum) tametsi à Thaletico atheismo, qui Deo plane nihil vult esse cum fabricatione rerum negotii, adeo excuso, ut ejus comparatione religio ipse, qualem & vulgo habent quidam, videri queat, atheorum tamen catalogo minime expungendum statuo. Fuit autem atheismus ejus in eo gradu quem minimum vocavit (36). -- Alibi I so far excuse Anaxagoras and his two companions (Diogenes Apolloniatem, and Archelaum) from the Atheism of Thales, who will not allow GOD to have any concern in forming the world, that in comparison with him he may be esteemed religious, as some have usually filed him, yet I judge him by no means to be struck out of the Atheistical catalogue. However his Atheism was of that degree which I have called the least.

[E] A passage which will inform us, that he made very fine discoveries in Astronomy, and . . . the proportion of the sun's diameter.] Apuleius furnishes me with this passage. 'Thales Milesius, says he (37), ex seipso illis sapientia memoratis viris facile præcipuus: fuit enim geometricæ penes Grajos primus repertor, & astrorum naturæ rerum certissimus explorator, & astrorum peritissimus contemplator, maximas res parvis lineis reperit: temporum ambitus, ventorum flatus, stellarum meatus, tonitruum sonora miracula, siderum obliqua curricula, Solis annua reverticula: idem Lunæ vel nascentis incrementa, vel senescentis dispendia, vel delinquentis obstacula. Idem sane jam proclivi senectute divinam rationem de Sole commentus est: periundo comprobavit: quotiens Sol magnitudine sua circum quem permeat metiatur. Id à se recens inventum Thales memoratur edocuisse Mandratum Prienensem, qui nova & inopinata cognitione impendio delectatus, optare jussit quantam vellet mercedem sibi pro tanto documento rependi. Satis, inquit, mihi fuerit mercedis Thales sapiens, si id quod à me didicisti, cum proferre ad quospiam coeperis, tibi non adsciveris: sed ejus inventi me potius quam alium repertorem prædicaveris. -- Thales, the Milesian, the most eminent of the seven famous Sages; for he was the first inventor of Geometry among the Greeks, the most judicious inquirer into nature, and the most skillful observer of the stars: he made great discoveries by small Geometrical lines; the regulation of times and seasons, the theory of the winds, the course of the stars, the wonderful causes of thunder, the oblique motions of the planets, the annual revolutions of the sun, the reason of the increase, decrease, and eclipse of the moon. He also, in his old age, found out the most surprising proportion with regard to the sun; which he not only invented but confirmed also by experience, the proportion between the sun's magnitude and the circle it describes. Thales, as soon as he had found it out, is said to have communicated it to Mandratum Prienensem, who being exceedingly delighted by so new and unexpected a discovery, desired him to ask what reward he would have for it. The wise Thales replied, It will be a sufficient reward to me, if you do not publish what I have taught you as a discovery of your own, but fairly declare that I am the inventor.'

It seems to me that the true sense of these words, quotiens sol magnitudine sua circum quem permeat metiatur, is this which I have given to them, viz. that Thales found out the measure of the sun's diameter, and of the circle it appears to describe round the earth. We are told, that he computed how many times the whole body of the sun was to change it's situation to describe that circle; but we are not told how many times it was. The modern Astronomers suppose that the sun's diameter is about thirty minutes: from whence it follows, that, by changing it's place seven hundred and twenty times, according to the whole extent of it's globe, it describes the whole circumference of it's circle. Some infer from thence, that it's diurnal swiftness would not be very considerable, if it were true that it moves in the manner supposed in Tycho Brahe's system; that is, like an

arrow

should ask for it; he only desired, that he would be so ingenuous as to declare, that the glory of that invention was his due (c). (c) See the remark [D].

arrow in the air, and not as the nails of a wheel. Can- not oxen, with a slow pace, go, in a few hours, through a space seven or eight times greater than they are. Observe, in the example of Thales, how very much pleased the inventors of things are with the glory of a first discovery. That wife man of Greece was now grown old, and in high reputation.

He was insensible as to lucre, pecuniary rewards, or any other advantage; but not as to the injustice of those, who should rob him of his discovery, or de- prive him of the glory of it, by a disobliging silence. See what Tacitus says, speaking of Helvidius Priscus, that the last thing even the wife man can part with, is the desire of glory (38).

(38) Opum con- temptor, recti parvix, confians aduersus metus. Erant quibus spe- tentior famae videretur, quan- do etiam sapien- tibus cupido glori- e novissima exultur. Tacit. Hist. lib. iv, cap. 5, 6.

THAMYRAS, who invented the science of the Haruspices in the island of Cyprus. See TAMIRAS.

THAMYRIS, a Poet, and one of the most excellent Musicians of his time, was born at Odrya in Thrace, whither his mother (a) retired to hide her shame. This was occasioned by her having the imprudence to lye with a man (b), who would not marry her. Without doubt she often desired it of him, as she found her big belly increase, which quickly followed their amorous commerce; but he gave no ear to it, and obliged her by this means to leave her country, which was Mount Parnassus [A]. The son, of whom she was delivered at Odrya, was called Thamyris, and was endowed with a great many perfections, which might have raised him to the highest pitch of glory, had not the vanity which was intermixed with them run him into a thousand extrava- gancies. He trod in his father's steps, for he learned Music so perfectly, that the Scythians made him their king, though he was a foreigner (c). He had the finest voice of any man in his time, if we believe Plutarch, who adds, that he composed a Poem concerning the war of the Titans with the gods (d). Some other Poems are ascribed to him; five thousand verses on the creation of the world, and a system of Theology con- sisting of three thousand verses (e), which was still extant when Suidas was writing his Dictionary. There is no great probability that those two Poems were entirely different. He was more antient than Homer by eight degrees according to some, or five according to others (f), and he was the third, who gained the prize of singing at the Pythic games (g). He is said to have been the first inventor of the sin against nature [B]. The challenge which he had the assurance to give to the Muses was full of scandalous insolence: proud of his beauty, and of his skill in musical instruments, he challenged them to a trial of skill, upon this condition, that if he got the victory, he should deprive them all nine of their virginity; and that if he was overcome, he would submit himself to their discretion. The Muses, in all probability very well assured of success, accepted the condition, and after their victory deprived him of his sight, and of his skill in Music. Homer, who has mentioned this challenge of Thamyris [C], and the punishment inflicted upon him on that account, says nothing of his pretension in case he had been conqueror; a pretension like that of male partridges, when they fight in the presence of their females (h); but Apollodorus, and the Scholiast upon Homer, are as express in this particular as possible (i). Natalis Comes would have done well to cite them [D]. It is surprising that Lucian did not show his bantering wit upon this head, and that he should content himself with representing Thamyris as an ungrateful

(a) Her name was Odyra, ac- cording to Sui- das; and Argiope, according to Pau- sanias and Apol- lodorus.

(b) His name was Philammon, and he was a good Musician; See Pausanias, lib. iv, p. 143, & lib. x, pag. 322, Plot. de Musica, pag. 1132.

(c) Conon, apud Photium, num. 186, pag. 428.

(d) Plutarch. de Musica, pag. 1132. Natalis Comes, Mythol. lib. vi, cap. xiv, says that Plu- tarch values that poem more than all the others; but it is certain he neither praises nor dispraises it.

(e) Tzetzes, Chil. VII. Hæd. CVIII.

(f) Suidas.

(g) Pausan. lib. x, pag. 322.

(h) Tunc inter se dimicant ma- res desiderio fe- minarum, victum ajunt Venerem pati. Pliny, lib. x, cap. xxxiii.

(i) See the re- mark [D].

(1) Conon, apud Photium, num. 186, pag. 428.

(2) Apollodor. lib. i, pag. m. 11. See also Suidas, and the Scholiast upon Homer, in Iliad. lib. i, ver. 102.

(3) Apollod. lib. i, pag. m. 2.

[A] Which was mount Parnassus. Others (1) say she retired from Peloponnesus, and that Philammon, a handsome young man, who was too much beloved by her, and had received too great a share of her favours, was born at Thoricum in Attica.

[B] The first inventor of the sin against nature. That I may not advance this without proof, I shall cite these four Greek words, Πρωτος ἀρσεναίων ἐρῶν ὁρίσιν. Macula Venere primus usus discitur (2) - - - He first, introduced the love of males. The boy he fell in love with, was the same Hyacinthus, who was afterwards loved by Apollo, and killed by him accidentally with a quoit. He was the son of the Muse Clio, and of Pierus the son of Magnes (3). This is what we find in Apollodorus; but Suidas calls the boy Hymneus, and makes him the son of Calliope and Magnes. I have not read in any author what Lloyd and Hofman have copied from Charles Stephens, namely, that Thamyris, the most beautiful of all men, fell in love with boys at first, and afterwards changed his course, and loved the Muses. This is perverting and overturning every thing that is to be met with among the An- tients.

[C] Homer, who has mentioned this challenge. It is in the second book of the Iliad, in the catalogue of the Grecian fleet, on occasion of the town Dorion, near which he says, Thamyris was met by the Muses. It is evident, by what is said both before and after, that this town was not in Thrace, as Lloyd will have it, but in Peloponnesus. Lucian, who places it in The- VOL. V.

faly (4), was no better acquainted with it's situation. Beroaldus, who would prove from Lucan, that it was in Boetia, has committed two faults for one (5). Diodorus Siculus, in the third book, and Dion Chry- sostom, in his third oration de Fuga, have men- tioned that challenge of Thamyris, and how he was punished for it. Barthius has found in that oration, that Thamyris lost his sight, and his skill in Music, on account of his wealth (6). But this is not the author's meaning.

[D] Natalis Comes would have done well to cite them. He has given a just account (7) of that adven- ture; but he quotes only Asclepiades of Myrlea (8), which is a wrong way of quoting, and a remainder of the vain affectation of some learned men of Italy, upon the revival of learning. Some quoted a Greek author only in general; others called him by his name, but they took care not to say, that what they cited out of him, was only to be found quoted in some known authors. The scholastic Divines and Philoso- phers are not so unfair in their quotations - they do not scruple to refer the reader for a passage of an author, whose works are in every body's hands, to a modern writer who quotes it. Thus Father Terillus, in his book upon the Prima Regula Morum, does seldom quote the Fathers, or Thomas Aquinas, but upon the credit of Sanches, Vasques, and other Jesuits, as is observed by the author of the fourth Denunciation of the Philo- sophical Sin. I here give myself an example of such quotations. However it be, Natalis Comes should have told

(4) Quæ tetigit Phylax Pteleos- que & Dorion ira Fibile Pie- ridum. Lucan. Pharf. lib. vi, ver. 352.

(5) Beroald. in Propert. Eleg. XXII, lib. ii.

(6) Barth. Comm. in Sta- tium, Tom. ii, pag. 962.

(7) Nat. Comes, Mythol. lib. vi, cap. xiv.

(8) He is a fa- mous author. Myrlea, a town of Bithynia, was since called Apamea.

(k) *Prodicus Phocæensis, apud Pausaniam, lib. iv, pag. 143.*

(1) Pausan. *ib.*

(m) Ibid.

person [E], who turned against the Muses the talent he had received from them. Some authors have said, that the punishment of his presumption was put off till he should arrive in the infernal regions (k). Pausanias says, he believes that Thamyris should arrive in the infernal regions (k). Pausanias says, he believes that Thamyris lost his sight, not as Homer says, for having contended with the Muses, but through sickness (l). It is observed (m); that this Poet left off making verses after he lost his sight, and that he threw his lyre into a river [F]: hence it is, that when he was painted blind, he was represented with a broken lyre (n). Note he invented the Music called Doric [G]. Plato has feigned, according to the principles of the Metempsychosis, that the soul of Thamyris transmigrated into the body of a nightingale (o).

(*) *Prodicus Pine-*
cænsis, *apud*
Paufaniam, *lib.*
ix, *pag.* 304,
& *lib.* *x*, *pag.*
347.

(o) Plato, de
Republ. lib. x,
pag. 765.

told us, that there are some authors extant, who may be consulted as to the conditions of the challenge. Συμβουλευοί, says Apollodorus, ἂν μὲν κρείττω ἐυρεθῇ, ἀλλοσιδαίον ἄσασσι. --- Making his bargain, if he be found come off conqueror, to lie with them all. The Scholiast upon Homer has the same expression upon the passage of the second book of the Iliads: Συμβέλει, ἂν μὲν κρείττω ἐυρεθῇ ἀλλοσιδαίον ἄσασσι.

[E] It is surprising that Lucian did not show his bantering wit upon this head, and that he should content himself with representing *Thamyris* as an ungrateful person.]

Ἐκτός ἐστι μὴ κατὰ τὸν Θάμειρον, ἢ τὸν Εὐρύτοιν, ἔτι τὴν φωνήν, ἢ τοὺς Μούσαις ἀντιδρῶν, πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀπαρτὴν τῆς φωνῆς, ἢ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι ἐπαίδων, ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν τοῦτων, καὶ ταῦτα, δοτιὲς ὅντι τῇ ἐπιφύτῳ τοῦτων, καὶ ταῦτα, cujus *Thamyris*, vel *Eurytus*, ut musis occinat, at quibus canendi normam accepit, vel Apollinem, idque jactulationis præceptorum, jactulando provocet (9). . . . Unless of the same disposition with *Thamyris*, or *Eurytus* is the former of whom I presumed to sing with the Muses, who had taught him that art; the latter challenged Apollo to foot, notwithstanding he had been his master. Perhaps this merry writer forgot that circumstance, or never observed it in his reading. It is well he did not; for this, in all probability, is the true reason why he did not jest upon it in any of his books, by fallly and maliciously supposing, that the Muses did not sing well that day, either from a pretended cold, or one really caught in a very lucky season, or from some other artifice, like those made use of by courtiers and ambitious men.

(9) Lucian. in
Reviviscentibus,
pag. 389, Tom. i.

when they play (10), and that therefore Thamyras, &c. But we must not forget, that, according to some authors (11), the prize annexed to the victory was not a transient favour, but an actual marriage to be contracted between him and the nine Muses : this was consequently a lasting business.

Connubio jungam stabili propriamque dicabo (12).

In Hymen's lasting bands I'll make her thine.

[F] *It is observed . . . that he threw his lyre into a river.* Cafeneuve, in his French Commentary upon some epistles of Philostratus, says, that Thamyris, after his punishment, *threw his lyre against mount Parnassus, and that from the stroke of it there issued a brook, which was from thence called Balyra.* This is a strange alteration of Pausanias's words, which inform us (13), that at the distance of thirty *stadia* from the gate of Messena in Peloponnesus, there was a river called Balyra, because Thamyris had thrown his lyre into it.

[G] He invented the Music called Doric.] He was too great a master in that art, to content himself with leaving it in the state he found it, and not to be ambitious to make some new improvements in it. 'Ly-
' dios modulus Amphion (invenit) Dorios Thamyras
' Thrax: Phrygius Marfyas Phrix (14). --- Amphion
' invented the Lydian mood in Music, Thamyras the Thra-
' cian the Doric mood, and Marfyas the Phrygian
' the Phrygian mood.'

(14) Pliny, lib.
viii, cap. lxi,
pag. m. 102.
See also Clemens
Alexandrinus,
lib. i, Strom.
pag. 307.

(11) Canon,
Y apud Photium.
S, num. 186, pag.
r. 428.

(12) Virgil. *Æn.*
lib. i, ver. 73.

ne (13) Pausan.
er lib. iv, pag.
re 143.

(14) Pliny, *lib.*
vii, cap. lvi,
pag. m. 102.
See also Clement
Alexandrinus,
lib. i, Strom.
pag. 307.

(a) Intituled,
Προγυμνάσματα, Progymnas-
mata.

THEON, a Greek Sophist, of whom we have still remaining a Rhetorical work (a), written with great politeness and judgment. His rules are clear and short, and he makes a good choice of common places for the furnishing of arguments. There is no subject wherein he has been more successful, than that concerning the Divine Providence [A]. He passes a right judgment upon the beauties as well as the faults of the most illustrious Orators and Historians. I shall prove, by an example, his great nicety in the placing

[A] *There is no subject wherein he has been more successful than that concerning the Divine Providence.* Read the twelfth chapter of his book, where you will find a very plentiful collection of the finest arguments that a Pagan could conceive; and which will convince you Theon was a man of great parts. You will there find, among other things, that mens being persuaded that the gods continually see every thing they do, makes them live in great safety, and practise their duty; and that those who think themselves under the care of the gods, spend their lives with the greatest pleasure imaginable. Let us hear his own words: *ἔφη ὅτι ἀποφάσεις ἀπὸν τοῖς, καὶ περὶ τῶν ὅλων τὸν βίον διδόντες, τοιούτους ἔχειν ἐπισκόπους διὰ πᾶσιν τοῖς κατὰ τὸν βίον πράξεσιν. καὶ ὅτι μάλιστα ἡδυνάεω ζῶσιν, οἱ ἡνυμμένοι ἐπιμελητάς ἔχουσιν τὰς θεῶν.* *Quemadmodum et omnium tutissime ac diligentissime eos vivere confect, qui omnium suarum in vita actionum inspectores se habere existimant Deos. Sed et jucundissime aetatem agere, qui à Diis respici se credunt* (1). It is certain, that if men know how to live according to their principles, the doctrine of God's presence would be the most effectual means to divert them from all evil, and to make them pursue good. The most profligate have the power to hold their hands and refrain their tongues, when they think they are seen or heard by some persons whom they fear or respect. With how much more reason should the persuasion, that God sees every thing, keep men constant to their duty (2)? It is upon this account, that the authors of pious books do so much inculcate the necessity of me-

(1) Theo, in
Progymn. *cap.*
xii, pag. m.
135.

(2) *Confer quæ supra* in the remark [A], of the article THALES.

dictating upon God's preference. From hence comes also the custom of fixing up this sentence even at the corners of the streets, GOD SEES THEE, SINNER. It is also certain, that those who believe themselves under the protection of God, must enjoy an inexhaustible fund of comfort and pleasure. Some of the profane Poets were not ignorant of it; but they have given a just cause of scandal by making use of this maxim to obtain a mistress (3).

stress (3).
I shall here take notice of one thing, that is to be met with in a book, intituled, *Pratiques de Piété pour le bonnetier le S. Sacrament*. The author of it relates (4) 'this saying of Marthal de Gassion. 'If I believed the Real Presence, I would spend my whole life in a church-with my face prostrate to the ground; and I cannot persuade myself, that many Catholics believe what they say concerning that mystery, when I consider how little respect they express at church.' If that Marthal had believed the Real Presence, he would have done as others do: He would have been accustomed to that doctrine, and by habit he would have become insensible to it; that was already his case, as to the doctrine of God's presence throughout the whole universe. A visible presence of CHRIST's humanity would, without doubt, be more efficacious than God's presence; but a presence of CHRIST's human nature, will soon come to the same thing. Those who believe it are no more sensibly affected with it, than the Protestants are with the doctrine of God's presence.

(3) See the
XVIIth Ode of
the first book of
Horace, and mind
these words,
Di me tuentur
Et Mæsa cordes
All seeing gods
my cause defend,
My pray'rs accept, my wife
besriend.

(4) See the Bibliothèque Universelle, Tom. i, 212.

[B] I shall

placing of words [B]. Here is another proof of his good taste. He would not have maxims or sentences to appear in relieve, or like embroidery, in narrations, but to be incorporated with them in an imperceptible manner [C]. His book was printed at Basil, with the Latin translation of Joachim Camerarius in the year 1541: but the best edition is that of Leyden 1626, in 8vo. Daniel Heinsius, who published it, carefully revised the Latin translation, and corrected it in a great many places.

[B] *I shall prove by an example his great nicety in the placing of words.* When he recommends perspicuity of expression (5), he points out several causes of obscurity which ought to be avoided. He says, among other things, that we should never leave our readers or hearers in an uncertainty where to refer a certain part of a period; and therefore he blames this expression: *Δῖμον ἐρεχθίδος μεγαλήτορος, ὃν ποτ' ἀθήνη*

ἔρρεψε δι' ὅς θυγάτηρ, τέκε δὲ ζείδωρος ἀρετα. Populum præstantis Erechthei, Pallas quem Jove nata aluit, terra edidit alma (6). -- *The people of the great Erechtheus, whom Pallas, Jove's daughter, bred, and earth produced.* One cannot tell, says he, whether it be the people, or Erechtheus, whom Pallas bred, and the earth produced. He adds, that Heraclitus's books were grown very obscure, by such an order of words, so very frequently to be met with, whether it was owing to the author's carelessness or design. *Παρε*

ταυτην δὲ τὴν ἀμφισβόλιαν, τὰ Ἑρακλείτη τὰ φιλοσοφία βιβλία σκοτίζον ὡς γόνο, κατακρύπτει αὐτῇ χρισμάνει, ἥτοι ἐξέπιδες, ἢ καὶ δὲ ἀγνοίαν. Ex hujusmodi ambiguis locutionibus Heracliti philosophi libri obscuritatem contraxere: qui ad fastidium illis, Jove gnarus fore ignarus, usus est (7). Since Theon appears to have been so very nice with regard to ambiguous expressions, I am at a loss to know where he met with any authors, who had writ in the manner he desired; for the greatest masters of the Greek and Latin tongue are full of such ambiguities. It is true, they are not so perplexing in a piece of History or Oratory as they are in a treatise of Physics; and that therefore the Philosopher, censured by Theon, was

particularly obliged to avoid them. I have said, in another place (8), that the French language is not so subject to this defect as the Greek and Latin: but it must be confessed, that even some excellent writers too much neglect, in that respect, the strict rules of our Grammar. A new Theon would point out to them a great many faulty periods not to be justified.

[C] *But to be incorporated with them in an imperceptible manner.* This is, without doubt, the true sense of these words: *Ὅταν μὲν τοι συνεχῶς ἐγκλαμινγνύη τις, καὶ λαμβάνη ταῦτα ὑποκρινά, ἐπιχαρὶς πῶς ἢ διήγησης γίνεταί.* Quæ sententiola quidem quamvis sæpe inferantur, modo ne emineant, mirifice amœnam ac venustam efficiunt orationem (9). -- *When these maxims are frequently intermixed, and yet at the same time concealed, the narration becomes surprisingly beautiful.* Petronius was of the same taste. Read the following words of the preface to a book of Mr Corbinelli. *Those, who have read Livy, will be surprized to find so many maxims in an Historian, who has but very few, or none, but of such a sort as those mentioned by an ancient author*

which are incorporated with the body of the discourse, without having the turn or appearance of maxims. This is giving a fine encomium on that Historian. Moral and political sentences and reflexions, not interwoven with the thread of the discourse, do not deserve much commendation. It is no difficult thing to scatter them in that manner; but the inserting them, in the very body of the narration, requires a great deal of art. They ought to appear there like a flat painting, and not like a book embossed in relieve.

* Curandum est, ne sententiæ eminentes extra corpus orationis expresse, sed in textu verborum colore nitant. Petr. Satyr.

(8) Remark [C] of the first article ACHILLES.

(9) Theo, cap. iv, pag. 46, & 47.

(8) Remark [C] of the first article ACHILLES.

(9) Theo, cap. iv, pag. 63, & 64.

* Curandum est, ne sententiæ eminentes extra corpus orationis expresse, sed in textu verborum colore nitant. Petr. Satyr.

(a) Strabo, lib. xiv, pag. 444.

(b) *Ἐπιφανέστατος πάντων ἱστορῶν* Chirifimus omnium historiæ dicitur.

(c) Dionys. Halicarn. Epist. ad Pompeium, fol. 52. pag. m. 262.

(d) Photius, B. bl. Cod. 176, pag. 392.

(e) Id. ibid. See the end of the last remark.

(f) Aulus Gellius, lib. x, cap. xviii.

(g) Quintil. lib. m. 469.

(h) Ex clarissima Rhetoris officina duo præstantes ingenio Theopompus & Ephorus ab Iocrate magistro impulsu se ad historiam contulerunt: causas omnino nullas attulerunt. Cicero, de Orat. lib. ii, fol. 73, D.

(i) Cicero, in Bruto, pag. 514.

THEOPOMPU S, an Orator and an Historian, born in the isle of Chios (a), flourished in the time of Philip, King of Macedonia, father of Alexander the Great (b). He was the most famous of all the disciples of Isocrates (c), and carried the prize from all the Panegyristes sent for by Artemisia to praise Mausolus (c). There was no considerable town in Greece where he had not harangued with universal applause (d). This was one of the reasons he advanced, to justify the good opinion he had of his own merit; when having very much preferred the modern Orators to those of the preceding age, he instanced himself for one of the best of his time (e). After he had signalized himself as an Orator, he set himself about writing Histories [B], and made it appear, that the study

[A] *He flourished in the time of Philip father of Alexander the Great.* The anonymous writer, who has described the Olympiads, says, he flourished in the XCIIIId. It is a mistake, which has been followed by Suidas, and adopted by Meursius (1) and Vossius (2). Jonsius confutes it effectually (3). He quotes Diodorus Siculus, who has observed that the XLIIId, XLIIIId, and XLIIId books of Theopompus's History, contained what passed in Sicily from the third year of the XCIIIId Olympiad, to the second year of the CIXth

(4). Is it likely, that an author, who flourished in the XCIIIId Olympiad, should have been alive in the CXth Olympiad (5)? Here is a more solid proof. Theopompus published a letter, and some advices he had wrote to Alexander, who did not begin to reign till the CXth Olympiad. I pass by several other proofs alledged by Jonsius: they might be eluded, and after all they are of no more weight than those I have just now mentioned. We shall therefore take no farther notice of them, but observe that he might have found in Photius a much stronger argument than all he alledges; for, as I have said in the text of this article, we read in Photius, 1. That Theopompus was but forty-five years old when Alexander caused him to re-established at Chios. 2. That Ptolomy, King of Egypt had thoughts of putting him to death. This shews that he was so far from flourishing in the XCIIIId Olympiad, that he was not born till towards the hundredth at the soonest.

[B] *After he had signalized himself, as an Orator, he set himself about writing Histories.* Quintilian makes this observation: 'Theopompus ut in historia

prædictis (Herodoto & Thucydide) minor, ita Oratori magis similis, ut qui antequam esset ad hoc opus sollicitatus, diu fuerit Orator (6). -- Theopompus as in History inferior to the former (Herodotus & Thucydides), so was he much more of the Orator, having distinguished himself in that character long before his being persuaded to write History.' Cicero does not contradict Quintilian, when he says, that Theopompus never pleaded any causes; for there were a great many Orators in Greece who never pleaded at all. In short, it was Isocrates, who advised Theopompus to apply himself to History (7). The passage I have quoted out of Cicero, might make one believe, that Theopompus and Ephorus were of much the same genius, since their master advised them to apply themselves to the same study; but do not let this deceive you. They had not the least resemblance; one wanted a curb, and the other a spur. Theopompus was too warm. Ephorus was not warm enough. This was the reason that Isocrates used different methods with them. 'Hoc doctoris intelligentis est, videre quod ferat natura sua quemque; & ea duce utentem sic instituire, ut Isocratem in acerrimo ingenio Theopompi, & lenissimo Ephori dixisse traditum est, alteri se calcaria adhibere, alteri frenos (8). -- This is the part of an able master to discover every particular genius of his scholars, and to teach them accordingly, as Isocrates is reported to have said with regard to the bold turn of Theopompus, and the mild one of Ephorus, that he would make use of the spur to the one, and the bridle to the other.' Cicero expresses this in another place better still for my purpose; for he declares, that these two

(c) Aulus Gellius, lib. x, cap. xviii.

(d) Photius, B. bl. Cod. 176, pag. 392.

(e) Id. ibid. See the end of the last remark.

(6) Quintil. lib. m. 469.

(7) Ex clarissima Rhetoris officina duo præstantes ingenio Theopompus & Ephorus ab Iocrate magistro impulsu se ad historiam contulerunt: causas omnino nullas attulerunt. Cicero, de Orat. lib. ii, fol. 73, D.

(8) Cicero, in Bruto, pag. 514.

of Eloquence is a good preparative for it [C]; for he acquired the reputation of an able Historian. He was besides, very well qualified for this undertaking; for he boldly published

scholars were never alike. 'Dicebat Iſocrates

'ſe calcaribus in Ephoro, contrā autem in Theopompo
'ſrenis uti ſolere: alterum enim exultantem verborum
'audacia reprimebat, alterum cunctantem, & quaſi
'verecundantem incitabat. Neque eos ſimiles effecit
'inter ſe, ſed tantum alteri affinxit, de altero limavit,
'ut id confirmaret in utroque, quod utriusque natura
'pateretur (9). Iſocrates ſaid that he uſed
'to treat Ephorus with a ſpur, and Theopompus, on the
'contrary, with a bridle: the great forwardneſs and af-
'ſurance of the former wanting to be reſſeſſed, and the
'great backwardneſs and modeſty of the latter to be en-
'courageſed. Nor did he make them in the leaſt alike, but
'only added to the one, and pruned off from the other,
'what they might confirm in each of them, what their re-
'ſpective genius would bear.' Quintilian relates the
ſame fact (10). Others make a like obſervation con-
cerning Plato, with reſpect to Ariſtotle and Xeno-
crates, and concerning Ariſtotle, with reſpect to Theopom-
pus and Calliſthenes (11).

[C] The ſtudy of Eloquence is a good preparative to
ſerious Hiſtory.] This was Cicero's opinion; for he is thus
addreſſed by Pomponius Atticus: 'Potes tu proſecto
'ſatiſfacere in hiſtoria quippe cum ſit opus, ut tibi
'quidem videri ſolet, unum hoc oratorium maxime
'(12). You may be ſure of ſucceeding in Hiſtory,
'ſince it is a work, wherein you uſe to ſay Oration is the
'chief ingredient.' Nevertheless, it ſeems, that a man,
who has been uſed to compoſe orations, is not very
well qualified to obſerve, in his expreſſions, that grave
ſimplicity, which becomes the character of an Hiſto-
rian. It is to be feared, that his ſtile will be too lofty,
and too full of metaphors. But this is a much ſtronger
objection againſt thoſe, who ſay, that none can be a
good Hiſtorian, without being a good Poet (13). This
has been advanced by ſome very great men. How-
ever it be, Theopompus's ſtile was thought to favour
more of an Orator, than of an Hiſtorian, and to be
an imitation of that of Iſocrates. *Vetrum hoc
commune iudicium eſt dictionem ejus oratoriam ac imprimis
ſocraticam ſimiliorem eſſe, quam hiſtoriam* (14). Thoſe,
who juſtify him by ſaying in general, that he came
nearer the ſtrength of Demotheſenes, do not wholly
remove the difficulty, for that very thing ſhews, that
an oratorial eloquence prevailed in his hiſtorical writ-
ings. The beſt thing therefore that can be ſaid for
him is what we find in Dionyſius Halicarſaſſeus. I
ſhall give it in Latin: It will inform us, that Theo-
pompus added to the character of Iſocrates the ſtrength
which his ſubject required, and that his cenſures were
as ſharp as thoſe of Demotheſenes. 'Ea forma quæ in
'elocutione cernitur, maxime ad ſimilitudinem Iſo-
'crateæ accedit. Pura enim dictio, vulgaris, ſimplex,
'perſpicua, ſublimis, magnifica, & ſummam pompam
'præ ſe fert, & quadam harmonia temperata eſt, ju-
'cunde & ſuaviter fluens. Differt autem ab elocutione
'Iſocratis in austeritate & vehementia in aliquibus;
'nimirum cum ſe in affectus concitandos dederit, &
'vel maxime cum urbibus & ducibus improba conſilia
'& res geſtas exprobat atque vitio dat. Multus
'enim eſt in iis, & à Demotheſenis acrimonia ne pau-
'lulum quidem abeſt (15). The form of his ſtile
'is moſt like that of Iſocrates, for his expreſſion is pure,
'familiar, plain, clear, ſublime, magnificent, pompous,
'tempered with certain harmony, very pleaſant and
'agreeably flowing. But it differs from that of Iſocrates,
'ſometimes by it's ſharpeſs and ſeverity; that is, when
'he deſigns to ſtir the paſſions, and eſpecially when he
'expoſes and laſhes the evil counſels and miſconduct
'of cities and generals. For he enlarges much upon
'theſe, and is not in the leaſt ſhort of Demotheſenes's
'ſeverity.' Cicero obſerves, that Theopompus
eclipsed the glory of Philoſtus, and Thucydides,
by the loſtineſs of his ſtile. 'Ut horum concii-
'ſis ſententiis, interdum etiam non ſatis apertis cum
'brevitae, tum nimio acumine, officiit Theopompus
'elatione atque altitudine orationis ſuæ, quod idem
'Lyſiæ Demotheſenes: ſic Catoſis luminibus obſtruxit
'hæc poſteriorum quaſi exaggerata altius oratio (16). . . .
'That their concife, and ſometimes not over-clear periods,
'were out-done by Theopompus not only in brevity and
'perſpicuity, but alſo in loſtineſs and magnificence;
'as Lyſias's was by Demotheſenes. So Cato's glory is
'eclipsed by the more improved ſtile of the Moderns.'

But there is one thing, in which he ſhewed himſelf
too much an Orator: he carefully avoided the meet-
ing of vowels, and was extremely fond of the turn
and cadence of his periods, and of the correſpondence
of grammatical figures. This is a fault, for which he

is reproached by Dionyſius Halicarſaſſeus (17); and
there is without doubt ſomething very mean in ſuch
an affectation, when the grandeur and majeſty of the
ſubject ought to engage the whole attention of the
writer. We may ſay however, as to what concerns the
meeting of vowels, that he did very right in avoiding
it, and that he was only to blame for diſcovering that
he avoided it too ſcrupuloſly. I obſerve, that when
Cicero ſays, Theopompus was blamed upon that ac-
count, he does not ſay he was blamed juſtly: nay,
he ſeems to ſay, that he was blamed unjuſtly. 'Ut
'in legendo, ſays he (18), ſic animus in dicendo pro-
'ſpiciet quid ſequatur, ne extremorum verborum cum
'inſequentibus primis concurſus, aut hiulcas voces
'efficiat, aut aſperas. Quamvis enim ſuaves, graveſque
'ſententiæ, tamen ſi inconditis verbis efferuntur, of-
'fendent aures, quarum eſt iudicium ſuperbiſſimum.
'Quod quidem latina lingua ſic obſervat, nemo ut
'tam ruſticus ſit, qui vocaleis nolit conjungere. In
'quo quidam etiam Theopompum reprehendunt, quod
'eas literas tantopere fugerit, & ſi id magiſter ejus
'Iſocrates, at non Thucydides. . . . In ea eſt crebra
'iſta vocum concurſio, quam magna ex parte, ut vi-
'tioſam, fugit Demotheſenes. . . . As in reading, ſo
'in ſpeaking the mind ought to regard what is to follow,
'that the meeting of each ſubſequent word with the fore-
'going may produce neither too open nor too rough a ſound.
'For altho' the ſentences are agreeable and grave, yet if
'they are expreſſed in improper words, they will offend
'the ear, whoſe judgment is very arbitrary. Which
'the Latin tongue obſerves in ſuch manner, that the
'greateſt clown of all takes care to join his vowels right.
'Some alſo find fault with Theopompus on this head, for
'avoiding ſo ſcrupuloſly theſe openings, which if his
'maſter Iſocrates minded, Thucydides did not. . . . With
'him the meeting of vowels is very frequent, which De-
'moſthenes in great meaſure has avoided as faulty.'

Duris Samius ſpoke of Theopompus's ſtile with great
contempt; but, as Photius (19) obſerves, he was far
from equalling him. Conſult Longinus in two places
of his treatiſe on the Sublime. He commends and
juſtifies him in the one, and cenſures him in the other.

'This may be further ſeen, ſays he (20), in a paſſage
'of Theopompus, which Cæcilius blames I know
'not why, and which I think on the contrary ought
'rather to be praized for its juſtneſs, and for being
'very expreſſive. Philoſtus, ſays that Hiſtorian, readily
'ſwallows all affronts, which the neceſſity of his affairs
'obliges him to ſuffer.' It is in the Greek *δενδρὸν ἂν
ἀναγκασθῶν ἀναγοράγῃς ἀπαγγεῖλαι*. Tanaquil-
lus Faber renders theſe words: *Philippus rerum neceſſita-
tem devorare callidus*. The other paſſage of Longinus
begins thus (21): 'In like manner, the Hiſtorian
'Theopompus has given a deſcription of the King of
'Perſia's deſcent into Egypt, which is otherwiſe ſub-
'lime; but he has ſpoiled all by the mean expreſſions
'he has intermixed with it. Is there any city, and
'nation in Aſia, ſays that Hiſtorian, but what has ſent
'ambassadors to the King? &c.' Longinus, having
repeated the remaining part of the deſcription, adds:
'From the higheſt elevation he falls into the loweſt
'meanneſs, in the very place where he ſhould have
'been moſt lofty. For the buſhels, raggo's, and ſacks,
'which he improperly mentions in the pompous de-
'ſcription of thoſe preparations, would make one
'think that he is deſcribing a kitchen.' The Jeſuit
Cauſinus who was a good judge of Rhetoric, does not
approve that cenſure. Theſe are his words: 'Dionyſ.
'Longinus, mordax Criticus, eum irridet, quod ubi
'dona Regi Perſarum ab Aſiaticis oblata commemorat,
'poſt ſtragulam veſtem, purpuram, tabernacula aurea,
'periſtromata, emblemata, carnes etiam victimarum
'falſas, regi oblata ad alendum exercitum, comme-
'moret. Debat, inquit, iſta minuta, aut omittere,
'aut initio collocare, ut à minoribus ad majora aſcen-
'deret: ſed in eo frigidus eſt, & fruſtra mordax Lon-
'ginus. Erat enim ideliſ hiſtorici, & prudentis, poſt
'opulenta principum dona, tenuiorum quoque in co-
'lendo rege ſtudia commemorare, & rem, ut geſta eſt

(9) Cicero, de
Oratore, lib. iii,
ſol. 90, C.

(10) Quintil. lib.
ii, cap. viii, pag.
81.

(11) Diog. Laër-
tius, in Xeno-
crate & Theo-
phraſto.

(12) Cicero, de
Legibus, lib. i,
circa init. ſol. m.
328, C. See alſo
Cicero, in I de
Oratore.

(13) See the
Penſées diverſes
ſur les Comètes,
num. 5.

(14) Voſſius, de
Hiſtor. Græciſ,
pag. 34.

(15) Dionyſ.
Halicarſaſſeus, Epit.
ad Pompeium,
in fine, pag. m.
264.

(16) Cicero, in
Bruto, pag. m.
114.

(17) Quod ſi in
iis in quibus
ſummum ſtu-
dium poſuit, col-
liſionem vocum
& numeroſas cir-
cuſcriptiones ac
figuras ſimiles
neglexiſſet, longe
melior in eloc-
utione ſe ipſo
evaleſciſſet.

Dionyſ. Halicarſaſſeus,
Epit. ad Pom-
peium in fine,
pag. m. 264.

(18) Cicero, in
Oratore, ſol.
124, B.

(19) Photius,
Bibl. num. 176,
pag. 393.

(20) Longinus,
chap. xxviii,
juxta Editionem
Tanaquil. Fabri.

(21) Id. ibid.
cap. xxxix,
juxta Editionem
Tanaquil. Fabri.

published disadvantageous truths, and was not sparing of his money when an exact enquiry into matters of fact required great expences [D]. He is blamed for his digressions [E], and it is very likely, the censure passed upon him on that account is very reasonable, though perhaps it is not in all respects so exact and equitable as it should be, nor has the plan he laid down been considered with due attention. If we had his preface, perhaps we should find something in it, which might justify him in some measure; but I do not think that any thing can fully excuse him, not even to such readers as have the greatest indulgence for Historical Episodes. With much more reason would he be condemned by those Critics, who cannot bear any thing in History that is foreign to the

* est, describere. Quod si tantopere petafonem aver-
* satur, quin Homerum, suum numen, reprehendit,
* qui tam simpliciter rem coquinariam à principibus
* obitam describit: & quid hoc est, nisi μαγείρεν.
* quod infestatur in Theopompo, φαντασία est (22) ?
* --- Longinus, a severe Critic, ridicules him, because
* in speaking of the presents made to the King of Persia
* by the Asiatic nations, after the carpets, the purple
* robes, the gilt tents, the tapestry, and inlaid work, he
* mentions even the salted meats of the sacrifices which
* had been presented to the King for the maintenance of
* his army. These low matters, says he, ought either to
* have been omitted, or to have been mentioned first,
* that there might be a natural rising from small to
* great: but in this Longinus appears dull, and severe
* without reason. For it was the duty of a faithful and
* prudent Historian, after the magnificent presents of
* Princes to take notice also of the respect paid to the King
* by the meaner sort, and to describe every thing in the
* order it happened. But if he has such an extreme
* aversion to the kitchen, he must in course find fault
* with his divine Homer, who has described with so
* much simplicity the cookery of Princes; and what is
* this but the describing a kitchen which he has objected
* to Theopompus. This seems to me to be the most
* plausible thing that can be said in Theopompus's vin-
* dication; but if I was to chuse, I should rather side
* with Longinus than with Father Caussin. For the
* faithfulness of an Historian does not oblige him to
* give a particular account of all the presents that have
* been made to a King. But what is alleged against
* Longinus in the last part of Father Caussin's objection
* seems to me a home-thrust. You cannot, says he,
* find fault with Theopompus, without blaming Homer
* your great deity. It is certain, that Homer has fre-
* quently touched more particularly on the kitchen
* than Theopompus.

[D] He boldly published disadvantageous truths, and
* was not sparing of his money when an exact inquiry . . .
* required great expences.] See, below, the remark [H].
I shall content myself here with those words of Athe-
* neus: Εἰ τις τούτοις ἀπιστεῖ, μαθήτω καὶ παρὰ
* Θεοπόμπου τὴν Χίον, ἀνδρὸς φιλαλήδους καὶ πολλὰ
* χρήματα καὶ ἀναλώσαντος εἰς τὴν περὶ τῆς ἱστορίας
* ἐξέτασιν ἀκρίβειαν. His fides si quis non adhibeat,
* dicat Theopompum Chium veritatis studiosum homi-
* nem, & qui historias exactè inquisitione, magno pe-
* cuniarum impendio, percrutatus est (23). --- If any
* person doubts the truth of these things, let him learn them
* also from Theopompus the Chian, a person who was a
* great lover of truth, and who spent large sums of money
* in strict inquiries after it.

[E] He is blamed for his digressions.] The Sophist
Theon (24) says they were so long, that it was im-
* possible to read them thorough without forgetting the
* subject from which he digressed. It was necessary to
* recollect it, which is an unpleasant thing to those who
* read a work of that nature. Photius, in order to
* shew how Theopompus launched into matters foreign
* to his subject, gives us this instance. His history of
* Philip, King of Macedonia, contained fifty-eight books,
* which were reduced to sixteen, by retrenching every
* thing that had no relation to the actions of that Prince.
* You will see this with some circumstances of it in the
* following words: Πλείσταις μὲν ἐν παρεβάσει
* παραδομένης ἱστορίας, τὰς ἱστορίας αὐτῷ λίγους
* Θεοπόμπου παρατίθει. διὸ καὶ Φίλιππος ὁ πρὸς
* Ῥωμαίους πολέμους, ἐξελὼν ταύτας, καὶ τὰς φί-
* λππε συντάξας μὲν πρῶτος, αἱ σκοπὸς εἰσι
* Θεοπόμπου εἰς ἐκκαίδεκα βίβλους μόνας: μὴδὲν
* παρ' αὐτῷ περὶ τοῦ εἰς ἁφελῶν, πλὴν (ὡς εἰρηται)
* τὰν παρεκτεσθῶν τὰς πάσας ἀπὸ ἡμέτερας. Digres-
* sionibus itaque variae historiae quamplurimis, histori-
* cos suos implet libros Theopompus. Quamobrem &
* Philippus, ille qui cum Romanis bellum gessit, digre-

sionibus hisce sublati, & Philippi rebus gestis, quas
* Theopompus scribendas potissimum susceperat, col-
* lectis, in sedecim eas dumtaxat libros (nihil de suo
* addens, aut præter digressiones, ut diximus, detra-
* hens) redegit (25). --- Theopompus therefore spins out
* his various Histories with numerous digressions. For
* which reason Philip, he who waged war with the Ro-
* mans, pruning off these digressions, and collecting the
* actions of Philip of Macedon which Theopompus had prin-
* cipally undertaken to write, reduced the whole into six-
* teen books only, adding nothing of his own, nor retrench-
* ing any thing, as I said before, but mere digressions. If
* you attend to the extracts, which the same author
* gives us (26) of the twelfth book of this History of
* Theopompus, you need not be told how much he de-
* lighted in digressions. You may judge of it very
* easily from this small specimen. For the rest, if any
* thing can make us believe, that the Roman name was
* scarce known to the Greeks in Alexander's time, it
* is the finding that Theopompus says nothing of Rome,
* except, that it had been taken by the Gauls (27). This
* city would have afforded him matter for a long
* digression, had it been ever so little known at that
* time.

Perhaps we may justly fear, that Photius's account
* is somewhat fallacious. Theopompus began his Hi-
* story with the reign of King Philip, and his principal
* design was to relate the actions of that Prince; but
* perhaps he proposed at the same time to give an ac-
* count of the most remarkable transactions in the other
* parts of the world during that reign. Consequently
* in reality, and according to the intention of the au-
* thor, that work must have been an universal History
* of that time, and not that of Philip in particular.
* What was retrenched therefore, when it was reduced
* to sixteen books, ought not to be looked upon as di-
* gressions, properly so called. The wars of Cyprus
* and of Sicily, and of many other places were retrench-
* ed, which perhaps he did not mention occasionally,
* and by way of digression only, but as an essential part
* of his design. It is impossible to decide the matter,
* since we have neither his Preface, nor any other part
* of his work to consult. However, I believe, that
* Photius has carried the thing too far; and if I was to
* complain of Theopompus's digressions, I would not
* insist, as Theon (28) does, upon his relating many
* things, wherein neither the King of Macedon, nor
* any of his subjects, had any concern. Can it be
* denied, that the main design of Thuanus was to write
* the History of France? And yet how many things
* does he relate, that have no relation to the French?
* I should therefore blame Theopompus for putting a
* wrong title to his work (29): but if he had acquaint-

ed his readers that he proposed likewise to give the
* History of other countries, I should not call his ac-
* count of the wars of Evagoras, and of the tyrants of
* Syracuse, a digression. In order to pass a right judg-
* ment upon his Episodes, I would not compare them
* with Philip or Macedon. I would go no further than
* this: his twelfth book, for instance (30), was design-
* ed for the wars of Cyprus. He there goes back as
* far as the siege of Troy; he speaks of Agamemnon,
* and Mopsus the soothsayer, &c. Does what he says
* of them carry me too far from Evagoras King of Cy-
* prus? If it be so, I blame him; but I see no reason
* for any to complain, that Mopsus and Agamemnon
* carry them too far from the court of Macedon. I am
* of opinion, that even this restriction would not be
* sufficient to justify that Historian. Without doubt,
* he ran too frequently into Episodes, wherein he was
* apt to nod, and forget himself. That fault ought to
* be a new reason for us to lament the loss of his Hi-
* story; for since the only design of his digressions was
* to explain antiquities, to relate the origin of things,
* and different traditions, how many curious things should

(22) Caussin, de
* Eloquentia Sacra
* & Humana, lib.
* i, cap. xx, pag.
* m. 19.

(25) Photius,
* Bibl. num. 176,
* pag. 363.

(26) Id. Ibid.
* pag. 390, 391.

(27) Theopom-
* pus ante quem
* nemo mentionem
* habuit (de Roma-
* ni) urbem duntaxat à Gallia
* captam dixit.
* Plinius, lib. iii,
* cap. v, pag. m.
* 324.

(28) Theo, in
* Prolegomena.
* iv, pag. 44, 45.

(29) It was in-
* titled, τὴν Φι-
* λιπποῦ. Ros
* Philippi.

(30) Photius,
* Bibl. num. 176,
* pag. 391.

(23) Athen, lib.
* iii, cap. viii,
* pag. 85. Diony-
* sius Halicarnas-
* sen, ubi supra,
* pag. 263, praises
* that author for
* the pains and
* charges he was
* at in collecting
* materials.

(24) Theon, in
* Prolegomena-
* tis: I have quoted
* his words in the
* remark [E] of
* the article PHI-
* LISTUS.

the subject [F]. He is also blamed for his many fabulous stories, and too long speeches [G], and for being too satirical [H]. He had a most terrible trick put upon

should we find in it, that are now unknown to us, and which we could not have been informed of by a concise History?

[F] He would have been condemned by those critics, who cannot bear any thing in a History that is foreign to the subject. How could Theopompus appear before their tribunal, and expect any favour from them, when they have passed sentence upon Tacitus? They lay down, in the first place, these rules (31), That in the choice of Memoirs, an Historian ought to give himself up entirely to truth, and the distinguishing of facts; that he ought to renounce his own taste, and to neglect foreign ornaments, which neither contribute to make things clearer, nor to enlarge our knowledge as to matters concealed, nor to enlarge our knowledge as to matters concealed, his . . . that his narrations ought to be uninterrupted, his . . . that his reflections rare and always computations exact, and his reflections rare and always

(31) Anonimiana, pag. 13.

(32) This it relates to the word history, which is not to be found nearer than 5 or 6 periods before. This shows a great negligence of the rules of Grammar.

(33) Ibid. pag. 14, 15.

(34) It should have been said this.

(35) Anonimiana, pag. 22.

(36) Ibid. p. 23.

(37) Ibid. p. 24.

(38) There is here a solecism in the French original.

(39) Cicero, de Legibus, lib. i, circa init. fol. m. 328, C.

I believe this judgment upon Tacitus will appear unjust and extravagant to good judges; and it had been well for Theopompus, if all those, who criticized him, had been like the author of these passages in the Anonimiana. He would have been condemned without mercy, and in a very insulting manner; but he might have answered, that his Judges went upon strained maxims, and he might have come off by saying, that all Historians were involved in the same censure, as well as he, and that consequently it was false and over-nice.

[G] He is also blamed for his many fabulous stories, and too long speeches. As to the fables, which Theopompus inserted in his work, I shall alledge Cicero's testimony. 'Intelligo te alias in historia leges servandas putare, alias in poemate: quippe quum in illa ad veritatem quæque referantur, in hac ad delectationem pleræque: quamquam & apud Herodotum patrem historiarum & apud Theopompum sint innumera fabulæ (39). - I know you are of opinion that the rules to be observed in History, are quite different from those to be observed in Poetry: since truth is the end of the one, and pleasure the end of the other: alibi both Herodotus, the father of History, and Theopompus abound in fables.' Dionysius Halicarnæus mentions two absurd tales of that Historian. 'Multas ineptias præfert ex quo genere illa sunt quæ

de Sileno commemorat qui in Macedonia apparuit, & quæ de dracone ad trirremum pugna navali tendente & alia nonnulla iis similia (40). - He is (40) Dionysius Halicarnæus ubi facit de Sileno, ubi facit de dracone, & alia nonnulla iis similia. - full of idle stories, of which kind are his accounts of Silenus's apparition in Macedonia, and of the dragon's engaging in a sea fight, and some others of the like stamp.' I cannot tell whether what is said of Silenus's apparition, is the same thing with the dialogue of Silenus and Midas. It is to be found in Ælian (41), as taken from Theopompus. This is an adventure, which appears so fabulous to Ælian, that he concludes the recital of it with these words: Καὶ ταῦτα εἰ τῷ πεισθῶν ὁ Χίος λέγων, πεπιστεύθη. ἐμοὶ δὲ δεινὸς εἶναι δοκεῖ μυθολογῶν, καὶ ἐν ἑστέροις, καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δὲ. Hæc, si cui fide dignus videtur Chius, (i. e. Theopompus) credat. Mihi egregius fabulator tum in his, tum in aliis videtur (42). - And these may meet with credit among such as can trust the veracity of the Chian (that is, Theopompus) who relates them. But to me, he appears, both in these and other things, most notoriously fabulous. It may be doubted whether Dionysius had that dialogue in his view, for he speaks only of the fables inserted in Theopompus's History, and Servius informs us, that Theopompus had related that story in a book intitled, *Thaumasia*, *Wonderful things* (43). But this doubt is not very strongly founded; since that Historian might have repeated in his History what he had said in another book, or might have adorned his *Thaumasia* with some pieces of his History.

Note, we ought not to reckon among Theopompus's fables his Geographical mistakes, or the falsities grounded upon some relations, which it was difficult for him to rectify (44): in this last class ought to be placed, the falsities vented by him concerning the Egyptians (45).

Here is a touch upon the length of his harangues: But as for those long speeches, and tedious harangues, which Theopompus, Ephorus, and Anaximenes, put into the mouths of their Captains, at the head of their soldiers just ready to engage, we may say of them with the Poet,

They're fools who thus the tongue employ,
So very near the enemy (46).

[H] He is also blamed . . . for being too satirical. Vossius (47) quotes three authorities for it, that of Cornelius Nepos (48), Lucian, and Josephus. The latter observes, that Theopompus defamed the Athenians (49). The words of the second deserve to be set down. He says, that the Historians, who insert speeches in their Histories, ought to be sparing of their praises and censures, and to remember that they are not at the bar; or otherwise that they will be guilty of Theopompus's fault: Τὴν αὐτὴν Θεοπόμπῳ αἰτιαν ἔχεις, φιλαπεχθονίας κατηγοροῦντι τῶν πλείων, καὶ διατεβῶν ποιμὴν τὸ πᾶν, ὥς uno laudando κατηγορεῖν μάλλον, ἢ ἰσορροπῶν τὰ περὶ ἑκάστην. (Alciade) com- Alioqui in eadem eris culpa qua Theopompus, qui plurimos odiosè nimis accusat, & eam rem in studium quoddam vertit, ut accuset magis, quam res gestas historiarum tradat (50). - You will commit the same fault with Theopompus, who was too satirical on several, and made it his business rather to write satire than History. Vossius to these three might also have added the authority of Plutarch, who says, that Theopompus is more to be credited when he praises than when he censures. Ὡς μάλλον ἐπαίνῳ πιστεύειν αἰτιαν τῆς ἰσορροπίας. Cui celebranti credas magis quam obterenti (51). Dionysius Halicarnæus takes Theopompus's part on this head: he compares him with Physicians, who lance and cauterize the infected parts to the quick, but without hurting those that are sound. Proinde etiam obrectator videtur esse, dum nonnullos debitis convitiis afficit, & facta virorum illustrium non necessaria perstringit: simile quiddam faciens ac medici, qui corruptas corporis partes secant & urunt, quam profundissime cauteria & sectiones immittentes, non tamen sanas corporis partes & bene affectas attingunt (52). - He also seems given to scandal, while he loads some with deserved reproaches, and spares not the slips of the greatest persons:

(41) Ælian. Var. Hist. lib. iii, cap. xviij, pag. m. 200.

(42) Id. lib. vii, pag. m. 112.

(43) Servius in Virgil. Eclog. VI, vers. 13, & 26.

(44) See Strabo, lib. vii, p. 219.

(45) See Diodorus Siculus, lib. i, cap. xxxvii.

(46) Plutarch. in Præceptis Reipublice, p. 803. Amynta's translation.

(47) Vossius, de Hist. Græc. pag. 33.

(48) Theopompus . . . & Timæus qui quidem duo malevolentissimi nemici quo modo in illo uno laudando

(49) Cornelius Nepos, in Alciade, cap. xi.

(50) Josephus, contra Apionem.

(51) Lucianus, vere Historie, lib. i, pag. m. 705, Tom. i.

(52) Plutarch. in Lyfandro, p. 64.

his name, and in a style altogether like his, a considerable republics of Greece [I]. We have great loss [K]; for the character which a great make us lament the loss of them. He says, causes of actions, and into the tempers and that he was very lucky in his conjecture (g), and under the appearance of virtues (b): so that his conduct was examined with all the exactness. I omit the other high encomiums bestowed on him in the remark [C], what judgment the. What has been quoted out of his works by them regretted. It has been observed, that there is in that author (i). All that I can say concerning Chio with his father, who was convicted of sins (k). He was re-established in his country by a letter, which Alexander wrote to procure his

(f) Dionys. Halicarn. Epist. ad Pompeium, pag. 263, 264. See also pag. 191.

(g) Idem, pag. 191.

(b) Idem, pag. 263.

(i) Plutarch. in Agesilao, pag. 614, C.

(k) Photius, in Biblioth. num. 176.

discourses of a Panegyrist should influence either his conversation, or the moral and historical books he writes. This distinction may be observed even at this day. One who on a solemn day, as for instance, when prizes are distributed, bestows noble and magnificent encomiums, will not spare his censures fitting by the fire-side; and even though he enjoys still his pension, he will say many unacceptable things, if he turns Historian. I do not say that every body acts in this manner. There are but too many, who prove as great flatterers under the character of an Historian, as under that of an Orator. But Theopompus and some others were not of this stamp.

[I] He had a most terrible trick put upon him, which was by publishing in his name, and in a style . . . a History, which reflected upon the most considerable republics of Greece.] Anaximenes, his enemy, put that trick upon him. It is related by Pausanias, who, if I am not mistaken, is the only author that mentions it. These are his words: φαίνεται δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν ὁ Ἀναξίμενης ἐχθρὸν ἐκ ἀμαθείας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπιφθονώτατα ἀμυνόμενος. Ἐπεφυκε μὲν αὐτῷ σοφιστῆς, καὶ σοφιστῶν λόγους μιμνῆσθαι. ὥς δὲ οἱ διάφοροι ἐς Θεόπομπον ἐγγράφοντες τὸν Δαμασίστρατον, γράφει βιβλίον ἐς Ἀθηναίους, καὶ ἐπὶ Λακεδαιμονίους ὁμῶς καὶ Θηβαίους συγγραφήν λοιδόρεν. ὥς δὲ ἦν ἐς τὸ ἀκρεβέστατον αὐτῷ μιμημένον, ἐπιγράψας τῷ Θεόπομπῳ τὸ ὄνομα τῷ βιβλίῳ, διέπεμψεν ἐς τὰς πόλεις. καὶ αὐτῷ τε συγγεγραμῶς ἦν, καὶ τῷ ἐχθρῷ τῷ ἐς Θεόπομπον ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐσπύετο. Idem etiam Anaximenes inimicum suum non minus vafre quam invidiosus ultus dicitur. Nam qui ingenio sophista esset, quam sophistarum orationem aptissime imitaretur, suscepta cum Theopompo Damastirati filio similitate, e historiam conscripsit maledictorum in Athenienses, Lacedaemonios, & Thebanos plenissimam. Ad unguem vero quum Theopompi stylum expressisset, supposito ejus nomine, per Græciæ civitates librum divulgandum curavit: quæ res Theopompo magnam apud omnes plane Græcos invidiam concitavit (61). . . . But Anaximenes appears to have revenged himself on his enemy, not only very dextrously, but also very invidiously. For he was both a Sophist himself, and an excellent imitator of others. So that having a difference with Theopompus, the son of Damastiratus, he wrote a book which was a severe libel upon the Athenians, the Lacedaemonians, and the Thebans. And as he had imitated the style of Theopompus to the greatest exactness, he put Theopompus's name to it, and dispersed it through those cities. By this contrivance he raised a great resentment against Theopompus throughout all Greece.

(61) Pausan. lib. vi, pag. 496, Edit. 1696.

(62) Photius, in Biblioth. num. 170, pag. 392.

(63) Dionys. Halicarn. Epist. ad Pompeium, in fine.

(64) Athen. lib. xiii, pag. 595.

(65) Id. ibid. pag. 586.

(66) Idem, lib. iii, pag. 230.

(67) Id. lib. xiii, pag. 604.

(68) Id. lib. xi, pag. 508.

(69) Schol. A. Arist. in Aves.

(70) Apollonius, Hist. comment. cap. x. Laër. tius, in Epimeneide & Pherecyde. Servius, ubi supra.

[K] We have none of his books remaining which is a great loss.] He published a great number of Orations (62), and several letters (63). He wrote one to Alexander (64), and another to the inhabitants of Chio (65), which are quoted by Athenæus. He also wrote some advices to that Prince (66). His treatise περὶ τῶν συληθέντων ἐκ Δελφῶν χρημάτων: de rebus quæ sacrilegio ex Delphis surreptæ sunt (67); and that κατὰ τὴν Ἰλιάδων διατεταγμένης: de exercitationibus Platonis (68), are quoted by the same author. His dissertation περὶ εὐσεβείας, de Pietate, is quoted by the scholiast upon Aristophanes (69). Others cite his θαυμάσια, admiranda (70); but he acquired his reputation principally by two Histories. One was that

(n) Strabo, lib.
xiv, pag. 444.
See also Athe-
næus, book vi,
pag. 230.

(m) Dionys. Halicarn. Epist. ad Pompeium, pag. 263.

(71) Anonym.
in Descript. O-
lymp *apud* Vof-
fium, ubi supra
pag. 32.

(72) Photius,
Bibl. num. 176,
pag. 389.

(73) Diodorus
Siculus, *lib. xvii*
cap. iii.

(74) Jonsius, de
Script. Hist.
Philos. pag. 46
raises it.

(75) Vossius, d.
Hist. Grecis,
pag. 31.

(76) See Mau-
fac's Notes upon
Harpocraton,
voce ΚΑΤΑΤΛΕ

(77) Pag. m.
64. 65.

(78) Hugo Gr
tius, in Anno
tis *ad Librum*
de Veritate R.
lig. Christ. p.
m. 181.

(79) It is at
pag. 7, of the
Amsterdam e
tion. 1602.

(80) Porphyrius,
lib. i, τῆς Φι-
λολογίας ἀκρο-
άσεως de erudito
auditu, *apud* Eu-
sebiūm, Præpar.
Evangel. *lib. x*,
cap. iii, pag. m.
464.

rk (74).
Vossius is mistaken when he says, that Harpocration quotes a letter of Theopompus to Tifamenes (75). This is not true: Harpocration quotes a dramatic piece written by Theopompus, the comic Poet, and entitled *Tifamenes* (76).

[L] *The title of a peripatetic Philosopher, bestowed on him by Grotius.* The resurrection of a dead body,

101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612

ominibus. -- *And Theopompus in the eighth book of his*
Philippics, who says that, according to the Magi, men
are to rise again, and become immortal, and that all
things are to remain perpetually under the same denomi-
nations. He speaks here of Theopompus the Hi-
erorian, who makes the subject of this article. Now
I do not remember ever to have read, that he was
placed in the number of Philosophers; and I think
he was too proud to become the disciple of Aristotle
at an age so far advanced. But even though the
fault of Grotius could be excused, he would be liable
to just censure upon another account. For what he
quotes out of Diogenes Laërtius proves only that
Theopompus mentioned in his History the opinion
of the Magi, concerning the resurrection. Let us sup-
pose Theopompus to have been a very illustrious Per-
ipatetic, will it follow from his passage, alledged by
Diogenes Laërtius, that a famous disciple of the great
Aristotle believed, that men would rise again? I
Historians believe whatever they relate? If Mr
Cordemoi, who was a Cartesien, had inserted in his
History of France a doctrine of the ancient Druids,
might it be concluded from thence, that this doctrine
was believed among the Cartesians? This is certainly
a very weak passage in the learned commentary, which
Grotius added to his excellent book concerning the
truth of the Christian Religion.

[M] Theopompus was accused of being a Plagiarist. It is pretended (80), that he inserted word for word in the eleventh book of his $\Phi\iota\lambda\iota\pi\pi\iota\kappa\alpha$, a long

sage out of an oration of Isocrates; that upon other occasions, in order to hide his robberies, he changed the scene and the names of the persons; that, for instance, he related, that Pherecydes having drunk of the water of a well in a town of Syria, foretold an earthquake which happened three days after; and that he took that course because he was sensible, that if he had mentioned that earthquake, as a thing foretold by Pythagoras, in the town of Metapontum, his Plagiarism might have been discovered, and his readers would have known that he had it from a book of Andron (81). It is added, that he stole several things from Xenophon, and spoiled them: for resolving to insert in the eleventh book of his History of Greece the conference of Pharnabazus and Agætiæus, which Xenophon had so well described, he deprived it of its beauty. He would not use the words of the author he stole it from, for two reasons, the one was with a view to conceal his theft, the other out of a desire to shew how well he could flourish upon so fine a subject; but he came off wretchedly: his narration was languid, and remarkable only for its heaviness and dullness, whereas that of Xenophon was full of vivacity. Τὰ γὰρ περὶ τῆς φαρναβάζου πρὸς Ἀγέτιαν συνόδου . . . εἰς τὴν ἐνδεκάτην τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν μεταθεῖς ὁ Θεοπόμπος, ἀργὰ τε καὶ ἀκίνητα πειστικῶς καὶ ἀπεσπῆτα λόγῳ γὰρ δύναμιν, καὶ διὰ τὴν κλοπὴν, ἔξερρασιαν ἐμβάλλειν, καὶ ἐπιδεικνύσθαι σπατάλῳ, βεβῶσι, καὶ μίλλον, καὶ ἀναβαλλομένῳ τοῖς αἰσινεταί, καὶ τὸ ἐμψυχον καὶ ἐνεργὸν τὸ ἑσπορῶν διὰ τὸ διαφθεῖραι. *Nam illum sane Pharnabazi cum Agætiao congressum . . . in Græcarum historiarum undecimum transfulit Theopompus: verum ita quidem, ut omnia sine vi, sine motu, habere prout ac jacere viderantur. Dum enim is, ut plagium dissimulet, dicendi facultatem ostentare gessit, et elaboratæ dictionis cultum affert, tardus, confusibundus: ac procrastinanti similis videtur, adeoque vivam illam a spirantem Xenophonis efficacitatem elidit (82). Lastly we are told (83) of a book intitled Ἰνquestαι, *In**

We must observe, by the by, that if Theopompus falsified what he stole from Andron, it affords us an example of what is said, that falsehood makes a greater progress than truth. Many grave writers ascribe the prediction to Pherecydes (84).

We must not forget, that Porphyrius accuses him also of preferring himself to Iocrates, and of boasting that he had got the better of him in a trial of eloquence upon Mausolus's tomb. *Καίτοι ὑπερβόησεν τὴν ἰσοκράτην καὶ νενικησάμην ὑφ' αὐτοῦ λέγει καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ Μουσουλῷ αἰῶνα, τὸν διδασκαλόν.* Iocrotem interea deficit, eoque certamine, quod Mausoli honorem institutum est, victum ab sefe M. gifftrum gloriatur (85). --- *And be despised Iocrotem and boasted that he had conquered his master at his orations at the tomb of Mausolus.* Photius ought have mentioned this particular among those of the same nature related by him. I cannot tell why he has omitted it. He says, Theopompus himself declares, that Iocrates, Theodectus, Naucrates, and myself, were at that time the four greatest Orators in Greece (86), that Iocrates and Theodectus being poor, composed Orations for money, and kept schools for a livelihood, but that he and Naucrates, having wherewithal to live handsomely, spent all their spare time in study. Note, that the translator does not well exprefs the sense of these words: *καὶ ὡς αὐτὸν εἰν αὐτῷ παράλογον, ἀντιποικίμενον τῶν πταιῶν* (87). He pretends the meaning of it is, *ought not to be thought strange that I should*

(81) Who collected Pythagoras's predictions in a book intitled *Tripot*. *Id. ibid.*

(82) Porphyria,
ubi supra, pag.
465.

s (83) *Id. ibid.*
pag. 467.

(84) Cicero, *El*
i, ii, de Divinat
Plinius, *lib. ii*
cap. lxxix. A-
pollonius Hist.
memor. *lib. v*
Diogen. Laërt.
lib. i, num. 116

es, (85) Porphyri
ubi supra, pag
to 464.

(36) Τύτρε
ἀμα αὐτῷ τῷ
πρωτῷ τῇ
ἐν λόγοις τῷ
δαίσις ἔχιν
τοῖς Ἑλλαν
Hos secum in
dicendi facul
principatum
Græcia tenui
Photius Bibl
num. 176, 1

place (87) Id. ibi
self

(88) Neque vero
tristis se aut
preter rationem
primas sibi vin-
dicare.

myself in the first rank (88). Theopompus was not so proud; he only says, that he may reckon himself among the first without being guilty of rashness.

This is a sufficient piece of vanity, and needs not be increased by an unfaithful translation.

THERON (VITAL) a French Jesuit, was born at Limoux in Languedoc in the year 1572. He turned Jesuit in 1587. He taught Rhetoric, Philosophy, and Moral Divinity, and professed the fourth vow. He applied himself to preaching for the space of fifty years and this he did in the most considerable towns of France. He was rector of the college of Montauban, and provincial of the province of Toulouse (a). He published at several times a great many Latin verses, that were very much esteemed, and continued these compositions even in his old age, when it did not appear that his poetical vein was in the least impaired. Balzac commended him mightily for it [A]. He was mistaken as to the age he ascribed to him [B]. This Jesuit died at Toulouse the twenty-fifth of February 1657 (b).

The Chevalier Theron, his nephew, captain in the regiment of Lanoy, and son of a counsellor in the parliament of Toulouse (c), is a good French Poet. In the *Mercur Galant* (d) may be seen a small poem of his composing.

(a) Taken from
Sotuel, in Bibl.
Scriptor. Societa-
tis Jesu, pag.
784.

(b) Id. ibid.

(c) Merc. Galant,
January 1703,
pag. 112.

(d) Ibid.

[A] When it did not appear that his poetical vein was in the least impaired. Balzac commended him mightily for it.] Here follow some thoughts of Balzac: they are taken from a letter written by him to Father Theron, the fourth of March 1643. *The winters of Naples, full of light, and crowned with roses, give me a lively image of your old age. That of Massinissa was not so brisk and vigorous; and the child he got at four years of age was not a production comparable to the Poem you have composed at seventy-five. This shows, that the fire which descends from Heaven, by way of Inspiration, is not extinguished by the abatement of natural heat. And if art has attained the invention of inextinguishable lamps, the Master of Art may no doubt preserve in its full force the luminous part of our mind, and continue the ardour and vivacity of its fountains. . . . I find myself obliged to contradict a wrong saying, which I advanced formerly as an eternal truth. That there is no such thing as a fine old age. I beg pardon for this rash saying. I was not then acquainted with your Muse, which gives the lie to my proposition, and demolishes a proverb I expected to have made current. The old age of your Muse is not the decay, but the confirmation of her beauty. . . . Had I the courage of the authors of your country, I should say a great deal more upon it: I would say, at least, of this admirable old lady, that, at the age of Hecuba, she has as many lovers as Helena had in the flower of her youth. I could name an infinite number, who burn in Paris, and fight on this side of the Loire (1). In order to give some weight to those encomiums, I must observe, that Balzac praised Father Theron very much in the letters he addressed to his other correspondents. This is what he wrote to his friend Chapelain. 'Since you have the curiosity to know the character of Father Theron, whom I thought you had known much better than I do, I must tell you that he is a Poet above seventy-five years old. Soon after the King's birth he made two Poems in short verses, which I take to be Glyconick; and the late King, on the favourable character he had received of them, ordered*

'Motin to translate them. They are intitled, *The Crowns, and the Dauphins*, and have been printed at Paris in Latin and French. They are two valuable pieces, and I am sure you will be pleased with them. I have seen some other things of his, where in I have observed an excellent genius; but I know at the same time that he is lazy, and cares the least of any man alive to employ his talent (2).'

Mr Baillet does not so much as mention this Poet. [B] Balzac . . . was mistaken as to the age he ascribed to him.] We have just now seen, that he said on the 15th of February 1641, that Father Theron was then above seventy-five years old. At this rate that Jesuit must have been born in 1566. But this is false; for Alegambe and Southwell make him but fifteen years of age when he was admitted among the Jesuits in the year 1587. Such mistakes are commonly disobliging; for few people like to be accounted older than they are. I do not except even those who do not intend to marry. I know very well that some old men, who, as it was said of the first Duke d'Epemon, have passed the age of dying, are as willing to make themselves five or six years older than they are, as they were formerly desirous to make themselves younger by so many years. Vanity finds its account in this, since it is a more wonderful thing that a man of ninety or a hundred years should still have some vigour, than if he enjoyed his health pretty well at eighty or eighty-five years of age. Other old men are well pleased with a right computation; they are afraid that a wrong reckoning, which brings them nearer than it ought to the end of their race, will make them less respected. However it be, Balzac's misreckoning was of another nature: it was not disobliging, but rather in compliment to Father Theron; a present of six years inspired a greater admiration of his Poetry; the older he was thought to be, the more he was admired for the sprightliness of his verses. However I am of opinion Balzac spoke as he thought.

(2) Idem, Let-
tres à Chapelain,
book vi, Letter vi,
p. m. 283, 284.
It is dated the
15th of February
1641.

(1) Balzac, Let-
tres Choises,
Part. ii, book i,
Letter xviii, pag.
m. 313.

THESMOPHORIA. So they called the festivals celebrated in honour of Ceres, considered as a Law-giver [A]; for there were other festivals consecrated to her,

23

[A] Ceres considered as a Law-giver.] According to the opinion of the Antients, mankind was indebted to this goddess for two great benefactions. She taught them sowing and reaping, and gave them laws.

Prima Ceres unco glebam dimovit aratro:
Prima dedit fruges, alimenta que mitia terris:
Prima dedit leges. Ceresis sumus omnia munus (1).

(1) Ovid. Me-
tam. lib. v, Fab.
vi, ver. 341.

First Ceres taught the lab'ring bind to plow
The pregnant earth, and quick'ning seed to sow.
She first for man did wholesome food provide,
And with just laws the wicked world supply'd:
All good from her deriv'd. . . .

Consult the commentators on the words of Virgil;
VOL. V.

Maissant lesas de more bidentes Legifera Cereri (2). It is therefore very probable that two sorts of feasts were dedicated to her, and that the Thesmophoria were principally instituted with regard to her character of Law-giver (3). The word itself lead us to this opinion; for, according to Hesychius, *θεσμός* signifies a divine law, *νόμος θεῶν*. 'Sacra ipsius Thesmophoria,' id est, legum latio vocatur. . . . Her feast Thesmophoria, so called from her giving of laws. These are the words of Servius on the mentioned passage of Virgil; but this did not hinder the practice of some ceremonies relating to her character of inventress of reaping. Pausanias (4), and one of Gruterus's inscriptions (5) testify, that one of her epithets was *θεσμοποιός*. For the rest, the following passage may serve as a proof of what is advanced in the text of this article; that the sacred books were carried by virgins of unspotted reputation

(2) Virgil, *Æn.*
lib. iv, ver. 58.

(3) See Castella-
nus de Festis
Græcor. p. 166.

(4) Pausan. lib.
x, pag. 352.

(5) Gruteri, In-
script. pag. 309.

(a) See Aristophanes in *Θεσμοφορίας*.

(b) See the remark [A], at the end.

as inventress of the products of the earth. The men were not allowed to be present at the Thesmophoria; and only women of the better rank, who are free, were admitted to celebrate them (a). They went in a procession at Eleusis, carrying the sacred books to be publicly carried by virgins of unspotted reputation (b). This feast lasted three or four days, some say it continued nine, the women were not permitted to lie with their husbands till it was over. It is pretended, that to render this abstinence the more supportable, they lay upon certain leaves which had a refrigerating virtue [B]. But it is very strange,

tation. Πάρθενος γυναῖκες, καὶ τὸν βίον σεμναί, κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς τελετῆς, τὰς νομίμους βίβλους καὶ ἱερὰς ὑπὲρ τῶν κορυφῶν αὐτῶν ἀνέτιθεσαν καὶ ὥσανε λίσσανεσαι ἐπὶ ἄρχοντο εἰς Ἑλευσίναν. Virgines mulieres, vitæque honestæ; quæ per solennitatis diem legales libros & sacros vertice gestantes, tanquam supplicantes Eleusinem contendebant (6). -- Virgins of an upright life, during the ceremonies, carried the sacred books of laws upon their head, and came to Ceres in a praying posture.

(6) Schol. ad Idyll. iv, Theocritus.

(7) Compare with this the remark [B] of the article PHASIS.

[B] To render this abstinence the more supportable (7) . . . they lay upon certain leaves which had a refrigerating virtue. Ovid is silent as to this, and only mentions the custom of their separation from their husbands.

Festa pie Cereris celebrabant annua matres
Illa, quibus nivea velatæ corpora vestæ
Primitias frugum dant spicae ferta suarum:
Perque novem noctes Venerem tactusque viriles
In vetitis numerant (8).

(8) Ovid. Metam. lib. x, vers. 431.

To Ceres now drew nigh the annual feast,
At which the matrons in white stoles were dress'd.
Twisted in wreaths, they bring they yellow grain,
The first ripe products of the grateful plain;
And nine forbidden nights from nuptial joys abstain.

I am not at all surpris'd at his omission of this circumstance, because it was no way pertinent to his design. His silence here therefore is of no consequence. Of all the several authors I could alledge, I shall instance only Pliny and the Scholiast on Theocritus. 'Græci Lygon vocant, alii agnon, quoniam matronæ Thesmophoriis Atheniensium castitatem custodientes, his foliis cubitus sibi sternunt (9). -- The Greeks call it Lygos, others Agnos, because the matrons, in the Athenian festival, called Thesmophoria, in order to preserve themselves chaste, use to lie upon those leaves.' These are the words of Pliny, speaking of the *vites*, which our Botanists call *Agnus Castus*. Where, note, by the way, that they have changed an epithet into a proper name. The Greeks pretended, that those who eat or drank this plant, or laid it under them in their beds, would thereby be preserved from impurity; and therefore gave it the epithet of ἀγνός, from the word ἀγνός, which signifies *chaste*. This word is now become the proper name of the word *vites*, tho' not alone, but with the Latin word of the same signification. As to the scholiast on Theocritus, these are his words: Τὴν κορύζαν, κορύζαν εἶπεν. ἐστὶ φυτόν ἀνικτικώτατον. ἔρθεν καὶ ἐν τοῖς Θεσμοφορίοις ὑποστρωρῶσι τὸ φυτόν τὴν θερμότητα τὴν κατὰ τὰ Ἀρεδίσια ἐκλύποντες. Conyzam dixit Cnyzam. Planta refrigerandi summa vi pollens, quam propterea in Thesmophoriis lecto substernunt, calorem ad res venerens extirpantes (10). -- Conyza be called Cnyza. It is a most refrigerating plant. Hence, in the Thesmophoria, they laid this plant under them to prevent venereal inclinations. It ought to be observed, that he speaks of conyza or cunilago, a plant of a different species from that mentioned by Pliny. And also upon what occasion this remark was made; which was to explain a place in Theocritus, where a shepherd is introduced telling what he would do, in case his dear friend should make a prosperous voyage to Mitylene. 'I will place, says he, a crown of flowers on my head, I will drink of the best wine, and strew herbs on my bed up to my elbows.'

(9) Plinius, lib. xxv, cap. ix, pag. m. 327. *Further Hardwin says on this passage, Hæc tamen verba.* Dioscor. lib. i, cap. 137. & Galenus, lib. 6, de sic simp. med. pag. 148. *Ælianus item, lib. 9. Hist. animal. cap. 26.*

(10) Scholiast. Theocritus ad Idyll. VII. *He says the same things on the 14th Idyll.* Κούζα φυτόν χερμώδες, ὡς αἱ Θεσμοφορίοι εἰσι δὴ τὴν ἀγνὴν σβιδάσκειται. Cnyza, planta graminis forma qua Cereris sacra celebrantes feminae lecto ad fervendam castitatem inferunt.

Et iborus densatus erit ad cubitum usque
Cnyza, sphodelo & flexibili apio (11).

(11) Theocritus. Idyll. VII, pag. m. 53, 54.

This, recited by the scholiast, was one of the herbs strewed on the women's beds during the Thesmophorian rites in order to preserve them from incontinency. It will be granted me that those who by splendid feasting, and such other signs of joy on a festival, rejoice that their vows are accomplished, have no recourse to those remedies which stifle all amorous thoughts. It is not therefore likely that the *cunilago* had any such effect; and the scholiast of Theocritus advances a thing that is contradicted by the very text on which he comments. Perhaps he would not be in the wrong to affirm, that the strewing of leaves on the women's beds during the Thesmophoria, was only one of the ceremonies of that festival. It is no uncommon thing in great solemnities to strew the streets with flowers and leaves. Festoons are placed on the gates; and sometimes the chambers participate of these ornaments: nor is it unlikely that the Greeks might extend this custom to the beds of those who celebrated the festival of Ceres. In process of time some inquisitive persons, fond of discovering mysteries, at last imagined, that sage antiquity had found this to be a remedy against incontinency. Nay, I cannot tell whether the wits and satirists were not the inventors of this supposition, which others a long time after might deliver seriously, and as a real fact. It is certain, a more discrediting reason for this custom could not have been advanced; nor can I imagine the Grecian women were tame enough to submit to a remedy which would so publicly proclaim their lasciviousness. Their consent was not waited for, some will say: but I might answer, did Greece ever put the sex on such a foot, as to subject them to shameful customs. It is not easy to find in the whole map of the world, one corner of the earth, where things are established on this foot; and if we would find such a place, we ought not to look for it in Attica, Peloponnesus, or the isles of the Ægean sea. In order to make this probable, it should be said, that the honour of the women was not in the least concerned in these strewings of *Agnus Castus*. But who will believe it? Must not he have a very mean opinion of their virtue, who can imagine that married women could not lie alone five or six nights, (or put it nine, (12) if you please) without rendering themselves unworthy by temptations, and impure proceedings, to celebrate a festival where chastity was required? I expect to be answered, that all countries are not alike, and that in climates less hot than Greece, wine or strong liquors, tho' plentifully drank, would not produce the same venereal irritations that the meanest food would elsewhere occasion; and that consequently we ought not to judge of the ceremonies of the feasts of Ceres by the desires of the northern nations. But admit we do not stir out of Greece, I persist in my opinion, that these motives for the use of *Agnus Castus* are not at all probable: for if the women, of their own accord had recourse to this remedy, they must acknowledge a very great weakness, and proclaim a scandalous infirmity, and which neither modesty nor prudence would permit them to reveal. Prudence, I say, because such a confession might cruelly disturb and alarm their husbands. Some might by trading be obliged to several weeks absence. A law-suit might detain others as long. Several went to the wars, or engaged in foreign voyages. Those who never went from home, were not always in good health; and those who were could not tell how soon they might fall sick. What ground was there, in all these cases to rely on their wives chastity, who made profession of their incontinency, at the Thesmophorian feast? This was a very august festival, a solemn act of religion; the women held the principal functions of this holy ceremony. Chastity was necessary for their celebrating this solemnity, the ritual enjoined it. They had

(12) Ovid, m. may be seen above citation (8), makes this festival of Ceres last nine days.

Ἄ δ' εἰς αἶς ἐσσεῖται πεπυκασμένα ἐς τ' ἐπὶ
παῦχον
Κορύζαν ἀσφοδιώπτε πολυγνάμπωπε σελίνω

strange, generally speaking, that they should want such a remedy; and yet more so that they should acknowledge the necessity of it. The principal object of their worship in this festival, was that part which distinguishes them from men [C]. You may very well

had therefore the most powerful motives to continence: the divine worship, conscience, the public prosperity, the honour of Ceres, and the awfulness of her mysteries were all concerned in it: and nevertheless we are told, they owned themselves unable to contain during the short term of this festival. What was then to be expected from their virtue, when put to longer trials on other occasions? It is therefore certain, that by having recourse to *Agnus Castus*, they must have betrayed a great imprudence, in a voluntary manner, by filling their poor husbands with jealousies and uneasinesses. But what will you say, some may object, if their husbands established this custom? I answer, that if they were the authors of it, either by way of advice, or command, it is not in the least likely that the women would have submitted to it either as a necessary, or at least a very useful remedy; for in accepting of it, they must have confessed a natural infirmity, which would have done great injury to their honour, and rendered them suspected of infidelity in the absence or sickness of their husbands. All the husbands who had been so imprudent as to propose or approve of this counsel, would have exposed the reputation of their wives. The wits could not have failed to cry out, These good men know how matters stand, a dire experience has obliged them to hunt after expedients; they never have a night's quiet, except those which religion provides for them. But when they lie by whilst the Theismophorian rites are solemnized, the remembrance of what is past, makes them glad to rely on the virtue of *Agnus Castus*. I must repeat the observation I have made before. To what purpose would they have relied on that virtue during the festival? Would this have appeased the alarms of those who were gone a long voyage, or a long journey? Would it satisfy the minds of the sick? It may be affirmed, that whoever should have introduced this custom, would have deserved to pass for a disturber of the public peace.

A hundred other reasons convince me, that the use of the *Agnus Castus* in the beds of the women who celebrated the Theismophorian rites, was not founded on the motive which is alleged. The same reason which led to the enjoining this remedy to married women, during that festival, would have occasioned it's being prescribed to them during the absence or indisposition of their husbands, and to young widows and virgins all the year long. Since therefore the latter was not done, we ought not to give the least credit to the former. If both of them had been practised in the manner I have mentioned, we should find in some author or other, that no plant was more common than *Agnus Castus* all over Greece. Every person would have had a great many beds of them in his garden; whole forests had been filled with it, and expert planters employed on purpose to cultivate it; for the frequent stripping of it's leaves, would have required the greater care in keeping it alive. It would have been the first care of those, who, in their declining years, should have married women much younger than themselves, to make large plantations of *Agnus Castus*, that they might continually have a decent remedy to assuage those desires they could neither prevent nor satisfy. The leaves of this shrub would have been worshipped as the tutelary god of married men, and a *Deus averruncus*, or *alexicaeus*, with respect to cuckoldom. Some Juvenal would have congratulated Greece upon it (13): and it would have been observed of these leaves what another hath said of frogs (14). But we find no appearance of any such thing in the monuments of Antiquity.

Perhaps it may be objected, that the Theismophorian rites exacted an extraordinary purity, an imagination exempt from what the Casuists call *unruly thoughts*, an uninterrupted application to the excellency and sublimities of chastity; which was unnecessary at other times. All the answer I shall make to this, is, to ask what proof there are of this extraordinary peculiarity of the Theismophoria. I am sure such a notion of this festival is only imaginary (15). I would also add, that neither *Agnus Castus*, nor *Canilago*, nor willow-

leaves (16), &c. are capable of inspiring such a purity, and moreover I reason thus: The Athenians were too sensible a people, to believe that a few leaves between the sheets were sufficient to mortify leudness. I will grant that there are some herbs, which, in length of time, may refrigerate those who eat them; but as to the external application of them, I cannot tell whether it may not justly be said of lust as of death, 'vires vim mortis non est medicamen in hortis.' -- Death's power is not subdued by herbs. I cannot forget the answer of Theano, Pythagoras's daughter, who, when asked, *How many days respite, after having to do with a man, were requisite to qualify a woman to assist at the Theismophoria?* replied, She was qualified the minute after, if she had to do with her husband, but never if with any other. *Apud Theodoretum*, lib. 12. Græcanicarum affectionum, Pythagorica Theano, rogata *quoto demum die mulieri liceret à complexu viri Theismophoriis interesse?* 'Απὸ μὲν τῆ ἰδίας περὶ ἡμέρας, ἐν ᾗ ἀπὸ δὲ ἀλλοτρίης ἐδέτοτο. *Ei quæ à proprio viro surrexerit, statim licere respondit; quæ ab alieno nunquam* (17). This moral decision of Theano doth not in the least favour of rigour. Such a lady as she would not, if now alive, condemn frequenting the communion under pretence of too short an interval after the conjugal duty. What may farther be inferred from her answer, is, that in order to a due performance of the Theismophorian functions, a preparation of some days continence was thought necessary. But as this prolonged the time of abstinence, it may be objected that I ought not to be surprized, that they should have had recourse to *Agnus Castus*. But this is indeed too weak an objection to make me alter my opinion. I refer the reader to what is said in my last remark but one.

It would be unjust to condemn my criticisms on this head, for equity will not permit us to sacrifice the reputation of an infinite number of Grecian women, to all the consequences which may be drawn from the testimony of Pliny and some others, if they have not deserved such an affront.

[C] *The principal object of their worship in this festival, was that part which distinguishes them from men.* Fasoldus, who has wrote a small tract on the Grecian festivals, cites Theodoret in relation to this circumstance. 'In hoc quoque festo pudenda muliebris mulieres illæ initiatæ honore divino afficiebant. -- In this festival also the women who were initiated paid divine honours to the pudenda muliebris.' Theodoretus, lib. 3. Græcan. Affection. (18). He doth not cite the words of Theodoret, tho' he found them in Castellanus in the manner following: Καὶ τὸν κτήνα τὸν γυναικῆιον (ἴσως δὲ τὸ γυναικῆιον ὀνομαζομένη) ἐν τοῖς Θεισμοφορίοις, παρὰ τῶν τελεσσομένων γυναικῶν θείας τιμῆς ἀξίωμεν. Nec minus muliebrem pestinem (sic enim pudenda mulieris vocant) in Cereris festo, mulieres initiatæ divino honore dignum habent (19). -- And the pesten muliebris also, (so they called the pudendum muliebre) was esteemed by Festus Græcorum the women initiated at the Theismophoria to be worthy of divine honour. Fasoldus also informs us, that at Syracuse they carried a representation of this part, formed with a sort of meal and honey, in a procession on the last day of the feast in honour of Ceres and Proserpine. This he grounds on the authority of Athenæus, lib. 14.

Athenæus, says he (20), refers muliebris pudenda, μύλλοι appellata, quæ ex sesamo & melle facta erant, ultimo die hujus festi apud Syracusanos, qui hæc sacra etiam observant, Cereri & Proserpinæ circumlata fuisse. -- Athenæus relates, that the pudenda muliebris, called μύλλοι, made of flour and honey, on the last day of this feast, which were observed by the Syracusians, were carried in honour of Ceres and Proserpine. Perhaps he hath not rendered the sense of Athenæus exactly, and instead of the last day of the festival, he ought to have translated it at the great Theismophoria. The Greek runs thus: Ἡγεκλειδῆς δὲ Συρακούσιος ἐν τῷ περὶ θεσμῶν, ἐν Συρακούσαις φησὶ τοῖς παντελείοις τῶν θεσμοφορίων ἐκ σπέρματος καὶ μέλιτος κατὰ σκευὴν ἀφ' ἧς αἱ γυναῖκες, ἀκαλεῖσθαι κατὰ πᾶσαν Σικελίαν μύλλους,

(16) Salicem habere vim permendi feminis, & libidinis extinguendæ. author est Theophrastus. Ἐπιανὸς Ἀφροδίτης μάλα μὲν πυνκτοῖ. Ἄλλοι δὲ γυναικῶν κατὰν ἀπαιτῶν. (17) Id. ibid. (18) Joh. Fasoldus, in Græcorum veterum Ἱερολογία, Dec. III, sum. 1, pag. m. 280. (19) Castell. de rum, pag. 173. (20) Fasoldus, in Græcorum veterum Ἱερολογία, Dec. III, sum. 1, pag. m. 280.

(13) O sanctas gentes quibus hæc nascuntur in hortis Numina. Juven. Sat. XV, ver. 10.

(14) See the passage of Pliny cited in the remark [I], of the article DE MOCRITUS.

(15) See the following remark.

well imagine the ancient fathers did not spare the Heathens on the subject of such ceremonies. For the rest those who celebrated this festival were obliged to watch the whole night [D].

I shall

(21) Athen. lib. vii, pag. 647.

(22) The translation note is, Ceres Thesmophoria & mysteria, majora minoraque fuerunt. Vide Cysalodum.

(23) The translation note here, is, τὰς θεαῖς ἀλλοτρίαις θεαῖς, nempe Ceres & Proserpine. He falsely supposes, that τὰς θεαῖς, is put into the text.

(24) Montagne, Essays, lib. iii, cap. v, pag. 128, 129.

(25) To this may be referred what Daniel Heinfius saith in his answer to Balzac's Dissertation on Herodes infantia, pag. 112. Quem (Pana) eundem cum Priapo, quem pudenter nec pudendum modo sed pudendi fuit prope partem faciant. Arnobius, lib. vi, pag. 209, Jovis genitalibus propriis inferior Priapus.

(26) Sic effata, sine vestem contraxit ab imo, Obiecte oculis formatae inguinibus res: Quas cava succubitus Baubo manu, nam puerilis Ollis vultus erat, plaudebat, contrectat amice. Orpheus, apud Arnobium, lib. vi, pag. 175. See Clemens Alexandrinus, in Protrept. pag. 13.

(27) Arnob. lib. vi, pag. 174, 175.

campus renders it thus: Heraclides Syracusius libro de vetustis & sanctis moribus, scribit, apud Syracusios in Thesmophoriis (22), ex sismo & mille fingi pendenda muliebria, quæ per ludos & spectacula (23) circumdabantur & in tota Sicilia vocabantur Mylli. You will find in Montagne's Essays a great many such passages. I have not seen this in the place where he observes (24), that in the greatest part of the world this part of our bodies was desired and distinguished by the chief magistrates were revered and distinguished by this part; and that in several ceremonies, instituted in honour of divers deities, the representation of it was carried about in pomp. The Egyptian dames, in their Bacchanal feasts, wore a wooden one, finely covered, about their necks, proportioned in size and weight to their strength; besides that, the statue of their god was furnished with one far surpassing the other parts of his body (25). The married women in my neighbourhood, adjust the upper-part of their head-dress to that shape, in order to boast of the pleasure they received from it; and when they become widows, they turn it behind, and hide it under their head-dresses. It is probable that the reason why the part proper to the other sex had such honours paid to it in the Thesmophoria, was in remembrance of the good service it had done to Ceres. This goddess having made a strict search after Proserpine, who had been stolen away from her, without being able to find her, arrived very disconsolate at Eleusis. Here an old country-woman, named Baubo, used all endeavours to persuade her to take some refreshment, and to drive away melancholy. But all to no purpose. Ceres ultimately refused every thing, and would not admit of any consolation. Baubo changed the scene and endeavoured to divert the goddess with a new invented spectacle. She retired into another chamber, where she tricked up a certain thing which had been long neglected, as a piece of waste ground; after which she returned to the goddess, to whom she shewed her nudity, putting her body in the most extravagant postures she possibly could (26). Ceres fixing her eyes on this object could not help laughing, and soon after accepted of the proffered refreshments. I cannot describe this in our language so naturally as an ancient Father of the Church has done, whose words are these. Rogat illa (Baubo) atque hortatur contra, sicut mos est in hujusmodi casibus, ne fastidium suæ humanitatis assumat: obstinatissime durat Ceres, & rigoris indomiti pertinaciam retinet. Quod cum sæpius fieret, neque ullis quirit obsequiis ineluctabile propositum satigari, verit Baubo artes, & quam seris non quiebat allicere, ludibriorum statuit exilarare miraculis: partem illam corporis, per quam seculi femineum & subolem proderet, & nomen solet acquirere generi, tum longiore ab incuria liberat: facit sumere habitum puriorem, & in speciem levigari nondum duri atque striculi pusionis: redit ad Deam tristem, & inter illa communia, quibus moris est frangere ac temperare mærores, reteggit se ipsam, atque omnia illa pudoris loca revelatis monstrat inguinibus: atque ubi affigit oculos diva, & inauditi specie solaminis pascitur. Tum diffusor facta per risum, aspernatam sumit atque ebibit potionem: & quod diu nequivit verecundia Baubonis exprimere, propudiosi facinoris extorsit obscenitas (27). Hence with very good reason he vigorously attacks the Pagans on the ridiculous absurdity of their festivals; what, could this object afford so extremely diverting to Ceres, who could at all times see the same in herself? 'Ut animum com- modare alimoniis possint, victuique sumendo, non ratio, non tempus, non sermo aliquis adhibetur gravis, aut affabilitas seria, sed propudiosa corporum monstratur obscenitas, oblectanturque partes illæ, quas pudor communis abscondere atque naturalis verecundia lex jubet: quas inter aures castas sine veni- nosis est, ac sine honoribus appellare præfatis. Quid- nam, quæso, in spectu tali, quid in pudendis fuit verendique Baubonis, quod feminei sexus Deam, & consimili formatam membro, in admirationem converteret atque risum? quod obiectum lumini con- spectuique divino, & oblivionem miseriarum daret, & habitum in lætiorem repentina hilaritate traduce-

ret (28)? -- To induce her to eat, and take some (28) Id. ibid. 'refreshment, neither reason, nor time, nor any grave sag. 176. discourse, or serious complaisance were made use of, but obscene parts, are offered to her view, which com- mon decency and the natural laws of modesty require to be concealed: which to chaste ears without leave or due reverence, ought not so much as to be named. What now, I desire to know, in such a sight as this, what in the pudenda of old Baubo, could move the laughter and admiration of a goddess formed with the same parts herself? What an object was here to de- light the view of a goddess in such a manner, as to drown all thoughts of sorrow, and introduce so sudden an appearance of joy?' Is it not very probable that in commemoration of this adventure, divine honours were decreed to that object which had so opportunely diverted the goddess Ceres? Hence arises an objection against the assertion laid down in the precedent article: for, some will say, the Grecian women ought to be more than ordinarily fortified, when they not only lay alone, but were employed in the contemplation of a subject so apt to taint their imagination, and excite immodest thoughts. I confess, this may in some measure weaken my arguments; but all things well considered, they remain still strong enough to make me continue in my opinion.

[D] They were obliged to watch the noble night.] This might furnish my adversaries with another objection. The husbands, will they say, considering, 1. That their wives were separated from them, whilst they were employed in celebrating the memory of a tickling adventure, and in worshipping a tempting object, of which they were also obliged to make images in paste (29). 2. Their watching all night; might well give some disagreeable suspicions. For watchings have always afforded lucky opportunities. It is therefore not unlikely, that they had recourse to effectual preservatives, such as the leaves of *Agnus Castus*. These difficulties are very inconsiderable; for, besides that all men were absolutely excluded from the Thesmophoria, which might afford a plenary satisfaction to the jealous and distrustful husbands, is it possible to believe the Grecians foolish enough to rely on the feeble assistance of leaves, when they doubted their wives virtue, notwithstanding the engaging obligations laid on them by the necessary circumstances of the festival, such as the utter exclusion of men, the chastity enjoined, the watchings in the temple, &c. if it be asked on what authority I found the text of this remark, I alledge these words of Arnobius (30): 'Vultis enim consideremus mysteria & illa divina, quæ Thesmophoria nominantur à Græcis: quibus gente ab Attica sancta illa pervigilia consecrata sunt & pannychismi (31) graves. . . . Would you have us consider also those divine mysteries which the Greeks call Thesmophoria; in which the Athenians celebrated those holy watchings, and serious vigils.' I do not deny but several disorders were occasioned by these watchings. Plautus's *Aulularia* runs upon the marriage of a young woman who was got with child on such an occasion (32). The Romans never attempted the abolition of some nocturnal feasts, till they discovered their irregularities. Certain Grecian cities also abolished the same ceremonies: and the following words inform us how Aristophanes bantered those devotional watchings (33): 'Diligentissime sciendum est, ut mulierum famam multorum oculis lux clara custodiat, initienturque eo ritu Cereri, quo Romæ initiatur. Quo in genere severitatem majorum fenatus vetus auctoritas de Bacchanalibus; & consulum exercitu adhibito quæstio animadvertitque declarant. Atque omnia nocturna, ne nos duriores fortè videamur, in media Græcia Diagondas Thebanus lege perpetua sustulit. Novos vero Deos, & in his colendis nocturnas pervigiliones sic Aristophanes facetissimus poeta veteris comædiæ vexat, ut apud eum Sabazius, & quidam alii dii de peregrinis judicati è civitate ejiciantur. . . . It is most carefully to be enacted, that day-light and the public eye may guard the reputation of women; and that they be initiated to Ceres, as they are

(29) See, above, citation (21), the passage of Athenæus; but the argument grounded upon it is not very certain, for we do not find by whom these images were made.

(30) Arnobius, lib. vi, p. 173.

(31) That word signifies to watch the whole night, as appears by the glossaries, *perovigilium*, *παννυχισμός*, *παννυχία*.

(32) Is adulterant illius est avunculus. Qui illam stupravit nocte, Ceres vigilavit. He is the uncle: to the youth who dares with her during the vigils of Ceres. Plaut. in Prologo *Aulularia*.

(33) Cicero, de Legibus, lib. ii, fol. 335, A.

I shall observe, on this occasion, a mistake of Brantome; who has falsely asserted, that, according to Pliny, the Vestal virgins made use of *beds of leaves* to preserve their chastity [E].

'are initiated at Rome. How the customs of this kind formerly observed in the Bacchanalias are now approved, the debate of the Senate before the Consuls upon this question, sufficiently decided. All nocturnal ceremonies, that we may not seem less polite than others, have been abolished in the midst of Greece by a perpetual law of Diogenes the Theban. But the most facetious old comic Poet Aristophanes bantered the new Deities, and their nocturnal worship in so severe a manner, that Sabazius and some other gods mentioned by him, were judged foreigners and expelled the city.' Read also what is said by a certain Journalist in his extract of a dissertation of Mr Rainfant. The secular games were not only celebrated for three days, but also three nights together; for they assembled in the temples, where they watched, prayed, and performed their sacrifices: this was what they called *Peruigilium*; and to prevent all indecencies in these public assemblies, the youth of both sexes assisted at them under the conduct of their fathers and their mothers, or some of their elderly relations, who could answer for their deportment, as Augustus had decreed. The precaution was necessary and the law very wise; love is too diligent in quest of favourable opportunities, to forget its interests in these nocturnal assemblies. But it was somewhat late when the Emperor Augustus applied a remedy to it. Prefat sero quam nunquam. Better late than never. It is not to be doubted but before this, the three nights of the secular games were a very happy time for the amorous youth, and that they made the best use they could of it, since they knew it was impossible to enjoy it twice (34). The devotional watchings of the Primitive Church were not entirely free from abuses of this kind; for which reason St Jerom advises the young virgins when they assisted at these rites, not to stir so much as a finger's breadth from their mothers (35). This Father had done much better to acquiesce in the just complaints of Vigilantius, who condemned these nocturnal meetings on account of the impurities there committed (36). They were at last obliged to suppress this devotion, as Cardinal Bellarmine acknowledges. 'Quoniam occasione nocturnarum vigiliarum

'abusum quidem irreperere coperant, vel potius flagitia non raro committi, placuit Ecclesie nocturnos conventus, & vigilias proprie dictas intermittere, ac solum in iisdem diebus celebrare jejunia (37). . . . Because on occasion of the nocturnal watchings, abuses had crept in, or rather horrid vices were too frequently committed, the Church was pleased to forbid those night meetings, and vigils properly so called, and to celebrate fastings only on the same days.'

Without doubt the mandate of the Archbishop of Paris in the year 1697, against the custom of visiting Mont St Valerien in the holy week, was founded on like reasons.

[E] Brantome . . . has falsely asserted, that, according to Pliny, the vestal virgins made use of beds of leaves to preserve their chastity. These are the author's words at large (38): 'I have seen and read a foolish Italian pamphlet, which pretends to give receipts against concupiscence, of which sort it lays down thirty-two, but they are so ridiculous, that I would not advise the women to the use of them, lest they should bring their bodies into too low a condition. This is the reason why I would not here transcribe them. Pliny alledges one of them, which the Vestals and Athenian Ladies formerly made use of during the feasts of Ceres called *Theismophoria*, to refrigerate and extinguish every strong amorous desire, that by this means they might celebrate this festival with the utmost chastity; this was the making beds of the leaves of *Agnus Castus*. But you must imagine that they thus mortified themselves only during the rites; and that afterwards they threw away their beds. I have seen one of these trees at the house of a very fine and honourable lady in Guienne, which the often shewed for its rarity to strangers who came to visit her, and told them the virtue of it; but I could never observe or hear that any of the sex had stuffed the least corner of their bed with its leaves, or plucked so much as one branch, not even the Lady herself, who was the proprietor of the tree and place, and consequently could dispose of it at pleasure. See the margin (39).

(37) Bellarmine, de Ecclesia triumph. lib. iii, cap. ult.

(38) Brantome, Dames Galantes, Tom. ii, pag. m. 163, 164.

(39) It is no wonder, because every woman who had gathered those leaves, must have confessed her infirmity.

(34) Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, March 1685, Art. II, pag. 259, 260.

(35) Vigilantium dies & solennes pernoctationes sic virgineola nostra celebrat, ut ne transferantur quidem unquam a matre discant. Hieronymus ad Letam de Institut. Filiae.

(36) Vide Hieronymum adversus Vigilantium, cap. iv. Consult Mr Van Dale, de Oraculis, pag. 237, of the first edition, and pag. 60, of the second. See also remark [D], in the article VIGILANTIUS.

THIBAUT or THEOBALDUS, Earl of Champagne, the fifth of that name, rendered himself famous among other things by his passion for Queen Blanche [A], St Lewis's mother: and though he was unsuccessful in it, as most Historians believe, yet he exposed this great queen to censorious tongues [B]. Some (a) pretend that he discovered

(a) Varillas, Minorité de S. Louis, printed at the Hague 1685.

[A] His passion for Queen Blanche. Claudius Fauchet has not forgot our Earl of Champagne nor his Amours, when he treats of the ancient French Poets. 'Blanche, says he (1), who was a young, beautiful, and besides a Spanish Lady, managed Thibaut so artfully, that he abandoned the other Barons: and, what was yet more, he discovered the design to seize the King in his return from Orleans to Paris. But Thibaut's Amours displeasing several Lords, it happened (as I find in a certain authentic manuscript Chronicle which I have by me) that Thibaut one day entering the hall where Queen Blanche was, Robert Earl of Artois, the King's brother, threw a soft cheefe in his face, which the Earl of Champagne being affronted at, took occasion to retire from court, in order to avoid a greater disgrace. However the great Chronicle of France tells us, that the Earl again took up arms against the King; but being informed of the great preparations made against him, he sent some of the wisest of his council to desire a peace, which was agreed to. But as the King had been at a great expence on this account, therefore the Earl was obliged to quit Montereau-fault-yonne, and Bray on the Seine, with their appurtenances to him. On this occasion it was (says the great Chronicle) Queen Blanche told the Earl that he ought never to take up arms against the King her son; but should remember that he came even to his own country to assist him against the Barons when they attacked him. The Earl earnestly looking at the wife and charming Queen, and struck with her great beauty, replied, By my faith, Madam, my soul, my body, and all my lands

'are at your command. Nor is there any thing that I can please you which I would not freely undertake: nor will I ever by the grace of God, engage against you or yours. He departed very pensive, often reflecting on the Queen's winning looks and charming air. The tender passion soon seized his heart, but when he remembered that she was a Lady of so high a rank, and strict virtue, that he could never think of enjoying her, it was turned into despair. And because deep thoughts beget melancholy; to divert them he was advised by some wise men, to apply himself to Poetry and Music; in which he succeeded so well, that he composed the most melodious songs that ever were either sung or plaid on instruments, and caused them to be inscribed in the halls of Provins and Troyes. And they are called the King of Navarre's songs.

[B] He exposed this great Queen to censorious tongues (2). Several things gave occasion to it. Thibaut had rendered himself odious by his precipitate retreat from the camp at Avignon, and became more so on account of the suspicions he lay under of having poisoned Lewis the VIIIth; which were increased, when so good an understanding was observed betwixt him and the Queen-Dowager, that he disclosed to her all the designs of the confederate Princes; and all this at a time that several provocations had engaged him to declare himself as one of the chiefs of the league. This looked very like a reciprocal affection betwixt them (3). A widow without this would never come into any correspondence with a man, who is supposed to be her husband's murderer. Besides, the confederate Princes marching into Champagne, met Queen Blanche

(2) See other scandalous reports concerning this queen in the remark [D].

(3) The modern Historian of St Lewis, lib. ii, num. 6, pag. 11, tells us that the confederate which Blanche discovered to be reconciled to Thibaut, tho' she knew he passionately loved her, occasioned several ill reports.

(1) Des anciens Poëtes François, book ii, pag. 117.

V O L. V.

Q q q

discovered his passion, before that princess was a widow [C]: and they add that Lewis the VIIIth the husband of Blanche, was obliged to dissemble the affront, by reason of the wars in which he found himself engaged. That the earl brought this prince considerable forces, and behaved himself very bravely; but that he could not resolve to winter out of his own territories, and that he expressly declared he would return home. That the king imagining this impatience of the earl to proceed only from a desire of seeing the queen, and being also sensible of the great prejudice he should receive by this lord's retreat, used him ill, and threatened him. That Thibaut enraged at the affront, and meditating a terrible revenge caused the king to be poisoned. That finding the queen had the same indifference for him in her widow state as she had before, he confederated with the princes who designed to remove her from the regency; and that they met with no difficulty in engaging him in that affair, because he was easily persuaded that the queen's indifference proceeded from the passion she entertained for the Cardinal Legate [D], who had resided for some time at the Court of France. That it was equally easy for the queen to oblige him to abandon the confederates; for she only acquainted him that she should not be displeased to see him. That he had conceived great hopes of succeeding in his amours by this bare compliment. That he deserted the princes of the league, and discovered their designs to the queen, at a very favourable juncture. That turning their

Blanche on the way; she was going to the Earl's assistance, and would not abandon him, tho' they pursued him as the poisoner of her husband. This conduct appeared so suspicious, that they laughed at the offers she made of punishing Thibaut, in case he was guilty. The following passage is taken from a modern author, who has consulted authentic manuscripts. *The Queen sent a second order to the Princes of the League to quit Champagne; assuring them, that if they had any complaint against Thibaut, she was ready to do them justice. But all she could obtain from them, was that they had taken up arms to do themselves justice, and not to wait for it from a woman, who declared herself the protectress of her husband's murderer (4).*

(4) Histoire de S. Louis, lib. ii, num. 21, pag. m. 84, ad ann. 1229.

As for the songs composed by the Earl, most Historians tell us they proved the ill success of his amours. The passage of Claudius Fauchet already cited, shews that this unfortunate gallant was advised to divert himself with songs, and by this means to expel the melancholy which preyed upon him. Common sense obliges us to believe, that if Blanche had favoured the Earl's passion, he would have better concealed his flame; and that the despair of obtaining any tender returns from the Queen, occasioned such repeated sighs and so many languishing verses as he recorded on the walls of his palace. We are told that it was a sort of folly and extravagance, which a proper compassion in the Queen would have entirely prevented. Let us hear a modern author. 'Whether his presumption equalled his love; or his passion degenerated into folly; or he was prepossessed that concealing would rather increase than cure his dislike; or the Queen's virtue had at last thrown him into despair: it is certain he was so little solicitous to conceal the consuming fire; that he affected to discover it by all means which the most wretched extravagance could suggest to a man of his quality. He composed several amorous songs, in which he discovered more wit than elegance: he found opportunities to hand them to the Queen; they were set to Music; they were fitted to all sorts of Instruments, and to keep up the idea of them when they should lose the grace of novelty, or to preserve the memory of them when the author and the Princess should be no more, he caused them to be engraved in brass, and exposed to the view of all the world in the galleries of his palaces at Troyes and Provins: as if he was afraid that future ages would not be sufficiently informed of his folly, or that the age he lived in was very barren of satirists (5).' Varillas is here mistaken in his Chronology; he supposes Thibaut guilty of all these extravagancies before the death of Lewis the VIIIth: but I chose to rely on the History cited by Fauchet (6), which dates all these songs after the loss of Montreuil and Bray. This agrees with the Chronology of one of our best Historians (7): this loss, says he, did not make him wiser; he still persisted in the foolish passion for the Queen which had ruined him, and retired to his castle of Provins to indulge his amorous extravagance, by making verses and songs. He was obliged to surrender these towns in the year 1235, according to Mezerai (8).

(5) Varillas, Mémoires de S. Louis, pag. 12.

(6) See, above, the remark [A].

(7) Mezerai, ubi infra.

(8) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom. ii, p. 715.

I shall conclude this remark with the words of the modern Historian of St Louis, which are an exact recapitulation of what hath been said. 'The author who has collected most of these scandalous reports, and who perpetually praises Blanche to a degree of excess, speaks of these stories as meer rumours which he had picked up; adding of himself, tho' he was an Englishman, that it would be criminal to give credit to them. He also assures us, as well as another author who was born at Liege, while these reports were yet fresh, that they only proceeded from the animosity of the nobles against the regency and the steadiness of this Princess; and indeed every age furnishes examples enough of this kind. Besides, of the four authors who have related this story, not one has so much as insinuated that the Queen had the least inclination to favour the Earl of Champagne's passion, if it was true that he had any for her: but one of the four positively avers, that Thibaut only scribbled his ditties on the walls of the palaces of Troyes and Provins, to charm the despair into which Blanche's virtue had cast him. That if amongst the rest of those excellent works, some verses appear which seem liable to be wrested to this purpose; it is in truth a strange thing to alledge the evidence of such a one as Thibaut, a Poet transported by a warm imagination, who may as probably entertain the public with such adventures as never happened to him, as others of the same character tire the reader with the passions which they never felt (9).'

[C] Some pretend that he discovered his passion before that princess was a widow. It is very likely that his passion did not wait for the king's death. Nor is it at all less probable that such a vain, inconstant, courageous prince, might have had a sufficient command over his passions, to love the queen a long time, without giving any marks of it. Note, that she was at least forty, and perhaps older, when she lost her husband: for she was married to him in the year 1200, and he died in 1226. It is very rare for a man to see a fine woman of thirty years of age, without any concern, and to fall in love with her all of a sudden when she is forty, and after she has had above ten children. This was the case of Queen Blanche in the year 1226. One of our Historians imagines that there was a great deal more vanity than love in this action of Thibaut. The Earl of Champagne, says he (10), was the person who gave this advice to the queen. This young prince was touched with a sort of gallantry for her, rather owing to the vanity of a courtier, than to the charms of a woman above forty. He is thus far in the right, that vanity is capable of obliging a man to act the part of a lover: but he doth not in the least consider, that the earl's passion might have begun long before the queen was forty years old. And at that age it was much easier for her to keep alive a flame long since kindled, than to begin to kindle one.

[D] The passion she had entertained for the Cardinal Legate. An author whom I have often cited (11) observes that the Cardinal's person was very agreeable; that his charming mien was equalled by none; that he

(9) Histoire de S. Louis, lib. x, num. 14, pag. 126.

(10) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom. ii, pag. 710, ad ann. 1227.

(11) Varillas, Minorité de St Louis, pag. 12.

whole rage against him, they entered into and ravaged Champagne. That the Queen-Regent assisted him, and so composed the difference, that they were deprived of all pretences for an invasion. That they fought another way to ruin him, by accusing him of the king's death. That the queen brought him off, obliging them to lay down their arms on condition that he should immediately serve in the wars against the Infidels, accompanied with a hundred knights to be maintained at his own expence (b). This whole relation mentions nothing of the crown of Navarre: which obliges me to take notice in this place, that Thibaut obtained that crown in the year 1234, after the death of Sanche (c), who left no children. Two years after, he undertook a Crusade against the Infidels, of which he was also the chief: but for the usual reason, I mean the misunderstanding of the princes engaged in that enterprise, the expedition came to nothing. He died in the year 1253 (d), leaving his dominions to Thibaut his son. In his latter days he was engaged in several broils with his clergy, and even drew an interdict on the kingdom of Navarre for the space of three years, for having banished the Bishop of Pampelona (e). We shall see in the remarks that he was a great Poet [E]. He was a man suspected on flight grounds of the greatest crimes. It was thought he poisoned Philip Earl of Boulogne [F], uncle to St Lewis.

(b) *Id. 244.*

(c) Father, or, according to others, uncle to Blanche of Navarre, Thibaut's mother.

(d) And not 1277, as La Croix du Maine says, pag. 465.

(e) See the History of St Lewis by Monf. de la Chaille, lib. xi, num. 4, pag. m. 172.

had a delicacy of wit which was extremely surprising, and that Europe never produced such a complete courtier. He adds that Blanche had a very particular esteem for him; that she consulted him on important affairs; that she sometimes preferred his advice to that of others, and that she never denied any of the little favours he asked for his friends. There needed no more, to kindle a jealousy in Thibaut, or to furnish detractors with a fair pretext, to spread injurious reports against the honour of the queen-regent. This they did not fail to do; and what was yet harder the men of letters were the chief promoters of those satires; for the students of the university of Paris, all of them of an age at that time so far advanced, that it would at present appear scandalous for a man of the same age, not to have his degree of doctor (12), being disgusted at the proceedings on occasion of their quarrel with the citizens (13), left the city, after having published licentious songs and verses to blacken the reputation of the Queen-Regent, and the Pope's cardinal legate who governed her (14).

[E] He was a great Poet. Prefident Fauchet speaks thus of him. *The Italians formerly so well esteemed the songs of Thibaut King of Navarre, and other French poets, his contemporaries, that they imitated them, as Dante has shewn, who in his Book de Vulgari*

Eloquentia, cites this king as an excellent master in Poetry. (15). You will meet with several fragments of this king's poetry in Fauchet's book (16).

[F] *It was thought he poisoned Philip Earl of Boulogne.* This earl was the son of Philip Augustus, and he was the chief of the league formed against the Regent Blanche, soon after the death of Lewis the VIIIth. 'As his death was very sudden, the people, always prone to calumny, were very willing to ascribe it to a violent cause, and by dark hints charged it on the queen her self. But to Thibaut, Earl of Champagne, attempt to vindicate her would be to injure her: and in reality they fell upon Thibaut in quite another manner, either because he had been the greatest gainer by it, or because being persuaded that he had already made a bloody essay on Lewis the VIIIth, they did not think that he would make any scruple of this second murder. But the truth is, no proof was ever given of his being guilty of either, tho' the manner in which he took the death of the latter, was like enough to make him suspected of having been the cause of it (17). Thus we see how Queen Blanche was made to have a share in every bad action. So hard it is to have a great reputation, and not be exposed to the malice of censorious tongues.

(15) Fauchet, des anciens Poëtes François, book ii, p. 118.

(16) Du Verdier Vau-Privas has inserted in his Bibliothèque Française, what Fauchet says of Thibaut, Earl of Champagne.

(17) Hist. de S. Louis, lib. iii, num. 20, pag. 140.

(12) Hist. de S. Louis, lib. ii, num. 16, p. 71.

(13) These quarrels began in the year 1229. See a short deduction of them in the Hist. de S. Louis, ubi supra.

(14) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. Tom. ii, pag. 715.

(6) Epirota patre Venetis genitus. Paulus Jovius, Eleg. cap. xci.

THOMÆUS (NICOLAS LEONICUS) was a famous professor at Padua in the XVIth century. He was a Venetian, originally of Albania (a). He studied the Greek literature at Florence under Demetrius Chalcondylas; and was the first among the Latins who explained in Greek at Padua the works of Aristotle. He resolved to have recourse to the fountain-head, in order to re-establish Philosophy, which he found miserably disfigured by the vain subtilties of the schoolmen, and the speculations of the Arabian Commentators [A]. As he was a great Humanist, we have no reason to be surprised at his dislike of the manner of philosophizing which was practised at that time, nor at his courage in undertaking to explain the Greek text of Aristotle. His manner of living was truly philosophical: he was fond of a studious repose, without giving way to the commotions which emulation and ambition usually inspire (b). He was content with a moderate fortune. He lived frugally and never married [B]. He took the death

(b) Vita ejus procul a contentione ambitione in studio mollique otio versabatur. Jovius, ibid. Præter virtutem bonaque artes tota in vita nullius rei appetens. Petrus Bembus, in Epitaphio Leon Thomæ, apud Chytræum Delic. literar. pag. m. 152.

[A] *Philosophy which he found miserably disfigured by . . . the schoolmen, and . . . the Arabians.* Paul Jovius happily expresses the sad condition to which the schoolmen had reduced Philosophy. They never enquired after truth; but studied the art of raising objections, and answering them by the help of a hundred new-fangled terms, which they did not themselves understand. 'Philosophiam ex purissimis fontibus, non ex lotulentis rivulis salubriter hauriendam esse perdocebat, explosa penitus sophistarum disciplina, quæ tum inter imperitos, & barbaros principatum in scholis obtinebat, quum doctores excogitatis barbara subtilitate Dialecticorum figmentis, Physicas quæstiones non ad veritatis lucem, sed ad inanem disputandi garrulitatem revocarent; & juvenis in gymnasio Aratum, & Barbarorum commentationes secuta, à recto, munifico itinere in confragosas ignorantie crepidines duceretur (1). . . . He taught that philosophy ought to be derived from the pure source itself, and not from the muddy

rivulets, and that they should banish the sophistical learning, which then obtained the ascendant in the schools among the ignorant, when the professors by the invention of logical fictions, and barbarous subtilties reduced all philosophical questions not to the light of truth, but to the vain humour of disputing, and the youth in the university by following the comments of the Arabians and Barbarians were led from truth, and fortified in the craggy precipices of ignorance.'

[B] *He was content with a moderate fortune . . . and never married.* His chaste and innocent life, is very well expressed in the following citation. 'Pervenit veneranda barbe canitie ad septuagesimum tertium ætatis annum (2), mediocri substantia, ipsaque civili frugalitate, & cælebs & felix, quod nemo vel innocentia, & doctrinæ conscientia, vel munditia coram poris, vel anima nitere, beatior ætate nostra fuerit (3). . . . He arrived to the seventy-third year of his age, with a venerable aspect, a moderate

(2) Spondan. ad ann. 1533, num. 20, makes him live till he was 75 years old. (3) Jovius, Elogiot. cap. xci, pag. 213, a fortune

(1) Paulus Jovius, in Elogiis, cap. xci, pag. m. 213.

(c) Petrus Bem-
bus, *ibid.*

(d) Spondan. ad
ann. 1533, num.
20.

of a crane which he had kept forty years for a preface of his own approaching end [C]. Considering the age he lived to, any thing might have furnished him with such a thought. He succeeded very well in Poetry (c). He died at Padua, in the year 1533, aged seventy-five years (d). I shall speak of his writings in one of my remarks [D]. He had a brother whom Pierius Valerianus ranks amongst the unfortunate learned men [E].

'fortune, great frugality, in a single and happy state, so that no person in our time has been more distinguished, either for the innocency of his life, the sanctity of his doctrine, the neatness of his person, or the brightness of his mind.'

[C] He took the death of a crane which he had kept forty years for a preface of his own approaching end.] For this the same Paul Jovius is also my authority. Aluerat domi gruem, de manus ipsius fenili oblectamento cibaria capientem, per quadraginta annos. Is senio tabefactus quum perisset, & ejus desiderio triste omen concepit, prædixitque nullo laceffitus morbo, se non multo post adamati gruis fatum, maturo vitæ exitu secuturum. --- He had kept in his house for forty years a crane, which in his old age he took a pleasure to feed with his own hand. The crane happening to die of old age, he took the death of it to be ominous, and though he was in good health, foretold that without any distemper, he should follow his favourite bird, and die, at his crane had done, of old age.

[D] I shall speak of his writings in one of my remarks.] He composed, in imitation of the Academics, ten dialogues on curious or important subjects, as de divinatione, de nominum inventionibus, de ludo lalaris, de precibus, de animorum immortalitate, &c. He translated or paraphrased some tracts of Aristotle and Galen (4), and published a miscellany of very fine collections, under the title of *Varia Historia*, wherein according to the custom of the age he lived in, he never cited those ancient authors who furnished him with materials. As to his translations Huëtius gives him the following good character. 'Emendatus in terpes, ad auctoris nutum totum se fingens (5). --- An exact interpreter, perfectly representing his author.' There is another observation to be made concerning his work intituled *de Varia Historia libri tres*, that he wrote it when young, but did not publish it till he was very old in the year 1531. This is what he himself says in his epistle dedicatory to Cuthbert Tonstal, Bishop of Durham. 'Commentariolos de *Varia Historia* quos alias juvenis admodum multiplici cum Græcorum tum Latinorum lectione confeceram seposueramque nunc edendos excudendosve curavi: ut quando maturioris ætatis pleraque jam à me de omnimoda philosophia exierunt opera ex academicorum peripateticorumque fontibus hausta, hæc quoque juvenilia studia nostra sua aliquando mercede non defraudarentur. --- My commentaries on various history, which I composed while very young, with great pains in examining both Latin and Greek authors, and at that time laid by, I do now publish, that since the greatest part of the works of my maturer years on all sorts of philosophical subjects, derived from the fountains of the Academics and Peripatetics have been made public, these studies of my youth also may at last meet with their due reward.'

OBSERVATION concerning juvenile works.

Here is an author who had the prudence not to publish his juvenile productions before he had acquired a great reputation by his works composed in his riper years. This is a very wise conduct; for there are few authors who do not repent the precipitation with which they hurry their first essays into the world, even before the dawn begins to appear on their chin. Grotius, who perhaps had the least reason of any body, to repent of it, was in extreme confusion on this account. 'This is the confession he makes in a letter, wherein he praises Scriverius for the contrary conduct. 'Quo rependam non habeo, ex quo tandem resipiscere cœpi ab ea insaniam, quæ mihi cum aliis nonnullis communis fuit, ut cœca quadam innocentie libidine nihil nisi insaniam meam publicarem, daremque ea mundo spectanda, quæ nunc ne solus quidem apud me sine magno pudore & acridoloris sensu conspicio. Tu vero (dicam non ut blandiar, sed ut raram animi fortitudinem, quam, si possum, imitari velim, sane, quod possum, probem atque commendem) in annos non doctrinæ tantum, sed & sapientiæ capaces, tibi te & publico servasti; & quò nullum maturæ mentis certius esse

signum potest, ausus es ita utilitati aliorum studere, ut appareret priorem tibi hujus esse quam gloriæ tuæ rationem (6). --- I am incapable of making any amendment, since I have begun to recover from that madness which was common to me with some others, of publishing, out of a blind ambition of being known, my own disgrace, and of presenting those pieces to the world which now I cannot read my self without great confusion and concern. While you (I do not speak it out of flattery, but that your rare fortitude of mind, which should be imitated by me if it were possible) approved and commended by me since that is possible) have reserved the publication of your self and works, to years, that are capable not only of learning but also of wisdom: and which is the most certain sign of a mature understanding, you have ventured to study the public good in such a manner, that it should appear that you had a much greater regard to this than your own glory.' Those authors who are not quite so hasty in a greater risk; because the world is more inclined to excuse the faults of writers of 15 than those of 20, or 25 years of age. These therefore ought to take special care of their first book; for if it be worth nothing they will find a thousand difficulties to retrieve their reputation, and cure the public of their prejudices. If they with Thomæus keep their juvenile compositions by them till they have established a good reputation, they may then easily pass an indifferent piece upon the world. They must not follow the Italian fashion, where the lacqueys go before their masters; but place the finest of their equipage in the van, to prepossess the spectators in favour of them, and the remainder will follow in time. They would not lose the recompence of their first labours, if they believed with Thomæus that these ought also to meet with their reward. It is undeniable, that at a certain pitch of reputation, authors may put off indifferent performances with success, which would be laughed at, if published by persons not known. But those who make an ill use of this prepossession of the public are very often deceived. They collect all their papers, they go back even to their most trifling manuscripts, written when they were just come from the university; or even while they were students, and send them to the Printer. They at last disgust all their readers, and sometimes are more blamed for their last books, than they were praised for their first.

[E] He had a brother whom Pierius Valerianus ranks amongst the unfortunate learned men.] He would not have been at all inferior to our Thomæus, if he had lived as long: but he died young, and yet he lived long enough to suffer a great deal of misery: short and evil were his days. Let us relate what Valerianus says of him, 'Bartolomæum Leonicum cognomento Fuscum agnovistis, cujus ingenium, & absolutissimam eruditionem omnes admirabamur. Is cum Patavinum bellum, & totius ejus regionis desolationem, incendiaque devitasset, Romæ aliquandiu fuit, sed, cum neque hic otium, quod sibi proposuerat, reperisset, in Cassinatem recessit solitudinem, facta illi a loci illius monachis, quiescendi copia; sed, dum hic sperat scripta sua luculentissima maturare, & immortalæ sibi gloriæ comparare, paucis postquam illuc secesserat diebus, rapidissima correptus febri, cum ægrotaffet gravissimè, valetudinis ejus violentia sublatus est: futurus dubio procul Leonico Thomeo germano fratri non inferior, si fata eum diutius in vita esse voluissent (7). --- You knew Bartolomew Leonicus, surnamed Brown, whose genius and complete erudition we all admired. This man after he had escaped from the Paduan war, and the desolation and the burning of all that country, made some stay at Rome, but when he could not there find the leisure which he wanted, he retired into the solitude of mount Cassin, the Monks of that place giving him a retirement; but whilst he was in hopes of completing his excellent writings and of gaining immortal glory, a few days after he retired thither, he was suddenly

(6) Grotius's letter, in which he thanks Scriverius for a copy of the authors, de Re Militari, dated June 8, 1607, in my edition it is at the beginning. To this example of Grotius, add those alleged by Mr Baillet, in the first Tome des Savans, Part. ii. ch. ii.

(7) Pier. Valerianus, de Literariorum Infelicitate, lib. ii. p. 24.

'suddenly seized with a fever, and the violence of his
'dysenter carried him off. Had he lived longer, he | 'Thomas.'

T H O M A S (PAUL) Sieur de Girac, son of Paul Thomas Sieur de Maisfonette [A], was a very learned man, a good neighbour, and hearty friend to Balzac. The fame of his wit and learning had never perhaps extended beyond the walls of Engoulême his native place, if he had not criticised the works of Voiture: but this critical piece, though a small dissertation, occasioned a long controversy which made a great noise in the world. Costar, Voiture's friend, had no sooner seen this dissertation, but he undertook to refute it. This design, which he executed very slowly, and with abundance of artifice, as it is said, succeeded to his wish [B]. He published a defence of Voiture which was very much esteemed [C]. Girac thought himself obliged to reply; and he did not make use of Latin, as he had done in his first dissertation, but defended himself in French, the language in which Costar had published the apology for his friend. The design of Girac's answer (a) was not only to defend his criticism on Voiture's letters, but also to censure some faults of Costar. For this reason the latter replied in two pieces, one of which was an apology for himself, and the other the sequel of his defence of Voiture. His adversary returned to the charge, and published a large volume against that Sequel. The controversy went no further; and indeed it had been carried to the greatest extremities which the French language is capable of bearing on serious subjects. Costar was a rallying wit, who when he began to strike, gave heavy blows. He made both Balzac and Girac feel the weight of them in his first defence. An author, when he is piqued, commonly imagines that he does not take sufficient revenge, unless the strokes he returns are heavier than those he has received. Girac followed this principle in his answer, as did Costar likewise in his new defences; and Girac answering them in the same strain, carried the invective to the highest pitch. To meet with books more abusive than this reply, we must have recourse either to those who write in Latin, or to those who have written in French not long ago in some towns of Holland, which I will not name. Girac had the advantage of striking the first and the last blow. There was another thing which evidently proved that the victory was on his side, and this was

Costar's

(a) He published it in the year 1655, and joined with it his Latin dissertation, which had been already printed in the second edition of his Defence of Voiture. I have an edition of this defence printed at Paris in the year 1664, wherein it is said in the advertisement that this was the first time Mr Girac's Latin Dissertation was published. How ridiculous it is to affirm this in the year 1664!

[A] The son of Paul Thomas Sieur de Maisfonette.]

(1) Colomessus, Gallie Oriental. pag. 183.

Mr de Girac's father was born at Jarnac (1), but lived at Engoulême; he understood Hebrew very well, as appears by these words of Jarrige: Father Beaufés having last year received from one of our ministers a letter in Hebrew, travelled all night from Ruffec to Angoulême, to get it translated and answered by Mr Thomas de Maisfonette, a learned man, who is perfectly acquainted with that language. This honest gentleman cannot deny the truth of what I say (2). Mr Colomies (3) cites this passage of Jarrige, and says (4), that he had read Mr de Maisfonette's poems with pleasure, and that Balzac praised him in his Latin letters (5), as did also

(2) Réponse aux colonnes de Jacques Beaufés, chap. ii.

(3) Colom. Gallie Oriental. pag. 184.

[B] This design, which he executed very slowly, and with abundance of artifice, as it is said, succeeded to his wish.] A little after the impression of Voiture's works, Balzac, who, perhaps could not see the good reception they met with, without chagrin, desired Mr Girac to give him his opinion of them. Mr Girac, in compliance to his friend, wrote a Latin dissertation on that subject, and Balzac communicated it to Costar, to have his sentiment of it. Costar thought this a favourable opportunity of signalizing himself, and as he believed that Balzac was not displeased that some faults had been found in Voiture, he resolved to make such an apology for the latter, as might indirectly reflect upon the former. But in order to take the surer measures, He at first excused himself as not being able to give his opinion on Girac's remarks, alledging a thousand affairs, which deprived him of all leisure for it. At last, some years after, and when it was least expected, he sent his defence in manuscript to Mr Balzac, conjuring him, that if he found any lines in it which displeased him, to blot them out, to commit them to the flames, or throw them into the water, for he absolutely abandoned them to him. In the mean time this book, which is nothing but a satire, attacking the reputation of the person to whom it is addressed, notwithstanding all the professions of loving and honouring him, was printed, and in every body's hands, before the manuscript reached him (6). A passage in the Menagiana makes me doubt whether the last part of Girac's relation is true. I do not believe that the defence of Voiture was printed before the author sent the manuscript copy to Mr de Balzac. For I find this in the Menagiana (7): 'Mr de Balzac, . . . after having obliged Mr de Girac to write in Latin

(6) Girac, Préface de la Réponse à la Défense de Voiture.

(7) Pag. 166, of the first Dutch edition.

against Voiture's Letters, engaged also Mr Costar to undertake the defence of them, and to write against Girac; this was to make sure of the praises of both parties. I was going through Mans in my return to Paris, when the Defence was finished. Mr Costar gave me two copies of it, one to be sent to Mr Pinchessne, Mr de Voiture's nephew, and the other, to Mr Conrart. He told me he freely submitted it to all the alterations which his friends would propose, whether it were by adding or retrenching. One of the copies was communicated to Mr de Balzac, who sent his corrections. In the mean while the work was printed, and his corrections not coming till the impression was finished, he was informed that they came too late; and the book appeared as such as it was, which gave him some uneasiness. Compare this with Mr Costar's account (8); and with a letter of Balzac to Conrart (9), and you will plainly see that Balzac received the manuscript, before the book was printed. This will not hinder several people from believing that Balzac was imposed upon, and that all the excuses grounded upon Voiture's nephew, causing the book to be printed without Costar's knowledge, are but so many insults. The wars of authors have their stratagems, as well as those of princes; and it is probable that this was a stratagem of the pen-combatants, which was practised on this occasion against Balzac. The impression went on, and was finished in spite of the strong opposition he made by means of Mr Conrart (10).

[C] Costar . . . published a Defence of Voiture, which was very much esteemed.] It may be said that this book made him known to the world; after this, his name was spread every where, and, what is much better, by means of this book, he obtained a pension of five hundred crowns. He could not help, says Mr Girac (11), expressing on all occasions, his satisfaction and joy, that he had been acquainted with me. And, indeed, in what corner of France has he not published, that he was infinitely obliged to me for having given him an opportunity of making himself known to the world; and that by my means the eyes of all the learned and polite were fixed on him, and that to me he owed the glory and applause which he received from all parts, and what he esteemed yet much more, that I have been the cause of his having gained five hundred crowns? I have seen several of his letters, which are all in the same tone, and I have not met with one of

(8) Suite de la Défense, pag. 20, & seq.

(9) The xvth of the ivth book, dated the 15th of June 1653.

(10) Ubi supra.

(11) Réplique à Costar, pag. 3, 4, Dutch edition. See also the Menagiana, pag. 368, 369.

VOL. V.

R r r r

Costar's using all his interest to obtain of the magistrates that his antagonist's reply should be suppressed [D]. The reason he alledged that his morals were attacked is, generally speaking, somewhat specious; nevertheless in this case it was of no force [E]; for he was

* Epist. Dedic.
to the Suite de
la Deff.

of his friends who has not thanked me in his name, for having occasioned this happy book, which his Eminence had thought worthy of his liberality *. These are his own words in his Epistle Dedicatory.

[D] Costar used all his interest to obtain of the magistrates, that his antagonist's Reply should be suppressed. It is less shameful for a Logician to be guilty of the fault which they call *υσταχθισις εις αλλο γινος*, to slip, to run from the question, to ramble out of the way, in order to catch at another difficulty, than it is for a man of wit, after having for some time combated with his pen, to quit that weapon, and have recourse to the arms of the civil magistrate. This is visibly giving ground, quitting the field of battle, and throwing away his sword and buckler, in order the sooner to reach a place of refuge, and hide himself behind an altar. I am surprized that Costar, who was a person of wit and penetration, did not foresee that his conduct would meet with this construction, and be compared to that of a Gentleman who, in a quarrel, where his honour is concerned, should apply himself to the civil magistrate, instead of having recourse to his sword. He answered, and replied to the criticism on Voiture, he treated his adversary as ill as he pleased, he charged him with a thousand faults, and after having taken the greatest liberty which the Republic of Letters allowed him, he betook himself to the Lieutenant-Civil, to hinder his adversary from making his defence, and using the same liberty. This was a loud injustice; but the fear which such a conduct betrayed was yet more apparent than the injustice of it. Girac was not silent on this head; he sufficiently insulted his adversary. 'What is become, says he (12),

(12) In his first letter to Mr de Montausier at the beginning of his reply, fol. 3 verso.

† Sequel of the defence, pag. 12, L. 366.

(13) Girac, *ibid.*

‡ Sequel. pag. 424.

§ L. 334.

(14) Girac, *ubi supra*, fol. 5 verso.

'of the generous sentiments of this bravo, who, not long ago, styled himself a gentleman of Pomerania, and Orondates junior †; who boasted of his feats, and of always having the sacred larus of antient civility, so deeply engraven in his mind, that it was impossible for him to violate or infringe them. If these frivolous and ridiculous imaginations are evaporated, and Mr Costar's brain is no longer troubled with such visions, does he not see, (to express myself in plainer terms), to what confusion and scandal a man of letters, as he is, exposes himself, who, when accused of a thousand instances of ignorance, a thousand blunders, and a thousand absurdities, recurs to the civil magistrate, and to his interest, to suppress the books which convict him, instead of defending his opinions, or owning his errors?' He made another advantage of the great confusion and disorder which appeared in the conduct of his adversary. This disorder, says he (13), appeared very plainly through the whole course of his proceeding, but nothing published it more effectually, than the protestation he made so publicly ‡, never to read, while he lived, any thing which went under my name. For if his hatred or contempt of me was so great, that he would never look on any of my books, why does he give himself so much trouble to hinder their publication? Why does he so loudly protest §, that in the pursuit of so vast a design which he proposed, he will not be diverted by the way; that the stones which I shall throw at him will not be able to stop him; that he should have a heap of them to denote his victory, and that tho' I should continue to sling at him, he would not so much as turn his head. However, neither the sacred obligation of an oath, nor such a solemn protestation could hinder him from reading my book, nay, from bribing my Printer, in order to get all the sheets of my book, as fast as printed off. But, to continue his allegory, I had scarce taken this fatal sling into my hand, but this intrepid, this terrible and haughty Goliath was so shamefully struck with fear, that he fled out for help, and implored the assistance of the civil magistrate. Yet this hope will be in vain, and I desire no other proofs of his flight and of victory, if I may so call the defeat of so cowardly an enemy, than the pains he takes to avoid me.'

[E] The reason he alledged . . . was nevertheless of no force. Let us hear Girac a little farther (14). 'By what authority therefore does he presume to pro-

scribe authors, and act the tyrant in an empire, which hath always maintained the possession of an entire and perfect liberty? It is, indeed, an unprecedented attempt, and worthy of the arrogance of my adversary. For though he covered his design with a more specious pretext, and took other measures to obtain that sentence, in which he now triumphs, it is imposing on the judge and the world, to persuade them that he was forced to take those measures, by the pretended calumnies cast on his religion and morals. And he must surely be a very nice man to complain of two or three short letters which I have made use of, when he cannot deny that he wrote them, and at the same time must own that what he himself has printed on these matters is much more shameful and scandalous. Besides, they were in the hands of all the curious, and publicly read in every province where Mr Costar is known.'

After having alledged some other reasons to justify the use he made of these letters, he goes on in this manner (15): 'It must therefore be, because he blushes

'to see his fraud, insincerity, false learning, and misunderstanding of authors detected. He is concerned to find himself disturbed in that fine, general, and long enjoyed reputation, which he fancies he possessed without any interruption, and that the enchantments and illusions by which he made a bad cause appear good, will no longer prove effectual. He knows very well that his fine language, the only thing that has any charm in his writings, will no longer impose upon the credulous. He is apprehensive that instead of lofty epithets of illustrious, the ornament of France, and the glory of our age, he should be taken for an ignominious ramus, a giddy-headed man, and a plagiarist. These are the genuine motives which made him take the resolution of having recourse to chicanery, as the last refuge of a desperate cause, amidst the trouble, confusion and disorder to which he is reduced.'

Some, perhaps, may say, that Costar was not so unjust as certain persons, to desire that he might be allowed to write against his adversary, but his adversary not allowed to answer him (16). He was willing that the Lieutenant-Civil should include him in the prohibition, and make an order that neither Mr Costar nor Mr Girac should, for the future, write against one another: but this is saying very little in favour of Costar; for having published all he had to say, he could be very little affected by a prohibition of writing any more. His advantage was to have his adversaries hands tied up. 'Truly, says Mr Girac (17), it is not an easy matter to conceive what could oblige the Lieutenant-Civil, to order that Mr Costar and I should not, for the future, write against one another; when I had not yet begun to defend myself (18), and my adversary had published three large volumes, in which he had treated me in so opprobrious a manner, and loaded me with so much calumny, that I must of necessity either refute him, or suffer very greatly in my reputation. I must allow a school-master, who scarce knows the first elements and principles of Science, to raise himself on my ruins, and procure himself an esteem at my expense. So that whatever resolution I may have taken to stifle my just complaints against the injury which has been done me; I cannot help saying of this sentence of the Lieutenant-Civil what an excellent person ** said long ago of that of a certain Emperor. This sentence destroys itself, it confounds and overturns all things, and, under the pretext of a fallacious humanity, covers an extreme and unprecedented rigour. It binds the hands of the accused, in order to deliver him up a prey to his enemies; it robs oppressed innocence of what the severest laws never refused to the most guilty criminal, as it takes away all possible means of justification, by imposing silence on the person accused. It forbids Mr Costar to say any thing more to me, after he has so long worn out my patience, and tired his own cruelty and rage with abusing me. Was there ever a more capacious, more unjust, or more deceitful contrivance?' I must observe to my reader, that Girac does not forget the passage of Tacitus concerning Crematius Cordus. Thus

(15) *Ibid.*

(16) See the book intitled La Chimere de la Cabale de Rotterdam démontrée, pag. 63, of the preface.

(17) Girac, *ubi supra*.

(18) This must be understood of the sequel of the defence of Voiture and of Costar's apology. The Lieutenant's sentence preceded Girac's reply in this respect, but before this sentence, Girac had answered the defence of Voiture. Wherefore he does not express himself exactly.

** Tertullian, in his apology.

was not accused without proof [F], and that ought rather to have engaged the judges to

he shews, in the conduct of his adversary, not only a great deal of injustice, but also a great deal of imprudence; for Tacitus observes, that the prohibition of a book gains it a reputation.

A REFLEXION on the conduct of authors, who procure the prohibition of the books of their adversaries.

It is evident, that an author who employs the authority of the civil magistrate, for the prohibition of books written against him, manifestly betrays his defeat and inability to answer, while he increases the curiosity of the public after those very books. Why then do so many authors recur to this method, when they have interest enough to make it effectual. Is it a very agreeable thing, to declare to all the world that they are not able to resist an author who is their adversary? Can self-love find it's account in raising a desire to read those books in several people, who would otherwise never hear of them, and who buy them on no other account but because they are informed that those books are prohibited? Can self-love, I say, which is so angry at the contents of them, and so eager to stifle the memory of them, find it's account in putting the public upon enquiring more curiously into the particulars contained in them? What charm can there be in publishing a sentence of prohibition of certain books in the Gazettes? Is not this the way to proclaim to all Europe the shameful necessity a man lies under of imploring that assistance of the civil magistrate, which he ought only to seek from his pen (19)? I think it may be said, in answer to these questions, that the authors who take such measures, find no great satisfaction in them at the bottom. It is only a last shift, to which they give the most comfortable turn they possibly can. They endeavour to regain, by their own interest, what they have lost by the pen of their adversaries. They would keep the populace on their side; the populace, I say, who are always prone to judge the strongest party in the right: they would prevent the attacks of other adversaries; for how many persons are there who are silent on the injustice of a man, only in proportion to the good or ill he is able to do by his interest? Not to say that they hope a great many unwary readers will conclude that a book which is prohibited, must be stuffed with fallacies. It is true, that several people are guilty of this wretched reasoning; for they do not consider that the civil magistrates, even when they suppress a book for prudential reasons, and agreeably to their regulations, do not pretend to prejudice the public against the facts contained in it, for they take no cognizance of them, nor do they pretend to be judges of them. This seems to me one of the principle motives which engages certain authors to hold the same conduct with Coftar; a conduct far from being honourable, to say no worse of it, and entirely sophistical. Is it not a meer sophistry to change the state of the question? Was the dispute between Coftar and Girac any way concerning their greater or less credit with the Judges of the Chatelet? Did Mr Girac, confined within his province, pretend to have more friends, or greater interest than his adversary in the capital city, in order to solicit a process? The question was, whether Voiture's thoughts were right or wrong, whether he had been strongly censured, and weakly defended, or the reverse. What does it avail in this question, to have interest enough with the Lieutenant-Civil to get a book suppressed?

[F] He was not accused without proof. It ill becomes a pastor, a priest, a minister, to employ his pen on subjects of gallantry and pleantry. For which reason Mr Coftar, who was a priest, had the cure of souls, and was an Arch-deacon (20), forgot his character, and all the rules of decency, when he employed his wit in being waggish with the fair sex, and interperfed his letters with a great many wanton stories. His adversary cruelly persecuted him on this head; if a war so justly founded deserves the name of persecution. On this passage, in a letter of Coftar to a maid, *Your nimble feet dance in perfidion, they help you to fly top over tail, to shew the forked tree, and represent a thou and other fine figs.* Girac says (21), that when the Arch-deacon saw this young lady in so pleasant a posture, he was not so hard-hearted as that hermit (22), who turned the hair of some young girls perfectly grey, because they laughed at his not daring to see them naked. Mr Coftar (says he) is too gallant a man to impose such severe penances on the ladies; and if such an adventure

should happen to him, I dare swear for him, he would sooner wish that he had not a grey hair himself, than cover the heads of those poor wretches with them (23). (23) Ubi supra, He will not pardon this Arch-deacon for saying in a letter to a lady, where he represents himself at the point of death. *I cannot tell where I shall undergo my purgatory; it would be a most agreeable consolation, if I might be permitted to undergo it in your chamber. I should have so much pleasure to see you so charming, &c* (24). (24) Coftar, Letter cxxxviii. Tom. i. Nor will he pardon the pity which Coftar expresses for one of the Graces on account of her husband's impotence. *He rails against the Poets for their cruelty, and even impertinence in marrying one of the Graces to Vulcan, and another to Sleep. However, continues he, the first was not awfully disconsolate, if what a Queen of the Amazons said be true, that lame men kiss best, ἀϊσα χαλκός οἶσσι.* But he deploras the miserable condition of the second, since Virgil has told us, that sleep is soft, & somno mollior herba. *What an excellent quality is this in the husband of a goddess everlastingly young! It was a great happiness for him that Pasithea (so she is called) was soluta zonâ, as were all the Graces, & solutis Gratiz Zonis, or else*

Quærendum aliunde foret (nervosius illud) Quod posset zonam solvere virginem (25).

(25) Girac, ubi supra, pag. 22.

He will not forgive Coftar the explication he had given of these words in Horace (26), *Bacchum in remotis carminibus rupibus Vide docentem.* I have recited it in the article SICYONE. He is charged with yet grosser impurities, extracted from his printed works (27); he is even censured for a letter he wrote to his Physician. This indeed was not printed; but as he distributed copies of it every where (28), his adversary made no scruple to charge him publicly with it. He had still some remains of a fever on him, and finding two nights successively that nature revived, he wrote this agreeable news to his Physician (29), desiring to be informed whether he might rely on an old proverb, which represents this symptom as a sign of recovery. As this letter is short, and in Latin, I shall make no difficulty to print it at large: *Febbris mea longè remissior fuit quàm fuerat hæctenus, hac nocte placidissimè quievi, haud scio an usquam melius. Sub ortum Solis (neque enim tibi & medico & amicissimo viro quicquam reticere æquum est) valida tentigine, & satis diuturna & non insuavi, quod & heri acciderat, correptus sum. Lufit animus aliquantulum in umbra voluptatis, sed ne de Theologo malè sentias, dormiebam. Vides, mi colendissime seu potius mi jucundissime senex, nondum in me fuerat esse eam partem corporis, cui apodixin defunctoriam scribere paratus eram. Vetus verbum est, id jam jam reditura sanitatis argumentum indubitatum esse. Verum uni tibi plus credo quàm univervis adagiis. Si commodum est ad me scribas velim hac de re quid sentias, hoc est quid sentire debeam. Ride, vale, & me ama, alioquin nec ridebo, nec valebo* (30). - - - *My fever is very much abated, and I do not remember that I ever had a better night in my life than the last. About sun-rise (for I ought to conceal nothing from you, who are my Physician and intimate friend) I was seized with a strong tension, which was of some continuance as well as pleasure; and I met with the same symptom yesterday. My mind sported a little in the shadow of pleasure, but that you may suspect nothing amiss in a Divine, I assure you I slept. You find, my worthy, or rather my merry old friend, that I have not yet buried that part of the body, for which I was preparing to write an epitaph. The old proverb makes it an undoubted sign of returning health. But I rely more upon your opinion than all the proverbs in the world. I beg you would write to me, if you conveniently can, and let me know what you think of this matter, that is, what I ought to think of it myself. Laugh, farewell, and love me, otherwise I shall neither laugh, nor farewell.* Balzac having read this letter, wrote to Coftar, among other things, as follows. *Now, that I see by your's to Mr le Gouff, that you are not content with health alone, but pretend to vigour, and look rather like a stout wrestler than a man who is barely well, I do not know, &c* (31). It must be owned that these reproaches regarded Mr Coftar's morals; but this was no reason why

(19) Between author and author, the weapons ought to be equal, each ought to have recourse to his pen alone. He may be allowed to lay *dextra mihi Deus & firram quod misile libo*: (Virgil. Æn. lib. x. ver. 773.) If he says, I will have recourse to the civil magistrate and to my interest with the gods of the earth, he is like a champion who arms himself against a naked man.

(20) Girac's Reply, iii, pag. 25.

(21) Ibid. pag. 29.

(22) He cites Theodoret's Hist. Relig.

(23) See the Entretien de Coftar & de Voiture, pag. 200. Girac's Reply, pag. 23, 24, and the New Letters against Maimbourg's History of Calvinism, pag. 743.

(24) Girac, pag. 21.

(25) His name was Mr le Gouff, a Physician of Niort.

(30) Girac, *ibid.*

(31) Balzac, Lettres Choieses, Part. ii, Lett. iii, pag. 562, cited by Girac, *ibid.*

to license than to prohibit Girac's book [G]. Patin has not spoken very exactly of this dispute [H]. One cannot sufficiently wonder at the nicety of Voiture's friends; they pretended that Girac for daring to criticise upon him, deserved Military execution [I]. The passage which proves this, informs us that this author was rich. The same thing is affirmed in a passage of Balzac [K]. What I have said concerning Mr de Girac in

why the Chatelet ought to suppress Mr Girac's Reply, since it could not pass for a libel; for the author puts his name to it, and proved his accusations.

[G] And that ought rather to have engaged the Judges to license than to prohibit Girac's book! A critical book, which strongly represents to a Priest, the ill use he makes of his time and wit, is no unprofitable work. On the contrary, the public good seems to require that there should be men bold enough to censure those Ecclesiastics whose life is not conformable to their profession. Now it is leading a life very inconsistent with the duty of a Priest, who had the cure of souls, and was an Arch-deacon, as Mr Costar was, to set up for a wit, and to spend the best part of his time in reading books of gallantry, and writing, what they call fine things, to ladies and gentlemen. This ought to be left to the Voitures and the Sarrazins, and, in general, to those who are not of a profession which forbids their meddling with trifles. Or if the inclination be strongly bent, and the person have a happy talent that way, he ought to keep in a lay-station; and then he is free to make as many verses, and write as many letters of gallantry as he pleases. He may jest and trifle in his books at discretion, and laugh at the four censurer who is displeased with it. But if he enters upon an ecclesiastical life, and takes on him the charge of souls, or is only in orders, he ought not to play the galant, either with his tongue, or his pen. Nay, methinks it were to be wished that the rewards which the Voitures, the Sarrazins, and other fine wits, have a just claim to, were not assigned them out of the revenues of the Church, as they are very frequently

(32) See the article BENSERADE, remark [E], and the article RONSARD, remark [O].

(33) The *Ménagiana*, pag. 90, of the first Dutch edition, says this of Mr Costar.

(34) In a letter dated October 25, 1658, being the lxxiv of the first edition, and the cxxii, of the second.

(35) This does not agree with Girac's letter to Mr de Montausier, dated March the 1st, 1659. (It is at the beginning of his Reply) where he says. Having all my life professed my hatred of law-suits, and that I would, as much as possible, seek for that tranquillity and ease of mind, which are incompatible with the fatigues, the tricks and quirks of the bar; I heartily renounce the prosecution of injuries which I have received. See also his Reply, §. xii, pag. 93.

(36) Biblioth. François, ch. viii, last section.

and does not forget to tell us that Mr Girac's last reply, though the impression of it was stopped, had lately been published (37). Some are of opinion, adds he, that Mr Girac is in the right to defend himself; others say, he ought not to have continued this quarrel after the death of Costar, who cannot reply. These last words are liable to censure. Sorel speaks of Girac as of a man who was living in the year 1667, when he had been dead four years. He speaks of his Reply as of a work just published; and yet there had been an edition of it (38) in the year 1660. He ought to have blamed those who censured Girac for continuing this war after Costar's death. Such censurers were very unreasonable, since Girac's reply was printed in Costar's life-time; and if it was not sold, this was because Costar had interest enough to hinder it. Was it therefore just, under pretence that he was dead, that is to say, that he could no longer oppress his adversary by his interest with the Chatelet, to deprive the author of his right of publishing his vindication, and the Bookseller of the means of recovering the money laid out in the impression?

[I] Voiture's friends . . . pretended . . . that Girac . . . deserved military execution.] Costar informs us of it (39). 'To speak truth, a man of this humour is very liable to be beaten (I mean with the tongue and pen) for we do not live in an age so licentious as that, when the Roman young gentlemen walked in the streets the whole day, with long rods concealed under their robes, to chastise the insolence of those who did not approve of the Poet Lucilius, if such people were so unhappy as to fall in their way (40). Nevertheless Mr Girac is in danger of quartering some *Gens d'Armes*, if they pass through Angoulême; and I wonder that he who is not very neglectful of his interest, and is very careful of his affairs, should forget the Captain who told him two or three years ago: out of respect to the Marquis de Montausier I will prevent my company quartering upon you: he is a Lord to whom I owe every thing; but it is on condition that you do not pretend to write any more against Voiture (41). I can hardly imagine what could make Mr Girac so little afraid of those menaces, unless he fancied that being a celebrated author, he had no occasion for the recommendation of any body, and that his book alone would prove an inviolable safe-guard against the soldiers.' He afterwards alleges the regard Alexander had for Pindar's house, and that of Alphonfus King of Arragon for a seat of Cicero, and concludes with these words. I know all this, and something more; and yet if Mr de Girac was my friend, I would not advise him to depend on these great examples, but to take better securities against the Captain, Protector, and Avenger of the Wits. Can any thing be more extravagant than this Captain's pretension? He would have all the world approve Voiture; and no fault to be found in the works of that author, and he threatened to quarter his company upon the village of him who should dare to criticize upon this fine genius. Is not this a fine way of revenging a friend? Is not this introducing a military government into the Republic of Letters, the most free state in the world? Behold the effects of prepossession! Voiture's relations and friends had a mind to set him up for the Pope of Wit, and to constitute him in all matters which came within that province, an infallible rule of Orthodoxy. They ought at least to have been contented with the excommunications of Parnassus against those who should dispute the infallibility of such a Pontif. But they threatened them with the quartering of soldiers. A strange way of converting Heretics in wit! Does not this resemble the French dragooning?

[K] The same thing is affirmed in a passage of Balzac.] Girac answering his adversary on the threats of this Captain revenger of the wits, declares, That he had hitherto been so happy as to have no soldiers quartered in his village (42). He was therefore Lord of a village (43). By what follows, it appears that his

(37) Ibid. pag. 142, edition of 1667.

(38) At Leyden, in 8vo.

(39) Sequel of the Defence, pag. 40, 41.

(40) See the remark LUCILIUS, remark [P].

(41) Girac answers this in §. xii, pag. 93.

(42) Replique, §. xii, pag. 93.

(43) This village was near Engouland.

the project of this Dictionary, shall be one of the remarks of this article [L]. You will find in it the time of his death, and with what restriction we are to understand an encomium bestowed on him on account of his knowledge in the oriental languages.

The judgment of Mr Chevreau concerning these two celebrated combatants, Girac and Costar, gives all the advantage to the former [M]. I doubt not but that the most intelligent judges would agree with Chevreau, if they would take the pains to examine all the pieces of this controversy: Those who should search to the bottom of this dispute, would probably find a new reason to pass sentence against Costar, for using Mr Balzac very ill. He is severely censured for it in the preface to Balzac's *Entretiens*. Mr du Rondel, who from his youth has been a great admirer of Balzac, and does yet continue so as much as ever [N], was so incensed at this conduct of Costar, that he hardly forbore writing against him.

(44) Balzac's Dissertation to Dom Andr. de St Denys, at the end of his *Socrate Chrétien*, pag. 201, 202.

(45) In his Dissertation against Voiture, he says, *Qui enim ego medius in filvis occupat a rusticis que plemus & in-juriam judicem de homine.*

(46) Balzac, ubi supra, pag. 203, says, My friend, though a great Poet, and as elevated a genius as the greatest Poets, is at present employed in more earthly, and meaner thoughts. For a trifle of six thousand crowns, or thereabouts, he has made no conscience of clearing the shades, &c.

(47) Biblioth. Choiseul, pag. 9.

(48) Gallia Orientalis, p. 217.

(49) In a discourse printed with the *Socrate Chrétien*, pag. m. 298, and the following pages.

(50) Dictionary, French and Latin, printed at Limoges, 1664.

(51) Chap. vii, last section.

(52) Continuation of the Defence of Voiture, pag. 77.

(53) Balzac, Epist. Select. t. pag. m. 294.

lands were very well wooded. (44) *The passage in the Dissertation which you desire should be cleared, is a piece of his History. Those Silvæ which now employ Mr de Girac (45), are not metaphorical, and of the same nature with those of Statius or Politian. But in the common language, it is a wood which he has filled, and sold for 1500 Pistoles (46). But what will Diana and the nymphs, the Dryads and Hamadryads, Pan and the Sylvans, say of all this? If the whole train of petty gods could but find a Poet at their devotion, what Elegiac complaints, what Iambic imprecations would be levelled against another Poet, who so cruelly drives them from their ancient abode, who wounds and murders the nymphs with the hard blow of the ax, and gives them the last fatal stroke, by felling the sacred trees in which they inhabited?*

Non sine Hamadryadis fato, prostrata bipenni
Alta cadit quercus: clausam sub cortice Nympham
Mors eadem plantamque manet.

*When the sharp ax falls down a lofty oak,
Some Hamadryad feels the fatal stroke:
The nymph who lives within the bark conceal'd
Meets the same death to which the tree must yield.*

[L] *What I have said . . . in the project of this Dictionary shall be one of the remarks of this article.* I declared very freely that I thought Mr Girac was in the wrong to blame Costar on account of the marrow of the lions, wherewith several authors say that Achilles was fed: and thereupon I made the following remark. By this we do not pretend to derogate from his merit, or adjudge the victory to his adversary. If, on the one side, Costar's thoughts seem more shining and brightened by the sun of the capital city, as Mr Balzac would say, it appears, on the other side, that Monsieur de Girac had more learning. It was a great loss that he died so young. In a word, I very readily subscribe with Mr Colomies (47), but with the restriction hereafter mentioned, to the fine elegy which Mr de Balzac bestows on Mr de Girac in one of his Latin letters, and which Mr Colomies cites (48), as well as to the praises which Balzac gives him in French (49), and to those which Father Gaudin has bestowed on him in the Preface to his Dictionary (50). According to that Preface Mr de Girac died the second of January 1663. Mr Colomies, says he, died in April following. However his death should not have been wholly unknown, as it was to Sorel, when he published his *Bibliothèque Française*, in the year 1664, and when he renewed and enlarged it in 1667, where he treats (51) very fully of the controversy betwixt Costar and Girac; on this head see also Guy Patin's seventy-fourth letter. The difference amongst authors concerning the death of illustrious men is incredible. And yet this subject does not seem liable to many variations.

The restriction I promised is as follows. Mr de Balzac writing to Scipio le Gaillard (to Mr Costar (52) explains Balzac's *Scipionis jucundo*) says that Mr Girac understood Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, beyond what is possible to conceive. 'Habeo jam certe quicum non solum suavitissimo sermone horas confuso, sed etiam a quo recedo semper & melior & doctior. Paulum Thomam à Giraco, paternâ virtute, sua virtute clarissimum; rerum divinarum & humanarum cognitione instructum, à prima adolescentia: litteris Latinis, Græcis, Hebræicis supra quam credibile est, ornatum; omnibus denique & naturæ & artis præfidiis ad dicendum, ad scribendum paratum (53).--- I now have one with whom I not only spend my hours

in the most agreeable manner, but also from whom I always depart both wiser and better. Paul Thomas de Girac, famous both for his family's virtues and his own; instructed from his infancy in all sort of learning both divine and human; skilled in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, above what can be imagined; and qualified both for speaking and writing with all accomplishments both natural and acquired.' Mr Costar taking occasion from this character to rally his adversary, represented (54) him deeply engaged in the bulky volumes of the Latins, Greeks, Hebrews, Arabians, &c. less sensible of the beauties of modern authors, than of those that appear in some dead or oriental language, and spending the best of his time on a scholiast on Lycophron, or perhaps on Rabbi Nephthali; whereupon Mr Girac makes this fair confession to him: You think perhaps, says he (55), to reproach me with an odious thing, which, if it were true, I should take for a great honour; but as I always act with sincerity and truth, you may if you please be satisfied, that my studies are scarce yet advanced beyond the Greek and Latin tongues; that I scarce understand the principles of the Hebrew tongue, and am entirely ignorant of the Arabic and Oriental languages, which you mention to cry me down. This was acting like a man of honour who would not take advantage of the flatteries of his friend, to impose on the public; he does not deserve to have these words of Horace applied to him,

*Sed vereor ne cui de te plus quam tibi credas (56). I fear, when you shou'd to yourself be known,
You'll trust another's thoughts more than your own.*

This is properly making a good use of this distich of Cato:

Cum te aliquis laudat, judex tuus esse memento:
Plus aliis de te quam tu tibi credere noli.

*When others praise, you your own judge should be,
Nor credit more than in yourself you see.*

If Mr Colomies had observed Girac's answer, he had not placed him in his *Gallia Orientalis*.

[M] *The judgment of Mr Chevreau . . . gives all the advantage to Girac.* The particulars of this judgment are these. 'I dare aver to you . . . that there is a very considerable difference betwixt Mr de Girac and Mr Costar: The first pushes with all his force; and the other shuffles and does not parry at all: or, to speak plainer, Mr Costar does his utmost to resist truth and reason by dint of common-places; and contents himself with denying what the other proves. To re-assume the former figure. The one charges home and overthrows whatever resists him. The other rallies as well as he can, and disputes what he is assured never to obtain. The victor is astonished at the weakness of his enemy; and the vanquished rallies with no ill grace (57).'

[N] *Mr du Rondel is as much as ever an admirer of Balzac.* This is what he wrote to me, on his reading the first tome of the *Mélanges* of Vigneul Marville: 'Several other things please me in this Miscellany (58); but there are two or three which I do not like; particularly amongst the rest what he says of Balzac. Such a man should not be mentioned without respect and veneration. Without him our language at this time would be wavering and uncertain; and we are obliged to him for knowing how to speak and write. It is true that in the examples

(54) Costar's Defence of Voiture.

(55) Girac's answer to the defence of Voiture, pag. 47.

(56) Horat. lib. i, Epist. xvi. ver. 19.

(57) Chevreau, *Oeuvres mêlées*, pag. 350.

(58) He pointed out to me several places which he liked in that book.

'he has left us he seems to brave rather than instruct us. His elevation is so lofty, so nervous, so majestic, and he maintains himself so well in his height and sphere, that he is perfectly inaccessible; but this is not his fault at the bottom. If no body has followed him, this cannot prejudice either the uncommonness of his merit, the vigour of his motion, or the beauty of his flight; they rather make him the more remarkable. Let the Voitures be allowed to write prettily, naturally, and in the plain common stile; this suits very well with them, and they cannot do better. But let us not be angry with Balzac, for being exalted above mankind, by the most charming, most noble, and most glorious attempt that was ever made. Before him the sublime stile was

unknown in France, and our language was thought incapable of it. But he has plainly evinced the contrary; and because in opening our eyes he has displayed his address and courage, we cannot pardon him the discovering our stupidity and sloth. This is the consequence of conversing with insensible wretches; we awake them to our prejudice, and because they cannot despise us, they will not fail to hate us (59).

If you find here some lively marks of the admiration of Balzac, you may also observe the fertile effect of so just an admiration. Mr du Rondel clearly discovers that he is able to imitate what he so much values in this great model of majestic eloquence.

(59) Mém. du Rondel's Letter from Maastricht, dated July 10, 1700.

(a) See Colomesti Opuscula, pag. m. 162.

THORIUS (RAPHAEL) a Physician and Latin Poet, flourished in England under the reign of King James the I, (a). He wrote a letter which was printed *de causa morbi & mortis Isaaci Casauboni*. His elegy on Casaubon's death was also published. His Poem on Tobacco is very much esteem'd [A]. I am of opinion that he did not in the least doubt the truth of the maxim, that water drinkers never make good verses (b). Perhaps he was never so put to it in all his life, as when Mr de Peirefc obliged him to drink a large glass of water [B]. King James desired to hear the story, which is very diverting.

(b) Nulla place-re diu nec vivere carmina possunt, Quae scribuntur aequae potioribus. Horatius, Epig. xix, lib. 2, v. 2.

(1) Pag. 475, of the second edition, which is that of Leipzig, 1700.

(2) König, Bibl. pag. 805.

[A] His Poem on Tobacco is very much esteemed. The Oxford catalogue, mentions an English and Latin edition of it at London 1651 in 8vo. *Hymnus Tabaci, or a Poem in honour of Tobacco*. Mr Pasch, Philosophy Professor at Kiel, cites an edition of Utrecht 1644, in 12mo, in the sixth chapter of his treatise *de Inventis novis antiquis* (1). Mr König speaks of an edition of 1628 in 4to at Leyden (2). But this is not the first; for Mr de Zuylichem in the year 1625, wrote some verses in *Petologiam Raphaelis Thorii*. You will find them at the end of *Momenta defloria*. With some Latin verses composed by the same author and Thorius, one against the other by way of an amicable combat.

[B] Mr de Peirefc obliged him to drink a large glass of water. Mr Peirefc dining at London with several learned men, could by no means be excused from drinking a health which Dr Thorius drank to him. The glass was of a monstrous size, for which reason Mr Peirefc excused himself a long while, and alledged a thousand reasons; but he was forced to drink it: Before he did it, he made this bargain that Thorius should drink a health to be proposed by him in his turn. After he had drank the wine, he filled the same glass with water, and took it off, first naming the health to the Doctor. Thorius had like to have sunk, as if he had been struck with thunder, but

finding no way to avoid it, he fetched several profound sighs (3), he put his mouth a thousand times to the brim of the glass, and as often withdrew it. He called to his assistance all the fine sayings of the Greek and Latin Poets, and was almost the whole day in emptying by repeated trials this accursed cup. You will find this more agreeably related by Gassendus, in the following words. *Contigit ut in quodam virorum doctorum convivio, Doctor Thorius ipse Peirefcio ingenti Scypho praeberet: Ac ille quidem se excusare, ob vastitatem patet; ob merum insolitum; ob imbecillum stomachum; ob computandi infrequentiam: verum cum nihil admitteretur, petiit, ut saltem sibi liceret, postquam Thorio fecisset satis, suo arbitrio praeberet. Annuerunt omnes, ac tum assumptis, quasi adigente necessitate animis, secundum hausit calicem, eodemque mox aqua op-pleto, Thorio intentans praeberet, totumque rursus (tanquam injectum temperaturus merum) absorpsit. Ille quasi fulmine ictus, delapsusque nubibus, vix tandem ad se rediit, & quia ex condito agebatur, neque resiliere fas erat, tam longa suspiria e pectore duxit, toties admovit, removitque ora, tot interea carmina ex omnibus Graecis, Latinisque Poetis profudit, ut diem penè contriverit instillandae aquae in insuetum guttur. Atque id ipsum est, quod Rex cum audisset ex aliis, ex Peirefcii ore accipere voluit (4).*

(3) Some believe he was pensive enough, as Poets sometimes are in the heat of their liquor to apply the words of the Evangelist, St. Matth. xxvi, 39.

(4) Gassendus, in Vita Peirefcii, lib. ii, ad ann. 1606, Oper. Tom. v, pag. 263, col. 2.

(a) Stephanus Byzant. voce Τιβαρηνία.

TIBARENIANS, a people of Asia bordering upon the Euxine Sea (a). They were famous for two very remarkable customs, the latter of which seems the consequence of the former. They were extremely addicted to sporting, and laughing, in which they placed their *summum bonum* (b); and as soon as their wives were delivered of their children the husbands kept their beds, played the part of sick persons, and received from their wives all the nursing which in other places is bestowed on child-bed women. It is plain this custom was only owing to this buffooning humour, which led them to make a jest of every thing. Several authors speak of this last custom [A], which was also used in the isle of Corfica (c). Lancelotti of Perugia has unjustly insulted

(c) Diodes. Siculus, lib. v, cap. xiv.

(b) Εὐφρος ἐν πύπτῳ φησὶν, ὅτι Τιβαρηνοὶ καὶ τὸ παιῖον καὶ τὸ γαλῶν εἶναι ἐν γαλῶν καὶ μνηστῆρ ἀνδραμονίαν ἔχοντες. Εὐφροῖ, lib. v, inquit Tibarenes studio ludendi & ridendi teneti & maximam felicitatem hoc judicare. Id. ibid. See also Pomponius Mela, lib. i, cap. xix, ubi says Tibareni Chalybas attingunt quibus in risu lusque summum bonum est.

[A] Several authors speak of this custom. I shall content myself with citing these verses of Apollonius.

Σώοντο πάρεξ Τιβαρηνίδα γαῖαν.
Ἐνδ' ἐπεὶ ἄρ κε τέκονται ὑπ' ἀνδράσι τέκνα
γυναικες,
αὐτοὶ μὲν στενάχουσιν ἐν λεχέεσσιν πεσόντες,
κράτα δ' ὀσάμενοι τὰ δ' ἐν κομέεσσιν ἐδωδ' ἄνιεραι,
ἡδὲ λαστρά λεχέα τοῖσι πίνονται.

Eruperunt ad Tibarenorum terram.

3

Ibi, cum è viris gravidæ mulieres reddiderunt fœtum, Ipse versantur in gemitu, & puerperio cubant, Caputibus circumvinctis: illæ rursus molliter curant escis Præbitis viros, & puerpera ipsi lavacra calfaciant (1).

Among the Tibarenians they retire.
Here, when the teeming wives are brought to bed,
The men cry out, and lie in in their stead;
Bind up their heads, and make their wives take care
To nurse them well, and child-bed baths prepare.

(1) Apollonius, Argonaut. lib. ii, v. 1013, 14, m. 241.

Valerius

insulted Diodorus Siculus on this subject [B]. Theodoret observes that after the Tibarenians had received the Gospel, they abrogated a cruel law which had been observed amongst them, which obliged them to throw their old people head-long from a Precipice (d).

(d) Theodoretus, de Græc. Affect. Sermon. ix, pag. 615.

(2) Valer. Flaccus, Argonaut. lib. v, vers. 143.

Valerius Flaccus says the same thing (2), and if the testimony of two Poets be insufficient, the reader may besides find that of an Historian, in the remark [A] of the article NYMPHODORUS.

[B] Lancelotti of Perugia unjustly insulted Diodorus Siculus on this subject. He published a treatise intitled, *Farfalloni de gli antichi Historici*, where he abuses 'Diodorus Siculus, because in the fourteenth chapter of his fifth book, he affirms that the Corfican women as soon as delivered, quitted their beds to their husbands who lay-in in their stead. And yet nothing is more common in the greatest part of America; or else what is reported of Canada, and several other places, ought to be looked upon as mere cheats; which is not at all likely, considering the condition of those who inform us concerning that part of the world, and the impossibility of their entering unanimously into any agreement to deceive us (3). I wonder that le Mothe le Vayer takes no notice of the Tibarenians nor of the antient Spaniards. Γαργήσαι γὰρ αὐταί, τεκῆσαι τε διακοναί τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐκείνης ἀνδ' αὐτῶν κατακλίνεσθαι. Mulieres enim agros colunt, & cum pepererunt, suo loco viros decumbere jubent, iisque ministrant (4). ----- For the women till the ground, and when they are de-

livered of their children, nurse their husbands, who are put to bed in their room. Mr Colomiés believed that this merry custom which formerly was observed in Berne, viz. that as soon as a woman was delivered she got up, and put her husband to bed, who acted the sick wife, was derived from the Spaniards (5). He adds, that this was practised by the Tartars, according to the testimony of Marcus Paulus Venetus, chap. 41 of the second book of his travels. Note, that various causes might engage these nations to observe this custom; for it is not probable that the humour of turning human life into ridicule, in order to attain the felicity which they placed in laughter, engaged the antient Corficans, and the American nations, to agree with the Tibarenians in this practice. I should be glad to be informed what reasons prevailed with the nations of Canada, &c. who put the husband to bed instead of the woman who was delivered. Would they by this means encourage him to get more children; would they induce him to it by the hopes of a good nursing bout? Or do they fear that if the husband were to have the trouble of acting the nurse, he would be the less willing to make his wife sick? But perhaps it would be found very difficult to account for so ridiculous a custom.

(5) Colomiés Mélanges Historiques, pag. 25.

(3) La Mothe le Vayer, Observations sur la composition des Livres, Tom. xv, of his works, pag. 30, Edit. of Paris, 1681, in 12mo, he cites the ixth Farfalloni.

(4) Strabo, lib. iii, pag. m. 114.

TIBUR, a city of Italy near to, and older than, Rome, called at present Tivoli. It was built on the river Ania (a), either by the Aborigines, according to Dionysius Halicarnassensis (b), or by a company of Greeks from Peloponnesus (c), according to several other authors. It was already in a very flourishing condition, when Æneas landed in Italy [A], if we may believe Virgil, and we find that it made a very long and vigorous

(b) Dionys. Halicarn. Antiq. Roman. lib. i, cap. xvi, pag. m. 14.

(c) See the remark [A].

(a) Now called Teverose.

[A] It was in a very flourishing condition when Æneas landed in Italy. Virgil reckons it amongst the great cities which armed against the Trojans.

Quinque adeo magnæ, positis incudibus, urbes
Tela novant, Atina potens, Tiburque superbum,
Ardea, Crustumericque & turrigeræ Antemnæ (1).

(1) Virgil. Æn. lib. vii, vers. 639.

Five cities forge their arms: th' Atinian powers,
Antemnæ, Tybur with her lofty towers,
Ardea the proud, the Crustumarian town.

DRYDEN.

Leandro Alberti so ill understood this place, that he says, Tibur was one of the cities which forged arms for Æneas. 'N'e fatto anche memoria, says he (2), d'essa città da Vergilio nel settimo libro annoverandola fra quelle cinque città che fabricarono l'armi ad Enea così,

(2) Leandro Alberti, Descritt. di tutta l'Italia, fol. 147, verso, Edit. Venet. 1561.

Quinque adeo, &c.

This city is also recorded by Virgil, in his seventh book among those which forged arms for Æneas;

Five cities, &c.

Virgil in the same book mentions the names of the two Tiburine chiefs who went to the war against Æneas:

Tum gemini fratres Tiburtia moenia linquunt,
Fratris Tiburti dictam cognomine gentem,
Catillusque, acerque Coras, Argiva juvenus (3).

(3) Virgil. ubi supra, vers. 670.

Then two twin brothers from fair Tybur came,
(Which from their brother Tyburs took the name,) Fierce Coras, and Catillus void of fear,
Young Argive champions, in the front appear.

DRYDEN.

Lloyd makes use of this passage to prove that Catillus and Coras built Tybur; but he falsifies the text, by reading *maria condunt* instead of *moenia linquunt*. This is a way to find every where proofs for what

ever we please, this is a way to make the honest reader believe any thing. But we ought not to look for an authority for the building of this city in these words of Virgil, but in those of his commentator Servius. 'De Græcia, says he (4), tres fratres venerunt ad Italiam: Catillus, Coras, Tybur vel Tyburnus. Hi simul omnes unam fecere civitatem & eam de fratris majoris nomine Tybur appellaverunt: licet & alias fecerint singuli. --- From Greece came into Italy three brothers; Catillus, Coras, Tybur or Tyburnus. These all in conjunction founded a city, and called it Tybur from the name of their elder brother: tho' they each of them singly built others.' Pliny ascribes the foundation of this city only to one of these three mentioned in these words of Servius, he speaks, I say, only of Tyburtus, who he pretends was the son of Amphiraus. I have elsewhere (5) cited his words, which, containing something very particular, I would advise the reader to turn to them. Others pretend that the three brothers mentioned by Servius were Amphiraus's grandsons, and the sons of Catillus. Tybur, sicut Cato facit testimonium, à Catillo Arcade præfecto classis Evandri; sicut Sextius, ab Argiva juventute. Catillus enim Amphirai filius post prodigalem patris apud Thebas interitum Oeclei avi iussu (6), cum omni fœtu ver sacrum missus tres liberos in Italia procreavit, Tiburtum, Coram, Catillum, qui depulsus ex oppido Siciliæ veteribus Sicanis, à nomine Tiburti fratris natu maximi urbem vocaverunt (7). --- Tybur, as Cato witnesses, from Catillus the Arcadian Admiral of Evander's fleet; as Sextius, from the Argive youth. For Catillus the son of Amphiraus after the extraordinary death of his father at Thebes, by the command of his grandfather Oeclaus, was sent with all his family under a vow to Italy, where he begot three children, Tyburtus, Coras, and Catillus, who, expelling the antient Sicanians from a city of Sicily, called it Tybur from the name of their elder brother. Salmastius's censure on this passage of Solinus is very unjust. He strangely exclaims against this author. 'Sanum putamus fuisse Solinum cum hæc scriberet? Quis Siciliam pro Italia sanus dixit? . . . Scio Sicanos Italiam olim tenuisse. . . Sed Italiam dictam fuisse Siciliam, nemo, quod sciam, prodidit; falsissimum igitur, & absurdissimum est, quod hec narrat Solinus (8). --- Can we believe Solinus in his wits when he writes this? Who in his

(4) Servius, in Virgil. Æn. VII, vers. 670.

(5) In the remark [M], of the article AMPHIRAUS.

(6) Leandro Alberti, Descritt. d'Italia, fol. 147, batb committed a fault, per comandamento del suo avolo Tideo. By command of his grandfather Tydeus, faith he. His translator is guilty of another in expressing it hortatu Tydei patris. --- By the advice of his uncle Tydeus.

(7) Solin. cap. ii, pag. m. 13.

(8) Salmast. Exercit. Plin. in Solin. pag. 61.

(d) See Livy, lib. vii.
(e) According to Calpurnius, pag. m. 195. Accord- ing to Sigonius, in Faltis, in the year 399.

resistance against the Roman arms (d), before it submitted to that victorious Republic. But it was at last obliged to submit, in the year of Rome 403 (e). It is pretended that this city, once so haughtily upbraided the Romans with its services to that republic, that its deputies could obtain no other answer than these words, *you are proud* (f). The inhabitants had a particular devotion for Hercules, in honour of whom they built a most magnificent temple [B]. They also worshipped with no small zeal the god

(f) See the re- mark [d] at the end.

Tiburnus

'his senses ever called Italy Sicily. . . . I know the Sicilians formerly inhabited Italy. . . . But that Italy was ever called Sicily, no body, that I know of, has ever advanced; and therefore what Solinus says here, is most false and absurd.' But presently after he grows somewhat cooler, he supposes the fault is owing to some wretched Pedant who foisted a gloss on the text of this author. 'Sed fortasse ita scrip- serat: qui depulsi veteribus Sicani, à nomine Tiburti fratris natu maximi urbem vocaverunt, cum sciolus aliquis heic Sicanos legeret, ad oram videtur addi- disse, ex oppido Sicilia quia scilicet putaret Sicanos non alibi quam in Sicilia fuisse (9). . . . But per- haps he wrote thus: who, expelling the antient Sica- nians, built a town, which they called Tybur, after the name of their elder brother, which some pretender reading, seems to have added in the margin, from a city of Sicily, as thinking that there were no other Sicilians but in Sicily.' He did not observe that what he cites nine or ten lines after confounds all his criticism. 'Quinimo Siculos illos veteres Tibur op- tidum tenuisse scribit Dionysius lib. i. παρ' οἷς, inquit, καὶ ἐς τὸδε χρόνον, μέγα τι τῆς πόλεως ἐνομάζετο Σικελίων (10). . . . For that the antient Sicilians inhabited the city of Tybur, Dionysius writes book i. From whom, says he, even to this time one part of this city is called Sicilia.' That is, part of the city Tibur is yet called Sicilia or Siculum. Is not this a manifest evidence that this place was so called before Tiburtus and his brothers drove out the Sica- nians? Why then is this trifling used either against Solinus himself or the present text of his book? Note that Catillus passed for the principal founder of Tibur. Hinc Tibur Catille tuum (11). . . . Catillus hence your Tybur; as Silius Italicus hath it: To which we may add these two verses of Horace:

(9) Id. ibid.

(10) Id. ibid.

(11) Silius Ita- licus, lib. viii, pag. m. 345.

(12) Horat. Od. xviii, lib. i.

(13) Id. Od. vi, lib. ii.

(14) Ovidius, lib. iv, Fasto- rum, ver. 71.

(15) Strabo, lib. v, pag. 165.

(16) Mart. Epig. viii, lib. iv.

(17) Steph. By- zant. voce Ti- buris.

(18) Servius, in Virgil. Æn. VII, ver. 630.

Nullam, Vare, sacra vite prius severis arborem
Circæ mite solum Tiburis, & mœnia Catili (12).

Vare, to plant the vine, suits best of all
Tybur's mild soil, and Catillus's wall.

For the rest, that this city was of Greek original, is unanimously confirmed by an infinite number of au- thors.

Tibur Argeo positum colono
Sit mæx sedes utinam fenestæ (13)!

May Tibur, where Greeks built a seat,
In my old age be my retreat.

Ovid expresses it no less clearly:

Jam mœnia Tiburis udi
Stabant, Argolicæ quæ posuere manus (14).

Most Tybur's walls were standing in those days,
Which Argive hands of old were known to raise.

See also Strabo (15), Martial (16), and Artemidorus cited by Stephanus Byzantinus (17).

We must not forget Servius's commentary on these words, 'Tiburque superbum in the seventh of the Æneid, aut nobile, says he (18), aut per transitum tetigit illud, quod cum aliquando à Senatu auxilia poscerent Tyburtes sub commemoratione beneficiorum, hoc tantum à Senatu responsum acceperunt, superbi estis. . . . This epithet proud, either means its magnificence, or alludes obliquely to its behaviour, when requiring on a certain occasion some assistance from the Senate which it claimed as due in regard to former services, all the answer the Senate gave was, Ye are proud.'

[B] The inhabitants had a particular devotion for Hercules, in honour of whom they built a most magnifi-

cent temple.] Statius ranks Tibur amongst the four places where this deity was principally worshipped.

Nec mihi plus Nemeæ, priscumque habitabit Argos,
Nec Tiburna domus, Solique cubilia Gades (19).

Nor Nemea, nor old Argos will I own
More favourite abodes, nor Tybur's town,
Nor farthest Gades where the sun goes down.

This temple of Hercules was one of those repositories where the richest treasures were secured. Augustus when he had occasion, drew large sums from thence as well as from the capital, the temple of Antium, and that of Lanuvium. He promised to pay interest for them. Appian who relates this, adds, that in his time very considerable sacred treasures were secured in those places (20). The following lines witness that the Oracles were frequently consulted in the temple of Tibur:

Quod ni templa darent alias Tirynthia fortes,
Et Præneste poterant migrare fores (21).

If the Herculean temples silent were,
Præneste's sisters quickly wou'd be there.

These verses are to be met with in one of Statius's Sylvæ, which was composed by him in compliment to Manlius Vopiscus's country-seat near Tibur. The Oracle of Præneste faith Statius, would gladly quit its residence, and remove to this charming place, if the temples of Hercules were not already occupied by other Oracles. The commentators on this place are very much puzzled. Sabellicus owns (22) that he never met with any thing relating to this Oracle of Her- cules of Tibur, and is inclined to believe that this passage rather regards the Oracle of Albunea, a deity, worshipped in conjunction with Hercules by the in- habitants of Tybur. To this purpose are cited the following words, 'Quodque Albuna sacras Tiberis per flumina fortes, portarit (23): . . . And that Al- buna shall extend her Oracles over Tiber's stream: but with very little reason; for this passage has no re- lation to an Oracle which was to be consulted at Ty- bur, but to the books which a Sybil brought to Rome. Another commentator imagines that the fol- lowing passages of Propertius affords an authentic te- stimony:

Nam quid Præneste dubias, ô Cynthia, fortes,
Quid petis Aezæ mœnia Telegoni?
Curve te in Herculeum deportant effeda Tibur?
Appia cur toties te via ducit anum (24)?

Why to Præneste her dark fate to know;
Why thus to Tusculum, does Cynthia go?
Why to Herculean Tybur does she stray?
Why thus grow old upon the Appian way?

You see plainly, says Barthius (25), that Cynthia went to Tibur to consult the Oracle there, and was not this the Oracle of Hercules? I answer that Pro- pertius does not say this voyage to Tibur was founded on that motive. What he observes about consulting the Oracle extends no farther than the first verse: Tibur is no more concerned in it, than the walls of Telegonus, that is Tusculum. The only thing we can learn from this passage of Propertius, with re- gard to Tibur is, that this city enjoyed the epithet of Herculeum. This we may also be informed of from these words of Silius Italicus,

Quosque sub Herculeis taciturno flumine muris
Pomifera arva creant Anienicolæque Catilli (26);

(19) Statius, Sylva i, lib. iii, sub fin. pag. m. 55.

(20) Appianus, lib. v, de Bell. Civilibus, pag. m. 399.

(21) Statius, Sylva III, lib. i, ver. 79, pag. m. 15.

(22) See Barthius in Statium, Sylva III, lib. i, pag. 107.

(23) Tibullus, Eleg. v, lib. ii.

(24) Propert. lib. ii, Eleg. xxxii, pag. m. 476.

(25) Vides clare & Tibur penitus Cynthia ad ca- piendas fores: quæ autem illæ cum hujus præ- cipue nomen hic jungitur, Barth. ibid. pag. 108.

(26) Silius Ita- licus, lib. iv, pag. m. 171.

Tiburinus [C]. The Romans built several country-houses in the territories of this city [D]. This has also been customary in later ages. The inhabitants of Tibur were put to the sword by Totila's soldiers, in the year 545, as Procopius informs us. The German wars ruined this city: Frederic Barbarossa caused the walls to be re-built, and enlarged it. Pope Pius II ordered a fortress to be built there, at the entrance of which is the following inscription of Giovanni Antonio Campani (g).

Grata bonis, invisa malis, inimica superbis
Sum tibi Tibur enim sic Pius instituit (b).

*The good to save, the bad and proud to bow,
Tibur, to Pius I my building owe.*

Lloyd is extremely mistaken when he speaks of the mountain of Tibur, as of a place famous

*And Tybur's race o'er fruitful regions own,
Where Anio's waves wash the Herculean town.*

*Cetronius does high costly villas raise
With Grecian marble, which the fight amaze;
Some stand upon Caieta's winding shore,
At Tibur's tow'r, and at Præneste more.
The dome of Hercules and Fortune show
To his tall fabrics like small cots below.*

DRYDEN.

Shall we forget Horace, who had a house there which he frequently resided at, and so earnestly desired might be the fixed retreat of his old age (37)? 'Vixit plurimum in secessu ruri sui Sabini aut Tiburtini: domusque ejus ostenditur circa Tiburtini lucum (38). . . . He spent great part of his time in his Sabine or Tibur retirement: and his house is shown near the grove of Tybur.' He tells us that Munatius Plancus had a very beautiful house there (39). What I advanced in the beginning of this remark might be proved by a crowd of witnesses, but I shall content myself with a few.

Cum Tiburtinas damnet Curvatus auras
Inter laudatas ad Styga missus aquas.
Nullo fata loco possis excludere: cum mors
Venerit, in medio Tibure Sardinia est (40).

*Since against Tibur's air Curvatus raves,
Sent from its pleasant streams to Stygian waves.
No place can save you: when death leads the way,
Tybur's as fatal as Sardinia.*

These are verses made upon the death of a man, who could not save his life by breathing the fine air of Tibur: and the following were by the same author addressed to Faustinus, who enjoyed the refreshment of this place, during the heats of the dog-days.

Herculeos colles gelida vos vincite bruma,
Nunc Tiburtinis cedite frigoribus (41).

*In winter you th' Herculean hills excel
But now in their cool shade we chuse to dwell.*

I have already cited Silius Italicus, who calls the adjacent lands *pomifera arva*, - - - *fruitful in apples*; to which may be added these verses of Horace.

Et praeceps Anio, & Tiburni lucus, & uda
Mobilibus pomaria ravis (42).

*And Anio's Cai'ra'st, and Tiburnus's grove,
Where thro' moist orchards winding rivi'lets rove.*

Christian Rome hath not been less charmed with the pleasures of Tivoli; for Leandro Alberti relates that the Prelates of the court of Rome, antiently passed the summer in this refreshing air (43). Cardinal Hippolyto d'Este, as Moreri observes, built a very fine palace there, with the most magnificent gardens in the world. Uberto Folietta published a description of it which deserves reading. See also the Itineraries of Italy, particularly those of Andreas Schottus, and Geronimo Capugnani.

(g) Leandro Alberti, Descritt. di tutta l'Italia, fol. m. 248.

(b) Ex eodem, ibid.

(37) See the remark [A], citation (13).

(38) Sueton. in Vita Horatii.

(39) Sen te fulgentia signis Castra tenent, seu densa tenebrae Tiburis umbra tui. Whether in shining camps you stay, Or to your Tyber haste away. Horat. Od. VII. lib. i.

(40) Martial, Epig. ix, lib. iv.

(41) Idem, Epig. vii, lib. iv.

(42) Horat. Od. VII, lib. i.

(43) Leandro Alberti, Descrizione d'Italia, fol. 148.

(27) Martial. Epig. xiii, lib. i, and Epig. lxii, lib. iv, &c.

(28) Leandro Alberti, ubi supra.

(29) Strabo, lib. v, pag. 164.

(30) Aul. Gellius, lib. xix, cap. v.

(31) Horat. Ode VII, lib. i.

(32) Sueton. in Aug. cap. lxvii.

(33) See the remark [I], of the article HADRIAN.

(34) See the remark [C], of the article ZENOBIA.

(35) Stat. Silva III, lib. i.

(36) Juven. Sat. XIV, ver. 86.

VOL. V.

T t t t

[E] Lloyd

TIBUR.

350

famous for the ivory found there [E]. He had better have been silent on this head, and have mentioned the fine quarries with which those parts abounded [F]. We must not forget the fountain and the goddesses Albunea [G], one of the most memorable things in the

[E] Lloyd is extremely mistaken when he speaks of the mountain of Tibur as of a place famous for the ivory found there. He may justly be accused of two gross faults. *Tiburinus mons*, saith he, *locus eboræ notissimus*; and immediately after he cites two verses of Martial, one out of the twelfth epigram of the seventh book

(44) De Tiburtinis albescere collibus audit. Sibi bears that Tibur's bill can bleach. Mart. Epig. xii, lib. vii.

(45) Et Tiburtino monte quod albet ebur. The ivory whitening on Tibur's bill. Id. Epig. xxxviii, lib. viii.

(46) Theophrastus auctor est & ebur fossilis candido & nigro colore inveniri. Pliny, lib. xxxvi, cap. xxviii.

(47) Martial. Epig. xii, lib. vii.

Dum Tiburtinis albescere collibus audit
Antiqui dentis fusca Lycoris ebur,
Venit in Herculeos colles: quid Tiburis alti
Aura valet? parvo tempore nigra redit (47).

*Swarthy Lycoris bears with great delight,
That Tibur's bills can make old ivory white:
Thither she goes, to bleach in Tibur's air;
And soon returns, but black instead of fair.*

Martial's thought is, that Lycoris having heard that old ivory whitened on the mountain of Tibur, went thither; but instead of bleaching her tawny complexion, she turned black in a small space of time. He had made use of the same raillery before.

Tibur in Herculeum migravit nigra Lycoris
Omnia dum fieri candida credit ibi (48).

(48) Idem, Epig. lxii, lib. x.

*Herculean Tibur black Lycoris's seeks,
In hopes its bleaching pow'r might reach her cheeks.*

Ramirez de Prado affirms that Pliny says, the cool air of Tibur gives ivory a greater degree of whiteness (49). He cites also Propertius and Silius Italicus, one of whom says (50).

(49) Lycoris irridet quæ cum sciret ebur candidius fieri frigidissima Tiburis aura ut Plinius testatur. Laus Ramirez de Prado in Mart. Epig. lxii, lib. x.

Rampis Anio qua pomifer incubat arvis
Et nunquam Herculeo numine pallet ebur;

*Where Anio thro' fruitful orchards flows,
And ivory its unchanged whiteness shows,
Which to th' Herculean deity it owes.*

And the other (51):

(50) Propert. Eleg. vii, lib. iv, sub fin.

(51) Silius Italicus, lib. xii, pag. m. 490.

(52) Pafcit dixit pro sustentat & conservat. Ramirez de Prado, ubi supra.

Quale micat semperque novum est, quod Tiburis
aura
Pascit ebur (52).

*As the pure ivory, which in Tibur's air,
Appears for ever new, for ever fair.*

Thus it plainly appears that Mr Lloyd hath improperly cited the second passage of Martial, since it doth not signify that the Tiburtine mountain furnished ivory; but only that the air there had the virtue to preserve the purity and brightness of ivory, and even to repair them.

[F] The fine quarries with which those parts abounded. Strabo speaks of them, and observes that they furnished stone for the greatest part of the edifices of Rome (53). The stones of Tibur were in great esteem; (53) Strabo, lib. They were so hard, as to be proof against all heavy burdens and injuries of the weather; but the fire soon destroyed them. 'Tiburtini (lapides) ad reliqua

'fortes, vapore diffiliunt (54). -- The Tiburtine stones (54) Pliny, lib. 'bear every thing else, but fly with heat.' These words of Pliny will become more intelligible by comparing them with the following: 'Tiburtina vero & quæ

'eodem genere sunt omnia, sufferunt & ab oneribus & à tempestatibus injurias: fed ab igni non possunt esse tuta: simulque ut sunt ab eo tacta, diffiliunt & dissipantur, ideo quod temperatura naturali parvo

'sunt humore (55). -- Those of Tibur, and all of that kind, bear all injuries from weights and weather; but are not at all secure from fire: for as soon as they are affected with that, they split and fly in pieces, because of their having so very little moisture in their

'natural temperature.' Pliny relates as a witty repartee what Cicero said to the people of Chios, who out of ostentation shewed him the walls of their houses built with speckled marble. I should admire them much more, said Cicero, if they had been built with Tiburtine stone. *Primum, ut arbitror, versicolores istas maculas Chiorum lapidinae offenderunt, cum exstruerent muros, facito in id M. Ciceronis fide: omnibus enim ostentabant ut magnificum. Multo, inquit, magis mirarer, si Tiburtino lapide fecissetis (56).* A very

learned man pretends that if these stones had been transported to the isle of Chios, they would perhaps have been more esteemed, because far fetched (57). This is not unlikely: but I do not believe that Cicero's

raillery was grounded upon this foundation; he seems rather to have meant only this: you buy your marble very cheap, your island produces it, do not brag therefore of the sumptuousness of your buildings. Your riches and expences would appear more magnificent, if the materials of your buildings were brought from

Tibur. (56) Plinius, lib. xxxvi, cap. vi, pag. 237. (57) Rome vulgaris in eam ad vectus infamem acceptisset fortassis ab loci underetur intercedine pretium. Herdian. in Plin. lib. d.

[G] We must not forget the fountain and the goddesses Albunea.] Let us begin this note with a passage of Virgil.

At rex follicitus monftris, oracula Fauni
Fatidici genitoris adit, lucosque sub altâ
Consult Albunea: nemorum quæ maxima sacro
Fonte sonat, sævumque exhalat opaca mephitis.
Hinc Italæ gentes, omnique Oenotria tellus,
In dubiis responsa petunt (58).

*Latinus, frighted with this dire oment,
For counsel to his father Faunus went.
And sought the shades renown'd for prophecy,
Which near Albunea's sulphurous fountain lie.
To those the Latian, and the Sabine land
Fly, when distress'd, and thence relief demand.*

I omit the remainder of this passage, and only observe that it informs us, that those who consulted this Oracle slept on the skins of their victims, and received their answer during their sleep. It doth not appear certainly from these words of Virgil, whether the god Faunus resided in the Albunean grove; for the laws of Grammar allow us to believe that King Latinus consulted the Oracle of Faunus, and the sacred Albunean groves, that is to say, that he informed himself of the pleasure of the gods in two different places: but yet the most reasonable meaning of these words seems to be, that the King consulted the Oracle of Faunus in the sacred Albunean grove. There is one small difficulty to get over, which is, that no person, that I know of, informs us that there was any Oracle of the god Faunus at Tibur. This city adored Hercules as their grand Divinity: their other deities were Tiburnus and Albunea. Faunus is not mentioned. Will any one say that Virgil was not here concerned to accommodate his fictions to tradition? This may perhaps be more true than probable. However it be, we may observe that Albunea was at the same time

(58) Virgil. Æn. lib. vii, ver. 41.

the neighbourhood of Tibur.

(59) Sciendum
sine unum no-
men esse fontis
& silvæ. Servius,
in Virgil. *Æn.*
lib. vii, ver. 82.

(60) In Tibur-
tino alfidium
montibus. *Id. ib.*

(61) Horat. Ode
VII, lib. i.

(62) Lactant.
lib. i, Divin.
Instit. cap. vi,
pag. m. 19.

(63) Strabo, lib.
v, pag. 164.

(64) Juxta Ro-
mam Albule æ-
que vulneribus
medentur. *Plin.*
lib. xxvi, cap.
ii, p. 779.

(65) Sueton. in
Augusto, cap.
lxxxi.

(66) Cluver.
Ital. antiq. lib.
ii, cap. x.

(67) Virgil. *Æn.*
lib. vii, ver. 82.

(68) Martial.
lib. i, Epig. xiii.
See also Epig. iv,
lib. iv, and Sta-
tius Silva iii,
lib. i, ver. 75.

(a) Engolismenfi
agro oriundus.
Thuanus, lib.
xviii, circa fin.
pag. m. 974.
Sammarthanus,
Elogior. lib. ii,
pag. m. 80,
expressis himself
thus: Ducebant
Tilli genus suum
ab Engolisma.
La Croix du
Maine is mistaken
in filling the bro-
ther of this per-
son a gentleman
of Paris.

time the name of a grove, of a fountain (59), and of a deity of the mountain of Tibur (60). She only appears under the notion of a fountain in these words of Horace, ' & domus Albunæ resonantis (61): - And *Albunæ's murmuring fountain*.' In the words of Virgil before quoted, she appears under the notion of a grove as well as of a fountain; but the following passage of Lactantius elevates her to a goddess: *Decimam Tiburtini, nomine Albunam, quæ Tiburi colitur, ut dea, juxta ripas amnis Anienis: Cujus in gurgite Stimulacrum ejus inventum esse dicitur, tenens in manu librum. Cujus sacra Senatus in Capitolium transfulerit* (62). That is, Albunea was the tenth of the Sibyls and worshipped at Tibur as a goddess; and her image was reported to have been found with a book in her hand in the gulph of Anio. Note that some are of opinion that the fountain Albunea was only another name for those mineral waters called *Albula* or *Albule*. Strabo says they were cold, that they arose from several springs, and either drank or bathed in, cured several diseases (63). Pliny ascribes to them only the virtue of healing wounds (64): but Suetonius (65) does not speak of them with this restriction. Cluverius (66), who believes them to be the fountain Albunea, may allege this reason for it: this fountain according to Virgil trunk,

Sævumque exhalat opaca Mephitim (67).

And shaded o'er emits a sulph'rous smell.

But according to Martial and several others this quality belonged to the mineral waters called *Albula* or *Albule*.

Canaque sulfureis Albula fumat aquis (68).

And sulph'rous steams rise from pale Albula.

Therefore, &c. Note, that Albula was a small river which discharged itself into the Anio, whose principal spring according to Cluverius was the fountain Albunea. This author believes that the image of the Tiburtine Sibyl or Albunea was reported to be found in this fountain. He adds that the ancients made a deity of this spring, and consecrated to it a grove, a Temple and an Oracle (69), and that it appears from an epigram of Martial that there was a grove consecrated to the Muses in this place (70). But the last is utterly false, and Cluverius read too hastily the following words of Martial.

Itur ad Herculei gelidas quæ Tiburis arces,
Canaque sulfureis Albula fumat aquis.
Rura, nemusque sacrum, dilectaque jugera Musis
Signat vicina quartus ab urbe lapis:
Hic rudis æstivas præfabat porticus umbras,
Heu quam, &c (71).

To Tibur's airy towers where leads the way
And sulph'rous steams rise from pale Albula:
The fourth mile stone points out the sacred grove,
And pleasant fields, seats which the Muses love.
Here the rude porch yielded a summer shade,
Alas how, &c.

If he had considered them with the least attention, he would have found that they did not in the least concern Tibur but another place in the road thither, four miles from Rome. It is not even certain that there was in this place a grove consecrated to the Muses: it may be supposed that Martial meant nothing more, than that Regulus's lands were beloved by these goddesses (72). We ought to take notice that Martial has placed a distance of twenty miles between Rome and Tibur (73).

(69) That is, the Oracle of Faunus.

(70) Sed & Camenarum fons Musarum ibidem fuisse nemus ex Martialis Epig. xiii, lib. i, colligere datur. Epitome Cluverii, per Bunonem Ital. antiq. lib. ii, cap. x, pag. 431.

(71) Mart. Epig. xiii, lib. i.

(72) So Farnaby understands that verse of Martial.

(73) Mart. Epig. lvi, lib. iv.

TILLET (JOHN DU) in Latin *Tilius*, Protonotary, and Secretary to the king, and Register to the Parliament of Paris, was born in Angoumois (a), and flourished in the XVIth century. He applied himself with surprising diligence to illustrate the History of France; and it may be said, that no body has ever yet treated this great subject according to the plan which he laid down. He not only proposes to give a particular account of the wars, and general events which are to met with in the meanest Chroniclers; but he likewise inquired into (b) whatever related to the domains of the crown, the laws and ordinances, the ancient form of government, the person and household of the king, the officers of the crown, the grandes of the realm, the creation of their offices, ranks, duties, and undertook to explain all this by authentic records, whereof he gave catalogues which were very curious and instructive. He would have carried on his work much farther, if the court had furnished the necessary expences; but he complains that he was obliged to put a stop to it, because he was not assisted in the great charges which his inquiries made unavoidable [A.]

A small

[A] He complains that he was obliged to put a stop to it, because he was not assisted in the great charges . . . unavoidable.] This particular, which will without doubt be agreeable to curious readers, is to be met with in the epistle dedicatory of his work. I shall cite a long passage of it, since it will acquaint us with several circumstances of this author's undertaking. It must be remembered that he addresses himself to Charles IX. ' Having with very great labour and expence searched, since my institution in my office, an infinite number of registers of your parliament, examined the libraries and charters of several churches in your kingdom, and, by the permission of the late King, your father, (whom God absolve) had access to your treasury of charters, and inspected them all by his command, and upon his declaration that he would bear the charge, and recompence my assistants, (who must necessarily be very many in works of this kind), I undertook to compile in an historical form, and according to the order of reigns, all the differences of this third line now reigning with its neighbours, the domains of the crown by provinces, the laws and ordinances from the Salic law by volumes, and reigns, and, in a particular collection, what relates to the persons and families of our kings, the ancient form of government of the three estates, and the

course of justice in the said kingdom, together with the changes which have happened therein. Pliny relates, that King Alexander the Great expended eighty thousand talents, which amount to forty eight thousand crowns, in voyages, and other charges which were necessary to attain the knowledge of the properties of animals, whereof Aristotle by his command composed fifty books. The eighth part would have served to compleat my said works, which I began to apply myself to with great diligence, and presented to his Majesty six volumes of them: four relating to the said differences, one to the said ordinances, and one to the persons and families royal: but it happened to me as Mr Girard de Mountagu, Secretary and Treasurer of the Charters to King Charles V, writes in the prefatory epistle to the Repertory-General, and Register of the said Treasury marked A. A. that some of his predecessors in the said office had begun a work relating to the said Treasury, but left it imperfect, for want of being able to bear the expence, and so have I been forced to do. For however, the said King, and the Queen your mother declared their pleasure, and even frequently gave their command, for the furnishing the charges, and recompence for my assistants, and in order to perfect the said works, they produced no effect, and

I was

A small part only of his vast collections has been published [B]. If he acquired a great reputation by this exact knowledge of the constitution of the kingdom, he on the other hand amassed great riches [C], by his great assiduity in the particular functions of his office. The book which he published in the year 1560, concerning the king's majority, rendered him odious to the Protestants. They refuted it, and he reproaches one of their Historians for supposing that he never made them any reply [D]. They published some disadvantageous things of him, as the motives to his work,

'I was abandoned, and even reproached by my said assistants, whom I had entertained a long time, partly at my own expence, and partly fed with the hopes of the said recompence. This, I say, in my excuse, and to testify the infinite regret which I have upon being disabled from doing that service to your crown which I wished, not ascribing to others that misfortune, (if it be one), yet notwithstanding this accordance, to my duty I have upon my own sole bottom, as far as I was able continued part of my undertaking. . . . I have enlarged by one half the collection concerning the persons and families Royal, and, if I live, I will pursue and perfect what relates to the three estates, and to the course of justice in your said kingdom (1)'.
(1) Du Tillet, Epistle to King Charles IX, before his collection of the Kings of France, &c.

[B] A small part only of his vast collections has been published. We have just now seen that they consisted of six volumes, and that while he was waiting for assistance to put the finishing hand to the five first, he prepared the sixth, and dedicated it to Charles IX. It was printed under this title, *Recueil des Rois de France, leurs Couronne & Maison*: but I would not warrant that it had the same title upon the first publication; for Du Verdier Vau-Privas (2), and La Croix du Maine (3), mention only this Title, *Memoires & Recherches touchant plusieurs choses memorables pour l'intelligence de l'Etat & des Affaires de France*. La Croix du Maine adds that this book first printed at Rouen in the year 1577 for Philip de Tours, was reprinted at Paris by James du Puis, and that this second edition is much more full and correct, and was revised by the author's manuscript, with several figures and portraits of the Kings of France, their coins, and other remarkable things, which were not in the first edition. After this he particularises the works not printed, and places in this list the collection relating to the persons and families royal, and the treatise on the King's majority. This is a mistake, since it is certain that the latter of those two books had already been published in 1560, and perhaps also the former is the same with that just now mentioned by La Croix du Maine to have passed two editions. Note, that soon after there was published a work of du Tillet in Latin concerning the history of France: it was printed at Frankfurt in the year 1579, under the Title *Commentarii de Rebus Gallicis*.

(4) In the Advertisement to the Reader.

The Bookseller who published the Collection of the Kings of France, their crown and family, gave hopes that the heirs of du Tillet would not stop there. Now let the name, says he (4), the praise, and the memory of the said Sieur du Tillet be perpetuated in this kingdom, let them be perpetuated every where else. . . . And to the gentlemen, his sons, in like manner, let thanks be given in the name of us all, whom they have not only obliged with the impression and publication of this work: but also promise us others too of the same hand, and of the like matter, having a great regard and zeal for the grandeur of our nation, and the singular pleasure and satisfaction of every one, who is desirous to be informed in things of this kind, no less than their late Father. Reader, Having solicited and obtained from them this considerable promise for your use and benefit, I also take upon my self, and engage to remind them of it continually, out of the desire I have to procure and communicate to you, by my impression, something which may confirm and preserve you in the opinion you may have already conceived of me, that I do and shall always make it my business to publish such books as may prove very greatly to your advantage. Adieu. I think that after the first edition of this collection, the sons of John du Tillet furnished the Booksellers successively with the following additions. I. A collection of the ranks of the greatees of France. II. An account of every family of the kings and greatees of France. III. A collection of the wars and treaties of peace, truces, and alliances, between the kings of France and England. IV. A memoir and admonition concerning the liberties of the Gallican Church. These four pieces

are to be met with in my edition, which is that of Paris (5) 1618 in 4to, with a chronicle, by way of (6) By Peter abridgment, of the kings of France, composed by Metayer. John du Tillet, Bishop of Meaux, brother to the Register.

La Croix du Maine did not know that our John du Tillet was the author of an *Institution of a Christian father to his children*, which was printed at Paris in the year 1563 in 4to. I find in the catalogue of the Archbishop of Rheims's library (6), *Sommaire de l'Histoire de la guerre faite contre les Albigeois, extraite du Tresor des Chartres par Jean du Tillet, à Paris chez Robert Nivelles 1590 in 8vo*. Mr Teissier observes that there is also a book intitled *Pontificum aliquot Romanorum exempla cum Ethnicorum Principum gestis comparata, printed in the year 1576, composed by John Tilius* (7). He knows not which of the two brothers is the author of it. I do not know it neither: I only know that this work was printed at Amberg, in the year 1610 in 8vo.

[C] If he acquired a great reputation . . . he amassed . . . great riches.] Thuanus furnishes me with this circumstance, tho' he does not express it in the same manner as I have done. I shall give the words of this great Historian. 'Qui (Jo. Tilius) cura, diligentia, & summa in suo munere assidue, non solum ingentes opes, sed veram gloriam, & quæ majorem nemo nostrorum antea meruit, exacta Juris nostri & Franco-Galliæ omnis antiquitatis cognitione sibi comparavit (8). . . . John du Tillet, by his care, diligence, and extreme application in his office, not only acquired great riches, but also true glory, to which none of our countrymen were more entitled, by his exact knowledge of all the laws and antiquities of France.'

[D] He reproaches one of their Historians for supposing that he never made them any reply.] Whenever we mention the disputes of authors, we ought not to neglect observing what was the first occasion of them, and what was the subject of their writings. We must not therefore be under any concern, if some readers should think the following quotations too long. Charles V had passed at the wood of Vincennes in the year 1374, an ordinance concerning the Kings of France, attaining their majority on their entering into the fourteenth year, which was approved, and published in parliament, the King being present, and holding his bed of justice, the twentieth of May, one thousand three hundred and seventy five. Notwithstanding, after the death of the said King Henry II, when his eldest son King Francis II, took the crown at the age of fifteen years, five months, and twenty one days, and being also married, some desiring to change the religion in that kingdom, resorted, by audacious writings, upon the administration of the said King, and of the Queen his mother as unlawful: to whom I presented at that time a piece intitled, *Pour la Majorité du Roy tres-Chrestien contre les rebelles*. . . . For the majority of the most Christian King against the rebels. Their Majesties having seen it, and found that the authority of the said King was therein asserted and proved, commanded that it should be printed and published. I remonstrated that it was not drawn up with any other view than for instruction and advice, in order that the said authority might not be suffered to be infringed, which might be preserved and secured without the printing that piece. However to inform every one of the right of the said King, their said Majesties persisted in ordering the said impression. Which being finished, there came out soon after an answer to it, under the title of *Legitime Conseil, --- Lawful Advice, to which I replied by another piece, intitled, Pour l'entière Majorité du Roy tres-Chrestien, contre le Legitime Conseil malicieusement intitulé par les rebelles*. . . . For the full majority of the most Christian King, in answer to the Lawful Advice so intitled by the rebels, which put a full stop to them. This answer was passed over without the least notice by that impostor in his commentaries on the state of religion, and

(7) Teissier, Addit. aux Eloges, Tom. i, pag. 345.

(8) Thuanus, lib. xlviii, pag. m. 974, col. 2.

work, and went so far back as to relate the facts which they pretended were the cause of his aversion for Renaudie, the chief of the conspiracy of Amboise [E]. I shall recite (c) (c) In the remark [E]. what

(9) Du Tillet, *Recueil des Rois de France*, pag. m. 277, 278.

(10) Commentaires de l'Etat de la Religion & Republ. liv. ii, fol. 38, verso.

(11) Ibid. fol. 43.

(12) Ibid. folio 44.

(13) Ibid. folio 45.

of the republic published without any name. But the said piece itself still extant is sufficient to convict him of an impudent calumny both in this and other particulars (9). The person he calls an impostor was the President de la Place, who has given but a very indifferent character of him in his history. We shall take a short view of this scene. La Place gives at first (10) a particular account of the several books and libels published against the house of Guise in the reign of Francis II. He says afterwards that they were answered by John du Tillet by a piece intitled the *Majority of the King* (11). He gives a very short abstract of this work, and concludes it in these words (12): 'And lastly, he addresses himself to those who declare that they make profession of the gospel, telling them that their assertion was false, and that what they professed was rather a novel opinion, calling their preachers mutinous and seditious: and concluding that God would bless the arms that should be made use of against them.' He adds, that almost as soon as this book was published there was an answer made to it, of which he gives an exact summary, and does not forget to enlarge upon the personal reflexions therein used. 'It was added, says he (13), that the author of the said book, being advanced to honour and dignity by the liberality of the Kings of France, (whose pen ought to have been consecrated and dedicated only to maintain equity, the states, and policy of this kingdom, and the authority of justice) had very much forgot himself, by endeavouring to confirm the authority of those who have never ceased to pervert all orders whatsoever hitherto observed in this kingdom, without returning any answer, deliberately, and with design, to what had been alledged, that those of the house of Guise were absolutely incapable of the places they held. And appearing as if he had no regard to this, he fell foul upon those who were no way to blame, and who in proper time and place would not be backward in their own defence: but this author at last painted himself to the life in the colours of Achitophel, whom he exactly resembled in the counsel he gave at the conclusion of his book. For as the former advised the pursuing the loyal party who were for supporting their King against the usurper Absalom: so the latter advises the putting them all to the sword, declaring himself by this a rebel, and traitor, and desiring nothing but cruelty, confusion, and the destruction of the kingdom.' Here the scene ends: and, to speak freely of it, we must allow it to be either too short or too long. For if the Historian had a mind to say nothing of du Tillet's reply, he ought to have passed over the answer of the Protestants; and since he did not think proper to suppress the latter, he ought not to have suppressed the former. We shall see presently that he is not the only person who has been guilty of this small sin of omission, and that others have been guilty of something worse.

[E] They published some disadvantageous things of him, as the motives to his work, and went so far back as to relate the facts . . . the cause of his aversion for . . . the chief of the conspiracy of Amboise.] Louis de Regnier, Sieur de la Planchette, having given almost word for word the same account with the President de la Place, stopped short all at once, without saying one word of John du Tillet's reply. He did even much worse; for he affirmed that this author being pressed to reply, answered, that it was much better not to make any reply. 'There were several other persons who took pen in hand in answer to du Tillet's book, but if I was to give an account of them all, it might give the reader too much trouble. These answers falling into the hands of the Cardinal, he sent for du Tillet, and his brother the Bishop of St Brien, and desired them in the presence of his most intimate and familiar friends to write a reply. For, said he, I am afraid these pieces will make their way into Germany, and break the King's measures, since the princes, namely the Protestants with whom we would keep friendship, are very great readers of such books: and whence once they have made an impression on their heavy brains, it is not easy for the secret agents we have among them to find means to

VOL. V. No. CXXVIII.

deface them. On the contrary, this greatly opens the way for the Huguenots to procure audience, in such sort that we cannot so readily play upon these princes as we could wish, and we are the more frequently defeated in our designs. It is said that du Tillet excused himself very earnestly, because the subject was difficult, and too much cleared up by the histories of France: so that this would be only furnishing fresh matter for the Huguenots, to write on and over-load the Cardinal and his family with abuse. That among those desperate persons, there were some of surprising parts, who had no other way of maintaining their credit, or supporting their cause, but by their writings. So far ought we to be from giving them the least handle of this kind, that instead of writing we ought to employ against their persons and effects all the severities that can be contrived; in order to take from them all firm footing, and to discourage their writings: which was judged the best expedient by all the company, and that the Cardinal might write particular letters to the German princes, which would serve as an ample vindication against all calumnies that might be charged upon him, and not being published in print would not be contradicted. And this he promised to do as what was most advisable (14).

The history from which I take this passage is a book which it would be very hard for an infinite number of persons to meet with: the bare citing it therefore will be of little or no service to them; the only true way to satisfy them is to relate here at full length the account we there find concerning the motives of du Tillet. It is an account full of very curious and remarkable matters. I shall therefore give it here, without being afraid of tiring the reader with the prolixity of the quotation.

(15) Du Tillet, . . . rummaging the ancient registers and records of the Parliament of Paris, began to look into them; and finding several memorable pieces which had been quite forgot by our Historiographers, either through carelessness or ignorance, he proposed to make a collection of them for the service of posterity. This being intimated to the King (16), he found it would be very proper and useful in regard to his own interest, and that of the kingdom. And therefore commanded him to pursue it with diligence; and as it was a work of great expence, money was given him for the undertaking, with the promise of a reward. Because also it was proper for him to be assisted with registers and informations from the chamber of accounts, from the treasury of charters, and other places, he had letters containing very express command, to give him admittance to them, and to let him take whatever he should have occasion for. In which he used an extreme diligence. But having advanced the work, the king died, without du Tillet's receiving the reward he expected. And what surprized him more was, that after the death of the king, all his friends found themselves estranged or banished from the court, so that his place of Register was in great danger by reason of its value, and because those of the house of Guise had at that time begun a method of distributing among their friends all the offices, and places of advantage which they could lay their hands on. Du Tillet had then only access to the Constable, whom he made acquainted with the command he had received from the late king, and the service that France ought to expect from it. In which he did not forget the pains he had taken, requesting in recompence for those and for his services, that at least his post of Register to the Parliament might be continued and confirmed to him. The Constable, who had received some services from du Tillet, promised to present him to the king, have him confirmed in his place, and to use his interest for him. But with respect to his book, not being a man of letters, he did not concern himself about it. It happened that as he was speaking of it to the king, and du Tillet had his books lying before him on the table, the Cardinal of Lorraine came in, and cast his eye upon them. And believing that this work would be very proper to instruct him in state-affairs,

U u u

(14) La Planchette, *Histoire de François II*, pag. 370, & seq.

(15) Ibid. pag. 372, & seq.

(16) The author speaks of Francis I.

(d) In the remark [C].

what they advanced: The reader may judge of it as he pleases. We shall see in the following article (d), that he was said to have been a pupil of Calvin. He died at Paris on the 11th of November 1570 (e). His place of Register to the Parliament of Paris was enjoyed by his descendants for above a century [F]. It ought not to be forgot, that he was

(e) Peter de St Romuald, Journ. Chron. Tom. ii, pag. 540. La Croix du Maine, Bibl. Franc. pag. 269, and Sammarth. Elogior. lib. ii, pag. m. 80, mention only the month of November. Corret Marci, who places his death in the month of December.

and to compleat the designs he had already formed, he began to find fault with, and to cast an odium upon this excellent undertaking of du Tillet, and even to accuse him before his majesty of disloyalty, in designing to publish the secrets of the kingdom, and those things which our kings ought with the greatest care to conceal, that they may be inspected only by very few persons. The Constable did not insist much in favour of du Tillet. For he was of opinion that learning effeminated the gentry, and made them degenerate from their predecessors, and even that it had engendered heresies, and increased the Lutherans to such a number as they were then arrived to in the kingdom, so that he had very little esteem for learned men, and their books; which was the reason that du Tillet did not find so much countenance and support from this quarter as he expected. However, finding himself thus rebuked, he alledged the command he had received from the late king, and desired that his books might be read and examined, by which it would be found that he had not exceeded the bounds of his instructions. Upon this the Cardinal procured an order from the king to take these books to peruse them, and to make his report to the council. This he accordingly did, and sent them home to his house, where he ordered du Tillet to attend him to give him an account of what he had done, and to wait the king's pleasure. Thus was this affair at a stand, and du Tillet, instead of receiving a recompence for his long labours, had enough to do to make all the friends he could to appease the Cardinal: so that he was afraid of losing his goods, estates, and life. The cardinal on his part having caused these books to be perused by some learned persons whom he kept in his family, to instruct him in such affairs as he was to propose to the council, to which he was then very much a stranger, by reason of his youth, and want of experience, he found by their report, that these labours might be of great use and assistance to him: but that to publish them in print, there were things of too great importance, and which might even prejudice the rights which his family claimed to some duchies and lordships of France. He never thought he ought not to treat the author so roughly, but to caress, and receive him kindly, and to procure for him the confirmation of his place. Which being done, would lay him under so great an obligation, that it would be easy to get him to suppress whatever these books contained in derogation to his rights. Besides, that the gaining such a servant to the parliament, would be no small conquest: for by his means it would be easy to learn all the secrets of that court. All which they engaged to bring him to comply with, and to think himself very happy also in meeting with such good fortune. The Cardinal approved of this advice, and knew so well how to put it in practice, that he gained the point he aimed at, in such manner as we have before related. Du Tillet also esteeming it no small matter, to be received into the good graces of the Cardinal, and to have the confirmation of his office by his favour, became his affectionate servant: and, in order to find means to inform him of every thing with greater certainty, he recommended to him his own brother for Protonotary. By this means, as the Cardinal increased in favour, fortune, honours, and grandeur, the affection of this Register for his service increased in proportion; so that no law-suit was ever carried on so secretly, with regard to fine duchies, counties, or lordships of consideration, but that he was advertised of it, so as to find means to recover them. The said Cardinal, therefore, having afterwards attained the highest post under the reign of Francis II, whose history we are writing; du Tillet voluntarily took in hand the defence of the house of Guise, knowing that if any harm should happen to them, his life might one day be in danger: as, on the contrary, it was to be imagined that this piece having strengthened their cause, must entitle him to greater favour, as in truth the Protonotary, who had also found means to be employed by the Queen-mother, received for recompence the Bishopric of S. Brieu. The court of parliament induced by the like respect, and willing to oblige these governors, gave a licence to this book of the Majority, using all their power to suppress the pieces on the other side, and making enquiry after the Printers who were suspected of publishing them, in order to punish them as guilty of high-treason. Moreover, there was another consideration which put this Register upon writing against those of the enterprize of Amboise, namely, the mortal enmity he bore to la Renaudie, on account of a law-suit between them for matters of forgery, wherein the honour of du Tillet was greatly concerned. And though he obtained a verdict in his favour (17), yet Renaudie publicly and expressly declared, that it was by his interest that he had succeeded in all the courts of France, and in regard to his place, which gave him such great opportunities of serving his friends: but that he hoped, that if ever justice should be open to him, he should make the iniquity of the judgments appear, and convict du Tillet of forgery, as in fact he did obtain a reversal, and letters of rehearing some time before the death of King Henry. He reproached also du Tillet, that after he and his family had been maintained and educated in the house of la Renaudie, he had been sent to Paris very young to solicit their law-suits, and there entertained so curiously and closely in his studies, that by their favour and interest he was at last preferred to this post of Register to the parliament; which finding himself possessed of, instead of rendering his loyal service to that house for the favours he had received from it, he had, by forgeries all very manifest, procured for his brothers four or five thousand livres a year in benefices, which were held by one of the uncles of the said Renaudie: and farther, sought all means to appropriate to himself the remaining part of their estate, because he had got possession of all the deeds and titles to it. But all this was superseded by the death of la Renaudie, who while living had kept du Tillet in the greatest anxiety.

I believe the history of the Sieur de la Planche was not printed till after the death of John du Tillet.

[F] His office of Register . . . was enjoyed by his descendants for above a century.] This is what we find in the True State of France, printed in 1657. There is in the Parliament of Paris a Register in chief, who is now Jary, but Mr du Tillet, whose ancestors enjoyed this office for three hundred years past, which is one of the most profitable in all France (18). Here is, in my opinion, an error in Chronology: for I believe that before our John du Tillet, not one of his family (19) had ever been Register in chief to the Parliament of Paris. And note, that the State of France, printed in 1680 (20), names Philip-James as Register at that time.

Here follows a fine encomium on the grandson of John du Tillet. On the 29th of December, 1646, Monsieur du Tillet, Register in chief to the Parliament almost during sixty years, died after a tedious distemper, which he underwent with very great patience. He is commended in a most particular manner for having given in his life-time above a million of gold in charities, alms, and liberalities, and yet not left either the name or arms of John du Tillet, Baron de Buffiere, any way recorded on that account. He lived seventy-eight years and six days (21) (§ a).

(§ a) It is not true, as Mr Bayle very justly observes, that the office of Register in chief to the Parliament was for 300 years successively in the family of du Tillet, neither is it true that John du Tillet was the first of his family who was preferred to it. This will appear by the following extract from a memoir communicated

(17) Compare with this the words of Parlat, pag. 102, of the History of Francis II. La Renaudie had a long law-suit with John du Tillet, Register in Chief to the Parliament of Paris. It was for the ecclesiastical benefice of Champignolle in Angoumois, of six thousand livres a year; and la Renaudie after having prosecuted him through all the supreme jurisdictions of the kingdom, under pretext that his adversary had relations there, obtained at last an evocation to the Parliament of Dijon, where he was legally convicted of forgery. Parlat adds that du Tillet caused la Renaudie to be imprisoned, who could not prevent being condemned to death; but that the Prince of Joinville, loved the life of this prisoner, and obtained letters of rehearing, which re-established him in his estate and reputation. Tottel's Register, 220, pag. m. Renaudie was condemned only to pay a large fine, and to be banished for some time.

(18) Véritable Etat de la France, pag. 453, Edit. of 1657.

(19) That is to say, father, grandfather, and grandfathers, which is the meaning of the author whom I have cited.

(20) At pag. 430, of Tom. II.

(21) Peter de St Romuald, Journ. Chron. Tom. ii, p. 70.

was either the author or promoter of the edict (f) which prohibits the remitting money to Rome for the dispatching of benefices (g).

(f) Made in September 1551.

(g) Thuanus, lib. viii, pag. 168.

communicated by Mr Francis Janicon, Advocate to his Majesty's privy-council, and Deputy-General of the Reformed Churches in Guienne.

ELIAS DU TILLET, whose father was Secretary to Louisa de Savoy, Countess of Angoulême, the mother of Francis I, was ennobled in April 1434, and was, in 1514, President of the Accounts in Angoulême, and Vice-president of the Chamber of Accounts in Paris. In regard to him, Francis I gave to his son SERAPHIN DU TILLET, knight, Valet de chambre to the King, the office of Register in chief to the Parliament of Paris, in which he succeeded Nicholas Pichon his father-in-law. The Letters-patent of this grant are dated at Claye the fifth of November 1518, and he was sworn in the fourth of February 1519, new stile. From that time, this office has not been out of the family. JOHN, his brother, obtained it, on the seventh of September 1530; JOHN, his son, the twenty-fourth of July 1552; JAMES, his brother, on the second of January 1578; JOHN,

called *the Younger*, on the fourth of March 1588; FRANCIS, in 1638; and JOHN-FRANCIS, in 1674. This year the king divided the office into four parts, whereof a person named Philip-James had one, which he enjoyed till 1689, when JOHN-FRANCIS DU TILLET re-entred upon it. John du Tillet, brother to the first John, and son of Elias, was made Bishop of St Brieux, in 1553, and Bishop of Meaux the 16th of December 1565. He died in the month of December 1570.

It appears from hence, 1. That Seraphin du Tillet was the first of this family who was Register in chief to the Parliament of Paris. 2. That this Philip-James was not of the family of du Tillet, as this passage, related by Mr Bayle, implies, and as Mr Bayle himself appears to have believed. 3. That this Philip-James seems to have discharged this office only till such time as *J. Fr. du Tillet* should come of age, or be qualified to discharge it himself. REM. CRIT.]

TILLET (JOHN DU) younger brother of the foregoing, was an Ecclesiastic, and became a very learned man (a). He was a perfect master of languages, the ancient Roman law, and Ecclesiastical Antiquity. He searched, by the permission of Francis I, the most celebrated libraries in the kingdom, and took from those libraries a great many books, which enabled him to publish several valuable ancient pieces, both Ecclesiastical and Civil (b) [A], and particularly an old manuscript, that goes under the name of Charlemagne [B], and which did not much please the Roman Catholics. He was preferred successively to two bishoprics; some say he was first Bishop of Meaux, and afterwards of St Brieux (c), others that he was first Bishop of St Brieux and afterwards of Meaux (d). He composed some controversial treatises, and yet was suspected of inclining to Calvinism [C]. The public very much esteemed a short chronicle of the Kings of France (e), which he published in Latin (f), and in French (g), and continued from Pharamond

(c) Sammarthan. *Elog. lib. ii, pag. 79.*

(d) Thuan. *lib. xliii, pag. m. 974.*

(e) Sammarthan. *Elog. lib. ii, pag. m. 30. La Croix du Maine, pag. 268.*

(f) In the year 1551.

(g) In the year 1553.

[A] He published several valuable ancient pieces, both Ecclesiastical and Civil. He printed at Paris, in 1538, some treatises of Pacianus, Bishop of Barcelona, and in 1540 *Apostolorum Canonum & Concilia XIII*; and in 1550, *Codicis Theodosiani Libri priores octo emendati, & posteriores octo integri primum*; and in 1555, *Evangelium Matthæi Hebraicè & Latinè*; and in 1567, the works of Luciferus, Bishop of Cagliari.

[B] and . . . an old manuscript, which goes under the name of Charlemagne. He published it at Paris, in the year 1549; but no notice is taken in the title-page, either of the name of the Printer, or of the place where the book was printed, and in the preface, which he added to it, he took the fictitious name of Eliphilus. It has been thought, with a great deal of probability, that by the former part of this word he intended to signify, that being animated with the spirit of Elias, he had a design to destroy images; and that by the latter part he described his own name Tilius, for Tilia in Latin, is the name of a tree, which the Greeks call

them, that this notion of theirs is false; and that this piece was at least approved and adopted by Charlemagne. See the proofs alledged by Mr Daillé, and his answers to the chicaneries of Bellarmin (3). Father Maimbourg ingeniously confesses that, this book was written under the Emperor Charlemagne. It remained in obscurity, continues he (4), till the year 1549, when a Lutheran having found it in an ancient manuscript, published it with a preface of his own, under the borrowed name of Eli Phil, in which he inveighs terribly against the worship of images. It cannot, however, be denied, that this book was the very work ascribed to Charlemagne, as appears by the answers which Pope Adrian made to the objections contained in it. He pretends, that those who composed it had nothing of the spirit of that Prince, who would not have written in that manner. This remark has been invincibly refuted in the *Entretiens d'Eudoxe & d'Euchariste* (5), the author of which confesses, that there is room to believe that Charlemagne was the author of those four books which go under his name. I am surprised that no body has censured that Jesuit, for asserting that they were published by a Lutheran. Could he be ignorant, that all the world has long since acknowledged, that the editor of them was a Bishop?

(3) Daillé, *Traité des Images, lib. iv, ch. iii. See also Mr du Pin, Biblioth. Tom. vi, pag. 120, Dutch edition.*

(4) Maimbourg, *Hist. des Iconoclastes, lib. iv, pag. m. 23.*

(5) Pag. 273, Dutch edition.

(1) Taisnier, *Adit. aux Eloges, Tom. i, p. 344. ex Vossio de Hist. Lat. lib. ii, cap. xxx, pag. 290.*

(2) See among others Alanus Copus, *Dial. IV, cap. viii, xix; & Dial. V, cap. xii, & seq. Surin, in Admon. de Syn. Francof. in the third Tome of the Councils, Part. i, pag. 159.*

Phibra (1). It is certain that his Preface is not conformable to the principles of the Roman Catholics upon the worship of images; but rather to a book he published, which condemned the divisions of the second Council of Nice. This is the title under which he published it: *Opus illustrissimi Caroli Magni, nutu Dei, Regis Francorum, Gallias, Germaniam, Italianque, fruebatur finitimas Provincias, Domino opulante, regentis, contra Synodum, que in partibus Græciæ pro adorandis imaginibus stolidè sive arroganter gesta est. Item: Paulini Aquileiensis Episcopi adversus Felicem Urgellitanum, & Eliphandum Tolitanum Episcopos Libellus. Quæ nunc primum in lucem resuscitantur. Anno Salutis MDXLIX.* A second edition of this book was printed at Cologne in the year 1555, and it has been inserted by Goldast in the collection of Imperial Decrees de Cultu Imaginum, on the worship of images, published at Francfort in the year 1608, in 8vo. Several controversial writers of the Romish communion (2) have maintained, that this is a supposititious piece, that Charlemagne was not the author of it, and that it was not composed in the time of that emperor, but rather by the Heretics of the XVIth century. It has been demonstrated to

[C] He composed some controversial treatises, and yet was suspected of inclining to Calvinism. Here follows the titles of them: A treatise on the Antiquity and Solemnity of the Mass, on the Apostles Creed, and on the XII Articles of our Faith; at Paris, 1566, in 8vo. The Answer of a Bishop to the Ministers of the New Churches; at Paris, 1566, in 8vo (6). He published it also in Latin. Advice to the Gentlemen seduced by the Stratagems of the Ministers of the New Churches; at Paris, 1567, in 8vo. A treatise on the Christian Religion.

What follows is a proof of his being suspected: Cardinal Perron accused him of having some ill design against the Romish Religion, in publishing the treatise of Charlemagne. It is Monsieur du Tillet, says he (7), who caused it to be printed studio nocendi, out of a design to do mischief, rather than on any other account; and he who had been a pupil of Calvin, could have no other

(6) Du Verdier, *Biblioth. Franc. pag. 757, 758.*

(7) Perroniana, who caused it to be printed studio nocendi, out of a design to do mischief, rather than on any other account; and he who had been a pupil of Calvin, could have no other

ramond down to the year 1550. He died in the same month and year with his brother the Register (b). Some say that LEWIS DU TILLET, Archdeacon of Angoulême was their brother [D].

(b) That is to say, in the month of November, 1570. Sammarth. Elog. lib. ii, pag. 80, and La Croix du Maine, pag. 269.

(8) Ibid. at the word Calvin.

other opinion of images than this. Calvin, says he, in another place (8), was very much perplexed on the subject of the Eucharist. It is said, that Messieurs du Tillet have still in their hands some letters of his own writing on that subject of the Eucharist, which discover more clearly the opinion he had of it, than any of his other writings. It is not to be wondered at, if these Messieurs du Tillet have been a little suspected, as they had Calvin for their master. It cannot be thought strange, that the Preface which John du Tillet, the Bishop, prefixed to the book of Charlemagne, should render him suspected; for he expressed himself in the strongest terms against the abuse of images, and did not contain himself within the bounds that have been fixed by some Catholic Doctors (9). Perhaps he wrote afterwards against the Huguenots, for no other reason but to clear himself of all suspicion. What I have cited from the Perroniana proves, that his brother, the Register, was not esteemed truly orthodox, and that it was pretended he had been a disciple of Calvin. He purged himself however so entirely, that the Protestants looked upon him as their persecutor (10). And, by the way, I shall here correct a mistake in the Index to the second volume of the Ecclesiastical History of the Reformed Churches in the kingdom of France. We there find under the letter T du Tillet, the Register, and his cruelty, 7. 501; but when we consult this page 501 of the VIIth book, we meet with nothing there which can necessarily be imputed to this du Tillet. We read there only that some Protestant soldiers, who went out of Bourges in 1563, in order to go to Orleans, took a private road, by which some of them found their way very well, but the rest lost themselves: among whom there were thirty or forty, who being tired, and having very little powder left to defend themselves, were surprised and cruelly massacred by the persons who were kept by John du Tillet, Register to the court of Parliament of Paris, in his house of la Buissière near Chabillon on the Loin (11). If the author had said that du Tillet, residing at that time at la Buissière, had ordered this massacre, the Index of the book had been correct; but he leaves us at liberty to imagine that du Tillet might have no hand in it: for is it not allowable, in civil wars, for any one to guard his castles in the best manner he can? If the soldiers made use of commit any disorder, the owner of the castle, who is often at an hundred leagues distance, having given no orders in particular, can never be answerable for it. Those who make Indexes to books frequently commit mistakes of this kind.

(9) Mr du Pin, for example. See page 153, of his Nouvelle Bibliothèque, Dutch edition.

(10) See the remarks [D] and [E], of the article foregoing.

(11) Beze, Hist. Eccles. des Eglises, Vol. ii, livr. vii, pag. 501.

(12) Florimond de Remond, Hist. de l'Hérésie, lib. vii, ch. ix, pag. m. 383.

[D] Some say that LEWIS DU TILLET, Archdeacon of Angoulême, was their brother. Florimond de Remond shall be my author. He affirms (12), that Calvin having retired into the city of Angoulême, was entertained there for the space of three years, at the expense of Lewis du Tillet, Curate of Clairs, and Canon of Angoulême, whom he taught the little Greek he knew. He was brother to the Bishop of Meaux, and to John du

Tillet, Register to the Parliament of Paris. This author adds (13), that Lewis du Tillet, having his head full of the opinions which Calvin had imprinted on him, and being desirous to see all those great men who had declared war against the Catholic Church, made a journey into Germany (14). . . . Du Tillet on his return having recovered his reason, renounced forever the doctrine of his master. Thus Calvin quickly lost the first of his conquests; for this was the first foul which was ever believed to be seduced by him. He shews very strongly the repentment he had against this man in his Preface to the Psalms. For it is of him he speaks, where he mentions a certain person, who after wildly revolting, and returning back to the Papists, discovered him passing to Geneva. He means du Tillet, whom he never mentions without re- flexion. Du Tillet, after his return to Angoulême, having, by letter, bid his last adieu to the novel opinions of Calvin, and made public abjuration of his Heresy, ascended the pulpit, (for he was a man of learning) preached, and declaimed against Lutheranism as zealously as he had before desired to promote it. The name of Calvinism was not yet in use. He was elected Archdeacon, which dignity he long disputed with la Renaudie (15). According to this account, it would be false that du Tillet, the Register, had been the disciple of Calvin: the Perroniana would confound things.

(13) Id. cl. x, pag. 889, 890.

(14) See the remark [A A], of the article CALVIN.

(15) Thuanus, lib. xxvii, pag. 488, says that la Renaudie

Note, that Papyrius Masso's brother, affirms, that Lewis de Tillet was not brother, but nephew to the Register of the parliament. 'Is (Ludovicus Tillius) erat filius H. lix in privato Coniutorio Regio Confessarii & Vicepresidis Rationalium, Aloisii & Sabaudia Francisci primi, matris, fratrisque Joannis Tillii Senatus Parisiensis exceptoris, cujus scripta extant (16). . . . Lewis du Tillet was the son of Elias, Privy-counsellor to the King, and Vice-president of accounts to Louisa of Savoy, Francis the first's mother, and the brother of John du Tillet, Register to the Parliament of Paris, whose writings are extant.' He does not say that the Register had no share in the return of this disciple of Calvin. You may observe, if you please, that this brother of Papyrius Masso got the best information he was able of all these things during his residence at Angoulême, where he had a canonship (17). Peter de St Romuald (18) observes, that this Canon du Tillet was named Lewis or Seraphin: he relates some facts advanced by Florimond de Remond, but instead of quoting this Florimond, he quotes Papyrius Masso, who has said nothing of them.

He went to law for a benefice which his uncle by the mother's side, had in Augoumois, and to which du Tillet the Register claimed a right. See, in the remark [E], of the preceding article, the words of la Planche, and of Varillas.

(16) Addit. to chap. iv, of the Life of Calvin. pag. 457. Elog. Pap. Massonis.

(17) Id. ibid. pag. 456.

(18) In Continuatione Chronici Adami, pag. 297.

I find, in the Mercure Galant for the month of May, 1705 (19), one SERAPHIN DU TILLET, who was lately dead, a Counsellor in the grand-chamber, and an Abbot DU TILLET, who was still living; and that the mother of the late Count d'Entremont, Lieutenant-General of Bresse, and grand-mother of the Marchioness de l'Hôpital, was descended from the Register John du Tillet.

(19) Pag. 181.

TILLI or THILLI, a lordship in Brabant [A] which gave a title to John Count de Tilly, who was born there, and has been one of the greatest captains of the XVIIth century. He is mentioned in Moreri's Dictionary, under the word Tzerclas, which was the

[A] A lordship in Brabant. Gramaie informs us that it had belonged to the house of Warfuzé, and that Robert de Warfuzé transferred it to Gerard Marbais in the year 1389. It was afterwards possessed by John de Limiette, and then by Sanfon de Lalain, who, on the twenty-fifth of June, 1448, conferred the Dominium altum & bassum, on John Serclaes, descended from one of the most noble Patrician families of Brussels (1). The lordship of Tilly was then entirely independent; but afterwards became a fife to the Dukes of Brabant, by virtue of the following instrument: 'John, Lord of Thilly, transfers into the hands of my Lord Duke, his house and lordship of Tilly, with all its rights and appurtenances as by him enjoyed, and our said Lord the Duke hath again transferred the said house

(1) Patricia imprimique nobili apud Bruxellam stirpe edito. Le Roy, in Topographia Gallo-Brabantia, pag. 99.

and lordship, and all the lands thereto appertaining to the said John, his heirs and successors, to hold it in perpetual fief of our said lord and his heirs and his successors the Dukes and Duchesses of Brabant. And the said John held his said house and lordship of Thilly of our said lord, and therefore did his fealty, and homage, and took the oath of allegiance, as customary in the court of the fiefs of Brabant. And our said lord received his homage with a salvo to his highness and lordship, and to the rights of every one. Done the 16th day of May, in the year 1449 (2). This John Serclaes was the father of James t'Serclaes, who was the father of Martin t'Serclaes father of John t'Serclaes, member of the council of war to the Emperor, who married a daughter of the Count of Friesland (3). (1) Id. ibid. (2) Id. ibid. (3) Ex eod. ibid. From

(a) That is, in the year 1696. The Gazettees are continually mentioning them.

the family name of this famous General. He had an elder brother, whose grandsons at this present time (a) make a very considerable figure. There are three brothers of them, all called Counts de Tilly. One is Canon of Liege; the two other bear arms. One of whom is General of the troops of Liege, and has been raised to the dignity of a prince by the King of Spain [B]. The other by his long services has been advanced to the chief posts in the Dutch army (b). He married a sister of the Count of Reckheim, Bishop of Coire or Chur, and Canon of Cologne and Saltzburgh, a lord who by his great merit and exalted genius supports the illustrious nobility of his house.

There are some mistakes in Moreri's article *Tzerclas* [C], which is that of John Count de Tilly. I do not know whether he is not mistaken, when he says that this General was made a count at the Diet of Ratisbon, in the year 1623: I shall only say, that according to Father Labbe, *John and James de Tilly were created Counts of the Empire by the Emperor at Vienna the 3d of September 1622* (c). The Sieur Blanc observes that Count Werner, nephew of Count de Tilly, was wounded at the battle of Statlo in the year 1623 (d).

(b) Lieutenant-General of Horse, and Governor of Arnheim, in 1701. See the *Lettres Historiques*, of November 1701, pag. 607.

(c) Labbe, Chron. Franc. Tom. v, pag. 846.

(d) Blanc, Hist. de Baviere, Tom. iv, pag. 190.

(4) Id. ibid.

From this marriage proceeded John t'Serclaes, created count by the Emperor Ferdinand II (4), and one of the greatest Generals of the XVIIth century.

[B] One . . . raised to the dignity of a Prince by the King of Spain.] This is the tenor of the Letters-patents, as abridged and published by the Baron le Roy. They are dated at Madrid the twenty-second of December 1693. 'Charles, by the Grace of God, King of Castile, &c. Being informed, that several ancestors of our most dear and royal Lord *Albert T'Serclaes de Thilly*, Count of the holy Roman empire, Gentleman of our bed-chamber, Serjeant-General of battalia in our armies in the Low-countries, and, at present, by our permission and consent, General of the troops of the Prince and Bishop of Liege, our ally, and others of his family have, with the utmost bravery and resolution, done several important services to the Emperors, Kings, and Princes, our august predecessors. As also that the said *Albert T'Serclaes de Thilly*, hath served in our armies from the year one thousand six hundred and sixty six, as Captain, Lieutenant-Colonel, Colonel of horse, and Serjeant-general of battalia, and that on all occasions which have offered in our service, he hath neither spared his life nor estate, of which we have received the utmost satisfaction which we can desire. As well as of the services he continues at present to perform in the quality of General of the forces of the Prince and Bishop of Liege, for the common cause, with a zeal, bravery, and experience so well known to all the world. Knowing moreover, that the said *Albert T'Serclaes de Thilly* is descended from a very illustrious and ancient family, which has always been supported by several great, high, and very considerable alliances, and that besides he possesses several lands, lordships, and estates, sufficient to maintain his honour, as those of Montigny, Farciennes, Preme, and others; and being willing, for this reason, to raise, advance him, and distinguish with greater honours, rights, prerogatives, and pre-eminencies; we have of our certain knowledge, &c. made and created, and we do by these presents make and create, *Albert Count de T'Serclaes de Thilly*, Prince of T'Serclaes,

conferring and granting that he may bestow the said title of Prince upon the seat and lordship, which he shall name, under our obedience and jurisdiction in our said Low-countries: which seat and lordship we have to that end erected, and do by these presents erect into the dignity, title, name, style, and pre-eminence of *Principality of T'Serclaes*, &c (5).'

[C] There are some faults in Moreri's Article *Tzerclas*. I. He has forgot to set down the surname of this General of the troops of the Catholic league. II. The name of the town which he took after the battle of Prague, is *Ellenbogen* and not *Elbogen*. III. It should have been observed that *Ellenbogen* was a town of Bohemia. IV. The defeat of the Margrave of Baden at Wimphen did not follow, but preceded the taking of Heidelberg. V. What happened at Mansfeld near Darmstadt (6) was not a defeat, but only a check, and likewise preceded the conquest of Heidelberg; therefore these words of Moreri, *Tilly had formerly . . . taken Heidelberg*, contain an anachorism. VI. These words are not intelligible. He had formerly aided the Arch- duke Leopold in the taking of Breda. This, perhaps, is an error of the press, and should have been corrected. *Bretta*, the Latin name of *Bretten*, a small town in the Palatinate. This Arch- duke Leopold was Bishop of Stralsbourg, and joined his troops with those of Count Tilly at the siege of Heidelberg (7). VII. Instead of saying that the Duke of Weimar, and the Duke of Alkenburg (8) were made prisoners at the battle of Statlo, he ought to have said *Duke William Saxe-Weimar, and Frederic Duke of Saxe-Altemburgh*. For want of this particular distinction of names, said Altemburgh which the Sieur Blanc has used (9), there arise many in the Dutch ambiguities, which are disagreeable to the accurate reader. VIII. To say that there were among the prisoners several other Princes, is advancing an untruth; for the Sieur Blanc, who names the principal prisoners, only names these two who were princes. Observe that in the edition of France, in 1698, they gave the right title of the book of Julius Bellus *Laurea Austriaca*; but in that of 1699, they called it, agreeably to the Dutch editions, *Maurea* instead of *Laurea*.

(5) *Idem*, Erection de toutes les Terres, Seigneuries, & Familles titrées de Brabant, pag. 106.

(6) Thus it must be called, and not *d'Armstadt*, as Moreri has it. In the Paris edition, 1699, this fault is corrected.

(7) See Blanc, History of Bavaria, Tom. iv, pag. 153.

(8) They have for want of this particular distinction of names, said Altemburgh which the Sieur Blanc has used (9), there arise many in the Dutch ambiguities, which are disagreeable to the accurate reader.

(9) History of Bavaria, Tom. iv, pag. 190.

TIMÆUS, a Greek Historian, the son of an illustrious father [A], was of Tauro-menium in Sicily, and flourished in the time of Agathocles, who died in the fourth year of the CXIIIth Olympiad (a). He wrote several books [B], and among others, the history

(a) Athen. lib. ii, pag. 37, & alibi.

(1) Diodorus Siculus, lib. xvi, cap. vii.

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) Id. lib. xiv, cap. xvi.

(4) Taken from Plutarch, in the Life of Timoleon, pag. 240.

[A] The son of an illustrious father.] He was the son of Andromachus, who was very famous for his riches and excellent qualities, and may be esteemed the founder of one of the most considerable towns in Sicily; for he assembled all the fugitives of Naxos, a city which Dionysius the tyrant had ruined, and settled them on a hill called Taurus. This gave rise to Tauro-menium (1). This he did in the second year of the CVIth Olympiad (2). It was long before this time that Dionysius had destroyed Naxos (3). Note, that Andromachus reigned with very great lenity in his new city, and shewed himself an enemy to all tyrants. He received Timoleon's troops, and animated his subjects to assist them, in order to deliver all Sicily from the yoke of tyranny (4).

VOL. V.

[B] He wrote several books.] Three of Syria: sixty-eight of *Argumentis Rhetoricæ*: ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΝΙΚΑΣ ἢ ΧΕΡΟΝΙΚΑ ΠΕΡΕΣΙΔΙΑ, *Olympionicas seu ælia Chronica*. ἸΤΑΛΙΚΑ ΚΑΙ ΣΙΚΕΛΙΚΑ libris 8. ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΑ ΚΑΙ ΣΙΚΕΛΙΚΑ. In the first of these two last works, he gave the History of Sicily, so far as it was concerned with the Roman History; and in the other he did the same, so far as it is concerned with the Grecian History (5). He wrote the History of Pyrrhus, by itself, as we are informed by Dionysius Halicarnassæus (6), and by these words of Cicero: 'Deesse mihi nolui quin te admonerem ut cogitares conjunctene malles cum reliquis rebus nostra contexere, an, ut multi Græci fecerunt, Callisthenes Troicum bellum, Timæus Pyrrhi, Polybius Numantinum: qui omnes à perpetuis fuis

(5) Vossius, de Hist. Græcis, pag. 82. See Suidas.

(6) Dionys. Halic. lib. i, cap. vii.

(7) Cicero, Epist. *lib. vi.* ad Familiāres, pag. m. 255. *suis historiis ea quæ dixi bella separaverunt* (7). - *I would not be so far wanting to myself, as not to advise you to consider, whether you had rather incorporate the history of my affairs with that of others; or, as many Greeks have done, Callisthenes the war of Troy, Timæus that of Pyrrhus, and Polybius those of Numantia; who have all of them separated those wars I have mentioned, from their general Histories.* We have already seen that Timæus's History consisted of two parts, and they say that the first contained eight books, without taking any notice of the number contained in the second. But it is necessary to add, that several cite it without observing this division; they mention in general such or such a book of his Histories. The highest number, quoted by Athenæus, is the twenty-eighth (8). Diogenes Laërtius does not go beyond the eighteenth (9).

(8) Athen. lib. eighth (8). Diogenes Laertius does not go beyond this
xi, cap. vi, pag. eighteenth (9).
471. [C] He was very much addicted to detraction.] This

(9) Diogen.
Laërtius, in Em-
peocle, lib. viii,
num. 6a.

(10) Diodorus Siculus, lib. vi, circa init.

(11) Strabo, lib. xiv, pag. 440.

(12) Polybius, *lib. xii*, p. 659. *propter infinitam acerbiteratem* (12). --- *Therefore v*
now may justly seem to condemn those things whic
meus has thrown out against Demochares. For *v*
pears neither worthy of pardon, nor of credit fr
body, because of his deviating so notoriously from t

into calumny, out of his natural malicioſneſſe. Clemens Alexandrinus gives us Timæus and Theopompus for a couple of ſatirical and fabulous Hiſtorians. Ἰστορίαι ἀπὸ Θεοπόμπου καὶ Τιμαίου μύθος καὶ βλαπτικὰ καὶ φημίβηλα. See Theopompus quidem & Timæo qui fabulas & maleſticiſa component (13). Cornelius Nepos does much the ſame thing (14). Note that Athenæus obſerves, that ſfter writing againſt Timæus, called him Epitimæus (15). He was perhaps the firſt inventor of this pun. Note alſo that Ariſtotele was one of thoſe abuſed by Timæus (16), and we muſt not forget this circumſtance, viz. that this Hiſtorian vented all his spleen againſt perſons, even when they were not in the wrong. Thus he exclaimed againſt thoſe who mentioned Phalaris's Bull. He loudly proclaimed them fabulous writers; and with the utmoſt heat maintained that there was never any ſuch thing (17); when it was he himſelf who was miſtaken, for this Bull was ſtill in being in the time of Diodorus Siculus (18). It had been tranſported to Carthage, when Imilcar ſacked Agrigentum, and was reſtored to the Agrigentines two hundred and ſixty years after, when Scipio Africanus deſtroyed Carthage. Theſe particulars are related by Diodorus Siculus (19), as affording a favourable opportunity to censure our Timæus, and to ſhew the conjunctures wherein we ought to excuſe or not excuſe the errors of Hiſtorians. We ought to excuſe them, when the facts lie ſo obſcure that even with very great diligence they cannot be diſcovered: but we ought never to excuſe them, when either negligence, or an inclination to flatter or calumniate any perſon, carry them out of the right way. The author's words in the original will ſufficiently ſhew that he was not ſatisfied with the

way. The author's words in the original
 better please those who are capable of understanding (19) *ἴδω*
 them. It is on their account I have transcribed them :
 other readers ought not to be displeased, they may
 pass them by without the trouble of reading them,
 and yet understand in general the thought of the Hi-
 storian. Περὶ δὲ τῶν φιλοτιμύσεων εἰπεῖν συγ-
 γράβην, διότι τὴν Τιμαῖον ὁ τῶν πρὸ αὐτῆς συγ[γρα-
 φῶν πικρότατα κατηγοροῦν, καὶ συγνύων
 ὑβρίαν τοῖς ιστοριογράφοις ἀποτίνας. αὐτὸς ἐπι-
 κτάται σχεδὸν ὅλῳν, ἐν οἷς μάλιστα αὐτὸν ἀποτί-
 σκειν ἀκαθολογούμενον. δεῖ γὰρ, οἷμαι, τὸς συγ-
 γράφεις ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἀνέκδοτοις τυγχάνειν συγ-
 γνύων, ὥς ἐν ἀνθρώποις, καὶ τοῖς ἐν τοῖς
 πεποιημένοις χρόνοις ἀληθείας ὅσας δύνασθαι
 τὸς μύθοις κατὰ περὶ αἰρέσειν ὁ τυγχάνοντας τὸ
 ἀκριβὲς προσκινῶντος κατηγορίας τυγχάνειν, ὅταν
 κολλασκόντες τινας ἢ δι' ἐχθρῶν πικρότητα περὶ-
 βάλλουσιν, ἀποφαλλάντων τὴς ἀληθείας (20) :
 Quā de re studiosius differre mihi libuit ; quia Timus,
 cum magnā acerbitate scriptores ætatem suam antece-
 dentes reprehendat, nullumque historicos veritatis stu-
 dium relinquat ; ipse tamen, ubi diligentissimum veritatis stu-
 dium profuturum, nugari & alucinari deprehendatur.
 Scriptores enim in iis, quæ non assequuntur, veniam
 (meo quidem iudicio) tribui æquum est, quippe, cū
 homines sint, & temporum præterlapsum veritas dif-
 ficulter & caligine eruat. Contrā verō, qui dat operā
 exactam inquisitionem negligunt, hos merito accusan-
 dos, arbitror, & quando nimirum nonnullis adulando,
 vel per odium virulentius alios impugmando, à regiā
 veritatis viā exorbitant & aberrant. - - - I have chosen
 to speak of this the more zealously ; because Timæus tho'
 be condemned most bitterly the writers who preceded him,
 and leaves no excuse at all for Historians, yet is himself
 found defective in those very things where he most of all
 values himself for his accuracy. For it is but reasonable,
 I think, that authors should be intitled to pardon in those
 things which are unknown to them, as they are men, and
 as truth is difficult to be discovered in ages that are past.
 But, on the contrary, that those should be deservedly con-
 demned, who purposely are inaccurate, when in flatter-
 ing or abusing others, they deviate from truth.

[D] Great doubt has been made of his veracity.] See the passage of Polybius cited in the preceding remark, and that which shall be quoted below (211). ⁽²¹⁾ In the remark [8].

[E] To

the spirit of revenge [E]. Several other faults have been discovered in his History [F]; but some excellent judges allow him to have been very learned, and very eloquent [G].

[E] *To pursue Agathocles with so little justice.* . . . He lifted too much to the spirit of revenge.] Agathocles had forced him to fly out of Sicily: this indeed cost him nothing during his life, but after his death he paid for it. Agathocles, when living, was out of the reach of Timæus's resentment: the latter was obliged to defer his vengeance until Agathocles was in his grave. Then he discharged the torrent of his rage against him: this tyrant was not only defamed by a description of his crimes and ill qualities, but also by fabulous calumnies. He robbed him of all the glory of his successful enterprises, and laid to his charge all the misfortunes which befel him, not excepting the most fortuitous: he represented him as a coward, tho' it was evident enough that this General had given a thousand proofs of his courage and valour. If it had not been so, was it possible for him, only a potter's son, as he was, to have subdued all Italy, and a great part of Italy and Libya? Doth not Timæus contradict himself? In all the rest of his book he exalts the valour of the Syracusans to the skies, and yet he pretends that Agathocles, who subdued them, was the greatest of cowards. Παρ' ἄλλην γὰρ τὴν γράβην ἐγκωμιάζων τὴν τῶν Συρακοσίων ἀνδρείαν τὸν τῶν κρατήσαντα θηλία φησὶ διεμνοχέειν τὰς ἀπαντας ἀνδρείας. Cum per totam historiam Syracusanorum fortitudinem laudet illum qui subegit ipsos omnes mortales ignavia longe superasse dicit (22). He betrays therefore too plainly his passion and hatred. The five last books of his history, which treat of the actions of Agathocles, do not deserve any praise. Suidas, to whom I am obliged for all this (23), allows that in all the other parts of his history, he took extraordinary care to speak the truth. Οὐτὸς δὲ Τίμαιος τὰς ἀμαρτίας τῶν πρὸ ἐαυτοῦ συγγράβων περὶ τὰ ἐξελύχας, κατὰ μὲν ἄλλα μέρη τῆς γράβης πλείστην πρῶτον εἶχε τῆς ἀληθείας. ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ἀγαθοκλέους, πρᾶξι, τὰ πολλὰ κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν τὴν δυνάμειν, διὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐχθρὰν: Timæus isti qui veterum historicorum peccata gravissime redarguit, in aliis quidem scripti partibus maximam veritatis curam provide fecit. In Agathoclis vero rebus pleraque ementitus est in principem illum propter odium quo prosequatur eum (24).

(22) Suidas, ubi infia.

(23) Suidas, id. Timæus, pag. 911.

(24) Id. ibid.

(25) Polyb. lib. xii, pag. 659, Edit. 1619, in folio. Add to this the words of Justin, lib. xxii, cap. 4. In Sicilia patre figulo natus (Agathocles) non honestiorem pueritiam, quam principis originis habuit. Siquidem forma, & corporis pulcritudine egregius, diu vitam stupri patientia exhibuit. Annos deinde pubertatis egresus, libidinem à viris ad feminas transiit. Post hæc apud utrumque scævum famofus, vitam locrocinis mutavit.

(26) Id. ibid. See Justin. Variorum, of Mr. Gravina, lib. xii, init. and Suidas, in Tpl. 911.

(27) Πάντων γένων ἀρετῆς. Fuit ille sane omnium maxime impius, Polyb. lib. xii, pag. 659.

ill-nature been hyperbolic, in the relation of whatever was to be blamed in Agathocles's conduct, and intirely suppressed whatever would admit of praise. Ὁ δὲ περισκοτισμένῳ ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας πικρίας τὰ μὲν ἐλαττώματα δυσμενικῶς καὶ μετ' ἀνζησεως ἡμῖν ἐξηγήσατο, τὰ δὲ κατορθώματα συλλυβδῶν παραλείπει: Egregius hic scriptor maledicendi studio occæcatus minus recte facta cum quadam animi malignitate solitus narrare, & simul omnia in majus extollere, præclara facinora simul cuncta prætermittit (28). . . . But being blinded by his ill-nature, he has related the worst things with malice and exaggeration, and omitted by the lump those that are right. Nothing can be more judicious than this whole discourse of Polybius.

[F] Several other faults have been found in his history.] We learn from Suidas (29), that Timæus was called a rhapsodical old woman γρασοσυλλέκτης, because whatever came in his way he inserted in his history. This is the same thing as if they had called him a compiler of old wives tales. Polybius charges him with speaking very ignorantly of Italy (30), and that in his description of Africa, besides being guilty of the same fault, he betrayed a trifling genius, a want of judgment, and a great deal of credulity with regard to obsolete traditions. Τὸν δὲ Τίμαιος εἰποι τις ἂν ὁ μόνον ἀνείρητον γεγονέναι περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Λιβύην, ἀλλὰ καὶ παιδαριώδη καὶ τολμῶς ἀσυλλόγιστον καὶ ταῖς ἀρχαίαις φημίαις ἀκμήν ἐνδεδεμένον: Timæum jure pronuntiet aliquis non solum imperitum rerum Africae, sed etiam puerili ingenio virum, ac proflus infirmo judicio & qui antiquitus traditis opinionibus supra modum fuerit deditus (31). . . . But it may be said that Timæus, was not only an ignorant Historian, as to the affairs of Libya, but also trifling, extremely injudicious, and too much addicted to old stories. He blames him for writing on hearsay, and having shewn little judgment περὶ τὰς ἀναιρέσεις παλαιῶν ἀνέκδοτων. In judicandis iis quæ sibi narrarentur negligens fuit (32). This was undoubtedly the cause of the contradictions which were laid to his charge (33). To these may be added the passage of Longinus, which I shall cite in the remark [J], and those of Plutarch quoted hereafter: and observe, by the way, that he was not so bigotted a follower of the ancient traditions, as not to refute some of them: but he was not very happy in his choice; since, for instance, he wrongfully rejected the tradition of Phalaris's Bull (34), and that of the colony of the Locrians (35); nor did he probably go upon a better foundation, when he denied that Zaleucus gave laws to that people (36). Nay, he denied, that there ever was such a person as Zaleucus (37).

[G] But some excellent judges allow him to be very learned and very eloquent.] The passage of Diodorus Siculus above cited (38), may serve me here for a commentary; but I find my account much better in the following words of Cicero. 'Minimus natus horum omnium Timæus, quantum autem judicare possum longe eruditissimus, & rerum copia ac sententiarum varietate abundantissimus, & ipsa compositione verborum non impolitus magnam eloquentiam ad scribendum attulit, sed nullum ufum forentem (39). . . . Timæus, later than all these, but, as far as I am able to judge, by far the most learned, and most abounding both in the copiousness of his materials, and in the variety of his maxims, and not without politeness in the composition of his words, discovered a great deal of eloquence in his writing, but no forms of oratory.' He had been naming Herodotus, Thucydides, Philistus, Theopompus, Ephorus, Xenophon, and Calisthenes. I mention this only to shew what place Timæus possessed in Cicero's esteem. All these great historians were inferior to him in point of knowledge, as well as in fertility of subject and thought. This is saying a great deal. He has not ranked him disadvantageously with regard to his eloquence: you will apprehend this yet better by the following words. Genera Asiaticæ dictionis duo sunt, unum sententiosum & argutum, sententis non tam gravibus & severis quam concinnis & venustis qualis in historiæ Timæus (40). . . . The Asiatic way of speaking is of two kinds, the one sententious

(28) Id. ibid. Edit. 1619, in folio.

(29) Suidas, in Timæus, pag. 911.

(30) Polybius, lib. ii, pag. 105.

(31) Id. lib. xii, init. pag. 653.

(32) Id. ibid. pag. 668.

(33) Athenæus, lib. vi, p. 272.

(34) See the remark [C], citation (17).

(35) Polyb. lib. xii, pag. 656.

(36) Cicero, de Legibus, folio 333, C.

(37) Id. lib. ii, de Legibus, folio 333, C.

(38) Citation (10).

(39) Cicero, de Oratore, lib. ii, fol. 73, D.

(40) Idem, in Bruto, circa fin. pag. m. 451.

(c) *That is, at Athens, if we believe Corradus in Brutum Ciceronis, pag. 115.*

(d) Polybius, lib. xii, p. 670.

(e) Id. *ibid.*

(41) Plutarch.
in Nicia, initio
pag. 523.

Fat, and stuffed out with dull Sicilian grease.

(42) You will find this in the remark [C], of the article FONTARABIA.

(43) Μαίζω
 τους Τιμονα-
 ντας των ἱπ-
 Πανασάτων
 Θιῶν. Timo-
 leontem illustris-
 simis Diis majo-
 rem facere. *Sui-
 das, in Τίμαιος,*
pag. 910.

(45) Longinus,
de Sublimi ge-
nere, cap. iii.

Alexander spent less time in the conquest of all Asia, than
 Isocrates in finishing his panegyric. Longinus censures
 him for comparing a great prince to a sopsit; and main-
 tains that by the same reason, we might believe, that the
 Lacedæmonians were less valiant (47) than Isocrates,
 since he was but ten years in composing his panegyric,
 when they spent thirty in the conquest of Melina.
 What consequence is here? did Timæus speak of the va-
 lour of Isocrates? Is it comparing an orator with a
 conqueror; to compare the time in which one writes, with
 that in which the other conquers? Tho' there is no pro-
 portion betwixt actions entirely different, does it follow
 that there is none between the long and short space of
 their duration? May we not say, that the great Gustavus
 Adolphus rendered himself master of part of Germany, in
 less time than Mr Vaugelas spent in translating Quintus
 Curtius, or Father Strada in finishing his history, or
 Scriverius in publishing his Martial? *

* Scaliger calls him somewhere in his *Epistulae*, *Lentulum Martialis editorem*.

This censurer of Timeus hath not considered the design of comparisons. They are intended to express, in a lively manner, the greatness or smallness of objects. There is nothing therefore more proper to be compared to certain things, than what most apparently enlarges the idea of them. So to render the rapidity of Alexander's victories the more conspicuous, they may be very well opposed to the slowness of a panegyrist. Consider, on one hand, the obstacles of war, the great number of enemies which Alexander engaged, and the vast extent of land which he subdued; consider on the other, the facility of writing a discourse which may be recited in an hour: and it is impossible but that you must be struck with the incredible swiftness of this conqueror, if you imagine that he spent no more years in his conquest than the Rhetorician in composing an oration. Another conqueror who had not subdued so many provinces in 30 years as Alexander in ten, would not have served so well in this comparison as Socrates; for we are naturally inclined to imagine almost an infinite disproportion betwixt the labour of a Rhetorician, and that of a conqueror. We think it infinitely more easy to range words, than subdue kingdoms. We must allow therefore that Timeus was very happy in his choice. He took what might strike the imagination of his readers in the most lively manner. I have read in a modern author (48) that the Duke of Candale, and Cardinal de la Valette, Generals of the French army, in the year 1637, took Landrecies almost in seven days than Charles V. formerly employed months in the not taking it, being forced, after six months time, shamefully to raise the siege. This is without doubt a beautiful, lofty, and noble idea; but I am sure that we should be yet more sensibly touched with the expedition of a conquest, if it should be said, *A famous Engineer formerly spent as much time in drawing a plan of this place, as the General in taking it.* The precedents of the best authors declare as strongly in favour of Timeus as these reasons. The greatest Roman Orator said, that Pompey had finished more wars than others had read, and

(48) Girard Vie du Duc d'Esperoon.

and (48) Girard,
Vie du Duc
my, d'Epemnon.

Plutarch has condemned him justly on account of his puerility with relation to a composition place,

and that travellers never went through so many countries in so little time, as he subdued them by his victories. ' Qui sæpius cum hoste confligit quam quicquam cum inimico concertavit: plura bella gessit quam cæteri legerunt: plures provincias confecit quam alii concupiverunt (49). . . . Quis unquam aut obeundi negotii aut consequendi quæstus studio tam brevi tempore tot loca adire, tantos cursus conficere potuit quam celeriter Cn. Pompeio ducis belli impetus navigavit (50) ? . . . Who has often engaged in a pitched battle, than any other person has done in an ordinary quarrel: waged more wars than others have read; conquered more countries than others ever coveted. . . . Who could ever go to so many places, and perform so many expeditions in the way of business or trade, in so little time, and with so great dispatch, as Pompey employed in carrying on his wars ?' Is not this comparing Pompey with the meanest man who is but just able to read, and with a merchant, whose thirst for gain transports him from place to place (51). If the comparison betwixt Alexander and a Rhetorician so much blamed by Longinus is not good; ought we not to condemn this, which notwithstanding is really admirable, and the most proper thing in the world to excite those ideas in the mind, which the orator proposed to excite? But to come to modern examples. I shall not alledge what was said of Charles VIII, that he run through Italy swifter than a quarter-master with chalk in hand, and without stopping. I shall come directly to Mr Boileau, one of the greatest masters. He assigns two reasons in excuse for not fingering the victories of 1672. The first is, that the names of the towns which the king conquered in Holland, were harsh and barbarous, affording only such whimsical fillables as were subject to no measure (52). The second reason is, that the conqueror marched too fast for the Muses to keep pace with him.

(49) Cicero, pro Lege Manilia, fol. 104, B.

(50) Id. ibid. D.

(51) Impiger extremos curis mercator ad Indes, Per mare pauperem fugiens, per fax, per ignem. Horat. Epist. i, lib. i, ver. 45.

(52) This puts me in mind of these two verses, Rhon & Tenedos, Simoïsque & Xantos & Ide Nomina sunt ipso pœne timenda sono. They are Lædæmia's words, in her letter to Protyllus, apud Ovidium Heroid. Epist. xiii, ver. 53.

(53) Despreux, Epitre IV, ver. 20.

Encor si Tes exploits moins grands & moins rapides
Laissoient prendre courage à nos Muses timides,
Peut-être avec le temps, à force d'y rêver,
Par quelque coup de l'Art nous pourrions nous sauver.
Mais dès qu'on veut tenter cette vaste carrière,
Pégase s'effarouche & recule en arrière :
Mon Apollon s'étonne, & Némégue est à Toy,
Que ma Muse est encore au camp devant Orfroy (53).

Were your exploits left rapid, or left grand,
My tim'rous Muse might take her pen in hand;
Perhaps by force of thought, and length of time,
Attempt some tolerable work in rhyme.
But at the sight of such a vast career,
Pegasus trembles, and starts back with fear.
Apollo wond'ring sees Nimegean yield,
Before my lagging Muse can take the field.

Mr Pellifson made use of this thought in his invocation to Pegasus, a piece of poetry which was extremely admired; the whole design of which is to express that the king's conquests were so incredibly swift, that the Poets could not follow the rapid torrent. Since Mr Pellifson's choice of this image, so many authors have used it, that it is become a common-place. I remember to have seen it in the Paris Gazette, and this was, if I am not mistaken, when Mr de Guilleragues had the direction of that paper. He declares that he is forced to take advantage, that is, to anticipate his majesty's victories, that he may in some measure keep pace with his rapid expeditions. Mr Pavillon, who knows how to manage a subject with so much dexterity, has very agreeably turned this thought in his ode on the taking of Namur in the year 1693. Note, that this manner of complementing the king, is very well approved by an excellent judge of the justness and delicacy of thoughts: *Perhaps you have not heard, says he (54), of another madrigal with which I am infinitely pleased.*

(54) Bouhours, Manière de bien penser dans les Ouvrages d'Esprit, pag. 199, 200. Dutch edition.

Louis plus digne du trône
Qu'aucun Roy que l'on ait vû,
Enseigne l'art à Bellone
VOL. V.

De faire des impromptu.
C'est une chose facile
Aux disciples d'Apollon :
Mais ce Conquerant habile
A plutôt pris une ville
Qu'ils n'ont fait une Chançon.

Lewis more worthy of a throne,
Than any monarch we have known,
Infracts Bellona in his fight,
Impromptu with the sword to write.
Apollo's scholars with their quill,
Here easily display their skill;
Yet this great conqueror's not so long
About a town, as they a song.

All these thoughts are ingenious, continues Eudoxus; but the elegy here appears very wisely, and these authors profess their design of praising, whereas he wbo said,

Croit que l'on fait les vers comme l'on prend les villes,

Believes that Rhymes are made, as towns are won,

seems not to think of praise: he seems to be in an angry mood, and to think only of coming off; and by this means the praise, that he bestows by the by, is so much the more nice. The exact conformity betwixt these thoughts and Longinus's parallel will not allow us to doubt that this passage carries in it Father Bouhours's approbation of Timæus. But to prevent all scruples on this head we ought to have recourse to the express words of this Jesuit (55): ' I am not of Longinus's side; his criticism went too far in charging Timæus with puerility as to his praise of Alexander. He that should say of Lewis le Grand, that he conquered the first time Franche-Comté in fewer days than it was possible to write his Panegyric, do you think he would say any thing ridiculous? And if, at his return from a campaign so short and so glorious, it had been said that those who on that account were obliged to compliment his majesty, had occasion for more time to prepare their speeches than he employed in the conquest: would you ensure the thought? I do not believe I should, replied Eudoxus; and yet I take Timæus's thought to be ill founded, because the speeches which you mention relate to the King and his conquests; but Iocrates's Panegyric did not concern Alexander or his victories.' With all due deference to this Eudoxus, I believe it would have been better for him to have given his approbation without any reserve, I agree, the Greek author's thought would have been more perfect, if Iocrates's Oration had been a Panegyric on Alexander. This would have given it an additional beauty: but I cannot allow that the want of this circumstance vitiates the comparison. Without this, it still retains a lively image of the rapidity of Alexander's conquests.

(55) Id. ibid. pag. 81, Dutch edition.

I ought not to forget that Mr Racine must needs be for Timæus against Longinus. Read this passage in Madam de Sevigni's letter to the Count de Buffly, dated the 3d of November 1677. ' What you say of Racine and Boileau is indeed very just. The King said to them four days ago: I am sorry that you did not come to the last campaign, you would have seen the war, and your journey would not have been long. Racine answered: Sir, we had only dressed cloaths; we indeed bespoke riding cloaths, but the places you attacked were taken before they were made. This compliment was very agreeably received (56). I cannot tell whether any body has yet made use of a thought of Martial. It concerns the Amanuenses, who wrote faster than the words were dictated to them.

(56) Lettres du Comte de Buffly Rabutin, Tom. i, pag. 226, Dutch edition.

Currant verba licet, manus est velocior illis,
Nondum lingua, suum dextra peregit opus (57).

Before the words, the writer runs along,
And the quick hand quite distances the tongue.
Y y y y

(57) Martial. lib. viii, Epig. cxxviii.

Why

place, very much used in antient History. That is, the compiling of good or ill presages [K]. From the character of Timeus, it is easy to conclude, that he was very unfit to be an Historian; and that he ought especially to have avoided exercising his pen on the actions of Agathocles [L].

Why might we not say, that the arm of a Conqueror finishes a war with greater expedition, than the tongue of an Orator does a speech?

[K] *Plutarch has condemned him justly on account . . . of the common-place . . . of presages.* He falls in to the foolish conceits of Xenarchus in several places, as where he says, that he took it for an ill boding Omen for the Athenians, that the Captain Nicias, having his name derived from the word *Niké*, which signifies victory, should oppose the Sicilian enterprise; and that by the mutilation of the Hermes's, that is, the images of Mercury, the gods advertised them, that in this war they should suffer a great deal of mischief from the Syracusan General, whose name was Hermocrates the son of Hermon: and besides, that it was probable Hercules would support the Syracusians on account of the goddess Proserpina, who was the protectress of the city of Syracuse, in return for the favour done him, in rendering to him the infernal dog Cerberus; and on the contrary, that he would oppose the Athenians, because they defended the Ægeïtz, who were descended from the Trojans, his mortal enemies, by reason he destroyed their city, in revenge of the violated faith, and of the injury done him by King Laomedon. But perhaps his judgment was just as remarkable in writing these fine stories, as in censuring Philistus's style, or railing at Plato and Aristotle (58). We may here, observe by the way, what false notions the Pagans had of God. The Dialogue teaches us that the iniquity of the Fathers are visited on the children no farther than to the fourth generation. And here is a Pagan Historian who imagined that the Trojans drew on their Protectors the hatred of Hercules, eight hundred years after the differences which had happened between this demi-god and a Trojan prince.

[L] *Timeus . . . was very unfit for an Historian; and he ought especially to have avoided exercising his pen on the actions of Agathocles.* His favourite talent was the imprinting a satirical character on his writings: he naturally loved to criticize and censure. For this reason it was impossible that an History written by him should be good, even tho' he had possessed all the other talents necessary for an Historian (59). This satirical spirit prompts a writer to suppress all laudable actions, and only to present to the reader the weak or the ill side of things. It exerts itself principally when we are representing the actions of a man who has injured us. There was no History therefore which our Timeus was so little capable of writing well as that of Agathocles, for he wrote it in a town, where he was in exile, having been banished his own country by Agathocles. The memory of that injury was every moment before his eyes, and cried aloud for vengeance in the ears of the writer. I leave it to you to determine whether an author naturally satirical, could in these circumstances preserve an exact neutrality betwixt the good and ill qualities of the tyrant who had banished him. Those who are fond of railing, would find without doubt, if they would give themselves the trouble of a narrow search, that their satirical humour is the product of a choleric and arrogant temper. Now as this temper excites strong desires of revenge, even on account of the smallest offence, it is reasonable to conclude that Timeus found in himself a violent passion to be revenged on Agathocles. For which reason he ought not to have mentioned him in his History, because he must

be sure that if he mentioned him he could not avoid violating the laws of History. The most modest and moderate should distrust their own virtue, when describing the actions of a persecutor. They ought very justly to apprehend, that the injuries of banishment may raise those clouds, which will conceal from them the true state of affairs, and thereby hinder their discharging the duties of an Historian (60). With much more reason ought such a man as Timeus to be apprehensive of the illusions of resentment. I am of opinion that there are some men so considerate, that they would rather choose not to write at all, than to set up for Historians in such circumstances as expose them to these misrepresentations: they would not content themselves with calming the first commotions of the mind, and staying till time had closed up the wound; but they would for ever renounce writing on a subject which would infallibly open it again. But Timeus was not of this temper; and I dare affirm that the sole desire of revenging himself on Agathocles, would have determined him to take pen in hand immediately to compose a History of Sicily. Every age can furnish us with examples of authors, who had never thought of writing Histories, if personal resentments and modish passions had not been their motive. They have not patience to stay till their passion is over, which is the least they ought to do; but they write from the first beginning of their resentment. They should remember this fine precept,

Ne frena animo permitte calenti,
Da spatium tenuemque moram: male cuncta mini-
frat
Impetus

*Cool first, nor give your angry mind the rein,
For violence your end will ne'er obtain.*

But perhaps they are afraid they should not be able to write, if they should stay till their minds are composed. Perhaps they fancy that anger gives them a talent which they had not before.

Si natura negat facit indignatio verum (61).

If nature does not, anger makes us write.

Hence we find their Histories to be so very partial, and that they add their own comments on every action which they relate. One would be apt to take them for Judges of the Inquisition: they give sentence on every fact; they pronounce it weak and base, &c. why do they not give the reader leave to form this judgment? They ought to confine themselves to a narration which only contains the principles or the premises of reasoning; the reader would draw the conclusion himself, whether it tends to censure or to commend. It is enough therefore to represent facts: sentences of this kind ought to be managed in the same manner as those called maxims: they ought not to shew themselves in *Relievo*; but ought to be incorporated in the narration, as has been already observed (62). There are a great many modern Histories, in whose titles the epithet *Critical* is wanting; for the authors of them do nothing else but criticize, and sometimes engage in a regular dispute. They relate and then refute alternately.

(60) See the remark [B], of the article HALL (RICHARD).

* Stat. Theob. lib. 2, ver. 697.

(61) Juven. Sat. 1, ver. 79.

(62) In the remark [C] of the article THEON.

(58) Plutarch. in Nicias, pag. 523. Note that Longinus on the Sublime, ch. iii, laughed at the reason taken from Hermocrates's name.

(59) Compare with this the remark [D], of the article REMOND.

TIMESIUS, [A] was a very considerable man in Clazomenæ, the place of his birth. He there enjoyed so great an authority, that he did whatever he pleased; and as the public was obliged to him for several services, he did not apprehend that he should become odious by his greatness. But he was satisfied to the contrary, when passing by a place where some little children were playing at cockals, he listened to their talk. One of them was busied in making a cockal fly out of a hole: The thing appeared so very difficult, that most of the children believed he would not be able to do it: But he who was to play being of another opinion, *I wish to God, said he, that I could make Timesius's brains fly out, as I will do this cockal.* Timesius no longer doubted but that he was extremely hated in the city; and as soon as he came home, he told what he had heard to his wife, ordered her to pack up her things and follow him, and departed from Clazomenæ (a). I am ready to believe it was after this time that he undertook to conduct a colony into Thrace, and to rebuild Abdera. We have seen elsewhere (b) that his design did not succeed, and that he was driven out by the Thracians before he had regulated his new establishment. The Teians who in the LIXth Olympiad abandoned their city, succeeded much better in the design of building Abdera. They retained such a vast respect for him, that they honoured him as a hero (c). He experienced the truth of the answer, which the oracle gave, when consulted concerning the conducting of a colony, which was; *Look for swarms of bees, and you will find abundance of wasps* (d). The misfortune was, that instead of ejecting the drones like the bees in Virgil (e), the wasps constrained him to give over his enterprise.

(a) Plutarch. *Præc. Reip. ger.* pag. 812.

(b) In the article ABDERA.

(c) Herodot. *lib. i. cap. cxcviii.*

(d) Plut. de Amicor. multitud. pag. 96.

(e) Ignavum fucos pecus a præsepibus arcent. Virgil. *Georg. lib. iv. ver. 168.*

[A] *Timesius.* I call him by the name which Herodotus has given him, and not by that of Timesias given him by Plutarch. I have elsewhere observed (1), that a very learned man has called him Tifamenes, and probably by a typographical error has ascribed to him the driving out the Thracians (2). Another has said that he was expelled by the Teians; I have also taken notice of this mistake (3).

(2) *Ibid.* remark [B].

(3) *Ibid.* remark [C].

TIMOLEON, the General of the Corinthians, was one of the greatest men of ancient Greece. He might have been called the scourge of tyrants; for his strongest inclination and principal employment was to punish the usurpers of sovereign power, and to maintain or re-establish liberty. If he fought against tyrants, it was not to rid himself of competitors, but to seize the unlawful authority of which he would deprive them. We find but too many such enemies of usurpers. As to him, all his undertakings were in favour of the people. He carried his zeal for the interest of his country so far, that he caused his eldest brother Timophanes to be killed [A], after having found that all his remonstrances and intreaties were not capable of converting him. We ought to know that Timophanes set up for a tyrant in the city of Corinth. His death drew after it consequences very disagreeable to Timoleon. Some people reproached him with it as an execrable parricide, and his mother loaded him with curses [B]. This threw him into

[A] *He caused his elder brother Timophanes to be killed.* He did not stain his own hands with his brother's blood; but he was however one of the real authors of his murder, which happened in the following manner. Timoleon confederated himself with two persons, one of whom, named Æschylus was Timophanes's wife's brother, the other was a Soothsayer named Satyrus (1). They all three went to the tyrant, and endeavoured to persuade him for the last time to restore liberty to the people. He at first laughed at them, and afterwards grew very much enraged. Upon this Timoleon stepped a little aside, covered his face and wept whilst the other two killed Timophanes (2). This is Plutarch's relation, which generally speaking agrees with that of Cornelius Nepos (3). But Diodorus Siculus says that Timoleon himself killed his brother (4). There is one difference observable betwixt Cornelius Nepos and Plutarch. The first says that Timoleon joined with his brother-in-law; the other tells us that it was with Timophanes's brother-in-law. Let us express this more clearly. This associate, according to Plutarch, was Timophanes's wife's brother (5); but, according to Cornelius Nepos, he had married a sister of Timophanes and of Timoleon. Per aruspem communemque affinem cui foror ex iisdem parentibus nata, nupta erat, fratrem tyrannum interficiendum curavit (6). - - - He procured his brother to be killed by a Soothsayer, and a relation in common to both brothers, having married their own sister. Mr Morel is here guilty of an error. Timoleon, says he, consented that Satyrus, who had married their sister should kill this upstart tyrant. He cites Diodorus Siculus, and Plutarch: the first does not mention him; and the other does not say that Satyrus was any way related to Timoleon; he only calls him a Soothsayer. And as to the other accomplice, he calls him Æschylus, and makes him Timophanes's

wife's brother. It is not impossible that this Æschylus might have married Timophanes's sister, and yet be Timophanes's wife's brother. Upon this foot Cornelius Nepos and Plutarch would both be in the right, tho' each must have omitted a part of his relation to that family.

[B] *Reproached him with it as an execrable parricide, and his mother loaded him with curses.* Let us take this fact in its full extent as related by Plutarch. Those who could not bear popular liberty, or who had been long accustomed to be near the persons of great men and to make their court, made a show of being very well pleased with the tyrant's death; and yet by continually reproaching Timoleon for having committed a parricide execrable and abominable both to the gods and men, they made so great an impression upon him, as occasioned his repenting that he had any concern in it: and besides being informed that his mother bore it very impatiently, and that she was continually uttering against him the most terrible expressions and horrid maledictions, he went to her, with a design to comfort her: but she ordered the door to be shut upon him and would not see him. Being thus overwhelmed with grief, and troubled in mind, he took a sudden resolution to starve himself to death: but his friends who did not abandon him in this desperate melancholy, continued to urge him by persuasions and earnest intreaties, till they forced him to eat. After this he resolved to retire for the remainder of his life to a country solitude, and to quit all concern in the government of public affairs. He at first led so rigorous a life, that he not only abstained from ever coming to the city, but avoided all company, and did nothing else but wander up and down from place to place, in the most remote and solitary parts of the country he could find, and consume himself with melancholy (7). . . . Whether it was his regret for the death of his brother, or his being ashamed to appear before his mother, which forever it was, it so broke his

(1) So Theopompus calls him: but Ephorus and Timæus call him Oribasus. Plut. ubi supra.

(2) Taken from Plutarch, in the Life of Timoleon, pag. 237.

(3) Cornel. Nepos, in Vita Timoleonis. cap. i.

(4) Diodor. Siculus, lib. xvi. cap. lxxi.

(5) Ἀδελφὸν ἔσχε τῆς Τιμοφάνους γυναῖκος. Plutarch ubi supra.

(6) Cornel. Nepos, in Vita Timoleonis, cap. i.

(7) Plutarch in the Life of Timoleon, pag. 238.

into a despairing melancholy; he designed to put an end to his life; and when at last his friends had engaged him to alter his resolution, he renounced all public affairs, and confined himself to an obscure solitude. Here he spent twenty years, as in all probability he would have done his whole life, if an opportunity had not offered of restoring Syracuse to its liberty. This city oppressed by the tyranny of Dionysius, had recourse to the Corinthians. They resolved to assist them, and gave Timoleon the command of the troops designed for that service. That voyage was accompanied with very favourable omens [C]; but he met with many difficulties to be surmounted in order to his landing in Sicily; for Ictes the tyrant of Leontium, who had pretended to join with the Corinthians in the recovery of the liberty of Syracuse, but at the bottom aimed at dethroning Dionysius, for no other end, but in order to render himself master of that city, had joined with the Carthaginians, and possessed all the passes. He kept Dionysius besieged in the fortresses of Syracuse, having already taken the rest of the town. Notwithstanding these obstacles, Timoleon by stratagem landed in Sicily, defeated Ictes's army, and in a little time after became master of the citadel of Syracuse, and afterwards of the whole city. The citadel fell into his hands, by means of Dionysius the tyrant surrendering it together with his person into his hands (a); and he took the city by storm, without having so much as one of his soldiers either killed or wounded. He caused the fortresses to be razed, in order to ascertain to the inhabitants the duration of that liberty which he had recovered, and after having been successful in his endeavours to re-establish good order in this place, he applied himself to the restoring of the ancient liberty of all the cities in Sicily, which then groaned under tyrants. He forced Ictes to renounce his alliance with the Carthaginians, and to content himself with living in a private capacity in the city of Leontium. He obliged Leptines the tyrant of Apollonia to surrender himself, and sent him to Corinth. He obtained a signal victory over the Carthaginians. He punished the treachery of Ictes who entered into new alliances with them [D]. He defeated

(a) He was sent to Corinth: but it cannot be said, as it is in Moreri, that he was sent thither, after he had been overcome by Timoleon; for Dionysius did not oppose Timoleon.

(8) Id. *ibid.*

(9) Hoc præclarissimum ejus factum non parum modo probatum est ab omnibus. Nonnulli enim læsam ab eo pietatem putabant: & invidiam laudem virtutis obtebant. Mater vero post id factum, neque domum ad se filium admisit, neque aspexit, quin eum fratricidam impiissime detestans compellaret. Quibus rebus ille adeo est commotus, ut nonnunquam vitæ finem facere voluerit, atque ex ingratorum hominum conspectu morte decedere. *Cornel. Nepos, ubi supra.*

(10) Diodorus Siculus, *ubi supra.*

(11) Plutarch. *ubi supra, pag. 238, 239.*

his spirit and disheartened him, that for twenty years after he did not in the least intermeddle in any honourable or public affair (8). Cornelius Nepos says much of the same thing (9): But Diodorus Siculus says nothing of this long melancholy of Timoleon; but, on the contrary, gives us to understand, that there was only a small distance of time between the death of Timophanes, and the expedition of Syracuse (10). He says, that as soon as Timoleon had killed his brother there arose a great tumult: one part of the inhabitants demanded justice on the murderer, and others requested that those elegies should be bestowed on him, which were due to the destroyers of tyrants. This dispute was referred to the decision of the senate; the cause was pleaded on both sides by the counsel for and against Timoleon: The judges had not pronounced their sentence, when the Syracusan ambassadors came to request the assistance of the Corinthians. The senate ordered that Timoleon should be sent to Syracuse, and that if he discharged that trust well, he should be treated as the killer of a tyrant; but if the contrary, as a parricide. I shall once more cite Plutarch, to evince, by an unquestionable example, how much the best Historians can wrest the most essential characters of a fact. Here is Diodorus Siculus, who assures us that the Corinthian senate did not intrust Timoleon with the command of their forces, otherwise than under a disagreeable condition, namely, that his criminal process should end in his abolition or condemnation, according as he should behave himself well or ill in that post. But Plutarch's relation is quite different: he says that Timoleon was elected General absolutely, and without any condition, by the voice of the people: After which Teleclides, who was then a person of the greatest authority in the Corinthian affairs, rising up, made a speech to Timoleon, in which he exhorted him to behave himself like a good man and brave commander in this charge: for, said he, if you do this we shall pronounce sentence on you, that you have killed a tyrant; but if you do not discharge this trust well, we shall condemn you for murdering your brother (11). These are no trifling variations, but essential differences, and, to use a Latin phrase, *toto cælo diverſi*; — diametrically opposite. We cannot possibly excuse both these Historians; one of them must necessarily have fallen into a very great mistake.

[C] With very favourable omens. I shall not mention the happy preface he met with at Delphi: Moreri hath already done it. But here are others: When the fleet was ready, and the forces completely equipped for their departure, the priestesses of the goddess Proserpine declared, that in their sleep the night before, the goddesses Ceres and Proserpine appeared to them in travelling dresses, and

told them they would go with Timoleon to Sicily. On this account the Corinthians fitted out a galley, called the galley of Ceres and Proserpine (12). . . . When Timoleon was on the main sea, having the wind astern, in the night he thought that on a sudden the heavens opened, and displayed a large quantity of bright and visible fire, expanding itself over his ship, and appearing in the form of a burning torch, like those used in religious ceremonies. This torch accompanied and conducted them throughout their voyage, and at last dispersed and vanished at a place near the coast of Italy, where the pilots had consulted to land. The Soothsayers being asked the signification of this presage, answered, this miraculous apparition confirmed the dream of the priestesses of Ceres, and that the goddesses favouring the enterprise, had sent this light from heaven to shew them the way; the island of Sicily being sacred and dedicated to Proserpine, the rape on which goddess was also said to be there committed, and the sovereignty of it given her as a nuptial gift on her wedding-day (13). (12) *Id. ^{ibid.}* This relation of Plutarch might have been more accurately stated; but nevertheless, all circumstances duly weighed, it clearly enough appears that this was only a dream, and that there was no such thing as a real conducting fire which went as a guide before the fleet. So that this cannot reasonably be compared with the pillar of fire which went before the Israelites, or with the star which led the wise-men to Bethlehem.

[D] He punished the treachery of Ictes, who entered into new alliances with the Carthaginians. Timoleon's glory was by this somewhat eclipsed; for he permitted vengeance to be carried too far, and cruelty to be exercised upon those persons whom he had much better have exempted from punishment. Plutarch's words are these: 'A few days after, Timoleon bringing his army before Leontium, took Ictes, his son Eupolemus, and the General of his horse, alive, they being delivered up into his hands by their own soldiers. Ictes and his son were punished with death, as traitors and tyrants; and Euthydemus, tho' a valiant man and brave warrior, met with no more mercy, for some reflecting expression he was accused of having uttered against the Corinthians. For it was affirmed, that in a speech he made to the Leontines, on occasion of the Corinthians first arrival in Sicily to wage war against the tyrants, he said, amongst other things, that they ought not to be surprized or affrighted, if

Corinthian dames were gossiping abroad*.

* Thus we see most men are very frequently more enraged at reflecting words than injurious actions; they more patiently suffer a real injury than a reflection

* It is the beginning of Euripides's *Medea*.

defeated Mamercus the tyrant of Catana, and pursued him to Messina, where the tyrant Hippo had given him shelter. He besieged that place, and had the satisfaction to get both those tyrants into his hands [E]. So many glorious actions did not inspire him with the least inclination for supreme power: But, on the contrary, he rejoiced that there were some persons in Syracuse who publicly accused him [F]. He spent the rest of his life in this city [G], where he received all the marks of gratitude which he deserved: He really enjoyed there all the advantages of supreme power [H], without losing the glory of having never acted for any other end than the liberty of the people, and with-

out

‘reflexion, and pardon their enemies, when they have revenged themselves as to the fact, because they can do no less: but provoking expressions seem to proceed from too great an excess of hatred and malignity. After this, Timoleon returning to Syracuse, the Syracusians tried, condemned, and executed the wives and daughters of Ictes and his son. This seems the harshest action of Timoleon’s life: for if he had pleaded he could easily have saved the lives of these unhappy women: but he was not at all solicitous about it, he entirely abandoned them to the fury of the citizens, who were resolved to revenge on them the injuries done to Dion after he had expelled the tyrant Dionysius: for Ictes had caused Dion’s wife, Arete, his sister Aristomacha, and his son, who was but a child, to be drowned in the sea, as we have related in the life of Dion (14).’ Plutarch’s reflexion on human weakness, which pardons injurious actions easier than reflecting words, is very judicious.

(14) Plut. ubi
supra, pag. 253.

[E] He had the satisfaction to get both those tyrants into his hands. They both came to an unhappy end. Hippo, finding Messina besieged by sea and land, embarked on board a ship in order to escape: but he was taken before he got out of the harbour; and the Messinians having got him into their hands, caused the children to come from the school to the theatre to see one of the finest spectacles in the world, which was the punishment of a tyrant, who was publicly whipped, and afterwards executed. As to Mamercus he surrendered himself to Timoleon to be tried by the Syracusians, on condition that Timoleon should not be his accuser. He was brought to Syracuse, where he endeavoured to pronounce a studied oration which he had composed for that end: but finding that the people cried out, and made a great noise, to prevent the hearing of him, and consequently that it was not very likely they would pardon him, run cross the theatre, and struck his head with all his force against one of the steps on which the people sat, designing, by dashing out his brains to dispatch himself immediately; but he had the misfortune to miss his aim, for he was taken up yet alive and suffered the same punishment which was usually inflicted on thieves and robbers.

(15) Id. p. 253.

(16) Id. ibid.
pag. 251.

(15). We must not forget that Mamercus was a Poet, and had irritated the Syracusians by his satirical verses. Let us hear Plutarch on this head (16). ‘The common people of Syracuse bore very impatiently the jests which their tyrants made and said of them: for Mamercus, among others, valuing himself extremely on his talent in poetry and tragedy, having, in some engagements, gotten some advantage over the strangers which were in the Syracusan pay, gloried in his success, and dedicating the bucklers he had taken from them in the temple of the gods, added the following galling verses, in raillery and contempt of the conquered.

*These spacious shields shining with Tyrian dye,
And richly wrought with gold and ivory,
We by the dint of valour did obtain,
Altho’ our bucklers were but small and plain.*

Here is a Poet not mentioned by Vossius. Hieronymo Ragusa, the Jesuit, does not forget him in his eulogies of the ancient Sicilians (17); but instead of referring us to Plutarch he only cites Giovanni Vintimiglia.

(17) Mamercus quoque poetarum Siculorum gloria effulsit. Ex Joanne Vintimiglia in Tabula Poetarum Siculorum. Hier. Ragusa, in Elogiis Siculorum, pag. 178.

[F] He rejoiced that there were some persons in Syracuse who publicly accused him. This seems to me the most shining part of his life: we shall relate it without retrenching any of Plutarch’s words: But since it is, as we may say, necessary that not only all laws which the Latins call Castitæ, should have crests on their heads, as Simonides proverbially expresses it; so in all cities governed by democracy, there will be detractors. There were two of these at Syracuse, who being accustomed to

harangue the people, impeached Timoleon, one of them named Laphystius, the other Demaretus. Upon the appointing a certain day by the former of these, for Timoleon to appear before the people to answer to a crime of which he pretended to convict him, the citizens mutinied, and would not allow the authority of the summons. But he appeased them by remonstrating to them that he had run through so many fatigues, and exposed himself to so many dangers, to the end that every Syracusan might freely enjoy the full benefit and privilege of the laws. Another time Demaretus in a full assembly of the people having reprehended and censured several of his actions, during the time that he was General, Timoleon made no answer to it; but only told the people that he heartily thanked the gods for having granted what he had so often requested and desired in his prayers: which was, that he might once see the Syracusians enjoy the perfect freedom and privilege of saying whatever they pleased (18). Those who shall prefer the Latin of Cornelius Nepos, may read it here. Huic quidam Laphystius homo petulantius et ingratus, vadimonium cum vellet imponere, quod cum illo se lege agere diceret, et complures concurrissent, qui procacitatem hominis manibus coercere conarentur: Timoleon oravit omnes, ne id facerent, namque id ut Laphystio ceterisque liceret, se maximos labores summaque adiisse pericula. Hanc enim speciem libertatis esse, si omnibus quod quisque vellet, legibus experiri liceret. Idem, cum quidam Laphystii similis, nomine Demaretus in concione populi, de rebus gestis eius detrachere capisset, ac nonnulla invehiret in Timoleonem: dixit, nunc demum se voti esse damnatum: namque hæc à diis immortalibus semper precatum, ut talem libertatem restituerint Syracusanis, in qua cuivis liceret, de quo vellet, impune dicere (19).

(18) Plut. ubi
supra, pag. 253.

(19) Cornel. Nepos, in Vita Timoleonis, cap. iv.

[G] He spent the rest of his life in Syracuse. There is nothing more extraordinary than a great man, who knows how to enjoy his glory in quiet, without aspiring after new dignities. Most of those who arrive to a great height of reputation and an extensive authority, imprudently aim at mounting yet higher, and by this means expose themselves to some mortifying oppositions, and especially in popular states. Timoleon was wiser: He never afterwards returned to Corinth, but obliged his wife and children to come to him: he never intermeddled with those troubles which afterwards arose among the Greeks, nor exposed himself to the envy of his fellow-citizens, which most governors and generals have raised by their too great and insatiable desire of honours and authority. He spent the remainder of his days in Sicily, in the happy enjoyment of the fruits of his own labours, the greatest of which was to see so many cities, and so many thousands of men obliged to him for their happiness (20).

(20) Plut. in Vita Timoleonis, pag. 253.

[H] He really enjoyed there all the advantages of supreme power. If we may believe Cornelius Nepos, Timoleon’s conduct was that of a very wise man; he voluntarily quitted all authority, and by this means acquired a power more secure than that of kings: ‘Quum tantis esset opibus, ut etiam invitis imperare posset, tantum autem haberet amorem omnium Siculorum, ut nullo recusante regnum obtineret: maluit se diligere, quam metui. Itaque cum primum potuit, imperium deposuit, & privatus Syracusis, quod reliquum vitæ fuit, vixit. Neque verò id imperitæ fecit. Nam quod ceteri reges imperio potuerunt, hic benevolentia tenuit. Nullus honos huic defuit: neque postea Syracusis res ulla gesta est publica, de qua prius sit decretum, quam Timoleonis sententia cognita. Nullius unquam consilium non modò antelatum, sed ne comparatum quidem est. Neque id magis benevolentia factum est, quam prudentia (21).’ - - - Altho’ he was so very wealthy as to be able even to take the government by force, and also so universally beloved by the Sicilians, that he might have obtained it with their consent, yet he rather chose to be the object of their affection, than of their fear. Therefore as soon as

(21) Cornel. Nepos, in Vita Timoleonis, cap. iii.

Z z z

out exposing himself to the envy of republican spirits. His funeral solemnities were very magnificent. I must not forget his acknowledging that all his great exploits were the work of the gods [1], a favour of fortune, a good luck, and not the effect of his own prudence

'be possibly could, he laid down his command, and spent the remainder of his life at Syracuse in a private capacity. Nor was this ill judged. For what other sovereignty held by power, he enjoyed by benevolence. No honour was unpaid to him: nor was any step ever after taken by the Syracusians without first consulting Timoleon. The opinions of others were not only not preferred, but even not put in competition with his. Nor was this more owing to his goodness, than to his prudence.' This Historian adds, that tho' Timoleon became blind he did not give over being serviceable to the public. He caused himself to be carried in a litter to the assembly, and gave his opinion without stirring out of it. We shall relate this a little more particularly from Plutarch. 'It was a great pleasure to see how highly he was honoured in their councils. For if the affair in debate was of small consequence, they dispatched it themselves without him: but if it were of importance, and required mature deliberation, they called him to their assistance: he was carried in his litter across the public place to the theatre, where the assembly of the people was held, which he also entered in his litter: the people unanimously saluted him, and he returned their salutations; and after the praises and benedictions of the whole assembly were bestowed on him, the business in debate was proposed to him, and he gave his opinion; which being approved by the voices and suffrages of the people, his servants carried him back across the theatre in his litter, and the citizens received him with clapping of hands and loud acclamations of joy. After which the council proceeded to dispatch the remainder of their public affairs by themselves (22).'

(22) Plut. in Vita Timoleon. pag. 254.

(23) Ibid. pag. 253.

(24) Cornel. Nepos, ubi supra, pag. 344.

A REFLEXION on this acknowledgment of Timoleon.

(25) Plutarch. in Præceptis Reip. gerendæ, pag. 816, where he expressly mentions Timoleon.

(26) The Abbot de Saint Real, de l'Usage de l'Histoire, Discours vii, p. m. 223.

[1] I must not forget his acknowledging that all his great exploits were the work of the gods. And in his familiar letters written to his friends at Corinth, as well as in several speeches made to the people of Syracuse, he often said, that he rendered thanks to God for having been pleased to make him the glorious instrument, in his gracious purpose of saving and delivering Sicily from slavery. And having built a temple in his house, he dedicated it to Fortune, and there sacrificed to her: and, which is more, he consecrated and dedicated his whole house to holy Fortune (23). Cornelius Nepos relates the same thing. 'Nihil unquam neque insolens, neque gloriosum, ex ore ejus exiit: qui quidem, cum suas laudes audiret prædicari, nunquam aliud dixit, quam se eâ re maximas diis gratias agere atque habere, quod, cum Siciliam recreare constituissent, tum se potissimum duces esse voluissent. Nihil enim rerum humanarum sine deorum numine agi putabat. Itaque fuit domi sacellum Æτοματίας constituerat, idque sanctissimè colebat (24). -- Nothing that was presuming or boasting ever came out of his mouth: who even when he heard himself praised, never made any other reply, than that he was and ought to be extremely thankful to the gods, that when they had resolved on the relief of Sicily, they had made choice of him to be the General. For it was his opinion that no human affairs are transacted without the direction of the gods. In consequence of which he built a temple in his house to Fortune, and paid his devotions there with great zeal.'

This chapel which he caused to be built in his house to Fortune, and the strict worship which he paid to this divinity, give us reason to believe that he spoke as he thought, when he attributed his happy success not to his own prudence, but to the favour of heaven. Otherwise it is very probable that all those who made these acknowledgments, had not always in view the duties of religion, I mean the gratitude with which we ought to attribute our success to divine providence, and not to our own wisdom. Several have talked in this manner only for a political end; either with a design to appease the envious, or to create a greater confidence in their friends (25). Let us quote an author, who knew how to make very judicious reflexions. The greatest obstacle, says he (26), which the founders of sects and empires have met with in their designs, is the natural aversion all men have to submit one to another, to acknowledge a supe-

riority of merit and understanding. It has always been a certain rule among them to exclude from all manner of pre-eminence, those who discover any pretension to it, or a belief of their deserving it. And therefore all great men have with the utmost care avoided ever mentioning the extraordinary qualities which they had received from the liberal hand of nature. They have always exerted them with so much circumspection, that while every body else admired them, they themselves only might seem ignorant of them. . . . (27) But the most successful artifice they ever made use of to avoid irritating the pride and natural independence of men while they were enslaving them, was, that these illustrious impostors encouraged the people to ascribe all their excellent and superior qualifications to some secret communication which they had with the gods: by means of this address whatever was great in them ceased to offend any person, because it was no longer looked upon as any personal merit, which men are naturally averse to acknowledge, but only as an effect of good fortune, chance, or the favour of heaven which extends itself equally to the worthy, and unworthy, and does not debase the one or the other. . . . (28) It is upon this foundation that Cicero when obliged to particularize all his conduct against Catiline, in order to justify one who was accused of being concerned in his conspiracy; this great Orator very well knowing that a recital so glorious for him, would in his own mouth rather alienate than engage the minds of his auditors; to render this the less odious he very artfully, in the entrance of his Oration, ascribes all his great actions on this occasion to a divine inspiration. 'O dii immortales (vobis enim tribuam quæ vestra sunt, nec vero possum meo tantum ingenio dare, ut tot res, tantas, tam varias, tam repentinas, in illa turbulentissima tempestate Reipub. mea sponte dispenserim) vos profecto animum meum tunc concessistis, vobis patriæ cupiditate incendistis, vos me ab omnibus cæteris cogitationibus ad unam salutem Reipub. contulistis, vos denique in tantis tenebris erroris & inficentiæ clarissimum lumen prætulistis menti meæ.' -- O ye gods, cries he, at first setting out with this view, Immortal gods, (for to you I will render what is intirely yours, nor can I indeed presume so much on my capacity, as to believe that I could ever by myself have provided against so many accidents, so great, so different, and so unexpected, and in so turbulent a state of the common-wealth) yes, it is you who have inspired my soul with this ardent zeal for the preservation of my country; you who have taken me from all other cares to apply me solely to the prosperity of the republic: it is you, in short, who have introduced this shining light into my mind, before overshadowed by error and ignorance.'

If these reflexions of the Abbot de St Real are judicious, those of Mr Costar are not less so, when he is enquiring into the reasons why Sylla thought fit to assume the surname of Fortunate. He disapproves Mr Girac's opinion who says: 'It was indeed an instance of moderation in so illustrious a commander to ascribe to Fortune so many signal victories, which he might have attributed to his own valour. Nevertheless it was out of a consummate prudence, and a refined policy, that he yielded to the envy which ordinarily attends those who raise themselves above others. The ancient Sages always feared the goddess Nemesis, who diverted herself with debasing and destroying those too highly exalted (29).' Let us see Costar's reflexions on this passage of his adversary: As for Sylla it was not the defeat of Mithridates, which engaged him to assume the name of Fortunate. After having oppressed all the enemies of his greatness and person, and becoming Dictator by dint of his own authority, he made an ample recital of all the felicities which had attended both his military and civil actions: after which he declared that, in acknowledgment of those favours which heaven had heaped upon him, he had resolved for the future to add to his other names the title of Fortunate. That this was out of moderation and in order to avoid envy, as Mr Girac believes, is what I cannot persuade myself. I rather imagine that it was to give a greater assurance to those of his party, and greater terror to those who opposed him. In effect, we are more apprehensive of the fortune of a great man than

(29) Girac, Remarques sur les Entretien de Costar, p. 255.

† Plut. in Sylla.

† Pag. 255.

prudence (b). This gives me an opportunity to make some extracts concerning what the ancients have said on the influence of Fortune [K], and particularly to refute those who affirm

(b) Taken from Plutarch, in the life of Timoleon.

of his virtue, because virtue is a cause purely human, of which we know pretty nearly the measure, and extent; whereas Fortune is a divine cause whose power is unlimited. It is for this reason also, that we more readily rely on the protection of the fortunate, than on that of the virtuous; and the Lord Chancellor Bacon is of opinion, that Cæsar had not so effectually encouraged the Pilot frightened with the tempest, if he had said, Fear nothing, thou carriest Cæsar and his virtue, as he did by this encouraging expression, Fear nothing, thou carriest Cæsar and his Fortune (30). It is better in my opinion to ascribe to Sylla both these motives, that alleged by Girac and opposed by Costar, as well as that advanced by the latter; for it is certain, that in the Pagan times, they very much feared the goddess Nemesis, and firmly believed her an enemy to the proud. It was thought, that the General Timotheus's reverse of Fortune was owing to his refusing to acknowledge his obligations to his stars. Let us hear what Plutarch says on this head: *Timotheus, the Athenian, the son of Canon, whose malicious enemies attributed all his great actions to the favour of Fortune, to express which they represented in pictures, Fortune bringing towns to him already taken in her net, whilst he was asleep; very warmly resented it, and was very much incensed against them on that account, urging that they robbed him of his just glory: on which occasion once upon his return from a successful war, after having given an account to the people, and publicly recited the particulars of his expedition, he added, Athenian Lords, Fortune has no hand in what I have related. The gods were so enraged at this ridiculous ambition of Timotheus, that he was never afterward successful; they thwarted him in all his actions to that degree, that he became so odious to the people that he was at last banished and expelled Athens (31).* To this may be added what Plutarch tells us of Sylla's affecting the contrary. The facts are curious. Sylla not only patiently acquiesced with those who cried him up as a particular favourite of Fortune, but backed their opinion, and glorying in it as a special favour of the gods, he ascribed the glory of all his actions to Fortune (32), either out of a sort of vain glory, or a real imagination that of the gods conducted him in all his affairs; for he himself informs us in his commentaries, that of the enterprizes which seemed to have been well concerted, those that he boldly hazarded according as opportunity offered, tho' directly opposite to his former thoughts and resolutions in council, were such as succeeded best. Besides when he said that he was rather born for fortune than war, he seems to acknowledge his successes rather owing to his fortune than to his valour. In short, he appears [on all occasions entirely to submit to, and own his whole dependence on Fortune; since he even owns it as a singular favour of the gods, that he preserved such an union and amity with his father-in-law Metellus, who was a person in equal authority with himself (33).] See in Plutarch (34) some other facts which he has extracted from the commentaries of this Roman General; and observe that he supposes it possible to ascribe to Fortune by way of rodomontade, whatever great actions have been performed. Εἰς κόμπαν χάριμεν, εἰς ὅτι τῶς ἐχὼν τὴν δόξαν πρὸς τὸ θεῖον, whether, says he (35), Sylla spoke thus out of a bravado, or from his having this real opinion of providence. To me the justness of this disjunctive does not clearly appear: for if this great Captain had not really believed that God had favoured him, I own he might yet have said so for some political reasons already mentioned: but I cannot see that vanity or vain-glory could induce him to it, since he was not one of those nonsensical romancers, who ground their bravadoes on extravagancies, and are sufficiently satisfied if they do but talk. Such a man as he could not be ignorant, that he diminished the merit of his prudence and valour, in proportion as he acknowledged that Fortune was the cause of his victories. How therefore could he make this acknowledgment out of a principle of vanity, supposing him to be guilty of a lie? I add this, because Plutarch's disjunctive supposes, that Sylla could not have spoke thus from a motive of vain-glory, if he had been

persuaded of the truth of what he said. In my opinion therefore the Historian ought to have joined these two particulars, which he hath separated. He ought to have said that Sylla being persuaded that providence had heaped on him its most surprising blessings, affected to boast of it, and from thence was supplied with matter for his vanity; for as all things are liable to be abused, it is certain, that if, on the one side, wise men humble themselves, by acknowledging that they are only the instruments of providence; on the other hand, haughty men pride themselves, by imagining that God has been pleased to make use of them for the execution of his designs. They look upon themselves as his favourites, and from that time believe themselves above all the rest of mankind. Consider that St Paul himself had occasion for a strong check, and severe mortification, to prevent his being puffed up with pride, by the excellency of those Revelations which God by his special grace had communicated to him. But to say something in defence of Plutarch: those persons who believe nothing of what they say concerning Fortune, may nevertheless ascribe their greatest actions to her out of vanity and presumption. They may govern themselves by the general opinion; and imagine that those who believe God to be the sovereign director of all things, will admire and firmly rely on his favourites. A modern author pretends that a certain boast of Tiberius (36) was rather political than vain. For it is of great importance for a Prince to be fortunate or to be thought so. And this passes among his subjects for merit and virtue, and the more so as they believe their felicity depends on his. So Tiberius who perfectly understood all the maxims of government, loudly proclaimed the prosperity of his house, declaring that such a fortunate incident had never before happened to a Roman Prince. From whence he thought to render himself more venerable to the people, by making them believe him to be the favourite of the gods (37).

[K] What the ancients have said on the influence of Fortune. If I would here collect all that they have said on this subject, I should be obliged to write a whole book on that head. I only propose to glean a few ears in this spacious field. It may be affirmed that no hypothesis is better established in the writings of the ancients, than that human industry and prudence have a much less share in events, than our good or ill fortune, or in other words, an unforeseen concurrence or disposition of circumstances not in the least depending upon us. 'Sunt in his quidem virtutis opera magna, sed majora Fortuna.' -- Among these indeed the actions of virtue are great, but those of Fortune yet greater. Pliny speaks this (38), after having related several events: but who doubts that he might have said the same of an infinite number of other particular occurrences? He lays down a little farther the same maxim, tho' somewhat more obscurely. 'Plurimum refert in quæ cuiusque virtus tem-pora inciderit.' -- The times in which each person's virtue happens to appear are of very great importance. Tho' Quintus Curtius should not expressly tell us (39), that Alexander's conquests were less owing to valour than to fortune; his History alone would have sufficiently declared it. Cornelius Nepos affirms that in the division of military glory, fortune has always the greatest share: 'Jure suo nonnulla ab Imperatore miles, plurima vero Fortuna vindicat, sequæ his in potestate habuit. Q. Curtius, prædicare (40). -- The soldier justly claims some share with the General, but fortune much more than either, since her assistance may truly be said to be of greater consequence than his conduct.' Mr Spanheim (41) conjectures that these words are only an imitation of the following: 'Nam bellicas laudes solent quidam extenuare verbis, easque detrudere ducibus, communicare cum militibus. . . . maximam vero partem quasi suo jure Fortuna sibi vindicat, & quidquid est prospere gestum id pene omne ducit suum (42). -- For some are accustomed to extenuate military successes, and deprive the Generals of them sharing them among the soldiers. . . . but the greatest part of all is claimed as it were of right by Fortune, who seems every thing her own which is performed with success.'

(30) Costar. A-polos. pag. 317, 318.

(31) Plut. in Vita Syllæ, pag. m. 454.

(32) And yet Salust tells us, Atque illi (Sullæ) felicissimo omnium ante civilem victoriam nunquam super industriam fortuna fuit, multique dubitavere fortior an felicitior esset. Salust. de Bell. Jugurth. pag. m. 362.

(33) Plut. in Syllæ, pag. 454.

(34) Ibid.

(35) Ibid.

(36) The wife of Drusus, the son of Tiberius, being delivered of two boys, Tiberius said in a full senate, that since the beginning of the empire, no man of his rank had been blessed with the like good fortune. Tacit. Ann. lib. ii.

† Quibusdam fortuna pro virtutibus fuit. Hist. 2.

* Cælestis favor, & quædam inclinatio numinum ostenderetur. Hist. iv.

(37) Amelot de la Houffaye in his Tiberius, chap. lxxxiii, pag. 106, Edit. 1683, in 4to.

(38) Plinius, lib. vii, cap. xxviii, p. m. 49.

(39) Fatendum est quum plurimum virtuti debuerit plus debuisse fortune quam solus omnium mortalium buit. Q. Curtius, prædicare (40). -- The soldier justly claims some share with the General, but fortune much more than either, since her assistance may truly be said to be of greater consequence than his conduct. Mr Spanheim (41) conjectures that these words are only an imitation of the following: 'Nam bellicas laudes solent quidam extenuare verbis, easque detrudere ducibus, communicare cum militibus. . . . maximam vero partem quasi suo jure Fortuna sibi vindicat, & quidquid est prospere gestum id pene omne ducit suum (42). -- For some are accustomed to extenuate military successes, and deprive the Generals of them sharing them among the soldiers. . . . but the greatest part of all is claimed as it were of right by Fortune, who seems every thing her own which is performed with success.'

(40) Cornel. Nepos, in Thrasibulo, cap. i.

(41) Spanheim sur les Césars de Julien, p. 428.

(42) Ciceron, O. rat. pro Marcello.

affirm that there is no other cause of prosperity than prudence, nor of adversity than imprudence.

'*success*.' Cicero who spoke this to Cæsar, had no reason to fear that he should be offended at it; for no person more expressly acknowledged the empire of Fortune than Cæsar (43). You may see in Mr Spanheim (44) what Livy, Diodorus Siculus, and others, have acknowledged concerning this Empire, either in express words, or by declaring that we ought not to judge of personal merit by the success of actions, which is entirely subject to Fortune, but by the means that are used. Scarce any one of the Poets has expressed himself so nervously on this subject as Juvenal.

(43) See the article CÆSAR, remark [H].

(44) Spanheim sur les Cæsars de Julien, pag. 428, & 255.

Si fortuna volet, fies de rhetore consul;
Si volet hæc eadem, fies de consule rhetor.
Vintidius quid enim? quid Tullius? anne aliud quam
Sidus & occulti miranda potentia fati (45)?

(45) Juven. Sat. VII, ver. 197.

'*Tis fate that flings the dice; and as she flings,
Of kings makes pedants, and of pedants kings.
What made Ventidius rise, and Tullius great,
But their kind stars, and bidden power of fate?*

Juvenal also says,

Plus etenim fati valet hora benigni
Quam si nos Veneris commendet epistola Marti,
Et Samia genitrix quæ delectatur arena *.

* Juven. Sat. XVI, ver. 4.

*For one lucky hour is of more consequence to a soldier,
than a recommendation to Mars, either from his mistress
or his mother.*

The sentiment of princes being here of greater force than that of a poet; I shall cite the answer of Dionysius the younger, when he was asked this question by Philip King of Macedon: *Wherefore did you not maintain yourself in the kingdom which your father left you? Do not be surprised at that, replied he, for my father, who left me all his other effects, did not leave me his fortune by which he acquired them* (46).

(46) Ælian. Div. Hist. lib. III, cap. lx.

I might subjoin to these quotations the thoughts of several modern authors; but shall content my self with a passage in Montagne. 'It is commonly observable in human affairs, that Fortune, in order to convince us of the great power she bears over all things, and of the pleasure she takes in checking our presumption, not being able to make fools wise, makes them fortunate in spite of virtue. And she is most inclined to favour those executions, where the design is more especially her own. Hence we daily see the most simple among us defeat the greatest enterprizes, both public and private. And as Siranæz the Persian answered those, who were very much surprised at the ill success of his affairs, considering that his designs were so well laid; that he alone was master of his designs, but as to the success that was in the breast of fortune: So these may answer in the same manner, but in a different sense. The greatest part of the affairs of the world are done of themselves.

* Fata viam inveniunt.

* Fate finds the way.

'The event frequently authorizes a very foolish conduct. Our interposition is only a thing of course, and more commonly in consideration of custom and example than reason. When I have been astonished at the greatness of an action, and upon enquiry of those who have accomplished it, have been let into the motives and management; I have found their counsels very common, and the most vulgar and customary are perhaps also the most secure and best adapted to practice, if not for shew. . . . Good luck and ill luck are in my opinion two sovereign powers. It is ridiculous to think that human prudence is able to act the same part as fortune will do. And his enterprize is very vain, who presumes to secure both the causes and consequences, and lead as it were by the hand the progress of his undertaking. Vain more particularly in martial councils (47).'

(47) Montagne, Essays, Tom. IV, lib. III, ch. viii, pag. 198, 199. of the Hague edition 1727.

Notwithstanding all the authorities just now cited; it is certain that several good writers have maintained that every one is the author of his own fortune, and is either miserable or happy as he acts imprudently. Plautus has laid down this maxim.

LY. Ne opprobria, pater. Multa eveniunt homini
quæ volt quæ nevolt.

PH. Mentire edepol, gnate: atque id nunc facis
haut consuetudine,

Nam sapiens quidem pol ipse fingit fortunam sibi.

Eo ne multa quæ nevolt eveniunt nifi actor malu'it (48).

LY. Sir, blame me not. We can't command events.

PH. Son, you're mistaken: that's a vulgar error.

A wise man always cuts out his own fortune.

Nothing proves cross but from an ill contriver.

(48) Plautus, in Trinummio, Act II, Sc. ii, ver. 30, pag. n. 741.

It is also to be found as cited from an ancient poet, in a discourse (49) attributed to Sallust. 'Res docuit id verum esse quod in carminibus Appius ait fabrum esse suæ quemque Fortunæ. . . . Experience teaches the truth of what Appius says in his verses, That every man is the maker of his own fortune.' Cornelius Nepos, alludes it twice in his life of Pomponius Atticus. 'Itaque hic fecit ut vere dictum videatur sui cuique mores pingunt fortunam. . . . NAM (50) . . . quantum poterimus rerum exemplis lectores docebimus, sicut supra significavimus, suos cuique mores plerumque conciliant. ARE FORTUNAM (51). . . So that from this example it appears true, That the conduct of every person makes his fortune. . . . We shall convince the readers as far as we can by experience, as we have before hinted, That every person's fortune is generally owing to his conduct. Those who have exclaimed to much against Theophrastus (52) for praising that maxim, that fortune and not wisdom is the directress of life, have come very near to Plautus's assertion. And what shall we say of Juvenal, who after having, in his 7th satire, preached up the omnipotence of fate tells us in his 10th satire that all depends on prudence?

(50) Cornel. Nepos, in Vita Pomp. Attici, cap. xi.

(51) Id. ibid. cap. xix.

(52) Venerit idem Theophrastus & libri & scholia omnium philosophorum, quod in Callistene suo laudat illam sententiam. Vitam regit fortuna non sapientia. Cicero, Tusculan. lib. v, folio 273, B.

Nullum numen abest, si sit prudentia: sed te
Nos facimus, fortuna, deam cæloque locamus (53).

Fortune was never worshipp'd by the wise:
But, set aloft by fools, usurps the skies. DRYDEN.

(53) Juven. Sat. X, ver. 565. See also Sat. XIV, ver. 315.

Some Moderns have approved Plautus's opinion. Galeotto de gli Oddi pronounced an oration on this subject in the academy of the *Insensati* at Perugia (54). Regnier declares for the same opinion in one of his satires:

(54) See Des Seccado Luciolotti, in the book intitled Chi l'indovina è felice, pag. 231.

Nous sommes du bonheur de nous même artisans,
Et fabriquons nos jours ou fâcheux ou plaisans.
La fortune est à nous, & n'est mauvaise ou bonne,
Que selon qu'on la forme ou bien qu'on se la donne (55).

(55) Regnier, Sat. XIV, fol. m. 96, verso.

Prosperity's the work of our own hand,
And life is white, or black, as we command.
Fortune is but the creature of our will,
As we are pleas'd to form her, good, or ill.

Mr de Cailliere, in his book of the Fortune of persons of quality maintains: *That our good or ill fortune depends on our conduct* (56). He declares in his Epistle Dedicatory, *that he designs to destroy the idols of Fortune, to demolish her temples and altars, and to rob her of the founder part of her adorers.* Tho' Mr de Silhon says, that Fortune is a fantome which religion hath abolished, and whose invention was not useful since the unhappy and imprudent attribute to her the causes of their misery, and the effects of their ill conduct (57), yet I do not reckon him as one of the favourers of Plautus's maxim; for he did not pretend, that, in order to succeed in our undertakings, it is sufficient to comport ourselves in them according to the rules of prudence, and to have a good

(56) It is the title of the first chapter.

(57) Silhon, Mémoire d'Etat, book I, ch. I, at the beginning.

imprudence. But it ought not to be expected that I should do it by incontestable reasons. It

a good cause. He owns a prosperity and adversity, dispensed by the providence of God, without any necessary regard to our intentions and measures. There appeared some time ago a very good book, intitled, *Reflections on what is called Good or Ill Luck in Lotteries* (58). The author is undoubtedly of Plautus's opinion; or, to speak plainer, he does not believe that the fortunate lots run for or against certain persons with any sort of distinction. It is not therefore a general opinion, that there is some unknown cause which favours or crosses certain persons without any regard to their good or ill qualities, or the measures they take to attain their ends. But we must own, that the greatest number of suffrages is for the affirmative; however as that is no manner of proof of the truth of an opinion, I wish that some able pen would examine this subject to the bottom, and discuss what could be said on each side. I hope there will be some persons found to undertake this task; in the mean time I will here offer a few reflexions.

I. I observe first of all, that we ought not to imagine that the Pagans represented fortune, as a being which blindly distributed good and evil, without knowing what she did. They called her blind (59), I own; but that was not in order to deprive her absolutely of all knowledge; it was only to signify that she did not act with a just discernment. So we say a Prince is blind in the distribution of his favours, when he bestows and takes them away by caprice, and without any respect to the merit of his subjects. We do not pretend to say, that he does good or ill to such and such, without knowing that he gives or takes away the respective place from the respective person. We only mean, that he doth not govern himself according to the rules of reason and justice, and that he is determined rashly by the instigation of his inconstant passions. This is the idea which the Heathens formed of fortune. They were all persuaded, except a few Philosophers, that the Divine Nature was a sort of being divided into several individuals. They attributed to every god a large share of power; but did not exempt them from the imperfections of our nature; they believed them susceptible of anger and jealousy, literally speaking; they made no scruple to affirm, in their most serious writings, that a malignant and ferret envy of the gods opposed their prosperity (60). They more particularly attributed to the god which they called Fortune, a conduct which was inconstant, rash, and capricious to the last degree. It was for this reason that an infinite number of temples were built to her, and that she was worshipped in a particular manner, in order to prevent the ill effects of her caprices. They did not therefore believe that she wanted either eyes, or ears, or thought. Those Philosophers who acknowledged the unity of the deity, called that divine being Fortune, when they considered it only as a distributor of good and evil things, which did not conform itself in the least to what we call merit, constancy, or reason. But the wisest of them always owned that it never acted contrary to absolute justice, or without good reasons, which it understood very well. After all, God himself says, That his ways are not our ways, and his thoughts are not our thoughts.

II. My second reflexion is, that under the gospel dispensation we attribute, to earthly goods, all the defects which the Pagans ascribed to the goddess Fortune. We say, that the possession of them is no sign of merit, that they are very fleeting and perishable, and that they miserably deceive those who rely on them, &c. It is easy to observe the reason of this diversity of language. The Christians acknowledge only one God, and by that word they understand a nature infinitely perfect, which governs all things, and dispenses all events; but the Pagans lavished the name of God into an infinity of limited beings, imperfect, full of faults and vicious passions. For which reason they made no scruple to charge on them the irregularities of human life, when they could not discover the cause of them amongst the free actions of men. The Christians, on the contrary, impute to the creature whatever infirmity they meet with in the universe; they ascribe to the nature of the benefit what the Pagans placed to the account of the benefactor.

III. I say, in the third place, that it can scarce be denied, that there are fortunate and unfortunate people,

VOL. V.

that is, according to the Pagan language, that there are some people who are made the sport of fortune in the whole course of their affairs, whilst there are others, whose way she smooths, and takes care to shew them numberless instances of her favour. Merchandise, gaming, and the court, have always furnished examples of these two things; but nothing so manifestly confirms this as the military life. It is there Fortune rules more than any where else: our Timoleon, Alexander (61), Sylla, Cæsar, and several other ancient warriors, have acknowledged it in the most authentic manner: the moderns confess it also both in their memoirs and conversations. I have been told by a person of quality, that the Constable Wrangel assured him, that nothing was more rash than to hazard a battle, which was liable to be lost by a thousand unforeseen accidents; tho' at the same time the most exact measures have been taken, which the most consummate military prudence can suggest. Girard, Secretary to the Duke of Epemon, has shewn, in the long life he has written of that famous favourite, so many happy events independent on precaution, that it is hardly possible to deny the truth of the popular opinion concerning the fortune of some people. After this, says the Historian, we ought not to wonder if the Duke never complained of Fortune in the adversity of his old age: on the contrary, some of his friends once talking on that subject, he told them that he should be very ungrateful for the benefits with which Fortune had constantly favoured him for above sixty years, if he should be disgusted at her leaving him for the small time he had then to live; that he had scarce ever observed an entire life fortunate, tho' much shorter than his; and that in the inconstant state of human affairs, it was no small advantage, that his disgraces were referred to a time, when he was hardly any longer capable of relishing prosperity.

IV. My fourth reflexion is, that it seems very false, that what we call good fortune depends only on prudence; and that what we name ill fortune, is only the result of imprudence. I freely own, that the assertion of the author (62) above cited does not appear to me well grounded. It is not true that the winning gamester always plays better than the loser. It is not true that the Merchant who grows rich, always surpasses in the knowledge of trade, or industry, and circumspection, those who do not grow rich. No person is ignorant, that in those games which depend on chance, there is somewhat which contributes more to losing or winning, than whatever depends on the skill of the gamblers. There are days when a man wins large sums: this is not owing to his playing with greater application, or with a more ignorant gamester; but he has a good game, the very cards are dealt him which he wants, or the dice turn up according to his wishes. On other days he experiences the quite contrary. In the very same sitting, he finds sometimes the turn of fortune; he is lucky in the beginning, and unlucky at the end; he loses in the last hour, more than he won in all the foregoing. There are men who immediately after they begin to play, perceive their good or ill luck, and finding that the day does not favour them, they are so wise as not to push any farther, and give out in good time. Not that they distrust their address and capacity, but they distrust what doth not depend on their skill. This somewhat is not so apparent in trade; it is nevertheless certain, that persons of mean capacity, and of very little judgment, sometimes gain immense sums by such sort of dealings, as those of better understanding and greater experience would not run the hazard of engaging in. It may be affirmed in general, that those who acquire the most riches by trade, are neither more intelligent, nor more industrious, than several others whose gain is less considerable. The latter therefore are not so much the favourites of Fortune as the former. Consequently there is a good or ill fortune in human life, independent on prudence or imprudence. I do not believe the author I am at present examining, will deny this, so far as relates to play and commerce: he only had in view the fortune which people of quality may make in the service of their prince. If he only intended to advise a gentleman to chuse the prudent part, I have nothing to say against his opinion; but he goes much farther: he would persuade us, that

5 A

(58) Printed at Amsterdam, 1696.

(59) Spargitque manu munera cæca peiora focum. Seneca.

(60) Hinc five invidia Deum, five fato rapidissimas procurentis imperii cursum parumper Gallorum Senonum incursumque supprimitur. Florus, lib. 1, cap. xiii. Indignantium voces exaudiebant tam viridem & in flore ætatis fortunæque invidia Deum eripit esse rebus humanis (Alexandrum.) Q. Curtius, lib. 2, cap. v.

(61) Rex jussit confidere felicitati suæ remissè, sibi enim ad aliam gloriam concedere Deos. Q. Curtius, lib. vii, cap. vii. Rex fortuna sua & consiliis suorum se utrumque esse respondet, nam & fortunam cui confidat & consilium suum. Quid temere & audacter faciat sequitur. Id. ibid. cap. ix.

(62) Mr. de Cailliere in his book de la Fortune des Gens de Qualité.

It is not possible in a subject of this nature to lead the reader to evidence, or demonstration.

that those who succeed, owe their advancement to their wife conduct only, and that those who do not make their fortune, ought to impute it to their imprudence. This is what I cannot believe. I will allow him to call it wife conduct, whatever a man does to conform himself to the present circumstances, as to be a braggadocio, a debauchee, a wag, a buffoon, &c. whenever it is the certain way to please; or to pretend to be mad, when without it he cannot escape imminent dangers (63). I allow every thing to be called imprudence, which is contrary to the humour of the present times; as to be a very honest man in a depraved court, where there is nothing to be got by any but rascals. Notwithstanding all this, I cannot help maintaining my assertion, that the rise and fall of great men are not commonly the meer effects of prudence or imprudence. Chance, precarious accidents, and fortune, justly claim a large share. Some occurrences which we neither contrived nor forelaw, discover the way, and make us hasten our pace. A caprice, a jealousy, which it was impossible to foresee, stops us short all of a sudden, and throws us entirely out of the way.

V. The better to refute Mr de Cailliere, I must add here a fifth reflexion. We must not affirm, that all events being connected with a determinate cause, fortune is a chimerical being, and so that we are no otherwise fortunate or unfortunate, but as we foresee, or do not foresee the chain of natural causes and effects. To shew the nullity of this objection, I will suppose a fact not only very possible, but which may also be proved by some examples. A Prince causes a town to be besieged in the middle of winter: if rain, snow, or ice, come upon him, he is not likely to take it; but if the weather be dry, and the cold moderate, he will take it. There follows several successive weeks of fine weather; no rain, no snow: the siege advances daily, and the town capitulates before the frost comes. Another Prince besieges a place in the middle of summer, and is likely to take it if the season keeps its ordinary course; but if it rains hard for several days, if the nights are cold, if this occasions several distempers in the camp, he will not be able to take it. There happens a reverse of seasons, the summer is cold and rainy, the trenches advance but slowly, the army grows weaker daily by the diseases which this unseasonable weather produces, he finds himself forced to raise the siege. Can you possibly ascribe the happy success of the first siege to prudence, or the ill success of the second to imprudence? This would be asserting two absurdities; for in the first case, there was no foreseeing the fine weather, nor the ill weather in the latter; and consequently there was no prudence in attempting the first siege, nor imprudence in undertaking the latter. It is therefore purely owing to good fortune that the first succeeded, as it is to be ascribed to ill luck that the latter miscarried. I know very well, that if men could foresee rain and fair weather, it would have been an act of imprudence to have formed the latter siege. The ill success in that case would have been a great fault, and not a misfortune; but human foresight does not extend so far, and if we are ignorant that the summer will prove rainy, it is not owing to imprudence. There are a hundred fortuitous accidents, which we can no more foresee than these, that are equally capable of disappointing the best concerted military enterprises. Now as some Generals are much more frequently perplexed with these cross occurrences than others, we may reasonably acquiesce in the popular opinion, that there are fortunate and unfortunate Generals. But we must not hence infer, that the fortunate are always, or almost always, as prudent as the unfortunate. On the contrary, we must believe that the latter sometimes surpass the former both in prudence and valour (64). Consult Porfiterus, in his notes on a passage of Tacitus, wherein that Historian assures us, that all human affairs are a continual sport (65). This commentator will give several illustrious examples, which prove that the best concerted designs in this world are confounded by an invisible force, which human prudence cannot guard against: this is particularly observable in the conclaves (66). And as for those who pretend that every person is the author of his own fortune, you may

find them solidly and amply confuted in a book of Don Lancelotti (67).

Observe carefully what I am going to say. Princes commonly judge of things by the success. A General stands very well in their favour who succeeds in a military enterprise; but if the contrary happens, he forfeits their esteem and friendship. Even when they are sensible, that the victory was barely a piece of good fortune, and the defeat was not in the least owing to any fault of the General, they are always more disposed to prefer the victor than the vanquished; for with them to be fortunate is a commendatory character, as, on the other side, an unfortunate, tho' shining merit, is but a disagreeable quality. Since therefore battles are lost and won by unforeseen accidents, it is clear that misfortunes happen independently on imprudence, and that some make their fortune independently on prudence. A lucky rafhness, you will tell me doth not deserve the name of temerity; for since it has succeeded, it is a sign that it was proper to produce it's wished effect. Now where does prudence consist? Is it not in making use of proper means to accomplish our designs? My answer is, that to act prudently, we ought to know that the means we use are proportioned to the end. A rash fortunate man is unacquainted with this proportion; he is hurried on by an impetuous fury; there appears nothing in his conduct but what is to be met with in that of the rash unfortunate; and therefore the success of the enterprise ought not to be ascribed to prudence but to fortune. Observe also another thing; it is no manner of imprudence not to be precautioned against those things which human capacity cannot discover, and consequently if a person doth not succeed at court, or if he loses the fortune he has already made, it is not always to be attributed to imprudence. Is it possible for him to discover all the caprices, dis gusts and jealousies that arise in the mind either of a monarch, or of his mistresses or favourites? Can he discover all the grimaces of false friends, obviate their calumnies, and prevent their lies and false reports which wound without threatening. This was the confession of a great minister, whose genius was not less than his authority. In the post which you are in, said Cardinal Richelieu to a Captain of the guards (68), it is easy for you to know your friends and your enemies. No disguise can conceal them from your discernment; but with respect to mine, in the post which I hold, I cannot penetrate into their sentiments, they all speak to me in the same language. They all make the same earnest court to me, and those who would ruin me, give me as great marks of amity, as those who are sincerely attached to my interests (69); Regnier, in the satire already cited, tells us:

La faveur est bizarre, à traicter indocile,
Sans arrest, inconstante & d'humeur difficile,
Avecq' discretion il la faut caresser,
L'un la perd bien souvent pour la trop embrasser,
Ou pour s'y fier trop, l'autre par insolence,
Ou pour avoir trop peu ou trop de violence,
Ou pour se la promettre ou se la denier,
Enfin c'est un caprice étrange à manier,
Son amour est fragile & se rompt comme verre,
Et fait aux plus matois donner du nez en terre (70).

Most fickle is the favour of the great,
Unsteady, whimsical, and strange to treat.
Men ne'er can be enough upon their guard,
Some lose her by caressing her too hard;
Some by dependence; some by insolence;
Some by too much, or little violence;
Some by presumption, some by self-denial;
In short, she'll balk your skill on ev'ry trial.
Brittle as glass itself, she's quickly broke;
Nor can the wisest ward the fatal stroke.

VI. Let us then take it for granted, which is my sixth reflexion, that the prudence of a man is not the sole nor even the principal cause of his fortune. There

(63) *Inspiciens esto, quum tempus postulat, aut res: Stultitiam simulare loco, prudentia summa est.* Cato, *Dist.* xix, lib. ii. David, and Brutus, and several others have been the better for such a conduct. See *Cornelius à La-pide in lib. i, Regum, cap. xxi.*

(64) One may say of several great captains, what Florus said of Sertorius, lib. iii, cap. xxii, *vir summe, quidem sed calamitose virtutis.*

(65) *Mibi quanto plura recentium seu veterum revolvam, tanto magis ludibria rerum mortalium cunctis in negotiis observantur.* Tacit., *Annal.* lib. iii, cap. xxviii.

(66) See the *Mélanges de Vignieu Marville*, Vol. ii, pag. 330, 331, of the Dutch edition. See above citation (16), of the article ANTONI-ANO.

(67) *It is intitled Chi l'indovina e Savio, ovvero la Prudentia humana fallacissima: The author refutes in the third Discurso of the second book the Oratum of Galotto degli Oddi.*

(68) *Mr de Fabert, who was Marshal of France.*

(69) *Histoire du Maréchal de Fabert, pag. 55.*

(70) *Regnier, Satire XIV, fol. 96.*

tion. We find at most only strong probabilities in it; and it is no small objection against

There are some fortunate people, whose conduct is very imprudent: and others unfortunate, tho' their conduct is prudent. The difficulty is to know what this fortune is, which favours some people and persecutes others, without regard to their merit or the measures they take. To recur to God, is not to remove the difficulty; for acknowledging him the general cause of all things, it will be asked whether he directs immediately, and by particular acts of his will, all those unforeseen occurrences which cause the designs of one man to succeed, and confound the enterprizes of another. If you answer in the affirmative you will bring all the philosophers, especially the Cartesians on your back, who will maintain that you attribute such a conduct to the Supreme Being, as is inconsistent with an infinite agent. He ought, they will tell you, to establish a few general laws, and by this means produce an infinite variety of events, without recurring every moment to exceptions, or particular acts, which must needs be miracles, tho' we should not call them so, by reason they would be so frequent (71). You may indeed reply to them, that the occurrences favourable to the fortunate, and contrary to the unfortunate, are a natural consequence of general laws; but they will not easily believe you. You will never be able to persuade me, that chance can produce what I am about to say. Let an hundred tickets well sealed be ranged in order on a table; Let ten of them be blanks, and ten of them marked with the letter A, and write a sentence on all the rest; then let ten men be called in, and one of them directed to take up the 1, the 15, the 21, the 37, the 44, the 68, the 80, the 83, the 90, and the 99. Let another be ordered to take the 3, the 6, the 13, the 25, the 50, the 73, the 88, the 89, the 95, and the 100. Tell me, I pray, if the first of these men draws the ten blank tickets, and the other the ten marked A, can you ever hope to persuade me that this was the result of the general laws of the communication of motion? Do you not perceive your self that these twenty tickets were placed in such an order, that one half of them by a premeditated design, should fall entirely into the hands of the first of these ten men, and the other into the hands of the second? I say also, that supposing certain gamesters had always, or almost always the best cards, (72) or in general, that certain persons are almost always favoured by accidental occurrences; this would require something besides the natural result of the communication of motion, this must proceed from a particular direction and determination; and I should rather choose with several learned men to deny the distinction of good or ill fortune, than to explain it only by the general laws of nature. But we argue here on the hypothesis, that there are fortunate and unfortunate people.

Cannot we recur to occasional causes, I mean, to the desires of some created spirits? Platonism might easily be brought to favour such an explication; but it is opposed by strong arguments, according to the idea which Theology gives us of the angelical nature. This teaches us that the angels are some of them perfectly good, and others extremely wicked, and both endowed with an almost unlimited knowledge, under the general direction of God. This idea cannot easily be reconciled to the particular train of fortunate or unfortunate occurrences. But confining our selves to hypotheses purely philosophical, we shall be better able to answer these objections, if we suppose for example, that the invisible spirits (73) are more different from one another, than men are amongst themselves; that there is a great subordination amongst these spirits; that there are some who are sometimes good and sometimes evil, sometimes in a good humour, and sometimes in an ill one; that they are fantastical, inconstant, jealous, envious, that they thwart one another, that their power is very much limited in certain respects, and that if they can perform a thing which is very difficult, it does not hence follow that they can accomplish a thing which is much easier. Do not we see country-women ignorant of the alphabet, who know a thousand excellent secrets to cure diseases? Archimedes who invented such admirable engines, could he sow? could he spin? However it be, there is no fortune without the direction of an intelligent cause, and I cannot be sufficiently surprized that a

learned man should venture to say, that Fortune was neither God, nor nature, nor understanding, or reason, but a certain natural and irrational impulse (74). (74) Jovianus Licet disputatum sit, fortunam à natura prorsus esse aliam, non desuere tamen, qui assererent, etsi à natura moribus, institutisque longe plurimum fortuna abhorreat, sitque ipsa inconstans admodum, & lubrica, non continua, non eadem ubique, non eorundem semper effectrix, non simileis sibi retinens progressionem, non discriminata servans tempora, denique improvida sit, repentina, inordinata, temeraria, qui sive mores, sive impulsus, neque naturæ convenient, neque rationi, quarum utriusque propria sit constantia, maturitas, ordo, mensura, regula, discriminatio item rerum, temporum effectuum, non inquam desuere, fortunam qui asserant, irrationalem quandam esse naturam, nec aliud illam denique, quam naturæ impetum quandam, hoc est ratione carentem agitationem naturæ quandam, in iis ipsis videlicet, quæ nec rationi subjiciantur naturæ, neque hominum electionibus, ac consiliis. Impetum itaque esse eam censent, quod sit absque ratione, feraturque suo sponte tantum agitata, atque impulsu, quodque ubi impetus dominetur; illic rationi nullus omnino relictus sit locus, nulla prorsus autoritas, aut pensatio earum quæ gerantur rerum (75). - - - Though it is disputed, that fortune is entirely distinct from nature, yet there have been some who assert, that notwithstanding fortune is very far from being reconcilable to the methods and laws of nature, being so remarkably inconstant, fickle, unsteady, various, producing different effects, never observing the same measures, or any certain seasons; lastly improvident, sudden, impetuous, rash, which whether they be rules or impulses, are neither agreeable to nature nor reason, to both of which belong constancy, perfection, order, measure, regularity, and a distinction of things, seasons, and effects; there have been some, I say, who assert that fortune is a certain irrational nature, and nothing else but a certain impulse of nature, that is, a certain natural agitation void of reason, namely in those things that are neither subject to natural reason, nor to human choice or design. They hold therefore that it is an impulse, that it is exerted without reason, and carried by its own spontaneous directions and power, and that where this impulse prevails there can be no room left for reason, no influence at all, nor consideration about what is to be done. Perhaps you would gladly be informed for what reasons he deprives God and nature of the acts of Fortune: wherefore, since his works are somewhat scarce, I will here insert what he has said on this head. 'Fortunam non esse Deum, - - - That fortune is not God,' is the title of one of his chapters: and this is what he says in that chapter. 'Quomodo enim Deus erit, si hæc tam sæpe, tam inconsiderate, tam etiam inique, atque ex inopinato extollit ignavos, locupletat immeritos, vexat, atque affligit, infantes, bonos in calamitatem adducit, ac servitutum, pravos statuit in solio, liberat à periculis perverfos, moderatos, & honestos viros laboribus periculis ærumnis, ac miseriis conficit? Tyrannorum hæc sunt non Dei, cujus est summa bonitas, aboluta justitia, rectissimum judicium, æquissima rerum omnium dispensatio (76). - - - For how can she be God, when she so frequently, so inconsiderately, and so unjustly, and suddenly advances the lazy, enriches the undeserving, vexes and afflicts the innocent, brings the good into calamity and slavery, fixes the wicked on a throne, delivers the perverse from perils, and throws the temperate and just into difficulties, dangers, troubles, and miseries? These are the acts of tyrants, not of God, whose goodness is infinite, justice absolute, judgment impartial, and dispensation of all things most equitable.' The following chapter intitled 'Fortunam non esse naturam, - - - That fortune is not nature,' amongst other things contains the following words: 'Naturam quoque non esse eam hæc ipsa liquido satis docent, quod fortuna ipsa quidem inconstans est, inordinata, varia, repentina, incerta. Contra vero quid natura ipsa ordinatius, constantius, certius? cujus est ordo, ea lex, ac regula, ut non, nisi certis, constitutisque à principis suo tempore, suis progressionibus, mensurisque tum universa proveniant, tum etiam singula quarumcunque ipsa re-rum, effectuum, operum author est & causa. Pergit

(71) There are some other objections taken from morality which may be seen hereafter in Pontanus's words. See also the *Reflexions sur le Bonheur & Malheur de L'homme*, ch. viii, pag. 93, & seq.

(72) Take notice of this clause; for even if there was no providence, but only a fortuitous effusion of good and evil throughout the universe, it must happen that some men would find themselves in happy circumstances, and others the contrary. See the article MA. HOMET II, remark [F].

(73) I call them so in opposition to human souls, which are spirits united to sensible bodies.

against the opinion I defend, that Cardinal Richelieu, whose abilities were surprising, would

(77) *Id. ibid.*
 'Pergit natura ordine suo, graditur suis passibus,
 'dispensat actiones suas cum temporibus, viribus,
 'opibusque suis utitur cum mensura, & penso, non
 'fluitat, non nutat, stabilis est in officio suo, sibi que
 'semper constat (77.) . . . That she is not nature will
 'also appear from hence, that fortune is inconstant, in-
 'ordinate, various, sudden, uncertain. On the con-
 'trary, what is more orderly, constant, and certain
 'than nature? Since she observes such order, law, and
 'rule, that not only universals but particulars also,
 'among all the things, effects, and works, whereof she
 'is the author, are produced from certain principles, in
 'certain seasons, and by certain progressions, and mea-
 'sures. Nature proceeds in her own method, pursues her
 'own steps, dispenses her own acts with regard to sea-
 'sons, exerts her powers and faculties with weight
 'and measure, she never fluctuates, she never nods, she
 'is steady in her duty, and always consistent with her
 'self.' See the margin (78).

(78) Jerome Garimberto, who lived in the XVth century, wrote in Italian a treatise della Fortuna, where in the tenth chapter of the first book he la fortuna è un impeto naturale privo di ragione negli huomini; - That Fortune is a natural impulse void of reason, and in the next chapter, that a man is happy, when he is led by a natural instinct to a thing, which he does not foresee, and without any shew of reason.

(79) Aulus Gellius, lib. vi, cap. ii, pag. m. 171.

(80) Homer. *Odyss. lib. i, ver. 32.*

Therefore Chryseides denied that there was an encouragement to be given to those men, whether worthless and idle, or wicked and impudent, who, being found guilty of a fault or crime, fly immediately to the necessity of fate, as to some asylum; and ascribe the worst of all they can commit, not to their own ill conduct but to Fate. This was first observed by Homer, the wisest as well as oldest of the poets, in these verses.

Perverse mankind! whose wills, created free,
 Charge all their woes on absolute decree;
 All to the dooming gods their guilt translate,
 And follies are miscall'd the crimes of fate.

MR POPE.

These three Greek verses are taken from the first book of the *Odyssy*, and signify in Latin.

Pope, quomodo jam Deos mortales culpant
 Ex nobis enim inquit mala esse: at illi ipsi
 Ob sua scelera præter fatum dolores patiuntur.

La Fontaine hath ingeniously described the same injustice; you will find his thoughts and several others in the book which I quote (81). But may it not be pretended, that, on several occasions, the person who is unhappy by his own fault, has not a less right to complain of fortune, than the unfortunate who has punctually discharged his duty? May we not say that this power, which we call Fortune, occasions misery two ways? She sometimes permits a man to use all the means which prudence can suggest, and yet deprives him of the success he ought to expect; she pleases her self with this, in order to shew her superiority, and the insufficiency of our reason and of human wisdom. Sometimes also she plunges men into misery, by obstructing their use of the means which might have preserved them from it: she confounds their judgment, and hurries them on to irreparable mistakes. It was probably thus that she irretrievably ruined the affair of Pompey. She had declared for Julius Cæsar, and procured him the triumph, by allowing him to act agreeably to all the qualifications of a great commander, and by eclipsing in Pompey's soul those eminent qualities which he possessed. They did not appear at the battle of Pharsalia; Pompey there shewed himself

a weak man, and an unskilful General. Was not this eclipse supernatural? Was it not the influence of some superior force, which had designed to raise Cæsar on the ruins of his competitor? Velleius Paterculus declares that when the destinies are resolved to ruin a man, they deprive him of prudence (82): 'Sed pro-
 'fecto ineluctabilis fatorum vis cuiuscunque fortunam
 'mutare constituit, consilia corrumpit . . . (83) sed præ-
 'valebant jam fata consiliis omnemque animi ejus (84) (85) *Id. ibid.*
 'aciem prætrinxerant. Quippe ita se res habet, ut cap. xxviii.
 'plerumque fortunam mutaturus Deus, consilia cor-
 'rumpat, efficiatque, quod miserrimum est, ut quod
 'accidit, id etiam merito accidisse videatur, & calus
 'in culpam transeat. . . . But indeed the irresistible
 'power of fate designs a reverse of fortune, and corrupts
 'their counsels: . . . But now fate over-ruled their
 'counsels, and clouded their understandings. For so it is,
 'that when God intends a reverse of fortune, he gene-
 'rally corrupts human counsels, and so orders it, which
 'is the most miserable circumstance, that what happens
 'shall seem to have happened deservedly, and that the
 'accident shall be construed into a fault.' The senti-
 'ment of this grave Historian was very common
 'amongst the Pagans; and every day we use this
 'saying as a proverb, 'quos Jupiter vult perdere de-
 'mentat. . . . Those whom Jupiter marks out for de-
 'struction, he first deprives of their understanding.' A
 'certain writer being to prove that it is possible for two
 'authors to express the same thought without borrow-
 'ing from one another (85), cites *Philipp de Commines*,
 'who without ever bearing of Paterculus's name, yet said,
 'as well as he, that when God begins to chastise princes,
 'he first lessens their sense, and makes them avoid the coun-
 'sels and company of the wise. I shall cite an excellent
 'passage of Ammianus Marcellinus: 'Ut solent manum
 'injecitibus fatis hebetari sensus hominum & ob-
 'tundi, his illecebris ad meliorum expectationem
 'erectus, egressusque Antiochia numine lævo duc-
 'tante, prorsus ire tendebat de fumo, . . . As mens sensus
 'loquitur vetus, ad flammam (86). . . . As mens sensus
 'use to be clouded and stupified by the controuling power
 'of fate, being encouraged by these inducements to hope for
 'better things, and going out of Antioch under the con-
 'duct of his evil genius, he went as the proverb says,
 'out of the smoke into the fire.' A little after speaking
 'of Nemesis, he tells us that she turns men out of their
 'way, and perverts the ends and designs of men:
 'Hæc ut regina causarum & arbitra rerum ac discepta-
 'trix, urnam sortium temperat, accidentium vices
 'alternans: voluntatumque nostrarum exordia interdum
 'alio, quam quo contendebant, exitu terminans, mul-
 'tiplices actus permutando convolvit (87). . . . She, as (87) *Id. ibid.*
 'queen, arbiter and disposer of causes and things, pre-
 'sides over the turn of lots, varying accidents at her
 'pleasure: and terminating very often what our wills
 'had begun, with a conclusion quite different from that
 'to which they were directed, makes a strange jumble
 'and confusion in things.' She does not always effect
 'this by error, the sometimes makes use of mere igno-
 'rance. What I call error is that false judgment which
 'our mind makes of things, in comparing them toge-
 'ther, and choosing the worst: and I call that igno-
 'rance, when a man is in such a state, that the neces-
 'sary ideas do not offer themselves to his imagination.
 'Now when he takes the wrong side, either by reject-
 'ing the proper means actually present to his mind, or
 'by reason of the absence of those ideas, which ought
 'to have presented those means to him, he passes for
 'imprudent; but it is certain, that in the first case im-
 'prudence is more voluntary than in the second, and
 'consequently more to be condemned. Several philoso-
 'phers assert, that what is called pure omission is never
 'free. Who would venture to maintain that we are
 'masters of our memory, and that it is a moral fault not
 'to remember certain things upon any occasion when
 'we want to remember them to conduct us in our deli-
 'berations? Those who acknowledge the empire of
 'Fortune, would, I think, be unreasonable, if they sup-
 'posed that she doth not influence our forgetfulness or
 'omissions: for, on the contrary, it is by them that the
 'frequently occasions our ill success. She removes those
 'ideas which would naturally occur to us, and hinder
 'our committing faults. How often has it happened
 'that a man of judgment has very much prejudiced
 'himself by the answers he has made to several questions
 'proposed

(81) Réflexions sur ce que l'un appelle bonheur & Malheur en matière de Loteries, &c. vi, pag. 79, & seq. See also Regner, ubi supra, fol. 96 verso.

(82) Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii, cap. lvi.

(83) *Id. ibid.*

(84) *Id. ibid.*

(85) *Id. ibid.*

(86) *Id. ibid.*

(87) *Id. ibid.*

would not allow any other cause of unhappiness besides imprudence [L].

proposed to him? All those to whom he relates the questions, ask why he did not make such an answer? He is immediately convinced that he should have done it. He owns it; he is surprized that he did not think of it; he protests that on all other occasions this idea must necessarily have occurred to him, so natural does he find it, so easy, and exactly conformable to common sense. Nevertheless, he is convinced that he did not in the least think of it, and that even the most confused notion of it never reached his thoughts. Why will you not allow him to believe that his ill fortune presided over this forgetfulness, and purposely directed it? Our divines do not deny that providence sometimes blinds men, with respect to omissions, as well as with regard to actual judgment. Plutarch would never allow this doctrine, for he very strongly recommends to those who read the poets, the rectifying of all those passages which represent the gods deceiving us, and inflicting us to evil. He particularly warns us of these verities in Euripides (88), thus translated by Amyot :

(88) Πολλαῖς
μορφαῖς οἱ
θεοὶ σοφισμῶ-
νων σφάλλουσιν
ἡμᾶς κρείττο-
νας τοφικώτε-
ρας. Multis di formis
homines sophif-
icatum quod his
potentia præstint
in fraudem agunt.
*Euripides, apud
Plutarchum de
audiendis Poëtis,
pag. 20, 21.*

Les Dieux puissans trop plus que nous ne sommes,
Vont abusant nous autres povres hommes
Par plusieurs tours de ruse tromperesse.

*The gods, whose nature pow'r superior knows,
By various frauds on man's weak mind impose.*

He is so far from owning that a divine power influences us to choose the wrong way, while at the same time we know the right way, that he would have us ascribe it to a brutal passion.

Αἱ αἱ τόδ' ἤδη θείον ἀνθρώποις κακόν,
Ὅταν τις εἰδῇ τάχαθόν, χρεῖται δέ μῃ.

Θηριῶδες μὲν ἔν, καὶ ἄλογον, καὶ οἰκτρὸν, εἰδότες
τὸ βέλτιον, ὑπὸ τῷ χείρονος ἐξ ἀκρασίας καὶ μα-
λακίας ἄγεσθαι.

Eheu, malum mortalibus divinitus
Venit, ut bonum videant, non utantur tamen :

Immò verò belluinum, non divinum est hoc malum,
& brutum ac miserabile, melius videntem intempe-
rantia & molitie ad deterius rapi (89).

(89) Id. *ibid.*
 pag. 33, E.

*Alas! From heav'n to man all ill ensues,
We see the good, but want the pow'r to chuse.*

So far is this from being true, that evil is beastly, brutish, and wretched, instead of heavenly, and it is our intemperance and folly that hurry us away to ill, while the good is full in our view. But how solid forever these reflexions of Plutarch may be in some respects, we ought always to remember, that our Theology, and the universal language of all Christians, founded on all passages of holy writ, lay it down as a certain truth, that the blindness of man, his rashness, folly, and cowardice, are frequently the effect of a particular providence, which inflicts them on him as a punishment; and that his prudence, his wife answers to questions, his resolution, and his understanding are favours inspired by providence, in order to his preservation and prosperity. The heathens were not ignorant of this doctrine; for we find that Manlius declared to the Roman citizens, that if the gods prevented his ruin, it would not be by defending on earth, but by inspiring the Romans with a wife resolution, as they had inspired him with that valour and courage which saved the Republic: ‘*Benè factis quod abominamini; dii prohibebunt hæc: sed nunquam propter me de cælo descendente: vobis dent mentem oportet, ut prohibeatis: sicut mihi dederunt armato togatoque, ut vos à barbaris hostibus, à superbis defenderem civibus*’ (90). . . . *You do well in declaring your abhorrence: the gods will prevent these measures; but they will never descend from heaven for my sake: let them give you the courage to prevent them; as they did me, both armed and unarmed, to preserve you from barbarian enemies, and haughty fellow-citizens.*

(90) Titus Livius, *lib. vi*,
pag. m. 176.

I cannot conclude without observing, that if on the one side, we call that ill fortune, which is sometimes the natural consequence of imprudence; on the other

side, we name that good fortune, which is sometimes the result of prudence. We have seen some men so rash in their conduct, that there was no room to doubt but that it would end in some cruel mortification; they attacked and fell foul of all the world, and if the first engagement discovered them to be wrong-headed, the following were only a long train of rash, irregular and violent sallies. According to all rules, these men ought to have been shamefully crushed, and nevertheless we have seen them flourish, or at least retire from the battle without any mark of dishonour. This is a great piece of good fortune, say some. But it is certain that some stratagem, some refined stroke of policy, had a greater share in this good success than fortune. These pretended rash men had taken their measures long before hand, with a great deal of prudence; they had rendered themselves necessary to those who were capable of extricating them out of every embarrassment. They had found the secret of being subservient either to their private pleasures or ambition. The circumstances of the times favoured them; the trade of directing spies or some other secret service was of extraordinary use. They were sure of succeeding in their unreasonable quarrels; they did not therefore act rashly.

[2] Cardinal Richelieu, however, would not allow any other cause of unhappiness than imprudence.] Mr Aubert informs us of this particular. He says that Cardinal Richelieu, and the Duke d'Olivarez two prime Ministers, the one of France, the other of Spain, were rivals and antagonists, (91) That their power was much of an equal duration; that they were compared to two stars of the first, or at least of the second, magnitude; which drew on them the eyes, the esteem, and admiration, of all Christendom. That the Cardinal was first eclipsed by a natural death, the 4th of December 1642. And that the other enjoyed the advantage of shining alone, not above five or six weeks, being disgraced the 17th of January 1643. The motive or pretext of his disgrace, was the ill success which accompanied all his enterprises. This was in effect accusing him of imprudence. In Cardinal Richelieu's opinion, imprudent and unfortunate are but two words to express the same thing.

(92). Thus be willingly put in practice one of his most constant maxims which was, to give it you in his own terms (93). 'That in state-affairs it is impossible to be over-cautious, or to look out for too great security. 'That a statesman, if he can, ought always to have two strings to his bow; that to succeed he ought not to take too exact measures, but that in order to do much, he ought to exert himself, and make preparation for doing yet more: that in a word, in all important affairs, if he did not take those measures which seemed too extensive in Theory, he would always find them too short in Practice.' It is hard to believe, that the Cardinal, on occasion of the failure of successes in some of his enterprizes, never acknowledged that he had, notwithstanding, taken all those measures which prudence could suggest. If therefore on such occasions he thought himself guilty of some imprudence, he extended the idea of prudence beyond its true bounds; for if he believed that those, who trusted a man who deceives them, are imprudent, he supposed prudence to comprehend the certainty of events which depend on free-will. But that is a palpable error. There are persons who have given so many successful proofs of their fidelity, and in so signal a manner that one may trust them in an important affair, without the least shadow of imprudence. And yet they differ

charge their duty very ill, they begin their treachery on this occasion, and betray their trust. It would be requiring a more than human knowledge from a prime Minister, to pretend that he has rashly and imprudently relied on this man (94), that it is not his misfortune but his fault if the affair has miscarried, since he ought to have been aware of the inward change of this person. You see then that this question is liable to several equivocations or disputes about words. The ill fortune of an enterprise is always attended with some want of knowledge. If indeed you call this imprudence, and will argue in consequence of this definition, you may fully and without reserve maintain Cardinal Richelieu's position; but your definition will be false, and at the bottom you will agree with your adversary.

(91) Aubert,
Histoire du Car-
dinal Mazarin.
livr. i, p. 100.

(92) This is very different from the opinion of Garimberto, who maintained, *della Fortuna, cap. xviii*, that he who acts according to prudence ought not to be called a fortunate man; and *cap. xix*, that no person is fortunate either by art, or prudence, or the favour of God, but by a natural impetuosity raised in the soul; and *cap. iii*, *iv*, *lib. ii*, that fortune favours the bold, and is a friend to the presumptuous, and very often to the rash. See, above, remark [A] of the article CHARLES V.

(93) See the same Aubert, Hist. du Cardin. de Richelieu, livr. vii, cap. iv, pag. m. 383.

(94) Compare what is said above, remark [K], num. v.

TIMOMACHUS. TIPHERNAS. TYPOTIUS.

(a) Moreri has
aid very impro-
perly, some
pictures of a *Me-
des* and an *Ajax*.

(b) In Veneris
Genetricis sede.
*Plin. lib. xxxv,
cap. xi.*

(c) Epigr. cxi,
cxii.

TIMOMACHUS, a celebrated Painter, born at Byzantium, flourished in the time of Julius Cæsar. He painted an Ajax and a Medea (a) which were purchased for eighty talents by that emperor, to be placed in the temple of Venus (b). The sum is not inconsiderable, amounting according to Father Hardouin's computation to 192 thousand French livres. Timomachus had not put the finishing hand to his Medea; which made it still more valuable. Pliny justly admires this capricious taste of men [A]. There are in the Anthology, some epigrams on this Medea, which Aufonius has translated into Latin (c). This was not the Painter's master-piece; for besides that his Iphigenia and his Orestes were not less esteemed, his Gorgon was the picture in which he had discovered the greatest art. I have collected some mistakes [B].

[A] Pliny justly admires this capricious taste of men.]

If the sketches of a great master should be more valued than the finished pieces of a mean artist, we should not wonder at it; but that the perfect works of a great hand should be less able to excite our admiration than his rough draughts, seems unreasonable. Is pity concerned in this affair? Do we think it our duty to love these pieces, because they have had the misfortune to lose their author before they received his finishing hand? Perhaps we hunt after reasons, which none are able to give. Let us therefore quit our search; and only cite what Pliny has said. 'Il-
' lud perquam rarum ac memoria dignum, etiam su-
' prema opera artificum imperfectaque tabulas, sicut
' Iria Aristidis, Tyndaridas Nicomachi, Medeam Ti-
' momachi, & quam diximus Venerem Apellis, in
' majori admiratione esse quam perfecta (1). - - - It is
' something very uncommon, and worth recording, that
' the last works and unfinished pieces of Painters, such
' as the Iris of Aristides, the Tyndarida of Nicomachus,

(1) Plin. lib.
xxxv, cap. xi.

' the Medea of Timomachus, and this Venus of Apellis,
' which we have just now mentioned, have been much
' more admired than those that were perfect.'

[B] His Gorgon was the picture in which he had dis-
covered the greatest art. I have collected some faults.]
Read these words of Pliny, chap. xi. lib. 35. 'Præ-
' cipue ars ei fuisse in Gorgone visa est. - - - His art
' seemed to have succeeded more particularly in his Gor-
' gon.' Charles Stephens had cited the fifth book; Mr Lloyd has suppressed this quotation instead of rectifying it, and has added nothing to this article, but that Athenæus lib. 14. cites one Timomachus, who had written the History of Cyprus. Moreri and Hofman cite no authorities. The article Timoniachus is left out in the last editions of Charles Stephens, tho' it remained in that of 1620, which was revised and corrected by Frederic Morel. It is strange that this learned man should not discover the change of an m into ni by a typographical error, had produced the pretended Painter Timoniachus.

(a) And not
George, as Mo-
reri has it.

(b) Leand. Al-
bertus, in De-
script. Ital. pag.
m. 132.

(c) Taken from
Paul Jovius,
Elog. cap. cxvii,
pag. m. 259.

TIPHERNAS (GREGORY) (a), a native of Tifernum in Italy (b), deserves a very good place amongst the learned humanists of the XVth century. He understood Greek, and translated into Latin a part of Strabo. It is that which Guarinus Veronenfis had left untranslated. Some tell us that Politian laid claim to the version of Herodian, of which Tiphernas was the real author; but this is scarce credible (c). The manner in which Tiphernas obtained the Greek professorship in the university of Paris [A] is very singular. You will meet with his Latin verses in the *Deliciæ Poetarum Italorum* (d). He sometimes bought his own provisions, but he haggled in such a studied stile, that the peasants did not like it [B].

[A] The Greek Professorship in the university of Paris] These are the words of Peter Matthieu: Emanuel Chrysolora's school produced Gregory Tiphernas, who came to Paris, and presenting himself to the Rector, told him, that he came to teach the Greek authors, and demanded the recompence allotted by the holy decrees. The Rector was a little surprized at the assurance of this stranger, yet commended his design, and with the advice of the university retained him, and granted him the ap-
pointment he desired. Hermymus of Sparta succeeded him (1). Gabriel Naudé relates the same thing, and makes use of it to prove the disposition of Lewis the XI, to protect learned men. We may judge, says he (2), by Philopbus's epistle cited in the preceding chapter . . . how he constantly encouraged the Constantinopolitan Greeks, who came to Paris, to reside there, and continue the course of their studies in hopes of his liberality. Gregory Tiphernas was the first who made way for the rest (3), who being arrived at Paris presented himself to the Rector, &c. Naudé cites Melanchthon in oratione de Capnione, tom. 3. Several authors mention this pas-

(1) Peter Mat-
thieu, Histoire
de Louis XI,
livr. xi, pag. m.
734, 735.

(2) Naudé, addi-
tions to the Hi-
story of Lewis
XI, pag. 185.

(3) One may
infer from these
words of Naudé,
that he believed
Tiphernas was a
Greek.

sage of Tiphernas, and amongst the rest Sixtinus Ama-
ma, who observes, that he came to Paris about the
year 1470, and informed the Rector of what had
been ordered by the council of Vienne: he did not
forget to say that the university of Paris was expressly
mentioned in the decrees of that council (4).

[B] He haggled in such a studied stile that the pea-
sants did not like it.] Jovianus Pontanus, who was his
disciple, tells the story in this manner: 'Gregorius
' Tiphernas quo præceptore Græcis in literis usus
' sum adolescens, ad forum accesserat rerum venalium,
' dumque rusticano cum homine non potest de mer-
' cimonio convenire, sermone enim cum illo nimis
' composito utebatur, ibi ego qui rem perpendissem,
' conversus ad rusticum, &c (5). - - - Gregory Tiphernas
' who taught me Greek in my youth, went one day to
' market to buy some things, but could not agree with a
' countryman about the price of them, because he spoke
' to him in too affected a language, which perceiving I
' turned to the peasant, &c.'

(4) See Sixtinus
Amama, in Præ-
fatione de excusa-
dis SS. Lingua-
rum studiis, pag.
197, of his Anti-
barbarus Bibli-
cus, Edit. 1628.

(5) Jovian. Pon-
tanus, de Sermo-
ne, lib. v, cap. i,
pag. m. 1704,
1705.

(a) Tessier, ad-
ditions to the E-
logies out of
Thuanus, Tom.
ii, pag. 353,
Edit. 1696.

(b) See the re-
mark [C].

TYPOTIUS (JAMES), you will find in Moreri what Mr Tessier has already pub-
lished concerning this Flemish Civilian (a). I shall correct some things in that ac-
count (b), and only add that Typotius was guilty of such ill actions, and of writing a
book in which he defamed to many persons of quality in Sweden (c), that he narrowly
escaped a capital punishment. He in particular abused the illustrious Pontus de la Gar-
die [A], whom he had accompanied in his embassy to Rome (d). The indignation of
John

(c) See the re-
mark [A].

(d) See the Life
of this Pontus,
of this Pontus,
published in the
year 1690, by
Claudius Arrie-
nius Oernhielm,
pag. 165.

[A] He abused . . . Pontus de la Gardie.] He
accused him of gaining the favour of Eric King of
Sweden by delivering to him the fortrefs of Wardberg
which belonged to Denmark. He supposes that Pontus
was in the service of his Danish Majesty at that time,
which was in the year 1565. Mr Oernhielm refutes
this accusation by the passport which that King gave

to la Gardie, March the 16th 1571. La Gardie being
in the Swedish service was taken by the Danes in a
battle in which the latter were victorious in the year
1569. He was detained in prison till the peace was
concluded on the 13th of December 1570, and ratified
on the 16th of March 1571. The King of Denmark
gave him a very honourable passport, which he would
not

John III, King of Sweden, against this author, clearly appears from his answer to a letter, requesting him to release Typotius from his imprisonment [B]. He would not grant him this favour; the prisoner was not discharged till after the death of that prince; and having been again received into favour for some time, he found the face of affairs changed (e), and retired to the imperial court. He did not die in the year 1604, as Thuanus relates, but some time before. There is something else to be rectified in his article [C].

(e) See the remark [C].

not have done if he had looked upon him as a traitor. 'Non aliunde melius dilucet Typotiani mendacii vanitas, quâ, ut superius indicavimus, nugatur, apud Ericum Sueonum Regem Pontum captivum locum gratiæ, prodiat ei Wardbergeni arce. Si sic se res habuisset, quomodô potuisset Fridericus Rex, sponte nullaque adactus necessitate, rerum sibi carissimarum proditorum, cari dilectique sibi Equitis nomine compellere? Quis unquam Regum, arcium, terrarum copiarumque suarum proditorum, dignatus est nomine tam honorifico, ac non potius quovis, pro atrocitate facti, proscribi non injusto convicto? Cur non æquam tanto facinorosi mercedem retulit? Cur alia omnia de se meritum, mancipio jam sibi etiam traditum, non benignè tantum toto captivitatis tempore habuit Rex, sed etiam reintegratâ cum Suecis pace, honoris gratiæque plenissimis literis securum redire fecit in Sueciam (1)? - Nothing can more evidently display Typotius's falsehood, which as we have before-mentioned, he invented against Pontus, by affirming that he had ingratiated himself with Eric King of Sweden, by betraying the castle of Wardberg to him. If it had been so, how could King Frederic, of his own accord, and without any necessity, call one who had been a traitor in delivering up so valuable a place, his dearly beloved knight? What King ever honoured with such an appellation, the betrayer of his fortresses, dominions, and forces, or rather would not have given him the character due to his treachery? Why did he not reward him according to his villainy? Why when he deserved so ill at his hands, and was delivered up to him, did the King not only treat him kindly during his confinement, but also after concluding a peace with the Swedes, gave him a passport full of very honourable and gracious expressions? The author I am citing gives the very words of the passport, translated out of the original into Latin. A little before, he had told us that Typotius spoke very ill of Pontus de la Gardie's extradition, which, continues he, is not to be wondered at; for this writer had assurance enough to calumniate even the Kings of Sweden themselves. He observes that this satirical piece had been lately reprinted by the care of some malicious persons. 'Quæ paulo liberaliore manu adduci à me oportuit, ut famosum libellum Jacobi Typotii venenati convincerem mendacii, quo ille, fuggerente veteri quodam congerone Ægidio, ut ipse fatetur, homine ignoto ac terræ filio, natalibus, vitæ famæque Pontum adpergere voluit labem, quoniam sædissimam conciviti ubi ipsi, typis committens furo diſtionis pictas livorise plenas calumnias. Sed quid mirum est, allatrasse eum genus & famam Pontum, qui ne Regibus quidem, aut ulli Suecicæ gentis honesto viro fatis fuit æquus? Etenim, in monstro illo ingenii fœtu, reculo nuper à malevolis, nefandis in bonorum famam sceleris conficiis, atque ideò nec loci nec editoris nomen proferre ausis, debacchatur in Ericum ipsum & Johannem Reges, adeò non parit aliis viris illustribus ex ordine Equestri, quorum gloria semper fuit, ac deinceps erit apud posteros memoria. Quin imo, in religionem, & nationem ipsam, cujus, ut Pontificius è Belgio sacrificulus, flagrabat odio, stolidè nonnunquam invehitur (2). - This I thought myself obliged to particularize more fully, that I might convict Typotius's scandalous libel of a malicious lie, with which, upon the authority of one Giles an old companion, as he himself confesses, a man of no family or consideration, he intended to asperse the life and reputation of Pontus, but has in reality drawn a much greater reflexion upon himself, by committing to the Press such invidious calumnies coloured over with fine expressions. But what need we wonder that he should carp at the fame and family of Pontus, who has never done justice to any gentleman of the Swedish nation, nor even to the Kings themselves. For in that monstrous production of wit, lately reprinted by some malicious persons, conscious of a wicked design against the reputation of the innocent, and therefore not daring

to name either the place or the publisher, he inveighs against both King Eric and John, and does not spare other illustrious persons of the Equestrian order, whose memory has and will be to latest posterity always glorious. Nay he even sometimes exclaims very foolishly against their religion and nation, to which as a Popish Mass Priest of Flemish extract he bore the utmost hatred.' For this satirical boldness, adds he, and other crimes, Typotius was condemned to death, which he had certainly suffered if the King of Denmark had not interceded for him; but tho' the intercession of that Prince saved his life, it did not protect him from an ignominious banishment. Ob quæ, aliæque facinoræ, damnatus hic fuit capitis, lussitque factis dignum supplicium, nisi intercessio Regis Daniæ intervenisset, quæ quidem à merita morte illum liberavit, sed non ab ignominiosa ex hoc regno Relegatione (3).

[B] His answer to a letter requesting him to release Typotius from his imprisonment.] Frederic II, King of Denmark had written this letter to him: The King of Sweden's answer runs thus (4): 'Quo minus (5) petitioni Majestatis Vestræ in hac causa satisfacere possimus, facit magnitudo scelerum, quibus caput suum obstrinxerat idem Typotius, quæ si æque Majestati Vestræ ac nobis nota fuissent, scimus, non tantum tributuram fuisse Majestatem Vestram ejus delictis ac precibus, ut pro ipso intercedere sustineret. Etenim is homo est, qui virus mendacis lingue, sine ullo discrimine, in summos imosque passim effundit. Inde est, quod non tetro tantum carceri mancipandum, sed ultimo etiam supplicio afficiendum eum censuimus, in quem si quid mitius in posterum decreverimus, id clementiæ nostræ, Majestatiqve Vestræ intercessionem, non innocentie suæ debebit. Confidimus certò, majestatem Vestram hanc excusationem nostram, ut justam & idoneam approbaturam. - What makes me incapable of gratifying your Majesty's request in this case is the greatness of the crimes which the said Typotius has committed, and which if they were so well known to your Majesty as they are to me, I am sensible you would not have had such a regard to his prayers and intreaties as once to have interceded for him. For he is a person, who lets loose the virulency of his lying tongue, against high and low, universally without any distinction. For this cause it is, that I thought him worthy not only of confinement in a loathsome prison, but also of a capital punishment: and if I should hereafter mitigate his sentence, he will owe it to your Majesty's intercession, and my clemency, not to his own innocence. I do not in the least doubt, but your Majesty will approve this excuse as very just and reasonable.' This letter of the King of Sweden is dated the 17th of February 1583. Note that the King of Denmark interceded for James Typotius, at the request of a person for whom he had a particular regard, and who was his Physician and brother to the prisoner (6).

[C] He died . . . before the year 1604. There is something else to be rectified in his article.] Thuanus's fault in placing his death in 1604 (7), has been observed by Mr Mollerus in his additions to Scheffer's *Suecia Litterata* (8). There is a book printed in 1602 (9) in which we find Typotius's funeral elogy by John Jessenius à Jessen, Physician to the Emperor. If Mr Teiffier had been aware of this, he had corrected Thuanus's error. Some authors say that Typotius died in the year 1600 (10). We find in the Preface to the second tome *Symbolorum Pontificum, Regum, & Principum Octavii de Strada*, dated the 15th of March 1602, that he died after having finished the explication of the symbols of this second tome. These words, *Jacobus Typotius . . . in aula Suecica diu fuit, Carolo Sudermaniæ duci ac tandem Regi cum Sigismundo Polonia Rege nepote tunc diffidenti percarus* (11), are found translated thus by Mr Teiffier: 'James Typotius . . . resided a long time at the court of Sweden, where he was very much regarded by the Duke of Sudermania and the King, who

* Mæffenius Scandize Illustratæ I. VII, ad Anno 1581. A Ponto Typotius plus-marum convictus imposturam & calumiarum, carceri perpetuo adjudicatur mancipaturque, inquit, unde mirum non est, quod in illum in primis debacchetur.

(3) Id. ibid.

(4) Id. ibid. pag. 12, 13.

(5) That is, that Typotius should be released out of prison.

(6) Vix evitato, Frederici II. Danorum Regis (qui Frater ejus Matthias gratissimus erat atque à cura valetudinis) intercessione. Jo. Mollerus, Hypomn. ad Schefferi Suecia Litteratam, pag. 443.

(7) Thuan. Hist. lib. cxxxi, pag. m. 1041.

(8) Pag. 443.

(9) It is Tom. ii, Symbolorum Octavii Stradae. See Mr. Mollerus, Hypomn. ad Suecia Litteratam, pag. 444.

(10) Witte, in Diario Biograph. Mollerus, ubi supra. Valer. Andr. Biblioth. Belgicæ, pag. 432, says that he died about the year 1600.

(11) Thuan. ubi supra.

(1) Claudius Arhenius Oernhielm, in Vita Pontis de la Gardie, pag. 19, 20.

(2) Id. ibid. pag. 11, 12.

(12) Teiffier's
Elogies, taken
out of Thuanus,
Tom. ii, pag.
353.

'had at that time some difference with Sigismund King of Poland his nephew (12). This translation is faulty; the Duke of Sudermania's christian name is faulty; the Duke of Sudermania's christian name ought not to have been suppressed, nor a King of Sweden been introduced distinct from this Duke; for it is visible that Thuanus says that Charles was Duke of Sudermania, and afterwards King of Sweden. In this he was right, but he is wrong to affirm that Typotius was long in favour with this Charles. He should have said that Typotius continued a long time in favour with King John the third, brother to this Duke of Sudermania, and that he fell from it afterwards in a terrible manner, having been imprisoned and condemned to death, and obtained his life only by the intercession of the King of Denmark. He might have added, if I am not mistaken, that after the death of John III, he was restored to favour, which he enjoyed under Sigismund the son of the said John; but that he had no interest in Sweden when the Duke of Sudermania was created King upon the exclusion of Sigismund King of Poland his nephew; that he kept his ground during the contest betwixt the uncle and nephew, and at last retired when Sigismund's party was ruined. These were, I think, the vicissitudes of Typotius's fortune. I ground my opinion on what Valerius Andreas says in his *Bibliotheca Belgica*, that after the death of John III, he was set at liberty by Sigismund, and pronounced the inaugural oration at his coronation before the States of the realm. 'Mortuo deinde Suecorum Rege Joanne, ejus filius atque in Regno successit Sigismundus III, annitente etiam Danie Rege Christiano IV, Typotium pristinae mox restituit libertati: eique tum imposita est provincia in ipsis Regni Comitibus Stocholmiae Orationem illam, quam Inauguralem vocant, habendi, qua Suecorum erga Regem suum fidei atque benevolentiae causas diserte exposuit. Rege autem in Regnum Poloniae, quod ei per electionem accesserat, profecto, Typotius a Romanorum Imp. Rhodolpho II, inter Aulæ suæ familiares adlectus, ac Cæsarei Historiographi titulo ornatus, Præge diem clausi extremum circa annum salutis millesimum sexcentimum (13). . . . Afterwards John, King of Sweden, dying, Sigismund III, his son and successor, being also encouraged thereto by Christian, King of Denmark, quickly restored Typotius to his former liberty; and also gave him in charge to speak the inaugural oration before the assembly of the States at Stockholm, in which he very learnedly explained the reasons of the loyalty and affection of the Swedes towards their King. But Sigismund going to Poland, where he had been elected King, Typotius was invited to court by Rodolphus II, Emperor of the Romans, and being honoured with the title of his Imperial Majesty's Historiographer, ended his days at Prague, about the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred.' We find in the same *Bibliothèque*, that his *Orationes Genethliacæ ad Annam Sueciæ & Poloniae Reginam*, were printed at Stockholm in the year 1594. The above-mentioned inaugural oration was also printed at the same place in the same year (14), and he informs us (15), that he published the funeral oration of King John III, who died in November 1592. It was printed at Stockholm in the year 1594 (16). This shews that he was in a very good situation in Sweden after the death of that monarch. There is one thing not easily reconcilable in all this, which is, that very good authors affirm (17), that the intercession of his Danish majesty saved him from a capital punishment, but not from the infamy of being banished the kingdom. Frederic II, King of Denmark, interceded for Typotius either in the year 1582, or in the beginning of 1583. If on his account the punishment of death was changed into banishment, one would think it should be said that the prisoner was banished in 1583. And yet we have seen (18), that Sigismund, the successor of a Prince (19), who died in 1592, gave Typotius his liberty, and that Christian IV, King of Denmark, interceded for him. I am at a loss to reconcile these two relations; perhaps, after the death of King John, Sigismund reversed Typotius's exile, and recalled him.

(13) Valer. Andreas, *Biblioth. Belg.* pag. 432.

(14) Scheffer, in *Suecia litterata*, pag. m. 274.

(15) Typot. lib. ii, de salute Reipubl. pag. 122, *epud* Scheff. *ibid.*

(16) Mollerus, *Hypomn. ad Sueciam litteratam*, pag. 444.

(17) Mollerus, *ibid.* pag. 443. See also the remark [A], at the end.

(18) Above, citation (13).

(19) John III, King of Sweden.

(20) Mr Tentzelius's *Conferences*, month of September 1690.

some pages of which, relating to Typotius, I got translated. I have there found a passage which makes me believe that Mr Ornhielm was mistaken in saying that the intercession of Frederic II, King of Denmark, did not prevent this person from being banished Sweden with infamy. This passage is contained in a letter from Zachary Palthenius to Typotius, and printed with a treatise of Typotius, at Franckfort, in 1595. Palthenius affirms, 1. That John III, King of Sweden, prevented Typotius's being entirely ruined by his enemies. 2. That Sigismund III, King of Poland and Sweden, restored this prisoner to his liberty. 'Quæ tibi ergastulum, aut, ut tu loqui soles, Dei gratia peperit, de fortuna & legibus, cum fortuna, quam liberatio, uti videre est, concepit, ego fasciis involvi, prodibuntque brevi in lucem. Felix infelicitas tua, quæ tibi veræ laudis, imo solidæ felicitatis principium exstitit. Abfuit à familiarium commercio, doleo, dolet mecum litteratorum chorus, quanquam meroris tui vehementioris nullum signum in libris tuis repererim, & tu Joannis III, Regis Sueciæ humanitatem ac adversariorum malignitatem cautes. Sed cum abesses à tuis, versatus es cum, quæ maxime tuæ sunt, Musis. Restitutus in libertatem à Sigismundo III, Poloniæ & Sueciæ Rege, huic enim secundum Dei, cui etiam ille cedit, misericordiam, consuetudinem nostram refert acceptam, profert in lucem luce dignissimos diverſi argumenti plurimos Codices (21). . . . Those works of yours, de Fortuna & Legibus, which your prison, or as you are used to say, the Divine Mercy produced, I have laid together, and shall very shortly make them public. Happy is your unhappiness, which has proved to you the foundation of real glory, and even of solid happiness. You have been secluded from the conversation of your friends, which was a misfortune that affected not only myself but all the learned world, tho' I perceived no sign of any extraordinary affliction in your writings, and you are used to cry up the humanity and clemency of John III, King of Sweden, as your security against being made a sacrifice to the malice of your adversaries. But while you was absent from your's, you was present with the Musis, which are most entirely your's. Being restored to your liberty, by Sigismund III, King of Poland and Sweden, for to him, according to the Divine mercy, to which he himself is subject, you ascribe the renewal of our conversation, you bring to light several pieces on different subjects, which may highly deserve to be made public.' Mr Tentzelius says, that Typotius dedicated his treatise *de Fortuna*, printed at Franckfort in 1595, to Sigismund III, King of Sweden, as he did his book *de Fato*, printed in the same year, and at the same place, to Christian, King of Denmark; and that he says at the beginning of his treatise *de Fortuna*, that he had received many favours from King Sigismund, and that he had waited the return of that monarch at Calmar, and that his enemies prevented his going to meet his majesty at Dantzic. You may observe that the Preface to this book was written at Wurtzburg in December 1595. It is very surprising that Mr Ornhielm, Historiographer of Sweden, should be ignorant that this man was honourably discharged out of prison, and not by an infamous sentence of banishment.

(21) Zachar. Palthenius, *Epist. ad Typotium*, *epud* Tentzelium, *Monastice Univerſitatis*, September 1690, pag. 861.

Here follow some mistakes of Mr Moreri. I. He says that Sigismund, King John's successor, gave Typotius his liberty, and employed him in several affairs of the utmost importance. Mr Teiffier (22) has made use of the same words, quoting only Valerius Andreas, who says nothing of this kind, nor any thing farther than that Typotius being set at liberty, was appointed to make the inaugural speech before the States of the kingdom. II. At last, adds Mr Moreri, like a faithful copier of Mr Teiffier, *Sigismund being elected King of Poland, Typotius retired to the court of the Emperor Rodolph II.* This means, that Sigismund was elected King of Poland some years after he succeeded John III, King of Sweden. Nothing is more false; John III died in November 1592. Sigismund, his son, was not crowned King of Sweden till 1594, and he had been elected King of Poland in 1587. The third mistake of Mr Moreri is in having fixed Typotius's death in the year 1604.

(22) Teiffier, *Additions aux Eloges*, Tom. ii, pag. 354.

TYRANNION,

TYRANNION, a celebrated Grammarian in Pompey's time, was of Amifus in the Kingdom of Pontus. He was called at first Theophrastus; but by reason of his tormenting his school-fellows, his master Hestizæus gave him the name of Tyrannion [A]. He was a disciple of Dionysius Thracius at Rhodes. He fell into the hands of Lucullus, when that Roman general put Mithridates to flight, and seized his dominions. This captivity of Tyrannion was not disadvantageous to him, since it procured him an opportunity of rendering himself illustrious at Rome, and of acquiring great riches. These he applied, among other uses, to the erecting a library of above thirty thousand volumes (a). He died very old, harassed and worn out with the gout (b). Suidas is mistaken as to the time of his death [B]. I must not forget that Murena asked Tyrannion of Lucullus, that he might have the glory of enfranchising a celebrated Grammarian. The reflexions of Plutarch on this occasion are not improper [C]. The pains Tyrannion took in collecting books, very much contributed to the preservation of Aristotle's works. The writings of this Philosopher met with a singular fate [D]. It deserves

(a) Charles Stephens, Lloyd, Hofman, Murena, say only three thousand.

(b) Ex Suida, in *Tupavriov*.

[A] By reason of his tormenting his school-fellows . . . he was called Tyrannion. In the version of Suidas we find these Greek words, *Τυραννίων ἀνομιᾶς διὰ τὸ κατατρέχειν τῶν ἀμασχιῶν*, thus rendered, *Tyrannion dicitur quod condiscipulos exagitaret*, i. e. *κατατρέχειν*. - - He was called Tyrannion, from his tormenting his school-fellows. It is hardly necessary to acquaint the reader that *exagitaret* is a typographical error, instead of *exagitarit*; but we may very well say that Mr Möreri has not sufficiently minded the title of his book; he gives his own conjectures for the translations of the authors, whom he cites at the end of his articles. If he had writ a romance instead of an historical Dictionary, this liberty had been excusable. No author had informed him that *Theophrastus becoming proud of his science, and despising his equals, was named Tyrannion*.

[B] Suidas is mistaken as to the time of his death. How was it possible that Tyrannion should die in the third year of the CXXth Olympiad, as we read in Suidas, since he was not brought to Rome till after Lucullus had put Mithridates to flight in the CLXXVIIth Olympiad? Patricius (1) conjectures that instead of *ἐλμπιάδ' ἔρ'*, Suidas said *ἐλμπιάδ' ἔρ'*. According to this, Tyrannion died in third year of the CLXXth Olympiad. There is some probability in Patricius's correction; and yet it is certain that Tyrannion taught in Cicero's house, in the last year of the CLXXth Olympiad (2); and as he took care to put Cicero's library into order (3); it is not very likely that he was then in the infirm state in which he died, according to Suidas. What I am going to say is infinitely more conclusive, either against Patricius's correction, or against Suidas himself, if he spoke agreeably to Patricius's conjecture. When Cæsar was in Africa, making war against Juba, in the year of Rome 707, which was the second of the CLXXXIVth Olympiad, Cicero and Atticus promised to meet one day, in order to hear Tyrannion read a book of his own composing (4); and Atticus was reproached by his friend for having heard it read without him (5).

[C] Plutarch's reflexions on this occasion, are not improper. Murena, says he, did not at all answer the generosity of Lucullus; for, in seeming to enfranchise Tyrannion, he deprived him of his liberty. It had been much more honourable to have let him remain what he was. These are Plutarch's words, in his description of the sacking of Amifus, which Lucullus not being able to prevent, he repaired that loss as well as he was able. *Τότε καὶ Τυραννίων ὁ γερμαλικὸς ἐλάω. Μορήνας δ' αὐτὸν ἐξητήσατο, καὶ λόβων ἀπληθεύειν, ἀνελευθερῆσαι τὴν δωρεὰν χρησάμενος. ἔχων ἤντιμ' ἀνδρῶν διὰ τὰς αἰτίαις ἐσπιδασμίνον δέλον γενέσθαι πρότερον, εἴτα ἀπελευθερῆσαι. ἀπαίρεισι γὰρ ἢ τῆς ὑπαρχούσης ἢ τῆς δοκούσης ἐλευθερίας δόσει. ἀλλὰ Μορήνας μὲν ἔκ ἐλπίδας μίνον ὥρην πολὺ τῆς τῶν ἐλευθερίας καλοκαγαθίας ἀποδόνων.* Eadem tempestate captus est Tyrannio grammaticus. Hunc Murena petivit à Lucullo, quem ut accepit, manumissit eum. Verum usus est eo munere illiberaliter, nolebat enim insigni virum eruditioe Lucullus prius servum fieri, inde libertinum. Quippe ereptio presentis erat illa simulate libertatis donatio. Ceterum non hic tantum offendit se Imperatore suo Murena honestate imparem (6). - - At that time was taken Tyrannion, the Grammarian. Murena begged him of Lucullus, and

having obtained his request, manumitted him, making but an ungentle use of his present. For Lucullus did not think it by any means proper, that a man of such extraordinary learning should be first made a slave, and then enfranchised. For the seeming liberty which was given him, was, in reality, the taking away that which he had even then a title to. But this was not the only instance which discovered Murena to be far inferior to his General in generosity.

[D] Aristotle's works met with a singular fate. This great Philosopher left them, together with his school and his other books, to his disciple Theophrastus. The latter left his library to Neleus, who had been scholar both to him and to Aristotle. Neleus caused it to be removed to Scepsis (7), and left it to his heirs. They being ignorant and illiterate, took no other care of this library than to keep it close shut up. Παρὶ δόκον ἰδιώταις ἀνθρώποις οἱ κατακλινεῖς εἶχον τὰ βιβλία ἐν ἐπιμέλῃ κείμενα. Reliquit interuditus hominibus, qui incuriē positos sub clavibus reposituerunt (8). And being informed how diligently the Kings of Pergamum, to whom they were subjects, sought after books, they buried under ground those of Neleus. A long time after this, their posterity took them out of their prison very much damaged by damp and vermin, and sold, at a great price, those of Aristotle and Theophrastus to one Apellicon, who caused them to be copied: but his transcribers very ill supplied those places which the worms had eaten, or the damp defaced; so that those books did not appear without innumerable faults. After Apellicon's death, his library was carried from Athens to Rome, by Sylla. Sylla's Library-keeper permitted Tyrannion, who was a great admirer of Aristotle, to take the writings of that Philosopher. The Book-sellers caused them to be transcribed, but they made use of ignorant people, who did not collate their copies with the originals; so that the mischief became greater at Rome than it had been at Athens. Thus far Strabo hath carried this relation, let us take the sequel of it from Plutarch and others.

Plutarch (9) says, that Sylla having rendered himself master of Athens, seized upon Apellicon's library, where were the greatest part of Aristotle's and Theophrastus's works, then very little known to the public. He adds, that it was reported, that after Sylla had transported them to Rome, Tyrannion, the Grammarian, got several of them into his hands; and that Andronicus Rhodius having procured copies from him, published them, and made those tables or indexes which were afterwards joined to them (10). Plutarch and Strabo agree, that for a long time the Peripatetics were unacquainted with the writings of Aristotle and Theophrastus, and that the ignorance of Neleus's heirs was the cause of it. Strabo says expressly, that the modern Peripatetics surpassed the ancient, because the latter having but very few of Aristotle's books, and those few containing pieces of the least consequence (11), were not able to philosophise with profound and methodical exactness. But after Aristotle's writings were discovered, it was much easier for those of that sect to reason according to their master's scheme; yet they were obliged to rely much upon conjectures, because there was an infinite number of faults in his works. This is Strabo's observation (12).

Athenæus (13) has a passage very necessary to be cited. He says that Neleus the possessor of Aristotle's library, sold it entire to Ptolomy Philadelphus, who removed

(7) It was the place of his birth, and a town of Troas.

(8) Strabo, lib. xiii, pag. 413. Salmasius, in Tertul. de Pallio, pag. m. 177. prooves by this passage that κατακλινεῖς signifies a precious thing, which is carefully preserved. Strabo insinuates no such thing. Besides Salmasius speaks of Apellicon's heirs, whereas he should have mentioned those of Neleus.

(9) In Sylla, pag. 468.

(10) Add to this the passage out of Porphyrius, in Vita Platini, which I have quoted in the article of ANDRONICUS, citation (9).

(11) These were called ἱπποκρίτοι: The others which contained a more profound doctrine, were called ἀπορρηματικοί.

(12) Strabo, lib. xiii, pag. 413.

(13) Lib. i, p. 3.

Whether the difference between Athenæus and Strabo, has been justly reconciled by Patricius.

(1) Disquisitiones Peripateticæ. Tom. i, lib. iv, pag. 36.

(2) Cicero, Ep. iv, lib. ii, ad Q. Fratre. It was written in the year, that Tullia was married to Crassus: it was the 697 year of Rome. See Fabricius in the Life of Cicero.

(3) See the remark [C].

(4) Epist. II, lib. xii, ad Atticum.

(5) Epist. VI, suprad. Libri.

(6) Plut. in Lucullo, pag. 504.

serves to be mentioned, especially since it relates to so famous a Philosopher. They were in

removed it to Alexandria, together with those books which he had purchased at Rhodes and at Athens. He observes, in the same place, that one Larentius, a citizen of Rome, under Marcus Aurelius, had made a larger collection of books, than either Polycrates, tyrant of Samos, Pisistratus, tyrant of Athens, Euclid, Nicocrates, the Kings of Pergamus, the Poet Euripides, or Aristotle the Philosopher. Here are two things in which Athenæus contradicts Strabo. The latter affirming, that Aristotle was the first who collected a library, and who taught the Kings of Egypt how to erect one. Athenæus names several persons who collected great numbers of books before Aristotle. He says further, that Neleus fold all this Philosopher's books to Ptolemy Philadelphus; but Strabo assures us, that Neleus left them to his heirs, who concealed them. The learned

(14) Dicauff. Peripatetic. Tom. i, pag. 29.

(15) De Philosophorum Sectis, cap. xviii, pag. 86.

(16) Ammonius, Prolegomen. in Categorias.

(17) Ammonius, ibid.

(18) Patricius, Dicauff. Peripatetic. Tom. i, pag. 35.

(19) Strabo, ubi supra.

(20) A. Gellius, lib. iii, cap. xvii.

RAPIN's account examined.

Father Rapin very agreeably relates the adventures of Aristotle's works; some fragments of which narrative I design to cite here, because they deserve some

reflexions. 'It is pretended that Aristotle could not prevail upon himself to publish his writings, out of pure respect for Plato; because he opposed his doctrine in several places. But this conduct discovered more policy than virtue; he was resolved to proceed with discretion, because mens minds were as yet too much prepossessed in favour of Plato's opinions. Hence it was that to conceal his works, he intrusted them to Theophrastus, with a strong injunction against their publication, which was religiously observed. So that Theophrastus, who was the trustee of them, Strato, Lyco, Demetrius Phalereus, and Heracleides, who succeeded one another in the Lyceum, taught Aristotle's doctrine only by tradition. This tradition not being supported by any writing, in process of time grew cool, and discovered nothing of that warmth which appeared in the other sects. . . . Theophrastus, that he might strictly observe his master's order upon his death-bed, intrusted Aristotle's writings to the dearest of his friends and disciples, on the same conditions with which he had received them. The name of this friend was Neleus. . . . He died soon after; tho' not without informing his heirs of the value of the *Depositum* which he left them. This they so well apprehended, that being informed the King of Pergamum . . . was making very diligent searches after books and writings, in order to erect a library, they buried Aristotle's works in a vault built on purpose, in order to secure them the better. This precious treasure remained concealed in that place for about one hundred and sixty years, from whence it was at last taken, half eaten with vermin, and almost entirely destroyed with the dampness of the place. It was at last taken out in order to be sold at a very dear rate to a rich citizen of Athens, whose name was Apellicon. . . . The Professors who then taught in the Lyceum, being informed of this, made their court to this citizen, who lent them those writings for some time. But he took them back again in order to secure them in his library, which he rendered very famous by this important *Depositum*. Some years after, Sylla . . . caused them to be taken away and carried to Rome. . . . he died quickly after, and these manuscripts fell into the hands of a Grammarian named Tyrannion, who understood where they were from his intimacy with Sylla's library-keeper. Tho' this Grammarian was a very learned man, and had collected a library of above 30000 volumes, after his being brought to Rome by Lucullus. . . . yet he did not know the value of Aristotle's works. But after his death, Andronicus Rhodius being come to Rome, and being perfectly acquainted with Aristotle's merit, because he had been bred in the Lyceum, treated with Tyrannion's heirs for these books, and having them in his power, he so earnestly applied himself to examine them . . . that he was in a manner their first restorer. . . . It was this Andronicus who first made Aristotle known at Rome, about the time when Cicero, by his great reputation, rose to the first posts in the Republic (21).

The remarks I shall make on this discourse, may be reduced to the following heads. I. Father Rapin doth not cite one author who says that Aristotle intrusted his writings to Theophrastus, with a strong injunction against their publication. Strabo and Plutarch, who observe that this Philosopher's books remained a long time unknown, ascribe the cause of it only to the ignorance of Neleus's descendants; and we have already cited an author (22) who assures us, that this Neleus fold Aristotle's library to Ptolemy Philadelphus. So far is he from saying that Neleus preserved these books according to the injunction laid on him against the publishing of them. II. Father Rapin misrepresents the narrative of the author whom he cites (23); for it is not remarked by Strabo that Neleus did not die without informing his heirs of the value of the *Depositum* which he left them; and so far is he from affirming that they well understood him, that he says they left those books locked up and in confusion (24). It is true that Strabo adds they buried them, when they heard the Kings of Pergamum were collecting books; this seems to signify that Neleus had forbidden his heirs to part with his library: but, in short, Strabo

(21) Comparison de Platon & d'Aristote, pag. 371, & pag. 1636.

(22) Athenæus, lib. i, pag. 3.

(23) He quotes Strabo, lib. xiii.

(24) Olib. ἐν μέλει καὶ ἀτακτοῖς ἐνταφίσαντο.

in the library of one Apellicon: I shall speak of him below [E]. Sylla rendring himself master of Athens, seized upon this library, and sent it to Rome. Tyrannion having found means to insinuate himself into an intimacy with Sylla's library-keeper, got into his possession all the works of Aristotle and Theophrastus which he could meet with. The sequel of this has been seen in the article of ANDRONICUS Rhodius, and is more amply specified below. Strabo was our Tyrannion's disciple (c) [F]; as Cicero's son and nephew were also his disciples at Rome. Cicero made use of him to put his library in order (G). Tyrannion wrote a book which Pomponius Atticus admired [H].

Strabo says no such thing, and it must be left to the casuists of Parnassus to inform us, whether it is lawful for an author to ascribe to those he cites, the consequences, reasons, and motives of what they have said, such as he fancies them to be. How do we know but that Neleus's executors were afraid that their Prince should not give them any thing for these books, and therefore thought it more proper to reserve them for a better opportunity? III. Father Rapin applies solely to Aristotle's writings, what Strabo says in general of all the books which Neleus left to his heirs. IV. Strabo does not say one word of those Professors of the Lyceum who made their court to Apellicon to borrow Aristotle's works of him for some time. He does not say that Apellicon having lent these books to them for some time, afterwards received them back; he says, on the contrary, that Apellicon caused them to be copied, and published them full of faults. V. No author ever said that Tyrannion did not know the value of Aristotle's works. Strabo rather insinuates the contrary by these words, *φιλοεστίας ὢν, he was a zealous admirer of Aristotle*. VI. Nor hath any one said that Andronicus Rhodius came to Rome after the death of Tyrannion, and that he bought Aristotle's works of his heirs: on the contrary, Plutarch affirms (25), that Andronicus Rhodius received those books at the hands of Tyrannion (26). If it was true that Andronicus did not come to Rome before the time mentioned by Father Rapin, he would not have found Tully in the beginning of his fortune, but at the height of his glory, recalled from his exile to the great satisfaction of the Roman people. The proof of this is drawn from Tyrannion's being brought to Rome in the CLXXVIIth Olympiad, where he became illustrious, enriched himself, collected a library of above 30000 volumes, and died very old (27). This was in the third year of the CLXXXth Olympiad, according to Patricius's correction of the passage of Suidas. Twelve years at least must be requisite for Tyrannion to store up such a large share of riches and books at Rome. Now the third year of the CLXXXth Olympiad is the very year of Cicero's being recalled (28). But besides, I have proved that Tyrannion was alive in the CLXXXIVth Olympiad, when Cicero was at least aged sixty years.

I may conclude this remark with a reflexion which I find in Vossius (29). It is no small glory to Aristotle, that his works being so long unknown, were no sooner come out than they outshone the writings of several other Philosophers, who had enjoyed a long and uninterrupted reputation. I shall add on my own bottom, that by a turn of fortune, the sect which was destined to prevail most in the schools, happened to be that which for several ages found it most difficult to lift up its head, and rise out of its obscurity. Lastly, I say that it is much more surprizing, that so many books of Aristotle are preserved, than that we have lost so great a number of them. It is true, there is room to doubt whether those which pass at present under his name, were the genuine issue of his pen. Vossius rejects the judgment of *Cælius Secundus Curio*, who owns no more of Aristotle's works than the History of Animals, the treatise of the world, and his Rhetoric to Alexander (30). But I am surprized that instead of alleging this Curio, he does not mention Francis Patricius, who has so learnedly discussed what are, and what are not, the genuine works of Aristotle, and has rejected a very great number as spurious. Ramus made the same attempt. Here is a passage which will inform us that he was not the first. (31) *Is it not strange that Francis Picus + who succeeded as well in the learning as in the principality of his uncle, this great Picus, the phoenix of his age, has laboured by a long train of reasons to demonstrate that it is utterly uncertain, whether Aristotle composed any one of all those books which are at present contained in the catalogue of his works:*

which was however confirmed afterwards by Nikelius +, and so well examined by Patricius +, that after having given proofs of his surprizing diligence in enquiring into the truth of this proposition, he concludes at last, that of all the books ascribed to this genius of nature, only four, and those very small and inconsiderable, with respect to the worth of the rest, are handed down to us free from suspicion or controversy, namely his *Mechanics*, and three others which he wrote against Zeno, Gorgias, and Xenophanes: when, on the contrary, Ammonius testifies in his commentary on the *Categories*, that in the magnificent library of Alexandria, they found forty books of *Analytics*, which all bore Aristotle's name, tho' he only composed four of them, the two first of which answer the nine cited by Diogenes Laërtius. This is to be imputed, as Galen observes*, to the emulation there was between the Kings of Pergamum and Alexandria, in liberally rewarding those who brought them a book of any good author, and especially of Aristotle, the better to adorn their libraries: before which time none of the ancient books had ever been falsely intitled. This I would shew more at large, if it had not already been done by Patricius**.

[E] One Apellicon, I shall speak of him below. I have said nothing of him in his place, but referred the reader hither: it is therefore just that I should say something of him in this remark. *ΑΡΕΛΛΙΚΟΝ* was of Teos, but settled at Athens, and was there some time. He was very rich and of a troublesome temper. He applied himself to Philosophy, and embraced the Peripatetic sect (32); but he made it appear that his talent lay more in purchasing the works of the Philosophers, than in acquiring any knowledge of their opinions. *φιλοβιβάζων μᾶλλον, ἢ φιλοσοφῶν. Librorum amore tenebatur majore quam Philosophiæ studio* (34). He bought Aristotle's, and several other numerous libraries. He spared no cost to buy rare books, and found out an expedient to rob the archives of the original decrees which had been antiently published at Athens. If there were in other cities any original pieces valuable for their antiquity, or very little known to the public, by reason of their being kept concealed, he took so much care to recover them, that he got all papers of this nature into his hands. The Athenians having discovered this robbery, had probably punished Apellicon with death, if he had not made his escape. His friends soon occasioned his being recalled. He engaged himself in the cabal of Athenion, a Peripatetic Philosopher, who was become very powerful by a popular sedition during the war betwixt the Romans and Mithridates. The confusions then reigning in Athens, contributed on the one hand to the elevation of Apellicon, and on the other to discover that he was utterly unfit for command. Athenion sent him commander to the isle of Delos; but Apellicon observed military discipline so ill, and took so little care to prevent being surprized by the enemy, that the Romans made a descent into the isle, without being perceived by him, and slew the garrison while asleep. Apellicon had the good fortune to save himself (35). He died a little before Sylla made himself master of Athens (36). I have already said what he did with regard to the writings of Aristotle, and what became of his library. He was an author; he is cited (37) as a defender of Aristotle against the calumnious reports raised against him on account of this Philosopher's intimacy with Hermias.

[F] Strabo was our Tyrannion's disciple. I have cited the place where Strabo relates this particular: but it is false, that he was his disciple in his own country, and that he was his countryman. Pompa who advances these two errors, hath mistaken Amicus, Tyrannion's native country, for Amasia the country of this famous Geographer (38).

[G] Cicero made use of him to put his library in order. This is what he writes to his friend Pomponius Atticus

↓ Lib. 4. cap. 6. de recta ratione Philosophandi.

† Difficult. Peripat. tom. i. lib. 3.

* Comment. in lib. Hippoc. de natura humana.

** Difficult. Peripat. tom. i. lib. 3.

(32) Gassend. Exercit. adverb. Aristoteles, lib. i. cap. iv.

(33) Athenæus, lib. v. pag. 214.

(34) Strabo, lib. xiii. pag. 419.

(35) Athen. ubi supra.

(36) Strabo, *ibid.* The taking of Athens falls on the CLXXXIIIrd Olympiad, about the year of Rome 666.

(37) Aristoteles Peripateticus, apud Eusebium Præp. lib. xv. cap. ii. pag. 793.

(38) Pompa in Ciceron. Epist. VI. lib. ii. ad Atticum, in Edit. Græviana.

(25) Παρ' αὐτοῦ (Τυραννιονος) τὸν ποσειδὼν Ἀνδρονικὸν εὐπορήσαντα τῶν ἀντιγράφων. A quo (Tyrannion) accepit Andronicum Rhodium exemplaria. Plut. in Sylla, pag. 488, B.

(26) Add to these remarks concerning Father Rapin, what has been said in the article of ANDRONICUS Rhodius.

(27) Ex Suidas.

(28) See Calvinius, ad ann. mundi 3893.

As Inference very glorious for Aristotle, but which may raise some doubt concerning his writings.

(29) Vossius, de Philosoph. Sectis, pag. 88.

(30) *Id. ibid.* pag. 87, where he observes that of these three works, the two last are not Aristotle's.

(31) Naudé Apologie des grans Hommes, *ib.* vi. pag. 101, 102, 103.

† Lib. 4. Examine. vanit. Doctrine Genitum.

(39) Epist. IV, lib. iv. He wrote it soon after he returned from his banishment. Confer Epist. IV, V, lib. iii, ad 2, fratrem.

(40) Epist. VIII,
lib. iv, ad Atti-
cum.

Atticus. 'Perbelle feceris si ad nos venieris.' designationem Tyrannionis mirificam in librorum meorum Bibliotheca, quorum reliquæ multo mitiores sunt quam putaram. Etiam vellem mihi mitas de tuis librariolis duos aliquos, quibus Tyrannio utatur glutinatoribus, ad cætera administris (39). --- You will do well to make me a visit: the admirable method of Tyrannion in ordering my library, is worth your seeing; I find the remains of it make a better figure than I could have imagined. I must also beg the favour of you to send me any two of your Book-binders, who may be assisting to Tyrannion in adjusting the covers, and other purposes.' He owns in another epistle (40) that the two persons whom Atticus sent

him did wonders: 'Postea verò quam Tyrannio mihi
' libros disposuit, mens addita videtur meis ædibus:
' qua quidem in re mirifica opera Dionysii & Meno-
' philii tui fuit. -- But after Tyrannion had metho-
' dized my books, my house seemed as if it was animat-
' ed; in which your Dionysius and Menophilus were won-
' derfully assisting. --

[H] He wrote a book which Pomponius Atticus admired (41.) Some believe it was a treatise of Profound. They ground their conjecture on these words of Cicero: *Quid ex ista acuta & gravi reseritur ad γεωγραφίαν* (42.) Another passage (43) seems to import that Tyrannion pretended to Geography.

(41) *Vide* Epist.
VI, lib. xii, ad
Atticum.

f (42) Ibid.

(43) Epist. VI,
lib. ii, ad Atti-
cum.

(a) His Name
was Dymas.

(b) Ex Suida.

TYRANNION, so called, because he was the disciple of the preceding [A], was first named Diocles. He was of Phoenicia. In the war betwixt Octavius and Mark Anthony he was taken prisoner, and bought by one of the emperor's freed men (a). He was afterwards given to Terentia, who enfranchised him. After this Tyrannion set up a school in Rome, and composed sixty-eight books. One of them was written to prove, that the Latin tongue was descended from the Greek (b). This Terentia had been Cicero's wife [B].

[A] *Because he was the disciple of the preceding.* I do not know where Lloyd, Hoffman, and Moreri, have found that he affumed his uncle Tyrannion's name; for Suidas whom they cite, says no such thing, and I cannot find it in the Paris edition of Charles Stephens 1620, nor in that of Geneva 1662.

[B] *This Terentia had been Cicero's wife.* Though Suidas has not distinguished the times, Moreri ought not to confound them. He ought not to say that Damas bought Tyrannion, nor that he gave him to

Terence, Cicero's wife. He who bought the slave was called Dymas, and no body said that it was he who presented him to this woman. He ought to have named her Terentia and not Terence; and to prevent mistakes, he ought not to have used an expression which signifies that Cicero was then alive. He had been dead a long time: Terentia was neither his wife nor his widow; for he had divorced her several years before his death.

(a) Ghilini,
Teatro, Tom. ii,
pag. 18, says he
was born at Fon-
tanablan Terra
del distretto di
Poitiers. - - -
Fontainebleau,
an estate in the
district of
Poitiers.

TIRAQUELLUS (ANDREW) in French *Tiraqueau*, one of the most learned men of the XVIth century, was born at Fontenai-le Comte, a town of Poitou (*a*). I have but little to add to what Teissier and Moreri have already said of him (*b*). I shall only say, that it is not at all probable he had so many children as some authors bestow on him. They make the number amount to forty-five, and tell us that if he had drank wine, he had been yet much more fruitful, as well in the productions of his pen, as in those of his bed [*A*]. He died very old in the year 1558 [*B*]. Some have been much

(b) Moreri has committed two faults, which I correct in the remark [B].

[(\$ a) *Mr Bayle might have cited in this place, Bezza's epigram, on Tiraquellus: Est tibi natorum quæ computat agmina conjux, Est tibi quæ natos bibliotheca parit, &c. Your wife with spoles of lovely children teems, In books your study no less fruitful seems. &c. REM. CRIT.*]

(1) *Æque ingenii ut corporis numerosa fecundus prole, cum singulis annis*

singulos annis
 singulos libros ac
 liberos reipublice
 daret. *Tbuan.*
 lib. xxi, pag.
 432, ad ann.
 1558. *Sammar-*
tbanus, in Elog.
pag. m. 33, say
in general cum
numerosam sobolem
ex bonissima
uxore suscepit.

(2) Pierre de
St Romuald,
Abrégé du
Thréfor. Chro-
nolog. Tom. iii,
pag. m. 324,
ad ann. 1558.

(3) Teissier, in the additions to the *Elogies*, *Tom. i, pag. 154.*

[A] *They make the number of his children amount to forty-five, and tell us, &c.* Not long since, I read in a Thesis de aquæ calidæ potu, maintained at Helms-tad, under Henry Meibomius, in the year 1689, that 'ho' Tiraquellus drank only water, he was father of forty-five children, and author of as many books, on which occasion these four verses are mentioned :

Fœcundus facundus aquæ Tiraquellus amator
Terquiddecim librorum & liberum parens,
Qui nisi restinxisset aquis abstemius ignes,
Impleffet orbem prole animi atque corporis.

*Learn'd Tiraquellus, tho' to water true,
Yet forty-five both books and children knew ;
And had his fire not been by water chill'd,
His double offspring must the world have fill'd.*

I dare aver, that the fact is stretched too far (§a). Thuanus could not have been ignorant of a thing so remarkable as this, and would undoubtedly have mentioned it, if he had believed it true: but he contents himself with saying that Tiraquellus bestowed a book and a child on the public every year (1). Some other writers have particularized the number; but confine themselves to thirty. *Tiraquellus was no less fruitful in the production of the children of his mind than of those of his body; for in thirty years not one passed in which he did not give the world a book and a son, and if on the one side he extended his name and family by a large number of children, all excellent persons, which he had by a virtuous wife, he acquired still at large a share of glory by the great number of books with which he enriched the public; but what increases the wonder is, that he was thus fruitful tho' he drank only water* (2). Mr Teissier, who cites Frey, admir. Gallie, confines himself also to thirty (3). Nor can we reach so far as forty-five if we regulate ourselves by the common ob-

fervation of those authors who mention this; they
 aver that Tiraquellus had but one wife, and that all
 his children were lawfully begotten. I am not sur-
 prized that this fecundity should appear more wonder-
 ful to those who reflect that this learned man drank
 only water: but this perhaps might even contribute
 to his prolific virtue. His natural heat would per-
 haps have been inflamed to an excessive degree by the
 use of rich wines, and in this excess he had been less
 fit for generation; for we are told of barren marriages,
 by reason of the too great salacity of the parties (4).
 However it be, Tiraquellus's wife had no reason to
 fear the attacks of the wits, as she might have done if
 she had been but seldom pregnant. Her husband was
 fond of his studies to an excessive degree; his works
 loudly proclaim that he spent whole days among his
 books. His writings discover a prodigious reading,
 labour, and researches, which require a strong applica-
 tion. When a man is known to spend the day in
 this manner, he is supposed to have exhausted him-
 self, and to require a great deal of rest in the night;

(4) See, above,
 the remark (H)
 of the article
 HERLICIUS.

Quod caret alterna requie durabile non est,
Hæc reparat vires fessaque membra novat (5).

*Our living to alternate rest is due,
This can lost strength, and wearied limbs renew.*

It is imagined that his spirits are wafted with studying, writing, and reading, and that he endeavours to obtain fresh supplies by a sound sleep, instead of undergoing new fatigues. On this account his wife is rallied in company, she is pitied, and bantered with very unacceptable complements of condolence: but if she can strew a house-full of children she is sheltered from these jests. As all things have two faces, it is certain that a married author buried all day amongst his books and papers, may pass either for an easy or troublesome

(5) Ovid. in E.
pist. Heroid.
Epist. iv, vv.
89.

much more guilty of Plagiarism towards him than ever he was towards others [C]. I have elsewhere (c) cited a passage, where it is observed that he inserted several obscenities in one of his books.

(c) Citation (14), of the second article S A N - C H E Z.

troublesome husband. This is just according to the wife he happens to marry. If she is a coquet and loose, he is a very easy husband; for whilst he studies twelve hours or more every day, she has free liberty to dispose of her person agreeably to her inclinations. But if she would do her duty, he is not in all respects a good husband, he sometimes obliges her to with herself a book (6), he goes to bed quite harassed with study, and his head full of a chapter which he could not finish. The inconveniences of this disposition of body and mind are visible to every body. Note that every thing has its exceptions: in reading the lives of learned men, we may observe a great many of them who had large families. The reason is that some constitutions are so strong and hearty, that they are sufficient for every thing.

Observe, that in order to justify those who aver that Tiraquellus had forty-five lawful children, tho' married but once, we cannot suppose of him, what the Menagiana relates of one Blunet (7), who had by his wife one and twenty children at seven successive births (8), three at each time; for if this learned Civilian's wife had very often brought him two or three at a time, it would have been the principal circumstance which authors would have observed. But not one of them has mentioned any thing like it; on the contrary, they have told us that Tiraquellus produced every year a book and a child. *Singulis annis singulos liberos reipublice daret* (9).

[B] He died very old in the year 1558.) Sammarthanus observes two or three times almost in the same page, that Tiraquellus attained to a very great age; but he does not specify the number of years: if he knew it, he is to blame, for not intimating it to his readers. I will not affirm that he did not know it, for it is his custom to neglect dates. He certainly knew that Tiraquellus died in 1558, and yet he has not said so; he makes use of a long periphrasis to express the time of Tiraquellus's death. 'Obiit, says he (10), planè senex haud multò ante quàm inter Henricum I. secundum & Philippum Hispaniæ Regem post varias bellorum offensiones de pace tandem per utriusque legatos ageretur. . . . He died a very old man, not long before the ambassadors on both sides, after various hostilities, concluded a peace between Henry II, and

'Philip King of Spain.' Mr Bullart makes use of these words of Sammarthanus, and explains them with respect to the time he believes they point at; but he has not succeeded it. 'Having attained to a venerable and decrepit old age, he piously exchanged earth for heaven at the end of the year 1559, just at the time when Europe saw the charming hopes of peace begin to appear again after a bloody war, which divided its most potent monarchs (11)'. A rare explanation! The treaty of Cateau in Cambresis, which gave peace to Europe, was concluded the 3d of April 1559. The world therefore could not be in hopes of this peace at the end of that year. Hence, doubtless, Mr Moreri was led into the mistake he has committed in placing this Civilian's death in 1559. He has been guilty of another fault which Mr Bullart might have helped him to avoid. He saith Michael de l'Hôpital wrote a poem in honour of the Tiraquelli, he ought to have said with Bullart in honour of Tiraquellus's writings (12). To speak exactly he ought to have said that Michael de l'Hôpital addressed one of his poems to Tiraquellus. For the rest, Ghilini is yet more mistaken than Mr Bullart, with respect to the circumstances which Sammarthanus made use of: Ghilini, I say (13), believed that the year 1556 did but by a few days precede the peace of Cateau, betwixt Philip II and Henry II. It is a blunder, and falsity to assert as he doth (14), that the 23d of December 1556, was the day on which Tiraquellus died.

[C] Some have been much more guilty of plagiarism towards him, than ever he was towards others.] He accuses Bartholomew Chassanæus of having stolen from his book *de legibus connubialibus* above six hundred pages entire, without making any alterations (15). *In hunc furti nomine vehementissime invehitur Tiraquellus cum alibi tum in tractatu de utroque retractu (17), ubi dicit eum plusquam sexcentas paginas integras ne vocabulo quidem mutato ex legibus suis connubialibus in tractatum suum de gloria mundi transcripsisse.* Chassanæus had accused Tiraquellus of having stolen several things from Cælius Rhodiginus. Against this charge he justified himself, and accused Chassanæus in his turn. His accusation is better grounded than that of his adversary (18).

(11) Bullart, Académie des Sciences, Tom. II, pag. 220.

(12) Bullart, ibid.

(13) Ghilini, Teatro, Tom. II, pag. 18.

(14) Id. ibid.

(15) Jacobus Thomæus de Plagio Literario, num. 385, pag. m. 169. He quotes Speckh. Cent. I. qu. 88. n. 10. p. 376.

(16) Thomæus quotes here several passages out of Tiraquellus, in *Leges Connubiales*.

(17) Thomæus, quotes here, §. 1. gl. 9. num. 76, circa fin.

(18) See Thomæus de Plagio Literario, num. 563, 564, pag. 249.

TIRESIAS, one of the most celebrated Soothsayers of antiquity, was the son of Everes (a), and of the nymph Chariclo, and derived his original from Udæus, one of those (b) who proceeded from the serpent's teeth sown in the earth by Cadmus. He was blind, for which several reasons were assigned. Some said that the gods, unwilling that he should reveal to mortals what they desired to conceal from them, struck him blind. Pherecydes ascribed it only to the anger of Minerva [A]. He said that this goddess was so incensed that she had been seen naked by Tiresias, that she put out his eyes. She was earnestly sollicitous by Chariclo her favourite, and Tiresias's mother, to restore that unhappy man to his sight. But not being able to do her that favour, she endeavoured to make him some amends by perfecting his hearing to such a degree, that he understood the language of all birds [B]. She also gave him a staff, with which he could guide himself

(a) Moreri calls him wrong *Iovius*.

(b) They were called *Ἐξαπτοί*.

[A] Pherecydes ascribed it only to the anger of Minerva.] It will be very proper to compare this place of Apollodorus with a hymn of Callimachus (1), which says that Minerva having been seen by Tiresias, while she was bathing her self in company with Chariclo in the fountain Hippocrene, had no sooner declared that he should see no more, than he lost his eyes. Chariclo was very much afflicted at this misfortune of her son. Minerva to comfort her, assured her, that it was an irrevocable law of the destinies, that all those who saw a deity without her permission, should be severely chastized (2); that a time would come when she would be esteemed a happy woman, for her sons escaping with the loss of his eyes. Minerva farther added out of her great affection for Chariclo, that she would render Tiresias the most excellent soothsayer in the world; that she would perfectly instruct him in the presages taken from the flight of birds; that she would give him a staff which should serve him instead of a guide; that she should confer on him a long life;

VOL. V.

and that he should be the only man, who after his death should be eminent for his knowledge in hell, where Pluto should particularly honour him.

[B] To understand the language of all birds.] Ὅλας ἀνὴρ ὀρνίθων φωνὴν ποιῆσαι συνίηται: Omnem avium vocem scire ut intelligeret. Methinks this favour of Minerva will not be understood in its full extent, if it be said only that she communicated to Tiresias a perfect knowledge of all the presages which depend on the singing of birds: we must proceed further, and suppose that they meant that birds communicate their thoughts to one another by their notes, as men do by words; and that Tiresias received of Minerva the gift of understanding and interpreting this language of birds. It is thus, Porphyry understood the matter (3); for imagining that brutes have not only the faculty of reasoning, but also that of speaking to one another, he has said, that Apollonius Tyanæus, Melampus, Tiresias, and Thales, understood and distinguished the various languages made use of by

(3) Porphyry, lib. III, de Abstin. See the article PEREIRA, citat. (32).

(6) See Vol. II, of the *Chevrance*, pag. 115, Dutch Edit.

(7) A mean citizen of Paris.

(8) Menagiana, pag. 127, of the fifth Dutch edition. It is further said that he debauched his maid, who at nine months end was delivered of three boys.

(9) Thuan. lib. xxi, ad ann. 1158, pag. 432.

(10) Sammarthanus, *Elog. lib. I*, pag. m. 35.

(1) *Εἰς Ἀντὶστήν* τῆς Παλλάδος, in *lavacrum Palladis*.

(2) See an instance of it in the text of the article ADONIS, citation (5).

himself as safely as when he had his eyes. Hefiod tells the story otherwise; he says that Tiresias having found two serpents copulating, he struck them with his staff (c) [C], and was immediately turned into a woman; that at the expiration of a certain time (d) he again found the same animals in the same situation, and resumed the form of a man. Now as he had tasted the pleasures of both sexes (e), he was chosen judge of a dispute which arose betwixt Jupiter and Juno, on the question, whether women had a larger share than men in the venereal pleasure. Jupiter affirmed it, Juno denied it. Tiresias decided against the goddess Juno [D]; who was on that occasion so enraged that she blinded

(4) Apollodor. lib. i, pag. 46.

(5) Phn. lib. x, cap. 49.

(6) Vide Pfeiffer. Theol. Judaicae etque Mohammed. p. 307, 308.

(7) Bonaventura Baro, in the first Tome of the Scotus defensio, mentions a Franciscan Monk, who understood the conversations of animals, and by what means foretold things to come.

(8) Animal. Hist. lib. viii, cap. v. See also Euripides, in Phœnic. ver. 846.

(9) Barthius, in Statium, Tom. ii, pag. 1065, 1149.

(10) Lutatius, in Stat. Thebaid. lib. ii.

(11) Hygin. cap. lxxv.

(12) Metamorphol. lib. iii.

by animals. With regard to Melampus we are told (4) that some serpents having licked his ears whilst he slept, were the cause, that when he awoke he understood what the birds said as they flew over his head; and that afterwards he declared to men the future events he learned that way. 'Qui credit ista & Melampodi profecto aures lambendo dedisse intellectum avium sermonis dracones non abnuet. . . . He who believes these things, will not deny the possibility of Melampus's being taught to understand the language of birds by serpents licking his ears.' These are Pliny's words (5), who immediately after adds that Democritus mentions the names of certain birds, whose blood mingled together would produce a serpent, which would instruct those who eat it to understand the conversation of birds. *Vel quæ Democritus tradit nominando aves, quarum confuso sanguine serpens gignatur, quem quisquis ederit intelleturus sit alium colloquia.* The Jews and several Mahometans maintain (6) that Solomon understood this language (7). To return to Tiresias, I observe that if we will take Apollodorus's expression to signify only, that Tiresias perfectly understood that sort of divination, which was properly called Augury, (or divining by birds) we shall find in Ælian (8) that Tiresias became principally famous on this account. Barthius imagines that this is quite contrary to Statius (9); but that conjecture is only founded on the false supposition that this Poet has introduced Tiresias despising auguries. I say this supposition is false, to prove which, against Barthius, I need only quote page 1069, of his own second tome on Statius, where he acknowledges that Tiresias declares, that the other ways of founding the intentions of the gods, had not afforded him such a profound knowledge of futurity, as what he had acquired by the invocation of the Manes. Is it despising a thing, not to acknowledge it for the very best of all?

[C] *Struck them with his staff.* Others say, that he trode upon them: 'In monte Cyllenio Tiresias dracones coeuntes calcasse dicitur: ob id in mulieris formam versus, ut Ovidius refert. Deinde monitus fortibus in eundem locum rediit, & in figuram pristinam (10). . . . On mount Cyllene Tiresias is said to have trod upon serpents copulating; on which account he was turned into the form of a woman, as Ovid relates. Afterwards, by advice of the oracle he returned to the same place, and resumed his former state.' Before Lutatius said this, Hyginus had told us, 'In monte Cyllenio Tiresias Evers filius pastor dracones venerantes dicitur baculo percussisse, alias calcasse, ob id in mulieris figuram est conversus: Postea monitus à fortibus in eodem loco, dracones cum calcasset, rediit in pristinam speciem (11). . . . On the mountain Cyllene, Tiresias a shepherd, the son of Evers, is said to have struck with his staff, otherwise to have trod upon, serpents in copulation, and for that reason to have been transformed into a woman: Afterwards being advised by the oracle he trod upon serpents in the same place, and resumed his former figure.' The commentators are very much puzzled about those words, *alias calcasse*; but why should not *alias* be taken for an adverb, after which there is no need of imagining that a globe hath slipped out of the margin into the text. Hyginus might very well mention both, in order to comprehend both traditions; but if nothing be wanting in the two mentioned passages, we may justly be surprized that these authors should omit some essential circumstances. The first forgot that Tiresias met a second time the serpents copulating, and renewed his first blow; he forgot, I say, that these two circumstances were necessary, in order to restore him to his manhood; he pretends that he was only obliged to return to the place. The other forgets the first of these two things. Ovid (12) with all his prolixity likewise forgets it. Hefiod in Apollodorus hath omitted the last of these two circum-

stances; he has not told us that Tiresias struck the second time. Phlegon and Fulgentius are the persons who have remembered them both. But, on the other side, Phlegon hath his peculiar variations; he will have it, that Tiresias struck one of the serpents the first time, and the other the second; but does not allow him to have struck them both each time (13). Eustathius, and the scholiast on Homer (14), as also Tzetzes on Lycophron, say, that the first time Tiresias killed the female and became a woman, and afterwards killing the male he was changed to a man again; and that this happened on mount Cithæron (15), and not on mount Cyllene (16).

[D] *Tiresias decided against the goddess Juno.* We are told that the better to give a judicial air to this decision, he took into his hand the balance with which justice is painted. He considered at first as a sum total the pleasure in dispute, then he made the division, and assigned to each sex its lot or quota in weight and measure; and pronounced that the whole being divided into ten parts the woman had nine, and the man one.

Οἷον μὲν μοῖρην δέκα μοιρῶν τέρπεται ἀνὴρ.
Τὰς δὲ δέκα ἐμπαῖσι γυνὴ τέρπεται νόημα.

Parte una è denis mas partibus oblectatur;
At mulier solidum coitus capit ipsa decuncem.

One part of pleasure is the share of men,
Women enjoy the other nine in ten.

Apollodorus, who cites these two verses (17), said just before, if we follow the present miserable state of his Greek text, that the pleasure being divided into nineteen parts the man enjoys nine, and the woman the other ten (18); at which Juno was so incensed, that she deprived him of his sight. Two things shew that this place is corrupted; the first is, that nothing can be more flat or insipid, and more remote from the design of the inventors of this chimerical dispute, than to represent Juno as condemned for so inconsiderable a difference. I say nothing of the severe punishment which she inflicted on her judge, for a sentence so little distant from truth; for I should be answered that her character is choleric, haughty, and revengeful (19), and that on this occasion her resentment exceeded the bounds of reason.

Graviter Saturnia iusto

Nec pro materia fertur doluisse, sui que
Iudicis æterna damnavit lumina nocte (20).

Juno too angry for a crime so light,
Condemn'd her judge to everlasting night.

The other reason is, that Apollodorus would be utterly void of judgment, if after having related the substance of the decision one way, he should soon after make appear by citing the words of the sentence, that he had miserably falsified it. If this blow may be warranted off by saying that we have only a small abridgment of Apollodorus, what shall we urge against so many other authors, who follow not his text, as we have it at present, but the two Greek verses he has cited, as the express sentence? Phlegon (21) and Lutatius (22) admit exactly the proportion expressed in these verses. The Scholiast on Homer (23) cites these two lines with a very inconsiderable alteration. Eustathius (24) quotes some words of them. Lucian (25) does not much differ from them at the bottom. Fulgentius differs still less (26); and the Scholiast on Juvenal (27), explaining a place where this Poet says, that those women who were most fond of manly occupations, and most avoided those of their sex, would not become men: the reason he assigns for this,

(c) Venus hanc erat utraque doct. Ovid. Metam. lib. iii, ver. 323.

(13) Phlegon, de Rebus mirabil. cap. iv.

(14) In Odyss. K, ver. 494.

(15) In Boetia.

(16) In Arcadia.

(17) Apoll. Rhod. pag. 193.

(18) Διανομία μοιρῶν παρὰ τὰς αὐδίας, ὡς αὖ, τὰς μὴ ὀνείας ἀνδρὶς ἡσέβας τὰς δὲ δέκα, γυναικας. De novem ac decem que inter coeundum voluptatis partes capiuntur, novem mas ac mulieres decem fœmine. M. ibid. pag. 191.

(19) Es germanus Iovis Saturnusque altera proles, æstivum tantum voluit sub pectore Rutilus. Can Saturni's iustice and Revenge's utter law, Such malign anger in her bosom bear? Æneid. lib. xii, ver. 830.

(20) Ovid. Metam. lib. iii, ver. 333.

(21) Phleg. de Rebus mirabil. cap. iv.

(22) In Statium, apud Barthium, Tom. ii, p. 318.

(23) In Odyss. K, ver. 494. Vide Munkelium in Hygin. pag. 128.

(24) In eund. loc. Odyss.

(25) In Amori-bus, where he says that according to Tiresias, 'H ἡμέρα τέρψας ἐστὶ μοῖρα ἡλιονακταί τῆς ἀβύσσου, πολέμβος δὲλεσίου tota parte maledicula mperat. . . . The woman's pleasure exceeds the man's, by one part.

(26) Tiresias dixit tres uncias habere virum amoris, & novem fœminam. . . . Tiresias said the man had three parts, the woman nine, Fulgent. Mythol. lib. ii, cap. viii.

(27) Una uncia libidinis est in masculis, octo in feminis. . . . The man has one part, the woman eleven. Scholiast. Juvenal. in Sat. vi, ver. 453.

blinded him [E]: But amends was made him by the gift of prophecy [F], which Jupiter

it, is the too unequal division of the venerable pleasure.

Quæ fugit à sexu, viros amat, hæc tamen ipfa
Vir nollet fieri; nam quantula nostra voluptas!

Inur'd to arms, and her own sex to fly,
Yet to be wolly man she would disclaim,
To quit her ten-fold pleasure at the game,
For frothy praises, and an empty name.

DRYDEN.

I ought not to forget that Barthius seems to me very happy in his correction of the text of Apollodorus in pag. 319, and 1066, of the second volume on Statius.

Some may ask whether this pretended judgment of Tiresias, is supported by natural or moral reasons. As for the reasons deducible from nature, I refer them to the Physicians; who, in all probability, will find it very difficult to give a clear decision of this question. And as for moral reasons, I do not believe any stronger can be alleged, than that it is agreeable to a wife and bounteous providence, such as that of God, to make compensations, and to multiply the female pleasure in proportion to the whole train of loathings, inconveniences, and pain, which the women endure from their conception to their delivery. On this foot, the share of pleasure ought to be prodigiously unequal in favour of that sex: but besides that the law of compensations would be attended with consequences that must lead too far; it may be said that God has thousands and thousands of ways of compensation besides this, so that nothing can be determined about any of these ways in particular. But the best morality of this fable is never to mention this pretended history of Tiresias, without adding, that it is false, as well in fact as reason. The necessity of this addition Brantome will confirm to you. 'I knew, says he (28), a young

(28) Brantome, Mémoires des Dames Galantes, Tom. ii, p. 45.

'lady, of a very good and great family, who was ruined and became a whore, by having heard her school-master relate the story or rather fable of Tiresias, who having experienced both sexes, was chosen by Jupiter and Juno, to decide a dispute betwixt them, whether the male or female enjoyed most pleasure in the act of copulation. The judge decided against Juno, that the woman enjoyed by far the greatest pleasure: the goddesses enraged at the sentence against her struck the poor judge blind. It is not to be wondered at, if this girl was tempted by such a story: For as she had often heard her companions, or other women say that the men so ardently pursued that pleasure, and took so great delight in it, and that the women, according to Tiresias's verdict, took a great deal more, she therefore must needs try it. Such lessons are, indeed, very proper for girls! Are there no other for them? But their masters will answer, that they will know every thing, and if in the course of their reading, histories or fables occur, which want explanation, (or explain themselves) they must explain them, and must not skip them, or turn to the next page. How many studious girls have been undone by reading this very story, that of Biblis and Caunus, and such like, in Ovid's Metamorphosis?'

As there are some who have objected, that I was in the wrong to suppose that this question should be referred to Physicians, it is necessary I should shew them that it has been in reality debated and discussed already in Physical treatises. I can justify this with so much the more liberty, because my whole quotation will be either in Italian or Latin: *Questo suo donare nasce dalla sfrenata sua libidine, e dal prendere maggior piacere nel atto venereo, che gli huomini non pigliano, e non sentono: Come prova Avicenna nel libro nono, e ventisimoprime degli animali, e Hali Abbate nel sesto libro della sua Teorica in questo proposito disse Duplicità est in fœmina concubitus voluptas, quia præter feminis motum, & orificii vulvæ in suggendo quoque nascitur oblectatio, vulva ipsa diversimode mota; il che conferma anco Galeno nel quarto libro de morbis, & symptomatis. E lo dimostra il giudizio di Tiresia, secondo i Poeti. . . . E lo conferma anco Pietro Aponense sopra il decimo quinto problema*

d'Aristotile; benché Polibio in quel suo libro de genitura provi il contrario, facendo due volontà: volontà intensiva, & estensiva, volontà intensiva chiamando l'ultima, & estensiva nel mandare fuori il seme genitale, & in questa vuole, che si diletta più l'huomo: estensiva intende quella, la quale si piglia innanzi l'emissione nel maneggiarsi: & in questa vuole si diletta più la donna, onde Gorreo Parifino medico dottissimo nelle annotazioni al libro di Polibio scrisse le seguenti parole à favor delle Donne: Tametsi maribus semen calidius acrius copiosiusque inest, motuque ipsi majore quam fœminæ in coitu concutiuntur, plufque multo caloris, & spiritus obtinent, quamobrem ex his major esse maris quam fœminæ videri possit. Verum in fœmina alia privatim considerare oportet, quæ inter præcipuas, & potissimas voluptatis veneræ causas esse possunt. Si quidem ejus uterus magno virili Seminis desiderio tenetur, ipsumque mirum in modum appetit, & attrahendo, sugendo, concipiendoque impensissimè delectatur, est enim ea in re uterus ventriculo similis, sicut enim iste suavis cibis, potibusque gaudet, eoque avidissimè amplectitur; ita ille semen amat, habetque gratissimum. Mario Equicola nel quarto libro de natura amoris. Dice, che se ciò fosse vero, che le donne havessero maggior piacere che gli huomini non hanno nell'atto venereo sempre le femine ricercherbbono i maschi, del che (dice egli) si vede tutto il contrario (29).

[E] She was so enraged that she blinded him.] Apollodorus does not acquaint us in what manner: but Hyginus informs us that she did it with her own hand, Juno irata manu averfa eum excæcavit (30). . . . Juno in a passion struck out his eyes with the back of her hand. Phlegon's expression may very well be interpreted, that she did it with her bodkin, καὶ ἀνὰ δὲ τοῦ τῶς ὀφθαλμοῦς. She pricked out his eyes. The scholiast on Statius adds, that she cut off his hands; illa irata manus ejus præcidit & excæcavit; . . . she in her fury cut off his hands, and blinded him. But he being the only author who says this, it is probable this place is corrupted. Barthius corrects it thus; manus ei læxæ, Vigener superjecit & excæcavit; . . . she laid her hands upon him, and blinded him; and confirms this conjecture from Apollodorus, who speaking of the punishment inflicted by Minerva on Tiresias, says she did it with her own hands; τὴν δὲ ταῖς χερσὶ τῶς ὀφθαλμοῦς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀλαζομένην ἑρπύων ποίνσαι (31); She laid hold of his eyes with her hands, in order to blind him.

(29) Giuseppe Palli of the academy of the Signori Ricoverati di Padova, & Informi di Ravenna, in the 33d and 34th pages of a book called i Donnechi Difetti, Printed at Venice 1618, in 4to, it is the fourth edition.

(30) Hygin. cap. lxxv. Vigener superjecit & excæcavit; . . . she laid her hands upon him, and blinded him; and confirms this conjecture from Apollodorus, who speaking of the punishment inflicted by Minerva on Tiresias, says she did it with her own hands; τὴν δὲ ταῖς χερσὶ τῶς ὀφθαλμοῦς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀλαζομένην ἑρπύων ποίνσαι (31); She laid hold of his eyes with her hands, in order to blind him.

[F] Amends was made him by the gift of prophecy.] He acquiesced in this exchange; it does not appear that he regretted the loss of his eyes: he is never introduced deploring his destiny; this had not been consistent with decency, after the great knowledge which his mind was supposed to have received. 'Augurem

Tiresiam quem sapientem fingunt Poetæ nunquam inducunt deplorantem cæcitatem suam. At vero Polyphemum Homerus cum immanem ferumque finxisset, cum arietem etiam colloquentem facit, ejusque laudare fortunas quod quo vellet ingredi posset, & quæ vellet attingeret. Restè hoc quidem, nihilo enim erat ipse cyclops quàm aries ille prudentior (32). . . . Tiresias, the Soothsayer, who is described as a wise man by the Poets, is never introduced by them as deploring his blindness. But Homer having described Polyphemus as cruel and fierce, introduces him conversing with a ram, and envying it's lot, in being able to run and skip wherever it pleased. And in this he was consistent, for the Cyclops himself was in no respect wiser than the ram.' Let the Cyclops, let ignorant men believe that the loss of bodily sight, is the loss of the joys of this world. It is true, that all the unthinking crew are not agreed on this principle, witness the two begging rogues mentioned in the XIXth Serée of Bouchet. They were at a church-door, and could not agree what was the joy of this world; for the blind man cried out, Bestow your alms on a poor man, who has lost the joys of this world: The other rascal, who by a faulcon-shot had lost what should have been in his codpiece, told him he lied, and averred that it was he who had lost the joy of this world.

(31) Barth. in Stat. Tom. ii, pag. 318. See also Munckerus in Hygin. pag. 128.

(32) Cicero, Tullian. V. circa fin.

We are told of a Princess who would have put it out of dispute by condemning the first of these beggars. The story runs thus: 'A Princess of great virtue, who remained a virgin all her life, lost her sight in

her

pitier bestowed on him. He acquired a great reputation by his divining science [G], notwithstanding which he was ignorant that the water of the fountain Tilphusa would prove fatal to him; for having fled with his countrymen [H] in the time of the second Theban war, he drank of this water and died. This is what we find in Apollodorus concerning him (f). We see in Strabo (g), that the Thebans at that time fled for refuge to the mountain Tilphusa, that at the foot of this mountain there was a fountain of the same name, and that Tiresias's tomb was there also. Pausanias (b) agrees with Strabo concerning the place where Tiresias's tomb was situated. This was, I confess, not very far distant from Alalcomenium; but yet Moreri is very much mistaken, when he says (i) that Alalcomenium was remarkable for Tiresias's tomb. We have given, in its proper place, the article of MANTO, the worthy daughter of this great Diviner, to whom she served as a guide, and was the staff of his old age (k); for it must not be forgot that he lived very

(f) Biblioth. lib. iii, pag. 191. 197, Edit. Sal. mar. 1661.

(g) Lib. ix, pag. m. 285. See also pag. 283.

(b) Lib. ix, pag. m. 307.

(i) In the article of ALALCOMENIUM; for he forgot it in that of Tiresias; he places that monument right, and quotes Strabo.

(k) O nostrar regimen vireque fenestra. Stat. Theb. lib. iv, var. 536.

her old age: being in that condition, a poor blind man was led to her coach-side, and cried out to her, My good lady, have pity on a poor man who has lost the joys of this world: the Princess hearing this, asked one of her women, *What is the matter with that man, is he then an eunuch?* No, madam, replied the waiting-woman, it is because he is blind, alas, poor man! *He is in the right*, said the Princess, indeed I did not think of that. The natural simplicity of this good Princess's question pleasantly enough discovered her opinion concerning the joys of this world (33). It is very probable that Malherbe would have decided the dispute conformably to the opinion of the beggar, who had lost by a faulcon-shot, &c. For, his weakness, in that respect, made him inconsiderable, and he would rather have chosen to be a condition to reap the ladies favours, than to obtain the highest dignities of the king his master (34). By the pathetic air of his complaints (35) one would be apt to judge that he had been more than once in the same disagreeable condition of the pretended hermit, who, in vain, had the charming Angelica at his mercy.

(33) Mr de Cailliere, of the French Academy, Recueil des bons Contes & des bons Mots, pag. 132, Dutch Edit. 1693.

(34) See the article M A L H E R B E, remark [B].

(35) See his Letter to Balzac, in the collection of new Letters, printed at Paris, 1642, pag. 65.

*Già refupina ne l'arena giace
A tutte voglie del Vecchio rapace.*

*Egli l'abbraccia, & à piacer la tocca.
Et ella dorme; è non può fare ischerma;
Hor le bacia il bel petto, hora la bocca:
Non è chi'l veggia in quel loco aspro & ermo,
Ma ne l'incontro il suo deftrier trabocca,
C'è al desio non risponde il corpo infermo,
Era mal'atto, perché haveva tropp'anni.
Et potrà peggio, quanto più l'affanni.*

*Tutte le vie, tutti li modi tenta:
Ma quel pigro rozzon non però falla.
Indarno il fren gli scote, è lo tormenta,
E non può far, che tenga la testa alta (36).*

(36) Ariosto, Orlando furioso, Canto Ottavo, Stanza xlviii, & seq.

Racan, Malherbe's good and faithful scholar, had also his master's taste; he would not have parted with the remainder of his vigour for all the triumphs of the greatest conqueror's, nor for all the policy of prime ministers. I am not at all surprized, says he, in a letter wrote to Balzac (37), that N. hath adventured to censure your eloquence, since Mr de Malherbe has had the impudence to accuse me of frigidity, when he himself is nothing but meer ice, and his last mistress died of age, the last hard winter: In boasting of the miracles of his youth, he plays a sure game, there being none living who can change the remainder of mine for the victories of the Prince of Orange, or the wisdom of Cardinal Richelieu, and should be very sorry to change conditions with my accuser. Malherbe's rallery ran thus: 'As for pastorals, his case succeeds the best in the world, but certainly as to what relates to the shepherdesses it could not go worse. This affair requires a sort of application of which his laziness is incapable. If he attacks a place it is in such a manner as to make it believed, that it would be only an incumbrance to him if he had it; and if he takes it, he so slightly keeps it that it must be supposed a woman has been very much surprized who has broke her fast for such a wretched morsel (38). Malherbe does not here speak of himself in the third person, as I once ima-

(37) Racan, Letter to Balzac, in Tom. ii, of the Collection of new Letters, printed at Paris, by Toussaint Quinet, in 1634, pag. 295, & seq.

(38) Malherbe, Letter to Balzac, pag. 61, of the Collection of new Letters, printed at Paris in 1642.

gined: he speaks of his disciple Racan, and it is on this account, that Racan justifies himself, and insults the other in the passage just now cited. But be it as it will, here is a couple of mean, carnal men, to whom Minerva could not have made amends, if instead of blinding them, as she did Tiresias, she had made them eunuchs.

I conclude with the thought of a Philosopher, but a Philosopher who was of a sect more reprobate and heretical in their notions of pleasure, than that of Epicurus. He had lost his eyes, and hearing the good women deplore his condition, he asked them, whether nocturnal enjoyments were not to be accounted pleasures. *Illud Antipatri Cyrenaeici est quidem paub obsecrans, sed non absurda sententia est. Cujus cecitatem quum mulierculae lamentarentur, quid agitis, inquit? an vobis nulla videtur voluptas esse nocturna (39)?*

[G] He acquired a great reputation by his divining science.] This appears by several passages in Sophocles, and other ancient authors. He was the only sage in Hell (40), if we believe Homer (41).

(39) Cicero, Tull. lib. vi, fol. 278, B.

(40) See what has been quoted out of Callimachus, in the remark [A].

(41) Odyss. K. var. 494.

*Τῇ καὶ τεθνηῶτι νῶν σόφῃ Περσεφίδῃ
Οἶον ἀπὸνύσσει. τοὶ δὲ, σκιάι ἀίσουσιν.*

*Huc etiam mortuo mentem tribuit Proserpina
Solut ut sciret, reliqui verò umbræ circumvolitant.*

*Among the other stult'ring shades below,
He only had Hell's favourite gift, to know.*

MR POPE.

He was honoured as a god after his death (42). Yet I cannot find, in the ninth book of Strabo, what Charles Stephens, Lloyd, Moreri, and Hofman quote from it, viz. that the inhabitants of Thebes paid divine honours to Tiresias, interred near Tilphusa. I find only in Pausanias (43) that they had in their city a place called Tiresias's observatory, *οἰωνοσκοπεῖον* (44) *Τίρεσιον*, (which probably was the place from whence he contemplated the auguries) and an honorary tomb, or *Cenotaphium*: for the Thebans owned that he died near Haliartus (44); and consequently that they had not his tomb amongst them. The Historian has furnished them with a very odd argument; but it does not much concern us. Those gentlemen who have cited Strabo, would have found their account much better in Didorus Siculus; who informs us that the Thebans celebrated a pompous funeral to Tiresias, and paid him divine honours (45).

[H] Having fled with his countrymen.] Mr Moreri has very much mistaken his original Charles Stephens, when he says, that Tiresias being in exile near the fountain Tilphusa, died there. Charles Stephens's Latin runs thus; 'Juxta fontem ejusdem nominis, ubi profugus diem suum obiit: - - - Near a fountain of the same name, whither having fled, he died.' Which is taken from Strabo, *ὅφ' ἡ Τίλφωσα κρήνη καὶ τῷ Τίρεσι μνημεῖον ἐκεί τελευτήσαντος κατὰ τὴν φύσιν, sub quo fons est Tilphosa, & monumentum Tiresiae qui extorris ibi mortem obiit.* If Mr Moreri had been acquainted with the history of Tiresias, he would not have rendered the word *profugus* by that of *exile*. From hence we may infer, that translators are liable to commit strange blunders, when they do not understand their subject; for they may, indeed, know three or four significations of the same word, but this does not hinder them from chusing that which by no means agrees with this or that place. I observe a considerable difference betwixt Strabo and Pausanias. The first

(42) Clem. Alexandr. I. Stromat. (43) Lib. ix, pag. 296, 297. (44) That town was not far from the mountain Tilphusa. (45) Θέλειται λαμπρὸς ὁ λαμπρὸς τῶν ματι, ἱερῶν, ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ. In the translation printed at Bologn. in 1548, lib. vi, cap. vi, p. 124. Quem, sui civis magna cum pompa sepelirent. Deorum tibi honores tribuissent, there is this, instead of ipse.

(1) Pausan. lib. ix, pag. 290.

(m) See Barthius, in Stat. Tom. ii, pag. 1106, and Tom. iii, pag. 673.

very long [I]. Some bestow on him another daughter called Hifloris (l), who by an ingenious stratagem deceived the goddess Lucina, and was the occasion that Alcmena, whose labour had been prolonged by that goddess, was happily delivered. There has been handed about a certain book under Tiresias's name, by an imposture which has been practised a thousand times. This book treated of the presages of frankincense, *de thuris signis*. It is twice cited by the scholiast on Statius (m). Tiresias dealt in all sorts of predictions; he made use of Pyromancy (n), Capnomancy, Necromancy, &c. The latter, which consisted in calling upon the dead, pleased him more than the rest (o); this he exercised very imperiously [K], and would not suffer the ghosts to be tardy in appearing. As he was blind, Manto his daughter was obliged to inform him of the phenomena of fire, and smook, &c. (p). Lucian in his treatise of Astrology observes, that Tiresias taught that the planets have not all the same virtue, nor the same sex.

He

(46) Pausan. lib. ix, p. 307.

(47) Diod. Sicul. lib. v, cap. vi.

(48) Petrus Muscardus (de quo vide Deckherum de Scriptore Adepto, pag. 397, Edit. 1686) Hist. Deor. fatidicorum, pag. 87.

(49) Some render it seven ages.

(50) See Munckerus, in Hygia, pag. 128.

first makes Tiresias die in his flight without falling into the power of his enemies: the second, on the contrary, depending on the Grecian histories, says (46), that those of Argos having taken the city of Thebes, were carrying Tiresias with the rest of their booty, to the temple of Delphi, but that he died in the way, by drinking of the fountain of Tilphusa. Diodorus Siculus (47) relates the fact in the same manner as Strabo. An author (48), whose memory I honour, saith, that Tiresias, in his latter days, retired to the mountain called Tilphosia, to end his life in repose, and remote from the tumults of the city. He does not cite any authority; but I make no doubt he had met with it in some celebrated writer. We must, however, say, that this retreat of Tiresias was not at all voluntary.

[I] He lived very long.] Hyginus, Phlegon, and Lutatius, agree in saying that Jupiter repaid Tiresias's loss of sight, by granting him, together with the knowledge of futurity, a life seven times as long as that of others *septem aetates* (49). Agatharides mentions but five ages; Lucian six: but, according to Tzetzes, some have made Tiresias eleven times the age of Man (50).

[K] This he exercised very imperiously.] Seneca makes him use menacing words.

Carmenque magicum volvit, & rabido MINAX
Decantat ore, quicquid aut placat leves,
Aut cogit umbras (51).

His furious voice the Magic charm repeats,
While trembling ghosts obey his awful threats.

Statius introduces him armed with threats and reproaches.

Atque hic Tiresias nondum adventantibus umbris
Testor ait, Divos quibus hunc sacravimus ignem,
Jam nequeo tolerare moram. Cassusne sacerdos
Audior, an rabido jubeat si Theffalia cantu
Ibitis, & Scythicis quoties armata venenis
Colchis aget, trepido pallebunt tartara motu?
Nostris cura minor?

Ne teneas annos nubemque hanc frontis opacæ
Spernite ne, moneo, & nobis favere facultas,
Scimus enim & quidquid dici noscique timetis (52).

And here Tiresias, while the ghosts delay'd,
Ye gods whose sacred fires now blaze, he said,
I cannot bear this loit'ring. Do I stem
An unskill'd Priest? or at the witch's scream,
Must you obey, while her Theffalian charms,
And Colchic poisonous drugs all Hell alarms?
And shall you fear me less?

You had not best, I friendly now advise,
My weaker years, and perish'd sights despise;
I too can make you tremble when I will,
And fly obsequious to my Magic skill.

(53) Pharfal. lib. vi, ver. 732, & seq.

See in Lucan (53) a long train of threats uttered by the Theffalian witch against the infernal gods. This rite was very common in the magical rites. A Pagan Philosopher ridicules them with a great deal of reason.

VOL. V. No. CXXIX.

Πολλὸν δὲ τέτων ἀλογώτερον, τὸ μὴ δαίμονι, εἰ τύχοι, ἢ ψυχῇ τεθνηκότι, αὐτὸν δὲ τῷ βασιλεῖ ἡλίου, ἢ Σελήνῃ, ἢ τινι, τῶν κατ' ἔργον ἀνθρώπων τῶν τυγχόντι ὑποχρίεσθαι, ἀπειλὰς περσφύροντα ἐκφοβεῖν, ψευδόμενον ἢ ἐκείνοι ἀληθεύουσι. Quodque omnium absurdissimum est, non jam vulgari cuiquam Dæmoni, aut defuncti animæ, sed ipsimet Soli syderum principi, Lunæ, reliquique Diis cœlestibus, homo cuius e Populi fœce obnoxius minas intonat, atque ut eos ad vera dicenda compellat, falsum vanumque terrorem ostendit (54). -- But what is most absurd in all this is, that not only a common dæmon, suppose, or a departed spirit, but even the majesty of the sun, or the moon, or some other of the celestial gods shall be frightened with threats by any vulgar wretch, and by false terrors compelled to speak truth. This puts me in mind of our popular stories concerning Magic: I do not mean the most common sort of stories, but those which seem to be eminent above the rest. It is pretended that there are some Magicians who exercise a sort of command even to compulsion, over those spirits which they raise up. As absurd as this may seem, it may be thought possible, if we should once allow that certain covenants or treaties are entered into betwixt men and evil angels: for there being doubtless a subordination amongst these spirits, there may be some dæmons who reign absolute over several others; cannot one of these superior dæmons promise his Magicians that he will subject to them all the spirits under his command? Cannot he promise them to threaten those with his displeasure who should prove ungovernable? Thuanus, who was present at a dialogue betwixt the Sieur de Calignon and a famous Magician, relates that the Magician did not deny his commerce with dæmons, but affirmed that his Magic tended only to the doing good to mankind, and that there was a very great difference between Sorcerers and Magicians. A Magician, said he, has no correspondence with any other than the aerial and celestial spirits, who are good and beneficent, and teach him a thousand very profitable secrets, and besides he commands those spirits. But a Sorcerer is a vile slave to terrestrial spirits naturally malignant and enemies to mankind. He added that there were schools of Magic in Spain, and that there had been also very flourishing ones in Germany, which were most of them dispersed since Luther had divulged his Heresies. 'Tam preclaræ artis scholas toto terrarum orbe ac professores sparsos, & adhuc in Hispania Toleti, Cordubæ, Granatæ, aliisque focis frequentari, fuisse olim & in Germania celeberrimas, sed magna ex parte defecisse, postquam Lutherus seminato hæresis suæ fermento, tot sectatores habere cepit (55). -- That there are schools of so famous an art, and professors dispersed over the whole earth, and still frequented in Spain, at Toledo, Corduba, Granada, and other places, as there were also some very much celebrated in former times in Germany, but are now most of them deserted, since Luther, by spreading the leaven, of his Heresy began to draw after him so many followers.' He did not confess to his judges all that he owned to the Sieur Calignon; but this did not prevent the Parliament of Paris condemning him to death upon the evidence produced against him. The thing is in my opinion remarkable enough to deserve being laid before my readers in Thuanus's own words (56): 'Magiam quam profitebatur Bellomontius, dæmonum, qui numinis divini particula sunt, cum hominibus conciliatricem artem præclaram esse ad beneficium inventam non ad maleficium, quo Sortarii qui vocantur vulgo utuntur, ipsi malorum spirituum vilia mancipia in

(54) Porphyrius, apud Eusebium, Præparat. Evangel. lib. v, cap. x, pag. 198, A.

contracts
with
gods

(55) Thuanus, ubi infra, pag. 1234. See the remark [H], of the article PONTIUS.

(56) Thuanus, de Vita sua, lib. vi, pag. 1233, 1234.

(q) Auspica a-
vium Tiresias
Thebanus (in-
venit.) Plinius,
lib. vii, cap. 56.
pag. 102.

He was the inventor of Auspices (q). He was worshipped as a god at Orchomenus; his oracle was famous there for several ages, but silenced at last after a plague had rendered that city desolate (r). Perhaps all the directors of the oracle perished by the contagion: or perhaps they believed that a god who suffered the inhabitants of Orchomenus to be destroyed by the plague, was not capable of predicting future events. I take no notice of supernatural reasons.

(r) Plut. de Or-
cul. defectu,
pag. 434.

magic-
poor!

(57) Id. ibid.

craftam ignorantiam demerfi, & veneno ac diris fa-
scinationibus eorum arbitrio perniciem humano ge-
neri machinantes, cum contra magi ipsi dæmonibus
imperant, & eorum confortio ac familiaritate arcana
naturæ vulgo ignota nec libris prodita cognoscere,
futura rimari, mala declinare, pericula antevertere,
amissa recuperare, corpora ceterius quam humana
ratione fieri possit, de loco in locum transferre, dif-
fidentis componere, patres cum filiis, uxores cum
maritis, & amicitiam cum iis quibus debet conciliare
discant, denique sibi rem cum aeris spiritibus &
celo participantibus esse, qui natura benefici nihil
nisi juvare sciunt, cum terrestres & subterranea in-
colentes, qui Sortiariis imperant, sint maligni &
nocere tantum noverint: tam præclaræ artis scho-
las, &c (57). - - - Beaumont pretended that the Magic
he professed was the art of maintaining a commerce
between spirits: (who are a particle of the Deity) and
men, invented for good and not for mischief, which
last is the end proposed by those called Sorcerers, them-
selves being the vile drudges of evil spirits, and plunged
into the most gross ignorance, and with poison and dread-
ful enchantments by their direction contriving destruction
to mankind; when, on the contrary, Magicians command
the spirits themselves, and by their commerce and ac-
quaintance are able to find out the secrets of nature
which are unknown to the vulgar, and not to be met
with in books, to foresee futurities, to shun evils, to
prevent dangers, to recover losses, to transport the body

from place to place quicker than is possible by human
means, to pacify enemies, to reconcile fathers with their
children, husbands with their wives, and re-establish
friendship where necessary; lastly, that these have only
to do with aerial spirits, and such as partake of Hea-
ven, who being naturally beneficent, know only how to
do good, while the terrestrial and subterranean ones,
who have the Sorcerers under subjection, are malignant,
and know only how to do mischief: that there were
schools of so famous an art, &c. See the remainder
of this passage in citation (55) of this article. Let us
conclude with Cicero's words, who informs us that
Tiresias was none of those vulgar Diviners who make
a trade of their impostures, and exercise them only
for bread. Ante hos Amphiaræus & Tiresias non
humiles & obscuri, neque eorum similes, ut apud
Ennium est, qui sui questus causa fidas suscitant sen-
tentias, sed clari & præstantes viri qui avibus & fig-
nis admoniti futura dicebant, quorum de altero
etiam apud inferos Homerus ait solum sapere, cæ-
teros umbrarum modo vagari (58). - - - Before these (58) Cicero, lib.
were Amphiaræus and Tiresias not mean and obscure, de Divinat.
nor like those mentioned by Ennius, who returned fore- fol. m. 310, C.
ed answers for gain, but famous and eminent men,
who by the help of birds and signs foretold things fu-
ture, of one of whom even in Hell Homer says he was
the only wise ghost, that the others only wandered about
like shades.

TISSANDIER (N). Author of a book no otherwise known to me than by a letter of Balzac. He died very old in the year 1628 [A]. La Croix du Maine does not mention him, and I do not think Du Verdier Vau-Privas, has taken any more notice of him [B].

(1) It is the 18th
of the eighth
book in the folio
edition.

[A] He died very old in the year 1628.] See the letter written the same year by Balzac to one Mr Tiffandier (1). He comforts him on the death of his uncle, who was as old as the Heresy and older than the League; for he had published a book to forewarn France of the conception of this monster, when the Cardinal de Lorraine conceived it. I need not tell you these are Balzac's expressions.

[B] And I do not think Du Verdier Vau-Privas has taken any more notice of him.] I express myself in this

manner, because I had not time to examine page by page whether Tiffandier were to be met with in this writer's *Bibliothèque Française*. The authors are there ranged according to their Christian names, and without subjoining a table of surnames. These are two inexcusable faults when they meet together. The first is supportable when it is alone, as it is in La Croix du Maine; but not to repair this by a table of surnames is only mocking the world.

(a) Cicero in
Bruto, pag. m.
280.

TITIUS (CAIUS) a Latin Poet and Orator, was a Roman knight. He carried Eloquence as far as it was possible for one who did not understand Greek [A]. His orations were composed with subtilties, examples, and politeness, so that they seemed to be composed in the Attic style. This subtilty of thought did not succeed on the stage, when he employed it in his tragedies, as he had done in his pleadings. It was not lofty enough to support the gravity of the tragic character (a). When the Consul Fannius proposed his law against luxurious feasting, Titius harangued the people to represent the utility of that law. We shall see in the remarks whether this fact will serve to discover the time when the *Lex Fannia* was made [B]. The oration made by Titius at that time demonstrates

(1) Cicero in
Bruto, pag. m.
280.

[A] He carried Eloquence as far as it was possible for one who did not understand Greek.] Cicero, the best judge in the world, gives him this character. 'Ejusdem fere temporis fuit eques Romanus C. Titius: qui meo judicio eo pervenisse videtur, quod potuit fere Latinus orator sine Græcis literis, & sine multo usu pervenire. Hujus orationes tantum argutiarum, tantum exemplorum, tantum urbanitatis habent, ut pene Attico stylo scriptæ esse videantur. Easdem argutias in tragediis satis ille quidem acute, sed parum tragice transtulit (1). - - - About the same time flourished C. Titius a Roman knight: who in my judgment seems to have arrived to as great a height as it is possible for a Latin Orator to reach, without a knowledge of the Greek tongue, and great experience. His Orations were so full of subtilties, examples, and politeness, that they seemed to be written in the Attic

style. He introduced the same subtilties into tragedies, with ingenuity enough, but very little becoming tragic compositions.'

[B] The time when the *Lex Fannia* was made.] I have in another place (2) examined Glandorp's opinion and found it ill grounded. This author believed (3), that he who proposed this law was not Caius Fannius the father, Consul in the year of Rome 592, but Caius Fannius the son, Consul in the year of Rome 632. For this he offers but one proof taken from a passage of Aulus Gellius, which is of no force. He might have alledged something more specious, if he had quoted Macrobius, who acquaints us that Titius contemporary with Lucilius advised the people to establish the *Lex Fannia* (4). It is certain that Lucilius was born in the beginning of the VIIth century of Rome: this agrees wonderfully with Glandorp's hypothesis;

(2) In the second
article FANNI-
US, remark [B].
(3) Onomastic.
pag. 333.

(4) Id offendunt
tum multi alii,
tum etiam C.
Titius, vir æti-
tis Lucilianæ,
in oratione qua
legem Fanniam
suasit. Macro-
bius, lib. ii,
cap. xii.

strates that drunkenness was arrived at its highest pitch [C]. The mistake of an interpreter of Horace [D], is inopportune: he has confounded our Titius with a TITIVS who

pothesis; for according to that Lucilius was about thirty years old, when the *Lex Fannia* was made. Consequently the Orator who advised this law must be Lucilius's cotemporary. But if you place the passing of that law in the year 593, this Orator and Lucilius could not be cotemporaries; for the former must have been an old man when the other was but just a youth, and consequently Macrobius furnishes a very plausible proof for Glandorp. This may be strengthened by these words of Cicero, 'Ejusdem fere temporis fuit Eques Romanus C. Titius; --- About the same time flourished Caius Titius a Roman knight.' For he had just spoke of three or four Orators who flourished towards the year of Rome 660. Titius must have lived very near their time, if he recommended the *Lex Fannia* in the year 632. But there must have been a great distance of time between him and them, if this law was passed in 593. Notwithstanding all these reasons I persist in my opinion declared in the articles

(c) Plin. lib. x, cap. 4.

FANNIUS. That passage in Pliny (5) which points out the precise interval of eleven years betwixt the *Lex Fannia* and the third Punic war, is more valid than ten citations, where it is only said in general, *ejusdem ætatis, ejusdem fere temporis*. These loose expressions, be lived almost cotemporary with another, or in the same age with another, will admit of some latitude, may be lengthened or shortened, and favour of a man who does not pretend to be very nice in his Chronology, and who speaks only according to the confused ideas of his memory. But when an author makes use of a determinate number, when he names exactly eleven years; it is a sign that he took pains, that he searched farther into the matter, and consequently Pliny's testimony is here of very great weight to fix the *Lex Fannia* in the year 593, since the year 604 was the first year of the third Punic war. If these reasons are not admitted, what shall we say, when we consider that according to Macrobius the *Lex Fannia* was enacted in the year 588, and nevertheless he advances that Titius and Lucilius lived at the same time, or in the same century (6)? I argue thus; either Macrobius was perfectly well acquainted with the age of Lucilius, or he was not: In the first case, we shall be obliged to conclude according to him, that an Orator who recommended a law in 588, and a Poet born twelve years after, lived at the same time, and so his words do not at all confirm Glandorp's opinion: In the second case they confirm it yet less; for no Chronological proofs can be drawn from a man, who speaks at random and without pretending to exactness. As for Cero's *ejusdem fere temporis*, it is a phrase which does not hinder us from believing that Titius made his harangue in the year 593. Observe that Afranius imitated Titius (7). I do not offer this as a necessary and demonstrative proof that he was younger, but only as a sign that he was so. Now Afranius was cotemporary with Terence (8), who died in the year 594 (9). Thus Cicero has here furnished us with a strong proof against Glandorp. Let us therefore say that our Titius flourished about the year of Rome 590.

(7) Quem studet imitari L. Afranius poeta, homo perargutus in fabulis quidem etiam, ut scitis, disertus. Cicero, in Bruto, pag. 230.

(8) Dulces Latini leporis facie per Cæciliam, Terentiumque, & Afranium, sub piri ætate nituerunt. Patruclus, lib. 1, cap. xxviii.

(9) Sueton. in Vita Terentii.

[C] That drunkenness was then at its highest pitch. The Judges drank so much wine before they went to the bench, that they were necessitated to piss plentifully in every corner. After having heard the state of the case, they caused the witnesses to be called, and in the mean time went to the chamber-pot: being returned they gathered the votes; and could scarce refrain from sleeping. Going to council they used to say, why should we torment ourselves with these fools, let us rather take a bottle and get some tid-bit to eat. Those who understand Latin will be much better pleased with Titius's own words, than with the abridgement I have given of them. 'Ludunt alea, studiose unguentis delibuti, scortis stipati, ubi horæ decem sunt; jubent puerum vocari ut comitum eat per cunctatum quid in foro gestum sit, qui suaserint, qui dissuaserint, quot tribus iusserint, quot veterint. Inde ad comitum vadunt, ne litem suam faciant: dum eunt, nulla est in angiporro amphora, quam non impleant, quippe qui vesicam plenam vini habeant. Veniunt in comitum tristes, jubent dicere, quorum negotium est, dicunt: judex testes poscit: ipse ita minatum: ubi redit, ait se omnia audivisse,

tabulas poscit, literas inspicit. vix præ vino sustinet palpebras. eunti in consilium ibi hæc oratio: Quid mihi negotii est cum istis nugacibus: quam potius potamus mulsam mixtum vino Græco, edimus tum pinguem, bonumque piscem lupum germanum, qui inter duos pontes captus fuit (10)? --- They play at dice, being perfumed with fine ointments, and attended by their whores, when the tenth hour is come; they send a man to the court, to inquire what has been voted in the Forum, who spoke for and who against, how many tribes gave their affirmative, and how many their negative. From thence they proceed to court, for fear they should have some accusation against themselves; as they go along, there is never a pissing-place in the whole street, which they do not fill, their bladders being charged with liquor. They come into court in ill humour, order the parties to proceed. The case is stated. The Judge calls for the witnesses: he himself goes out to piss: when he returns, he declares he has heard the whole, he demands the tables, looks into the writings, scarce can keep his eyes open, going to counsel there makes this speech; Why should one trouble himself with these triflers; how much better is it for us to sit down to some Muscadell and Greek wine, to eat a fine fat Thrush, or a delicate Sturgeon, caught between two bridges? Macrobius who hath preserved this curious fragment of this Oration of Titius, had cited another passage of the same in chapter IX, for we ought not to doubt that Cincius in *suasione legis Fanniae*, in chapter IX, is a mistake of the transcribers, who by degrees changed Titius into Cincius. This other passage informs us, that they used at Rome to cook several other animals together in a Hog's-belly, and that they called this a Trojan hog, in allusion to the Trojan horse which was filled with soldiers (11). These excesses wanted to be suppressed; Luxury was then become so enormous, that several children of good families prostituted and sold themselves in order to gratify their palate with delicious meats: drunkenness was become so common, that the citizens went drunk to the assemblies, where the public affairs were debated. This is what we are informed of by Sammonicus Serenus. 'Lex Fannia sanctissimi Augusti, ingenti omnium ordinum consensu pervenit ad populum. Neque eam prætores aut tribuni, ut pleræque alias, seil ex omni bonorum consilio & sententia ipsi consules perulerunt, cum republica ex luxuria convivorum majora quam credi potest, detrimenta pateretur. Si quidem eo res redierat, ut gula illecebre plerique ingenui pueri pudicitiam & libertatem suam vendiderent; plerique ex plebe Romana vino madidi in comitum venirent, & ebrii de republicæ salute consulerent (12). --- The *Lex Fannia* proposed under the most sacred Emperor Augustus, was given to the people with the universal consent of all orders. Nor did the Prætors or Tribunes carry it through, as they usually do most others, but the consuls themselves by the general advice and concurrence; since the common-wealth received more damage than can be imagined, from the luxury of entertainments. For the thing was come to such a pass, that to gratify their palate, a great many sons of considerable families sold both their chastity and liberty; crowds of the Plebeians came drunk to the assemblies, and in that condition gave their opinions concerning the safety of the republic.' The succeeding ages which have seen at Rome the most horrid vices, have not seen drunkenness to reign there: at present it is a vice not known in that country; but as for the ancient Romans, they lived like our true northern nations. See the drunkenness of the deputies of a synod in the remark [A] of the article BERENGARIUS. For the rest, I am surprized that Corradus, who was so consummate in the History of particular persons, knew our Titius only by this passage of Cicero: he was ignorant of those of Macrobius. 'C. Titius, says he in page 282 of his commentary on Cicero's Bruto, de quo scriptum nihil nos præterea vidimus. --- Caius Titius, of whom we have never met with any farther account.'

(10) Apud Macrobius, lib. ii, Saturnal. cap. xii, pag. m. 366.

(11) In suasione legis Fanniae obicit Cincio suo quod percum Trojanum mensis interant: quem illi ideo sic vocabant, quasi aliis inclusis animalibus gravidum, ut ille Trojanus equus gravidus armatus fuit. Macrobius, ibid. cap. ix, pag. 356.

(12) Sammonicus Serenus, apud Macrobius, Saturnal. cap. xiii, pag. 367.

[D] The mistake of an interpreter of Horace. It is Corradus who takes notice of this blunder without telling us whole it is. 'Unde videtur interpres Horatii

who lived in the time of Augustus.

* rati deceptus, qui putavit eundem Titium fuisse
* pindarici fontis qui non expalluit haustus, & eum
* qui scripsit tragedias, quum hic multo ante florue-
* rit, & ille tempore Augusti vixerit: quamquam ille
* potuit etiam utrumque præstare. - - - From whence
* Horace's Commentator seems to be mistaken, who thought
* that Titius who was not afraid to take a draught of
* the Pindaric fountain, was one and the same with him
* who wrote Tragedies, since the latter lived long before,
* but the former in Augustus's time: altho' he himself
* was able to excel them both. Corradus seems to
doubt whether Horace's Titius was at the same time a
composer of Odes and Tragedies, though there does
not appear much foundation for doubt, when we read
these six verses of the third epistle of the first book of
Horace:

Quid Titius Romana brevi venturus in ora?
Pindarici fontis qui non expalluit haustus,
Fastidire lacus, & rivos ausus apertos.
Ut valet? ut meminit nostri? fidibus latinis
Thebanos aptare modos studet auspice musa?
An tragica defævit & ampullatur in arte?

And what doth Titius, he of growing fame,
Who doth not fear to drink of Pindar's stream?
Who scorns known springs and lakes, that glorious he,
And is he well, and doth he think of me?

Doth he the Muse propitious nobly sing,
And fit to Roman harps the Theban string?
Or is he writing plays and treads the stage,
In murr'ring verse, and fowells with tragic rage?

CREECH.

The ancient scholiast on Horace assures us that he here means Titius Septimius, who had written both Lyric verses and tragedies, and whose tomb was to be seen below Aricia. Mr Dacier, after several others, pretends that this Titius was the same Septimius, to whom Horace addressed the sixth Ode of his second book, and for whom he wrote the ninth epistle of his first book. This may be; but since he gives no reason for it, and two reasons seem to oppose this opinion, I shall remain a Sceptic on this subject. The sixth Ode of the second book contains twenty-four verses, not one word of which insinuates, that Septimius was a Poet; whereas all that concerns Titius in the third epistle of the first book relates to him as a Poet only. This is my first reason. The second is, that Titius, in Horace's third epistle, is one of the wits who accompanied Tiberius, and composed a society of learned men in his court: whereas in the ninth epistle, Septimius is one who desires Horace to introduce him to Tiberius. I can say nothing in particular against another notion of Mr Dacier: he would have Horace's Septimius, and the Septimius who so ardently loved Acme in the forty-sixth epigram of Catullus, to be the same person (13).

(13) Dacier, upon the sixth Ode of the second book of Horace.

TORELLI (POMPONIO) Count of Montechiarugolo, lived in the XVIth century. He was son of a daughter of John Francis Picus, Count of Mirandola, and a member of the academy of the *Innomati* at Parma, and had there the epithet of *il Perduto* (a). He wrote a book intituled *Trattato del Debito del Cavalliero*, a *Treatise on the Duty of a Knight*, in which he gives very useful instructions to those who have already attained the honour of knighthood. He chose this subject, because he had a son who was a Knight of Malta. He lost him while his book was in the press, as he informs us in the Epistle Dedicatory, dated at Parma the 15th of February 1596. He was vassal to the Duke of Parma Ranuccio Farnese, to whom he dedicated his treatise. He frequently cites the Poets both antient and modern, and always in Italian verse. His morality is good, and he enters into so particular a detail, that he gives even (b) rules concerning what the Italians call *motteggiare* (c). He is so zealous for his religion, that he cannot acknowledge him for a true knight, who is out of the Popish communion (d), and insists upon a knight's abandoning the service of his prince who is excommunicated by the Pope (e). He is of opinion that a Heretic is almost always guilty of some enormous crime, and he cites thereupon Pius V [A]. The difference which he puts between the antient and modern Poets requires some limitation [B].

(a) Pomponio Torelli, del Debito del Cavalliero, folio 143, edition of Venice, 1596, in 8vo.

(b) Id. ibid. folio 128, verso.

(c) That is, witty sayings.

(d) Ibid. fol. 25.

(e) Id. ibid.

[A] He is of opinion that a Heretic is almost always guilty of some enormous crime, and he cites thereupon Pius V.] There are some persecutors who do not carry their prejudices to so high a degree of injustice: for they acknowledge that there are some Arch-Heretics whose morals have been unexceptionable. Our Torelli is more rigid. *Gli Heretici*, says he, (1) *Cavallieri esse non ponno* in the printed copy to the words *Gli idolatri* exclusively. *Solea dire Pio V. di santissima* in the printed copy to the word (2) *Ma* exclusively.

(1) Torelli, del Debito del Cavalliero, fol. 21, verso.

(2) Id. ibid. folio 25.

[B] The difference which he puts between the antient and modern Poets requires some limitation.] Our Poetry, says he, is more modest than either the Greek or the Latin; our Poets who write love-verses imitate Ca-

tullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid, only in such things as are exempt from lasciviousness and obscenity. *Nella Lirica* (poesia) *è Italiana, è Francese, è Spagnuola si vede, che molto* in the printed copy to the words (3) *Non vollero gli esclusi*. As for Porta whom he reckons among the Poets who avoid obscenities, he is however very much decried on that account (4); but this is not my principal observation; I have a much more considerable thing to object. There were in the XVIth century, and even in the XVIIth, several famous Poets who wrote as wantonly as the antients (5); and consequently Torelli's proposition ought not to be understood without some limitations.

(3) Torelli, fol. 155, verso.

(4) See this article remark

(5) See the remark [D], of the article MOLSA, and the explanation concerning obscenities, num. ii. iii.

(a) La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. Franç. pag. 124.

(b) See La Caille, at page 76, of the Histoire de l'Imprimerie.

(c) La Croix du Maine, ubi supra.

TORI or THORI (JEFFERY) The King's Printer, and sworn Book-seller to the University of Paris (a) in the XVIth century, was of Bourges. He contributed greatly to the bringing the printing types to perfection (b); for he wrote a book intituled, *Le Champ Fleury, contenant l'Art & Science de la proportion des lettres Antiques, ou Antiques, & vulgairement appellées lettres Romaines, proportionnées selon le corps & visage humain* (c). The flowery field, containing the Art and Science of the proportion of Attic or antique letters, commonly called the Roman letters, according to the human body and face. He himself printed it at Paris in the year 1592 in 4to, and afterwards in 8vo (d). Claudius Garamont, who made punchions and prepared the moulds for the Roman capitals (e) was his disciple (f). We

(d) Id. ibid. Hist. de l'Imprimerie, pag. 445, off. firmes that the book was printed by Gien Garamont, in the year 1592, in fol. (e) La Caille, Hist. de l'Imprimerie, pag. 76. (f) Id. pag. 99.

We shall see below the titles of the other works of Jeffery Tori [A]. He had been *school-master in the College of Bourgogne at Paris* (g), and had taught Philosophy with applause (b). He died in the year 1550 (i). Some called him *the master of the broken pot, which was the sign of his house* (k). Others say that his mark was a *broken pot filled with all sorts of instruments, and that he added this motto round it, Non plus* (l). Francis I. gave him a licence to print the *Horæ, or Primer, in consideration of the ornaments and flourishes which he made use of* (m).

(g) La Croix du Maine, Bibl. Franç. pag. 124.

(b) La Caille, Hist. de l'Imprimerie, pag. 100.

(i) Id. pag. 99.

(k) La Croix du Maine, ubi supra.

(l) La Caille, ubi supra, pag. 98.

(m) Ibid. Note, that the Sieur la Caille says that this licence is dated on the 28th of September 1544. This cannot be true, since Francis I died in the year 1547.

(1) According to Du Verdier Vau Privas, it was at Paris, in 8vo, in the year 1530.

(2) Taken from La Croix du Maine, pag. 125.

(3) Du Verdier, Bibl. Franç. pag. 445.

[A] The titles of the other works of Jeffery Tori. He translated into French the Hieroglyphics of Orus Apollo: *Plutarch's Morals, printed at Lyons* (1) by William Bowle: *the Table of Cebes, and Thirty Dialogues of Lucian, printed at Paris by John Petit in the year 1529: John Baptist Egnatius's Summary of Chronicles, printed at Paris by himself, in the year 1529* (2), and by Charles l'Angelier in the year 1543 in 8vo (3). 'He procured an edition of Antoninus's *Itinerary, in red and black, by HENRY STE-*

*PHENS in 1512, with a Preface and Advertifement of his own. . . . He is also the Author of a book intitled, *Ædiloquium, seu Digesta* (4) *partibus ædium urbanarum & rusticarum suis quæque locis adscribenda. Allo Epitaphia septem de Amorum aliquot passionibus, printed by SIMON COLINÆUS in 8vo, in 1530* (5). Mr Catherinot observes that there was printed in 1530, *Distiques Latins de Geoffroy Tori de Bourges, sur les Maisons de Ville & de Campagne avec plusieurs Tombeaux en vieux Latin* (6).*

(4) It should be of his own.

(5) La Caille, Hist. de l'Imprimerie, pag. 98.

(6) Catherinot, Annales Typographiques de Bourges, pag. 3.

TORQUATO (ANTONY) a famous Astrologer of the XVth century, was born at Ferrara. He gave Matthias King of Hungary a prediction in the year 1480, which was very fatal to Christendom; for he threatened with an entire ruin the Ottoman empire after a fixed time, which caused the Hungarians to engage in a war (a) that ruined them (b). Some of the events he had foretold proved true; but the principal proved chimerical [A]. This hath not disgusted people against uttering or believing such prognostics. They have been so often reiterated, that I forgive an Italian Politician for believing that the Turks suborned this sort of people to publish these predictions [B] in order to lull the Christians asleep. However, I believe that these Infidels did not bethink themselves

(a) See the remark [A].

(b) See Leunclavius, in Historiæ Mulsanæ Appendice.

[A] The principal proved chimerical. The substance of this prediction was: The Turks shall make war upon the Christians, and lose great numbers of their troops (1). They will first attack the Venetians, and do them great mischief: After which they will make peace with that republic, and take Belgrade, and Rhodes, and lay Hungary waste. At last making many threats, lacking Hungary, and attacking the Roman empire, they will fall under the power of the Hungarians, about the year 1594, or 1595. But before this they will enter into Apulia, they will disturb and afflict Sicily, Italy, the coasts of France and Spain. Soon after which their emperor shall be killed in a battle; their monarchy shall be destroyed under the 13th or 14th of their chiefs; they shall not exceed that number, nor the year 1596. The Christians shall then become masters of that vast empire (2). Read the reflexion made on this by a Doctor of Divinity of the Faculty of Paris. 'Non est vel

(1) Turci magna strage suorum in Christianos arma movebunt. See Filescus, de Idolatriâ magica, fol. 33, verso.

(2) See Filescus, ibid. & fol. 34, ex Leunclavius in Historiæ Mulsanæ Appendice, pag. Epistolæ.

(3) Filescus, ibid. fol. 34.

'hujus loci, vel mei otii Historias retexere, quibus multa quæ hic exprimentur, evenisse intelligamus, fati sit expendisse corollarium hujus prædictionis quàm varium sit, quàm falsum, quàm ridiculum, de Imperio Turcico funditus everto, ad annum Christi 1596, cum hoc anno 1608, tam florens & potens, magno quidem Christiani nominis malo, cernamus, quàm antea extiterit, nec ulla parte, aut hiare, aut nutare, aut inclinare, tanti Imperii moles perspicatur: nec in quarto decimo Imperatore Osmanida seriem Sultanorum & Principum suorum defecisse videamus, cum Sultanus Muhamet Cham, tertius hujus nominis, sit decimus quintus Osmanidarum Principum, à primò illo Osmano Sultano. Magnò certè constitit Hungaris hæc prædictio, cui cum stolidè inniterentur, motumque maximum sub Sultano Soleimanno in Hungaria excitassent, ab eo magna clade affecti, suæ credulitatis vesanz poenas non minimas dederunt, quemadmodum narrat Leunclavius histor. Mulsanæ lib. 18. (3). . . . This is not a proper place, nor have I leisure to recollect passages of History, by which it might appear that many things came to pass which are expressed in this prediction: Let it suffice to examine the corollary of it, and observe how various, how false and ridiculous it is, that the Turkish empire should be utterly destroyed about the year 1596: Whereas in this present year 1608, we behold it as flourishing and potent as ever, to the great detriment of the Christian name: Nor is there any part of that vast empire which seems to be either in a disjointed, or tottering, or declining condition; and we see the series of their sultans and princes continued down without failing

'in the fourteenth emperor descended from Osman: The Sultan Mahomet Cham, the third of that name, being the fifteenth prince descended from the first Sultan Osman. This prediction cost the Hungarians very dear; for having foolishly relied upon it, and raised a great commotion in Hungary under the Sultan Soliman, they were overthrown by him, and severely chastised for their mad credulity; as Leunclavius relates in his History of the Turks.

[B] I forgive an Italian Politician, for believing that the Turks suborned some people to publish these predictions. What this Italian Politician saith on this head seems to me worth copying. But we ought to remember that when this was written, the Turks were more potent than they have been since the siege of Vienna, in the year 1683. 'Molte predizioni d'Astrologi, oltre à molte profetie, secondo, che si dice, vi sono, & se ne leggono ogni dì, con le quali vien minacciata la, distruzione del Regno, & Imperio Turcheco, & ogni tanti anni pare, che si vadano rinnovando cotali credenze, senza vederene l'effetto. Hora io m'auviso, che non darebbe molto lontano dal segno, uno, che dicesse ciò esser' intentione de' medesimi Turchi, o di qualche Cristiano rinnegato; per addormentar gli animi de' Principi Christiani, con questo sonnifero, & rendergli negligenti, à pensar d'offendergli, con la speranza di dover veder, che il tempo debba esser quello, che trionfi di così fatto nemico: & non è dubbio, che Principi Cattolici, ricercati à colligarli contro il Turco, hanno dato per risposta, che egli era meglio star à veder quel che partorirebbe il tempo, parendo impossibile, che signoria così violenta, debba esser di lunga durata. Et per non parere di dire cose del tutto à vento, certo è, che per accelerar la morte di qualche Imperadore Romano, si serviva alcuno di sparger voci, che le stelle promettevano il principato à tal' uno, che essi conoscevano atto à dover, con sì fatto pretesto, insurgere contro al dominante, & accelerar' à se stessi la successione, con l'accelerazione della morte di lui. Onde al contrario potrebbe pur essere, che tra Turchi per diuturnar' il loro Imperio, si diffamassero queste decerie, della sua piccola durata, per indurre altri ad aspettar, che illo pronostico si verificasse, senza venir' all' atto d'offenderlo, armata mano; Il che farebbe un fottile, ma non impossibile stratagemma (4). . . . We daily read many predictions of Astrologers and many prophecies, which threaten the destruction of the Turkish empire: and we see these prophecies and predictions renewed from year to year, without ever being accomplished. Now I think that a

(4) Bonifazio Vannozzi, della suppellettile degli Avvertimenti Politici, Volume primo, pag. 97. man would not be far from the truth, who should say Bologna, 1609. that

TORQUATO. TORTELLIUS. TOUCHET.

themselves of this stratagem. There would be no great craft in it, for nothing more animates men to arm against a monarch, than a belief that it is written in the destinies that he shall be very soon destroyed.

that they were intended by the Turks themselves, or by some Christian renegade, as a soporific, to lay asleep the minds of Christian princes, and make them remiss in attacking the Turks, in hopes that at the time predicted they should triumph over such an enemy. There is no question but that the Catholic princes being required to enter into a league against the Turks, have answered, that it was better to wait for what time should bring forth, it appearing impossible that so unnatural a government could be of long continuance. And that I may not be thought to speak at random, this is certain, that in order to hasten the death of a Roman Emperor, a certain person set about a report that the stars promised the empire to such a one, who was ready under such a pretence to raise insurrections against the emperor and hasten the succession to himself, by hastening the emperor's death. Thus, on the contrary, it might be true, that the Turks to perpetuate their empire, spread about these surmises concerning the short continuance of it, in order to induce the Christians to wait for the accomplishment of that prognostic, and not to attack them with an armed force. This would be a subtle, but not an impossible stratagem.* This may serve as a supplement to the remark [GG] of the article MAHOMET. I daily discover fresh matter to en-

large it, as it generally consists of gross errors. Here is an instance of it. A Father of the Oratory relates, that on certain days of the year, the Turks solemnly curse the Christians. They read in their mosques a prophecy of the destruction of the Ottoman empire by the Franks, after it has continued ten ages (5). During the reading of this prophecy the women cry dismally, and sweep the altars with their dishevelled hair. They imagine that this ceremony will avert the impending fate with which they are threatened. This Father of the Oratory doth not affirm this of his own knowledge, but on the credit of one of his friends. *Vias Massiliensis Poeta* (6) *mibi creditur* valde bonus, says he (6), *mibi olim cum Massiliæ Rhetoricæ professor multum familiaris, in suis ad Sylvas* (7) *notis, morem refert Turcarum cum illi Christianos, quos perdite oderunt, ultrò statim diebus deestantur. Habent, inquit ille, Turcæ inter suos fastos prophetiam, per id tantum tempus, M. scilicet annos, Ottomanorum permanurum, mox subvertendum à Francis. Legitur illa quotannis suis in Mosquetis, ut illius omnis terrore ultrò Christianis adversentur. Lugent invicem ululantes feminæ, sparsisque comis infanda verrunt altaria: sicque huic malo fato procurare credunt, dum tam funesto vaticinio perterrentur.*

(5) This prediction does not concern the Turkish empire, but the Mahomedan religion. If it concerned the Turks, they would be a little too hasty; their monarchy would be very far from its destruction.

(6) Petrus Bartholæus, *Libro singulari de Ars. cap. xv, pag. 181, 182, Edit. Nemesii, 1636.*

(7) They are Statius's *Silvæ*, upon which *Vias*, a Poet of Provence, praised by Gellius, in *Vita Persii*, made loose notes.

TORTELLIUS (JOHN). See ARETIN (JOHN).

TOUCHET (MARY), mistress to Charles IX, King of France, was a native of Orleans. What is affirmed by so many authors is not true; viz. That she was an Apothecary's daughter [A]. Charles IX had children by her (a), and afterwards she was married to a person of quality. I believe she was not married to him till after the death of that monarch [B]. She had two daughters lawfully begotten, who followed her example; one was concubine to Henry IV, and the other to the Marshal de Bassompierre

(a) See the remark [F].

[A] It is not true that she was an Apothecary's daughter. She is obliged to Brantome for this origin, whom I shall cite below. Papyrius Masso seems to make her of a meaner descent, for one would think by what he says, that she was a Perfumer's daughter (1), *Amavit Mariam Touchetiam Aurelianensis Unguentarii* (2) *filiam*. Others say, she was a Scrivener's daughter; but it is certain that she was better descended, as Mr le Laboureur shews. John Touchet, her father, saith he (3), took the title of Sieur de Beauvais and du Quillart, Counsellor to the king, and Lieutenant-particular of the bailiwick and presidial court of Orleans. He was the son of Peter Touchet, a citizen of Orleans, and grandson of John Touchet, Advocate and Counsellor at Orleans, in the year 1492, whose father was Regnaud Touchet, a Merchant of the town of Parthai en Beaufle. And all that could be said against this lady's birth was, that her mother was Mary Mathy, the natural daughter of Orable Mathy, a Dutchman, and one of the king's Physicians, who to obtain this alliance, gave two thousand crowns with her, which was then a considerable sum.

An error about the family of Madame de la Valiere.

Men commonly fall into two sorts of extremes concerning those whom providence hath very much exalted above their birth. Some by fabulous genealogies furnish them with ancestors of the first quality; others debase them to a much meaner extraction than their true one; either to indulge envy and calumny, or to represent the aggrandizing of their fortune as something stupendous and more proper for exclamations. The Historian of the *Amours du Palais Royal*, hath degraded the nobility of Madame de la Valiere, in making her a mean citizen of Tours. Yet (4) she was of a family related to that of Beauvau-le-Rivau, one of the most noble of the country; and about an hundred years ago, one Lord de la Valiere married a lady who had been maid of honour to Queen Louise, consort to Henry III. Which doubtless he had never done, if he had not been a gentleman. We shall shew in their places, that slanders of this nature were raised against Albert de Gondi, first Duke of Retz, against

Cardinal de Pellevé, the Constable de Luynes, Cardinal Mazarine, &c.

[B] That she did not marry him till after the death of Charles IX. Mezerai knew very well that Mary Touchet's father was Lieutenant-particular of the presidial of Orleans; but I somewhat doubt what he adds, that Charles IX married this mistress to Francis Balzac d'Entragues, governor of Orleans (5). I pass over in silence that this Francis Balzac was not governor of Orleans, till several intrigues had occasioned the Chancellor de Chiverni's losing that government in the year 1588, before which he was only lieutenant of that city (6); I say only that his marriage with Mary Touchet, seems to be posterior to the death of Charles IX. And this is all I can say at present, not being in a place where I can consult the genealogy of this house, nor having yet in my possession such books as are capable of affording an entire certainty. But considering on one side what Papyrius Masso says, that King Charles, on his death-bed, durst not himself commend his mistress to the queen his mother, but did it by the mediation of Charles de Gondi (7); and on the other side, what Mr le Laboureur tells us (8), that we ought not to be surprized, that Mary Touchet found so good a match after so great a figure she had made at court, where she maintained her rank as well as any of the ladies of the first quality (9). Considering, I say, these two things, I cannot think she was married to the Lord d'Entragues in the life time of Charles IX. For if so, it would have been unnecessary for that prince to cause her to be recommended to Catherine de Medicis, (such an husband being a sufficient protector) and one could not apprehend why Mr le Laboureur offers so many reasons why we should not be surprized at the marriage of Francis de Balzac with Mary Touchet, without mentioning the chief, which must have been the great favours bestowed by a living king upon his mistress's husband. This author observes, that she was equally incomparable for wit and beauty, and that the anagram made on her name, *Maria Touchet, Je charme tout, (I charm all)* was very just. He saith also that Mr d'Entragues became

(5) Mezer. *Ab. Chronolog. Tom. v, pag. 184.*

(6) Thuan. *Hist. lib. xvi.*

(7) Brantome relates the thing somewhat differently. Being a dying, says he, he ordered Mr de la Tour to remember him to her (his mistress) and never durst speak of her to the queen his mother.

(8) Le Laboureur, *ubi supra.*

(9) He had said, pag. 70. That she had no less ambition and dexterity than the Duchesse of Etampes, and the Duchesse of Valentinois, and that she maintained her rank so well, that all the glory, and all the artifices of Queen Catherine, could not put her out of countenance.

pierre [C]. The reason she stabbed a page, according to some authors, is somewhat curious [D]. What she said, as she viewed the picture of the princefs, whom Charles IX

was

became so enamoured of her, that he was called in derision, *d'Entragues Touchet, Duke of Orleans*, in a libel intitled, *The king's edict disguised* (10), written in the year 1586, against certain sparks called Bourbons, and some stupid fops, and German drunkards.

(10) By way of allusion to the Duke of Guise.

[C] One was concubine to Henry IV, and the other to the Marfhal de Bassompierre. If the fact which I relate in the remark [D] is true, Henry IV might have been deceived; for perhaps the girl that was ravished might be the very lady d'Entragues, who so much valued the present of her virginity to this prince. A particular relation of her subtilties and cajoling is to be seen in Sulli's Memoirs, and Perefixe's History. The hundred thousand crowns with which the king presented her, were not a shower of gold sufficient to introduce him into her lap, and put an end to her artifices by which she disputed the ground. He must at last be forced to promise her marriage, to remove the difficulties and oppositions of the father and mother, which the daughter seasonably caused to intervene, and which she declared were not to be surmounted, unless these good people were brought over to such a nice point, by this promise satisfying their consciences towards God, and sheltering their honour from the malicious world. This fair one so artfully represented to her lover (11), *That he ought not to make any difficulty to satisfy their desire, since it was only that he should give her a small bit of paper* (12) in exchange for what to her was the most valuable thing in the world; that he obliged himself under his band to marry her within a year, provided, within the compass of that time she brought him a male-child. If the adventure mentioned by St Romuald, was meant of this lady, what vast expences and earnest pursuits was a great monarch put to, in order to enjoy a page's leavings!

(11) Perefixe, Vie de Henri IV, in the year 1600, where it is mistaken by one year; for it was in the summer, of the year 1599, that the king engaged her. See Bassompierre's Journal, Tom. i, pag. 58.

(12) It must be observed that the king, never to make use of that promise, there being besides no official sufficient to summon such a monarch to appear, and that it should be with all the conditions she knew were desired by him. Memoirs de Sulli, Tom. ii, pag. 247, 248, Duich Edit. 1652, in 12mo.

(13) See the remark [D].

(14) I have said above remark [A], that Mary Touchet's mother was a bastard.

(15) Catherine Henrietta de Balzac, Marchioness of Verneuil, who died in 1633, being in her 54th year, according to Father Anselme; from hence it would follow, that Mr de Perefixe should have allowed her more than 18 years, in the year 1600.

(16) Journal of his Life, Tom. i, pag. 152.

(17) Mary de Balzac, whom he only calls d'Entragues, by whom he had the Bishop of Xaintes, who died in 1676.

Mr de Rofini, the most zealous man in the world for the true interests of this prince, was not contented with tearing this promise of marriage when the king shewed it him; but he endeavoured to cure that prince, by urging to him more suspicions concerning the lady's virtue, than he seemed to entertain of it. It is true, that monarch told this favourite, that he fatigued himself in quest of a maidenhead, which perhaps he should not find. But the other talked much more suspiciously of her honour. 'If you remember, says he, what you have formerly said to me concerning this lady and her brother, in the Duche's time, how freely you then talked of them, and the commands which you obliged me to carry to that baggage, (for you then called the house and family of Mr and Madam d'Antragues) to leave Paris, you will be apt to doubt more than at present you do, whether you will ever find what you expect.' See Sulli's Memoirs, pag. 248, and 253, tome 2. of the Dutch edition, 1652 in 12mo.

However, from all this we learn, that this lady was more tender of her daughter's honour than she had been of her own. The punishment of the page (13), if true, is a proof of it, for she would not probably have been guilty of a murder on that account, if she had been treated in the same manner before. We may further observe how conscientious a mother she was, and how cautious with respect to the world, when her daughter was concerned, but she had not been so in her own case with regard to Charles IX. Yet her care was ineffectual: for as she trod in the steps of her grand-mother (14), so did her daughters in hers. One of them (15) furnished a natural race to Henry IV, as the other did to Marfhal Bassompierre. Let us hear the marfhal himself on this head. 'I returned to Paris, says he (16), to see my mistress (17) in the Coutellerie-street, where her lodging was, in which I had a private passage to the third story which her mother did not rent; and she came to me by a private stair-case of the wardrobe when her mother was asleep.' A little after he hints somewhat from whence one might infer, that Henry IV would have made no conscience of enjoying both sisters, which is that his prince was his rival. He informs us of another thing which confirms my last remark concerning Mary Touchet. 'By misfortune, saith he, the mother had notice of it,

and kept the stricter guard. One morning, going to spit, and lifting up the curtain of her bed, she saw that of her daughter's uncovered, and observing that she was missing, she rose very softly, and went up into the wardrobe, where she discovered that the door of our private stair-case was open, which she thought had been nailed up. This made her shriek out, and her daughter at her voice immediately ran to her. I in the mean time shut the door, and marched off in pain to know the event of this affair, which was that her mother beat her, and caused the door of the chamber, in the third story, where we were in the night, to be broke open, which she was surprized to find hung with velvet, and splendidly furnished with candlesticks and other utensils of silver, as well as all other rich furniture. Then all our conversation was broke off; but I accommodated the matter with her mother, by means of a young gentlewoman named d'Azi (18), at whose house I saw her, and asked her a thousand pardons, protesting that nothing had passed beyond kissing, which she pretended to believe (19). He was not long deprived of this lady's conversation, for after some months Madam d'Entragues being gone to court, he says (20), he passed his time very well with her daughter, and with others also. The young lady proved with child four years after, and being turned out of doors by her mother, she desired her lover to give her a promise of marriage to appease her mother, offering at the same time all the counter-promises which he could desire, urging that she begged this only, that she might lie-in quietly, and enjoy the benefit of her mother's affluence (21). She obtained her request, and was so good natured as not to fail in her counter-promise.

(18) Perhaps the same, whom he calls d'Achy, pag. 173, proper names being very much confounded in this Journal.

(19) Journal de Bassompierre, ibid. pag. 157, ad ann. 1606.

(20) Ibid. pag. 165.

(21) Ibid. pag. 261.

There goes a story which I shall here relate. That Marfhal taking the air in a coach with the Queen, when there was a great number of coaches in the ring, it happened that Madam d'Entragues's coach was obliged to stop for some time very near that of the Queen, by reason of the crowd. The Queen looking upon the Marfhal, *There is*, said she, *Madam de Bassompierre*. That is only her nick-name, replied he, loud enough to be heard by his old mistress: upon which she cried out, *You are a fool, Bassompierre: Not enough to marry your ladyship*, replied he; and then the coaches began to move. As this Marfhal had a vast number of amours, I cannot tell whether this other story in Mr Menage relates to another, or the same mistress: 'Marfhal Bassompierre's coach being entangled with that of a lady whom he had loved, and on whom he had spent vast sums, she said aloud; Is it you, Marfhal, from whom I have plucked so many feathers? It is true, Madam, replied he, but they were only the feathers of my tail, and my flight is not thereby hindered (22).'

(22) Suite du Menage, pag. 374, Dutch Edit.

[D] The reason why she stabbed a page, is somewhat curious. I shall here repeat, without the least alteration, what I have said in the project of this Dictionary. Dom Peter de St Romuald agrees in chronology with de Mezarai, as to the marriage of Mary Touchet (23); for he places it in 1572. His Printer was a perfect murderer of proper names, after the example of several of his brethren. The passage contains an action so particular, that it deserves to be set down entire. ' (24) It was about that time (25) that Francis de Bassac, Lord of Entragues-Marcouffe (26), governor of Orleans, married, for his second wife, Mary Touchet, an Apothecary's daughter in that city, equally remarkable for wit and beauty, by whom King Charles IX had had a son, afterwards called the Count d'Auvergne. An action as strange as bold is told of her, which she did to one of her husband's pages, who had ravished one of her daughters, very young and beautiful, in a summer-house in the garden, instigated by a mad fit of love. This wretch she stabbed upon the spot, depriving him of life, who had robbed her daughter of her honour. I wish that this honest Monk, who hath heaped up so many events of all sorts, but not without being liable to some suspicion, had told us where he had this; for I would not advise the reader to believe him upon his bare word.

(23) See the remark [F], towards the end.

(24) Pierre de St Romuald, abridgment of the third Tome of his Threſor Chronol. & Histor. pag. m. 348, ad ann. 1572.

(25) That is, the Paris Mafſacre.

(26) It should be Balzac, Lord of Entragues and Marcouffe.

[E] What

was to marry, deserves to be known [E]. I take this occasion to observe, that those who tell us that this king was no lover of women, have not looked narrowly into the matter [F]. It ought not to be thought strange that I should bestow some articles on such

[E] *What she said, as she viewed the picture of the Princess . . . deserves to be known.* She eagerly aimed at the possession of King Charles's heart, to the prejudice of his consort. She was very curious, when the treaty of marriage with Elizabeth of Austria was on foot, in examining the picture of that princess, and having very well considered it, she only said, *I am not afraid of her.* Insinuating by that, as Brantome faith (27), *her person and beauty, that*

(27) Brant.
Discours sur
Charles IX.

(28) Inspecta Isabella Reginae, quae recens in Galliam venerat, pictura, risisse dicitur, addito verbo nihil me terret Germana.

(29) Du Pleix,
Hist. de Henri
IV. pag. 262.

(30) D'Aubigné,
Tom. iii, p. 637.

ber. Infatuating by that, as Brantome says, *that she was presumed to much on her person and beauty, that she believed the king could not leave her*. Pappyrus Massio tells us, that when she examined the picture, and said, *smilingly, I am not afraid of that German lady, the queen was then arrived* (28); but it is not at all probable that Mary Touchet should have staid so long before she saw the Queen's picture; and Brantome's relation seems therefore more likely, with regard to the circumstance of time. Gabrielle d'Étrecé soon saw the pictures of the Infanta of Spain, and of Mary de Medicis, when there was a report of their marriage with Henry IV; they pretend she said, that she had no apprehension of the brown Spaniard, but very much feared the Florentine (29). We have this from an Historian, who affirmeth that he heard it himself. I remember, saith he (30), *that the King having intrusted to my keeping the pictures of these two Princesses, permitted me to shew them to the Duchess, and observe what she would say; whicb was, I am not afraid of that black woman, but she other gives me some apprehensions*.

[F] Those who tell us that this king was no lover of women, have not looked narrowly into the matter.] Those Historians who have most freely spoken of his ill qualities, say that he was not very irregular with regard to women. Some had endeavoured to throw him into debaucheries, both as to women and wine; but once perceiving that wine disturbed his reason, so much that it made him commit several violences, he abstained from it the whole remainder of his life: and as for women, being ill served by one of those about his mother's person, he took an aversion to the sex, and scarce ever was intimate with any of them again. So Mr Mezerai expresses himself, without observing the rule of the Gram-

(31) Mezerai,
Abrégé Chron.
Tom. v, pag.
183.

(32) See the pieces at the end of Balzac's *Socrate Gbretien*.

(33) Brantome,
ubi supra.

himself (31), without observing the rule of the dramatica-
 marian, who censured the placing of the expressions *a*
 in Voiture's famous sonnet, where the last imported
 much less than the first, *I bless my torment, and content*
to die, dare not complain of her tyranny (32). Brantome
 says, that this Prince did not at first appear very fond of
 the fair sex, and that the reproaches of the ladies animated
 him. 'I remember, *saieth he* (33), that in his briefest
 'age of seventeen or eighteen years, being once
 'violently tormented with the tooth-ach, and the
 'Physician's remedies proving ineffectual, a great lady
 'at court, and who belonged to him, gave him a
 'receipt, which she had often experienced herself, and
 'found very good ; but it did him no good, and
 'next day the asking him how he found himself ; he
 'answered, not well at all ; and she replied, *I am not*
surprized at it, Sir, since you neither love, nor trust
the women, but prefer hunting and dogs to all of us.
'Wherefore, said he, have you that opinion of me, that
I love the exercise of hunting better than your's ? By
G . . . , if you provoke me once, I shall join you so close,
that I shall throw you all on your backs one after an-
other. He was not as good as his word with regard
 'to ALL, but he attacked some of them, rather on
 'account of his reputation, than to gratify his laci-
 'viousness, and that very coolly too, and chose for his
 'mistress a lady of a very good family, and whom I
 'shall not name. She was a very beautiful, discreet,
 'and virtuous lady, whom he treated with all possible
 'honour and respect, and more, said he, to form an
 'agreeable air than for any other end ; nothing, said
 'he, contributing more to polish a young man, than
 'a love fixed on a fine and noble subject. He always
 'loved this virtuous lady to his death, even when he
 'had his Queen Elizabeth, a very agreeable and
 'charming person. He also was very fond of Mary
 'Jascoffe, otherwise called TOUCHET, an Apothe-
 'cary's daughter of Orleans, and a most beautiful
 'creature, by whom he had the Grand-Prior, at pre-

sent called the Count d'Auvergne : ' Here are three mistresses (34), besides a wife : for we ought not to confound her that Mr Mezerai faith served the king ill, with her whom Brantome would not name, and whom this prince loved as long as he lived. When therefore we consider that he died before he was quite twenty-four years of age, and after a long sickness, and that history lays to him two natural sons (35) : I cannot see on what that aversion is grounded, which Mr Mezerai ascribes to him. What would he have him do more ? He wanted, it seems, a great deal to fix the character of debauchery on the lives of people. It is, indeed, true, that in comparison of the horrible corruption of the court of France at that time, Charles IX might pass for a sort of a moderate man in that respect. This Historian mentions but one son of Charles IX by Mary Touchet, and tells us that he was born in 1572, and that he was first Grand-Prior of France, then Count d'Auvergne and Lauragais ; and afterwards Duke of Angoulême (36), and Count de Pontieu. Father Anselme differs from this chronology, and says he was born (37) at the castle of Fayet in Dauphiné, near Montmelian, the 28th of April 1573. I cannot clearly account to my readers why this lady should be sent so far from the court, and her own country, to lie-in. This was not her first child ; the high rank of the father took off the disgrace, and nothing could engage her to affect privacy, when upon such an occasion, a journey may seem necessary to conceal the thing, and to discharge the birth unknown to the world.

unknown to the world.

If what Brantome relates, without believing it, was true, we ought not to entertain a great opinion of Mezerai's Memoirs, as to the aversion which he ascribes to that Prince. *Some say (they are Brantome's words) that during his illness he ran to the Queen, and so heated himself that he shortned his days, which gave occasion to the saying, that Venus killed him with Diana, which I cannot believe, for this was never talked of at court amongst those that were most worthy of credit, for I was there.* What he saith of Venus and Diana, is an allusion to the two verses which he had already cited, and were a kind of epitaph on Charles IX.

Pour aimer trop Diane & Cythérée auffi,
L'une & l'autre m'ont mis en ce tombeau icy.

*Too much I Venus and Diana sought,
And therefore to my grave by them am brought.*

Papyrius Masso, who wrote an abridgment of this prince's life a year after his death, relates an event, perhaps, no truer than this, but at least more probable. He saith the king, in his long illness, once went to see his mistress Mary Touchet, and it was conjectured, that by diverting himself with her at an improper time, or to excess, he increased his distemper and hastened his death. *Sane Rex ipse inter moras longissimi morbi semel ad eam divertit, suspicioque est animum morbum ex importuno aut immo dico coitus & acceleratum vitæ finem* (38). Mr Le Laboureur (39) hath ill translated these words thus : *Also the king, once, during his tedious distemper, going to see her, it is taken for certain, that on account of not being in a condition to approach her, or being guilty of some excess, his disease increased, and this visit hastened his days*. Not to take notice that he delivers that as a certainty, which amounts only to a suspicion in the Latin, I am apt to think that there are scarce any readers who by these words, *on account of not being in a condition*, would not imagine something else than the Historian intended to say ; some accident like that which Mr Rabutin imitates out of Petronius (40). Mr Varillas has not failed to adopt this passage of Papyrius Masso. ' The king was dangerously ill, *saith he* (41), and those who knew him intimately, whispered two causes of it. The first was his hasty journey from Paris to Orleans to visit the beautiful Mary Touchet, his mistress ; and the second the poison which they pretended was given

PAPYRIUS
Masso ill translated
by Le Laboureur.
Varillas criticised.
(38) Papyr. *Maf-*
ratum *vitæ finem* (38).
(39) Mr Le Laboureur (39) hath ill translated these words thus :
(40) Petronius, *Tom.*
ii, page 179.
(41) In the Histoire anecdotée des Gaulois.
Ovid, *Annot. lib. iii, Eleg. vii, deservit* *ipse* *an accident at large*.
(41) Varillas, *Hist. de Charl. IX, Tom. ii, page 365*.
Edir, 1684.
him

(34) Le Laboureur, additions to Castelnau's *Mémoires*, *Tom. ii*, mentions a letter, where it is said that Charles IX was in love with the wife of the Sieur de la Tour. See the last paragraph but one of this remark.

(35) *Father Anselme, Hist. Générale, de France, pag. 146, does not say whether they had both the same mother: But Papyrus Massa mentions two, whom he had by Mary Touchet.*

der (36) The last
nd Dukes of Angou-
irst leme are descend-
dis- ed from him.
He died at Paris
, as the 24th of Sep-
ref- tember, 1650.

(37) Hist. Gé-
néalog. p. 173

this PAPHRIUS
 vent, Massillon translat-
 pro- ed by le Laboureur.
 Varillas criticized

ath ill (38) Papyr. Ma
during lo, in Vita Ca
coli IX.

(39) Addit. à
Castelnau, Tom
ii. pag. 819.

(40) *In the*
faire amoureux
des Gaules.
Ovid, *Amor.*
lib. iii, Eleg.
vii, describes
an accident a
large.

(41) Varillas
Hitt. de Ch
IX, Tom. i
pag. 365; L
Edit. 1684.

such women as these are [G].

(42) Brantome makes him master of the Wardrobe; Papyrius Maffio calls him *Carolum Gondium Cubicularium*. The Journal of Henry III, makes him master of the Wardrobe, and places his death on the 15th of June 1574, and attributes it to another cause.

him by his steward (42) la Tour, younger brother to the Marfhal de Retz and the Bishop of Paris. The extraordinary vigour of this prince seemed to surmount his sickness, and the apprehension which la Tour had conceived of the report spread concerning him, threw him into a phrenzy, which occasioned his death soon after. Mr Varillas only cites Papyrius Maffio.

This gives me occasion to make some remarks; for, I. The author to whom Mr Varillas refers us, doth not say that Charles IX was obliged to take a journey to Orleans to see Mary Touchet; and there is very little reason to believe that he should keep so far from the king, since she was his public mistress, and had had children by him. In the second place, it is false that Maffio charges this poisoning on la Tour; on the contrary, he makes him die of a distemper occasioned by his grief, for having lost, with Charles IX, the hopes of a vast fortune. I do not deny that la Tour was accused of this wicked act by others; but he ought then to have referred us somewhere else than to Papyrius Maffio's eulogy. Mr le Laboureur hath inserted, in his additions to Castelnau's Memoirs, page 462 of the second tome, a satirical letter, in which Catherine de Medicis is reproached for having caused Charles IX to be poisoned by the Sieur de la Tour, and afterwards la Tour by another. 'Your majesty contrived it so, says the author of this letter, that the late Sieur de la Tour was made to understand, either by you, or by your appointment, that the late king your son designed to kill him, that he might the more easily enjoy his wife; which the said la Tour was readily induced to believe, because he very well knew that the late king passionately loved her, and was, on that account, without difficulty, engaged to poison his said majesty, &c.' This letter is dated at Laufanne, the third month of the fourth year after the treachery, (that is, the Paris massacre) and is signed *Grandchamp*, who was a gentleman of Nivernois, who had been ambassador at Constantinople, and engaged in the intrigues of la Mole and Coconnas. In the third place, it is impossible to guess, from Mr Varillas's words, whether la Tour died before or after the king; but we should be more apt to conclude it was before than after: nevertheless he died after this prince, either of regret, or poison, or fear, or some other way.

Here is a particular which is not dishonourable to Charles IX. 'That prince one day walking in the Tuilleries, and seeing a charming fine woman, stark-naked, swim over the river from the Louvre to St Germain, stopped to observe her; but whilst his eyes, as well as those of the rest of the court, were fixed on the beautiful object, she dived out of sight, and at last rising to the surface of the water, as swift as lightning, flew ashore, began to wring her hair and do what Antipater says of Venus:

Voy n'agueres Venus hors de la mer fortant,
Ouvrage d'Apelles, entre ses mains tenant
Ses moettes cheveux; elle faict de sa tresse
Humide l'espraignant, fortir l'escume espaissie.

*Fair Venus, whom Apelles drew,
Arising from the seas,
Her wat'ry locks holds in her hands,
And thence thick foam does squeeze.*

'After which she retired, carrying with her the eyes and hearts of all the company. Nevertheless though the thing was diverting enough, it appeared so odd and strange to the king, that he was not heard to say one word in her praise, tho' he heard the greatest part of his retinue, and even the most relieved, loudly express their admiration (43).

[G] *It ought not to be thought strange that I should bestow some articles on such women as these are.* The beginning of this article in my Project contains these words: 'Dictionaries ought not to omit persons of this class: the figure which they make in the world, is high enough to place them there, and doubtless such a work as Mr Colomies promised (44) and designed to intitle, *Cupid on the throne, or the History of the Amours of our Kings since Dagobert*, would be very curious.' Since the impression of the Project, a book has appeared which carries the subject higher than Colomies designed it, and begins with Pharamond. I should rather choose Colomies's performance than this. Colomies would have said nothing but what he had taken from some book, he would have consulted scarce books, and always have named his vouchers. But this anonymous author who hath given us the History of the galantries of the Kings of France, from the beginning of the monarchy to Lewis XIV, hath cited no authors, and has not at all prevented our suspecting his book as a Romance. The first edition is better than the following ones: it is more natural and less clogged, and looks more like a History. I happened one day to praise it upon that account before the Bookfeller who printed it. But he very freely answered that he had found by the title of the book that it was the greatest fault in the work, and that it would be supplied in the second edition. The public did not find (said he) a sufficient number of intrigues and surprizing adventures in that piece, we shall insert enough of them to satisfy the reader. After this I distrust that performance more than before. There are several things in it concerning Mary Touchet which I have refuted, or have not related, not being sure that they are not the author's invention; as I judge concerning the dozen of cut-purses whom he has introduced, that the King might see the love-letter which his mistress had received from another galant, the Bishop of Valence's brother (45).

(43) Peter de Lancre, Counsellor of the Parliament of Bourdeaux, *Ta-blas de l'incroyance & infamie de toutes choses*, fol. 52, verso.

(44) Colomies, Gallia Orient. pag. 67.

(45) See the *Intrigues Galantes de la Cour de France*, Tom. I, pag. 234, Dutch Edit. 1695.

TOULOUSE, a city of France on the river Garonne, being one of the largest and most ancient cities of the west, and the seat of the second parliament of the kings dom, deserves a very long article; but Mr Moreri and the Author of his Supplement having described it at large, I shall not dwell upon it. I shall only say that its consuls bear the title of Capitouls, and become noble by virtue of their office. Mr de la Faille published an excellent dissertation on this subject (a), when a search was made after the false pretenders to nobility (b). The world impatiently expects the continuation of the Annals of Toulouse, which that illustrious Writer hath composed (c). This city which hath always abounded with learned men (d), and does still as much as ever (e), did very well deserve the establishment [A] of the Academy of the *Belles Lettres* erected there.

(c) Mr de Beauval spoke of the first volume of those Annals, September 1688, pag. 3, & seq. See also the *Journal des Savans*, of the 19th of April, 1688. (d) See Balzac, in the last page of his *Oeuvres diverses*, and *Sarberiana*, at the word *Toulouze*. (e) The Paris stage and the French academy may witness it.

(1) Intendant of Languedoc.

(2) I wrote this in 1696, since which time this Advocate-General is become President au Mortier, in the Parliament of Paris.

[A] *The establishment of the Academy of the Belles Lettres erected there.* Mr de Bafville (1), who in the Provinces over which he has been appointed intendant has shewn himself a son worthy of his illustrious father the President de Lamoignon, whilst his brother the Advocate-General (2) shews himself worthy of the same honour in the parliament of Paris, contributed very much to this new establishment. He resolved to change the *Floral Games of Toulouse* into an Academy of

V O L. V.

the Belles Lettres (3). The society of the Floral Games alarmed at this design, published some memoirs to engage the city to let things remain in their present posture. These memoirs were refuted; the uselessness of those games was shewn, and the necessity of establishing an Academy for the Belles Lettres in Toulouse was urged, that the happy genius which that city produces might be furnished with an opportunity of perfecting themselves in eloquence. It was asserted that that city might

(a) You may see the substance of it in a quarto book of Mr Giles de la Roque concerning nobility.

(b) That is about the year 1666.

(3) See the *Journal des Savans*, of the 14th of September 1693, pag. 666, Dutch Edit.

might furnish a great many subjects to imitate the Academists of the other cities of the realm, and a long list of excellent genius which Toulouse has produced was collected (4). To know whether these reasons were effectual we need only read the following passage extracted out of one of Mr Cousin's Journals. 'The Floral Games of Toulouse have been at last erected into an Academy, the letters patents for that purpose were sealed at the end of the last year. This society is composed of thirty five persons eminently distinguished for their merit and learning. They will distribute two prizes annually, out of the rents of the Floral Games, which are considerable (5).

(4) Ibid. pag. 668.
(5) Journal des Savans, of the seventh of February, 1695, pag. 108, Dutch Edit. where this is said to have been taken out of a letter written from Montauban the 12th of December 1695. It should be 1694; and observe that these words last year relate not to the date of the letter, but to that of the Journal.

(6) Journal des Savans, 1696, pag. 426, Dutch Edit.

(7) Ibid. pag. 427.

(8) Now Dean of the Presidial.

(9) Father of Mr Campanut, Regius Professor of the Civil Law.

(10) He is Professor of Philosophy. See citation (132), of the article RORARIUS.

(a) Cicero, Tuscul. lib. iv, fol. m. 270, B. See also lib. ii, de Finibus, fol. 219, D.

Since the first edition of this Dictionary I have been informed by the Journal des Savans of the 11th of June 1696, that it was not long after the establishment of the French Academy that Mr Pellisson, who was then at Toulouse, formed a scheme of a society designed to the same end; which yet was not brought to perfection till the year 1688, when some learned men began to meet at the house of Mr Carriere, chief Justice and President of the presidial court of that city, which they continued to do till the year 1694, when they removed to Mr de Mondran, a gentleman whose house was more conveniently situated (6). That those who desire to know who were the persons that composed this society, and what their exercises were, may be informed of it by reading the answer of Mr de Martel, one of the members and the worthy secretary of this society, which he caused to be printed at Montauban in 1692, to take off the disadvantageous impressions which the author of a Memoir against this establishment endeavoured to make, under the pretence of defending the Floral Games. That the gentlemen who assist at these Academical Conferences, frequently compose in verse and prose, pieces in honour of the King and on other important subjects; several of which have been printed and met with a general applause. Their zeal went considerably farther in the year one thousand six hundred and ninety four, when they bestowed a prize of a gold medal amounting to the value of twelve pistoles (7). All this and several other particulars much redounding to the glory of these gentlemen, are mentioned in an extract of a letter from Toulouse, published by Mr Cousin author of the Journal des Savans. I have received from that city a long manuscript memoir, the substance whereof I should very willingly insert here, if the Printer could give me time to write for and receive the information which I want. But as I did not examine this memoir till two days before I sent this article to the Press, I cannot wait for that information: I am therefore obliged to confine myself to a few extracts, by which the reader may easily perceive that the Academy erected at Toulouse, is distinct from the society in which the academical conferences mentioned in the Journal des Savans of the 11th of June 1696, were held.

These conferences began in two different places at Toulouse in 1640, at Mr de Malepeires (8), and at Mr de Campanut's (9): but these two societies united at Mr de Garrigis's counsellor of the presidial court, and chose for their director Mr de la Garde, who had rendered himself equally famous for his Latin Poetry, and his excellent discoveries in natural Philosophy; for he wrote against Aristotle's forms and accidents before Gassendus's works appeared. Mr Donneville, President au Mortier, re-established these literary exercises in a much more conspicuous manner in the year 1667. Mr de Nolet, Treasurer of France, some time after established regular conferences in his own house under the direction of Mr Bayle (10) Doctor of Physic; and

Mr Regis made excellent discourses in these conferences on Des Cartes's system. Another society was afterwards formed in the college de Foix, and they began to erect an Academy of Wits. The society of the Floral Games did not relish this project, and an anonymous author wrote a tract to prove it impracticable. Mr Martel a member of the Academy of the Ricourati at Padua, refuted him in a book (11), the extract of which is extant in the Journal des Savans of the 14th of September 1693. He in conjunction with Mr de Carriere (12) and Mr de Malepeire formed regular conferences which continued to the year 1698. Mr Pellisson, who with Mr de Malepeire had formerly laid the foundation of such literary exercises at Toulouse, could not see this happy re-establishment, without looking on it in some measure as his own work, since he had formed the first plan of it, and since the illustrious magistrate, whom he had formerly associated in the first conferences, had so large a share and was so much concerned in the reviving of them. This great man continually bent on the improvement of polite learning, suggested to the authors of these new exercises the erection of their society into an Academy of the Belles Lettres, to be firmly established at Toulouse. He offered his interest, flattering himself with reason that he was able to procure the same advantage for Toulouse, which he had formerly obtained, even in a conjuncture less favourable, in behalf of Soissons. To further this design he engaged the Prince du Mayne, Governor of Languedoc, to be their protector, who presented a petition to the King, supplicating his Majesty to approve the project and execution of that design. It was in acknowledgment of so signal a favour that Mr Richebourg, a member of this society, had the honour to address an ingenious fable to this Prince. . . . This piece of Poetry alarmed some of the gentlemen of the Floral Games . . . and then their society, favoured by several illustrious magistrates who were members of it, fearing the new Academy would be erected on the ruins of theirs, which had the management of a considerable fund, took the most proper measures to get it established by letters patents under the protection of the Chancellors of France. They preserved as much as possible the name and customs it had, in order to follow the footsteps of its ancient establishment: for besides that by their statutes these gentlemen are restrained from printing any thing in the name of the society, or returning any thanks on their reception, of the four prizes distributed, three, and even one of the most considerable, are appointed for Poetry. The gentlemen of the academical conferences redoubled their zeal to perfect their studies; and as they had particularly in view eloquence, antiquities, and all that relates to the Belles Lettres, they chose Terence's Comedies and Quintilian, for the subject of their conferences. Mr de Mondran, Treasurer of France, who had an house very conveniently situated in the middle of the city, chose it to them for the performance of their exercises.

The author of the memoir from whence I have extracted all this, concludes with saying that those conferences, which would not have been interrupted on any other account than the death of several worthy members, may, it is hoped, be revived in a juncture so favourable to the sciences as the general peace which prevails throughout Europe (13).

(11) Printed at Montauban, in 1692.

(12) Now Chief Justice.

(13) This was written in the beginning of the year 1700.

T R A B E A (Q U I N T U S) a Comic Poet, some of whose verses are cited by Cicero (a). The piece which he intitled *Ergastulum*, is cited by Nonnius Marcellus (b). Aulus Gellius informs us that Vulcatius Sedigitus gave him the eighth place among the ten Comic Poets of ancient Rome (c). Muretus's fraudulent imposition on the great Scaliger [A], which

(b) Nonnius Marcell. Vite Rarenter, pag. m. 515.

(c) Aulus Gellius, lib. x, cap. xxiii.

[A] Muretus's fraudulent imposition on the great Scaliger. I shall collect several passages relating to this fact. Scaliger at the age of eighteen valued himself on discerning the different manners of writing of all ages. Muretus to intrap him, made some verses which he shewed him, pretending that he had received them from Germany, and that they were transcribed from an old manuscript. Scaliger after

having attentively read them, assured him without hesitation that Trabea an ancient comic Poet was the author of them: and continuing in the same opinion that his conjecture was infallible, he afterwards cited these verses as written by this ancient Poet in his commentary on Varro, Muretus laughed at it heartily, without the least reserve (1). Co-star having expressed himself thus, in his apology, did

(1) Collat. Apolog. pag. 303.

which made him cite some verses of Trabea's which were of a much later date, deserves

did afterwards more particularly explain in a letter the circumstances of that fact. 'These verses of Muretus, falsely ascribed to the ancient comic Poet Trabea, deserve indeed your impatient desire to see them. As I have the honour to know you, I dare say that you will learn them by heart; for they elegantly express a moral and frequently useful reflection.

Here, si querelis, ejulatu, fletibus,
Medicina fieret miseris Mortalium,
Auro parandæ lacrumæ contrâ forent.
Nunc hæc ad minuenda mala non magis valent,
Quàm nania Præficæ ad excitandos Mortuos.
Res turbidæ consilium, non fletum expetunt.

*Were moans, or cries, or tears, a cure
For all those ill wretched men endure,
Then tears for money should be bought,
And would by every one be sought.
Now, Master, these stand us in stead
No more than songs to raise the dead.
Advice is useful in distress,
Whining affords us no redress.*

Scaliger cited these verses in his commentary on Varro de Re Rustica, page 211 of Henry Stephens's edition. Producam autem, scilicet he, locum veteris Comici Trabeæ ex Fabula Harpæce, ubi hoc loquendi genus usurpatur, &c. (2). (He is speaking of the phrase, auro contrâ) Quis enim tam aversus à Musis, tamque humanitatis expertus, qui horum verum publicatione offendatur, &c. - - - I shall quote a passage from the play Harpæce of the ancient comic Poet Trabea, where this manner of speaking is used, &c. for who is such an enemy to the Muses, and so void of humanity, as to be offended with the publication of these verses. Muretus bragged of having deceived that great man who thought himself infallible, and Scaliger sensibly touched by this cheat, revenged himself by the following distich.

Qui rigidæ flammæ evaserat ante Tolosæ
Muretus, fumos vendidit ille mihi.

*Muretus, who had from the flames 'scap'd free,
Of rigorous Tholose, sold the smoke to me.*

You understand what he means by the flames of the severe Tholose, and have not forgot that Muretus was accused before the parliament of that city of a crime, which is punished by fire. You will be glad to know too that Scaliger suppressed these verses of Muretus in the second edition of his commentary (3).

Mr Borremans should not have said that this snare was laid for Julius Cæsar Scaliger (4). What is said of this pretended passage of Trabea, being an epigram, is as groundless. 'Joseph. Scaliger, cui ille (Muretus) verba dederat, atque epigramma recens a se compositum pro veteri obtulerat, &c. (5). - - - Joseph Scaliger, on whom Muretus had imposed, and obtruded a modern epigram written by himself, for an ancient one, &c.' It was a passage in a scene of a comedy. See Mr Menage in the 83d chapter of the Anti-Baillet, where you will find several curious things concerning this fact, but not the whole passage of Scaliger. I cannot believe that Menage purposely omitted it. I suspect that he had not by him the commentary on Varro; for if he had known that it contains another snare into which this great Critic fell, I am apt to think he had freely cited it. I have not that edition of Scaliger's commentary, but on the credit of Scrivener I shall venture to affirm that immediately after the words cited by Costar are the following (6). 'Quod si hi placent, non gravabor, & alios ejusdem notæ, sed alios Poetæ, adhibere, qui tanquam superiorum gemini & germani sunt. Sunt autem Accii, veteris ac gravissimi Tragicæ, ex Oenomaio:

(3) Costar, ubi supra, pag. 419, in his second letter to Mr de Heurles.
(4) Borremans, Var. Lect. cap. iii, pag. x.
(5) Nicus Erythr. Pinac. I, pag. 12.
(6) Scrivener, Animadv. in Pervigilium Veneris, pag. 466, 467. Tristatus cui Titulus Bau-dii Amores.

Nam si lamentis allevaretur dolor,
Longoque fletu minueretur miseria,
Tum turpe lacrumis indulgere non foret,
Fractaque voce Divum obtestare fidem,
Tabifica donec pectore excessisset lues.
Nunc hæc neque hilum de dolore detrahunt,
Potiusque cumulum miseris adjiciunt mali,
Et indecoram mentis molliem arguunt.

'Qui versus hæc nunc latuerunt, eosque nunc primum in vulgus publicamus, quorum priores Trabeæ mihi ad verbum è Philemone (vel Menandro, secundum alios) mutuati videntur: qui eandem sententiam extulit: Εἰ τὰ δάκρυ' ἤμιν, &c. Hæc illustris heros, qui posteaquam dolum perferens, præ indignatione hoc distichon, quod mihi de manu in manum vivus videntque olim tradidit, ex tempore lusit:

Qui rigidæ flammæ evaserat ante Tolosæ,
Falsidico fumos vendidit ore mihi.

'Virum disertum designans, cujus nomini heic parco. 'Heroe (æterno, heu, doctorum omnium dolore) defuncto, incidi in Posthuma quædam scripta M. A. M. C. R. (7) & inter poemata repperi hæc.

AFFICTA TRABEÆ.

Here, si querelis, ejulatu, fletibus, &c.

prorsus eadem cum iis quæ supra recitavi. Illud alterum ex Acti Oenomaio fragmentum nusquam comparet: præterquam in Ritterhusii ad Oppianum Commentario: ubi Trabeæ & Actii hos versus, elegantes & memoria dignissimos (ut ipse vocat) producit, transcriptos & mutatos ex Notis Scaligeri. - - - But if these are agreeable, I shall add some others of the same sort, but done by another Poet, which are, as it were, the twins and brothers of the former. They are those of Accius, an ancient and very worthy tragic Poet, from the Oenomaus:

Could lamentations ease our grief,
Or many tears give us relief,
No shame 't would be for us to moan,
And in our prayers to sigh and groan,
'Till GOD should send us a delivery
From wasting plague or other misery.
But now we know all this is vain,
And rather adds unto our pain.
And those that are that way inclin'd
Shew a base effeminate mind.

Which verses have been hitherto unknown, and are now first published by me; the former, done by Trabea, seem to me to be borrowed verbatim from Philemon (or according to others, Menander): who expressed the same sentiment: If tears to us, &c. Thus speaks that illustrious man, who, when he perceived the trick that was put upon him, out of revenge made the following distich extempore, which he himself formerly delivered to me,

He from the flames of barbs Tholose got free,
And with a lie, he sold the smoke to me.

Meaning a certain learned man, whose name I here forbear mentioning. That illustrious person being dead (to the sorrow of all learned men) I happened to meet with some posthumous writings of M. A. M. C. R. (Marc Antony Muretus a Citizen of Rome) and amongst the Poems found the following.

FALSELY ASCRIBED TO TRABEA.

Were moans, or cries, or tears, a cure, &c.

Exactly the same as I have above recited. The other fragment out of Accius's Oenomaus is no where to be found but in Ritterhusius's commentary on Oppianus: wherein he quotes those verses of Trabea and Accius, which

(7) Those five letters signify, Marci Antonii Mureti Civis Romani.

serves to be mentioned here. The same mistake is to be found in the Lexicon of Buchnerus (d).

(d) *Vocæ Præfixa*, fol. 1128. See Muretus's Poems, pag. 50, Edit. Lipf. 1672.

which he calls elegant and most worthy of remembrance, and which he transcribed and borrowed from the annotations of Scaliger. I have not concluded this citation with Scaliger's words, but chose to continue it by citing those which Scriverius adds to them, because they afford matter for two critical remarks. In the first place you see that Scaliger's distich is otherwise expressed than Mr Baillet after Nicus Erythræus wife expressed it (8), and otherwise than Mr Menage has quoted it (9), and otherwise than Mr Menage cites it (9) from the collection of Scaliger's Poems published by Scriverius from Scaliger's originals. In the

(8) Baillet Jugem fur les Poëtes, numb. 1333, cites it thus: Qui flammis rigide vitaverat ante Tolose Muretus, fumos vendidit illi mihi.

(9) Menage, Anti-Baillet, chap. lxxxiii, cites it thus: Qui flammis rigide vitaverat ante Tolose, Muretus, fumos vendidit illi mihi.

(10) Menage, ibid. Note that he cites all those verses of Muretus.

second place we plainly see that Scriverius was ignorant that the pretended verses of Accius were any where else to be found than in Scaliger and Ritterhusius his copy. But we shall immediately see that they were inserted in an edition of Muretus's Poems published two years after Scaliger had published his commentary on Varro. Here is the proof of it (10): Muretus caused them to be printed in his collection of Poems of Aldus's edition in 1575, with this note: Cum veteris Comici Græci Philemonis sententiam à Plutarcho & à Stobæo acceptam, animi causâ ex primæ tentasem, & dicendi genere, & numero, veterum Latinorum simillimo: Placuit etiam expere, nunquid eandem comicæ explicare possem. Viri, sum est utrumque non infeliciter successisse. Per jocum itaque prioribus versibus Accii, posterioribus Trabeæ nomen ascripti, ut experiret aliorum judicium, & viderem num quis in eis inesset vetustatis sapor. Nemo repertus est qui non ea pro veteribus accepere. Unus etiam, & eruditione & judicio acerrimo præditus, repertus est, qui ea à me accepta pro veteribus publicaret. Ne quis igitur amplius fallatur, & rem totam detegendam, & carmina ipsa hic subiicienda duxi.

Afficta Accio.

Nam si lamentis, &c.

Afficta Trabeæ.

HERE, si querelis, &c.

As I had attempted for my diversion to express a reflexion of Philemon, an old Greek Comic Poet, and adopted by Plutarch and Stobæus, in style and verse like the antient Romans; I thought fit likewise to try, whether I could explain it in a comic style. In both which I imagined I succeeded pretty well. And therefore out of playantry I ascribed the former verses to Accius, and the latter to Trabeæ, that I might know the opinions of others, and see whether they favoured of antiquity. Every body took them to be antient. There was likewise a man of great learning and penetration, who having received them from me, published them as such. But that none may be further deceived, I thought proper to discover the whole matter, and subjoin here the verses themselves.

Falsely ascribed to Accius.

Could lamentations, &c.

Falsely ascribed to Trabeæ.

Were moans, &c.

These words of Muretus detect a mistake contained in the passage which is in the beginning of this remark. Mr Costar imagined that Scaliger ventured to find a

father for the Latin verses communicated to him; Mr Costar, I say, fancied that this great critic, not content to receive them as a fragment of an antient author, peremptorily decided that it was a part of a certain dramatic piece of Trabeæ. But Muretus shews that the fact was not so, but that he himself produced these lines as the verses of that antient Poet. Scaliger was only deceived by giving credit to Muretus's words. As for the rest, he clearly saw they were an imitation of some Greek verses in Plutarch (11), which in Amyot's version run thus:

(11) Plut. de Consol. ad Apollon. pag. 105.

Si nos mal-heurs les larmes gueriffoyent,
Et si nos maux incontinent cessoyent
Que l'on auroit larmoyé tendrement,
Au poids de l'or payées chèrement
En un mal-heur les larmes devroyent estre:
Mais maintenant les affaires, mon maistre,
N'y penfent point, & n'y jettent point l'œil:
Ains soit, ou non, que tu pleures en dueil,
Par ne lairront d'aller la même voye.
Qu'il-eil besoin donc que nostre zél larmoye?
Qu'y gagnons-nous? Rien: mais douleur produit,
Comme arbres font, des larmes pour son fruit.

If our misfortunes tears could cure

And make our woes to cease,

Then we should purchase tears with gold,

To give us a release.

But now, O master, in distress

No help from thence e'er came,

For, whether did you mourn or not,

It still will be the same.

Why then should we lament and cry?

What do we thereby gain?

Nothing: but e'en as fruit from trees,

So tears proceed from pain.

Scaliger was more excusable on this occasion than when he took the oration de duplici concordia, for a ments in attributing books to performance of Justus Lipsius (12), for nothing better resembles the verses of the antients than those of the pretended Trabeæ (13). But the oration falsely attributed to Justus Lipsius (14), is not like any of that writer's works. The Poet Apollonius Collatius hath nothing in him which looks like antiquity, and yet Scaliger and several other very good critics have taken him for an antient Poet (15). Add to this Mr Colomies words. 'I have heard Mr Vossius say, that Boethornius corrected and commented on a fa-tire de Lite, which he believed to be antient, but was written by the Chancellor de l'Hospital. This to my great satisfaction I afterward found true. Pricæus an English Critic is guilty of the same fault in his commentary on Apuleius's Apology, page 54 (16). A Madrigal of Menage passed for Tasso's: It is in the CXXXIIIId chapter of the Anti-baillet, and the History of this Innocent Cheat is inserted in the same Author's Miscellaneæ. Muretus complains that he was wrongfully accused of being the author of some letters and poems (17). Compare with this the remarks [M] and [P] of the article ERASMUS.

(12) See the Scaligeriana at the word Lipsius.

(13) See Boethornius, letter cent, to Camerarius.

(14) See the remark [I], of the article GOL.

(15) See Bartholinus in Clavdivio, pag. 795, Edit. in 4to. See also baillet, and the History of this Innocent Cheat is inserted in the same Author's Miscellaneæ. Muretus complains that he was wrongfully accused of being the author of some letters and poems (17). Compare with this the remarks [M] and [P] of the article ERASMUS.

(16) Colomies, Opul. pag. 123.

(17) Muretus, Epist. I, lib. I.

TRAERBACH, a small town in the Palatinate, with a castle situated on a rock, is the chief place of a Bayliwick in the county of Spanheim. It stands on the river Moselle, over-against Mont-Royal, between Triers and Coblentz. The Spaniards put a garrison in it in the year 1632. The Swedes took it in 1635 and delivered it to the French. But by the treaty of Munster it was restored to its former possessors. The French seized on it some time after the peace of Nimeguen, and fortified it with Mont-Royal. Both those places were restored by the treaty of Ryfwick in the year 1697, upon condition they should be dismantled (a). The French, under the command of Count Tallard, became masters of Traerbach, after a siege of some days in November 1702. The

(a) Extracted from the Dutch Gazette of Leyden, of the ninth of January 1705.

The allies retook it in December 1704, and met with more resistance than they had expected [A]

[A] *The allies . . . met with more resistance than they had expected.* They invested it on the third of November 1704, and began to cannonade it the sixteenth or seventeenth of the same month. The Baron de Trosné, a Brigadier in the Dutch army, and director of the attacks, boasted that he would carry the place in five or six days, as it was said in all the

Gazettes. However, the castle still held out the tenth of December, when the baron was killed by a musquet shot, and did not capitulate till the eighteenth. The Governor of Traerbach and the Major were killed during the siege. A very honourable capitulation was granted to the garrison.

TRAJAN, a Roman Emperor

Most learned men of the Romish communion now refute the story which was so much cried up, that the soul of this Emperor was delivered from hell by the prayers of Pope Gregory [A].

[A] *The story which was so much cried up, that the soul of this Emperor was delivered from hell by the prayers of Pope Gregory.* Paul and John Diaconus, who wrote the life of St Gregory, give an account of that affair (1). It is moreover asserted by St John of Damascus (2). The story is related in this manner.

(1) Dionysius de Sammarth. Histoire de St Gregoire, pag. 283.

(2) Ibid. pag. 284; but he observes that the learned doubt whether the sermon concerning the dead, where this is asserted, and which is found amongst the works of Joannes Damascenus, was written by him or not.

* No author that has writ the Roman History, has related this fact, which was however very remarkable. Trajan's panegyrist does not mention it neither.

(3) Ibid. pag. 283.

(4) Ibid. pag. 284.

(5) Ibid. pag. 283.

(6) Ibid. pag. 284.

† Bollandus, on the last chapter, of the Life of St Gregory, by Paul Diaconus.

‡ Auctore anonymo sed syn. chrono. say they.

St Gregory passing Trajan's square, which that prince caused to be adorned with stately edifices, where the principal actions of his life were represented, stopped particularly to consider a basso relievo, which described the favour he did to a poor widow *. This emperor marching at the head of his army, and being obliged to use great dispatch, a very old and poor widow came to beseech him with tears in her eyes, to revenge the death of her son who had been murdered. Trajan promised her that when he returned from his expedition he would do her justice. But, Sir, says the widow, if you should be killed in the battle, of whom may I expect it afterwards? Of my successor, answered Trajan. What will it signify to you, Great Emperor, replied the woman, that any other than yourself render me justice? Is it not better that you should do this good action yourself, than leave another to do it? It is said, that the emperor being then moved at the tears of that poor mother, and persuaded by her reasons, alighted from his horse, commanded those who were accused of the murder of the widow's son to be brought before him, and took an exact cognizance of the whole affair: and tho' the principal officers of his army urged him very much, yet he would not continue his march till he had determined it. He ordered a considerable sum of money to be paid to the widow, but spared the lives of the criminals. St Gregory, add they, touched with this action of justice and charity, prayed to God with many tears and groans, to take pity on that emperor. Being gone from thence to pray at St Peter's tomb, he there shed again a great many tears, and remained long in prayer on the same subject. Soon after he knew he had not prayed in vain: for falling into a sleep, rather extatistal than natural, God revealed to him that his prayers had been heard. But at the same time commanded him never to pray more for persons that die unbaptized (3). John Diaconus, who believed this story to be true (4), and said that it was read in the English churches (5), owns however that it was not received by the Romans, and that it had appeared to them improbable (6). 'It ought indeed to be rejected as a fable, that could find credit no where but with the Anglo-Saxons, who were as yet ignorant and uninstructed in the Christian religion: for John Diaconus evidently shews that it derived its original from them. I am surprised that learned men, who have been employed in collecting the acts of the saints, far from rejecting it, have made a † note to authorize and support it: I fancy the reason why they judged so favourably of it was, because they believed that the ancient life of St Gregory, which they published as the performance of an anonymous author, was written by a cotemporary Historian, as they expressly declare ‡. But that anonymous author is at the same time called Paul Diaconus, and that cotemporary Historian is of the IXth century, younger than St Gregory by about 250 years, as I have proved

in the Advertisement. Cardinal Baronius † has very amply refuted this story in the 8th tome of his Annals, and after him Cardinal Bellarmine, not to mention several learned Critics of our own time, who have shewn the absurdity and dangerous consequences of it. But as that does not hinder people from making use of it every day, to authorize a very pernicious doctrine, and to teach that the intercession of the holy Virgin saves those that belong to her, and that wear her livery, even tho' they die in mortal sin; I believe, those who love true piety will be glad to find this falsity refuted by St Gregory himself, and by what he says in his Dialogues (7).

† Ad an. 604, num. 30, & seq. L. 2. de Purgat. c. 8.

(7) Dionysius de Sammarth. ubi supra, pag. 284, 285.

Sammarthanus recites afterwards divers passages of the XLIVth chapter of the fourth book of those Dialogues, and shews thereby that St Gregory did not believe it possible to deliver a damned soul. He refutes likewise some answers that might be made in favour of the contrary opinion. See also page 409 of his work. He does not think it worth while to confute in particular another story which is added to the former. It is reported, that this Pope felt continual pains in his feet and stomach, as a punishment of the sin he had committed in praying for an emperor that was damned. Father Theophilus Raynaud ranks this amongst the calumnies which have been published against great men (8). He quotes Toftatus, who in the LVIIth question on the IVth Book of the Kings affirms, that St Gregory then committed a mortal sin. He says, that Alphonsus Ciacconius wrote a treatise to prove, that this story of Trajan's deliverance was true: and adds that Rutilius Benzonius maintained the same thing in his *Speculum Episcoporum*, but that Melchior Canus, and Soto, had very well conjectured the falsity of that story, and that Baronius, Bellarmine and Suarez, and several other moderns had clearly demonstrated it to be a fable. All the subtilties invented to reconcile this pretended deliverance of Trajan with the irreversibility of God's decrees against persons who are damned, he looks upon as meer cavilling: and rejects the reflexion of John Diaconus, that those pains were inflicted on St Gregory, as an antidote against the pride wherewith he might have been puffed up, after so great an exploit as releasing Trajan's soul from the pit of hell. *Hoc sane fundamento everso . . . præcitantur trices variae ab antiquis Theologis Scholasticis excogitatae, ad exponendum quo modo salva decretorum divinarum veritate de abyssu nunquam fefcense, (id est, ut ipse D. Gregorius XXXII. mor. c. 13. exposuit, de nulla unquam in inferno redemptione) potuerit vir sanctus, exorare Trajanem a Tartaro ereptionem: quibusdam dicentibus, Trajanum precibus sancti Gregorii ad vitam revocatum egisse penitentiam; quod habet S. Thomas in 4. distin. 45. quest. 2. art. 5. ad 5. Aliis afferentibus, suspensam fuisse Trajanem condemnationem, & D. Gregorii oratione impeditam, ut videre est apud D. Thomam in 1. distin. 45. quest. 2. art. 2. ad quintum & quest. 6. de veritat. artic. 6. ad quartum. Nihil bonum necessarium est, supposita narrationis prædictæ falsitate, quæ item revocata, concidit quod ait Joannes Diaconus, ægritudines de quibus diximus, immixtas esse Sancto Gregorio, ne ob eam Trajanem ereptionem exoratam, tumeret animo (9).*

(8) Theoph. Raynaud. Haplothea, §. ii. Serie iii. cap. xxvii, pag. m. 435.

(9) Id. ibid.

TRAPPE, an abbey situate in a very solitary place [A], on the frontiers of Perche in the diocese of Seez, is become very famous since the Abbot de Rancé hath reformed it. He held it in commendam above 25 years, but in 1662, he procured an agreement, by virtue of which the Monks of the strict Observance entered and took possession of the monastery. And the better to encourage their establishment, he quitted to them the seat of Nuisement which he enjoyed as Abbot in commendam (a). The following year he obtained of the king a permission to become regular abbot of this abbey. He took the regular vance of the Cistercian order on the 13th of June 1663, being then aged 37 years and five months (b). --- On the 26th of June following having received his patent from Rome, empowering him to hold the abbey of la Trappe, as a regular abbot, he made his profession in the abbey of Perseigne (c). --- The 3d of July following he received the abbatial benediction (d) --- in the monastery of St Martin of Seez, and went to his abbey the 14th day of the same month (e). By his natural eloquence and example he prevailed on his Monks to submit to the primitive austerities of their rule. There was not one of them but would follow his abbot's steps, and in imitation of him abstain from drinking of wine, eating of eggs and fish, and apply himself to manual labour for three hours every day (f). This abbey was fallen into great remissness of discipline. It was founded in the year 1140 [B].

(a) Description de l'Abbaye de la Trappe, pag. 13, 14, Paris edition, 1682. It is a letter of Mr Felibien, to the Duc de Liancourt, as it appears from the Journal des Sçavans, of the 28th of November, 1695, pag. m. 699.

(b) Felibien, ibid. pag. 15, 16.

(c) Felibien, ubi supra, pag. 19.

(d) By the hands of Mr Patrick Plunket, Bishop of Armagh, in Ireland.

(e) Ibid. p. 20.

(f) Ibid. p. 22.

[A] 'Abbey in a very solitary place.' This abbey is situated in a large valley. The wood and the hills which surround it, are disposed as if designed to hide it from the rest of the world. They enclose arable lands, plantations of fruit-trees, pasture grounds and nine ponds which encompass the abbey, and render it so difficult of access, that it is very hard to come at it without a guide. There was heretofore a road from Mortagne to Paris behind the walls of the garden; but tho' it was in the wood, and above five hundred paces from the enclosure, and tho' it was not possible to remove it farther without a vast expence, yet the Abbot turned it another way, in order to render the place round the monastery more solitary. And indeed nothing is more so than this desert: For tho' there are several towns and large villages at three leagues distance round it, yet to people who are there it seems to be a lonely and foreign country. Silence reigns throughout; and if any noise is heard, it is only the rustling of trees shaken by the wind, or the brooks running through the pebbles. This abbey discovers itself at going out of the forest of Perche, when one is coming from the south; and tho' the traveller thinks himself very near, he finds it almost a mile before he reaches it: But having at last descended the hill, crossed the heath, and gone on a little way amongst hedges and through shady paths he comes to the first court, where the receiver's apartment is. It is separated from those of the Monks by a strong pallisado of pales and thorns, which the Abbot caused to be made after he retired thither (1).

(1) Felibien, Description de l'Abbaye de la Trappe, pag. 6, 8 seq. printed at Paris in 1671, and the second time in 1682.

[B] It was fallen into great remissness of discipline. It was founded in the year 1140. I shall con-

tinue to use the same authors words who furnished me with the preceding remark. 'The abbey of our Lady de la Maison-Dieu de la Trappe, (for so it is called) was founded by Rotrou Earl of Perche, in the year 1140, and consecrated under the name of the blessed Virgin in 1214, by Robert Archbishop of Roën, Ralph Bishop of Evreux, and Sylvester Bishop of Seez. It felt for a long time the decay of the Cistercian order, and was fallen into the same irregularities, in which every body knows several monasteries of that order continue to this day, since the remissness introduced two hundred years ago, having not yet embraced the strict Observance of the rule re-established in France, by the late Cardinal de la Rochefoucault, when Mr Armand John Bouthillier de Rancé, Doctor of Divinity, chief Almoner to the late Duke of Orleans, and Abbot in commendam of this abbey above twenty-five years, by his great care and frequent exhortations, brought the Monks of this abbey to consent, and to request that it might be put into the hands of the Fathers of the strict Observance of the Cistercian order, to re-establish the primitive and exact practice of the discipline. The Abbot de Barbarie of the strict Observance, and visitor of the province, being come thither, at the request of the Abbot de Rancé, with a commission from the Abbot de Prieres, Vicar-General, made an agreement between the Abbot and the old Monks of la Trappe the 17th of August 1662, which was ratified in the Parliament of Paris the 16th of February 1663. By virtue of which the Monks of the strict Observance entered and took possession of the monastery (2).

(2) Felibien, ibid. pag. 11, 8 seq.

TREBATIUS (CAIUS) surnamed Testa (a), was a very great Civilian. He had a vast memory (b), and tho' he professed himself an Epicurean (c), he was a man of incomparable probity (d). During the war with the Gauls he was received into Julius Cæsar's favour by the recommendation of Cicero, and, if he would, might have enjoyed the profit of a Tribune's post without the exercise of that office [A]. Perhaps he would not have acquitted himself very well in it; for Cicero seems sometimes a little to reproach his

(a) Cicero, Epist. xiii & xxi, lib. vii, ad Famil.

(b) See the remark [A].

(c) Id. ibid. Epist. xii.

(d) See the remark [A].

[A] He was received into Julius Cæsar's favour by the recommendation of Cicero . . . and if he would, might have enjoyed . . . &c.] Cicero recommended him in the following terms: 'Hunc, mi Cæsar, sic velim omni tua comitate complectare, ut omnia quæ per me possis adduci ut in meos conferre velis, in unum hunc con-feras: de quo tibi homine hæc spondeo non illo veteri verbo meo, quod, cum ad te de Milone scripsissem, jure iussisti: sed more Romano, quo modo homines non inepti loquuntur: probiorem hominem, meliorem virum, prudentiorem esse neminem. Accedit etiam, quod familiam ducit, in jure civili singularis memoria, summa scientia. Huic ego neque tribunatum, neque præfecturam, neque ullius beneficii certum nomen peto: benevolentiam tuam & liberalitatem peto: neque impedio, quo minus, si tibi ita placuerit, etiam hinc cum ornibus gloriolæ insignibus. Totum denique hominem tibi ita trado de manu (ut aiunt) in manum tuam istam, & victoria & fide præstantem (1). ---

(1) Cicero, Epist. v, lib. vii, ad Famil. pag. m. 375, 376. Note, that in the first letter of the tenth book to Atticus, he uses these words, Trebatii boni viri & civis verba te gaudio esse delectatum. --- I am glad you was pleased with what was said to you by Trebatius, an excellent man, and good citizen.

'I beg of you, my dear Cæsar, to receive this gentleman with all possible kindness, and to bestow on him alone all the favours my interest with you can procure for my friends: I will answer for him, not in that old saying which I used, when I wrote to you concerning Milo, and which you justly laughed at: but in the Roman way, as wise men speak, that there is not a better, better or more prudent man living. Besides, he excels in the knowledge of the Civil Law; is endowed with a vast memory, and great learning. I do not ask for him the tribunship, lieutenantancy, or any particular post; I only intreat he may have your favour and friendship; and if you thought fit, I should not be against his enjoying those titles of honours. In fine, I deliver him entirely out of my own hand (as they say) into that of your's, excelling in victory and faithful-ness.' This recommendation had great effect, for Trebatius might, if he pleased, have been an honorary tribune, and enjoyed the profits of that high office:

his want of bravery (e); and doubtless it was only his learned conversation which endeared him to Cæsar and his friends. Several of the letters he received from Cicero are yet extant. Those who say that he engaged in Pompey's party, are very much mistaken [B]. He was always firm to Julius Cæsar, and persuaded Cicero to be of that side. He maintained his reputation so well after Julius Cæsar's death, that Augustus being in doubt concerning the validity of codicils, authorized the use of them by the advice and persuasive reasons of Trebatius [C], after having consulted the most able Civilians. Several are of opinion, that whenever we find in the Pandects (f) the sayings of the Antients brought in, it ought chiefly to be understood of Trebatius, and his disciple Labeo. The character of a learned man given to Trebatius by Horace, seems in my mind to signify a great deal in that place (g). This Civilian formed himself under Cornelius Maximus (h). He published several books [D]. He was sometimes mistaken in affirming, that certain things had never been considered [E].

(e) See Bertrand, de Jurispræd. lib. ii, pag. m. 248; and Cicero, Epist. x, lib. vii, ad Famil.

(f) Bertrand, ibid. pag. 249.

(g) Horat. Sat. i, lib. ii, ver. 78.

(h) Pomponius, de origine Juris, lib. iii, cap. xi, num. 45.

fic: 'Ex tuis literis cognovi præproperam quandam festinationem tuam, et simul sum admiratus cur tribunatus commodum, demto præsertim labore militiæ contemneris (2). --- By your letter I find you have been somewhat too precipitate, and wonder that you refused the profits of the tribuneship, especially as you were exempted from the trouble of the service.' Cicero foretold that he himself would prove the greatest obstacle to his fortune (3). He is not the only person of that turn: How many men are there who would have risen, if they had had but patience enough, or if they had been importunate, or very assuaging?

(2) Idem, Epist. viii, ejusd. Libri.

(3) Tibi unum timendum sit ne ipse tibi defuisse videatur. --- One thing you ought to take care of, which is not to be wanting to yourself. Idem, Epist. vii, ejusd. Libri.

* Plut. in vita Cæ.

(4) Guil. Grotius, de Vita Juriscons. pag. 78.

(5) Admonentem C. Trebatium ut affugeret minus familiari vultu respexisse. Sueton. in Julio, cap. lxxviii.

(6) Bertrandus, de Jurispræd. lib. ii, pag. m. 250.

(7) Menagius, Juris Civilis Axiomata, cap. xiv, pag. m. 79.

tain that Trebatius's authority was very great for several ages. Which Ammianus Marcellinus's words plainly testify: 'Hi ut altius videantur jura callere TREBATIUM loquuntur & Cascellium, & Alfenum, & Auruncorum Sicanorumque jam diu leges ignotas cum Evandri matre abhinc seculis obrutas multis (8). --- That they may seem to understand the Law more profoundly, they talk of TREBATIUS, Cascellius, and Alfenus, and the laws of the Arunci and Sicani which have been long since forgot, and buried in oblivion with the mother of Evander.'

[D] He published several books. An ancient scholar (9) asserts, that Aulus (10) Trebatius a Roman Knight, and Civilian, composed several tracts on the Civil-law, and nine books concerning religions. This account is not very exact, for Macrobius (11), hath cited the 10th book of that work of Trebatius. And these words of Bertrandus are yet less exact: 'Certum est Trebatium scripsisse de religionibus lib. duos (12). --- It is certain that Trebatius wrote two books concerning religions.'

[E] In affirming that certain things had never been considered. Cicero once convicted him of falsity. I shall cite the passage at large, to inform the reader that Trebatius entertained his friends very handsomely. Illuleras heri inter scyphos, quod dixeram, controversiam esse, possetne heres, quod furtum antea factum esset, furti recte agere. Itaque, etsi domum bene potus feroque redieram, tamen id caput, ubi hæc controversia est, notavi, & descriptum tibi misi: ut scires, id, quod tu neminem sensisse dicebas Sex.

Ælium, M. Manilius, M. Brutum sensisse (13). --- Last night, in our cups, you laughed at me for saying that it was a question, whether an heir could laid an indictment for a theft, which had been committed before he was made heir: and therefore tho' I had drank pretty freely, and it was late before I returned home, yet I took down in writing the chapter where this controversy is handled, and have sent it to you, that you may see that Sex. Ælius, M. Manilius, and M. Brutus had thought of that case, which you imagined had escaped all other Civilians. Those who quote this epistle of Cicero, to make it appear that Trebatius reduced the precepts of his sect into practice, and that he lived like an Epicurean libertine, reason very ill. Doth not Cicero, so opposite to Epicurus, own that he had drank very freely that night? And is it reasonable thence to infer any thing against his morals? It is therefore certain, that this passage doth not hinder Trebatius from being a proof that the impious opinions of the Epicureans were compatible with the practice of moral virtues; for, as I have already said, Trebatius was a man of great probity. Bertrandus draws another consequence from this epistle of Cicero: he pretends that it proves that Trebatius attempting to pass for the inventor of his answers, magisterially affirmed that no author had ever said any such thing: 'Tantam autem Trebatius in respondendo vanam ostentationem, inanemque gloriolam habebat, ut sæpissime quæ plerique ante eum dixerant, neminem præter eum sensisse audacter profiteretur (14). --- Trebatius was so ridiculously vain and ostentatious in his answers, that he would often confidently maintain, that no body besides himself knew a thing, tho' it had been said by a great many before him.'

(8) Amm. Marcell. lib. xxx, cap. vi, pag. m. 594.

(9) Vetus Scholasticus Horat. in Sat. i, lib. ii.

(10) He should have said Caius.

(11) Macrobius, Saturn. lib. iii, cap. iii, pag. m. 388.

(12) Bertrand. ubi supra, pag. 252, 253.

(13) Cicero, Epist. xxii, lib. vii, ad Famil.

(14) Bertrandus, ubi supra, pag. 252.

- (a) See the remark [2], of the article LEWIS XI.
- (b) Varillas, *Hist. de Louis XI, livr. x, pag. 331. Dutch Edit.*
- (c) Matthieu, *Hist. de Louis XI, livr. xi, pag. m. 751.*
- (d) Thevet, *Cosmographie Universelle, livr. xiv, fol. 517.*
- (e) Thuanus, *pag. m. 37, 38.*
- TRISTAN L'HERMITE (LEWIS) was the instrument of the revenges and cruelties of Lewis XI (a). He was Provost-Marshall, or, according to others, Great Provost of the king's household. He became so odious to all good men, that they were afraid to name him. . . . He was not content to obey the barbarous commands of depriving those of their lives who had not been convicted of any crime; but executed those orders with a precipitation not excusable in the most savage monsters of cruelty. This made him take sometimes the innocent for the guilty; and in order to repair the fault committed by his mistake, he was obliged to kill two persons instead of one (b).²
- He had been knighted by Charles VII, after the siege of Fronzac (c). His son PETER L'HERMITE was the father of JOHN L'HERMITE, who once shewed Thevet, the Cosmographer, in the house of Mortaigne, several *antient deeds, importing the relation betwixt the lords of that house and the antient Romans* (d). I take notice of this only as an instance of the folly of those traditions which are preserved in antient families. Thuanus wonders that Philip de Comines hath not mentioned this Trifstan, who left, says he, a great estate behind him, part of which was the *principality of Mortaigne in Gascony*. . . . *possibly it was he who imprisoned Philip de Comines, in a cage* (e).

- TRISTAN L'HERMITE (FRANCIS) Gentleman in ordinary to the Duke of Orleans, and one of the best Poets of the XVIIth century, *pretended to be descended from the Grand Provost of Lewis XI (a). He was born at the castle of Souliers (b), in the province of la Marche. He was brought up page of honour to Scævola de Sainte Marthe (c). His tragedy intitled Mariamne passed for an excellent piece (d) [A].* He was admitted into the French academy, in the place of Mr Colomby about the year 1649. After which he lived about six or seven years.
- He died very piously at the palace of Guise, without suffering his friends to visit him, and forgot them all to think of God (e).³ What is said of his poverty, doth not seem true in all particulars [B], and would be no proof of the

- (a) Chevrana, *ubi supra.* (d) See Mr Baillet, *Jugemens sur les Poëtes, num. 1483, and Mr Pellisson, Hist. de l'Académie Française, pag. m. 359, where we may see the catalogue of his works.* (e) Chevrana, *ibid.*

- [A] *His tragedy, intitled, Mariamne, passed for an excellent piece.* The Abbot Marolles observes, that *this play was that with which the incomparable Mondori, the best actor of his time, ended (1). This is a little equivocal. He should have said, that this famous player lost his life by the efforts he was obliged to make, to represent the passions which the author had described. In the Parnasse Reformé, an actor is introduced, saying to Trifstan, I believe you would have us act nothing else but Mariamne, and kill a Mondory every week in your service (2).*

- (1) Marolles, *Mémoire, Part. ii, pag. 242.*
- (2) Parn. Réformé, *pag. m. 106.*
- (3) Menagiana, *pag. 146, 147, of the second Dutch Edit.*
- [B] *What is said of his poverty doth not seem true in all particulars.* Let us hear what Mr Menage said of it (3). 'Mr Quinaut was a servant to Mr Trifstan. The Duke of Montausier said, that when he died, he left him his poetical vein, and would willingly have left him his cloak too if he had had one: on which Mr de Montmor made this epigram, which is cited by Mr de Furetiere:

Elie, ainsi qu'il est écrit
De son manteau joint à son double esprit,
Récompensa son serviteur fidele.
Trifstan eût suivi ce modele;
Mais Trifstan qu'on mit au Tombeau
Plus pauvre que n'est un Prophete,
En laissant à Quinaut son esprit de Poëte,
Ne put lui laisser de manteau.

Elijah, to reward Elijah's merit,
Left him his mantle and his double spirit.
Trifstan to do the like in vain had try'd:
Poorer than any prophet, when he died,
He left his friend his wit . . . but not a cloak beside.

- Mr Furetiere, whom Mr Menage cites, doth not ascribe this rally to Mr de Montausier, but to Mr Bourdelot. It is no small happiness for Mr Quinaut, says he (4), 'to have been servant to the illustrious Mr Trifstan, under whom he served his apprenticeship in Poetry. Which one day drew on him the compliment of a great prince †, who, at the end of one of his plays congratulated him, by comparing him and his master, to Elifha and Elijah. As Elijah, said he, when taken up to Heaven, by giving Elifha his mantle, left him the spirit of

- (4) Furetiere, *troisième Factum, pag. 22, Dutch Edit.*
- † The Duke of Guise.

prophecy; so Trifstan, at his death, transmitted to Quinaut his poetical genius. Mr Bourdelot, who was present, observed that the simile was lame in this respect; for Trifstan had never a mantle or cloak: which occasioned this epigram, that was then made to preserve the memory of this parallel.

Elie, ainsi qu'il est écrit, &c.

Elijah left, as it is writ, &c.

I doubt not but Trifstan's wretched condition was here exaggerated, and I cannot persuade myself that his poverty was like that of the famous Poet with whom Boileau begins his satires:

Damon ce grand Auteur, dont la Muse fertile
Amusa si long temps, & la cour & la ville:
Mais qui n'étant vetu que de simple bureau,
Passa l'été sans linge, & l'hiver sans manteau (5),

Damon, a mighty author, who had long
Amus'd the court and city with his song,
Asham'd to see himself so meanly dress'd,
For drugg'd was at once his worst and best,
That in hot weather he had scarce a shirt
To shift him, and his linnen stood with dirt;
And, what wou'd any man of wit provoke,
At Christmas to be seen without a cloak.

I dare engage that some persons, yet alive, might certify that they have seen Trifstan with a cloak, or at least that they know some who have seen him with one in cold weather or rain. I am willing to believe that it was not a new, or a very valuable one, but, in short, it was a cloak (6). A wit, disposed to divert himself with the poverty of the Poets, chiefly turns on these two topics, viz. their being ill clothed, and ill lodged; and this sort of rally most times exceeds the bounds of truth. Coslar was puzzled when obliged to account for these words. 'Aristo and Tasso have erected very rich palaces, not to speak of that of Love, in Marino's Adonis; and yet they hired chambers to lodge in: this is not what we call *edificare casas; building cottages*. These, Sir, are the people who, as you say, would delay building

- (5) Despreux, *Sat. I, at the beginning.*
- (6) Add that it was without doubt rather his own cloak, tho' perhaps bought in a Broker's shop, than a borrowed or hired one.

the injustice of the age, nor any argument of the sterility of the services done to the Muses

(7) *Entretiens de Voiture & de Costar, p. 329.*

building till the stones will successively come of their own accord, and place themselves one upon another (7). But his adversary discovered his fallacies and their origin; he observed that Costar was not much concerned for truth, provided he could please his fancy. The whole criticism which falls severely on him, runs thus: 'I own that Tasso was poor, yet he did not live in lodgings; he had his apartments in the palace of the Dukes of Ferrara, and other princes, in whose court he resided. And as to what concerns Ariosto, he was rich enough, and so far from being reduced to live in lodgings, that he built a very convenient house, where he generally resided, as he himself assures us in these verses which he caused to be engraved on it.

Parva, sed apta mihi, sed nulli obnoxia, sed non
Sordida, parva meo sed tamen ære domus.

*This is a small, but neat convenient house,
To none obnoxious, built at my expence.*

Battista Pigna, who wrote his life, saith, that he delighted much in building, and that his most common employment was, continually to alter or improve something or other in his house. *Ma dille-tando si molto d'edificare, &c. Intorno a questa sua casa non si contentando mai d'una cosa fatta, faceva spesso risarla dicendo d'essere ancora tale nel far versi, essendo che molto li mutava e rimutava.* If you desire another witness, Paulus Jovius says, in his Elogies, 'Receptus inde est ab Alfonso Principe tanquam horarum omnium extruxit peramoenâ hortorum uber-tate, frugi mensæ quotidianos sumptus adæquantem. . . . He was received by the Prince Alfonso as a friend and companion at all hours, by whose liberality he built a city-house, and had a pleasant fruitful garden to it, suited to his moderate circumstances. But you are not much concerned for the truth of what you say; you are afraid that things would be ridiculous if too true. All is well, if the matter doth not fail you, and you can fill the page. You say every thing that occurs to your fancy (8). Costar was not so flattered with this heavy blow as not to think of some shifts; but indeed they are meer cavils. It is true, saith he (9), that Tasso for a long time had an apartment in the ducal palace of Ferrara: but when he wrote his heroic poem Rinaldo, at Padua, or when he was employed in the disposition of the design and matter of his Gierusalemme liberata; did not he live in lodgings? and doth not he, in one of his letters, complain of their inconveniences? As for Ariosto, we shall find him, in his satires, complaining of his extreme poverty (10). . . . At last Alfonso's liberality enabled him to build a house. But Battista Pigna testifies, that it was at a very small expence, poca spesa. And a certain person telling him, that such a small building did not very well agree with so many towering and magnificent palaces, which he had erected in his writings; he answered, *That building with words, and building with stones were not the same things:* Egli dandogli questa festevole risposta, che porvi le pietre & porvi le parole non è il medesimo. I would ask Mr Girac, if it is not probable, that Ariosto lodged in a hired room, whilst the builders were at work; and much more before he was able to employ them (11)? Costar subjoins several examples. He saith that Terence had not so much as one hired house; that Vitellius when he left Rome to go into Germany **, where, soon after, the Roman legions created him Emperor, left his wife and children in a hired room; that Malherbe never lived otherwise; and that his excellent verses did not bring him in enough to build even a poor cottage which he could call his own (12). Every one must needs see that this way of answering is but a wretched apology; for, not to insist on every particular, could we not say that Ariosto, while the workmen were employed in building his house, rented another; a practice very common amongst a vast number of very rich people? Are Terence, Vitellius, or Malherbe, concerned in this dispute, or does the question run upon this, viz. Whether it was shameful (13) for Tasso and Ariosto to live in lodgings? The question is only about the matter of fact itself. Costar could not maintain what he advanced; he is therefore conquered. The same

VOL. V.

fate would probably fall on those who should be obliged to bring proofs that Tristan l'Hermite had not so much as a cloak.

Men are too much pleased with exaggerations in this sort of rallery; they imagine that without exceeding the bounds of truth, they cannot give a sufficient poignancy to their thoughts. I am going to cite a Rondeau, which supposes some Poets not able so much as to hire a lodging. This is a hint from the fable of Amphion's lyre, which had such a virtue, that without the help of any other architect, it was able to build a city.

Le (14) beau secret pour elever le corps
D'un grand Logis! Tels Ouvriers sont morts;
Il n'en est plus; à leur douce harmonie
Les gros moëtons venoient de compagnie,
Et s'arrangeoient comme par des re lorts.

A peu de frais, & sans aucuns efforts,
Pareilles gens édifioient alors,
La seule voix au Luth étant unie;

Le beau secret!

Ah! pour bâtir, si les charmans accords,
Si les bons Vers, tenoient lieu de trésors,
Que de Palais de splendeur infinie!
Nos Amphions sont en chambre garnie;
S'ils n'y font pas, c'est qu'ils couchent dehors:

Le beau secret (15)!

O happy art, a house to raise!
Such builders live not in our days,
At the sweet music of whose song
Huge stones spontaneous mov'd along,
And form'd a habitable pile,
Without the master's charge or toil.
'Twas but to sing and touch the lyre,
The house was built to their desire.

O happy art!

Al! were it now, as erst of old!
Wou'd verses pass instead of gold;
What splendid palaces wou'd rise,
What domes poetic brave the skies!
But our Amphions live alone
In hired lodgings: . . . or in none.

O happy art!

You see Mr Benferade thought it impossible to rally agreeably without taking his subject a note higher than those who touched it before him. He believed it too vulgar to lodge the Poets in a hired room very near the garret. This is, doubtless, the destiny of some, as well as it was the hard fate of the Gram-marian Orbilius, who, as Suetonius informs us, taught at Rome, with much more reputation than profit, and he himself complained, in one of his books, that the poverty which attended his old age, obliged him to lodge in a garret (16). This complaint seems better grounded than the confession which Martial makes of being lodged in the third story.

Et scalis habito tribus, sed altis (17).

And in a room three stories high was lodg'd.

Mr Gombauld was rallied for having no better lodging. 'Mr Boitard, President of the Chamber of Accounts at Montpellier, was very much pleased with jesting upon Mr de Gombauld. Once in rallery he caused a bill to be clapped on his door, importing, 'That if any person had found a Bruges fatten bag, in which are Mr de Gombauld's thoughts, if they will be pleased to bring them to the scutcheon of Anceux, in the Rue des Noyers, four pair of stairs, ubi ponunt ova columbæ (18), - where the pigeons lay their eggs, they shall be very well rewarded (19).' Some are of opinion, that Juvenal did not mean, that the best Roman Poets were just ready to turn Bakers, or Bagnio-keepers, but that the true sense of his words is, that they designed to lodge at some Bagnio-keeper's or Baker's.

5 I

(14) Benferade, Métamorph. d'Ovide misé en Rondeaux.

(15) This puts me in mind of Father Garass's words, in his Doctrine Curieuse, p. 63: 'They are of the opinion of the parasite mentioned by the old Comic Poet Cæcilius, that the greatest torment a parasite can be put to, is to see him sit at home, & to come down him to sup at home, & to come home late.'

(16) Docuit major fama quam emolumento. Namque jam per senex pauperem sub tegulis quodam scripto factetur. Sueton. de illust. Grammat. cap. ix.

(17) Mart. Epigramm. cxviii, lib. i. See also Epigramm. cix. of the same book, where he says, At mea Vipinæ spectant canalicula laurus.

(18) It is an allusion to these words of Juven. Sat. iii, ver. 201. Quem tegula sola tueretur A pluvia, molles ubi recludunt ova columbæ.

(19) Suite du Manuscrit, page 176. Dutch Edit.

(8) Girac, Remarques sur les Entretiens de Costar, pag. 263, 264.

(9) Costar, Apologie pag. 330.

(10) Costar quotes in this place several verses of Ariosto, that witness his poverty; but as has been seen above, in remark [E] of the article BENSERADE, the complaints of Poets are not always a proof of their being poor.

(11) Id. ibid. pag. 331.

** Uxor & liberis quos Romæ reliquebat meritorio canaliculo abditis, &c. Suet. in Vitell. cap. 7.

(12) Costar, Apol. pag. 331.

(13) Costar supposes without any reason for it, that people fancied he tarnished the reputation of Tasso and Ariosto.

TRISTAN.

402

(f) Marolles,
Denombrement
des Auteurs.

Muses [C]. He had a brother who applied himself to the writing of genealogies, and who published an *History of Touraine* (f), and is, if I am not mistaken, the same John Baptist TRISTAN

Baker's, that they might warm themselves for nothing. However it be, those lines of Juvenal give a lively description of their deplorable condition?

Cum jam celebres, notique poetæ
Balneolum Gabiis, Romæ conducere furnos
Tentarent: nec foedum alii, nec turpe putarent
Præcones fieri, cum, desertis Aganippes
Vallibus, esuriens migraret in atria Cleio (20).

(20) Juven. Sat.
vii, ver. 3.

But now the celebrated wits for need
Hire bagnios, to the crier's trade succeed,
Or get their own by baking others' bread!
Or, by the porter's lodge, with beggars wait
For greasy fragments at the great man's gate.

DRYDEN.

But Mr Benferade goes yet much further; he says, some Poets pass the whole night in the street, and lie under no other canopy than that of Heaven, being more miserable than foxes, who have holes, and the birds of the air who have nests (21).

(21) St Matthew
viii, 20.

It is so true, that the thing aimed at by this sort of rallery, is to shew, that Poets have no houses of their own, that a certain ingenious man delighted in supposing, that a Poet having once bought a house, a poetical parliament was called to consider of this great novelty, and the greatest Poets urging, they never lived otherwise than in lodgings, he was immediately obliged to sell his house. This story in Latin runs thus: 'Memini me olim legisse elegantem ingenii lusum, superiore ætate excusum, cum inscriptione: Poeta domum emit. Argumentum libelli est, nescio quis poeta, qui cum propriam domum emisset, res ea tanquam novi & pessimi Exempli, ad Poetarum Senatium delata, acerbè judicata est. Præfatus Senatus Eobanus Hessus constitutus, cui assederunt, Celtes, Huttenus, Bebelius, Brasicanus, alii. Cum Sententias dicerent, nemo ex omnibus fuit, qui vel Meccenatum gratia, vel ingenii felicitate tantum profecerit, ut ædes proprias vel hereditate vel emptione possederit; omnes rei familiaris incurii, in conducto se vixisse & fassi sunt & gloriati. Iussus igitur est quam primum ædes revendere, pecuniam vero in symposium conferre quo immanem hanc culpam elueret, & ubique habitare ac sine curis vivere poetice disceret. Hæc illi (22). I remember I read formerly an elegant piece of wit, printed in the last century, and intituled, A Poet bought a house. The substance of it is this; A certain Poet having purchased an house of his own, the matter was laid before the parliament of Poets, as being an unheard of and very bad precedent, and a severe sentence was pronounced upon it. Eobanus Hessus was chosen speaker, and Celtes, Huttenus, Bebelius, Brasicanus, and others, were members. When they came to give their votes, it appeared there was not one single person, who through the favour of patrons, or an happy wit, was worth so much as to be master of an house either by inheritance or purchase: all of them neglecting their private fortunes, owned, and bragged that they lived in lodgings. The Poet was therefore ordered forthwith to sell his house, and to buy wine with the money for their entertainment, and that he should learn to lodge and live always without care like a Poet.'

(22) Joh. Valentinus Andreas,
Epist. ccli, pag. 342.

The jests made on our Tristan l'Hermit were chiefly levelled at the meanness of his cloaths. It was he whom Mr Gueret chose to be an apologist for shabby Poets: for somebody having said, that their uncombed hair, their dirty linen, and the ridiculous figure which their ragged cloaths made, would force a smile from the gravest men (23); Tristan bluntly replied (24), 'You trouble your head about a trifle . . . let the Poets live as they please: do not you know they cannot abide constraint? And what is it to you, that they are all ill clothed, if their verse be lofty and magnificent? Do not deceive yourself, this great negligence is the source of their finest poems: they are thus unconcerned at worldly things, to make their court to the Muses with the greatest assiduity; and when their eyes appear to you staring or distracted, their imagination is busied in quest of those surprising wonders which ravish you. Would to God our

(23) Gueret,
Parnasse Réformé, pag. 101.

(24) Ibid. pag. 102, 103.

dramatic Poets were only guilty of this fault, I could easily pardon them. But, contrary to those you speak of, they are magnificently dressed, they look great by their rich apparel, and their poems are languid, and without method.

[C] . . . and would be no proof of the injustice of the age, nor any argument of the sterility of the services done to the Muses. If any one should ever think of reducing all the lists of poor learned men, which we find in several places (25), into an universal catalogue, it would swell to a very large book; and the Poets would here take up more room than all other authors, or if we either regard their accounts of themselves, or the truth of the fact. I think I have already cited these verses of Regnier:

Or avecq' tout cecy le poinct qui me console,
C'est que la pauvreté comme moi les afole,
Et que la grace à Dieu, Phœbus & son troupeau
Nous n'eumes sur le dos jamais un bon manteau,
&c (26).

This is my comfort with my scanty store,
They grow the sonder of me, 'cause I'm poor;
And, thanks to heav'n, to Phœbus and the Nine,
I ne'er had a warm cloak, nor place to dine, &c.

(25) You will find one in Weizmann's notes upon the words of Petronius: Nescio quo modo bene mentis foret esse pauperas. These notes are to be found in the edition of Petronius, published by Lestachius, at Frankfurt, 1619, in 4to.

(26) Regnier, Sat. ii, l. l. m. 5 vers.

A little lower he saith:

Pour moy, si mon habit, par tout cicatricé
Ne me rendoit du peuple & des grands méprisé
Je prendrois patience, &c.

As for my self, if tatter'd coat and vest,
Of high and low did not make me the jest,
I could be patient, &c.

The epitaph on Malherbe written by Gombauld, discovers the poverty of both of them:

L'Apollon de nos jours, Malherbe, icy repose;
Il a vécu long-temps sans beaucoup de support:
En quel siècle? passant! je n'en dis autre chose,
Il est mort pauvre, & moy je vis comme il est mort (27).

Here lies Malherbe, th' Apollo of our time,
Long while he liv'd with little to support him.
In what age? Passenger, I say no more,
He died, I live, alike, both very poor.

(27) See the Diverticules Curieuses, Part. 2, pag. 35, Dutch Edit.

It would be very easy to make a collection of pieces of Poetry of the like nature, which would fill several sheets. The general conclusion is that the age is very ungrateful and unjust to suffer so many men to be afflicted with poverty, who deserve so well to be rewarded, and to enjoy the conveniences of life. But it is certain that those who talk thus are very often in the wrong; for there are several Poets, whose poverty is only to be ascribed to their too great neglect of their domestic affairs, and not knowing how to husband the favours which they receive. Those who apply themselves wholly to the Muses, can scarce think of any thing else, and find so many charming engagements in the composition of a Poem, that they cannot take off their thoughts, even when their domestic interest requires them to be employed in something else, than the composing an Ode. The pleasing Poetry affords is very great, and . . . the hours pass away very fast which are employed that way. But does not this wonderful pleasure which Poets take in their performances, divert them from their affairs, prejudice their fortune, and estrange them from the usual conduct of other men? For rather than not finish a sonnet well begun, a Poet will suffer his friend to depart without bidding him adieu, abandon the sollicitation of his law-suit, and neglect the care of his health: as it happened to the Cavalier Marino, who burnt his leg as he was writing some stanzas of his Adonis. This poetic

absence

TRISTAN L'HERMITE de Soliers, who in the year 1661, published *the Cabinet of Lewis XI, containing several fragments, letters, and secret intrigues concerning the reign of that monarch; and several other curious pieces, never before published. Collected from several archives and repositories* (g).

absence is not hurtful when some misfortune has happened; for it does in some measure take off the sense of it: but it is prejudicial, when it throws men into sad accidents, like that of Marino. On indifferent subjects it is innocent and even diverting.

Si lors que tu luy parles,
Il te laisse au Roy Jehan, & s'en court au Roy Charles.

If when to him you talk,
He from one subject to another roves.

The elevated imagination of a Poet is no disagreeable object, when at leisure hours we see it take its flight, and soar up towards every thing that can afford it some thoughts. And if sometimes the beauty or the boldness of those pictures which he draws, divert us; yet the Poet's ill fortune is always to be lamented, because his most pressing affairs scarce ever prevail over his absence of mind (28). There are several other causes of the ill posture of their affairs, which are indeed shameful; some are poor notwithstanding the liberalities of a Mæcenas, because they are prodigal and voluptuous; others lose at play all the money which their poetical productions bring in. Our Tristram ruined himself by this. See what Mr Chevreau says of it. 'We may judge of his genius by his Marianna. We were intimate friends; and when he desired me to inform him of the fate of the last verses which he made for the Queen (29). I answered him that the person who shewed them to her majesty, did not chuse a time when the Queen was in a gay humour. But if she had made him a present, he would have made but a very indifferent use of it: gaming was his predominant passion; and he lost all he could play for. At several times he received of the Duke of St Aignan a thousand pistoles, out of which he could not spare enough to buy a good suit of cloaths (30). Could he then justly complain of the hardness of the age? If he was not rich in proportion to his condition, it was his own fault, and only to be charged on his ill conduct. He is reported to have written his own epitaph in these six verses.

(28) Sorbier, Letter lxxvii, pag. 559, 560.

(29) That is Christina, Queen of Sweden.

(30) Chevreau, Tom. i, pag. 29. Dutch Edit.

Ebloui de l'éclat de la splendeur mondaine,
Je me flatay tousjours de l'esperance vaine;
Faisant le chien couchant auprès d'un grand Seigneur,
Je me vis toujours pauvre, & tâchay de paroître;
Je vécus dans la peine attendant le bonheur,
Et mourus sur un coffre en attendant mon Maître (31).

Smit with the dazzling splendor of the world,
I fed my wishes with expectation vain,
Servilely crouching at a great lord's feet.
Still poor, I labour'd still to seem in want;
I lived in pain, expecting happiness,
And in the service of my master died.

Mr Chevreau mentions another Poet, who ruined himself by his pleasures, viz. Colletet. 'In his Poems we find this verse.

J'ay des maisons aux champs, j'ay des maisons en ville.

City and country houses I enjoy.

But these houses must have been in *paribus infidelium, imaginary*. He was naturally libidinous, and to tempt him, it was not necessary to be either fair or young. That he might not get a scandalous name among his neighbours, and not being able to live without a female servant, he married her, and she was no sooner dead than he got another, whom he also did not fail to make his wife (32). . . . Those who designed to take an inventory of his goods, assured me that he saved them that trouble, and left his son the name of Colletet only for an inheritance (33).

It would be almost as difficult to enrich certain authors, as to fill the Danaides tub. They are with respect to their expences what others are with respect to secrets (34); money slips from them a thousand several ways.

(31) See the Divertissement Curieuses, ubi supra, Tom. ii, pag. 341, Dutch Edit.

(32) Chevreau, ibid. pag. 30.

(33) Ibid. pag. 31.

(34) Plenus rimarum sum, hac atque illac perfluo. Terent. Eunuch. Act. i, Sc. ii.

TRISTAN DE SAINT AMANT (JOHN) an Antiquary and Medalist in the XVIIth century, author of a work in three volumes in folio, intituled *Commentaires Historiques* (a), was the son of Charles Tristram, auditor of accompts at Paris (b). Father Sirmond and he wrote against each other (c).

(a) See what judgment Mr de Spanheim gives of him, De usu & præst. Numism. p. 774, & Epist. vii, ad Morellium, p. 148. (b) See the Journal des Sçavans, of the 22d of August, 1689, pag. 584. Dutch Edit. (c) See Baillet's Anti, Tom. ii, p. 264.

TRONCHIN (THEODORE) a Minister, and Professor of Divinity, born April 17, 1582, at Geneva, where his father was a refugee on account of religion [A]. He was designed to be a scholar by the advice of his godfather Theodorus Beza, and he made an extraordinary progress in his studies. The testimonials given him in the year 1600, when he went to visit foreign universities, gave him the character of a young man of very great hopes. He confirmed this character among all the learned men to whom he was pupil, or with whom he contracted any acquaintance in his travels [B]. He returned to Geneva in 1606, and gave such signal proofs of his learning, that he was

[A] Geneva where his father was a refugee on account of religion. He was of Troyes in Champagne, and quitted France in 1572, on account of the massacre, which he escaped by the kind offices of a Priest his friend and neighbour, who hid him in his house. He designed to retire into Germany, and to have only passed through Geneva, where he nevertheless staid by the advice of a friend. He obtained the freedom of that city, and not long after was admitted into the council of two hundred, in acknowledgment of several services done to the Republic, during the war it was then engaged in with the Duke of Savoy (1).

(1) Taken from an impaired Memoir.

[B] In his travels. Leaving Geneva in 1600, he studied at Basil under John Nicolas Stupanus, Amanus Polanus, and Antony Waleus. He returned to Geneva in 1602, and departed thence in 1604, to go to Heidelberg, where he improved by the lectures of David Pareus Professor of Divinity, and by those of Æmilius Portus Greek Professor. He spent some time at Francfort to see Gruterus, who had rendered himself famous by his collection of inscriptions. In 1605, he went to the university of Franeker, to hear Sibrand Lubbertus. He staid a considerable time at Leyden, under the Professors Gomarus, Trelcatius, Bertius, and Arminius:

TRONCHIN.

404

was the same year made Hebrew professor. In 1607, he married Theodora Rocca, a woman of an extraordinary merit in all respects, sister to the first syndic of the Republic, and grand-daughter to the wife of Theodorus Beza, at whose house she was brought up, and whose god-daughter she was (a). He was chosen minister in December 1608, and created rector of the academy in 1610. He was desired in 1614, besides his Hebrew lectures to read in Divinity, one of the professors being then sick; and when a professorship of Divinity became vacant in 1618, he succeeded to it, and was thereby discharged from his Hebrew professorship. The same year he received orders from the pastors and professors of Geneva to answer the Jesuit Coton, who had writ against the French version of the bible, a book intitled *Geneve plagiaire*. He acquitted himself of this commission by a tract intitled *Coton plagiaire*, a work which was very much esteemed by the public. At the same time he and Mr Diodati were deputed by the church of Geneva to the famous synod of Dort (b), where he discovered his profound knowledge in Theology, and a moderation which was very much praised. In this great conjuncture he acquired some months in 1632 (c), and perfectly answered that lord's expectation, who testified afterwards a very great esteem and particular affection for him. He was very grateful, and honoured the memory of that duke by an oration which he pronounced a few days after the funeral of that great man in 1638. He continued to acquire great esteem in the exercise of all his employments, and by a very extensive correspondence in the reformed countries, where he obtained the friendship of the most learned men, as well as of several great lords and princes. He composed orations and Latin poems with great facility (c): His conversation was very instructive and agreeable; for he had added to the study of Divinity, and of several languages, the knowledge of the Civil-Law, and of several other sciences, and that of sacred and profane history, especially of the two last centuries, of which he knew an infinite number of particulars. He was one of those men, who are more fond of deserving reputation, than of hunting after it, and he might if he had pleased have published very excellent books, as Mr Mestrezat (d) assured us. He was chosen by the pastors in 1655, to confer with and assist John Dury, in the project of uniting the Lutherans and the Reformed, on which he wrote several tracts. He arrived to an happy old age free from diseases, and died very easily, after a fever which had continued some days, on the 19th of November 1657. He had just before received the visit of the pastors and professors in a body, who in their moving discourse to him gave him all the marks of a tender affection. It was observed that he survived all the foreign divines who assisted at the synod of Dort. He was a frank sincere man, zealous for religion, and the service of the churches, a great enemy to the vices of men, tho' very tender of their persons. His advice was greatly regarded both for the civil government, and in the two ecclesiastical bodies; and also by strangers, a great number of whom consulted him. Amongst other children he left LEWIS TRONCHIN, who was minister (e) of the church of Lyons, and four years after was elected to succeed his father both as minister and professor of Divinity (f). This worthy son still enjoys (g) that post with the reputation of one of the ablest Divines of this age. All those who are acquainted with the justness and penetration of his genius passionately desire that he would at last become an author, and are very sorry that he puts so slight a value on that title*.

(a) It is therefore a thing somewhat singular, that both the husband and the wife should have had such an illustrious god-father.

(b) The Republic of the United Provinces, had desired of that of Geneva, two of their Divines.

(c) I have mentioned his funeral oration upon Simon Goulart, in the dissertation concerning Junius Brutus.

(d) The Paris minister.

(e) He was admitted minister in 1651.

(f) Taken from a Memoir, sent from Geneva.

(g) I write this in 1701.

* He died at Geneva, the eighth of September 1705, being 76 years old. See his Elogy in the inaugural speech of Mr Turretin, his successor in the professorship of Divinity.

Arminius: under the last of which he publicly maintained a thesis in Divinity. He also frequented Meula and Baudius, and very often visited Joseph Scalliger and Heinfius, who shewed a great esteem and affection for him. He was loved and praised by all for his virtue and learning. At the Hague he saw Hugo Grotius, who gave him sixteen verses which he had composed, and told him that he did it to put him in mind of his love for him, and of his esteem for his learning. He saw at London Aaron Cappel; at Oxford Drusus (2), and John Reynolds; at Cambridge Richard Thompson and several others. He was very much esteemed at Paris by Montigni and Du Moulin ministers, and by Casaubon who bestowed great elogies on his learning and piety. He afterwards made the tour of France, and visited at Blois, Nicolas Vignier the great Historian; at Samur Philip Birgan, a Breton called thither by Du Pleffis and the academical Senate to be Professor of the Oriental tongues. He spent some months in 1606, at Montauban, where the Divinity Professor

Sonius shewed a particular esteem for him, and at Montelimar where the famous Daniel Chamier discovered a tender affection for him (3).

[C] He had leave to go to the Duke of Rohan for some months in 1632. This Duke was then Ambassador extraordinary from the King of France and General of his armies in the country of the Grisons. He sent a gentleman to Geneva with letters to the government, and the Pastors, to desire them to send him a minister to reside with him, with whom he might advise on those things which might tend to the good of the Reformed Churches in that country, that were ill treated by the Spaniards. Theodorus Tronchin was sent to him only for some months. The necessities of the Academy could not allow of his long stay. The term being expired, it was prolonged for two months at the instance of the Duke of Rohan. The churches of the Grisons preserved a great veneration for his person, and very gratefully acknowledged the good offices he had done them (4).

(3) Taken from the same Memoir.

(4) Ibid.

TRUBERUS

TRUBERUS. TULENUS. TULLIA.

405

(a) Konig. Bibl. pag. 810.

TRUBERUS (PRIMUS) was born in Sclavonia in the year 1508 (a). He was the first who taught the art of writing in the Sclavonian tongue (b), and he translated into that language the New Testament, the Catechism, the Augsborg confession, and some tracts of Melanchthon: which was the cause that Lutheranism spread not only in Carniola and Carinthia, but also in the dominions of the great Turk (c). He died in the year 1586 (d), and left a son named FELICIAN TRUBERUS, who was minister at Laubach in Carniola, and had been educated at Tubingen in the college where the Duke of Wirtemberg maintained at his own charge a certain number of students (e).

(c) Hailbrunnensis, Epist. Dedicat. Comment. in Jeroniam.

(b) Primus linguam Sclavonicam in literas referre docuit. Phil. Hailbrunnerus, Epist. Dedic. Comment. in Jeroniam. Primus excogitavit artem scribendi lingua Vandalica. Konig. Biblioth. pag. 810. (c) Konig. ibid. (d) Ibid. (e) Ibid.

TULENUS, a learned man in the reign of Henry II, had been preceptor to the Cardinal, and to the Admiral de Chatillon (a). He was affected with a sort of folly which did not prejudice his reason and judgment in any thing else but his amorous passion for a certain princess, which miserably distracted him. Of which Pasquier, an eye-witness, relates some circumstances [A].

(a) Pasquier's Letters, book xix, pag. 541, 542, book xxii, pag. 791.

(1) Pasquier's Letters, book xix, pag. 541.

[A] Of which Pasquier, an eye-witness, relates some circumstances. Proposing some objections against the common opinion of Physicians, that the judgment, imagination, and memory, are three faculties which are lodged in three separate ventricles of the brain, he saith that the distinction of the three ventricles is insufficient, and that the ventricle of judgment, and that of memory ought to be subdivided as often as either of them acts differently in us. And to prove these different operations, he observes that in the reign of Francis I, One Villenachon resided at court, whose judgment never appeared touched on any other account than his expecting to marry ladies of great quality (1); and after him, continues he, 'Tulenus a learned man whose judgment was entire in every thing else but a passion, which he had ridiculously vowed to one of the first Princesses of France, who was dead. With this person I once diverted myself at my own table, when several men of honour, who were strangers, and not in the least acquainted with him were present. He entertained us till the middle of our dinner with an infinite variety of learned and judicious discourse, to the admiration of all who heard him. At last believing I had sufficiently prejudiced the company in his favour, and that it was now time to make the good old man play another

part, I took occasion seemingly by accident to speak of this Princess; after which quitting his amble he immediately began to trot, relating an incoherent crowd of follies, concerning the good and ill treatment he had met with from her. The company amazed from whence this sudden change proceeded, could not tell what to think of him, he having before talked so wittily and learnedly. But after he was gone, I at large acquainted them with the reason of the alteration of his brain. Besides what I have related, it was observed of him, that the judging part being wounded on this subject, had also affected the imaginative so much, that at the first sight of any young lady whom he met with, he was persuaded it was his Julia, (as he called his pretended mistress in Latin, and Jolivet in French) and guided by this foolish imagination, he sometimes walked in his gown and square-cap as far as Fontaine-Bleau, persuading himself that she hid herself there. I relate nothing concerning him but what I have seen or heard of him (2). This example confirms what we have seen in another place (3), that some persons lose common sense with regard to some things, who nevertheless by the rest of their conduct plainly convince us that their sense, knowledge, and reason are entire and in a flourishing condition (4).

(2) Pasquier repeats the same thing much in the same words in the xxiiid book, pag. 791. But he says there that Tulenus was crazy in two respects, in aiming at the bishopric of Cambray, and in his love for that great Princess. See Sorel's remarks upon the Berger extravagant, pag. 176, 177.

(3) Above, towards the end of remark [E], of the article MARESTS (JOHN DEKS).

(4) See Fromon de Anima, lib. iv, cap. iv.

TULLIA, Cicero's daughter, is so often mentioned in that great man's epistles, that her history deserves to be enquired into. She was born the 5th of August (a), but the year is unknown to us. Some very learned men believe that she was married to her first husband in the year 689 (b). His name was Caius Pifo [A]. He was a man of strict honour, he interested himself with the utmost concern in the affairs of his father-in-law [B], and wanted neither capacity nor eloquence. It is thought he died during Cicero's exile, which was in 696. TULLIA was a second time married to Furius Craffipes the following year [C]. It is not known how she was separated from this husband; whether he died, or whether she was divorced from him: we are only told that in 703 she was married to Publius Cornelius Dolabella. This third marriage was contracted during Cicero's absence, when he was governor of Cilicia. Those friends whom

(a) Cicero, Orat. pro Sextio, & Epist. i, lib. iv, ad Atticum.

(b) See the remark [A].

(1) Corradus, in Quentura, pag. m. 83, and after him Sagittarius, in Vita Tullie, m. 5, & 11.

(2) See Cicero, Grevius's edition, Epist. ad Attic. Tom. i, pag. 33. And in Manutius's Commentary, pag. 18.

(3) Orat. pro Sextio, pag. m. 73.

[A] His name was Caius Pifo. This is not to be doubted of, if we consider these words: 'Tulliam C. Pisoni L. F. Frugi despondimus. . . . I have given my daughter Tullia in marriage to Caius Pifo.' So Tully concludes the third epistle of his first book to Atticus. It is thought to have been written in the consulship of Lucius Julius Cæsar, and Caius Martius Figulus, in the year 689 (1); but no reason is alleged for that date, and I find no hint in the letter itself to countenance it. Casaubon believes it was written before the year 686, and that Tullia was not above twelve years old at most when she was married to Caius Pifo (2).

[B] He interested himself with the utmost concern in the affairs of his father-in-law. Cicero could never sufficiently praise him. 'Vexabatur, saith he (3), uxor mea: liberi ad necem quærebantur: gener, & Pifo gener à Pisonis Consulibus pedibus supplex rejectus. . . . My wife was harassed, my children persecuted to death, and the humble petitions of my dear son-in-law Pifo rejected by the consul Pifo.' In one of

his Orations (4) he speaks thus: 'Alter fuit propugnator meorum fortunarum & defensor assiduus, summa virtute & pietate C. Pifo gener, qui minas inimicorum meorum, qui inimicitias affinis mei propinqui sui Consulibus, qui Pontum & Bithyniam Questor pro mea salute neglexit. . . . C. Pifo, my son-in-law, a man of great honour and probity, vigorously supported my interest; he despised the threats of my enemies, and the hatred of the Consul, who was allied to me and related to him: and when he was Questor, he neglected Pontus and Bithynia upon my account.' The like passages are to be found in his epistles. See the elogy which he bestows on him with respect to his eloquence and virtue in his treatise de Claris Oratoribus (5).

[C] Tullia was a second time married to Furius Craffipes the following year. See Cicero's epistles to his brother, book the second, epistle 4 and 7. Ludovicus Vives hath (6) reduced these two sons-in-law of Cicero to one: he supposes that Tullia was but twice married, the first time to Pifo Frugi Craffipes, and the second

(4) Post reditum in Senatu. See also his speech Post reditum ad Quirites.

(5) Pag. m. 398.

(6) In August. de Civit. Dei, lib. xix, cap. iv.

VOL. V.

5 K

(c) I mean Terentia, Cicero's wife, and Tullia their daughter.

whom he desired to inform him whether Dolabella was in good circumstances [D], acquitted themselves very ill of that commission; and he afterwards repented that ever he had consented to that match, before he could himself enquire into Dolabella's affairs, which were not in a very good posture. He was a young man who lived irregularly [E]; but knew so well how to cajole the mother and the daughter (c) [F], that they winked at his debaucheries, and looked on him as a good match. He gave his father-in-law very

(7) In the remark [N].

second to Cornelius Dolabella, and that she died in child-bed in the house of the latter. We shall refute this below (7).

[D] To inform him whether Dolabella was in good circumstances. I only advance this as a conjecture which I borrow from the learned Manutius: it is very probable and founded on some expressions of Cicero. He tells Atticus: 'Tullia mea venit ad me pridie Idus Jun. deque tua erga se observantia benevolentiaque mihi plurima exposuit, literasque reddidit trinas: ego autem ex ipsius virtute, humanitate, pietate non modò eam voluptatem non cepi, quam capere ex singulari filia debui; sed etiam incredibili sum dolore affectus, tale ingenium in tam misera fortuna versari, idque accidere nullo ipsius delicto, summa culpa mea (8). -- My daughter Tullia came to me the 12th of June, and acquainted me with the respect and civility you had shown her, and delivered to me three letters: but I am so far from conceiving pleasure, as I ought, on account of her extraordinary virtue, good nature, and piety, that I am overwhelmed with sorrow, because those excellent qualities are attended with unhappy circumstances of life, and that through no fault of her own, but mine.' Let us now see how the two last words are paraphrased by Manutius. 'Mea enim negligentia factum est, ut Dolabellæ nuberet: quem ego probare generum non debui, nisi prius omnia percrutatus, non solum quod ad mores, sed etiam quod ad facultates attineret: quod si fecissem, ejus ære alieno perpecto, nunquam passus essem, ut homini in tanta rei domesticæ difficultate constituto filia mea collocaretur; sed commisi, ut me absente res per amicos ageretur, quibus in Cilicium proficiscens ita mandavi (9), ut, quoniam ego tam longe abfuturus eram, de Tullia meâ matrimonio agerent ipsi quod probassent. in quo meam negligentiam agnosco, tantam enim rem aliis committere non debui, sed in reditu meum integram reservare. -- For it was owing to my negligence that she was married to Dolabella: whom I should not have approved of for a son-in-law, until I had first enquired into every thing, not only with respect to his morals, but likewise with regard to his circumstances: which had I done, and found that he was plunged in debt, I would never have suffered my daughter to be married to a man labouring under such difficulties: but I agreed that the affair should be managed by friends in my absence; to whom I gave a power, as I was going into Cilicia, and was to be absent so long, to do whatever they thought proper in the marriage of my daughter Tullia; wherein I acknowledge my fault, for I ought not to have trusted a matter of that importance to others, but to have deferred it entirely till my return.' This author confirms his paraphrase in the following manner: 'Cur autem hoc à Cicerone putem significari, facit Epistola ad Terentiam his verbis scripta: Tullia nostra venit ad me pridie idus Jun. cujus summa virtute et singulari humanitate graviore etiam sum dolore affectus, nostra factum esse negligentia, ut longe alia in fortuna esset, atque ejus pietas ac dignitas postulabat. Dixit autem, Tale ingenium in tam misera fortuna versari, hoc sensu; quod Tullia virum haberet tam perditum, tam flagitiosum, tam multa in tribunatu nefarie molientem: siquidem in tribunatu iniquas leges ferre Dolabella conatus est, maxime debitorum causa, è quibus ipse unus erat (10). -- I am inclined to think that this is Cicero's meaning, from the following epistle to Terentia: My Tullia came to me the 12th of June, whose great virtue and singular good nature gives me the greater trouble, as it was through my negligence that she did not meet with a fortune suitable to her piety and merit. The reason why he says, Those excellent qualities were attended with unhappy circumstances of life, was, because Tullia had a debauched and profligate husband, who excited tumults in Rome whilst he was Tribune of the people: for Dolabella in his tribuneship endeavoured to enact unjust

(8) Epist. xvii, lib. xi.

(9) This appears from these words of Cicero. In quo unum verum ne tu parum perspicuas ea que gesta sunt ab aliis esse gesta, quibus ego ita mandaram, ut cum tam longe abfuturus essem ad me ne referrent, agerent quod probassent. -- Wherein I am afraid you do not attend to one thing, viz. that what was done, was done by others, to whom I gave a commission, as I was to be absent a long time, to manage in that affair as they should think fit, without referring it to me. Epist. xii, lib. iii, ad Familiares, wherein he excuses himself for having married Tullia to Dolabella, the accuser of Appian, to whom he writes.

(10) Manutius quotes Dion in this place.

laws, especially in behalf of debtors, whereby he himself was one.

[E] He was a young man who lived irregularly. Cælius hinted it to Cicero, when he congratulated him on that marriage: I shall cite his own words because they contain the very compliment we should make at present in a like case. He excuses what was past on account of his youth, and though he durst not venture to assure him, that all the failings of that age were mended, yet he hoped the marrying such an accomplished lady, the daughter of such a father, would certainly compleat the cure. 'Gratulor tibi affinitate viri medius fidius optimi. Nam hoc ego de illo existimo. Cetera porro quibus adhuc ille sibi parum utilis fuit, & ætate jam sunt decursa, & consuetudine atque autoritate tua & pudore Tullia, si qua restabunt, confido celeriter sublata iri. Non est enim pugnax in vitiis, neque hebes ad id quod melius sit intelligendum (11). -- I congratulate you upon your affinity with a man, that is in truth an excellent person: for such is my opinion of the eighth book of him. As to those follies he may have been guilty of to his own prejudice, they are now cured with age; or if any still remain, I dare say he will be reclaimed by your company and authority, and by the virtue of Tullia. For he is not obstinate in his failings, and he has sense enough to know how to behave better.' Observe what Cælius says, that age had already cured the vicious inclinations of Dolabella. This inclines me to believe that Appian was mistaken when he affirmed (12) that Dolabella was not above twenty-five years of age when Cæsar was killed. He must then have been but eighteen or nineteen when he married Tullia. Was it then reasonable to say that the vicious course of his youth was past? But here are yet other difficulties against Appian. The commentators on Cicero will have the following words to be meant of Dolabella: 'Illud verò mihi permirum accidit, tantam temeritatem fuisse in eo adulescente, cujus ego salutem duobus capitibus judiciis summa contentione defendi, ut tuis inimicitias suscipiendis oblivisceretur patroni omnium fortunarum ac rationum suarum: præsertim cum tu omnibus vel ornamentis vel præditiis redundares, illi (ut levissimè dicam) multa defessent. cujus sermo stultus & puerilis erat jam antea ad me a M. Cælio, familiari nostro, percriptus: de quo item sermone multa scripta sunt abs te. Ego autem citius cum eo qui tuas inimicitias suscepisset, veterem conjunctionem diremisset quam novam conciliaissem. -- I am very much surprised that that young man, whose life with great difficulty I saved, when he was twice indicted for capital crimes, should be so indiscreet as to become your enemy and forget the patron and guardian of all his fortune: especially considering the vast honours and powerful interest you enjoyed, whilst he (to speak moderately) is in great want. Our friend M. Cælius had before informed me by a letter of his filly and childish discourse, concerning which you have likewise writ much. I had rather break off an old acquaintance with one that is your avowed enemy than contract a new one.' Cicero wrote this in 703, when he was in Cilicia, before Dolabella was his son-in-law. The epistle, of which these words are part, was written to a person whom Dolabella had accused (13). It seems therefore that they cannot be meant of any body else besides Dolabella. But it would be very strange, that before the age of eighteen a person should be twice arraigned for capital crimes. Besides I find that Tullia was not Dolabella's first wife. He had one who left him when he accused Appian (14).

[F] He knew so well how to cajole the mother and the daughter. This we may infer from these words of Cicero to Atticus (15). 'Ego, dum in provincia cum omnibus rebus Appium orno, subito sum factus accusator ejus socer. id quidem, inquis, dii approbent, ita velim: neque ita cupere certo scio. fed

(11) See Cicero's eighth Epistle of the eighth book of Familiares.

(12) Appian. lib. iv, de Bell. Civili.

(13) To Appian Pulcher. That letter is the 2th of the third book of the third book of Familiares.

(14) Inter petitionem & nominationem delationem uxoris à Dolabella discessit. Epist. vii, lib. viii, Cic. ad Familiares.

(15) Epist. lib. vii.

very great uneasiness [G], by the tumults which he excited in Rome when he was tribune of the people. He endeavoured to establish a law very prejudicial to creditors; for he pretended that debtors should not be forced to the payment of their debts, either by personal imprisonment or seizure of their effects. Mark Antony was obliged (d) to bring some troops into the city, who fell upon the favourites of Dolabella, of which they killed eight hundred [H]. Poor Tullia was unhappy in her last husband; and it is not to be doubted that her journey to Brundisium [I] to speak with her father, proceeded amongst other reasons from the necessity of consulting him how to behave herself towards so troublesome a husband. She was divorced from him [K], and yet Cicero always treated

(d) He was at that time General of the Horse, under the second dictatorship of Julius Cæsar, the year after the battle of Pharsalia.

Dolabella

‘crede mihi, nihil minus putaram ego, qui de Ti. Nerone, qui mecum egerat, certos homines ad mulieres miseram, qui Romam venerunt factis sponsalibus. sed hoc spero melius. mulieres quidem valde intelligo delectari OBSEQUIO ET COMITATE adolescentis, cætera non ἐξαναδίζω. --- Whist I am heaping favours on Appius in the province, I am on a sudden become father-in-law to his accuser: you wish it may prove fortunate, you say: I wish so too; and I am certain you heartily desire it. But believe me, there is nothing I less expected; for I had sent some persons to my wife and daughter concerning Ti. Nero, who had made proposals to me; but before they came to Rome, the match was concluded. I hope it will be for the better. I understand the women were wonderfully charmed WITH THE COMPLAISANCE AND CIVILITY of the young man, but did not examine into other matters.’ Terentia and Tullia were so charmed with the complaisance and civility of this young man that they pardoned his faults, and did not enquire into his life. The same thing frequently happens in our time. A young debauchee who renders himself agreeable by his deportment, and by acting the well-bred man, will so insinuate himself into the favour of both mothers and daughters, that they will not consider whether he has wasted his whole estate; he will exclude his rivals though more deserving than he, if they are not of the same obliging and complaisant behaviour. Let us have him, he pleases our eyes. This undoubtedly utterly ruined the affairs of the other suitor to Tullia, who was not Titus Nero, but Tiberius Nero: probably the same who married Livia, and was father to the Emperor Tiberius. Some authors believe that Dolabella by his flatteries and obliging civilities so touched Tullia’s heart, that she easily excused his almost dwarfish shape: for it is to him that Tully’s jest is applied, *Who has fastened my son-in-law to his sword* (16)? Their conjecture may be a little helped by Macrobius, who calls Lentulus the son-in-law, whom Cicero rallied in that manner (17). This surname agrees better with Dolabella than with Piso and Furius; for the Lentuli were a branch of the Cornelian family, and perhaps the Dolabella’s were of the branch of the Lentuli. See below a passage of Alconius Pedianus.

[G] He gave Cicero very great uneasiness. Not to repeat what I have said in the article of Dolabella concerning the new laws which he proposed in favour of debtors, I shall content myself with citing one or two proofs of his father-in-law’s uneasiness. ‘O dii, faith be in a letter to Atticus (18), generum ne nostrum potissimum, ut hoc, vel tabulas novas. Quod me audis, faith be in another letter (19), fractionem esse animo, quid putas, cum videas accessisse ad superiores ægritudines præclaras generi actiones? --- Can you wonder to hear I am dejected in mind, when you see the glorious actions of my son-in-law are added to my former troubles.’

[H] Of which they killed eight hundred. We should have had the particulars of this action, if Livy had come to us entire; for in the summary of his 113th book we find: ‘Quum seditiones Romæ à P. Dolabella tribuno plebis legem ferente de novis tabulis excitatæ essent, & ex ea causa plebs tumultuaretur, inducis à M. Antonio Magistro equitum in urbem militibus octingenti è plebe cæsi sunt. --- When seditions were excited at Rome by P. Dolabella, Tribune of the people, who enacted a new law concerning creditors, and on that account the people mutinied, Mark Anthony, Master of the Horse, having brought some troops into the city, eight hundred of the people were slain.’ All Historians represent the city at that time in a dismal condition. It is true that the inhabitants of

Rome were so accustomed to bloodshed in their streets, and in the assemblies of the people, by the animosity of contrary factions, that they were less surprized than we at this time should be, to see their city filled with guards continually ready to fall on one another.

[I] Her journey to Brundisium. Her miserable condition which she laid open to her father, overwhelmed him with grief; in so much, that this interview which on another occasion would have afforded this tender father the greatest pleasure, turned into an insupportable affliction: this appears from the words above cited in the remark [D], citation 8, and those in a letter written to his wife Terentia. ‘Tullia nostra venit ad me pridie Idus Junii: cujus summa virtute, & singulari humanitate, graviore etiam sum dolore affectus, nostra factum esse negligentia, ut longe alia in fortuna esset, atque ejus pietas, ac dignitas postulabat (20). --- My daughter Tullia came to me the 12th of June; whose great virtue and extraordinary good nature gives me the greater trouble, as it was through my negligence that she did not meet with a fate suitable to her piety and merit.’ Cicero did not detain his daughter long there, he sent her home; her presence not being able to lessen their mutual affliction. ‘Tulliam autem non videbam esse causam cur diutius mecum tanto in communi more retinerem: itaque matri eam, cum primum per ipsam liceret, eram remissurus. --- But I saw no reason to keep Tullia with me longer in our mutual great affliction: and therefore I sent her back to her mother as soon as she could go.’ This he writes to his friend Atticus in the seventeenth epistle of his eleventh book.

[K] She was divorced from him. This is not to be doubted of if we consider Sulpicius’s hint in his consolatory letter on her death. Amongst other reasons he offers this, viz. that in the unhappy posture of affairs, nothing could engage Tullia to desire to live, seeing her father could not have found a good husband for her. This supposes that she was perfectly disengaged from the conjugal bonds. ‘Quoties in eam cogitationem necesse est & tu veneris, & nos sæpe incidimus, hisce temporibus non pessime cum iis esse actum quibus sine dolore licitum est mortem cum vita commutare? Quid autem fuit quod illam hoc tempore ad vivendum magnopere invitare posset? quæ res? quæ spes? quod animi solatium? Ut cum aliquo adolescente primario conjuncta ætatem gereret? Licetum est tibi (credo) pro tua dignitate ex hac juventute generum diligere, cujus fides liberos tuos te tuto committere putares (21). --- How often must you have thought, as I have frequently done, that in such a situation of affairs, those had no reason to complain who were permitted without pain to exchange life for death? What was there that could much induce Tullia to desire to live? What thing? What hope? What pleasure of mind? Could she have spent her days in marriage with any young man of the first rank? It was in your power (I believe) considering your dignity, to choose a son-in-law from amongst that youth, had you thought a good one could have been found.’ If this proof was insufficient I would offer those places in Cicero’s letters concerning the restitution of her portion. ‘Teneor tamen dum à Dolabella procuratoribus exigam primam pensionem (22). --- I am detained till I receive the first payment from Dolabella’s agents.’ Some think that Dolabella designing to divorce Tullia, pressed the establishment of the new law, that he might not be obliged to refund her fortune to Cicero (23). It is surprizing that Alconius Pedianus was so ill informed of the fate of Tullia, as to affirm that after Piso’s death she married Lentulus, and died in child-bed at his house (24). Which are two or three mistakes.

[L] Cicero

(16) Adeo placuit Tullie novi sponsi comitas, ut minori ejus statura non offenderetur. Notus est Ciceronis locus, *Quis generum meum alligavit gladio?* Cæsar Sagittarius, in Vita Tullie, num. 30.

(17) M. Cicero cum Lentulum generum suum exigue nature hominem longo gladio acinsum vidisset, *Quis, inquit, generum meum ad gladium alligavit?* Macrobius Saturnalis, lib. ii, cap. iii.

(18) The xxiii of the xth book.

(19) The xliii of the same book.

(20) Cicero, Epist. xi, lib. xiv, ad Familiarem.

(21) Epist. v, lib. iv, Cicero, ad Familiarem, pag. m. 192.

(22) Epist. xviii, lib. vi, ad Familiarem, *scripsit ubi Cæsar was in Spain: against Pompey’s sons.*

(23) See Cicero, Grævius’s edition, Tom. ii, Epist. ad Attic. pag. 270.

(24) Cicero filiam post mortem Pisonis generi P. Lentulo collocavit apud quem illa ex partu decessit. *Alcon. Pedian. in Grat. Cicero, contra L. Pisonem, pag. 157.*

Dolabella as tenderly as possibly he could [L], till after the murder of Trebonius, he fell on

[L] Cicero always treated Dolabella as tenderly as possibly he could.] He doubtless had a greater share of capacity than reticulation, and he saw Pompey's party running into ruin more and more by the continual victories of Julius Cæsar. He probably feared that the conqueror would at last cease to shew his clemency, and would make away with such as had a republican spirit, and were men endowed with parts sufficient to oppose him. He knew that Dolabella was in very great credit with Cæsar: after which it is needless to ask why Cicero dissimbled his resentment against his son-in-law. His kind treatment of him kept him within the compass of friendship; for Dolabella stood Cicero's friend at Julius Cæsar's court, in opposition to those who endeavoured to render him odious, and a little after the death of Tullia he desired to be acquainted with the posture of his affairs. 'Quod scribis prælia te mea causa sustinere non tam id laboro, ut si qui mihi obtestent à te refutentur, quam intelligi cupio quod certe intelligitur me à te amari (25).--As to what you write, that you stand severe on my account; I am not so solicitous to have those brunts on my account; as to have it known that refused by you who asperse me, as to have it known that

(25) Epist. xi,
lib. ix, ad Fa-
miliares.

(26) The xith
of the ixth book
ad Familiares.

(27) Philipp. I,
pag. m. 690,
691.

(28) Talisque
everfio illius ex-
cratæ columnæ.
Ibid. pag. 674.
*I have cited the
whole passage in
the article DO-
LABELLA, ci-
tation (18).*

(29) In Cæsar.
cap. lxxxv.

pore, *long time*, is a mistake, which clearly proves that Suetonius had not read the first Philippic, or at least did not remember it; for that oration informs us, that the column was destroyed before the first of June. Cicero's letters tell us, that it was pulled down before the first of May (30). Now Cæsar was killed the fifteenth of the preceding March. But to return to the good correspondence betwixt Cicero and Dolabella: nothing could be more endearing than the letter which Cicero wrote to him on account of this column. 'Cum te semper tantum dilexerim quantum tu intelligere potuisti, tum his tuis factis hic incensum, ut nihil unquam in amore fuerit ardentius (31) Cicero, Epist. xiv. lib. i., ad Famil. pag. m. 32. 'Am, I always had a great affection for you, *thefe your actions have so inflamed my love, that nothing ever exceeded it*.' He doth not forget to acquaint him that he himself passed for the author of this good advice; and the turn of his thought is admirable. 'Eti contentus eram, mi Dolabella, tua gloria, fatique ex ea magnam lætitiâ voluptatè capiebam, tamen non possum non confiteri, cumulari me maximo gaudio, quod vulgo hominum opinio solum me adscribat tuis laudibus. Neminem conveni, convenio autem quotidie plurimos quin omnes, cum te summis laudibus ad cælum extulerunt, mihi continuo maximas gratias agant. Negant enim se dubitare, quin tu meis præceptis & consiliis attemperans præstantissimum te civem & singularem consulem præbeas. Quibus ego quamquam verissime possum respondere te quæ facias tuo iudicio & tua sponte facere, nec cuiusquam egere consilio: tamen neque plane assentior, ne imminuam tuam laudem, si omnis à meis consiliis profecta videatur: neque valde nego, sum enim avidior etiam quam satis est gloriæ. . . . A te autem peto, ut me hanc quasi falsam hereditatem alienæ gloriæ finas cernere, meque aliqua ex parte, in societatem tuarum laudum venire patiari: quamquam, mi Dolabella, (hæc enim jocus sum) libentius omnes meas, si modo sunt aliquæ meæ laudes, ad te transfererim, quam aliquam partem exhauserim ex tuis (32). . . . Tho' I was contented, (32) Id. lib. i. pag. 30. 'my Dolabella, with your glory, and received sufficient pleasure and satisfaction from it; yet I must own it was a vast addition to my joy, that people generally thought me intitled to a share in your honour. Every body I meet with, (and I daily meet with great numbers . . .) whenever they extol you to the skies, continually thank me at the same time. For they say, they do not question, but that by following my directions and counsels you shew yourself to be an excellent citizen, and an extraordinary Consul. Tho' I might truly answer them, that what you do, proceeds entirely from your own judgment and inclination, and that you do not want the advice of any body: yet I neither can cur with them altogether, lest I should lessen your merit, if it were thought to flow entirely from my counsels: nor do I very much contradict them, for I am more covetous of glory than I ought to be. . . . But I beg of you to allow me to usurp another's glory: and suffer me, in some measure, to be a partner in your reputation: tho', my dear Dolabella, (for I spoke in jest) I had rather transfer to you all my fame, if I had any, than to diminish yours in the least.' He seems to be transported when he speaks of this action to his friend Atticus. See Epist. xv and xvi of the sixth book, and the first letter of the xiiith book of the *Familiaris*. I have somewhere read that he designed to go to Syria Dolabella's lieutenant, if Hirtius and Pansa, who were to be Consuls the next year, had not dissuaded him. He let Dolabella go without him, and embarked for Athens, after having promised to return when Hirtius and Pansa should enter on the consulship. Contrary winds retarded his voyage, and he received some advices from his friends, which engaged him to return speedily to Rome. The day after his arrival the senate was assembled, but he did not appear there, at which Mark Antony was offended. This is what we find in Amyot's translation of Plutarch's life of Cicero. One might convict Plutarch of a mistake, if the phrase which he makes use of (33), and Amyot translates, *he let Dolabella go*, was not equivocal: but as it may barely signify, *he thought no more of Dolabella, he left him*, this criticism only affects the translator. He was in the wrong to think that Dolabella departed from Rome before Cicero; for the first Philippic was pronounced

(30) Epist. xv,
lib. xiv, ad At-
ticum.

. (31) Cicero,
Epist. xiv, lib.
ix, ad Famil.
pag. m. 32.

ed, (32) Id. 1111

take,
Amyot (33) Δολοβέ-
: but λαν μὲν εἶατο
abella, χαίρειν. Dola-
bellam missum
flator. fecit. Plutarch. in
parted Ciccr. p. 882, E.
ic was
ounced

on him with his whole stock of rhetorical figures (e) [M]. Tullia died in the year 708 [N]. Her father remained inconsolable for some time [O]: his friends used all their

(e) See the article DOLABELLA.

pronounced in Dolabella's presence, after Cicero's return. This obliges me to repeat what I have several times said, that it is extremely difficult to translate well; for tho' we may take the expressions of the original in the most probable sense, that doth not always secure us against mistakes; and the knowledge of a thousand particular events is necessary to direct us to express the true sense. For instance, if Amyot had remembered that Dolabella was present in the senate as consul, when Cicero spoke his first Philippic; if he had remembered that Cicero, in that oration, urged his reasons for departing from Rome, and the motives of his return, he would not have translated those words of Plutarch, *be let Dolabella go*. After all, I do not dispute the fact; I see no reason against my believing that Cicero designed to follow Dolabella into Syria. This is a fresh proof of the text of this remark.

[M] Till after the murder of Trebonius he fell on him with his whole stock of rhetorical figures. He had reason to censure very severely such enormous perfidy and cruelty; but he should have taken care not to contradict himself, and expose his reputation too much. He had protested a great value for Dolabella in several letters, and afterwards in his Philippics he declared that he never had any merit, and had been always a wicked wretch. 'Dolabella quidem tam fuit immemor humanitatis, quamquam ejus NUM- QUAM particeps fuerit, ut suam insatiabilem crudelitatem exercuerit non solum in vivo, sed etiam in mortuo, ac in ejus corpore lacerando atque vexando cum animum satiare non posset oculos paverit suos (34). . . . Dolabella was so void of humanity, tho' indeed he never had any, that he not only exercised his excessive cruelty on him when alive, but likewise when dead, and when he could not satiate his mind, he set his eyes in tearing and mangling his corpse.' He makes him equal to Mark Antony in all sorts of vice.

(34) Philippica XI, pag. 827, Edit. Græv.

'Duo hæc capita nata sunt post homines natos tetrica & spurcissima Dolabella & Antonius. . . . Ecce tibi gemitum in scelere par, insitatum, inauditum, ferum, barbarum. Itaque, quorum summum quondam inter ipsos odium, bellumque meminitis, eodem postea singulari inter se consensu, & amore devinxit impurissimæ naturæ & turpissimæ vitæ similitudo (35). . . . Dolabella and Antonius are two of the most cruel and infamous wretches that ever lived. . . . They are a couple not to be paralleled in wickedness, cruelty, and barbarity. And therefore the similitude of their most impure natures and flagitious lives has united them in mind, and affection, tho' you remember they formerly were at great variance, and mortally hated one another.' What could he say more? And when he affirms, that to compare Trebonius with Dolabella were to treat the former very unjustly, he expresses himself thus, for the passage deserves to be transcribed: 'Nam cæteris quidem vitæ partibus quis est qui possit sine Trebonii maxima contumelia conferre vitam? Trebonii cum Dolabellæ? alterius consilium, ingenium, humanitatem, innocentiam, magnitudinem animi in patria liberanda quis ignorat? alteri à puero pro deliciis crudelitas fuit; deinde ea libidinum turpitudine, ut in hoc sit semper ipse lætatus, quod ea faceret, quæ sibi objici ne ab inimico quidem possent verecundo: & hic, dii immortales, aliquando fuit meus, occulta enim erant vitia non inquerenti. Neque nunc fortasse alienus ab eo essem, nisi ille vobis, nisi mœnibus patriæ, nisi huic urbi, nisi diis penatibus, nisi aris, & focus omnium nostrum, nisi denique naturæ, & humanitati inventus esset inimicus. . . . For in other respects, who can compare Trebonius with Dolabella, without doing great injustice to Trebonius? Every body knows the wisdom, the temper, the humanity, the innocence, and heroic spirit of the former in delivering his country: but the latter delighted in cruelty from his cradle; and is guilty of such abominable lust, that he was always pleased to think, that he could not be upbraided with it even by an enemy who was modest: and this very man, O heavens! was formerly my son-in-law; for as I did not enquire into his life, his vices were concealed from me. And, perhaps, I should not appear against him now, were he not found to be an enemy to you, to his country, to his city, to his domestic gods, to the religion, and liberty of us all, and lastly, to nature and humanity.'

(35) Idem, in eadem Oratione, ibid.

VOL. V.

[N] Tullia died in the year 708. Cæsar was then in Spain engaged against Pompey's sons. The consolatory letter which he wrote to Cicero on this occasion was dated from Hispalis (36). Which is a strong proof of my text: that which Plutarch furnishes me with, is not satisfactory: it is not clear enough, nor free from some errors. This Historian having spoken of the divorce of Terentia, adds (37), that Cicero afterwards married a young woman, and that Tullia died in child-bed not long after this match. She died, continues he, at Lentulus's house, to whom she was married after the death of Piso, her first husband. To prove from this, that Tullia died in 708, one thing ought to be supposed, which Plutarch doth not mention, viz. that Cicero married his second wife in 708 (38). And as for the rest, it plainly appears, that Plutarch did not well consult Tully's Epistles, for he would there have been informed, that Tullia's second husband's name was Furius Crassipes, and that she died divorced from her third husband who was Dolabella. A modern author (39), in order to prove that Tullia did not die in child-bed, and that she was with child when divorced by Dolabella, alleges the following passage of Cicero: 'Tullia mea peperit XIV. Kal. Jun. puerum ἐπ' αὐγασίας, quod μὴ τὸ κρῖνον gaudebam; quod quidem est natum perimbecillum est (40). . . . On the 19th of May my daughter Tullia was brought to bed of a boy in the seventh month: I was glad she was safely delivered; but the child is very weak.' He ought to have known that Cicero wrote this before the battle of Pharsalia, and that consequently these words are of no use to prove that Tullia did not die in labour, and that she was divorced when big with child. What he should have alleged I find in another letter written during the last war which Cæsar made in Spain. The words are: 'Me Romæ tenuit omnino Tullia: meæ partus; sed cum ea, quemadmodum spero, satis firma sit, teneor tamē dum à Dolabellæ procuratoribus exigam primam pensionem (41). . . . The lying-in of my daughter Tullia detained me at Rome; but tho' she be now, as I hope, pretty well, yet I stay till I receive the first payment from Dolabella's agents.' Let us favour Plutarch and Alconius Pedianus as much as we please, we shall yet be forced to accuse them of having expressed themselves ill. Cicero, whose credit in this case outweighs that of an hundred Historians, informs us, that Tullia was pretty well after her delivery: so that the best supposition we can make in favour of Plutarch and Alconius Pedianus, is that Tullia, before she was perfectly recovered, was surprised by some dissipated incident to child-bed-women, of which she died.

(36) Now called Seville. See the xth letter of the xliith book to Atticus.

(37) Plut. in Cicero, p. 881, 882.

(38) Fabricius, supposes it in vita Ciceronis, pag. m. 193.

(39) Caspar Sagittarius, in Vita Tullia, num. 54.

(40) Epist. xviii, lib. vi, ad Attic.

(41) Epist. xviii, lib. vi, ad Famil.

[O] Cicero was inconsolable for some time. If we believe Plutarch (42), the Philosophers flocked from all parts to Cicero's assistance. They doubtless brought him the choicest of their troops, I mean the most excellent moral reflexions which their topics, or common places, could furnish. But it signified nothing, company was insupportable to Cicero, he confined himself in a solitude, where he found more consolation, than in the discourses of his friends, or his books. 'Quod me ab hoc mœrore recreari vis, facis ut omnia: sed me mihi non defuisse, tu testis es. Nihil enim de mœrore minuendo scriptum ab ullo est, quod ego non domi tuæ legerim. Sed omnem consolationem vincit dolor (43). . . . (44) Ne discessissem quidem è conspectu tuo nisi me plane nihil ulla res adjuvaret . . . mihi adhuc nihil prius fuit hac solitudine . . . me scriptio & litteræ non leniunt sed obturbant (45). . . . The pains you take to divert me from this grief, is a new proof of your friendship: but you can bear me witness that I have not been wanting to myself: for I read at your house whatever has been written to lessen one's sorrow; yet my grief exceeds all consolation. . . . I would not have left you, if pedior, non equidem satis (via enim urget) sed relaxor tamen. He endeavoured to relieve his mind by reading and writing. . . . Reading tude was preferable to every thing else. . . . Reading and writing do not comfort, but disturb me.' He protests, in another epistle (46), that solitude seemed to him the most supportable thing in the world. 'Nunc omnia respuo, nec quicquam habeo tolerabilius quam solitudinem. . . . Now I reject every thing, and find nothing so tolerable as solitude.' To be sensible of the disorder

(42) In Cicero, pag. 882, A.

(43) Cicero, Epist. xiv, ad Attic. lib. xii.

(44) Ibid. Epist. XVI.

(45) He says much the same thing in lib. xiv, lib. xii, Totos dies scribo, non quo proficiam quid, sed tantisper im- pedior, non equidem satis (via enim urget) sed relaxor tamen. He endeavoured to relieve his mind by reading and writing.

(46) The xviiiith of the same book.

5 L

their endeavours to comfort him : he himself wrote a book on that subject [P], and designed

disorder into which his affliction had plunged him, we need only consider his frank confession, that he sunk under his grief, and at the same time reflect on the ostentation with which he brags of his courage. He willingly boasted that he was inconsolable, but would by no means endure the reproaches of too much weakness. Sentiments utterly incompatible. Quod

(47) Epist. xxviii, ejusd. Libri.

me ipse per literas consolatus sum non poenitet me potui, nec si possem, vellem (47). - - I do not repent my having endeavoured to comfort myself by reading. I have lessened my affliction, but I neither could nor would get rid of my grief. Here is a man who neither could, nor would abate his grief. In hac solitudine careo omnium colloquio; cumque mane me in silvam abstrusi densam & asperam, non exeo inde ante vesperum, secundum te nil est mihi amicus solitudinis, in ea mihi omnis sermo est cum litteris, eum tamen interpellat fletus: cui repugno quoad possum, sed adhuc pares non sumus (48). - - In this solitude I am without any company and conversation; in the morning I hide myself in the thickest and most obscure part of the wood, and continue there till night: next to you there is nothing so agreeable to me as solitude: all my conversation in it is with books; but it is interrupted with tears, which I endeavour to refrain from as much as possible, but hitherto I have not been able to do it. He hid himself in the obscurest place of a wood from morning till night, and could not refrain from tears. Doth not he almost own that he had lost his senses? In consolationis libro quem in medio (NON ENIM SAPIENTES ERAMUS) morore & dolore conscripsimus (49). - - In the book on Consolation which I wrote (FOR I WAS NOT IN MY SENSES) in the height of my grief and sorrow. Doth not he confess that he had shamefully surrendered his arms to fortune (50)? But let us see, on the other side, how he glories in his courage (51).

(48) Epist. xv, ejusd. Libri.

(49) Tufcul. Quest.

(50) Lactantio teste affirmavit se tum a fortuna victum turpiter. Sagittar. ubi supra, num. 57, and before him Corradus, in Questura, pag. m. 294.

(51) Epist. xl, lib. xii, ad Atticum.

(52) A country-house, whither he retired after he had left Atticus.

Quod scribis te vereri, ne & gratia & auctoritas nostra hoc meo morore minuat: ego, quid homines aut reprehendant, aut postulent, nescio; ne doleam? qui potest? ne jaceam? quis unquam minus? dum tua me domus levabat, quis à me exclusus? quis venit, qui offenderetur? Asturam sum à te profectus, legere isti læti, qui me reprehendunt, tam multa non possunt, quam ego scripsi, quam bene, nihil ad rem, sed genus scribendi id fuit, quod nemo abjecto animo facere posset. - - You write to me, that you are afraid my interest and authority will suffer by my immoderate grief; for my part I know not what men find fault with, or what they would have: would they have me not to grieve? how is it possible? would they have me not to give way to grief? who ever gave way to it less than I? Whilst I was at your house, did I not always see company? Did ever any come that was offended with me? From your house I went to Astura. Those merry people, that find fault with me, are not able to read so much as I wrote there: how well I did it, is nothing to the purpose; but it was that sort of writing which cannot come from a dejected mind. To those at Rome who took it ill that he hid himself so long, he declared that his employments were not those of a man quite overwhelmed with sorrow. Ne me quidem contemno: meoque judicio multo stare malo, quam omnium reliquorum, neque tamen progredior longius, quam mihi doctissimi homines concedunt: quorum scripta omnia, quæcumque sunt in eam sententiam, non legi solum, quod ipsum erat fortis ægroti, accipere medicinam; sed in mea etiam scripta transuli; quod certe afflicti, & fracti animi non fuit (53). - - I do not think the worse of myself for it; and, in this case, I had much rather acquiesce in my own judgment than that of all others; and yet I do not exceed the bounds that very learned men allow me: all whose writings on this subject I have not only read, like a strong patient, by way of medicine, but also transcribed them in my own writings, which certainly is not a sign of a dejected and broken spirit. See the marginal note (45) above, which makes it appear that writing of books afforded him scarce any relief against his grief, but only a little stupified the part affected. Is this an effect of fortitude?

It must be owned that his affliction is the most con-

vincing proof which he gave of his tender affection for Tullia; but if he had died before her, we should not have wanted proofs of his extraordinary affection to her. All his expressions, when he speaks of her in his epistles, are so many evidences of it; 'Delicia, deliciolæ, mea anima, lux, desiderium. - - My darling, my delight, my soul, my life, my love.' It is very probable that Tullia was endowed with a thousand good qualities, and was one of the most charming ladies of her time, since she so deeply engaged the affection of such a father. Mr Sagittarius (54) conjectures, that she was instructed in polite learning. He had not advanced this as a bare conjecture only, if he had met with the passage hereafter cited of out Lactantius (55). If Plutarch is to be believed (56), one of the causes of Terentia's divorce was, that she would not allow her daughter a sufficient equipage to go to advise with her father at Brundisium. He adds, that Cicero's second wife was divorced, because she rejoiced at Tullia's death. There is no reason to dispute the truth of this with Plutarch, under pretence that Cicero's epistles to Atticus inform us, that this second wife lived a pretty long time with her husband after Tullia's death (57). This objection, I say, would be ill grounded, because it is certain the divorce had been effected the summer after Tullia's death (58).

Cicero's extraordinary affection for his daughter, inspired his enemies with such a boldness as to report that he loved her incestuously: So true it is, that there is nothing so pure from which a satirical genius cannot extract a filthy poison. Those cares which proximity of blood authorizes amongst relations of different sexes, are exposed to sinister interpretations when they are more than ordinary. How doth calumny envelop things! See in the margin (59) what the de-claimer, who assumed the name of Sallust, faith, and remember that Donatus, an antient interpreter of Virgil, believed that this verse of the Æneid,

Hic thalamos invasit natæ vetitæque hymenæos (60).

He with his daughter incest did commit.

ought to be understood of Cicero. But Servius rejects this opinion (61).

[P] He himself wrote a book on that subject.] I have cited some passages in the preceding remark that hint at this tract. It is great pity that it is lost. But it is not Sigonius's fault that the public doth not at present believe it is yet extant: he wrote a tract de Consolatione, and endeavoured to make it pass for Cicero's. The judicious Critics (62), prevented the deceit immediately. Sigonius, tho' he published some dissertations against them, did not gain his point. Cicero, on this occasion, seemed like those who eat nothing with pleasure, which they themselves have not a hand in cooking of. All the consolatory arguments which his friends offered either in conversation or by writing were ineffectual. It was his book de Consolatione only which in some measure abated his grief: Quid ego de consolatione dicam, quæ mihi quidem ipsi sane aliquantum medetur; ceteris item multum illam profuturam puto (63). - - What shall I say of my book de Consolatione, which indeed gives some relief to myself, and I believe will be of great service to others.

He observes, that in the greatest of his grief, he began the preparation of this antidote. In consolationis libro quem in medio (non enim sapientes eramus) morore & dolore conscripsimus, quodque vetat Chrysippus ad recentes quasi tumores animi remedium adhibere, id nos fecimus, naturæque vim attulimus, ut magnitudini medicinæ doloris magnitudo concederet (64). - - In the book of Consolation, which I wrote in the height of my grief and sorrow, (for I was not in my right senses) and because Chrysippus forbids to apply a remedy to the fresh wounds of the mind, I have given such strength to nature, that the force of affliction yields to the force of the medicine. This tract abounded with historical passages and instances, as St Jerom (65), and St Augustin inform us. Quis enim sufficit quantovis eloquentiæ flumine vitæ humanæ miseria explicare, quam lamentatus est Cicero in consolatione de morte filię, sicut potuit (66)? - - What man, with the greatest eloquence, can display the miseries of this life, which Cicero bewailed as well as he

(54) Ubi supra, num. 10.

(55) In the remark [R], citation (74).

(56) In Cicero, pag. 88a.

(57) Sed etiam non negavimus Cicero non admodum bene convenisse cum uxore nova, multo tempore post alium Tullia cum Cicero vixisse, ex Epistolis ad Atticum liquet. Sagittarius, in Vita Tullie, num. 70.

(58) See the xxviii letter of the fifth book to Atticus.

(59) Verum, ut opinor, splendens domus illi animos attollet, uxor sacrisque ac perjuris delictis, filia matris pelleret, ubi jucundior atque obsequior quam parenti patet est. - - But in my opinion you are puffed up with pride, on account of your domestic splendour, and your daughter debauched by her mother, who is more agreeable and obsequious to you than she ought to be to a father.

(60) Æn. lib. vi, ver. 623.

(61) Servius in hunc locum Æneidos. See Schottus, in Cicero vindicato, cap. xii, pag. m. 90.

(62) Lipsius, Gaubilus, &c.

(63) De Divitiis lib. ii, inst.

(64) Cicero, in Tufcul. apud Corradum, in Questura, pag. 294.

(65) In Epist. Negotiari.

(66) Augustin. de Civit. Dei. lib. xix, cap. 10.

(f) See the latter end of the remark [O].

(g) See the four first remarks.

designed to build a temple to the deceased, and even to make an apotheosis for her [Q]. His enemies were so base as to accuse him of loving Tullia incestuously (f). Plutarch is mistaken in some parts of her story. He did not know that she had had three husbands (g). Mr Moreri who had Gaspar Sagittarius's dissertation on the history of Tullia (b), did not know how to make the most advantageous use of it; he has scarce extracted any thing of consequence; only a story related by Cœlius Rhodiginus, which Mr Sagittarius has justly banished to the fabulous lands. The project of a temple is by Mr Moreri converted into a real one, furnished with a magnificent Mausoleum. See the

(b) He quotes it; but the Printers have put a comma after Gaspar, which made many readers believe that he had quoted two writers, Gaspar and Sagittarius.

'be could in this book of Consolation.' We shall produce below an observation of Lactantius.

[Q] And even to make an apotheosis for her.] He several times communicated his design to Atticus: but we shall at present content ourselves with two or three passages. 'Habeo nonnullos ex iis, quos nunc lectito, auctores, qui dicant, fieri id oportere, quod sæpe tecum egi, & quod à te approbari volo. de fano illo dico; de quo tantum, quantum me amas, velim cogites; equidem neque de genere dubito; placet enim mihi Cluati: neque de re; statutum est enim; de loco nonnunquam. velim igitur cogites. ego, quantum his temporibus tam eruditus fieri poterit, profecto illam consecrabo omni genere monumentorum, ab omnium ingenii scriptorum, & Græcorum & Latinorum: quæ res forsitan sit refractura vulnus meum. sed jam quasi voto quodam, & promisso me teneri puto (67). -- Some of those authors, whom I am now reading, say that I ought to do what I have often consulted you about, and which I should be glad you approved of. I mean with regard to the temple: and I intreat you, as you love me, to consider of it. Indeed I am in no manner of doubt concerning the kind of it, for that of Cluatus pleases me; nor as to the thing itself, for I am fully determined; but I am sometimes in doubt with respect to the place. And therefore I beg you would think of it. I am resolved to eternize her memory, as much as it is possible in an age so learned as this is, by monuments of all kinds from the ingenious writings of Greek and Latin. Which perhaps will make my wounds to bleed afresh, but now I think myself bound as it were by a vow and promise.' The following passage more clearly shews, that he was engaged by a vow to build a temple, and that he believed it was irreligious not to put that design in execution. Lactantius will inform us below concerning this engagement. 'Si ista minus confici possunt, effice quidvis. Ego me majore religione quam quicquam fuit ullius voti, obstrictum puto (68). -- If those things cannot be effected, do any thing. For I think myself more strictly bound than ever any one was by a vow.' A monument, a mausoleum, or whatever had the name or likeness of a sepulchre, could not satisfy him. 'Famum fieri volo; neque hoc mihi erui potest: sepulchri similitudinem effugere non tam propter poenam legis studeo, quam ut maxime affequeretur ἀποθεῖσθαι: quod poteram, si in ipsa villa facerem. sed, ut sæpe locuti sumus, commutationes dominorum reformido. in agro ubicumque fecero, mihi videor allequi posse, ut posteritas habeat religionem (69). -- I would by all means have a temple built; nothing can dissuade me from it. I endeavour to avoid the likeness of a tomb, not so much because of the penalty of the law, as that I may obtain an apotheosis: which I might do, were it to be in the village itself; but as I have often said, I fear the change of proprietors. Wherever I do it in the country, I think posterity might be brought to respect it from a sense of religion.' He gives his imaginations a very proper name. 'Hæc meæ tibi ineptiæ, fateor enim, ferendæ sunt (70). -- These my follies, for I own they are such, you must pardon.' If Mr Moreri had but given himself the trouble of considering with attention, what he pillaged from the moderns; would he have told us, That Cicero caused a temple to be built, in which he included Tullia's ashes, in a stately Mausoleum? Might he not have seen in the author whom he cites in the last passage quoted by me, which says that Cicero designing an apotheosis, avoided all that could be thought to look like a tomb? This was not on account of the expence, as he clearly explains himself: 'Ante quam a te proxime discessi, numquam mihi venit in mentem, quo plus infumtum in monumentum esset, quam nescio quid, quod lege conceditur, tantundem populo dandum esse, quod non magno pere moveret, nisi nescio quomodo, ἀλόγως fortasse,

(67) Cicero, Ep. xviii, lib. xii, ad Attic.

(68) Ibid. Epist. xlii.

(69) Ibid. Epist. xxvi.

(70) Id. Ibid.

'nollem illud ullo nomine, nisi fani, appellari. quod si volumus, vereor ne allequi non possimus, nisi mutato loco (71). -- Before I parted with you lately, it never came into my thoughts that it would cost more to build a monument, than what by law is to be given to the people, which would not trouble me much, were I not unwilling (perhaps without reason) that it should be called by any other name than that of a temple; and I am afraid, it could not be effected but by changing the place.' According to Cicero's principles, nothing was more absurd or impious, than to pay divine honours to those persons on whose tombs funeral rites were celebrated; and it was for this reason that he says he would not have given his suffrage to the decree of the Senate, which ordered supplications to be made to Julius Cæsar: 'An me censeatis, patres conscripti, quod vos inviti secuti estis decretum fuisse ut parentalia cum supplicationibus miscerentur? ut inexpiabiles religiones in Rempublicam? ut decernerentur supplicationes mortuo? . . . Fuerit ille L. Brutus . . . adduci tamen non possem ut quemquam mortuum conjungerem cum deorum immortalium religione, ut ejus sepulchrum usquam existeret ubi parentetur, ei publice supplicetur (72). -- Do you think, illustrious senators, that I would have given my suffrage to a decree, which you have unwillingly obeyed, that funeral rites should be mingled with supplications? that divine honours should be paid to the dead person, which is an impiety not to be atoned for? . . . Were it L. Brutus . . . yet I could not be prevailed on to render to any dead person the honours due to the immortal gods, to make public supplications to him, upon whose tomb funeral obsequies are celebrated.' If Mr Moreri had written confidently, he had avoided another mistake. He assures us that Cicero actually caused a temple to be built: of which there appears no footsteps in his letters. Cicero appears very earnest and warm on this design, I own; we find him even threatening his good friend, for not being forward enough, and prefixing a set time when the work should be finished: but it doth not appear by any of his letters, that the building of that temple was ever perfected, or even begun. Is not this a proof that his project came to nothing, and that either time, which asswages grief, made him sensible that his design was ridiculous, or that unforeseen accidents, or other affairs had diverted the execution of his Apotheosis.

Lactantius several times cites the book *de Consolatione*: by which it appears that Tully did not in the least scruple to sacrifice the honour and glory of his gods to his ridiculous fancy of deifying his daughter: to justify which, he shewed that the gods publicly adored in Rome, were formerly men. This instance affords a natural image of the empire of the passions. They spare nothing in heaven or earth, when bent on their justification (73). Lactantius's expressions are very beautiful, and the more deserve our transcribing, because they contain a fragment of a book which is lost, and the promise which Cicero publicly made his daughter, that he would place her among the gods.

M. Tullius . . . in eo libro quo seipsum de morte filia conolatus est, non dubitavit dicere, Deos, qui publice colerentur, homines fuisse. Quod ipius testimonium eo debet gravissimum judicari, quod & augurale habuit Sacerdotium, & eosdem se colere, venerarique testatur. Itaque intra paucos vericulos duas res nobis dedit. Nam dum imaginem filia eodem se modo consecraturum esse profiteretur, quo illi à veteribus sunt consecrati, & illos mortuos esse docuit, & originem vanæ superstitionis ostendit. Cu m verò (inquit) & mares, & feminas complures ex hominibus in Deorum numero esse videamus, & eorum in urbibus, atque agris augustissima delubra veneremur, assentiamur eorum sapientiæ, quorum ingenii, & inventis omnes vitam legibus, & insti-

(71) Ibid. Epist. xxv.

(72) Cicero, Philipp. I.

(73) We have seen of late a famous minister, who endeavoured to find in the Prophets of the Old Testament, all the faults that were objected against the false Prophets of Dauphiné, whom he obliged himself to defend as true Prophets.

the remark [2]. Cicero's words in the exordium of his book *de Consolatione*, where he advanced, that men come into the world only to suffer the punishment of their sins [R], will

(74) Lactant.
Divin. Instit.
lib. i, cap. 15,
pag. m. 48.

tutis exultamus, constitutamque habemus. Quod si
ullum unquam animal consecrandum fuit, illud pro-
fecto fuit. Si Cadmi, aut Amphitryonis progenies,
aut Tyndari in cœlum tollenda fama fuit, huic idem
honos certe dicendus est, quod quidem faciam, reque
omnium optimam, doctissimamque approbantibus
Diis immortalibus ipsis in eorum cœtu locatam ad
opinionem omnium mortalium consecrabo (74). . . .
Cicero, in that book which he wrote to comfort himself
for the loss of his daughter, made no scruple to say,
that the gods, who were publicly worshipped, had
been formerly men. Which testimony is of the greater
weight, as he enjoyed the augural priesthood, and de-
clares that he himself worshipped and adored those gods.
And therefore in a few words he informs us of two
things. For when he tells us, that he will consecrate
the image of his daughter in the same manner, as those
were consecrated by the antients, he shews that they
are dead, and acquaints us with the origin of vain
superstition. BUT, (says he) since we find a great
many both men and women ranked amongst the gods,
and since we reverence their magnificent temples in cities
and in the country, let us submit to the wisdom of those,
to whose abilities and inventions we owe a well regu-
lated and civilized life. Now if ever any living
creature deserved to be deified, she certainly did so.
If the offspring of Cadmus, or Amphitryon, or Tyndarus,
deserved to be translated by Fame into heaven, the same
honour ought surely to be paid to her; which indeed I
shall do, and shall place thee, my most excellent and
most learned daughter, in the number of the immortal
gods, with their own approbation and that of all man-
kind. I might stop here, but the rest of this passage
affording a reflexion, I shall subjoin it: *Fortasse dicat
aliquis præ nimio lætu delirasse Ciceronem. Atqui omnis
illa oratio & doctrina, & exemplis, & ipso loquendi
genere perfecta non ægri, sed constantis animi ac iudicii
fuit. Et hæc ipsa sententia nullum præfert indicium do-
loris. Neque enim puto, illum tam variè, tam copiosè,
tam ornate scribere potuisse, nisi lætum ejus & ratio ipsa,
& consolatō amicum, & temporis longitudo mitigasset*
(75). Lactantius proposes as an objection: that per-
haps Cicero raved when he wrote that book, and the
greatness of his affliction had affected his brain. But
I maintain, replies Lactantius, that his book *de Con-
solatione* is so fine, that it could only be composed by
a person who was in his perfect senses, and whose
grief had been softened by reason, the consolation of
his friends, or time. He was obliged to turn the
argument upon this, in order to render Cicero an un-
questionable evidence. But if he had designed to prove
the insufficiency of Philosophy to comfort a man in
affliction, he would then have alledged this very book
of Cicero, as the performance of a man who confessed
himself shamefully born down by grief for the loss of
his daughter (76). To what cause is this conduct to
be ascribed? Is it owing to inadvertence, or some
rhetorical artifice, that things are thus made use of to
contrary purposes.

(75) Ibid.

(76) See, above,
the remark [0],
cit. (59).

(77) Lactant.
Divin. Instit.
lib. iii, cap. xxviii,
pag. m. 197.

(78) Recte ergo
profatus est er-
rore ac misera-
bili veritatis ig-
norantia se tene-
re. . . . And
therefore he very
rightly said he
was detained in
error, and in mi-
serable ignorance
of the truth.
Id. ibid.

[R] Cicero . . . says that men come into the world
only to suffer the punishment of their sins. He could
not paint his grief by more signal characters, than
by saying, that human life is a punishment, and cen-
suring those of a contrary opinion. Quid Ciceroni
faciemus? qui cum in principio consolationis suæ
dixisset luendorum scelerum causa nasci homines,
iteravit id ipsum postea, quasi objurgans eum qui
vitam poenam non esse putet (77). . . . What shall we
say of Cicero, who, tho' in the beginning of his book
de Consolatione he had said that men were born to suffer
for their sins, yet repeats it again, censuring those who
think life is not a punishment. Lactantius ought not
to be blamed for censuring this assertion of Cicero (78);
for it is certain that it betrays an ignorance of the
reason why God placed us in the world: but as this
reason was above the reach of natural light, and is
only well known by the evangelical revelation, we
ought not to be much surprized that Cicero, hurried
on by grief, and oppressed by affliction, stretched the
platonic hypothesis. Plato's Philosophy taught, That
the soul of man did exist before it was inclosed in a
human body, and that this anterior state had been
much more glorious and happy than that of man.

Hence some pretended Philosophers advanced, that
the soul had never changed its condition, if it had not
deserved chastisement; and they concluded, that it
was confined to the body as its prison, in order to
inflict on it its deserved punishment. Quæ ignoran-
tia effecit ut quosdam dicere non puderet, idcirco
nos esse natos ut scelerum poenas lucrermus, quo quid
delirius dici possit non invenio. Ubi enim, vel quæ
scelera potuimus admittere, qui omnino non fuimus
(79). . . . From this ignorance it came to pass, that
some were not ashamed to affirm that we were born
to suffer the punishment of our sins, than which na-
thing can be more ridiculous. For where or what
crimes could we commit, who had no manner of exi-
stence. Cicero adopted this hypothesis (80), but
Lactantius looks upon it as the most senseless of all
extravagancies. And yet it is certain that this tenet
differs from the doctrine of original sin in its circum-
stances only; for since the Christian Faith instructs
us, that Adam sinned for himself and all his posteri-
ty, it follows, 1. That all souls, in the eye of God,
are involved in guilt even before they exist. 2. That
they are united to the body only by an act of punish-
ment, since by their being united to the body, they
incur the penalty of eternal damnation, to which they
are justly sentenced, and it is by no other means than
remission and grace that some are saved; wherefore
the scripture saith, that all men are born children of
wrath (81). Lactantius ought therefore to have re-
futed Tully's hypothesis more dexterously, and that
by proofs which only affect those particulars in which
it differs from that of original sin. If he had well
considered Arnobius's second book, he would have
found it was no easy matter to refute Cicero by phi-
losophical arguments; for I do not see what reply
the Platonists might offer to Arnobius's reasons, I
mean those objections which he offered against the af-
firmation, that immortal spirits in their own nature in-
nocent, happy, abounding in knowledge, either vol-
untarily descended into human bodies, or were sent
thither by providence. He makes a long enumeration
of the follies, crimes, and miseries of mankind, and
concludes that it was inconsistent with the goodness
and justice of God, that such spirits should be united
to human bodies. Into which he takes it to be ex-
actly the same thing to command or suffer them to
descend. Atque ita perficitur, says he (82), ut ni-
hil intersit omnino voluntariè venerint, an illius ob-
temperaverint jussioni: cum non prohibendo quod
oportuerat prohiberi, cessatione crimen fecerit pro-
prium, & retentionis dissimulatione permiserit prius.
Sed procul hæc abeat sceleratæ opinionis immanitas,
ut Deus credatur omnipotens, magnarum & invifi-
bilia rerum sator & conditor, procreator, tam
mobiles animas genuisse gravitatis ac ponderis con-
stantiæque nullius, in vitia labiles, in peccatorum
genera universa declives: cumque eas tales atque
hujusmodi sciret, in corpora ire jussisse, quorum in-
ductæ carceribus sub procillis agerent tempestatibus-
que quotidie fortunæ, & modo turpia facerent, mo-
do paterentur obsœna: naufragiis, ruinis, incendi-
orum conflagrationibus ut perirent. Pauperes alias,
alias ut mendicitas premeret, ut ferarum paterentur
aliæ laniatus, muscularum aliæ ut interirent veneno,
claudæ ut incederent aliæ, ut aliæ lumen amitterent,
ut articulis federent aliæ colligatis, morbis denique
obscurentur ut cunctis, quos infelix & miseria
mortalitas diversarum sustinet dilaceratione pena-
rum: tum deinde oblitæ unius esse se fontis, unius
genitoris & capitis, germanitatis convellerent atque
abrumperent jura: urbes suas everterent, popularen-
tar hostiliter terras, servos de liberis facerent, insultarent virginibus, & matrimoniiis alienis, odissent
invicem sese, aliorum gaudiis & felicitatibus invid-
erent: tum deinde se omnes maledicerent, carperent,
& favorem dentium mordacitate laniarent. Sed
procul hæc abeat, ut eadem rursus perfusio, ut ille
dicamus, tam immanis, & scelerata persuasio, ut ille
salus rerum Deus, omnium virtutum caput, benig-
nitatis & columnæ; atque ut eum laudibus extolla-
mus humanis, sapientissimus, justus, perfectæ omnia
faciens, & integritatis suæ conservantia manfones,
aut aliquid fecerit claudum, & quod minus esset à
recto,

(79) Id. ibid.
pag. 196.

(80) See, above,
the article
OVID.

(81) Eph. ii. 3.

(82) Arnobius,
lib. ii, pag. m.
74-75.

will admit of a good reflexion.

recto, aut ulli rei fuerit miseriarum aut discriminum
causa, aut ipsos actus quibus vita transigitur & cele-
bratur humana, ordinaverit, iusserit, & à sua fluere
constitutione præceperit. Minora hæc illo sunt, &
magnitudinis ejus destruentia potestatem: tantumque
est longè ut istarum auctor rerum esse credatur, ut in
sacrilegè crimen impietatis occurrat quisquis ab eo
conceperit hominem esse prognatum, rem infelicem
& miseram, qui esse se doleat, qui conditionem suam
detestetur & lugeat: qui nulla alia de causa sese in-
telligat procreatum, quàm ne materiam non haberent
per quam diffunderent se mala, & essent miseri sem-
per, quorum cruciatibus palceretur nescio qua vis
latens, & humanitati adversa crudelitas. --- And so
it is the same thing whether the souls came into their
bodies entirely of their own accord, or in obedience to
GOD's command: since by not preventing what ought
to have been prevented, he permitted and became the
author of sin. But far be it from us to entertain such
an impious thought, as if almighty GOD, the maker of
all things visible and invisible, should create souls so
fickle and inconstant, prone to vice and all manner of
sin: and that when he knew them to be such, should
command them to enter into bodies, that being therein
inclosed they might be continually tossed up and down
with the storms and tempests of fortune, and sometimes
all and sometimes suffer vile and abominable things:
that they might perish by shipwrecks, ruins, and fires:
that some might be oppressed with poverty, and others
reduced to beggary; some torn to pieces by wild beasts,
and others poisoned by insects; some lame, others blind,
and others again not able to stir a joint; in fine, that
they might be exposed to all the diseases and torments
of wretched mortality. And then, forgetting that they
all flow from the same fountain, and are all descend-
ed from the same father, should dissolve and break the
ties of flesh and blood, demolish cities, waste lands, in-
slave the free, ravish virgins and matrons, hate one
another, and envy one another's joy and felicity: that
they should curse, revile and maliciously slander one
another. But as I said before, far be it from us to
entertain such a monstrous and wicked opinion, as if
GOD, the Saviour of the world, the fountain of all
virtue, the author of all good, and (that we may ex-
tol him as we are able) who is most wise and just,
and makes all things perfect, and preserves them in
their integrity, I say, as if GOD should make any
thing defective or imperfect, or be the cause of misery
and danger, or decree, ordain, and appoint the actions
of human life. Those things are beneath him, and de-
rogate from the power of his greatness: and it is so
far from being right to believe him the author of those
things, that whoever imagines man was created by
him miserable and wretched; he who is sorry that he
exists, who detests and bewails his condition; who
thinks he was made for no other purpose but to undergo
a multitude of evils, and to be always miserable, and
by torments to feed the cruelty of some invisible power,
an enemy to mankind, I say, such an one is guilty of
the highest impiety. To censure this doctrine of Ar-
nobius as an ill one, would be too great a piece of
moderation, it ought to be called abominable; for it
overthrows the foundations of Christianity, and is not
much better than the doctrine of the Manichees. Ci-
cero might have found in it as lively a description of
human misery as he could have made; but he might
have answered that objection by his hypothesis of the
pre-existence of sin, which however false it was, might
yet inspire patience. For he might very well say to
himself, My daughter's death hath overwhelmed me,
and plunged me into despair; but about two hundred years
ago or more, I committed some crimes which deserve this
punishment. I hereby expiate them. I suffer for them
in this organized prison, in which my soul was confined
when I was born: It is just that I should be unhappy,
since I sinned so long ago. If Psyche's father had rea-
soned in this manner, he would not have answered, as
the author of that play, makes him answer to that
common place of consolation, that the gods have the
right to take away those children which they have
given.

Ah, cherche un meilleur fondement
Aux consolations que ton cœur me présente,
Et de la fausseté de ce raisonnement
V O L. V.

Ne fais point un accablement
A cette douleur si cuisante,
Dont je souffre ici le tourment.
Crois tu là me donner une raison puissante
Pour ne me plaindre point de cet arrêt des Cieux ?
Et dans le procédé des Dieux,
Dont tu veux que je me contente,
Une rigueur assassinnante
Ne paroît-elle pas aux yeux ?
Voi l'état où ces Dieux me forcent à te (83) rendre,
Et l'autre où te recet mon cœur infortuné :
Tu connoitras par là qu'ils me viennent reprendre
Bien plus que ce qu'ils m'ont donné.
Je receus d'eux en toi, ma Fille,
Un présent que mon cœur ne leur demandoit pas :
J'y trouvois alors peu d'appas,
Et leur en vis sans joye accroître ma famille.
Mais mon cœur ainsi que mes yeux
S'est fait de ce présent une douce habitude :
J'ai mis quinze ans de soins, de veilles, & d'étude,
A me le rendre précieux :
Je l'ay paré de l'aimable richesse
De mille brillantes vertus,
En lui j'ai renfermé par des soins assidus
Tous les plus beaux trésors que fournit la sagesse,
A lui j'ai de mon ame attaché la tendresse,
J'en ai fait de ce cœur le charme & l'allegresse,
La consolation de mes sens abbatus,
Le doux espoir de ma vieillesse.
Ils m'ôtent tout cela, ces Dieux,
Et tu veux que je n'aye aucun sujet de plainte
Sur cet affreux arrêt dont je souffre l'atteinte ?
Ah ! leur pouvoir se joue avec trop de rigueur
Des tendresses de notre cœur :
Pour m'ôter leur présent, leur falloit-il attendre
Que j'en eusse fait tout mon bien ?
Ou plutôt, s'ils avoient dessein de le reprendre,
N'eût-il pas été mieux de ne me donner rien (84) ?

Oh ! seek some better ground of consolation.
Think you, this weakly-pleaded Sophistry
Ought to restrain my just complaint of Heav'n ?
Let thy grown age be weigh'd against thy infancy,
And thou wilt see the gods take much more from me
Than what they gave. I, child, receiv'd in thee
A present which I did not ask from Heav'n :
Then with a cold and unrejoicing heart
I saw my family's increase, but now
A fifteen years endearing habitude
Has made that present precious to my eyes,
The subject of my late and early care,
Now ornamented with the richest treasures
Of wisdom and a thousand brilliant virtues.
It mov'd my tender soul with fond delight,
The charm and entertainment of my heart,
Staff of my life, my age's soothing bope,
And my diminish'd sense's consolation.
All this they take from me, these gods take from me.
And wouldst thou leave me unrepining sit,
And bear this harsh decree without a murmur ?
They too severely sport with our fond hearts.
If they were minded to resume their gift,
Why staid they till I set my soul upon't ?
Or rather . . . why bestow'd their gift upon me ?

However, I think that Cicero would much
better have relished Arnobius's discourse, which doth
not extenuate the miseries of life, than that of Lactan-
tius, which doth extenuate them. ' Quid ego dice-
mus, nisi errare illos, qui aut mortem appetunt tan-
quam bonum, aut vitam fugiunt tanquam malum ?
' Nisi quod sunt iniquissimi, qui pauciora mala non pen-
sant bonis pluribus ? Nam cum omnem vitam per
exquiritas, & varias traducant voluptates, mari cupiunt,
5 M

(83) A father is
brought in speak-
ing to his daugh-
ter, whom the
gods designed
shortly to take
away from him

(84) Molière,
Tragédie de Phé-
drite, Act. II,
Scène I.

si quid fortè his amaritudinis supervenerit: & sic habent, tanquam illis numquam fuerit bene, si ali- quando fuerit male. Damnant igitur vitam omnem, plenamque nihil aliud, quàm malis opinantur. Hinc nata est inepta illa sententia, hanc esse mortem, quam nos vitam putamus, illam vitam, quam nos pro morte timeamus. Ita primum bonum esse non nasci, secundum, citius mori. Quæ ut majoris sit authoritatis, Sileno attribuitur. Cicero in consolatione: NON nasci (inquit) longe optimum nec in hos scopulos incidere vitæ: Proximum autem si natus sis, quam primum mori, & tanquam ex incendio effugere fortunæ. Credidisse illum vanissimo di- sto exinde apparet, quod adiecit aliquid de suo, ut ornaret (85). - *What shall we say then, but that those err who either wish for death as a good, or decline life as an evil? But that they are most unjust, who do not weigh the greater good against the lesser evil? For tho' they spend their whole life in variety of exquisite pleasures, yet if any thing disagreeable happens to them, they desire to die: and, they behave, as if it had never been well with them, when any thing happens to fall out ill. They therefore condemn all life, and think it only full of evil. Hence that foolish saying, that what we esteem life is death, and what we dread as death is life. And also, that not to be born is the chief good, and the next to that is to die soon. Which saying, that it may be of greater weight, is ascribed to Silenus. Cicero, in his book de Consolatione, says, it is the greatest degree of happiness never to be born, nor to fall upon these rocks of life; and the next to that, if one is born, to die very soon, and to escape out of the fire of fortune. It is evident he believed that most ridiculous saying, because he added something of his own by way of embellishment.* By this we see that Cicero, in his book de Consolatione, put a great value on this sentence of Silenus: *The highest pitch of happiness, is never to be born; and next to that, to escape very quickly out of this life as out of an house on fire.*

He mentions this sentence in one of his books which are still extant, and adds some verses, which import, that we ought to mourn at the birth, and rejoice at the death of men. *Fertur etiam de Sileno fabella quædam: qui cum à Mida captus esset, hoc ei munus pro sua missione dedisse scribitur: Docuisse regem, NON NASCI HOMINI LONGE optimum esse:*

Proximum autem, quam primum mori: Quæ est sententia in Cresphonte usus Euripides.

Nam nos decebat cœtus celebrantis domum, Lugere, ubi esset aliquis in lucem editus, Humanæ vitæ varia reputantis mala: At, qui labores morte finisset gravis, Hunc omnes amicos laude & lætitiâ exequi (86).

There goes a story of Silenus, that when he was taken prisoner by King Midas, he gave him, by way of recompence for his liberty, the following sentence, That it was the greatest blessing NEVER TO BE BORN, NOPHANCES, and the next to that, to die soon. Which saying Euripides made use of in his Cresphontes.

*We at the birth of man should mourn,
For many woes his life attend;
But at his death we should rejoice,
Because to them it puts end.*

Plutarch has the original Greek of these verses (87). Lactantius supposes one thing which Cicero would have denied him: That the good things of this life surpass the evil. I am sure that the dismal state to which Cicero was reduced by the loss of Tullia, appeared to him such a weighty pressure that he would very willingly have quitted all the lustre of his glory, to be delivered from this insupportable anxiety. I believe also that he would not have returned into the world, on condition of passing through the various states that he had gone through (88). We have already seen (89) what he made Cato say: He thought as much of himself. He had nevertheless a large share of fortune's favour; his eloquence was admired; he was raised to the first dignities of the Republic; he acquired a glorious reputation: but, if I am not mistaken, he would have sworn that all the pleasures of his life, weighed against the pain and uneasiness which he had endured, or did then feel, would not have been as an ounce to a pound. I shall elsewhere (90) touch on this dispute: whether the good things of this life surmount the evil. Authors are divided on this subject, some declare for the affirmative, others for the negative.

TUPPIUS (LAURENCE) a Civilian, was born in Pomerania, and lived in the XVth century. He translated into Latin a German book, which the princes of the Augsborg confession caused to be written, to justify them for not submitting to the council of Trent [A]. The epistle dedicatory to this Latin version is dated from Straßbourg the 31st

[A] A German book which the princes of the Augsborg confession caused to be written . . . concerning the council of Trent. They had at first presented their grievances in the assembly of Naumbourg, when Pope Pius IV, and the Emperor Ferdinand exhorted them, either to come in person, or send their deputies to the council. They afterwards laid them before the Diet of Francfort, at the time of the coronation of the same Emperor. That memorial contained the reasons, for which they rejected the decisions of the council of Trent: but, the better to shew the equitableness of those reasons, they appointed a certain number of Divines and political Counsellors to compose a work, wherein those same grievances were enlarged, illustrated, and justified. You need only read the advertisement which is on the back of the title page of Tuppius's translation. *Hæc Gravamina pro DEFENSIONE SINCERÆ ET ORTHODOXÆ RELIGIONIS, propoſita primum in Naeburgico conventu Principum; deinde repetita, atque oblata Majestati Cæsareæ in Imperii conventu publico, qui ob Electionem & Coronationem Incolytæ Regis Rom. habitus fuit Francofurti: tandem summorum quorundam Imperii Ordinum mandatu & voluntate, à delictis ad hoc Ecclesiæ suarum Doctoribus, & Consiliariis politicis, uberiore explicatione singulorum Capitum, ex sacrarum litterarum testimoniis, Patrum scriptis, Theologorum scholasticorum Commentariis, ac Canonum interpretibus, aliisque scriptoribus compluribus; ad eum usum jampridem diligentia singulari collectis, illustrata sunt: & hoc scripto, quod ad posteritatem de horum Ordinum erga*

Religionem & Rempublicam studio extet, comprehensa. . . . These grievances, IN DEFENCE OF THE PURE AND ORTHODOX RELIGION, were first laid before the assembly of the Princes at Naumbourg, and afterwards presented to his Imperial Majesty by the Diet of the empire, held at Francfort for the election and coronation of the illustrious King of the Romans; and at last by the order and command of some of the chief Princes of the empire, are illustrated by certain Divines of their own churches, and by political counsellors, appointed for that purpose; each head being more fully explained from the testimonies of holy Scripture, the writings of the Fathers, the commentaries of school Divines, and interpreters of the canon, and several other writers, which have been very carefully collected to that end: and contained in this work, to be a monument to posterity, of the love those Princes have to Religion and the Republic. The title of the book is this: *Concilii Tridentini restitutioni seu continuationi à Pio IV Pontifice anno 1562, indictæ, decretisque tunc editis, opposita Gravamina: quibus & causæ necessariæ & gravissimæ exponuntur, quare Electores, Principes, Ordines Imperii, Augstaniam Confessionem amplexi, Concilium illud neque agnoscere neque adire voluerint. . . . Grievances opposed to the continuation of the council of Trent, appointed by Pope Pius IV in the year 1562, and to the decrees then passed: wherein are explained the necessary and important causes, why the Electors, Princes, and States of the empire, embracing the Augsborg confession, would neither acknowledge nor go to that council.* We have seen above (1) a citation from this work: it re-

(85) Cicero, Tusc. I, lib. fin. fol. m. 253, verso. See the remark [D] of the article XE. towards the end.

(87) Plut. de audiend. Poëtis, lib. fin. pag. 36.

(88) Compare with this what shall be said in the remark [F], of the article VAYER.

(89) In the remark [R] of the article PORCIUS.

(90) In the article XENOPHONES, remark [D]. See the article PERICLES,

(1) In the passage of Mr. Heidegger (who has, or might have, copied Bernegger's) recited in remark [H], of the article LATES

31st of March 1565. The work was reprinted in the year 1597 in 8vo.

lates to the Atheism of Leo X: but it is somewhat strange that no authority is quoted on that head, and that in a book of this nature facts should be advanced which are only known by uncertain reports. However, the work in general is not to be censured for want of quotations. It contains a great number of them, and they are very good in themselves: tho' indeed they are to be found in a great many other books. The observations on the tax of the Apostolic Chancery have not been spared (2), which are concluded with a long detail of the articles of that tax. That detail

(4) See pag. 79, and 89, of the edition of 1597.

might pass for an edition of *Taxa Sacra Penitentiaria*: and Hunnius looked upon it as such, when he inserted it in the Preface to his book *de Indulgentiis*, printed at Frankfurt in the year 1599, in 8vo: but observe, that as to the form, and even as to divers points of the matter, this edition is different from several others I have seen, and which I have mentioned elsewhere (3). I had conjectured (4), that du Pinet had followed the edition inserted in the book of the Protestant Princes of Germany; which conjecture is very well founded, as I have since verified.

(3) In the remark [B] of the article BANCK, and in the remark [B] of the article PINET.

(4) See remark [B], of the article BANCK.

TURLUPINS, A sect of impudent and scandalous heretics of the XIVth century, who taught that when man was arrived at a certain degree of perfection, he was freed from the yoke of the divine law: and contrary to the doctrine of the Stoics, who made the liberty of their wife man consist in being free from passions, they placed this liberty in being no longer subject to the precepts of eternal wisdom. They did not believe they ought to pray to God any otherwise than mentally; but what was yet more shocking in their sect, was that they went naked [A], and according to the example of the Cynics, or rather of brutes, they performed the work of the flesh at noon-day, in view of all the world (a). They pretended that we ought not to be ashamed of any part which nature has bestowed on us. Notwithstanding these profane extravagancies they affected a very spiritual and devout air, the better to insinuate themselves into the womens favour, and allure them into the snare of their unchaste desires (b). For this is the rock of all those sects who aim at distinguishing themselves by paradoxes in morality: examine to the bottom the visions of the pretenders to new light, and of the Quietists, &c. you will find if any thing can unmask them, it is somewhat relating to venereal pleasure; this is the weak part of the place, where the enemy makes the assault; it is a worm which never dies, and a fire which never goes out. These Heretics appeared in France, in the reign of Charles V (c). They chiefly appeared in Savoy and Dauphiné. Great care was taken to purge the world of them [B]. It is not easy to discover the true cause of their name. Vignier (d) derives it from their living in places exposed to the wolves. They affected to call themselves the FRATERNITY OF THE POOR, as du Tillet (e) and Gaguin (f) have observed.

(a) Cynicorum Philosophorum more omnia vendenda publicitus nudata gestabant, & in publico velut jumenta coibant, instar canum in nuditate & exercitio membrorum pudendorum degeneres. Gerson, apud Prætorium.

(b) Gerson, apud eundem.

(c) Mezerai. Abrégé Chronologie, Tom. iii, pag. m. 227, Duth Edit.

(d) Ad ann. 1159.

(e) Chronique des Rois de France, sous Charles V.

(f) In the Life of Charles V.

[A] They went naked.] We cannot sufficiently wonder that such a whimsical fancy should be so often renewed amongst Christians. Paganism affords us only the sect of Cynics, who fell into this impudent practice; and it must also be observed that this sect was not numerous, and that the greatest part of the Cynics did not discover their nudity, or do what is consequent upon it, as it was said of Diogenes. The Indian Gymnosophists were not naked in those parts which the Adamites, Turlupins, Picards, and several Anabaptists discovered. We ought then to grant, that in that respect the Christians have been more irregular than the Pagans. We shall not be surprized at this, when we observe that a gospel principle, of which the Pagans were ignorant, is liable to this abuse: I mean, that the second Adam came to repair the evil which the first had introduced into the world. From hence a Fanatic ventures to conclude, that those who are once partakers of the benefits of the covenant of grace, are perfectly restored to the state of Adam and Eve. I own that Fanaticism must be carried to an high pitch, and the dose must be very large, which is able to overcome the impressions of modesty which nature and a Christian education have stamped on us; but what is not the infinite combination of our passions, imaginations, animal spirits, &c. capable of doing? I have, in another place (1), spoken of some antient Anchorets, who scrupled to see their own nudity. The Pagans afford us no such example that I know of; they were only very careful of hiding it from the eyes of others. This was observed not only amongst the women (2), but also amongst some very debauched men (3). And therefore Petronius did not stretch too far when he said, 'Quam ne ad cognitionem quidem admittere severioris notæ homines solent. . . . To which knowledge they do not admit men even of a grave disposition.'

(1) In the remark [F], of the article ADAMITES.

(2) See the article OLYMPIAS, remark [I].

(3) See the same article, *ibid.*

(4) Ex computo Nicolai Mauregeri, Burgensis Parochensis de Auxiliis Præpositurae Parochensis, an. 1574, apud Du Cange Glossar. voc. Turlupini.

[B] Great care was taken to purge the world of them.] The following words afford us a specimen of that diligence (4): To Brother James de More, of the Preaching Order, Inquisitor of the Sodomites in the province of France, as a gift bestowed on him by the King's Letters-Patents, the second of February 1373, for and in

compensation of several pains, missions, and expences which he had been at, suffered and sustained in pursuit of the male and female Turlupins, whom he found and took in the said province, and who, by his diligence, have been punished for their errors and justices, the sum of fifty francs, which are worth ten Paris livres. Gaguin observes, in his Life of Charles V, that the books and cloaths of the Turlupins were burnt in the hog-market at Paris, without the gate of St Honoré; that Jean Dabentonne, and another person with her, being the chief preachers of that sect, were also burnt; but the latter, says he, whom I do not name, dying in prison, before sentence, his corpse was kept fifteen days in a heap of lime, to keep it from putrifying, after which it was burnt at the time appointed for execution. Du Tillet says also, that under Charles V, the superstitious religion of the Turlupins, who had called their sect the Fraternity of the poor, was condemned and abolished, and their ceremonies, books, and cloaths, condemned and burnt. But how do these cloaths which were burnt agree with the report of those, who tell us that they went naked? We must suppose the nakedness of all these sorts of Fanatics to have been limited with regard to times, or places, or with regard to certain members. We have seen that the Adamites did not strip themselves any where but in the stoves where they met, and that the Picards condemned above all, those who did not shew their privy-parts. The cold and rain would not permit them to go always naked: it is not at all probable that they durst regularly and continually appear naked in those cities in which they were not the most powerful; and it seems that the Turlupins in particular discovered only the parts which distinguish the sexes. 'Turlupini Cynicorum sectam suscitantes de nuditate pudendorum, & publico coitu (5). . . . The Turlupins revived the sect of the Cynics as to the nakedness of the privy-parts, and coition in public.' My citations out of Gerson amounts to the same thing. Therefore they had cloaths notwithstanding their impudence; and probably before persons not yet initiated, or those godly women whom they intended to draw into their nets, they did not immediately shew their privy-parts.

(5) Genebrard Chronique.

TURPIN,

TURPIN, a fabulous Historian of the actions of Charlemagne and of Roland. No body at present takes him for Turpin, promoted to the archbishopric of Rheims by Charlemagne, nor gives any credit to his relations; but some believe him to be near as antient as that Archbishop [A]. Others rather incline to fix him in the XIIth century [B]. If it were true that some Popes or Councils declared his book authentic [C], it would be a clear proof of a gross ignorance, or of an egregious imposture.

Mr Allard

[A] Some believe him to be near as antient as that Archbishop. Papyrius Masso places him a little after the reign of Charles the Bald; but speaks of him as of a wretched author, who mispent his leisure hours in composing a romance for the use of children. See the following remark.

We find a curious observation in Mr Catel. This author having mentioned some lies of Tilpin or Turpin, Archbishop of Rheims, adds: 'These fables written by Tilpin are very antient; for this book is to be seen in manuscript in a very antique letter, and in old French, in several libraries: they are followed by many old authors, as by Matthew Paris, who wrote the History of England; Dante, an antient Italian Poet; Chalcondylas, in his History of the Turks; Petrus Venetus, in his catalogue of Saints, who wrote the life of Roland, and others, which he partly extracted from the said Tilpin, and Godfrey of Viterbo, in his History called Pantheon, who imputing those fables, relates how Charlemagne went to Jerusalem to visit the holy places, where the mysteries of our redemption were accomplished. But most of what these Historians have written is fabulous, for Tilpin himself, in the Preface of his History, ascribed to Leopold, Dean of Aix-la-Chapelle, saith, that Charlemagne's Spanish wars are not mentioned in the antient chronicles of St Denys, of which he might be very well informed, being a Monk of the Order of St Denys. And besides, it is very hard to believe that Archbishop Tilpin should be the author of this romance, which contains the History of Charlemagne, in which the death of that Prince is mentioned, which happened in the year 814, and yet Tilpin died in 813, as Trithemius with a great deal of probability observes; for Uvulpharius, who succeeded him in his bishopric, held a council in 814, as Flodoard in the third book of his History of Rheims informs us (1).'

(1) Catel, Mémoires de l'histoire du Langue-doc pag. 545.

(2) Arnoldus Oihenartus, Notitia utriusque Vascónie, pag. 397.

(3) Mihi præfatio historice illi, à Gaufrido Priore Volsen, qui paulo ante annum 1200 scribebat, in exemplari manuscripto, cujus copiam fecit Joannes Cordesius Canonici Lemovic, præfixa, plane persuadet hoc opus, recens tempore Gaufridi vulgatum, Hispani hominis illo ipso sæculo xii viventis, abortum esse. Id. ib.

[B] Others rather incline to fix him in the XIIth century. Oihenart wonders that Papyrius Masso should place him much higher. 'Hanc (de rebus Caroli Magni prodigiosam Historiam) nescio quo argumento, Papyrius Massonus (est) autore imperitæ & mendacii damnet' è vetustate commendat. Dum, non multo post Caroli Calvi imperium, ab homine otioso in juvenutis scriptam fuisse videri pronunciat (2). - - Papyrius Masso recommends this wonderful history of the actions of Charlemagne, on account of its antiquity, but upon what authority I know not; tho' at the same time he accuses the author of ignorance and lying. For, he says, it seems to have been written not long after the reign of Charles the Bald, by one that mispent his time, for the use of children. Here is the reason which induced Oihenart to believe that Turpin lived in the XIIth century, and was a Spaniard. Mr des Cordes, Canon of Limoges, had lent him a manuscript of this history, to which was prefixed a preface, written by a Prior a little before the year 1200 (3). This preface imports, that the Prior had lately recovered that manuscript, which was brought him out of Spain, and which he took for Archbishop Turpin's history, to whose intercession he devoutly recommends himself. I believe his own words may not be unacceptable here: 'Gaufridus Prior Volsensis, sacro Martialis conventui & universo Clero Lemovicini climatis gaudiis sempiternis perfuri. Egregios invicti Regis Caroli triumphos ac præcellis Comitis Rotholandi prædicandos agones in Hispania gestos nuper ad nos ex Elperia delatos granatæ cepti & ingenti studio corrigens scribere feci, maxime quod apud nos ista latuerant hæcenus, nisi quæ joculariores in suis præferebant cantilenis. Quia verò scriptura ipsa Scriptorum vitio depravata ac pene deleta fuerat non sine magno studio decorando correximus, non superflua subtrahens, sed quæ necessaria aderant, addens, ne quis me putet reprehendere inclite laudis Turpinum qui se infra scripta scripsisse fatetur.

Ego tanti Pontificis oratibus mihi à judice pio dari veniam opto (4). - - Gaufridus, Prior of Voville, to (4) Apud Oihenartum, ibid. the convent of St Martial, and to all the Clergy of the country of Limousin, wisheth eternal happiness. The glorious exploits of the invincible King Charles, and the noble feats of the excellent Count Roland, performed in Spain, were lately brought me out of that kingdom, which I received with joy, and caused to be transcribed, being first corrected with great care; especially as those things had been hitherto unknown to us, except what has been vented in ballads. But because the writing was very incorrect and almost blotted out and defaced, through the fault of the transcribers, the correcting cost me a great deal of trouble: I did not throw out superfluities, but added what was necessary, lest I should be thought to find fault with the renowned Turpin, who confesses that he wrote the following history. To the intercession of so worthy a Prelate, I recommend myself.

[C] That some Popes or Councils declared his book authentic. Vossius having observed that this history in the manuscript of it in Bennet-college library at Cambridge, is intitled, Liber Turpini Archiepiscopi Rheimensis quomodo Carolus Rex Francorum adquisivit Hispaniam, adds, that Pope Calixtus declared it authentic (5). He doth not say this on his own authority, but (5) Vossius, de Hist. Latine, lib. ii, cap. xxiii, pag. m. 299. on the credit of Thomas James, which he supposes grounded on the title of the book, or some note written in the manuscript. Hunc librum dicit Papa Calixtus esse authenticum, ut adjungit Thomas James: Ut puto ex MSi operis inscriptione five nota ei addita (6). Vossius (6) Id. ibid. did not know the foundation of James's assertion; he did not remember a certain place in the Fasciculus temporum. The thing is this: Mr du Pleffin Mornai speaking of some canons of a council held at Rheims in 1119, adds this reflexion; 'And observe by what spirit those bishops were influenced, who in the same council declared authentic the history of Charlemagne by Archbishop Turpin, which is most fabulous and ridiculous, and as such condemned and exploded by Baronius himself (7). Coëteteau answered him thus: He cites in the margin his trifling chronicle of Fasculus temporum, who doth not say one word of this synod; and the fraud proceeds from hence, that speaking of Calixtus he saith, He wrote a little book of the miracles of St James: He also made a statute concerning the history of Charles, compiled by blessed Turpin, Archbishop of Rheims. Well, reader, is it not a pretty conclusion? Calixtus made a statute concerning the history of Charles, written by the Archbishop of Rheims; ergo the council of Rheims, where he presided, declared this book authentic. Certainly they had something else to do than amuse themselves with these fables. But after all where did his wretched chronicler find that Calixtus made no statute? What likelihood is there that he should so much as trouble himself with this Romance (8)? Gretser the Jesuit answering the same book of du Pleffin, doth not know whether what is related concerning the authenticity of Turpin ought to be reckoned fabulous. Perhaps, saith he, we should not be in the wrong to deny all this, for the acts of the council, nor the commentary of Hesso the Scholastic do not mention it at all (9). The Fasciculus Temporum only hints it in an indefinite manner: 'Statuit etiam (Calixtus) Historiam Caroli descriptam à beato Turpino Remensi Archiepiscopo. - - He made a statute concerning the History of Charles, written by the blessed Turpin, Archbishop of Rheims.' He doth not tell us the name of this statute, where or when it was made. But let us grant, adds Gretser, that Calixtus approved this book; what advantage accrues thereby to the mystery of iniquity? This History of Turpin is not so full of lies, but that the Protestants have published it amongst the antient Histories: 'At demus Calixtum Historiam Turpini statuisse, hoc est, confirmasse, quid utilitatis inde ad Mysterium Plebsium redit? Quæ tam fabulosa non est, ut absterreat Sectarios,

(7) Du Pleffin Mornai, Mystère d'Iniquité, pag. 279. He quotes Fasculus temporum ab. 1119.

(8) Coëteteau, Réponse au Mystère d'Iniquité, pag. 754.

(9) Neque enim in Actis quicquam hujus apparet, ut nec in Commentario Hesselii Scholastici, qui res gestas hujus Concilii et profecto litteris mandavit. Coëteteau, in Exam. Myst. Plebsii, pag. 353.

Mr Allard affirms that the romance of the Archbishop Turpin of the year 1092, was composed at Vienna by a Monk of St Andrew (a).

(a) Allard, *Bibl. de Dauphiné*, at the end.

(10) *Ibid.* Sestarios, quò minus eam cum aliis veterum monumentis publicent. Tettis Justus Reuberus, qui à suo Tomo Antiquorum Scriptorum Turpinum excludere, turpe duxit (10). - - - But suppose Calixtus made a statute, that is, confirmed the History of Turpin, what advantage accrues from thence to the mystery of du Plessis? That history is not so fabulous but the Sestaries publish it with other ancient Histories. Witness Justus Reuberus, who would not exclude Turpin from his volume of ancient writers. This last part of the Jesuit's answer is pitiful; for if it be a shameful thing, as it is no doubt, for a council to approve a book stuffed with impertinent fables, du Plessis's reflexion is very judicious. Besides, is it to prove strongly that a history is good, to say that a Huguenot or Lutheran compiler hath published it amongst other books? Is it not sometimes a sufficient Reason for the inserting a book in a collection that it hath some antiquity? And after all because a man is orthodox, is he necessarily happy in the choice of authors, who best deserve to be placed in a collection of Historians? Gretser had done very well to have kept to his first

answer: He ought to have been satisfied that the words of the *Fasciculus temporum* prove nothing. Mr Rivet is of the same opinion; he replies for M. du Plessis in the following manner (11). It is of no importance whether Calixtus confirmed this history of Turpin in a Council, or whether he did it alone by virtue of his authority. It is undeniable that the Carthusian, who collected the *Fasciculus*, expressed himself thus, statuit historiam Caroli, descriptam a B. Turpino, Rhemenſi Archiepiscopo. Here Coëteteau insults du Plessis, after having falsely translated; he made a statute concerning the History of Charles instead of he decreed, that is, established or confirmed the History of Charles. He may learn at his leisure from any little Grammarian the difference between Statuere Historiam and Statuere de Historia. If this Chronicler is mistaken, if he saith this without mentioning any author, we are not to blame. We return to the Papists what they give us. For my part I am inclined to believe that he is mistaken, and that instead of Calixtus's statutes for the establishment of Archbishop Turpin, he mistook and thought it concerned the confirmation of Archbishop Turpin's history.

(11) Rivet, Remarques sur la Réponse au Mystère d'iniquité, Tom. II, pag. 238.

TURREL or TURREAU, (PETER) in Latin *Turellus*, a Philosopher and Astrologer (a), and rector of the college of Dijon his native place (b), lived in the reigns of Lewis XII and Francis I. See what I have said of him in the remarks [B] and [C] of the article C A S T E L L A N. I add that he is author of a small book intituled *The Period, that is, the end of the world, containing the disposition of terrestrial things, by the virtue and influence of the celestial bodies*. This piece was printed at Lyons in the year 1531. There is likewise another book written by him, which was printed at the same place, and is intituled, *Fatal precision by the stars and disposition of the same on the region of Jupiter now called Burgundy for the year 1529, and for several years following* (c). James Tahureau in his dialogues very much ridicules this *Period or end of the world*. Longolius exceedingly commends Peter Turellus in his oration pronounced and printed at Poitiers in the year 1510, touching the praise of the French compared with the Romans. Peter de Saint Julien, fol. 13 and 14 of his History of the Burgundians, speaks of a Chorographical table of Burgundy, and of an History of Burgundy written by this Turrel (d). If we will believe Paradin, this Astrologer had foretold to the Queen-regent the misfortune of the battle of Pavia a little before it happened (e). We must not mistake him for that Turrel who wrote against the Franco-Gallia of Francis Hotman [A].

(a) Du Verdier Vau Privas, Biblioth. Franç. pag. 1065.

(b) La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. Franç. pag. 417.

(c) Extracted from Du Verdier Vau Privas, ubi supra.

(d) Extracted from La Croix du Maine, ubi supra, pag. 515.

(e) Paradin, Hist. de notre temps, pag. m. 132.

(1) Pappyrus Masson, and Anthony Matharellus. See, remark [I] of the article HOTMAN.

[A] We must not mistake him for that Turrel who wrote against the Franco-Gallia of Francis Hotman. We have named two authors (1), who refuted this piece. Here is a third. Petri Turelli, Campani, & in supremo Galliarum Senatu Advocati, contra Oibomanni Franco-Galliam Libellus, Parisiis apud Michael de Roigny 1576, in 8vo. This treatise was dedicated to Christo-

pher Thuanus, first President in the Parliament of Paris, and is dated the 12th of September 1575. The author proves in it, that as to kingdoms, hereditary governments are preferable to elective ones. He touches a little on the design of the Salique law, and the famous question whether women may be called to succeed to the crown of France (2).

(2) Taken from a manuscript Memoir, communicated by Mr Lancelot.

TURRETIN (FRANCIS), a Minister and Professor of Divinity at Geneva his native country (A), was born on the 17th of October 1623. Having studied at Geneva, Leyden, Paris, Saumur, Montauban, and Nîmes with great success, he was admitted to the holy ministry in 1648, and officiated at the same time in the French and Italian churches at Geneva. Two years after he was offered the Philosophy professorship, which he refused; but he complied with a call to the church of Lyons (a). He was recalled to Geneva at a year's end, that city wanting him for their Theological lectures, on which he entered in the year 1653. He was deputed to Holland in 1661, to request a pecuniary assistance which the city of Geneva then wanted. In that journey he met with all the success which he could promise himself, and got so great a reputation, that the Walloon churches of the Hague and Leyden earnestly invited him to their ministry, and the university at the latter of these places earnestly intreated his stay. After his return, he re-assumed the exercise of his office, in which he continued till his death with very great application. He died the 28th of September 1687, with the most edifying marks of an ardent love for God (b). He was a man of a great deal of merit; he

(a) To succeed Aaron Morus, brother to Mr Morus.

(b) Taken from his Funeral Oration pronounced at Geneva by Mr Pictet, the third of November 1687.

[A] At Geneva his native country. FRANCIS TURRETIN his grandfather, of an ancient and noble family of Lucca, having left Italy on account of his religion, resided some years at Antwerp, and had a great intimacy with the famous St Aldegonde. He afterwards went to Zurich, and at last fixed at Geneva, where he had a son named BENEDICT TURRETIN, who was an illustrious Professor of Divinity in that city, and very well known by his writings VOL. V. No. CXXX.

(1): This was the father of our Francis Turretin. All which the reader may find in the funeral oration of the latter pronounced by Mr Pictet, his nephew, a very eloquent piece and worthy of its author, who is a Minister and Professor at Geneva, and author, besides other works, of a book intituled, *Morale Chrestienne*, in several volumes in 12mo, and of a *Theologia Christiana* in 8vo.

fermons, intituled, *Profit des chatimens*. He had been minister of the church of Nîmes. [B] By

(1) He wrote among other books, *Défense des Vérités de Geneve contre le Pere Coton*. That work contains two volumes in 4to. He published also some French sermons.

was eloquent, judicious, laborious, learned, and zealous for orthodoxy. All which appears by the books he hath published [B]. He left a son endowed with extraordinary parts [C].

(2) See the encomium bestowed upon it in the Dutch edition, 1696. It has been abridged for the use of students. The name of the author of that abridgment, which was printed the second time at Amsterdam, 1695, is Leonard Rijfftenius.

[B] By the books he hath published. Besides his sermons dedicated to the Ducheſs of Scomberg, he wrote an answer to a tract published by a Canon of Aneci, to expoſe the Proteſtants amongſt other topics, on that of the obedience of ſubjects to lawful princes. He alſo answered the Biſhop of Lucca's letter to the families of Geneva, originally deſcended from his diocēſe, to exhort them to the profeſſion of the Catholic faith which their anceſtors had abandoned. But what will chiefly immortalize him is his *Inſtitutio Theologiæ Elenctica* in three volumes in 4to (2), and his theſes *de Satisfactione Chriſti* againſt the

Socinians, and *de neceſſaria ſeſſione ab Eccleſia Romana*.

[C] He left a ſon endowed with extraordinary parts. I have cited ſomewhere (3) the learned theſes which he maintained at Leyden in 1692. The Carteſian Philoſophy, in which he was ſo perfectly inſtructed by Mr Chouët (4), does very much ſet off his great knowledge of Divinity. A Profeſſorſhip of Sacred Hiſtory in the academy of Geneva was erected on his account, which he very worthily diſcharges, as well as the office of miniſter.

(3) In the article NICOLL, citation (15).

(4) This illuſtrious profeſſor, the ornament of Geneva, his country, has been long ſince taken from his profeſſorſhip, and admitted into the government of the Republic.

TUSCUS (BALERUS) paſſed (as we are told) for the author of a book condemned by the Inquiſition in 1622, and intituled *Tela Catholica contra judicia erronea*, he paſſed, I ſay, for the author of this treatiſe, becauſe it was thought that the ſtile diſcovered it to be written by him (a). Friar *Angel of the Purification*, Hiſtoriographer of the order of the barefooted Carmelites, made uſe of this inſtance to authorize his ſuſpicion that Conrad Janningus, the Jeſuit, was the author of a letter from the Emperor to his Catholic Maſteſty diſperſed in the year 1696, and alledged alſo that by this conformity of ſtile St Jerom found that John of Jeruſalem was the author of a certain letter (b). We ſhall ſee, below, his miſtake [A]. It is certain that the letter diſperſed under the Emperor's name was really written by his Imperial Maſteſty.

(a) Lambert, Batavus, in *Arte nautica Catholica*, lib. ii, cap. ix, apud Papebroch. Elucidat. Hiſt. pag. 149.

(b) Hieron. Epiſt. xv, apud eund. ibid.

[A] We ſhall ſee, below, his miſtake. Father Papebroch, who hath inſerted in one of his books, the complaint this Carmelite Hiſtoriographer brought before the Tribunal of the Inquiſition, ſays, that the Imperial Ambaſſador at Madrid, demanded that the author of this injurious complaint againſt the Emperor ſhould be puniſhed, and that it was reported that this Carmelite eſcaped the puniſhment only by diſowning the accuſation. Obſerve, that this accuſer attempting to prove that the letter, which he pretended to be ſuppoſitious, was Janningus's ſtile, cited, as the works of that Jeſuit, two tracts which were written by Sebaſtian de Sancto Paulo a Carmelite Monk (1). Was not this effectually to prove the conformity of ſtile? Father Papebroch adds (2) that he has not found the name of Balerus Tuſcus in any catalogue of books condemned by the Inquiſition,

and ſuſpects that this Balerus having prefixed his name to a book, wherein the private regulations of the Eaſt-India company were blamed, the Dutch Miniſters cenſured him, and that the author, without naming himſelf, oppoſed that cenſure by his *Tela Catholica*, which were alſo condemned. He alſo conjectures that Lambertus Batavus was captain of a ſhip in the Dutch ſervice, and conſequently a Proteſtant, and that his book taught the art of ſailing in all parts of the world. At laſt he ſaith, that the moſt expert in affairs of this nature, could not hitherto diſcover any thing concerning this book at Amſterdam. *Ipoſe (libro) needum reperto, licet ab ejuſdem rerum peritiſſimis Amſtelodami quaſitus ſit* (3). I never met with any perſon who had heard of this book, nor have I found the title of it in any catalogue.

(3) Id. ibid.

(1) Daniel Papebrochius, Elucidat. Hiſtorica actuum in Controverſia Carmelita, pag. 150. See alſo the ſiſt part of his answer, Art. xi, num. 240, 241.

(2) Id. ibid. pag. 153.



V A Y E R

V.



V A Y E R (FRANCIS DE LA MOTHE LE) a Parisian, Counsellor of State in ordinary, and Preceptor to the Duke of Anjou, only brother of King Lewis XIV, was a very learned man. He was admitted into the French Academy on the 14th of February 1639 [A]. He had more reading and learning than the greatest part of that society, but most of them wrote more elegantly than he: for his stile was not very polite; and though he had made less use of his memory and of his reading of the Latin authors than he did, he would yet have come far short of perfection in language. He was a man of a regular conduct, very like that of the ancient sages: a true philosopher in his manners, who despised even lawful pleasures, and was passionately fond of a studious life, and of reading and composing of books. This regularity, austerity, and wisdom, did not prevent his being suspected of having no religion [B]. It is likely that this suspicion was grounded on some dialogues which he wrote, and which appeared under the name of Orasius Tubero (a), and on his discovering generally in his works too great a prepossession in favour of Scepticism or the Pyrrhonian principles. It is certain there is a great deal of looseness in the dialogues of Orasius Tubero; but he that should conclude from thence that the author had no religion, would render himself guilty of a very rash judgment: for there is a vast difference betwixt writing freely what may be objected against faith, and believing it to be really true. Several people believe that these dialogues hindered his preferment to the place (designed for him) of preceptor to his majesty [C]. This is not very probable, since if the Queen or Cardinal Mazarin had been affected by this reason, they would not have intrusted the king's

(a) Tholomeus, and those of 'Tubertus Ocella', under which he disguised himself upon some occasions, allude to the signification of la Mothe le Vayer, or Voyer.

[A] He was admitted into the French Academy the 14th of February 1639. Mr Esprit and he were admitted into it on the same day (1). Mr Balzac writes on this subject to his friend Mr Chapelain thus: *I rejoice at the Academy's new acquisition of the Philosopher*

(1) Pellisson, Hist. de l'Acad. Française, pag. m. 228.

****, *who indeed is a fine gentleman, and doth not want wit; tho' he for the most part makes use of that of others* (2). I observe here by the way, that Moreri, when he saith that la Mothe le Vayer was one of the first admitted into the French Academy, is mistaken. For that cannot be said of a man elected in the place of a dead Academic (3).

(2) Balzac's first letter of the 17th book to Chapelain, pag. 149, 150, Dutch Edit. 1661. That letter is dated the fourth of January 1639.

(3) See Pellisson, ubi supra.

[B] He was suspected of having no religion. Patin shall be my voucher. 'Mr de la Mothe le Vayer was lately called to court, and made Preceptor to the Duke of Anjou, the King's brother. He is about sixty years old, of a middle stature, as much a Stoic as any man in world; he is one who would be praised himself but never praises any body, fantastical and capricious, suspected to be guilty of that sort of wit with which Diagoras and Protagoras were tainted (4).' Patin wrote this letter the 13th of July 1649.

(4) Patin, Letter xxii, pag. 97, 98, of Vol. i.

[C] Several people believe that these dialogues hindered his preferment to the place (designed for him) of preceptor to his majesty. The learned Naudé informs me of some things which contradict that opinion. He tells us: 'I have also been always persuaded, that the choice of men was one of the most difficult things at court. But I was thoroughly convinced of it when the question was put who should be preceptor to the king; for the intention of the queen and the ministers being to commit that charge to one of the ablest, most famous, and esteemed persons in France, they first cast their eyes on Mr de la Motte le Vayer, as on him whom Cardinal Richelieu had designed for that post, induced thereto, as well by the excellent book which he had written concerning the education of the Dauphin, as on account of the reputation he had acquired by his many other writings of being the French Plutarch. But the queen having resolved not to bestow that place on a married man, they were necessarily obliged to think of another; who was Mr Aubert, Abbot of St Remy, principal

of the College of Laon, Canon of that city, and Regius Professor of the Greek tongue, of whose polite manners, probity, learning, and facility of expressing himself with accuracy in Latin and French, no man can doubt *modo caput habet extra cucurbitum*, who is not a blockhead. But neither he, nor Mr Gassendi, the only oracle in our age of Philosophy, Mathematics, and Astronomy, and of whatever is excellent in the most sublime sciences; nor also Mr Rigaud, tho' the Coriphæus of our Humanists, and of a capacity universally known to extend to all other sciences, after having been put to the trial without knowing any thing of it, did stand it so well as the Abbot de Beaumont, Doctor of Divinity, and at present the worthy Bishop of Rodez, who was also preferred to another of the brightest ornaments of the Clergy, because not being inferior to any of the preceding, he had some other qualities, which turned the balance on his side (5). The reason which I have advanced (6) against those who pretend that the dialogues of Orasius Tubero were the occasion of our le Vayer's being excluded from this charge, seems to me demonstrative; for tho' it is usual to take a greater care of a young king's education, than of his brother's, yet they would never give a preceptor to a king's brother, whom they would not have intrusted with the king's education, for fear the preceptor should infect him with impious principles. If there had been no other reason, la Mothe le Vayer had been chosen preceptor to Lewis XIV, notwithstanding his dialogues, as well as to the Duke of Anjou: For since it was judged that so wife a man would carefully avoid infilling the Libertinism of Orasius Tubero into the young duke, it was more reasonable to conclude that he never durst presume to inspire it into the young monarch. Cardinal Mazarin was too well acquainted with mankind not to know that a Philosopher, who, by I know not what train of arguments, is led to Pyrrhonism in religion, is a man of a quite different character from a man who becomes impious out of brutality and debauchery. Such a Philosopher, in all particulars like la Mothe le Vayer, would be very uneasy, that persons liable to make an ill use of his opinions should ever imbibe them (7). He

(5) Naudé Dialogue de Mafcurat, pag. 375.

(6) In the text of this article.

(7) Compare with this the remark [F] of the article DES BARREAUX.

king's only brother to his care. The world was surpris'd that so wife a man should write so very freely on obscene subjects [D], but they were equitable enough at the same time not to draw any conclusion from thence to the prejudice of his morals: so true it is that

He would always be so discreet as to keep them from youth, and much more from a prince whose solid piety may extremely contribute to the public happiness.

What Moreri says that la Mothe le Vayer was Preceptor to his majesty for the space of one year, is affirmed by Mr Pellisson (7*). And we find in another writer (7**) that la Mothe le Vayer began to exercise that function in May 1652, and that he was chosen by the Queen-mother herself being already Preceptor to the King's brother. Though Mr Pellisson mentions only one year, it cannot be inferred from thence, that this function lasted no longer. We can only infer from it that it had lasted but one year, when he spoke of it, that is, when he published his History of the French Academy in 1653. However it be, this confirms what I have said against those, who believed that la Mothe le Vayer was excluded from that place on account of the dialogues of Orasius Tubero.

[D] He wrote very freely on obscene subjects. There are some very wanton thoughts, and very smutty expressions in the dialogues of Orasius Tubero: but perhaps they are nothing if compared with the third and fourth (9) days of the *Hexameron rustique*.

His other books contain nothing like this, though in certain places by way of quotation or otherwise he expresses himself somewhat cynically. He seems to have apologized for himself two ways. I. By making it appear (10) that Seneca, Dion Chrysostome, and St Augustin have inserted in their works some things so obscene and so filthy, that there is scarce any body but is offended at it; and yet the first is acknowledged the most austere moralist of the Romans, the second

(7*) Pellisson, History of the French Academy, pag. m. 352.

(7**) Pierre de Saint Romuald, in Continuatione Chronici Ademari, pag. 534, 535.

(8) Wherein he treats of the privy-parts of men and women.

(9) He tells us there, that by the Nymphs cave, Homer meant the privy-parts of Penelope.

(10) *Hexameron Rustique*, pag. 43, & seq. Compare with this, what is said in the article SANCHEZ, (THOMAS), remark [C].

(11) Ibid. pag. 42.

(12) Ibid. pag. 41.

(13) Ibid. pag. 99.

Accius esset atrox, conviva Terentius esset,
† Ovid. i Trist. Essent pugnaces, qui fera bella canunt †.

Terence a glutton, Accius would be fierce,
And soldiers those, who bloody wars rehearse.

The falshood of this way of arguing formerly influenced Timæus to assert † that Homer and Aristotle were great gluttons, the last having frequently treated of the seasoning of eatables, and the first frequently used the word *σπασμωδία*, which implies to distribute meats. And if such consequences are just, as Virgil must of necessity pass for a soldier, and Dioscorides for an infamous poisoner; so the pious meditations of Arctin will prove his of several passages sanctity, and the fine sentences of Seneca concerning poverty will make us believe him necessitous, notwithstanding the seven millions of gold in cash, and the eight hundred thousand livres annual estate which he is said to have enjoyed (14).

La Mothe le Vayer's maxim generally considered is very true: the judgment to be passed on a man's morals from his writings would be false on a thousand occasions. Sallust is an example which may be added to the former. What he says, 'against the corruption and disorders of his age could not be better expressed by any other; but he should have left that to Cato, or to some other persons of a rigid virtue, who were zealous for the antient discipline: and in my opinion a declamation against luxury and lewdness is not less incongruous in the History of Sallust, who was reprimanded for debauchery by the Censor in a full senate, and twice accused of adultery

† Ex Pol. in Exc. Const.

(14) See in Melibonius, in Vita Maccenatis, cap. xxi, pag. 132, a collection of several passages relating to the opposition between Seneca's morals and his writings.

before the Prætor (15), than an invective against the ambition of ruling would be in Cæsar's Commentaries (16). See how Cicero rallies Clodius's oration against the negligence of the Romans in their divine service (17). The world hath always been, and is at present full of persons who declaim against vice, and are themselves very immoral; who are grave and severe in their books, and very loose in their conduct. We should therefore be finely deceived, if we judged of their morals by their writings. But may we justly say by the rule of contraries, that there are some persons whose morals are stricter than their writings? Yes, I believe we may: but it more rarely happens that an author allows himself a large liberty in his writings, and but a little in his manners, and takes but a very little freedom in his books. The reason of this difference is very obvious; for he that can perform the most, can also perform the least, but he who is capable of performing the least cannot perform the most. What is more easy than to declaim in verse or prose against the irregularities of the age, and what is more difficult than to avoid sharing some part of them? A wise man therefore doth the hardest task; it is not then very difficult for him to instruct by the productions of his pen, for this is infinitely easier than that. But it doth not follow that a man who can write very edifying and religious books, clean and free from all immorality, can live as regular. This is infinitely harder than the other.

To come more directly to the point. Catullus and Ovid, whose verses were so impure, lived as they wrote. Their debaucheries with women were extolled. The same may be affirmed of the French Poets who composed the *Parnasse Satyrique*, and of several Italian Poets whose Poems are very filthy. And this sentence is very true.

Raro moribus exprimit Catonem
Quisquis verbis exprimit Catullum.

Cato's life he rarely follows,
Who in verse writes like Catullus.

But by allowing all this we do not thereby ruin la Mothe le Vayer's apology; for there is a vast difference betwixt these two things: 1. The relating debaucheries committed by ones self, praising, and applauding them, and exhorting the readers to an imitation: and, 2. the relating gallant adventures in terms a little too brisk and natural, enlivening the recital, though one condemns or disapproves those actions; and discussing a point of doctrine (18), or a mythological reflexion by phrases which represent impurities. The first of these is utterly inexcusable, and infamous, and ought to be severely punished. But the second is perhaps only a piece of wit, and naturally affords no reason to make any inferences prejudicial to the author's morals. It is this that saves le Vayer.

I shall observe, by the way, that we ought not universally to condemn all those Poets as unchaste in their lives whose verses are immodest. Catullus doth not deserve to be comprehended in the apology which he made for them: he too much exceeds all bounds in most of his Poems, and even in the very epigram in which he pretends to justify himself. There is enough in it to condemn him.

Pædicabo ego vos, & inrumabo
Aureli pathice, & cinæde Furi;
Qui me ex vericulis meis putatis
Quod sint molliculi, parum pudicum,
Nam castum esse decet pium poetam
Ipsum. Vericulos nihil necesse est:
Qui tum denique habent salem, ac leporem,
Si sunt molliculi, ac parum pudici,
Et quod pruriat incitare possunt.
Non dico pueris, sed his pilosis,
Qui duos nequeunt movere lumbos (19).

Aurelius

(19) Catullus, Epig. xvi.

(18) See in the article LUCRATIUS, remark [C], where has been said in his vindication.

that the publick is not always rash, blind, and unjust in their judgments! this subject affords a favourable opportunity of answering a question, lately proposed to a learned Journalist,

*Aurelius, thou Catamite
And Furius, thou Sodomite,
I'll — you, for that you say
I am immodest and too gay,
Because my verse is delicate,
Soft, tender, and effeminate.
The Poet should himself be pure,
Not so his verses, to be sure.
Those only pleasant are and witty
Which are soft and somewhat smutty,
And into people can inspire
A strong libidinous desire.
Not boys but men I write to please
Who cannot move their loins with ease.*

Ovid, Martial, and several others ought likewise to be excluded the benefit of this justification, though they profess their innocence, and the purity of their lives in the midst of all the impurities of their Muses (20). Beroaldus hath in vain endeavoured to excuse them, and made himself ridiculous when he said that if those books ought to be condemned which contain criminal gallantries; the canonical Scriptures ought to be treated in like manner: 'Si scripta omnia quibus amores, res amatoriae continentur sunt cum suis scriptoribus repudianda, repudiandus Canonicae scripturae, hoc est instrumenti veteris luculenta illa volumina, quibus nihil sacratius, nihil religiosius, nihil mysticum magis estimatur (21). — If all writings wherein amours and gallantries are contained, ought to be condemned, then the holy Scriptures should also be rejected, that is those writings of the Old Testament, than which nothing is reckoned more sacred, religious, or mystical.' This is wretched arguing, and doth not at all affect the reason for which these Poets are condemned (22). But if the aforementioned do not deserve the benefit I speak of, there are yet several who deserve to be included in it. Their lascivious Poems were only flights of wit: the contagion of these impure ideas did not infect their minds: they made those verses to display their ingenious thoughts; they could not resist the temptation of expressing themselves in such a manner as would make their genius applauded: they were willing to accommodate themselves to the taste of a vast number of readers, who find in it an agreeable tartness, and charms with which they are ravished. They had indeed done very well to have resisted this temptation, 'Tanti non erat esse te disertum. — It was not of so great concern to be thought witty.' But they were only words; their morals preserved their integrity, and what an emperor said of Voconius is applicable to them,

(20) *Circe mihi mores diktant à carmine nostro: Vita verecunda est, musa jocosa mihi.* Ovidius. lib. ii. Tristium, ver. 353. Innocens censura potest permittere lascivum: Lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba. Martialis, Epig. v, lib. i.

(21) Philippus Beroaldus, Orat. habita in principio Enarrationis Propertii, continens laudes Amoris.

(22) Consult Raderus upon Martialis, Epig. v, lib. i.

(23) Hadrianus, apud Apulejum Apolog. pag. m. 261.

(24) Quod nonquam ita dixisset, si forent lepidiora carmina argumentum impudicitiae habenda. Apul. ibid.

(25) Aufon. in Centone nuptiali, fol. 6n. pag. m. 115, 116. See the article AU-SONIUS, remark [E].

(26) See the article APULEIUS, citation (64).

Lascivus versu, mente pudicus erat (23).
In verse lascivious, but in heart was chaste.

This he would never have ventured to say, adds Apuleius, if too licentious verses were a proof of lasciviousness (24). Aufonius having occasion to prevent the suspicions which might be formed against his wisdom on account of his *cento nuptialis*, alleges several persons irreproachable in their conduct, who had taken great liberties in their verse (25): 'Sed quum legeris, adesto mihi, adversum eos, qui ut Juvenalis ait, Curios simulant, & Baccanalia vivunt, ne forte mores meos spectent, de carmine.'

Lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba:

'Ut Plinius dicit. Meminerint autem, quippe eruditi, probatissimo viro Plinio in poematis lascivum, in moribus constituisse censuram: prurire opusculum Sulpicii, nec frontem capere: esse Apulejum in vita Philosophum, in epigrammatis amatorem, in praeceptis omnibus extare severitatem, in epistolis ad Carcelliam subesse petulantiam (26). — But when you read, defend me against those, who, as Juvenal says, Like saints do look and like the devils live, lest they judge of my practice by my verse,

VOL. V.

My page lascivious but my life is chaste,

'As Pliny says. Learned men will remember, that Pliny a virtuous person was wanton in his Poems and rigid in his Morals: that Sulpicius wrote lasciviously and was not ashamed of it: that Apuleius was in life a Philosopher, in epigrams amorous, in all his precepts severe, and in his epistles to Carcellia wanton.' He besides mentions Plato, Annianus, Laevius, Erenus, Menander (27), and Virgil. Note, that a reader ought not to judge of Poets by himself; I mean that he ought not to think that that piece of Poetry which in reading hath an ill effect upon his mind, made the like impression on the Poet who wrote it. Some of them accustom themselves to these thoughts, and are touched with nothing but the poetical beauties with which they are clothed. Constitution and habit have created in them the same insensibility, which Marigny ascribes to a Governor of the Spanish Netherlands with regard to the fine ladies of the court of Brussels. The Arch-duke, saith he (28), seconded by his sole virtue resists the powerful charms of all the beauties of which I speak. . . . He looks on them as fires which dart refugent light, but do not inflame him.

Comme dans un jardin rempli de fleurs nouvelles,
Dont l'éclat fait des yeux le plus noble plaisir,
Un Sage curieux regarde les plus belles;
Mais sans fonger à les cueillir.

*As in a garden of new flowers
Whose beauty strikes the eye,
A virtuoso does not gather,
But only them survey.*

This Prince looks on all these miracles just as he does on the pictures of his gallery, and though the Queen of the North (29) lay six weeks not above four steps from his apartment, as if he had drank of Merlin's enchanted fountain, the passion which often disturbs the reason of the bravest heroes, does not at all affect him (30).

Dorme vicina à lui la donna bella,
Fusse altro, fusse l'acqua di Merlino
Non e quel ch'esser suole il Paladino.

You see some Poets make amorous verses, in which they express themselves wantonly, though age hath rendered them as cold as ice. Ought not what they say to pass for a flight of wit? Read Pontanus's hendecasyllabic verses, written to a lady who shewed her breast, and selected from several other verses less modest.

Prædico tege candidas papillas,
Nec queras rabiem ciere amantum,
Me quem frigida congelat fenestra,
Irritas male, calcasique, quare
Prædico tege candidas papillas,
Et pectus strophio regente vela.
Nam quid lacteolos sinus, & ipsas
Præ te fers sine linteo papillas?
An vis dicere basia papillas?
Et pectus nitidum suaviare?
Vis num dicere, tange, tange, tracta?
Te ne incedere nudulis papillis?
Nudo pectore te ne deambulare?
Hoc est ad Venerem vocare amantes.
Quare contege candidas papillas,
Et pectus strophio decente vesti,
Aut, senex licet, involabo in illas,
Ut possim juvenis tibi videri (31).

*Thy fair neck hide, take my advice,
Seek not to blow a lover's fire,
For tho' with age I'm cold as ice,
You make me burn with fierce desire.*

5 O

With

(27) Quid ipsam Menandrum? quid Comicos omnes; quibus severa vita est, & laeta materia. Aufon. ibid.

(28) Marigny, in his letters printed in the year 1658.

(29) That is, Christina Queen of Sweden.

(30) See concerning the devotion of that Arch-duke, a book intitled, *Mémoires de Hollande*, printed at Paris in 1678.

(31) Jovianus Pontanus, Hendecasyll. lib. i, fol. 187, verso, Edit. Venet. 1513.

Journalist, concerning John della Casa, and his detestable Capitolo del Forno [E]. La Mothe le Vayer is a great instance of the small portion of happiness we taste in this life; for

With handkerchief I beg you'd hide
Your pretty bobbies soft and fair,
Wherefore, pray, should you take a pride
In going with them wolly bare.
Do you by that intend to say,
My naked breast come feel and kiss,
And with my milk white bosom play,
For nothing I will take amiss.
To walk out with uncover'd breast,
A powerful motive proves it must,
For lovers, wanton and unchast,
To come and gratify their lust.
A gorget then do you apply,
Therewith thy snowy bobbies cover,
Or else, tho' old, on them I'll fly,
Like any youthful eager lover.

There are some authors who are more scrupulous in the choice of modest expressions, for fear that any licentious expressions should confirm the bad report which runs concerning their morals. Others on the contrary emboldened by their virtuous life and the good opinion which the world hath entertained of their wisdom, *morum fiducia*, are not so solicitous in this particular, and allow themselves too large a scope in order to divert their readers. Probably Mr de la Mothe le Vayer was of this number: he very well knew that he could alledge for his excuse in case of necessity (32), 'Verba mea arguuntur, adeo factorum innocens sum' (33). . . . They find fault with my words, 'because they have nothing to say to my actions.' Let us conclude with considering the stupendous diversity of tempers and characters observable amongst men. There are some who scruple to say, what they make no scruple to do: others dare not do what they freely venture to say. (34) A certain writer observes that 'those who discover so much zeal in leaving out such places in the Classics as offend chastity, are not always so sober as those ancient authors.

Nimirum Criticus facere id quam scribere mavult,
Quod mavult vates scribere quam facere (35).

For Critics would much rather act than write,
What Poets would much rather write than act.

[E] Concerning John della Casa, and his detestable Capitolo del Forno. I have already said that several Italian Poets ought not to be admitted to justify the obscenities of their Poems by this rule,

Lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba.

Tho' my page lascivious be,
I lead a life of probity.

I shall say nothing in particular against Calcagnini (36), but Molza, Mauro, John della Casa, &c. deserve a sentence of condemnation. Not but that the judgment passed on the last by incompetent judges, who have not read him, is too severe; and as we ought to do justice to every body, I am obliged to declare that they have wronged him in imputing to him a book *de Laudibus Sodomie*. This pretended Poem is nothing but the *Capitolo del Forno*, where, under the allegory of an oven, John della Casa describes the leud intercourse betwixt men and women. Allegories of this sort were then in fashion; one borrowed the metaphor of a fig, another of a bean (37). What is most horrible in John della Casa is that having observed that certain leud youths began to despise the common oven, he adds that for his part he was not so nice, and that he seldom baked any where else. Which was to own that sometimes at least he committed the unnatural sin.

Tennero il Forno già la Donne sole.
Oggi mi par che certi Garzanacci

L'abbian mandato poco men ch' al Sole.
Spazzolino a posta lor, nessun non vacca.
Dicon pur ch' egli è umido e mal netto.
E sono ben cagion quelle sue stracci.
Io per me rade volte altrove il metto:
Con tutto che'l mio pan sia piccolino,
E'l forno delle Donne un po' grandetto.
Benche chi fa questo mestier divino,
Sà ben trovar dove l'anno nascofo
Calà dirieto un certo fornellino (38).

Mr Menage cites this passage of the *Capitolo del Forno* in a French book which he published at the Hague in 1688. This ought to be observed, to prevent some cavillers saying, that I alledge things which no body before knew, and which ought to be kept unknown. Let us now come to the question which occasions this remark.

A certain person wrote from Utrecht to Mr Basnage de Beauval (39), that he had read in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for the month of July 1685, That John della Casa being reflected upon in a satire, *Moy 1696*, page 427, made an answer in Latin verses, where he denied the fact, affirming, That he never pretended to praise any thing besides the enjoyment of women. But I would fain see those Latin verses, adds that anonymous person of Utrecht, not being able to imagine that the Archbishop of Benevento was capable of denying the fact with so much impudence; for it is not long since I saw and read this infamous Italian piece, intituled, *Capitolo di M. Giovanni della Casa sopra del Forno*: and most certainly it is not concerning the use of women as women, that he intended to speak. Since Daniel Francus's book, where the Latin verses of that Archbishop are recited, is so hard to be met with (40), I here inform the reader, that he may read them in Mr Menage's *Anti-Baillet* (41). It is beyond dispute that Casa denied he had ever praised the sin against nature.

Obscene nihil
Scripsisse me scitote: namque tunc quoque
Festiva nos à turpibus secrevimus,
A mollibusque impura. Cumque verbis
Laudavimus Furnum, haud mares laudavimus:
Quod ille ait per maximam calumniam:
Sed feminas plane: ut videre Carmine
Ex ipso adhuc potestis.

Nothing obscene
Dropt from my pen, from smutty what is gay
I separated, and from soft impure.
And when in verse an oven I extoll'd,
Not men, as he most slanderously asserts,
But women I extoll'd, as you may see
By the poem itself.

You see he appeals to the poem itself for which he was accused. Most certainly, as we told in the *Histoire des Ouvrages des Scavans*, it is not concerning the use of women as women that he speaks. But we may answer, that most certainly his *Capitolo* concerns only that use. It is true, that he inserted in his poem the observation which I have cited, that certain leud youths were disgusted at that use, and hunted after the other, in which he very seldom imitated them. He doth not praise those leud youths, nor himself for sometimes imitating them; wherefore he cannot be justly accused of praising that abominable crime. But the Poem and it's author are nevertheless execrable; for tho' the epithet of *Mestier divino*, *divine practice*, falls on the venereal exercise in general (42), and not on sodomy in particular, the libertinism and profanation is such as cannot be sufficiently detested. Some (43) excuse him by

Lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba est,
Tho' my page lascivious be,
I lead a life of probity. And by
Lascivus versu, mente pudicus erat.
In verse lascivious, but in heart was chaste.

(38) John de la Casa, *apud Menage*, *Anti-Baillet*, cap. cxxx.

(39) See the *Histoire des Ouvrages des Scavans*, May 1696, page 427.

(40) Hist. des Ouvrages des Scavans, ibid.

(41) Anti-Baillet, ubi supra.

(42) Mr Menage, ubi supra, page 105, has these words: 'Benche chi fa questo mestier divino, è tenuto a be-ndere, ac-cording to found Grammar, if the love of men, and not of boys. See what goes before and what follows.'

(43) Menage, ibid.

And

for whatever reason he might seem to have to be contented with his state, he would not have returned into the world [F], on condition of being obliged to act the same part which

(44) Mr Menage quotes here the verses of Catullus, which you have seen above, in the remark [D], citation (19).
 'And indeed it is very probable that Cafa here calumniates himself, in imitation of several other Poets (44) . . . But of all the excuses alleged for Cafa, on account of this *Capitolo del Forno*, the best, in my opinion is, that he saith he repaired this fault by a virtuous life.'

Moribus,
 Industria, pudore, continentia,
 Lasciviam nos Carminis correximus
 Illius: emendavimusque seris
 Jocos.

*My wanton verse which gave offence,
 And all those jokes which I have vended,
 Now by a life of innocence
 And serious thoughts I have amended.*

These verses are part of the Latin poem which that curious person of Utrecht desired to see. There are also others in it wherein John della Cafa confesses his fault, but too faintly, and endeavours to excuse himself on account of his youth, and by the custom of good Poets, though on all other accounts, virtuous men.

Annis ab hinc triginta, & amplius, scio
 Nonnulla me, fortasse non castissimis
 Lussisse verbis: quod ætas tunc mea
 Rerum me adegit inscia, & semper jocos
 Licentia gavisa, concessu omnium,
 Juventa: quod fecere & alii item boni.

'Tis thirty years ago, and more
 Since I some verses did compose
 Perhaps obscene good men before
 Have done the like; my youth jocos
 Impell'd me, which, as all agree,
 Is thoughtless, and loves liberty.

The only excuse is that which Menage likes best. Let us observe by the by, that there are few subjects, where the boldness of authors in copying one another, without ever consulting the original, is more visible, than in this. Mr Menage hath cited several who accused Cafa, but he hath forgotten a very great number; and I wonder he did not know this place of a book which has been read by every body.

*John de la Cafa, Archbishop of Benevento, wrote a book in praise of Sodomy, calling it a divine work, and saying that he found a great deal of pleasure in it, and used no other sort of wensery (45). Observe, that the famous Mr Magliabechi having detected the infamous passages of the *Capitolo del Forno*, points out several other Italian Poets whose works are equally horrible, or even more execrable than this; of which the Protestants have nevertheless taken no notice: whence he concludes, that Vergerio's personal hatred against Cafa, was the source of their complaints so often copied. 'Io non intendo di far qui l'Apologisa del Cafa: troppo chiare sono l'infamità che si leggono in quel suo sporco Capitolo, &c. Contuttocio, come è detto, fu sua gran disgrazzia l'aver per nemico il Vergerio. Ognun vede le orribili infamità nel medesimo genere che si trovano nel Berni nel Capitolo a M. Antonio da Bibbiena, e nell'altro Capitolo sopra un Garzone, ed in mille altri luoghi: in Curzio da Marignolle: nel Ruffoli; in Marco Lamberti: nel Perfiani: ed in cento e mille altri nostri Poeti Fiorentini; per tralasciare altri quasi infiniti di altre patrie (46). -- I do not intend here to vindicate Cafa; the infamous things we find in his abominable Capitolo, &c. are too too evident. However, as I said before, it was his great misfortune to have Vergerio for his enemy. Every body sees the horrible obscenities of the same kind in the Berni, in the Capitolo of M. Antonio da Bibbiena, and in the other Capitolo sopra un Garzone, and in a thousand*

(45) Sainte Aldegonde, Tableau des Differens, Part. v, Tom. ii, ch. vii.

(46) Magliabechi, letter to Mr Bigot, in the *Anti-Baillet*, at the end of chap. cxx.

other pieces: in Curzio da Marignolle; in Ruffoli; in Marco Lamberti; in Perfiani; and in a world of other Florentine Poets, not to mention almost infinite numbers of Poets of other places.' The Poets were not the only persons who let loose at this rate; but prose was also made use of by some leud authors of that country: witness the oration of Heliogabalus, composed by Leonard Aretinus (47). All these authors are very much to blame, and so much the more inexcusable, because they knew the weakness of their readers. They were not of a country where nature is proof against temptations, but where it is easily heated; for which reason Poggius envied the Swifts, the honesty and sincerity which he observed amongst them. He could not sufficiently admire the Baths at Baden, where men and women, boys and girls, were bathing promiscuously, without raising any ill suspicions. Poggius Florentinus de Thermis Badenibus Helveticorum admirabundus scripsit ad Leonh. Aretinum (48), in iis pueros puellasque viros & feminas simul conspici: sæpe feminas nudas nudo viro obviam ire, nulla inhonesti suspitione: masculos campestribus seu femoralibus, feminas linteis indui vestibus, crurum tenus à latere scissis: neque collum, neque brachia, neque lacertos tegere, &c. Et addit postea: Cernunt viri uxores tractari, cernunt alteri colloqui. Eß quidem illis solatium, nihil bis commoveatur, nihil admittantur: omnia BONA MENTE fieri putant, neque est ex iis, qui Zelotypus esset, & mores nostris (Italicis) dissimiles, qui semper res in deteriorem partem excipimus: qui usque adeo calumniis delectamur & obiretationibus, ut, si quid videmus per ullam conjecturam, statim pro manifestis crimine attestemus. Invidet, imo nostras execror animi perversitatem, &c. (49). -- (49) Matthias Berneggerus, Question. Miscellanea, x, ex Taciti Germania.

(47) Exstat in monumentis Desiderii Erasmi Rotodami ex recensione editis, oratio invictoria Heliogabali Romanorum Imperatoris, habita in concione ad meretrices, quam à Leonhardo Aretino compositam plerique credunt. *Sacra Eleusinia, paterfacta, pag. 21. See the article PINEAU, citation (3), touching these Sacra Eleusinia.*

(48) That letter is the cxxxvth, among those of Æneas Silvius.

(49) Matthias Berneggerus, Question. Miscellanea, x, ex Taciti Germania.

Poggius, the Florentine, admired the Baths at Baden in Switzerland, and wrote to Leonard Aretin, that boys and girls, men and women, bathed promiscuously in them: that men and women often met one another naked, without raising ill suspicions. That the men wore drawers, and the women linen shifts, open in the sides as far as the knees; that they went with their necks, shoulders and arms bare, &c. And afterwards he adds: The husbands behold their wives handed by, and holding discourse with other men. They are not at all moved, nor surprized at such things, but are even pleased with them. They think every thing is done with an HONEST INTENTION, and there is not a jealous person amongst them. O how unlike are those manners to ours in Italy, who always take things in the worst sense, and who are so pleased with calumny and slander, that if we imagine or conjecture any thing, we immediately attest it as a manifest crime. I envy the Swifts, but I abhor the perverse turn of our minds, &c.

[F] He would not have returned into the world.] His words are (50): 'Life alone seems to me so indifferent, to say nothing farther to it's disadvantage, that far from ever desiring to renew the race, if put to my choice, I would not change the few remaining calamitous days in an age so far advanced as mine is, for the numerous years, expected by an infinite number of young persons, all whose pleasures I well know. I could really swear to this as well as Cardan, if I did not think it more to the purpose to cite his own expressions, to which I subscribe, tho', according to his manner of writing, they are more judicious than elegant: 'Nos, per Deum, fortunam nostram erigiam, atque in ætate senili, cum ditissimo juvene, sed imperito, non commutaremus. -- By G -- I would not exchange my small fortune, even in my old age, for the largest possessions of an inexperienced youth.' I suppose, with great probability, a thing, which he hath not exactly expressed; which is, that the race of life which he would not begin again, would be the same which he had almost finished. From whence I conclude, that there is scarce any part which to a man of judgment seems worth repeating on the stage of the world; for that which was allotted to la Mothe le Vayer, was the most desirable that could be imagined in his rank. He wanted nothing that was agreeable, if we may judge of it by the outside

(50) La Mothe le Vayer, Letter cxxiv, p. 204. of Vol. xii.

(b) He died in 1664.

which providence had imposed on him. He was extremely afflicted at the loss of his only son (b), his grief disordered him so much that he married again [G], and had no reason to deplore the loss of his first wife. The passage where he acquaints us with this last particular, is very favourable to those who assert, that the conjugal vow of fidelity is not

side. La Mothe le Vayer was born in the metropolis of his country, an advantage which all learned men, and several others, would bestow on themselves, if in their gift. He was very well educated by a learned Father (51), whose merit and employments (52) rendered him considerable. He was loved and considered by the two Cardinals, who governed France successively: splendid titles and honourable posts he did not want; for he was Counsellor of state in ordinary, and Preceptor to the King's only brother. He distinguished himself gloriously amongst the authors, and deserved a place in the French academy. The great number of books which he published, met with a very great demand. They were several times reprinted separately, and afterwards collected together. He was as rich as his condition required. He was a little inclined to forbidden pleasures during the heat of the beginning of his youth (53), but he soon extricated himself, and afterwards constantly led a pure life, which made him be looked on as a rigid follower of the most perfect morality (54), inasmuch that he acquired a very particular esteem on that account. It is a greater

(51) See La Croix du Maine, pag. 84, who calls him Felix de la Mothe le Vayer.

(52) Morel says he was Counsellor to the King, and Substitute to the Attorney-General in the Parliament of Paris.

(53) See the Hexameron Rustique, pag. 97, 98.

(54) Virtutis vere castos rigidique fastidit. Horatius, Epist. i. lib. i. ver. 17. We have seen that Patin calls him a Stoic.

perfection to be always wise than to become so by way of amendment; but the conversion to wisdom is more difficult than the keeping in her paths without ever turning out of the way. There was therefore in this particular of la Mothe le Vayer's life something very agreeable. This made him remember the violence which he made use of to renounce the pleasures which he was very well acquainted with: a violence greater, might he say to himself, than to abstain from those pleasures which one hath never tasted. Besides, was it not agreeable to find in his lot the successive enjoyment of the pleasures of the body and soul? This was more likely to tempt him to accept of the repetition of his condition, than if he had been deprived of the pleasures of youth. Yet neither this, nor all the other allurements of this author's life, tho' so charming, could engage him to desire the repetition of it. This is a proof that it was intermixed with crosses, of which we were ignorant, which turned the scale on the side of evil. But if misfortune fell in upon so many advantages; if it poisoned them with a loathsome bitterness, so as to make him despise life as a burthenome honour, which he would not accept, if he had the power of refusal: What can we think of the condition of so many persons, who seem to us to be destitute of almost all the causes of human happiness, and exposed to a thousand misfortunes? A great many assert, that except some brutal wretches, no old man would return into the world on condition to be obliged to act the same part over again. We are, indeed, unwilling to die, we would always live, we flatter ourselves that things will mend; but the remembrance of what is past, the good and evil things of this world being duly balanced together, does not permit us to desire to run again in the same career. The Antients feigned, that the souls that were to return into the world, passed through the river of oblivion, as if without that there were reason to fear they should grow restless. On this head, see the New Letters against Maimbourg (55).

(55) New Letters against Maimbourg's History of Calvinism. pag. 722, 719 bis, & 768.

[G] He afflicted himself extremely at the loss of his only son, his grief disordered him so much that he married again. To this purpose, Guy Patin furnishes me with two necessary passages. We have here an honest gentleman under very great affliction. It is Mr de la Mothe le Vayer, a celebrated author, and formerly preceptor to the Duke of Orleans, aged seventy-eight years. He had an only son about thirty-five years old, who fell ill of a continual fever, to whom Dr Esprit, Dr Brayer, and Dr Bodineau, have given emetic wine three times, and sent him to the place from whence there is no return (56). This is extracted from a letter, dated the 26th of September 1664. Three months after Patin wrote another letter, in which are the following words: Mr de la Mothe le Vayer, to comfort himself for the death of his only son, is this day married, being seventy-eight years

(56) Patin's Letter cccxvi, pag. 656, of Vol. ii.

old, to the daughter of M. de la Haye, formerly ambassador at Constantinople, who is at least forty. She flaid long enough to be a Sibyl. Non invenit vatem, sed virum, sed vetulum (57). -- She found not a prophet, but an husband, and that an old one. Observe, that Patin makes him seventy-eight years old in the year 1664. This doth not agree with what he says in another letter (58), that in 1649, he was aged about sixty years. Mr de Vize's Novelists makes it a round number; they assure us that he married when eighty years of age. The death of Mr Godeau gave occasion to speak of that of Mr de la Mothe le Vayer, who hath thereby left a second vacancy in the French academy. He was a very learned man, richly stored with polite learning, and hath left the public fifteen or sixteen volumes of his works, by which he acquired a vast reputation. He had been preceptor to the King's only brother, and at the age of fourscore, married Madam de la Haye. After which he lived several years. Thus the Novelists discoursed about it, and as they said nothing but what is true, I have nothing farther to add on this subject (59).

The author of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* sticks at seventy-eight years. I shall cite what he says somewhat at large, because, besides other particulars, we are thereby informed, that this marriage was a weakness which the Philosophers will never forgive him. Mr Petit discharges his indignation on some learned men, who imagine that the description of the Nymphs cave, denotes the characteristic part of women (60). He saith, that after the war which they have declared against the sciences, and human reason, nothing could stop their fury from attempting the ruin of polite learning by bespattering Homer. It is easy to perceive that this is levelled at the fourth day of the Hexameron rusticque of la Mothe le Vayer, a famous Pyrrhonist. Indeed it had been better if, in his old age, he had not printed such a book as this, in which, notwithstanding his caution in several places, it cannot be denied that there are too many impure thoughts. But this is not the only thing which is censured in the last years of this venerable old man, whose virtue had so successfully conducted him in the paths of the antient sages: he married again at seventy-eight years of age; a weakness which the Philosophers will never forgive him (61). Because all learned readers will desire to see this indignation of Mr Petit, as it is vented in the original, and perhaps may not have his work *de Sibylla*, I shall here cite his words: pag. 1118, 1119.

Sed & propudiosa quorundam interpretamenta excluduntur, qui ista imagine antri Nympharum utrum & pudendum muliebrem ænigmatice ab Homero designatum censent: quibus cum opponitur durum ejus antri portarum descriptio, eo amentia & furoris procedunt, ut ad adversæ & averæ seu pollicæ venæ flagitiosa divortia confugere non erubescant. Adeo impudentes ut non vereantur poetarum omnium principem, literarum parentem, ingeniorum fontem, ad hæc transferre nefanda, ut qui rationi humane & scientiis bellum indixissent, literas quoque omnes, infamato earum principe, quantum in ipsis esset, perderent (62). -- But likewise the shameful interpretations of some are exploded, who, by the image of the Nymphs Cave, fancy that Homer figuratively meant the womb and privy-parts of women. And when the description of the two gates of the cave is objected to them, so great is their folly and madness, that they are not ashamed to recur to the flagitious distinction of natural and unnatural venery. They are so impudent, that they are not afraid to lay those impious things upon the prince of Poets, the parent of learning, and the fountain of wit. For after they had declared war against human reason and the sciences, nothing remained for their fury to do, but to attempt the ruin of all learning, by defaming the prince of it. For the rest, la Mothe le Vayer's son was reckoned amongst the learned Abbots; it is to him that it is thought Mr Boileau inscribed his 4th satire. In the year 1656 he published a French translation of Florus, and dedicated it to the Duke of Anjou, the King's only brother. He saith, that

(57) Idem, Letter cccxi, pag. 70, of Tom. iii. It is dated the 30th of December, 1664.

(58) See the palage of Patin, cited in the remark [B].

(59) Mercurius Galant, for the year 1673, Tom. ii, pag. 38, 39. Dutch Edit.

(60) The author of a treatise of Anatomy, intitled, *Særa Elæphina partitæ*, explains in the same manner the cave of Anaxilas. See *Ælian. Var. Hist.* lib. viii, cap. i.

(61) Nouv. de la République des Lettres, Octobre, 1668, pag. 1118.

(62) Petrus Pontanus, *de Sibylla*, lib. ii, cap. 2, in fine, pag. 234.

not much better observed than that of Celibacy [H]. The reflexions he made in an another

that he published this Florus from the translations which the young prince had made. This version is accompanied with a learned and curious commentary, where Coeffeteau's translation is very much censured. See the elogies which the Abbot of Villeloin bestows on the father and the son (63).

(63) Marolles, *Mémoires*, pag. 194.

(64) You will see in the remark [B], of the article CRISTO (JAMES) who she was.

[H] *The passage . . . where he acquaints us that he had no reason to deplore the loss of his first wife (64), is very favourable to those who assert, &c. . .* First of all I ought to acquaint the reader that he never charges his wife with any amours: He only owns that he was perhaps as sensible of the inconveniences of marriage as any body. In a letter to a friend who had informed him that a certain person was separated from his wife, on account of adultery, he expresses himself thus. 'Do not expect that I should offer you a panegyric on a condition of life, whose inconveniences I am perhaps not less acquainted with than those who are most weary of them. I have always taken that sleep into which God call our first father before he presented him with a wife, not only for a caution to distrust our own sight, as a very bad counsellor in this affair; but for a moral instruction, that no man would probably take upon himself that incumbrance, if the eyes of his mind were open enough to foresee the inconveniences to which he subjects himself, who engages in so dangerous a society. And I never read the first verse of the tenth book of Ovid's *Metamorphosis*, where he arrays the god Hymen in a saffron coloured robe,

. . . *Croceo velatus amictu,*

without fancying that the Poet thereby designed to express what is so essential in marriage. The cares of a family which you take upon yourself, the several blows of fortune which you render yourself liable to, the inevitable jealousy which you will have of your wife, on account of the charms you find in her, and the fear of being touched in your honour, are they not sufficient causes of jaundice? And is it not a miraculous thing, if a constitution, even the most sanguine or gay, be not by this means icterical? But after all we ought to acquiesce in our destiny, and submit to what the wisest legislators have on this occasion ordered for the best. We cannot change their decrees, and we may render ourselves yet more miserable, by taking a course much more dangerous than that already prescribed to us (65). By these last words he gives us to understand that the inconveniences of marriage do not render that state the most miserable of all conditions of life; this he had plainly told us in the foregoing pages. *I am very much mistaken, if this man does not find the remedy which he designs to apply to his misfortune, worse than the evil which he believes to be insupportable; and if at length he does not find that in several respects concubinage is something more intolerable than marriage itself. For it does not seem sufficient to say only with the ancients,*

(65) La Mothe le Vayer, *letter lxxvii*, pag. 224, & seq. of Vol. xi.

Tam malum est foris amica, quam malum est uxor domi *.

* Laberius.

A mistress abroad is as great an evil as a wife at home.

. . . He is ridiculous, if he expects a greater intimacy in libertinism, and imagines that he shall be more ardently and sincerely loved in a state where the fires are barely artificial. You, as well as I, have known several men more harassed in extricating themselves from such a licentious life as he designs, than they could be by all the disgraces of an unfortunate marriage (66). All this is worthy of the wisdom and genius of this great author. But I proceed to what he says more essentially proper for the commentary on my text.

(66) Id. *ibid.* pag. 223, 224.

'I will not penetrate so far as you into the secrets of this marriage. It is enough that I tell you that without being a very great prophet, one might long since have foretold this adventure. No man ever discovered a more foolish passion for his wife, he made love to her with all the extravagancies of a lecher. But this is a great defect in a wife man, who ought to avoid all such behaviour; *Adulter est uxoris amator acris*. . . . He is an adulterer that too violently loves his wife; and this is, according to

VOL. V.

Laberius, to make a coquet of one's own wife. And truly it cannot be denied, that the wife I speak of has hitherto behaved herself in such a manner, that one may very well believe part of the coquetries her husband accuses her of, without doing her much wrong, or without being too credulous. And yet what does he charge her with besides living according to the mode? Indeed our manners in that respect are at present arrived at a very strange period; and the prostitution of the sex, even by those whose honour so absolutely depends on their conduct, is what is not to be accounted for by reason, nor could any thing but seeing it every day make us believe it possible *.

Eo prolapsi mores jam sunt, ut nemo ad suspicanda adulteria nimium credulus videri possit. . . . The age is now so corrupt, that none can be thought too credulous in suspecting adulteries. And the Latin grammar by its rules never rendered (*Cornu*) Horn so indeclinable, as our senseless deportment in this respect hath at present rendered it inevitable by a pleasant synonymy (67). Do not believe that la Mothe le Vayer is the only author who thunders out such terrible and satirical sentences: A vast number of other writers pronounce the same judgment. It would be too tedious to enumerate them, see only some of the newest books, those which terminate in *ana* (68), and those that go by the name of stories, letters, memoirs, comedies, novels, &c. They represent leudness like Deucalion's deluge which overspread the whole earth, and as a distemper which marriage rather heightens than restrains.

** Sen. Cont.

(67) Id. *ibid.* pag. 222, 223.

(68) *À Menagiana*, *Harlequiniana*, *Farsetiana*, *Saintveermoniana*.

They induce us to conclude that the time which Seneca mentions is returned upon us, the time I say when the multitude of adulteresses took off the shamefulness of that crime, when conjugal fidelity was a proof of ugliness, and an husband was taken for no other use than to excite the love of a gallant. Seneca's description is so nervous, that I choose rather to transcribe it than translate it faintly. Non expedit notum omnibus fieri, quam multi ingrati sint, pudorem enim rei tollet multitudo peccantium: & desinet probri loco, commune maledictum. Numquid jam ulla repudii erubescit, postquam illis quædam ac nobiles femine non consulum numero, sed maritorum annos suos computant? & exeunt matrimonii causa, nubunt repudii? Tam diu itud timebatur, quamdiu rarum erat, quia verò nulla sine divortio acta sunt; quod sæpe audiebant, facere dicerunt. Numquid jam ullus adulterii pudor est, postquam eò ventum est, ut nulla virum habeat, nisi ut adulterum irriter? argumentum est deformitatis, pudicitia. Quam invenies tam miseram, tam fordiam, ut illi fati sit unum adulterorum par? nisi singulis divisit horas, & non sufficit dies omnibus? nisi ad alium gestata est, apud alium manit? Infrunita & antiqua est, quæ nesciat, matrimonium vocari unius adulterium. . . . horum delictorum jam evanuit pudor, postquam res latius evagata est (69). . . . It is not fit that the world

(69) Seneca, *de Benefic. lib. iii*, should know, how many ungrateful persons there are: For the multitude of offenders would take away the shame of the offence, and a common reproach would cease to be a disgrace. Is there any woman now a-days, that blushes at a divorce, since some illustrious and noble ladies, compute their years not by the number of the consuls but of their husbands, from whom they depart in order to be married, and are married in order to be divorced? A divorce was so long dreaded as it was uncommon; but since there are now few or no marriages without it, people learn to practise what they often bear. Is any one now ashamed of adultery, since the age is become so corrupt, that no woman takes an husband but to be a cloak for adultery? Chastity is an argument of ugliness. What woman is so wretched, so fordid, as to be contented with one couple of adulterers? Unless she has one for every hour of the day, and the day is not sufficient for all? Unless she visits at one place and dines at another? She must be a doating old woman that does not know, that the keeping company with one man only is called marriage. . . . The shame of those crimes is now vanished, since they are become universally known.

The champions of monastical vows boast of no small advantage to their cause by this; as if they could

5 P

could not be confuted by this reason, *viz.* that incon-
tinency, which naturally prompts to marriage, and
is generally the cause of it, ought to be left at
full liberty to take its course. It is not at all
tamed by it, say they; and it may as effectually be
restrained by the vow of celibacy, as by the solemn
one of conjugal fidelity. There are two sorts of
vows, one of which ought to be observed as invio-
lably as the other; and if one is not better kept
than the other, as practice plainly shews, of what
advantage would the abrogation of monastical rules
be? The Monks and Nuns are charged with thou-
sands and thousands of leud actions. Terrible lifts
are made of bairds and abortions, and such other disor-
ders proceeding from the celibacy of Ecclesiastics (70).

(71) See the article PATIN, remarks [C], and [F].

(72) *Peter du Moulin, the son, Traité de la Paix de l'Ame, livr. iii, cb. xiv, pag. 382, Paris 1673.*

(73) Histoire de
la Mappemonde
Papistique, *pag.*
81, *Edit.* 1567,
in 4to.

(74) Ibid. pag. 32.

persons proceeding from the celibacy of Ecclesiastics (70). If those persons obliged to continency by their state of a single life, were at their liberty in the world, could not they fall into worse uncleanness? Turn our eyes to what authors relate of the abortive births (Paris 71). Under the covert of marriage, exempt from the fear of consequences, to what lewdness do they abandon themselves? And if those who have occasion to fear the anxiety which the fox was reduced to, I mean the necessity of being confined, till their bellies grow as flat as they were before, will notwithstanding venture it; can we expect any better from those who on the like occasion lie under no necessity to hide themselves, marriage veiling their fault from the eyes of the world? But you may say what you please, you champions of monastical vows, you will never be able to convince me, with all the proofs which you are pleased to cite out of la Mothe le Vayer and a hundred other authors, that the conjugal vow of fidelity is not better observed than that of celibacy, and that marriage is not an effectual remedy against the incontinence of a very great number of persons. We ought not to stretch too far what was said by a very good man, equally recommendable for his father's glory, and his own virtue. In one of the best pieces of Christian morality that we have, intitled, *Of the Peace and Contentment of the Mind*, a sensible, serious, grave, and religious book, he saith, that the husband whose wife is false ought to practise the great remedy against irremediable evils, which is patience, and that the good company of so many honest men, who are in the same condition, helps to bear it, and he needs not think it more strange than to wear a fashionable hat (72). Once more, this expression ought not to be urged too far; for the number of those, who follow the mode in their dress, surpasses the number of those whom this wife Divine endeavours to com-

port. What I have said above concerning the fox will be more intelligible, when I have related to those gentlemen what I have read concerning the pernicious effects of those vows, which they would justify. It is a story, the ground of which I could never yet meet with in the ecclesiastical annals : I have engaged some people in quest of it. In the mean while all that hath yet reached my knowledge is, that about the year 1537, the Countess of Guastalla, by the advice of Baptiſt de Crema, a Jacobin Monk, founded a fraternity of the *Victory over one's self against the flesh*. . . . To gain this victory, a certain lady named Julia, put a young fellow into bed with a young girl, and laid a crucifix as a barrier betwixt them, to the end that they should not kick one another, as we generally call bars or poles between horses: And this was the trial (73). This fraternity multiplied prodigiously. Such ladies, says my author (74), go very often to several of the neighbouring towns, to visit their Priests and spiritual Fathers, for they have their nests in several towns. But it often happens to them as to a certain famished fox, who entering into a chamber by a little hole, eat so greedily, and stuffed his belly so full, that he became so swollen that he could not get out again : So it happens frequently to these good ladies, when they enter the chambers of their fathers confessors, their bellies begin to swell to that degree that they are obliged to stay there, and not stir a foot till the fruit is ripe, because their repast proved too large : Which proceeds from their gormandizing, because their hunger is as great as that of the fox. See what Horace says.

*A hungry fox, when pinch'd for want of meat,
Crept thro' a little hole to heaps of wheat,
And there well fill'd he would return again
Thro' the same chink; he strove, but strove in vain:
When lo the wheel cry'd absurd design,
Fox, you were thin and lean when you got in,
And if you would get out be quite as thin.*

(75) Horace,
Epist. vii, lib. i,
ver. 29.

СРЕДН.

Let us return to la Mothe le Vayer. He judiciously observes, that this divorced woman was ruined by her husband's fault; who loved her too lasciviously. Brantome for the same reason charges the ill lives of several wives to their husband's account (77). Generally speaking we may affirm, that the mens part in all these disorders is infinitely greater than the women's. They are the instigators, sollicitors and seducers. This an author of the XVIth century hath

very nautically inclined. We very seldom see, faith he (78), women guilty of pride, cruelty, murder, drunkenness, gluttony, sacrilege, robbery, or generally tainted with all sorts of vices as the men are: But, on the contrary, they are for the most part humble, civil, sober, chaste, discreet, and charitable in their hearts are tender and humane; and if there are any, as it may be alleged against me, who are vicious I aver and maintain, that they are most commonly introduced and inticed to it by men, without whose inticement few or none of this sort would be found. And I speak plainer, for a small number of ill women the greater part of the men are stark nauts. And if any person is pleased to contradict me, I ask him what the men

would be, if they were continually enticed, excited and solicited to evil, vice and sin, by the women, as the women are by them, considering that of their own accord without any affliction they are so corrupt and vicious? Who ought to be esteemed most excusable, *he* who at the inticement of another loses her virtue, or he who uses his utmost endeavours to extinguish it, which I see confirmed by daily experience? And therefore I am a little surprized at the thoughtless sparks, who incessantly censure the women for the very vice which is not so common amongst that sex as amongst their own. If the women (as they say) were subject to luxury and incontinence, (which I utterly deny) ought they not to be as full as abominable and detestable, or rather more, in infinite load of other vices and imperfections which may find amongst themselves, the least of which deserve as much to be blamed as that? I cannot imagine where such an error should proceed, unless from a desire of tennening others to justify themselves: which would avail them with regard to me; for I know that they almost all so generally addicted to the same vice (by others) that there is not a wretch though ever so bad amongst them that doth not desire to gratify his lust.

ally, or as many women as please him: do thou
 the modesty and chastity did not stop the torrent of vice, it
 would be no more continence amongst mankind
 amongst brutes (79). But we see they are still
 without intermission, and with much less trouble
 they might enjoy their fill of pleasure, notwithstanding
 in which they very seldom fall into this fault, we
 though so much blamed in them, is becoming almost a
 to the men. Is it then less displeasing to God to
 a sex than in the other? It is indeed very strange
 they should be so severely censured, for what they
 glory in, considering also that the sin is committed on
 female side with some colour of excuse, whilst the
 male really none. What hath been lately said
 concerning the weakness of men, and the strength of
 men, in a book intitled, *Moliere Comedien*
 their charms *Elisbes* (80), is the best thing in that book
 and doubts he that wrote the satire against

(76) I cannot tell whether the following passage of a letter of Lucia Gonzaga, p. 134, may be applied to the members of that fraternity. *Havete ridette tanto quella pia crociata che io vi narrai occorre tra Guastallino, & lui. . . .* I laughed at those comical things which I told you happened there: it is the Guastallians and him. *Ho tentio Lando in meant by the word him.*

(77) Brantome
Mémoires des
Dames Galantes
Tom. i, pag.
54, 55.

(78) Claudius
Taillemont, L.
onnois, in bis
Discours des
Champs Faes.
l'honneur & e
altation des
Dames, print
at Lyons 155
in 8xx.

(79) Com
thus with
is laid in t
ticle LAN
NIANO,
tion (18)

which
vir- (80) Pri
one 1896. S
that vi, of A
fools pag. 157
in the of the A
other flam edi
con- You will
f wo- the fame
aux in the iv
book; of the D
huf- Currier
ands. 68, &
Dutch

at night, &c. [I]. He lived several years after his second marriage, and died in the year 1672 (c) I shall speak of the editions of his works [K].

(c) Moreri says in 1671. Mr Witte is very much mistaken in his *Diarium Biographicum*, where he places the death of this author, in the year 1664.

The

bands, in answer to Mr Boileau's satire against women, had a more fruitful subject than Mr Boileau.

[I] We have room to imagine that he was experimentally acquainted with the ill side of marriage, the broils of the day, and manner of composing them at night, &c.] See a letter which he wrote to a person who desired his advice concerning marriage. He first of all makes an enumeration of some imperfections which the antients attributed to women, after which he adds (81). 'But the want of capacity, and a sufficient number of other defects, with which those of our days abound more than ever, would not perhaps be so considerable, if we had the remedies which the antients practised against the most incorrigible. For besides divorces, which were allowed them if they found their wives but in a small fault, on four occasions they had a right to take away their lives, and the women ran as great a risk by drinking of wine, or using of false keys, as by impoling of children on the husband, or committing adultery . . . (82). But as our laws are very far from any such strict severity, we find that their indulgence favours the debauchery and depravation of women to that degree, that being at present restrained by no sort of fear, I see nothing which we ought reasonably to hope for from the most prudent of them,

(81) La Mothe le Vayer, letter xlv. pag. 357. of Vol. x.

(82) Id. ibid. pag. 358, 359.

† Juven. Sat. vi. vers. 50.

Paucæ adeò Ceres vittas contingere dignæ †.

*On Ceres' feast restrain'd from their delight,
Few matrons there but curse the tedious night.*

DRYDEN.

'And if we ought to except some few who are touched with a sense of honour, how can you be free from the rest of their infirmities, which the greatest Philosophers, nor the most potent Emperors have not been able to correct? Philip of Macedon † protested, that he did not know a humour so martial as that of his wife Olympias, who incessantly made war against him. Their gaming, the excesses in their feasting, and the rest of their profusions, at present exceed those of the most debauched of our sex, and quickly make an husband sensible of the truth of the Italian proverb, *spesa di sposa, noce che nuoce*. Nor are you yet to expect that the noisy uneasiness of the day will exempt you from the duties of the night. There is no peace or rest to be hoped for, if it doth not proceed from that side,

‡ Dio. Chryz. or. 2.

† Ovid. l. 2. ver. 413, de art. am.

Sed lateri ne parce tuo, pax omnis in illo est †.

*But no endearments no carresses spare,
Enjoyment pacifies the angry fair.*

** Diod. Sic. l. 17.

'And you will find the greatest part of them like the fountain of Hammon ** extremely cold by day, but very hot by night.' When a married man talks at this rate, he gives very good reason to believe, 1. That he has often undergone such a trial. 2. That this made him so well acquainted with the seal, which ought to be affixed to those reconciliations. 3. That he was very well versed in the distinction betwixt the groundless quarrels, which are like the ill humour of a creditor ill paid, and those which result from a peevish temper.

(83) Epistle Decretory of the third edition.

[K] I shall speak of the editions of his works.] His son collected them into a body in 1653, and dedicated them to Cardinal Mazarin. This edition in folio being followed by a second, he published a third, larger and more correct than the two former (83), and dedicated it to the king in 1662. After this edition another came out in fifteen volumes in 12mo, which comprehends more tracts than the last in folio, which was in three volumes. Those three volumes in folio contain but the twelve first tomes of that in 12mo. The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth, being the tracts which the author published in the year 1667, 1668, and 1669.

There is no small advantage to be made of reading this writer, and we have no French author who approaches nearer to Plutarch than he. We find beautiful thoughts, and solid arguments interwoven and dispersed through his works. Wit and learning go hand in hand. His wit would doubtless appear more conspicuously if it went alone; for the authorities and citations very often obscure it: but in some places it shines most by the happy application of a foreign thought. This author, amongst his other various sorts of reading, applied himself to that of voyages. In which each person hath generally his particular end. Mr Daillé (84) read them only to discover the difference betwixt the Apostles converting the antient Pagans, and the Popish Missionaries converting the new ones. Our Vayer had another aim, he only looked for arguments for Pyrrhonism. The prodigious diversity which he met with betwixt the manners and customs of different nations charmed him: he could not conceal the satisfaction with which he digested these materials, nor did he hide the consequences which he would have us to draw from thence, viz. that we ought not to be so decisive as to condemn as ill and unreasonable, whatever we do not find agreeable to our opinions and customs. I cannot tell whether he believed with Cardan, that Opinion is the queen of mankind (85), but I believe that he might have made as good an oration about the empire of Opinion as that of Schuppius, (86) and an excellent commentary on these three verses of Sophocles.

(84) See his life, written by his son.

(85) *Æstimatione & Opinione rerum humanarum Regine sunt.* Cardanus, lib. iii. de Utilit. apud Naudæum, Coups d'Etat, pag. m. 92.

(86) Christopher Pellerus quotes it sometimes in his Politicus sceleratus impugnatus. See there pag. 55, 56, & 219.

*Παῦσαι, κατ'ἀρκεί τῷ δὲ κεκλισθαι πατρός
Εἵτερ πύρκα γ' εἰδὲ μὴ, μέλιον βλάσῃ.
Τὸ γὰρ νομισθὲν τῆς ἀληθείας κρείττεϊ.*

*Pausa: sat est me hoc patre natum dicier,
Natus tamen si sum: fin autem, obest parum.
Nam veritate potentior est opinio*

Pausa, it is sufficient that I am said to be descended of this Father; it is no matter whether I really am so or not: for opinion prevails over truth.

His treatise concerning the Education of the Dauphin (87) and that of the Pagan Philosophy, are the best which he hath written. That of the Historians is good: but as Mr Baillet very judiciously observes, it did not cost him much pains (88). I have observed in it several other faults besides those which I have mentioned in the articles of Suetonius and Tacitus. No vans, Tom. ii, body is ignorant that his last works are much inferior to those composed in the flower and vigour of his age. These are the words of Mr Baillet (89).

(87) See Sorberiana, pag. 223, Dutch Edit.

(88) Baillet, Jugemens des Sçavans, Tom. ii, Art. 126.

(89) Id. ibid. Tom. i, Part. ii, ch. ix.

Mr de Vigneul Marville pretends that la Mothe le Vayer's works are only a collection of what he liked best in the course of his reading; that formerly such sort of rhapsodies were read, but are not relished at present (90). There is too much harshness and severity in this sentence: all unbiassed persons have always made a vast difference betwixt la Mothe le Vayer's writings, and rhapsodies. He was not an author who heaped up passages like the compilers of a *Florilegium* or a *Polyanthæa*. He contented himself to confirm his thoughts by those of the most excellent authors of Antiquity, or to use his learning in order to give new hints by the applications he made, or the consequences he drew. This is not what is called a rhapsody. He says an infinite number of things which were purely his own, and which he intermixed with a great deal of spirit and wit; and tho' he hath interspersed several borrowed thoughts, which are not chosen with sufficient discernment, it is nevertheless true that from thence arises a work, the reading of which is highly advantageous, and which continues to please some very good judges. Mr de Vigneul Marville believes that he hath done a great honour to France by saying that la Mothe le Vayer's rhapsodies are not adapted to our present taste, and that the readers no longer lose their time in reading them; but it is to be feared that he will hereby confirm

(90) Vigneul Marville, Mélanges d'Hist. & de Littér. Tom. ii, pag. 300, Dutch Edit.

(d) Vigneul Marville, *Mélanges d'Hist. & de Littérat.* Tom. ii, pag. 301, Dutch Edit.

(e) That is, that he was a Philosopher, who minded only the inward part, and despised the vanities of human life.

The French Academy considered him as one of their best members; but the world looked on him as a capricious humourist, who lived according to his fancy, and as a Sceptic Philosopher. His physiognomy and dress made every body that saw him judge him an extraordinary man. He walked always with his head erect, and his eyes fixed on the signs of the street. Before I was told who he was, continues the writer from whom I have extracted this passage, I took him for an Astrologer, or a searcher after secrets and the philosophers stone (d). This serves only to confirm what we have seen above (e).

He had some cousins, whose descendants make a very good figure in the Law (f).

confirm several foreigners in the judgment which they make, that France, too much disgusted with all that favours of learning, only employs herself in refining her language, and in giving a happy turn to the descriptions and characters of men. The best writings of the first Academists are not less slighted than those of la Mothe la Vayer (91); and yet it is agreed on all hands that the French Academy was never better filled than in its beginning.

(91) I made this observation to shew that if la Mothe le Vayer is not read as he was formerly, it proceeds from a general disgust at most things that have lost the grace of novelty.

(f) See the *Mercur Galant*, for March 1682, pag. 166, & seq.

VAL (GEOFFREY DU) See VALLEE.

(a) At Rouën, in 8vo.

(b) I have this from Mr Drelin-court.

(c) At Rouën, 1603, in 12mo.

(d) Ibid. 1612, in 8vo.

VAL (JOHN DU) a Physician at Issoudun, his native place, translated into French the Antidotary or Dispensary of John-James Wecker, Physician at Basil, and added to it several things of his own. This book was printed at Geneva in 4to in 1609. The new edition of Vander-Linden, *de Scriptoribus Medicis*, doth not mention him, any more than it doth JAMES DU VAL, a Physician of Evreux, who published (a) a book in French, treating of hermaphrodites and the delivery of women in 1612 (b). He had before printed (c) a book concerning the medicinal spring about Rouën, and (d) a new method of curing Catarrhs (e).

VALDES (JOHN) in Latin *Valdesius*, flourished at Rome under Pope Julius II. He was a young well proportioned handsome polite Spaniard. His learning, industry, and the friendship of several great persons procured him very great riches. He fell in love with a Senator's daughter, not less virtuous than beautiful; and finding that the only way to gratify his passion was honourable love, he courted her for marriage, and carried the matter even to the signing of the contract. A little after which it was discovered that it was not possible to advance so far as the nuptial solemnity, by reason of his engagement in the ecclesiastical life. This very much angered the father of the betrothed lady, and obliged him to complain to Cardinal Leonard de la Rovere, who commanded in Rome in the absence of Julius II. That Cardinal caused Valdes to be imprisoned in the castle of St Angelo. The prisoner seeing himself charged with a crime, promised to renounce his priesthood if the Pope would permit him, and marry the betrothed lady, even tho' she had no fortune. Upon which he was discharged under bail; but whilst they were endeavouring to obtain the dispensation, he was so embarrassed but twixt the desire of keeping his benefices, and that of enjoying a wife, that he could not disengage himself from this labyrinth, otherwise than by throwing himself headlong from the top of his house [A]. By which he broke all his bones, and died immediately very much lamented by the whole city. His mistress being informed of this desperate act,

(e) I have this from Mr Bower delot.

[A] He could not disengage himself from this labyrinth otherwise than by throwing himself from the top of his house. His struggles with two different passions, was very fierce: on the one side he found himself unable to quit the charms resulting from the large revenue of his benefices, and on the other he despaired of resisting the violence of his love, if he could find means to annul his contract. If I keep my benefices, said he to himself, I shall never enjoy the person I love, and I do not find myself able to endure that privation. If I enjoy this person, I shall lose my preferments, and I do not believe I can any more bear this loss than the other. This plunged him into a deep melancholy, which was aggravated by his reflecting on the prejudice he did his mistress. He knew that by breaking off the promised marriage, he at once ruined the reputation and fortune of a very virtuous lady. For he doubtless imagined that she would find no more a suitable match. The scrupulous niceness of the Italians is such that they cannot easily digest the privacies which they suppose one after a contract of marriage may have and actually has taken. Nay, in the very countries, where people are not so nice, some men would never marry a lady who hath several times hearkened to the declarations of love from a young spark admitted by her relations; for they suppose that the more she became sensible of her parents

consent, the lesser bounds she set to the caresses of young man, and that she abandoned the out-side of the place. What would they not think if the matter broke off betwixt the contract and the wedding-day? However it was, our Valdes thought he should ruin the reputation of this fair one, if he should annul the marriage-contract; he was touched with a compassion for her; he was ashamed to use her so ill; and these two passions joining with others so cruelly tormented him, that to free himself from this slavery he resolved to end his life. Early in the morning then he went to the turret on the top of his house, and threw himself into the street. Valdesius neque libenter sacerdotiis, quæ opulenta erant, abdicare cogitat, neque perferre se amorem, etiam si impune liceat, ulterius sperat. Igitur cum id consilii se cepisse videret, quod non facile poterat explicare, graviore ob id dolore affectus, quod pudicissimæ feminæ famam, & fortunam omnem everterat, si repudii nuntium remisisset, magnis excruciatu sollicitudinibus, misericordique & pudore confectus, ut erat æstivus dies, turriculam quandam ad prospectum super ædium culmen excitatam discinctus adhuc ascendit, quasi matutinalem auram strictiorem animi gratia captaturus, servuloque mox negotii certi nomine ablegato nullam aliam rationem nactus, qua se turbulentissimis miseriis explicaret, & dulcissimæ sponse famæ nominique pro-

spiceret,

would have killed her self; wherefore they were obliged to keep a watchful eye over her to prevent any attempts of that nature. You expect to hear that time and another sighing lover comforted her, but you are mistaken; for as soon as her grief admitted of a little solace, she turned nun (a).

(a) Taken from Pierius Valerianus, in *Litterarum Infelicitate*, lib. i, pag. 44, 45.

spiceret, ex editissimo eo loco in viam mediam sese precipitem dedit, quo ita totis offibus colliso, & statim exanimato, Alterii filia re percepta, ipsa quoque sponsi desiderio sibi met manum inferre tentavit, sed diligenti familiarium observatione prohibita, custoditque, posteaquam tempore dolor aliquantulum mitigatus est, maritalem perosa vitam perpetuo victura celibatu vestalem induit (1). -- Valdes could not think of resigning his rich benefices, nor did he believe he could be able to resist the violence of his love, even tho' the contract were annulled. Therefore, when he saw he was involved in difficulties, from which he could not extricate himself, being the more concerned because he should ruin the character and fortune of a very virtuous lady by breaking off the match, and being agitated between compassion and shame, and cruelly tormented with anxious thoughts, he went up one summer's morning, before he was dressed, to the turret on the top

of his house, as if to take a little fresh air, having sent out his servant under pretence of some business; and finding no other way to free himself from this insupportable misery, and to save the reputation of his dear mistress, he threw himself headlong from that high place into the middle of the way, whereby he broke all his bones, and died upon the spot. The daughter of Alterii bearing of it, attempted to kill herself for the loss of her lover, but was prevented, and carefully watched by her friends. Afterwards, when her grief was a little assuaged by time, she conceived an aversion to a married state, and resolving to lead always a single life, went into a convent. The author does not mention whether this unhappy man was interred in a church, or whether the judges exercised the rigour of the law on his corpse. He only tells us that the whole city deplored his death (2).

(2) Valdesius totius Romæ luctu deploratus est. *Id. ibid.*

(1) Pierius Valerianus, de *Litterarum Infelicitate*, lib. i, pag. 45.

(a) See the *Bibliotheca Anti-trinitariorum*, p. 2.

(b) *Nobili generatus in Hispania & dignitate equitum ornatus à Carolo Cesare.* Melchior Adam in *Vita Petri Martyris*, pag. 31.

V A L D E S (JOHN) one of the first founders of Lutheranism in the kingdom of Naples, was a Civilian (a), and a Spanish gentleman, on whom Charles the Vth conferred the honour of knighthood (b). It is believed (c) that in his travels to Germany he was tinctured with the opinions which were preached there against the Church of Rome; and that having carried to Naples the books of Luther, Bucer, and the Anabaptists, he made use of them to get profelytes. It is certain that he communicated his opinions to several persons, who privately assembled to serve God according to these new instructions. Some women of quality frequented these assemblies [A]. Some Monks of extraordinary merit, and among others Peter Martyr Vermilius (d), and Bernardinus Ochinus (e) resorted also thither. The Inquisition discovered it, and by the application of their usual violent remedies suppressed this beginning of reformation. Valdes's disciples were not all equally steadfast: some stuck to the new doctrines and retired into Protestant countries; but the greatest part yielded and betrayed their consciences [B]. He lived unmarried and very chastely, and died at Naples, about 1540 (f). He attacked the Church of Rome on some points only [C], and it is pretended that on the doctrine of the Trinity, he neither agreed with the Protestants, nor the Roman Catholics. The Unitarians have placed

(c) See the *Bibl. Anti-trinitariorum*, pag. 2; & Spondanus *ad ann.* 1547, num. 21, 22.

(d) See the remark [A].

(e) Spondanus, *ubi supra*, num. 22.

(f) Celius Secundus Curio, *preface to Valdes's Considerationes*.

[A] He communicated his opinions to several persons, who privately assembled to serve GOD. . . . some women of quality frequented these assemblies. A passage in Peter Martyr's life informs us of this more particularly. We have there a very fine eulogy on our Valdes, the founder of this dawning Church. 'Qui (Joannes Valdesius) posteaquam à Deo veræ religionis agnitione donatus est, vitam suam in Italia, & præcipuè Neapoli egit, quo loco doctrina & sanctissimo vite exemplo, quamplurimos, præsertim nobiles, Christo lucrificet, ac fuit eo tempore non spernenda Ecclesiæ piorum hominum in urbe Neapolitana. Nam in illo cœtu multi viri erant nobiles & docti; multæ etiam excellenti virtute femine: inter quas ut alias illustres & vere heroínas omittamus, silentio tamen præterire non debemus nobilissimam heroinam Isabellam Manricam, quæ postea CHRISTI nomine à patria exulavit. In hoc cœtu piorum fuit ibidem CHRISTI nomine exul Galeaxius Caracciolo Marchio Vici, & alii magni viri post exules, quos omnes nominare non necesse est. Quamvis autem hujus Ecclesiæ prima laus debeatur Valdesio: nihilominus tamen Martyris quoque virtus commemoranda est (1). -- John Valdes, after GOD had bestowed on him the knowledge of the true religion, spent his days in Italy, and chiefly in Naples; where, by his doctrine and holiness of life, he gained many to CHRIST, especially several of the nobility, and at that time there was a considerable church of pious men in the city of Naples. For in that assembly there were many noble and learned men, and likewise many women of extraordinary virtue; amongst whom, not to mention other illustrious and truly great ladies, I must not pass over in silence the most excellent Lady Isabella Manriquez, who afterwards was banished her country for the name of CHRIST. Among those pious men, Galeaxio Caracciolo, Marquis of Vico, was also banished for the sake of CHRIST; and after that, other great men, all whom it is needless to mention. Tho' the chief honour of this Church be due to Valdes: yet we ought not to forget the great merit of Martyr. See the remark [F].

[B] The greatest part yielded, and betrayed their consciences. Nicolas Balbani, minister of the Italian Church at Geneva, informs us of this: his words, according to Mr Minutoli's version, are: 'The greatest danger that threatened him (2) proceeded from the same person from whom he had received the beginning of his knowledge; for the number of the disciples of this Valdes, of whom we have already spoken, and who were the only company that Galeazzo frequented after he became acquainted with them, being extremely increased in Naples, most of them not advancing farther in point of religion than to establish the means of justification by JESUS CHRIST, and to condemn some of the grossest Popish superstitions, without abstaining, on that account, from frequenting the churches, and assisting at the Mass, and partaking with the rest of the Papists in several idolatries; it was to be feared that Galeazzo would make no greater progress than those gentlemen, whose good intentions miscarried when they came to be persecuted and imprisoned, and they were constrained to abjure their principles, after which some were put to death on pretence of relapsing to their former errors, and amongst them was Caferta himself, who had been the instrument of Galeazzo's conversion (3).

(a) That is, Galeazzo Caracciolo Marquis of Vico.

(3) Vie de Galeazzo Caracciolo, pag. 47, 48.

[C] He attacked the Church of Rome on some points only. Add to the passage I have just now cited the following words of the same book: 'There was then at Naples . . . a certain Spanish gentleman whose name was John Valdes, who having some knowledge of, and being even sensibly touched with the truth of the gospel, especially in the point of justification, had the happiness to sow some seeds thereof amongst the nobility he conversed with, and began in that manner to draw some gentlemen out of their ignorance, undeceiving them concerning the merit of good works, and the righteousness of men, as well as concerning several superstitions (4). Compare this with what I have cited from Thuanus, in 11.

(4) *Ibid.* pag. 10, the

VOL. V.

5 Q

placed him in the number of their authors [D]. He wrote some books [E], of which the

the article FLAMINIUS, and observe, that Flaminus was one of those who with Valdes confirmed Peter Martyr Vermilius in his new opinions (5).

(5) Melchior Adam, ubi supra.

[D] On the doctrine of the Trinity he did not agree... The Unitarians have placed him in the number of their authors.] See the following passage of the Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum: 'Ab eo (Johanne Valdesio) Bernardinus Ochinus sententiam suam contra receptam de Trinitate opinionem imbibisse perhibetur. Floruit a. 1542. De eo ministri ecclesiarum consentientium in Sarmatia & Transylvania lib. 1. cap. 3. de falsa & vera unius Dei Patris, Filii, & Spiritus Sancti cognitione, hæc scribunt: De Joanne etiam Valdesio, genere & pietate clarissimo, quid dicendum? Qui scriptis publicis suæ eruditionis specimina nobis relinquens, scribit, se de Deo ejusque Filio nihil aliud scire, quam quod unus sit Deus altissimus Christi Pater: & unicus Dominus noster Jesus Christus ejus filius, qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto in utero virginis, unus & eborum Spiritus (6). . . . Bernardinus Ochinus, is said to have taken from John Valdes his sentiments against the received opinion concerning the Trinity. He flourished in the year 1542. The ministers of the united churches in Poland and Transylvania, in the book concerning the false and true knowledge of one GOD, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, write thus concerning him: As to John Valdes, a man eminent for his birth and piety, what shall we say? In the books he published he gives evident proofs of his learning, and writes that he knows no more concerning GOD and his Son, than that there is one Almighty GOD the Father of CHRIST, and our only Lord JESUS CHRIST his Son, who was conceived of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin, and one Spirit of both.' This may perhaps be confirmed by Balbani's words: The Devil still continued to forge shackles for Galeazzo Caracciolo; for fear he should escape, he again endeavoured to pervert his mind, by the efforts which he obliged certain persons to make, to draw him over to a pernicious party. These were a band of Anabaptists and abominable Arians, who were unhappily spread in Naples and other parts of the kingdom; they promised themselves to find in Galeazzo (thinking the starting of a new opinion enough to gain a novice) the man whom they wanted to be their powerful support and defence, and the patron of their cabal: Wherefore they left no means which they thought proper unattempted to engage him on their side, and taint him with their heresy (7). The author further adds, that this gentleman vigorously repelled their efforts. Observe that he makes a distinction betwixt these Persons, and Valdes's disciples (8): But we may venture to say, that his acknowledging that a party of Antitrinitarians appeared in the kingdom of Naples, renders more probable what Sandius (9) affirms concerning Valdes's heresy. I have read a thing in Beza's letters which deserves a place here. A Minister of the French church at Embden, was accused amongst other things of having got translated and printed in the Dutch language, without the knowledge of his colleagues, Valdes's Considerations, full of blasphemies against the word of God (10), and of having left out the notes which were added to the Lyons edition. Besides other reasons in his defence, he urged the two following; that the book was not full of blasphemies, and that it ought not to be left permitted at Embden, to praise the piety of Valdes than at Basil, Zurich, and Geneva. He was answered, that book had done a great deal of mischief to the flock of Christ at Naples, and that Ochinus had there imbibed the errors which had ruined him; and that if any good men had bestowed eulogies on those Considerations of Valdes, they would change their opinion as soon as they had examined them. It was added, that the Bookseller at Lyons, who printed them, was very sorry and asked pardon for it, after Calvin and some others had informed him of his fault. Read all these particulars in the following Latin words of Beza: 'Scimus ex idoneorum hominum testimonio, quantum nascenti Neapolitanæ Ecclesiæ liber ille detrimenti attulerit; Scimus etiam quod fuerit de illo iudicium D. Joannis Calvini: Scimus & illud, Ochinum infelicis memorie virum ex illis lacunis suas illas prophanas speculationes hausisse, & ita tandem sensim à verbo Dei abductum in ultimum illum exitum sese præci-

(6) Biblioth. Antitrinitariorum, p. 2.

(7) Balbani, Vie de Galeazzo Caracciolo, pag. 45, 46.

(8) Ibid. p. 47.

(9) He is the author of the Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum.

(10) Multis erroribus atque etiam blasphemis adversus sacrum Dei verbum factis. Beza, Epist. IV, pag. 200, Tom. iii, Operum.

pitasse, in quo miser interit: ac proinde librum illum à spiritu Anabaptistico multis locis non multum diffidentem, id est, à verbo Dei ad iuanes quasdam speculationes, quas falso Spiritum appellat, homines abducentem, vel nunquam editum, vel statim sepultum fuisse magnopere cuperemus. . . . Ceterum quinam illi sint probati iudicii homines qui scriptum illud (personam enim ipsam Valdesii non attingimus) ut pium & religiosum libris etiam editis commendarent, nos quidem ignoramus, neque dubitamus quin si boni viri sunt, re diligentius perspecta sententiam mutent, quod & Lugdunensi Typographo viro bono evenit, ut qui, quamvis additis illis notis merito se posset excusare, admonitus tamen à fratribus, & nominatim quidem à D. Calvino, culpam deprecari quam excusare maluit (11). . . . (11) Theod. Beza. We know from unquestionable evidence, what mischief that book has done to the infant church of Naples: What opinion Mr John Calvin entertained of it: and that Ochinus, of unhappy memory, drew his gross errors from that corrupt fountain, and so by degrees forsaking the word of GOD, he ran into that pernicious heresy wherein he died: for which reasons we heartily wish, that book which differs not much from the Anabaptistical spirit, that is, it leads men from the word of GOD to vain speculations which they falsely call the spirit, had never been published, or immediately buried in oblivion. . . . But who those judicious men are, who in printed books have commended that piece (for as to the person of Valdes I say nothing) as pious and religious, I confess I do not know, and I do not question but if they are good men, they will change their opinion as soon as they have carefully examined the matter; which the Printer at Lyons, a man of probity did; for though he might have justly excused himself on account of the notes that were added, yet being admonished by the brethren, and particularly by Mr Calvin, he chose rather to deprecate than to vindicate his fault.

[E] He wrote several books. Of which Sandius gives us the following catalogue. Dialogi Charon & Mercurius impressi Italicè. Considerationes pie & doctæ. In Psalmos aliquot. In Evangelium Matthæi. In Evangelium Joannis. Commentarius in epistolam Pauli ad Romanos. a. 1556. Commentario brevis, & declaracion compendiosa, 3 familiar, sopra la primera epistola de san Pablo à los Corinthios, muy util para todos los amadores de la piedad Chriftiana (12). He observes that the Spanish Inquisition hath inserted Valdes's commentary on the first epistle to the Corinthians, in their index of prohibited books, both with and without the author's name. He was in the right to make this observation, for that it is so expressed in the index is very true (13). Don Nicholas Antonio observes the same thing (14); but he doth not seem to know who Valdes was. Joannes de Valdes quidam, faith he, scripsit commentario brevis à declaration, &c. . . . One John de Valdes wrote Commentario brevis à declaration, &c. He adds that du Verdier Vau-Privas says, that Claudius de Kerquifian a Parisian, translated the hundred and ten divine Considerations Joannis Valdesii out of Spanish into French. Du Verdier calls this author Jean de Valdesio, and faith, that the French translation of these divine Considerations was printed at Lyons in 8vo. by Charles Pesnot, and at Paris in 16mo, by Mathurin Prevost 1565 (15). So he says under the word Claudius de Kerquifian. But under the word Jean de Valdesio, Secretary to the King of Naples (16), he only speaks of one hundred Considerations, and refers us to Claudius de Kerquifian. By which we may observe that he had no regard to uniformity, either in proper names or the titles of books. He adds that Charon and Mercury, dialogues of the same Valdesio, were translated into French by an unknown author. This confirms the Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum, and the epitome of that of Gefner, where our John Valdes is called Secretarius Regis Neapolitani, Secretary to the King of Naples, and declared to be the author of the dialogues Charon and Mercurius. Let us say, by the by, that they deceive us, when they make use of the plural number with respect to the book wherein Charon and Mercury are the interlocutors. It is but one dialogue; which I own is followed by another, but in this the persons are Lactantius and an Archdeacon. The whole title of the book runs thus.

Du

(12) Biblioth. Antitrinitariorum, pag. ii. See also the Epitome of Gefner's Bibliotheca, pag. m. 506.

(13) See the Index Librorum prohibitorum & expurgatorum, pag. 756, of the edition of 1667, at the word Jean Valdesio.

(14) Nicol. Antonio, Biblioth. Scripturum Hispanicarum, Tom. i, pag. 606.

(15) Du Verdier, Bibliothèque Française, pag. 182.

(16) Ibid. pag. 759.

the most esteemed is intituled *one hundred and ten Considerations*. I shall mention below by whose care it was printed [F].

(17) Konig. Bibl. vet. & nova, pag. 826.

Due Dialoghi, l'uno di Mercurio & Caronte: nel quale, oltre molte cose belle, gratiose, & di buona dottrina, si racconta quel che accade nella guerra dopo l'anno MDXXI. L'altro di Laestantio & di uno Arcidiacono, nel quale puntualmente si trattano le cose avvenute in Roma nell'anno MDXXVII. Di Spagnuolo in Italiano con molta accuratezza & tradotti & revisiti. In Vinsgia con gratia & privilegio per anni Dieci. The date of the impression is not specified; The book contains 148 leaves in octavo. As for the rest Mr Konig misleads us (17), when he refers us to Pierius Valerianus with respect to John Valdes, who wrote a commentary on the epistle of St Paul to the Romans, printed in 1556. For Pierius's Valdes is another man. I find nothing concerning our Valdes in the Oxford catalogue; but under the name of *John de VAL D'Esso, or Valdesse*, you find *one hundred and ten divine Considerations*, printed at Lyons in 8vo, 1563. You will also find there the same book printed in Italian at Basil in 1550 in 8vo, and in English at Oxford, in 1638, in 4to.

[F] *By whose care it was printed.* The French edition which I here make use of, is that of Paris 1565, in 16mo, intituled *Dent & dix Considerations divines de Jan de Val d'Esso. Traduites premierement, & Es-paignol en langue Italienne, & de nouveau mises en François, par C. K. P.* The Preface is written by Celsus Secundus Curio, who was the editor of the Italian edition at Basil in 1550. He represents it as an excellent work, and after a great many eulogies, goes on in the following words. 'But we are obliged for this great and heavenly treasure, to Mr Peter Paul Vergerius, as the instrument of divine providence to occasion the printing and the publishing of it, that it may be seen and possessed by every person. For leaving Italy, and quitting a false and pretended bishopric to join and apply himself to the true apostleship, to which he was called by Christ, he brought with him several excellent compositions. He did as every body uses do, when, by some sad disaster, his house is on fire, or the town where he lives in danger of being plundered by foldiers; for in such a distress he endeavours to save himself with the most valuable things he has. In like manner our Vergier (18), having nothing dearer to him in this world

(18) His article will be seen hereafter under the word VERGERIUS.

than the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ, he carried off with him those compositions which tended to illustrate and enlarge it. He neglected the earthly riches, and carefully preserved the heavenly and divine treasures: Amongst which this little piece was one of the most valuable which could be imagined or coveted. After which, very well knowing that all things in their own nature excellent, raise their value and esteem, by being communicated and distributed to several persons, he left me these hundred and ten Considerations that I should publish them: which I have done, as you see with the utmost diligence that I have been capable of. These Considerations, as several can testify, were originally written by the author in Spanish, but afterwards translated into Italian, by a person of great piety and virtue; though through inadvertence, several Spanish idioms, have slipped into the version. And besides he has purposely retained some few words of the author's mother tongue, because John de Val d'Esso the author, was a Spaniard, of a noble and ancient family, raised to an honourable state, being at first a gentleman, knighted by Charles V, but after that a more honourable and magnificent Knight of JESUS CHRIST. After CHRIST was revealed to him, he did not long follow the court, but lived in Italy, and resided at Naples. Where by the engaging charms of his doctrine, and the holiness of his life, he gained many disciples to CHRIST, especially a good number of gentlemen and knights, and women of quality who deserved all sorts of praise. He was so mild and charitable, that he made himself debtor to every person for the great talents with which he was entrusted, and accommodated himself to persons of the meanest condition, and became all things to all men, in order to gain them to CHRIST. Not only this, but he served as an instrument to convey the light of the gospel to some of the most famous preachers in Italy. This is what I know, by having particularly conversed with them. . . . And besides he left several other excellent pieces behind him, which by means of the above mentioned Vergerius, we hope in time will be communicated to us.

VALDES (JAMES) (a) author of a book, in which he endeavours to prove that the kings of Spain ought to have the precedence of all Christian princes [A]. He was born in Asturia in the XVIth century, and run through the course of his studies at Valladolid, where he exercised the profession of an Advocate, and taught the Canon-Law for

(a) Nicolas Antonio, Biblioth. Scriptorum Hispanie, Tom. i, pag. 247, calls him Didacus.

[A] He is author of a book in which he endeavours to prove, that the kings of Spain ought to have the precedence of all Christian princes. This was published at Granada in 1602, in folio, and dedicated to Philip III King of Spain, and it was reprinted at Frankfurt in 4to, in 1626. The title is *Prærogativa Hispaniæ, hoc est, de dignitate & præminencia regum regnorumque Hispaniæ, & honoratori loco ac titulo eis eorumque legatis à Conciliis, nec non Romana sede debito, tractatus eximius, Reges Catholicos Christianissimis aliisque jure, regni, sede ac titulo potiores extitisse adhuc* (1) *liquido demonstrans* (§ a). The author had chosen this for the subject of an oration, which he pronounced in the University of Valladolid, in the presence of King Philip II. Which was so applauded, and that monarch was so well pleased with it, that he ordered him to write a tract on that subject. This occasioned the book (2), wherein Valdes pretends to the same fate with Ægidius Romanus, who having argued on the question *de Regno* in the schools, in the presence of Philip IV, King of France, received orders from that prince to prepare an entire treatise *de Regimine Principis*. *Mibi evenit id, quod olim Ægidio Romano accidisse Paulus Æmilius in Philippo IV auctor est, quod cum in Scholis publicam de regno coram Philippo Pulchro questionem habuisset, tandem ejus regis imperio, opus de regimine principis edidit* (3). If Valdes hath not more faithfully cited other authors, I look upon his book to be one of the worst in the world; for it is false that Ægidius Romanus disputed on the thesis *de Regno*, in presence of Philip IV. It is

(1) I transcribe this from the Frankfurt edition, where the word *extare* or *esse* seems to be wanting.

(2) Jacobus Vindobonus, in *Epist. Dedicat.*

(3) Id. ibid.

false that he received any order to write a book on that subject after the pretended disputation. But the thing is this. That prince engaged him to publish a tract *de Regimine Principum*, and afterwards commanded him to make a speech to him in the name of the whole university, at his return from his coronation. Paulus Æmilius's words are: 'Philippus pulcher jam inde à prima adolescentia Ægidium Romanum theologum observavit, authorque fuerat ut de regimine principum monumenta quæ extant conscriberet, ederetque. Eundem Lutetiam à Rhenenibus sacris regressus, quod Sacre Scholæ universique Musæi oratione novos excipi Reges solemne sit, dicere jussit (4). . . . Philip the Fair had from his very youth an esteem for Ægidius Romanus, a Divine, and made him write and publish a book which is now extant de Regimine Principum. When he returned to Paris, from his coronation at Rheims, he ordered him to make a speech, as is usual on that occasion, in the name of the whole university.' It is true that the subject of this oration was *de Regno*: Paulus Æmilius recites it, but it is of his own composition. Ægidius Romanus could not express himself otherwise than in the crabbed scholastic style; he could not use the selected words and neat Latin which that Historian lends him. As for the rest, the French authors have not been silent concerning this Spaniard's pretensions: They have published books to convince him of his mistake. See the *Memoirs concerning the precedence of the Kings of France before the Kings of Spain*, by T. Godefray, Advocate in Parliament,

(4) Paulus Æmilius, lib. viii, initio pag. m. 162, ad ann. 1286.

(b) Taken from Nicolas Antonio, Biblioth. Scrip. Hisp. Tom. i, pag. 247.

(5) Secretary to the King. He is very well versed in History, and has a very fine library.

for twenty years. After which he was promoted to the office of counsellor in the council of Granada. His *Additiones ad Roderici Suarez lecciones variarum Jurium* were printed at Valladolid in 1590 (b).

Parliament, printed in 1612, but above all, the book of Mr Bulteau (5) printed at Paris 1679. The *Journal des Savans* of Feb. 11, in the same year, gave an extract of it.

[(5a) That book was probably an answer for the King of Spain to the pretensions of France, maintained

in France by two pieces published about the year 1577, a little before the sitting of the first Estates at Blois. They are both to be found in the *Memoires de la Ligue*. Tom. IV. pag. 709. & seq. of the edition of 1598. R. M. C. R. I. T.]

(a) Plutarchus, in Sylla, pag. 474.

VALERIA, Sister to the Orator Hortensius [A], by a very curious way came to be Sylla's wife. She was a woman of great beauty and quality, but lived in a kind of celibacy, for she had lately been divorced from her husband. Sylla having just lost his wife, was present at a great combat of gladiators: the women sat then promiscuously with the men. Valeria going to sit next to Sylla, softly put her hand to his robe when she was behind him, and pinched off a little of the wool. He looking on her with surprise; *It is nothing, my Lord, said she, I would only enjoy a little of your good fortune as well as others.* These expressions, very far from displeasing Sylla, inspired him with some agreeable emotions. He presently discovered that he was touched; he sent to inform himself of the name, quality, and reputation, of the lady. After which nothing but glances [B] and mutual smiles passed between them, which at last ended in a promise of marriage [C]. The Historian (a), from whom we have this adventure, blames Sylla only; others think, that without wronging his judgment, he might also have censured Valeria [D]. Which he doth not in the least; but he observes that her husband was so far from regarding her alone, that he kept actresses and women-dancers in his house. He left her pregnant of a daughter, called *Posthumia*, from her being born after the death of her father.

(1) Valer. Maximus, lib. v, cap. ix.

[A] Sister to the Orator Hortensius.] Doubtless she was only his sister by the mother's side, and we should say that Hortensius's mother was married to a man of the ancient family *Valeria*. But on the other side, we know that Hortensius had a sister, who was the mother of Valerius Messala (1), Consul in the year of Rome 701. It must therefore be said, that his mother and sister married into the same family. I have not found any author, who hath informed me whether Valerius Messala's mother had the same father with Hortensius, or whether she was the same who married Sylla.

(2) Plutarchus, in Vita Syllæ, pag. 474.

[B] Nothing but glances.] If any one is ignorant that the Greek language abounds with very significant terms to express the mute language of love, let him only consider the words which I cite. 'Εκ δὲ τούτων, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὁμιλία ὑπὸ ἀλλήλους ἐγὼν' οἱ, καὶ παραπισσεύει συνήγεις προσώπων καὶ μετὰ διαμάχων διαδύσεις. Hinc oculorum invicem amictus, assidue ac leve in se mutuo vultus conversiones, rursus adjectiones (2). . . . Hereupon followed glances, smiles, and continual turnings of their heads to one another.

[C] Which at last ended in a promise of marriage.] Plutarch hath not exactly specified whether the proposals of marriage, and the acceptance of it, happened the same day at their going from the Shew. It is probable that that affair was not long a doing, and that after they had tired their eyes with making love by signs, while the gladiators were engaged, they broke silence as they were leaving the Amphitheatre. Sylla

quickly took fire, and the lady was not coy: it is therefore very likely that she did not put him to the trouble of asking twice, and that as soon as she had a glimpse of hopes to participate of Sylla's fortunate star, not by barely touching of his robe, or keeping a little of the wool of it, but by a conjugal union, she abandoned herself to that good fortune. This was to take opportunity by the fore-lock. From glances they proceeded to conversation, and from conversation to conjugal enjoyments; all this within a day, though Plutarch doth not tell us so in express terms.

[D] He might also have censured Valeria.] She perhaps, saith he, according to Amyot's version, does not deserve any censure for her carriage on this occasion; but tho' she was the most honest and virtuous woman in the world, the occasion of Sylla's marrying her, was neither honourable nor proper, because he was struck on a sudden by an affected look and expression, as if he had been a young boy, and those passions which are moved by these trifles, are commonly the grossest and most scandalous. Methinks I hear Brantome relate the adventures of his gallant women, after having given them the eulogies of good and virtuous ladies. If a translator should give himself never so little liberty, he might make Plutarch speak more reasonably than he doth in Amyot's translation: he might make him say, that tho' Sylla should have met with a virtuous woman, yet he would be to blame to marry her from such a principle of love as this which determined him.

(a) Taken from Nicus Erythreus, Pinacoth. I, pag. 170, 171.

(1) You will find it in the *Recueil de Pièces curieuses*, printed at the Hague for Moëtjens. See Tom. v, p. 14.

(2) The life of Adam. See the remark [L], of the article EVE.

VALERIUS (AUGUSTIN) Bishop of Verona, and a Cardinal, flourished towards the end of the XVIth century. He was born at Venice, and there he taught Moral Philosophy. He perfectly understood the Latin tongue, which he spoke readily and elegantly; but could not without difficulty express himself in his native language. His morals were very edifying, and he discharged the duties of a Bishop like a good pastor. He was created Cardinal by Gregory the XIIIth. His grief to see his country lie under the excommunication of Paul V, threw him into a distemper, of which he died (a). Besides several other books, he composed an holy Rhetoric, where he informs us of a very curious particular relating to the Martyrologies [A].

[A] He informs us of a very curious particular relating to the Martyrologies.] In the *Mercurie Galant* of December 1695, there is a letter inserted, which to me seems excellent (1). I cannot tell how the public judges of it; but I imagine that I am not the only person who relishes it. There is in it a judicious and modest censure on a piece of Loredano (2), which had then been just translated into French. The author seems to me to treat him

too gently, contenting himself with saying, *That he hath apparently trifled with his subject, and without any respect to the holy source from whence he drew it, has only painted it in the gayest colours of his eloquence, and adorned it with the most agreeable incidents which his imagination could suggest.* He adds, that Lope de Vega used the same liberty in his pastoral, where he treats of the shepherds coming to the manger at Bethlehem, and that he

he has seen a manuscript in folio, written by a poor young man on the dialogue betwixt our Lord and his disciples, as they were going to Emmaus. After this he relates, That Cardinal Valerio, Bishop of Verona, in his book, intituled, de Rhetorica Christiana, informs us, that one of the causes of the false legends of the martyrs was the custom formerly observed in several monasteries, to exercise the young Monks, by Latin exercises proposed to them on the martyrdom of some saint, which giving them the liberty of introducing the tyrants and the persecuted saints, as acting and speaking, in such a manner as appeared to them the most probable, at the same time gave them room to compose on these subjects a sort of histories, rather filled with ornaments and inventions than truth; but tho' they did not deserve much regard, yet these which seemed most ingenious and best composed, were laid up. So that after a long series of years, they, together with other manuscripts (3), being found in the libraries of the monasteries, it was very difficult to distinguish these exercises of wit from the genuine histories of the saints there also preserved. It is to be confessed that these pious writers are very excusable, they having no other design than to exercise themselves on holy subjects, could not foresee the erroneous consequences, which, in process of time, proceeded from thence; so that if posterity is thereby deceived, it is rather owing to their own want of discernment than a proof of the ill intention of those writers. It would be hard to have the same regard for the famous Simeon Metaphrastes, a Greek author, of the IXth century, who first gave us the lives of the saints for every day of the month through the whole year; since it is visible they were not written for that

purpose, but in a very serious manner, tho' at the same time amplified and stuffed with several imaginary events, as Bellarmin himself testifies, who plainly tells us, that Metaphrastes writ several of the lives, as they might be, and not as they really were (4). But it is no wonder that such a thing should have been done by some Ecclesiastical Historians, through a pious zeal to honour the saints, and to render their lives agreeable to the people, commonly more inclined to admire those they reverence than to imitate them; seeing this liberty crept into the very translation of some books of the Bible; as we are informed by St Jerome, in his Preface to that of Esther, that the Vulgar edition of that book of Holy Writ, commonly read in his time, was stuffed with several additions, which I cannot better express than in the words of that Father. 'Quem librum, sicut be, speaking of the book of Esther, Editio vulgata lacinolis hinc inde verborum finibus trahit, addens ea quæ ex tempore dici poterant, & audiri, sicut solitum est scholaribus disciplinis sumpto temate, excogitare quibus verbis uti potuit qui injuriam passus, vel qui injuriam fecit. . . . Which book in the vulgar edition here and there is patched with forgeries, such things being inserted in it as might have been said and heard extempore, as it is usual when a theme is given in schools, to invent what might have been spoken by one that suffered or committed an injury.'

Those who would see a vast number of curious and judicious observations on this head, need only read Mr Baillet's discourse of the lives of the saints. Of which Mr de Beauval has given us a very good extract in his Journal for January 1701, from page 37, to 56.

VALLA (LAWRENCE) One of the most learned men of the XVth century, was born at Rome in 1415 [A]. He very vigorously attacked the barbarity under which the Latin tongue had groaned for several ages, and wrote some books in which he collected the elegancies of that language so little in use in the works of the school-men and Civilians. But when he came to write an history, he shewed that he was more capable of pointing out how others ought to write, than of practising his own rules [B]. He was a great lover of criticism and contradiction, in both which he allowed himself a liberty which drew on him a great many enemies [C]. He had the courage to confute a false tradition

[A] He was born . . . in 1415.] The proof of this I draw from his epitaph, where we find he died the first of August 1465, and that he lived fifty years. The words of this inscription in the church of St John of Lateran are: 'Laurentio Valle harum ædium lacrum Canonico, Alphonsi Regis & Pontificis maximi Secretario, Apostolicoque scriptori, qui sua ætate omnes eloquentia superavit, Catharina mater filio pietissimo posuit. Vixit annos L. obiit anno Domini MCCCC.LXV. Calendis Augusti. . . . This monument was erected by Catherine, in memory of her most pious son [Laurence Valla, who was canon of this church, secretary to King Alphonsus and the Pope, and an apostolic writer, who excelled all of his time in eloquence. He died on the first of August 1465, aged fifty years.] According to Vossius (1), this distich follows the epitaph.

Laurens Valla jacet, Romanæ gloria linguz,
Primus enim docuit qua decet arte loqui.

Here Laurence Valla lies within this tomb,
Who was the glory of the Latin tongue;
For, be it's beauties first made us to know,
And th' art of speaking well he first did show.

I believe he is mistaken; these verses were indeed written as a sort of epitaph, by Franchinus of Cosenza (2), but it is no proof that they were engraved upon the tomb of the deceased. Paul Jovius does not say they were. Several persons are mistaken concerning the age of Laurentius Valla, and the year of his death. Some assure us that he signalized himself in the council of Constance, in 1420. 'Claruit in Concilio Constantienso personaliter sub Sigismundo Imperatore anno Domini 1420 (3). -- He distinguished himself in the council of Constance under the Emperor Sigismund, in the year 1420.' Here are two errors, for that council began in 1414, and ended in 1418. And we have seen that Laurence Valla was fifty years

of age in 1465. So that he was but three years old when that council ended. Gefner hath committed the same fault (4); he hath made him flourish in 1410 (5). The learned Huetius hath also adopted this opinion; for when he introduces Casaubon speaking towards the latter end of the reign of Henry IV, he makes him say (6), that two hundred years before Laurentius Valla translated Herodotus. His death is placed in 1457, by Paul Jovius (7), in 1467 by Spondanus (8), and in 1495 by Moreri.

[B] He very vigorously attacked the barbarity . . . But . . . he shewed that he was more capable of directing others than practising his own rules.] Paul Jovius furnisheth me with a proof of these two things. 'Indignatus tandiu corrumpi seculum leguleorum & sophistarum immani conspiratione, optimasque artes inculta sermonis barbarie defœdari, Elegantiarum libros edidit, traditis Romanæ elocutionis præceptis ex accurata veterum scriptorum observatione, quibus juvenutis æmulandi studio ad detergendas corruptarum literarum fordes accenderetur . . . apud Alphonsum regem de avitis bellis in Hispania, atque Sicilia gestis historia pericripita est, sed eo styli caractere, ut ejus minime videri possit, qui cæteris elegantiarum præcepta tradiderit (9). . . . Being much concerned that the age should be so long corrupted thro' the vile conspiracy of pettifoggers and school-men, and that the best arts should be defiled with gross barbarisms, he published some books containing the elegancies of the Latin tongue, and laid down some rules for speaking that language, from an accurate observation of antient writers; that thereby he might excite the emulation of youth to purify learning from it's dregs. . . . Whilst he was at the court of King Alphonsus, he wrote an history of the wars, carried on by that prince's ancestors in Spain and Sicily, but in such a stile, that no body would think it done by one, who had given rules for writing elegantly.'

[C] Which drew on him a great many enemies.] Here is another passage of Paul Jovius: 'Fuit Valla ingenio maxime libero, ob idque mordaci, contentio-

(4) Compare this with the article LAMBERT, citation (10).

(4) Gefner. in Bibl. fol. 477.

(5) And not in the year 1510, as Hankius, de Scriptor. Rerum Romanarum, Tom. ii, Part. i, cap. xi, pag. 118, says he did.

(6) I have set down his words, in the remark [K].

(7) Jovius, in Elog. cap. xiii, pag. 37; Bosfeld. in Leonibus, num. xiii, apud Hankium, ubi supra, pag. 117; Aub. le Mire, in Auctario de Scriptor. Ecclesiast. p. 275; Zeillerus, in Hist. Part. ii, pag. 154, agrees with Paul Jovius.

(8) Spondan. in Annal. ad ann. 1467, num. 13, which he grounds upon Paul Jovius, who only mentions the year 1457.

(9) Paul. Jovius, ubi supra, p. 36.

(3) See the article TANAGUIL, at the end of the remark [B].

(1) Vossius, de Hist. Latinitate, lib. iii, cap. vii, pag. 580. Moreri has transcribed this fault.

(2) Paulus Jovius, in Elog. cap. xiii, p. 37.

(3) Tritemius, de Scriptor. Ecclesiast.

(a) *Ex civitate patria seu iuffa Pontificis . . . seu sponte migrabat.* Hankius de Romanorum Rerum Scriptis, lib. ii, Part 1, pag. 116. Othuinus Gratius, in Fasciculo Rerum expetendarum, says, he was expelled from Rome.

tradition, which greatly pleased the court of Rome; it was the pretended donation of Constantine. He left his country either by the Pope's orders, or because he had rendered himself the object of the hatred of too many persons (a), and retired to the court of Alphonfus King of Naples, that great protector of learned men, who desired to learn Latin of him at 50 years of age (b). If he had confined himself to criticize on the Humanists, he had escaped several reflexions published against him with a great deal of animosity, which he returned in the same stile; but he did not stop here, he carried his censures yet higher, he fell on the ecclesiastics, and spoke very boldly of certain things which they approved, and he disliked [D]. These adversaries were much more formidable than those who disputed with him on points of literature only; they were not less able to revile, and besides could dart upon him the thunders of the Inquisition, and deliver him up to

(b) Cui jam quinquagenario Latinas literas anno Christiano circiter 1443 tradidit. Hank. ibid.

(10) *Id. ibid.*
 'soque, utpote qui aliena satirico dente facile perfringeret, & lites in literis, quasi id opus esset, adversus ignorantes acerrimas fereret. Extant enim Investivarum, & recriminationum aliquot libri, eruditè falsæque percripti; quibus dum læsi nominis famam tueretur, Facium Ligurem, Panhormitam, Pogium, & Raudensem jugulasse videri potest (10).
 . . . Valla allowed himself great liberties, and was of a satirical and contentious disposition; for he would bitterly inveigh against the writings of others, and maintain violent disputes in learning against the ignorant, as if it were a matter of great importance. Several books of invectives and recriminations, containing much learning and wit, are extant, wherein, whilst he endeavours to defend his wounded reputation, he seems to murder that of Facius, Panbormita, Pogius, and Raudens. I shall specify the titles of some of his works, which will be sufficient to prove him one of the greatest duellists of the Republic of Letters, and that we may justly compare his life to that of a gladiator. *Antidoti in Pogium Florentinum libri 4. in quibus promiscue & mores ac vitam hominis & impuram ditionem notat. Apologus & actus Scenicus in eundem. Adversus eundem libellus seu dialogus secundus. In Antonium Raudensem annotationum libellus. In Benedictum Morandum Bononiensem libri duo seu confutatio prior & posterior. In Bartolemeum Facium Ligurem & Anton. Panbormitam recriminationum libri 4.* He never forgave his adversaries one word or phrase that favoured of barbarism; which gave occasion to the fiction after his death, that he rendered himself so formidable in Hell, that Pluto dared not presume to speak Latin. To which it was added, that Jupiter would have given him a place in Heaven, if he had not been afraid of introducing a Critic of his words. Spondanus cites the four verses, which contain this ill-natured jest:
 'Acerrima mordacitate sua & aliorum doctorum virorum veterum recentiorumque satyricâ perfrictione infamis. Ut non illepidè quidam in illum mortuum, apud Tritheimium * sic lusit.

* Tritheim. de Script. Eccl.

Nunc postquam manes defunctus Valla petivit,
 Non audent Pluto verba Latina loqui.
 Jupiter hunc cœli dignatus parte fuisset,
 Censorem linguæ sed timet esse suæ (11) (§ a)

(11) Spondanus, ad ann. 1467, num. 13, p. 114.

'He became infamous by his bitter invectives and satirical reflexions on learned men, both ancient and modern: so that it was wittily said of him after his death, as we find it in Tritheimius:

Since Valla's dead, and into Hell convey'd,
 To speak in Latin Pluto is afraid;
 Jove dreads a Critic of his words in Heav'n,
 Or else to him a place he would have giv'n.

Cato, the censor, was rallied almost in the same manner.

Πύρρον, πανδακτύην, γλαυκόμματον, ἡδὲ δανύων
 Πέριον εἰς διδὸν φερεσθὲν δέχεται.

Ruffus, mordacem, glaucum, ne quidem exanimatum
 Porcium in infernum Persephone recipit (12).

(12) Plot. in Catone majore, init. pag. 336.

Red-bair'd Portius, and gray-c'd,
 'Gainst every body who inveigh'd,
 Tho' dead, from hell Pluto drives back,
 Fearing the thunder of his clack.

Another epitaph on our Valla was,

Ohe ut Valla filet solitus qui parcere nulli est!
 Si quæris quid agat, nunc quoque mordet humum (13).

(13) Volaterranus, Comae. Urban. lib. xxi, pag. m. 774.

Tho' Valla, who us'd none to spare,
 Mute in his grave is found,
 If you shou'd ask what he does there,
 Ev'n now he bites the ground.

Several have believed that in writing of books, his end was not the instruction of his readers, but to censure both the living and the dead. He fell upon Aristotle, Cicero, Virgil, and paid no respects to any besides Epicurus (14). The latter was a fit man at that time to be praised by those, who loved to be singular. All the world cried out against him, and abhorred him; which perhaps was the reason that rendered him admirable to Valla's eyes. This thought is not in Pontanus, whom I here cite: 'Qui cum Laurentio familiaris vixerunt, affirmant illum eo nequaquam consilio in Grammaticis scripsisse, ac dialecticis, quod doceret, disciplinaeque ab ignoracione vindicaret, atque a forde, verum ut malediceret, obloquendoque detraxeret de fama atque autoritate rerum scriptoribus; tum illis qui exemplo sunt ad scribendum aliis propter antiquitatem majestatemque dicendi, ac præcipiendi, tum illis ipsis, qui tunc viverent, qui ne dubitaverit ipse quidem dicere, profiterique palam, habere se quoque in Christum spicula (15).'
 These who were intimate with Valla, say, that he did not write Grammar or Logic to instruct his readers, or rescue learning from ignorance and error, but to censure and lessen the reputation of other writers, both such as deserve to be imitated for antiquity and majesty of stile, and those who were cotemporary with himself: and that he did not scruple to declare openly, that he had arrows in his quiver against Christ himself. This learned man, notwithstanding, did not want defenders: read the writings of Floridus Sabinus, and Erasmus's Epistle to Christopher Fisher in 1505 (16), occasioned by Valla's Notes on the New Testament, which he found in a library, and which he published. See also the third letter of the seventh book of Erasmus's Epistles.

(14) Ciceronem velicabat, Aristotelem carpebat, Virgilio sublebat. . . maximis quibusque ringens authoribus unitum Epicuro assurgeret. Jovianus Pontanus, de Sermone, lib. i, pag. m. 1574.

(15) *Id. ibid.*

[(§ a)] This epigram, which we find likewise in a letter of Goudanus to Erasmus, is there ascribed to Pogius. See the *Memoires de Litterature*, Tom. ii. pag. 50. Part i. REM. CRIT.]

[D] He fell on the Ecclesiastics, and spoke very boldly of certain things . . . which he disliked. It is agreed that his censure was not only personal, but also real in some respects; for he censured the faults of the Ecclesiastics, and some of their opinions. 'Ipso etiam sui sæculi Theologos seu ignorantia supina seu inveterata persuasione vanis opinionibus indormientes, ad veri sensum acutiore stilo excitare nihil veritus est . . . quod in publicis Scriptis quoddam Ecclesiæ Romanæ traditiones erroris damnavisset, aliis ipse gravis censor, hæreticæ pravitate censores sibi gravissimos sentiebat (17). . . He was not afraid to use a sharp stile to (17) Hankius, ubi supra.
 'excite the Clergy of his own time to a sense of the truth, who, through gross ignorance, or inveterate prejudice, entertained ridiculous opinions. . . As he was a severe Critic on others, so he found others severe on him, as being an Heretic, because he had condemned some traditions of the Roman Church as erroneous.' He was told, that unless he was weary of his life, he ought to refrain from censuring the Ecclesiastics, and writing such tracts as his refutation of Constantine's donation. Two things

to the penal laws of the secular power. They profecuted him so violently that he had been burnt alive, if King Alfonso had not moderated their rigour (c). They were then obliged to content themselves with whipping him round the Jacobins cloister. He returned to Rome, where he found so good patrons that they obtained for him the Pope's favour, and leave to teach, besides a pension (d). He died there on the 1st of August 1465, as appears by the epitaph (e) which his mother caused to be engraven in the church of St John de Lateran of which he had been canon. I shall give you the substance of a long relation which I have met with of his quarrels with the inquisitors [E]. We find besides that he had drawn on himself the violent enmity of a Civilian, whom he had gruelled in a disputation. He was provoked to this dispute by an air of contempt, which doubtless increased the rage of the aggressor. He is blamed for being a little too vain; for

(c) See the remark [D].

(d) Ibi quorundam patronorum ope sic faventem sibi reddebat Pontificem ut ab eo non tantum docendi potestatem sed stipendium quoque conquiretur. Id. ibid.

(e) See the remark [A].

things raised him enemies, he had galled the sacred heads by censuring both their morals and opinions.

Et sane à Francisco Philopho etiam communis est satyra luculenta, ut nisi vitæ suæ satur sit, abstinere velit à perfringendis sacri ordinis viris, ac similibus scribendis, uti illa adversus donationem Constantinam. Satyra ea existat Hecatothichorum lib. ii. fat. iv. (18).

(18) Vossius, de Hist. Lat. pag. 580.

And, indeed, he was admonished by Francis Philophus in a fine satire, to forbear censuring the Clergy, as he valued his life, and writing such traits as his refutation of Constantine's donation. That satire is in Hecatothichorum, lib. ii. fat. iv. Several people take one of these two things for the true cause of the persecution which he suffered, and the other for the pretence. His personal satires irritated the inquisitors, who, in order to be revenged on him, endeavoured to convict him of Heresy. The better to satisfy their resentment they accused Laurentius Valla of Heresy in several points of great consequence, such as the Mystery of the Trinity, the Doctrine of Free-will, and Vows of Celibacy, &c. It is affirmed, that he was condemned to be burnt, the execution of which sentence he escaped only by the favour of the King of Naples; that he was obliged publicly to abjure the assertions for which he had been condemned, and besides, to suffer the chastisement of the lash in the Jacobins monastery. Spondanus's words, in the year 1447, are:

Eodem tempore Laurentius Valla Romanus, elegantissimus quidem pro sæculo, sed pro quolibet tempore virulentissimæ linguæ homo; Neapoli existens, cum quadam propositione hæretica afferuisset, delatus ad Inquisitores, & in carcerem trusus, damnatusque pro hæretico, beneficio Alfonso Regis pœnam ignis evasit; propositionibus tamen publicè ejuratis, virgibus privatis per claustra monasterii Prædicatorum manibus revinctis cæsus (19). -- At the same time Laurentius Valla, a man learned indeed for that age, but of a most virulent tongue, for any age whatsoever, having advanced some heretical propositions, was brought before the Inquisitors, thrown into prison, and condemned to be burnt as an Heretic, but by favour of King Alfonso he escaped the execution of that sentence: however, having publicly abjured those propositions, he was privately whipped round the cloisters of the Jacobine monastery, with his hands tied behind him. He adds, that Poggius insinuates that Laurentius Valla had erred on those articles, which I have mentioned above (20). This is very remarkable. Spondanus doth not cite the propositions which Laurentius Valla was obliged to retract; he doth not even say that they contained Heresies relating to the Trinity, Free-will, &c. he saith only that one of Laurentius Valla's enemies insinuates it. This may make us think that Valla's doctrine was misrepresented by captious and malicious extracts, that it was charged as erroneous, tho' not really so. Observe, that notwithstanding all the mischievous efforts of the Neapolitan Inquisitors, he lived honourably at Rome; he there obtained permission to teach; he enjoyed a pension, and the Pope's esteem. This confirms the opinion of those who conjecture he was no Heretic, but that it was resolved he should be chastised for having censured the Clergy. See the following remark.

[E] I shall give the substance of a . . . relation which I have met with of his quarrels with the Inquisitors. The author whom I cite mentions these quarrels, after having related a dispute which Laurentius Valla had on a point of law. A Civilian censured him very severely: You are, said he, a Shoemaker, you go beyond your last, you do not content yourself with the study of Philology, you thrust your fiddle into other peoples harvest, and pretend to understand the Roman

Law (21). Explain me then that place of the Code, shewing him the famous puzzling Law, *Quinquæ perdam Præscriptione* (22). Valla replied, that nothing could be more unjust than to pretend that he was absolutely ignorant of the Roman Law, if he did not explain a passage which scarce any person had yet understood; that he ought not to propose this difficulty to those who only believe they have some knowledge of the ancient Law, but unto such as pretend to understand every part of it. *Quid improbius quam velle damnare me, ut nihil juris intelligentem, quia lo-*

cum aut nulli, aut vix ulli intellectum non exponerem? Devisse illum proponi non ei qui aliquid juris se intelligere diceret, sed ei qui omnia (23). He nevertheless, by the explication of the question, discovered that he very well understood the Roman Law; after which, in his turn, he proposed a question to the Civilian, and silenced him. This aggressor finding himself gruelled by the questions put to him concerning the right of præscriptions established in the XII tables, withdrew in a rage, and from that time conceived such a mortal hatred against Valla that he attempted his life. *Aliâ è Jure questione petita adversarium ad silentium adegit. Nam cum de Jure Usucapionum ex duodecim tabulis nonnihil rogaret, in eas angustias eundem illum suum adversarium adduxit, ut hic in conclave, velut furens se receperit, atque ex eo tempore homo vindictæ cupidissimus, odio plusquam Vatiniano Val-*

lam fuerit prosequutus, vitæque ejus infidatus (24). This is the first part of Boxhornius's relation, the second follows. As the science of the Divines is more holy and more necessary, continues he, and their authority greater, Valla could not attack their follies without exposing himself to the greatest dangers. *Ut Theologorum & sanctorum magisque necessaria disciplina est, & auctoritas major, ita cum eorum quoque ignorantia & putidissimis ineptiis commissus, vitam ac omnes fortunas suas in ultimum pene discrimen adduxit (25).* He was present at a Lent sermon, preached by a Franciscan (26) at Naples, he was one of the auditory, I say, when the Monk took for his text the Apostles Creed. And having observed the preacher to affirm that St Peter said, *I believe in God the Father Almighty*, that St Andrew added, *Creator of Heaven and Earth*, and that the other Apostles furnished the rest of the articles in their turn; after the sermon was ended, he asked Angelillus Campanus (27), whether there were any authors who related that the Creed was composed in this manner? Campanus answered, that he had never met with it in any book, and that this Monk was the only person whom he ever heard aver that St Jerom was born at Rome. They made him a visit, and asked him where he had read that this holy Father was a Roman. Several affirm it, replied he, but who denies it? Valla laughed at this incongruity (28), for it is he that affirms, who ought to produce his evidence, and especially when required; and others are not to name those who deny it. Yet he did not fail to observe to the preacher, that St Jerom makes himself a native of a town in Dalmatia. *Hieronymus ipse non se Romanum dicit, sed Pannonium aut Dalmatam ex oppido Stridone (29).* -- *Jerom himself does not say he was born at Rome, but at Stridon in Pannonia, or Dalmatia.* Some, answered the Monk, say he was a Roman, and others, that he was a Dalmatian. There were two faults in this answer. Could any witness worth hearing be opposed to St Jerom himself? And after all, ought he not to have named his evidence? Valla finding the ignorance and obliquity of the man left that subject (30), and proceeded to the question concerning the Creed. What

(21) Vallam aliquando acerbè increpuit quod, ut futor ultra credidam, humaniorum literarum cultu haud contentus falsè mitteret in mescum alienam, & Juris Romani peritiam aliquam sibi arrogaret. Boxhornius, Hist. Univ. pag. 953, Edit. 1652.

(22) Quem (lo-cum) obsecrissimum, & à nemine ejus ætatis Jurisconsultorum intellectum, imo depositum esse constabat. Id. ibi pag. 954. See the article ABE-LARD, remark [A].

(23) Boxhorn. homo vindictæ cupidissimus, odio plusquam Vatiniano Val-lam fuerit prosequutus, vitæque ejus infidatus (24). This is the first part of Boxhornius's relation, the second follows.

(24) Id. ibid.

(25) Id. ibid.

(26) His name was Antonius Betontinus.

(27) He was Secretary to the King.

(28) Primum hominis multum risu Valla excepti quasi alicui deberet ostendere qui negaret, & non ipse qui hoc affirmaverat, & quis traderet rogabatur. Id. ibi.

(29) Id. ibid.

(30) Cognitæ hominis imperitia & improbitate, ultra noluit insistere. Id. ibi. pag. 955.

ground

(19) Spondan. ad. ann. 1447, num. 10, pag. m. 3.

(20) Quod prolixius narrat Poggius secundò in eum invecivâ, errasse innuit in articulo Personæ in Deo, Trinitatis, Liberti Arbitrii, & Virginitatis sanctimonialium. Id. ibi.

(21) Vallam aliquando acerbè increpuit quod, ut futor ultra credidam, humaniorum literarum cultu haud contentus falsè mitteret in mescum alienam, & Juris Romani peritiam aliquam sibi arrogaret. Boxhornius, Hist. Univ. pag. 953, Edit. 1652.

(22) Quem (lo-cum) obsecrissimum, & à nemine ejus ætatis Jurisconsultorum intellectum, imo depositum esse constabat. Id. ibi pag. 954. See the article ABE-LARD, remark [A].

(23) Boxhorn. homo vindictæ cupidissimus, odio plusquam Vatiniano Val-lam fuerit prosequutus, vitæque ejus infidatus (24). This is the first part of Boxhornius's relation, the second follows.

(24) Id. ibid.

(25) Id. ibid.

(26) His name was Antonius Betontinus.

(27) He was Secretary to the King.

(28) Primum hominis multum risu Valla excepti quasi alicui deberet ostendere qui negaret, & non ipse qui hoc affirmaverat, & quis traderet rogabatur. Id. ibi.

(29) Id. ibid.

(30) Cognitæ hominis imperitia & improbitate, ultra noluit insistere. Id. ibi. pag. 955.

ground

he made too great a shew of his wit and learning, which he displayed with more pride and ostentation in the conversation of learned men, than in his works [F]. This is the character of those who aim at being paid on the spot, and are willing to be the witnesses of the admiration they aspire after. He embraced Epicurus's opinion with respect to the sovereign good [G], but so rectified as to render it agreeable to the principles of Christianity. He was an excessive admirer of Quintilian, and affected to despise Aristotle [H]. It is said that at table he once let fall this expression, that he had arrows in his quiver against

ground have you, said he, to assert that the Apostles formed it by pieces? The Doctors of the Church, answered the Monk, have informed me so. Name them, replied he, cite them. I have already answered you, said he, and then growing very angry, he said, that Valla was an impious man, and an enemy to the Christian religion (31). Some days after he defamed him in a sermon, and continued to inveigh against him so outrageously, that King Alphonso was obliged to stop the torrent of his calumnies. Valla thinking he was challenged to dispute with him, affixed to the great church all the propositions which he found censured, and offered to maintain them against all opposers. To this fight he invited several spectators, and even the king's son. He prepared a very spacious hall: every body was very attentive on the issue of this affair, but Valla's enemies would hazard nothing: in order to strengthen themselves, they made interest at court that Valla might be forbidden to proceed any farther. He obeyed, but insulted his adversaries by a Latin distich, which he affixed to the door of the hall.

Rex pacis, miserans sternendas Marte phalanges
Victoris cupidum continuit gladium.

*The king foreseeing, what slaughter would be made,
The victor's eager sword in pity laid.*

After this they became so incensed that they used their utmost endeavours either to have him condemned to death, or a perpetual imprisonment. They cited him before the Archbishop's Vicar-general. He appeared, and was surprized to see a numerous croud of Monks; for he never once suspected that this intrigue was of that importance. He was asked whether he did not believe that the Creed was compiled by the Apostles? No, said he, but by the Council of Nice, I ground myself on very strong reasons. The Inquisitor, who interrogated him, declared, that the answer was heretical. Some letters were produced, in which Valla corrected some errors, which by the negligence of the copiers had crept into the Pope's decrees, and it was urged against him, that this insolence deserved burning. He perceived the danger, and protested that on all these heads he believed as the Church believed. They pressed him to condemn and retract his writings; but he desired that first they would please to shew wherein he was mistaken, otherwise they would plainly make it appear that they did not aim at the correction of his heart, but only at that of his tongue. 'Cur non potius vos docetis esse revocanda? an mavultis oris mei quam animi emendationem? quo enim pacto ego emendor, nisi id quod ore fateor, animo etiam sentiam? Et quomodo ex animo sentiam nisi sententiam, quam ut verissimam haecenus tueor, vos falsi convincatis (32)?' -- Why do not you rather shew me what ought to be retracted? Do you desire the correction of my tongue more than of my heart? For how can I amend, unless I believe in my heart what I profess with my mouth? And how can I believe in my heart, unless you prove to be false what I have hitherto maintained to be true? A Bishop then laid hold on him, and cried out, Wicked wretch that thou art, thy pride must be immediately abated (33). Valla repeated as before, I believe all that the Church believes. He was afterwards asked what he thought of the ten Categories. What, replied he, do they belong to matters of Faith as the ten Commandments of the Divine Law? Why, replied they, should they not belong to Religion? Are you ignorant that the Logical Doctrine, *sensus divinus, sensus compostus*, serves to explain the most important controversies in Theology (34)? To shorten the dispute, answered Valla, I declare, that though our holy Mother the Church knows nothing of the matter, yet I believe

all that she believes concerning it. *Age, inquit Valla, rem compendii faciamus: etsi ista mater Ecclesia ignoret, tamen idem de illis credo quod mater Ecclesia.* They would have proceeded; but the king having sent people to protect Valla, they stopped there.

I find two faults in this long relation of Boxhornius: one is, that he refers all these things to the year 1411, which is before the birth of Valla; the other, that he cites no author.

[F] He displayed with more pride . . . in the conversation . . . than in his works.] Jovianus Pontanus makes this observation after having very much praised the modesty of Pomponius Laetus. 'Contra vero, continus be (35), Laurentius Vallenius, multae vir doctinae, ingenique in primis acuti, popularibus in congressibus, ac litterarum circulis ostentandae disciplinae judicatus est fuisse studiosior, ne dicam parum modestus, ut in iis circulis multo appareret diligentior, quam in libris ipsis, quos scriptos reliquit. Cumque non pauca in Dialecticis adinventisset adversus horum temporum artis ejus magistros, eo sese efferebat, palam ut diceret, nullam esse Logicae praeter Laurentianam. . . . On the other hand, Laurentius Valla, a man of great learning and penetration, when he was in public assemblies, and in company with learned men, was thought to be too forward, not to say that he wanted modesty, in shewing his learning, so that in those companies he displayed it more than in his books. And when he had found out several things in Logic against the masters of that art in those times, he was so vain as to say in public, that there was no Logic but the Laurentian.'

[G] He embraced Epicurus's opinion, with respect to the sovereign good.] See his book *de voluptate* & vero bono, which was put into the Index as a book the reading of which is prohibited. See also the book, which he calls *Apologia pro se & contra calumnias ad Eugenium quartum Pont. Maximum*. You will there find that he chiefly justifies what he had taught, that pleasure is the sovereign good. 'Defendit le suae scripta, & praecipue quod voluptatem statuerit summum bonum, Virtutes ancillas esse voluptatis, Prudentiam non a malitia, Nihil amari propter aliud, nec etiam propter se, Praescientiam Dei non obfistere bitrii libertati: Symbolum non factum esse ab apostolis per particulas (36). . . . He defended himself and his writings, and particularly what he had taught, that pleasure is the chief good, that the virtues were the handmaids of pleasure, that prudence differed not from malice, that nothing was loved either for its own sake, or that of another, that GOD's prescience was no obstacle to free-will, and that the Apostles did not compose the Creed by pieces.'

[H] He was an excessive admirer of Quintilian, and affected to despise Aristotle.] Vossius furnishes me with the comment I want on this head. I borrow it from that place where he attempts to prove that Aristotle is the greatest master of Rhetoric that we can imitate. 'Neque nos, adds be (37) aut Aufonius judicium moris, vet, qui Latinorum tantum rationem habuit: aut Vallenius (quamvis viri non minus de Rep. literaria meriti, quam Camillus olim de Romanâ) elogium terret: quia ille, nec in Fabio laudando modum invenit, nec in Aristotele, Tullio, Prisciano, (& quo non, si unum Fabium demas) infectando, sepe habet causam. . . . I am not moved at the judgment of Aufonius, which only regards the Latins: nor does the encomium of Valla (too a man who deserved no less of the Republic of Letters, than Camillus formerly did that of Rome) terrify me; because he observed no bounds in extolling Quintilian, and frequently, without cause, censured Aristotle, Cicero, Priscian, and every body else except Quintilian.' The following words are remarkable: 'Videtur autem vir ille nimis quantum liberaliter Quintilianum fuisse laudibus, quod videret Georgium Trapezuntium perpetuum esse in hoc incessendo. Nam & lib. iv. Antidoti scribit,

(31) Vehementer in Valla velut impium hominem & Christianae rei Ecclesiaeque hostem exorsus est stomachari. Id. ibid.

(32) Id. ibid.

(33) Tum Alejanus Episcopus ejusdem Ordinis (Praedicatorum) manus ei injectit & tibi, inquit, homo sceleratissime superbia hic dependenda est. Id. ib.

(34) Quidam, inquit, Alejanus, ad fidem ista pertinent? An ignoras ex illo dogmate Dialecticorum de sensu diviso & composito gravissimas in Theologia controversias explicari, Id. ib.

(35) Jov. Pontanus, de Sermonibus, lib. vi, cap. iv, pag. 1737.

(36) Celan. in Bibl. fol. 47h.

(37) Vossius, de Rhetorice actum ac constitutionem, pag. 48.

against the Messiah himself [I]. He did not understand Greek well enough to undertake, as he did, the translation of Thucydides, Herodotus, and Homer's Iliad: these versions are not good [K], but his notes on the New Testament are not amiss. See what Mr Simon saith of them (f). He was much more learned in Latin than in Greek, as his book of Elegancies compared with his versions of Thucydides, &c. proves: He is falsely accused of having stolen it [L]. Ludovicus Vives praises him for a thing which deserves to be known [M]. Mr Varillas hath committed several errors [N].

(f) In chap. xxxiv, of the Critical History of the Commentators on the New Testament.

scribit, ea de causâ sibi semestri integro cum Trapezantio fuisse contentionem; neque in gratiam cum eo rediisse, nisi cum in publicè docendi provinciam defineret. - - But he seems to have loaded Quintilian with such immoderate praises, because he found Georgius Trapezantius continually attacked him. For in the fourth book of his Prefervative he writes, that upon that account he maintained a dispute with Trapezantius for six months together: and was never reconciled to him, till he laid down his office of teaching in public. I believe, with Vossius, that the spirit of contradiction hurried Laurentius Valla to this excess of admiration of Quintilian: he had an adversary who continually declaimed against this Rhetorician, he wanted no other reason to espouse the contrary party. In his Logic he depresses as much as he could the authority of Aristotle.

[I] It is said that he once let fall this expression; that he had arrows in his quiver against the Messiah himself. We are told that he uttered this blasphemy to Antonius Panormita. This was doubtless whispered in his ear (38), and not spoke so loud that all at the table could hear it. Panormita trembled with horror, and would no more speak to him. 'Taceo, faith

(38) *Ysa Pontanus* says, as we have already seen, proferique PALAM habere se quoque in Christum spicula.

(39) Vossius, ubi supra.

† Lib. 1. de sermone.

‡ Fol. 87. edit. anni 1513.

(40) Spondanus, ad ann. 1447, num. 10.

† Laur. Vall. Not. in Epist. I. ad Cor. cap. ix, ver. 13.

(41) Simon, Histoire Critique des Commentateurs du Nouveau Testament, chap. xxxiv, pag. 485.

(42) Theophil. Raynaudus, in Hieroth. §. ii, Serie 1, cap. v, pag. 16, 17.

(43) Huettius, de claris Interpretibus, pag. m. 218.

'Vossius (39), quod neque in Christum (horrendum!) spicula sibi deesse dicebat; ut quidem scripsit Jovianus Pontanus †: & ante eum Poggius secundâ in Vallam Invektivâ ‡, ubi exprobat, quod hoc in convivio dixerit Antonius Panormita: qui propterea exhorruerit, & alloquio ulterius dignum negavit. - - I pass by his expression, that he had arrows (O horrible!) against CHRIST himself: as Jovianus Pontanus writes, and before him Poggius, in his second Invektive against Valla, where he upbraids him with having said this to Antonius Panormita, who trembled with horror, and would talk no more to him.' Spondanus (40) has not forgot this, after having told us that this Critic spared neither St Augustin, St Jerom, nor Boetius. We may add, that he had no mercy on Thomas Aquinas. 'His stile is too free, censuring too severely the faults of Remigius, Thomas Aquinas, & some other writers, who presumed to comment on St Paul (according to him) without any knowledge of the Greek tongue. He rejects as an idle tale what is commonly said of that Apostle appearing to Thomas Aquinas, and assuring him that no man so well understood his Epistles as himself. If this had been true, faith he, he had not failed to give him notice of his faults.' † *Peream nisi id commentitium: Nam cur eum Paulus non admonuit errorum suorum* (41) ‡ He several times injudiciously reprehended the Popes, as when he accused Celestin IV of being a Nestorian. Father Theophilus Raynaud loads him with invectives on this account (42).

[K] These versions are not good.] Let us see what Huettius supposes that Casaubon thought of them. 'Annus ab hinc ducentis Herodotum & Thucydidem Latinis literis exponebat Laurentius Valla, in eâ bene & eleganter dicendi copiâ, quam totis voluminibus explicavit, inelegans tamen, & pene barbarus; Grecis ad hoc literis leviter tinctus, ad auctorum sententias parum attentus, oscitans sæpe, & alias reagens, fidem apud eruditos decoxit (43). - - About two hundred years ago, Laurentius Valla translated Herodotus and Thucydides into Latin: but tho' the originals are writ so elegantly, yet his version is inelegant and almost barbarous. He was little acquainted with the Greek, unattentive to the sense of his authors, often negligent and careless, and thereby lost his credit with the learned.'

[L] As his book of Elegancies . . . proves: He is falsely accused of having stolen it.] This book hath been printed a great many times. He says in the epistle dedicatory that it was published, without his order or consent. This epistle dedicatory was inscribed to Torrellius, Chamberlain to Nicolas V. It is without any date, notwithstanding which one may see that it was written in that Pope's time. In those

days it was very difficult to collect so many observations: It required a vast study, and a strong genius. The great success of this book vexed the author's enemies, and moved them to say that he appeared in borrowed feathers, and that the piece was really a production of Asconius Pedianus. This calumny, which at the bottom very much redounded to Valla's glory, met with no credit. Vossius was very much in the right to call it impudent: 'Admodum perfrictæ frontis fuisse necesse est, qui, cum Laurentii Vallenis Elegantiarum libros in honore esse dolerent, in vulgus spargere, eos jam olim in Germania fuisse repositos, quodque scripti essent literis fugientibus ac fatiscientibus vix certis cognitis indicibus tandem fuisse, Asconii Pediani esse opus: cujus calumnie meminuit Mariangelus Accursius in diatribarum suarum defensione, cui Testudo nomen fecit (44). - - Those men must have been very impudent, who, being vexed that Valla's book of Elegancies was esteemed, gave out, that it had been found long before in Germany, and that because it was not writ in a fair hand, it was at last with difficulty discovered to be the performance of Asconius Pedianus; which calumny is mentioned by Mariangelus Accursius in the defence of his dissertations intitled Testudo.

[M] Ludovicus Vives praises him for a thing, which deserves to be known.] Notwithstanding Valla's great diligence in discovering the propriety of terms, and teaching it his readers, yet he spared his pains when he met with an obscure word, and seemed rather to desire that its meaning should remain unknown. This Vives with a great deal of reason approves. 'Bene Laurentius Valla de verbo quodam obsecro, ignorari malo quam me docente sciri (45). - - Laurentius Valla said well concerning an obscure word, I had rather it should remain unknown than be made known by my means.'

[N] Mr Varillas hath committed several errors.] I. He saith (46) that Laurence Valla, finding no longer any body to censure in the court of Rome, went to that of Naples. This is a double mistake, he hath ill translated his original, and advanced a thing, that has but little truth in it. The Latin which Varillas translates, signifies that Laurentius Valla finding nothing at the Pope's court which pleased him, went to that of Alphonse King of Naples (47). Is this to say, that he found no longer any body to censure in the court of Rome? Doth not this rather insinuate the contrary, that there remained yet a great many to censure? For when every thing in a court displeases, the subject of censure is not exhausted. We may take it for granted that a person of Valla's humour could never leave Rome for want of objects on which to employ his censure, because all that could be said against that court had already been said. II. Valla did not offer to write the history of the most illustrious events of Naples: But he wrote the History of Ferdinand King of Castile and Arragon, the Father of Alphonse King of Naples. Here are two faults more; Paul Jovius's Latin ill translated (48), and a falsity in the fact itself. III. There is a great deal of excess in the judgment Varillas passes against that book of Valla. He wrote it . . . with so little success, they are his own words, that his adversaries had room enough to reproach his falling into all the faults which he had censured in others. He commits a third time the two errors, which I have mentioned. Paul Jovius's Latin (49) saith no such thing, and it is utterly false that Laurentius Valla in writing this book, was guilty of all the barbarisms with which he charges other authors. IV. No body believes, though Mr Varillas assures it, that Laurentius Valla exiled himself from the court of Naples, because this work was slighted. He had other and more severe disgraces (50), which forced him to leave that court. V. It is very ridiculous to imagine that this learned man's mother made his epitaph. It is true we find these words in the inscription on his tomb, *Catharina mater filio pierrissimo*

(44) Vossius, de Hist. Latinis, lib. i, cap. xxvii, pag. 144. He quotes the Testudo of Mariangelus Accursius.

(45) Lud. Vives de tradendis Disciplinis, lib. iii, pag. m. 287.

(46) Varillas, Anecdotes de Florence, pag. 166.

(47) Quod nihil in aula Pontificis sibi placeret Neapolim ad Alphonsum regem se contulit. Jovius, ubi supra, p. 36.

(48) Apud quem (Alphonsum regem) de vitis bellis in Hispania atque Sicilia gestis historia percripta est. Id. ibid.

(49) Eo stylis character ut ejus minime videri possit qui ceteris elegantiarum præcepta tradiderit. Id. ibid.

(50) See, above, the remark [M].

posuit; but according to the style of epitaphs, this imports no more, than that his mother caused his tomb to be erected. And allowing this false principle of Varillas, we may easily believe that several persons who never understood one Latin word; have written very fine epitaphs in that language; for we find a great many under which we read *maestissima conjux* or *mater*, or *filia posuit*, or *maestissimi filii posuerunt*. VI. As one fault often introduces another, Mr Varillas falls into a fresh mistake; for believing that Laurentius Valla's mother made her son's epitaph, he avers that *no body would save her that trouble*. VII. As to what he saith of Valla, that he gave an ill example in the commonwealth of learning, by publishing first (51) *intire books of invectives and recriminations*, I refer him to Mr de Larroque, who hath shewed him (52) that St Gregory Nazianzen, and St Hilary published invectives, the one against the Emperor Julian, and the other against the Emperor Constantius. We may yet go higher, for though there is room to doubt whether Sallust's invective against Cicero, and that of Cicero against Sallust, are

really the performance of those authors whose names they bear, yet it is certain that they are older than Constantine's time. It cannot be said that Varillas intended only to speak of Christian writers; for the republic of letters of which he is speaking doth not exclude Pagan authors. But if we should have the complaisance to confine ourselves to the limits of Christianity, we should yet find other examples besides those mentioned by Mr Larroque. Have we not two works full of invectives, written by Rufinus against St Jerom (53)? I elsewhere (54) mention an invective written in the very age of Laurentius Valla, but before he thought of writing his. And Petrarch who preceded him one hundred years, did not he write invectives against a Physician? VIII. It is not true that Laurentius Valla *praised no Grammarian of his time besides Candidus December* (55). This is to be guilty of the same fault a fourth time, for the fact is utterly false, and he hath very ill translated his original (56). Paul Jovius's words tend to the praise of December without excluding any other Grammarian.

(53) They are commonly printed in the ninth volume of St Jerom's works.

(54) In the remark [B], of the article VERGERIUS.

(55) Varillas, ubi supra, pag. 167.

(56) Candidus December ... Laurentii Vallæ testimonio exschismate censuræ Grammaticus. Paulus Jovius, in Elog. cap. xv, pag. 339.

VALLA (GEORGE) a native of Piacenza. He was a physician and professor of polite learning at Venice, and flourished after the middle of the XVth century (a). He was very well acquainted with the Greek and Latin tongues, and wrote several books of Physic and Literature [A]. He so irritated the Duke of Milan by his too impetuous zeal for the Trivulcian faction that the Duke persecuted him, even to that degree as to cause him to be imprisoned at Venice (b). He endured the most grievous hardships in this confinement; but being tried was acquitted, and his post restored to him. He did not long enjoy it, a sudden death hurrying him out of the world soon after. He was just going out of his apartment in order to read his lecture; nothing stopped him but a natural necessity to go to the necessary house, where he expired in the same manner as Arius the Herefiarch. His scholars waited a long while in the auditory, and were seized with great sorrow [B], when acquainted with the reason why he did not come. He was that day to continue his explication of a passage in Cicero's *Tusculanæ Quæstiones*, which concerns the immortality of the soul (c). Pierius Valerianus, who informs me of this parti-

(a) Claruit sub Frederico III. juxta Tritemium verò sub Maximiliano Venerabilis A.C. 1494. Justus in Chronol. Medic. Merklinus, in Lindenio renovato, pag. 342. König places him in the year 1528. Mr Baillet, Jugemens des Savans, num. 909, supposes that he was alive in 1541.

(b) Pierius Valerianus, de Litterarum Infirmitatibus, lib. i, pag. 27.

(c) Taken from Pierius Valerianus, ibid.

[A] He wrote several books of Physic and Literature. The titles of some of them are: *De tuenda sanitate per vitium, & quæ secundum cuiusque naturam in vitium sequenda aut fugienda sunt. De humani corporis commodis & incommodis. Universæ medicinæ ex Græcis potissimum contritiæ libri septem*. It is observed in Lindenius renovatus, that the last tract is a part of that intitled *expetenda & fugienda* (1). We may add that our Valla translated out of Greek Rhazis de *Pesilentia*, Plessus de *vitius ratione*, Alexander Aphrodisiensis de *februm causis & differentiis*, Nemesius de *Natura hominis* (2), and some others (3). It is to be observed that Huetius calls him a very bad translator (4). The books of Literature composed by Valla, are either treatises of Grammar and Rhetoric, or commentaries on some books of Tully, on Horace's Art of Poetry, on Juvenal, &c. He also commented on the second book of Pliny: That work was printed at Venice in 1502, in 4to (5a) and must needs be very scarce since Father Hardouin could not meet with it (5). But we must not forget his book *de expetendis & fugiendis rebus*: It is a sort of Encyclopedia or body of all sciences, of which Paul Jovius speaks somewhat contemptibly; for doubtless the words which I am going to cite relate to this collection. 'Disciplinas, literasque omnes, uno ingenti volumine complexus, multa potius didicisse, quam in eo celeri transcurfu perscrutanda posteris reliquisse videtur. Quandoquidem coarctant omnia, indefesseque scribentis, requisitus ille Romanæ elocutionis spiritus omnino defuerit, quo uno voluminum vita præclarè altitur, longissimèque producitur' (6). - - - By comparing all arts and sciences in one large volume, he seems rather to have learned much himself, than to have left much to be learned by posterity, in such an hasty and precipitate manner. For whilst he was collecting and writing every thing with indefatigable pains, he wanted that necessary spirit of Roman elocution, by which alone the life of books is sustained and prolonged.' John Peter Valla, the author's son, caused it to be printed, and very humbly acknowledged that the work was not perfect: he makes several excuses to the reader (7) that death had prevented his father's putting his last hand to it. This work is divided into forty-nine

books or seven weeks. It was very much criticized by Sorel (8). Gefner observes that George Valla borrowed several things from the Greeks without owning it. 'Nos sane observavimus Georgium Vallam a Græcis permulta dissimulanter esse mutuatum, & non pauca perperam in Latinum sermonem transulisse' (9). - - - I have observed that George Valla borrowed very much from the Greeks without owning it, and translated several things into Latin very wretchedly. He then deserves to be put into the list of Plagiaries.

[(5a)] A copy of this edition passed through my hands at an auction, a little above a year ago: and John Peter Valla, the son of George, caused the same book to be reprinted in Folio, likewise at Venice, and also in 1502 by Simon Bevilacqua, with other works of his father, and particularly his *Commentationes in Prolomæi Quadripartitum*, not mentioned by Mr Bayle. As for the rest, two copies of this edition are in the King's library at Berlin. REM. CRIT.]

[B] His scholars . . . were seized with great sorrow. The following citation is longer than the text requires, but I shall still venture to insert it to shew what esteem Valla's scholars had for him. 'Haud ita multo post cum mane summo paratus esset conferre se ad auditorium, ubi tunc Tusculanas Ciceronis quæstiones prælegebat, deque animæ immortalitate vehementissimè, doctissimèque quotidie diserebat, dum interim corpori vacaturus excrementa cibi dejecit, animam etiam morte subitanea exhalavit. Nos qui quotidie ad admirandam hominis doctrinam sub matutino crepusculo conveniebamur, non prius tali nos doctore defraudatos intelleximus, quam hora profundi frustra elapsa certos, qui moræ causam sciscitarentur, domum ejus delegavimus, qui redeuntes gymnasium nostrum præter omnium spem, quia, nullum malæ valetudinis incommodum præcesserat voce illa erudita spoliavit, atque orbatum renuntiaverunt' (10). - - - Not long after, as he was ready to go one morning early to his auditory, and with be then explained Cicero's Tusculan questions, and with great learning and force of argument read lectures every day on the immortality of the soul, he went aside to ease nature, and in the mean time died suddenly. We who came every morning betimes to attend his admirable lessons knew nothing of our great loss, till the

(8) Sorel, de la Perfection de l'Homme, pag. 289, 290.

(9) Gefn. ubi supra.

(10) Pierius Valerianus, de Litterarum Infirmitatibus, lib. i, pag. 27.

(1) Extant operis sui expetendorum & fugiendorum libri 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. Merklinus, in Lindenio renovato, pag. 342.

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) See Gefner's Bibliotheca, fol. 273.

(4) Nec felicius Georgio Vallæ labor ille successit, nam & à Græcis diffinitæ sepe, & quæ assequitur non raro pervertit. Huetius, de claris Interpretibus, pag. m. 221. See, below, Gefner's words.

(5) Vide Hardouini Præfation. in Plinium.

(6) Paulus Jovius, in Elog. cap. cxxii, p. 256.

(7) In Epistola noncupatoria. See Gefner, in Biblioth. fol. 273.

cular, makes very judicious reflections on this kind of death [C].

'hour of teaching being elapsed, we sent some persons to his house to inquire the reason of his not coming; and upon their return they acquainted us with the melancholy news of his death, which was a great surprise to us all, because he had had no manner of illness before.'

[C] Pierius Valerianus makes very judicious reflections on this kind of death. He first observes that some may think George Valla's dying without any sickness to be a great happiness. He afterwards saith that according to the Christian doctrine, sudden death ought to be looked on as a misfortune. He then observes that according to Philosophy this accident and all others, which do not depend on us, ought not to pass for evils. Finally, he would have us believe that Valla's manner of death was a happiness, since it was not preceded by pains and uneasiness. *Erunt qui genus hoc mortis inter mortalium felicitates enumerabunt, quippe nullo dolore prævio, nulloque mortis metu statim exanimari. Nos tamen ex Christianæ pietatis institutis inferrimus hoc existimamus, ex Philosophiæ verò præceptis, neque quidem calamitates alias, quæ alterius, non nostri juris sunt, mala existimo; sed erit super hoc alias differendi locus. At fuerit felix Valla, quia cruciatu nullo, nulliusque rei anxius à vita migravit; nobis certè ejus discipulis calamitosa fuit hominis mors, quibus eruditionis suæ tam triste disiderium reliquit* (11). All this is very

(11) *Ibid.*
p. g. 28.

just; for the tormenting pains of a disease of fifteen days, and the languishing weakness of a long distemper, reduce a man to a miserable state naturally speaking. He is incapable of enjoying either forbidden or lawful pleasures; he suffers in body and mind; his members render him sensible of several uneasinesses; his reason is enfeebled; he is peevish, he is afraid of death, and cannot think of the approach of this King of terrors without horror. A sudden death spares all this, and ought therefore to pass for a great happiness, unless we reflect on the gospel-principles. Wherefore Pierius Valerianus very judiciously inserted this exception. Christianity teaches us that a sinner shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven without repentance: and experience convinces us that all men are sinners. According to these principles we ought to look upon sudden death as a very great evil, seeing the dead person hath not had sufficient time to humble himself before God, and implore his mercy through the merits of JESUS CHRIST. Now a man, who presents himself an impenitent sinner before the throne of God, can expect nothing but eternal damnation. This is the Christian doctrine. It is in vain to alledge that a man predestinated to salvation, cannot die impenitent, suppose his death never so sudden; and that a reprobate cannot die penitent though his death is preceded by a tedious sickness: it is in vain, I say, to alledge this; for this reflexion will not satisfy the scruples of those who reason in this manner, viz. a man predestinated to salvation always reconciles himself to God before his death; those who die suddenly have no time to reconcile themselves to God; they are not therefore predestinated to salvation. I own it would be rash to assert the minor of this syllogism as a certain truth; but after all it is the most specious argument against the advantage which several pretend to find in a sudden death. They do not fail to observe that diseases are very often great obstacles to repentance, either because they deprive us of our senses and judgment, or because they so much enfeeble our reason, and memory, that we are not very well qualified to reflect on the gospel truths, or to make a good use of the exhortations of a Divine, or in fine, because when they prove long and lingering

they occasion complaints and murmurs. This disposition leads directly to impenitence, and hardness of heart, and sometimes to impiety itself. Though we should agree to all this, yet we may very justly assert that diseases most commonly produce a better effect. So that to pronounce George Valla's death happy, it ought not to be considered according to the Christian principles, but looked on with the eyes of Augustus. In the judgment of that Emperor, that was the happy death which was preceded by no pain; he desired such a death for himself and his friends. He found herein what good men find in the death of the just, that is, the object of his wishes. He obtained almost what he desired. 'Sortitus exitum facilem & qualem semper optaverat. Nam fere quoties audisset cito ac nullo cruciatu defunctum quempiam sibi & suis evbavasiav similem (hoc enim & verbo uti solebat) precabatur (12). . . . He obtained an easy death, and such as he had always wished for. For whenever he heard that any one died suddenly, and without pain, he prayed that such a good and easy death (which was the expression he commonly used) might happen to himself and his friends.' Cæsar, whose son he was by adoption, was of the same opinion. He despised the lazy death of Cyrus mentioned by Xenophon, and nothing seemed to him preferable to leaving the world unexpectedly. 'Illud plane inter omnes fere constitit, talem ei mortem pene ex sententia obtigisse. Nam & quondam cum apud Xenophontem legisset, Cyrum ultima valetudine mandasse quædam de funere suo, aspernatus tam lentum mortis genus, subitam sibi celeremque optaverat. Et pridie quam occideretur in sermone nato super cenam, apud M. Lepidum, quisnam esset finis vitæ commodissimus, repentum inopinatumque prætulit (13). . . . All agree, that his death was such as he had desired. For when he read in Xenophon that Cyrus, in his last illness, gave directions concerning his funeral, he despised such a lingering death, and wished for a quick and sudden one. And the day before he was killed, as he was at dinner with M. Lepidus, a question being started, what sort of death is most eligible, he declared that he preferred that which is sudden and unexpected.' Heliod reckons it amongst the prerogatives of the golden age that men then died in the arms of sleep. One of our Critics has blamed Ovid for omitting this privilege in his description of the felicities of that age. Mr Menage remembered this censure, when he said that his father died in that manner. His words are: 'At verò cum dormiturus caput in cervical inclinasset, ecce tibi confestim exanimatus est. Dicitur est senis Ascrei, aurea ætate mortales quasi dormitos somno interisse: quam rem optimam, ut hoc te obiter doceam; neque enim te docendi occasionem ullam prætermittere debere mihi videor; in optimi illius sæculi descriptione omittit Peliguum Vatem non debuisset, rectè à Julio Scaligero animadversum. Eo igitur modo placido & quieto parens meus fato functus est (14). . . . But as he laid his head upon the pillow in order to sleep, he immediately expired. Heliod says, that in the golden age men died as if overpowered with sleep: which happiness, by the way, for I ought to omit no opportunity of instructing you, is not mentioned by Ovid in the description of that golden age, as Julius Scaliger rightly observes. It was in that calm and quiet manner my father died.' You see plainly that his taste and that of Scaliger the father (15) were agreeable to that of Augustus. They would willingly have applied to them who died thus, the proverb, *Le bien leur vient en dormant*, . . . Happiness comes to them in their sleep. See the remark [F] of the article REGIUS.

(12) Sueton. in Augusto, cap. 6.

(13) Sueton. in Cæsar, cap. lxxviii.

(14) Ægidius Menagius, in Vita Guillelmi Menagii, pag. 76, 77.

(15) In his remark upon the passage quoted by me, Menage speaks thus: 'These are the words of Julius Scaliger, in the eighth chapter of the fifth book de Poetica. Omisit autem illud Heliodi, longè optimum in hac ætate, ὁ δὲ πατὴρ ὡς ἐνύπνιον ἀνέμιον. The passage of Heliod is in his "Ἐγγραφαὶ Ἠλιακά."'

VALLA (NICOLAS) Doctor of the Civil-Law, and Canon of St Peter's Church at Rome, lived in the XVth century. He undertook to translate Homer's Iliad into Latin verse, but death prevented his completing that work (a). What he had already translated was printed after his death in the year 1474, and reprinted in 1541 [A]. We

[A] What he had already translated was printed in the year 1474, and reprinted in 1541. The first of these editions was made at Rome, and was neither known to Gesner or his abridgers, it contains the iiii, ivth, vth, xliiith (1), xlviiiith, xrxth, xxiid, xxiid and xxiivth

books of the Iliad, and a small portion of the xixth. To the second edition were added Joseph Ican's six books de Bello Trojano, and the translation of four books of Homer (2) in Latin verse by Opsiopæus (3).

[B] He

(a) See Vossius, de Poët. Lat. pag. 80.

(2) Viz. the 1st, 2d, 9th, and 10th, of the Iliad. Vossius, *ibid.*

(3) Taken from Vossius, *ibid.*

VALLA. VALLE. VALLE'E.

We have also his Latin version of a poem of Hesiod (b), and two letters in Elegiac verse. He died very young [B] in 1473 (c). His father LÆLIUS VALLA (d), Doctor of Law, was Confessorial Advocate (e).

(b) That which is intitled "Epya nai 'Hmāpas, Opera & Dis." This translation is in Epic verse, and was dedicated to Pius II. See Gesnerus, in Biblioth. fol. 524. (c) Konig, Biblioth. pag. 828, where he observes that his epitaph is to be found at pag. 117, of Fabricius's Roma. (d) Or de Valle. (e) Vossius, *ibid.*

(4) Pierius Valer. de Litterat. Infel. lib. ii, pag. 55.

[B] He died very young.] This Vossius doth not mention, but we find it in Pierius Valerianus. 'Inter Romanos autem, scilicet be (4), paucis ante annis non ignobilis fuit Nicolaus Valla, summæ juvenis eruditionis, Græcis, Latinisque literis apprime doctus, qui quidem adolescens admodum ad Homerum sublimitatem eleganti Latini carminis facilitate ceperat aspirare. Is tamen nondum alterum à vigesimo egressus annum fati quadam inclementia eruditorum omnium spei surreptus est. - - - A few years ago Nicolas Valla was in great reputation at Rome, being a young man of great learning, and perfectly skilled in Greek and Latin. When he was but a lad, he attempted to imitate Homer's sublimity in elegant and fluent Latin verse. Before he was quite twenty-one years of age he was snatched away by cruel fate to the sorrow of all learned men.' What occasions some difficulty is that Valerianus, who wrote in Clement the seventh's time (5), saith, that a few years before Valla died at the age of twenty-one. If we go to the rigour of exactness, this doth not very well suit a person, who dedicated a Poem to Pius II. Observe that I here consider the particular ways, by which Valerianus commonly expresses himself in the tract which I cite.

(5) See his Tract. de Litterat. Insuper, & pag. 11.

VALLA (NICOLAUS) in French du Val, Counsellor in the Parliament of Paris (a), and afterwards in the Parliament of Rennes, is the author of a Civil-Law book [A] which is pretty much esteemed. He flourished in the XVth century. He mentions his son-in-law James Capel, who was Counsellor in the parliament of Bretagne (b). Konig, confounds him with Nicholas Valla, who is the subject of the preceding article (c). It is not improbable that our du Val was the Counsellor of the parliament of Paris, who was suspected of Lutheranism in the famous *Mercuriale* of 1559, and by flight avoided the danger which threatened him (d). Thuanus calls him Nicolaus Valla (e).

(a) See Pasquier, Recherch. de la France, livr. ix, ch. xxxix, pag. m. 902.

(b) Nicolaus Valla, de Rebus dubiis, Tract. viii, circa fin. pag. m. 136. (c) Konig, Biblioth. pag. 828, where he ascribes to Nicolaus Valla, the translator of Hesiod, who died at Rome in 1473, the treatise de Rebus dubiis. (d) Thuan. lib. xxii, pag. m. 453. (e) *Id. ibid.* pag. 452.

[A] He is author of a Civil Law-book.] The title 'trouvé par Traictatus XX. I make use of the fifth edition at Arnheim, 1638, in 4to.

VALLE (ROLANDUS à) an Italian Civilian, lived in the XVIth century. He was not born at Casalmaggiore in the Milanese, as some have believed, but at Casal in Montferrat [A]. He wrote many books, whereof several editions have been printed in Italy, France, and Germany [B]. His Latin stile is very mean, and has nothing of that politeness which was already introduced among the Civilians.

[A] He was not born at Casalmaggiore in the Milanese, as some have believed, but at Casal in Montferrat. Quenstedt, who is not ignorant that he was Patrius Casalensis, Eques & Primarius Montisferrati Senator, - - - A nobleman of Casal, knight, and chief senator of Montferrat; (these are the titles he takes at the beginning of his works) imagines falsely that he was of Casalmaggiore, and places him amongst those illustrious men whom the Milanese has produced (1). I shall here give a convincing proof of his error, and which, by the way, will inform us of the miserable condition that Montferrat was reduced to by the war in 1551. 'Prædictus Papien . . . dicit se hanc questionem habuisse in patria mea Montisferrati, (quæ hodierna die, quæ est dies 27 Septemb. Anni 1551, est multum infelicitissima propter bellorum tumultus, tot tantæque hospitationes militum, quæ adeo intolerabiles sunt quod coguntur nedum pauperes, verum etiam & nobiles & divites omnem substantiam vilissimo pretio vendere, ac derelinquere patriam, & in externas Provincias se conferre) qui movetur (2). - - - Prædictus Papien . . . says that he treated this question, in my country

(1) Quenstedt, de Patria Viro. illustrium, pag. 295.

(2) Roland, à Valle, in Tractatu de lucro dotis, Quæst. xxvi, pag. 96, Edit. Colon. 1599.

(a) Taken from La Croix du Maine, pag. 725. Renatus de la Barre, at the beginning of his Notes upon Novatianus de Trinitate, says that man was called Bellum Vallensium. That is, handsome Vallée.

VALLÉE (GODFREY DE LA) a native of Orleans published a book at Paris intitled *Erre Geru, le fleau de la Foy bigarrée*. It is full of blasphemies and impieties against JESUS CHRIST. This author was burnt at Paris for his heresy in the year 1574. He was commonly called *bandome Vallée* (a). This is what we find in *la Croix du Maine's Bibliothèque Française*. Others say he was burnt for atheism at Paris in 1571, and that he wrote a book intitled *The art of believing nothing* (b). Maldonatus made a false reflexion on a passage which he pretends to be in that book [A]. I wonder that

[A] Maldonatus made a false reflexion on a passage which he pretends to be in that book.] This Jesuit's words are: 'Nonnulli progressi sunt longius, ut nihil crederent, quorum unus cum libellum quandam his annis de arte nihil credendi composuisset, nihil in

OF MONTFERRAT, which at this day, that is the 27th of September 1551, is by far the most miserable of all countries, because of the confusion of war, and the frequent and heavy quartering of soldiers, which is so intolerable, that not only the poor, but the noble and rich are forced to sell all their substance for a mere trifle, and to leave their native country, and go into foreign parts.'

[B] He wrote many books, whereof several editions had been printed, in Italy . . . and Germany.] His treatise *De lucro dotis*, printed at Venice, in the year 1567, and 1584, was reprinted at Cologne, in 1559, in 8vo; as also his treatise de *Inventarii Confessione*, which had been published at Venice in 8vo, in the year 1573, and 1584. His Counfels quibus graves præcipuas Juris Controversiæ, de Jure in Regni, Principatibus, Ducatibus, Comitatibus, Marchionatibus, & Feudis acquirendo vel amittendo deciduntur, &c. contain four volumes in folio in the Venice edition, 1592. They have been already printed in the same city separately, and the two first had been reprinted at Lyons in the year 1566, and with the third, in the year 1580 (3).

(3) See the Epitome de la Bibliothèque de Gelles, pag. m. xxvi, pag. m. 736, and the *Notes* of Maldonatus, in the year 1574.

eo nisi hoc unum verum dixit, oportere prius Calvinistam fieri qui atheus esse volet. Fuerat ille antea Calvinista, fuit postea atheus, & unicuique in sua arte credendum est. Verissima sententia: nam quisquis Calvinista est, si ea quam ingressus est incredulitatis

that so few authors have mentioned that Atheist, and that most of those who have taken notice of him have grounded what they say on the evidence of this Spanish Jesuit.

(1) Maldonat. in Evangel. Matthæi, cap. xxvii, pag. m. 572.

'dultatis via ire pergat, ad nihil credendum perveniat necesse est (1). -- Some have proceeded so far as to believe nothing, one of whom having written these few years written a small book concerning the Art of believing nothing, has not said one word of truth in it except this, that whoever would be an Atheist, ought first to be a Calvinist. He had before been a Calvinist, and afterwards turned Atheist, and every one is to be believed in his own profession. It is a very true saying: for whoever is a Calvinist, if he goes on in the same way of incredulity which he has begun, must at last come to believe nothing.' It is incredible how many Jesuits and other controversial writers amongst the Romanists, have copied this passage of Maldonatus. Several of them have at the same time corrupted it; for they suppose that Godfrey de la Vallée in his book endeavoured to prove at large, that whoever would be an Atheist ought first to be a Calvinist (2). Maldonatus never said that this assertion was amply handled in the little book *de Arte nihil credendi*. His copiers have not trodden in his footsteps in reasoning on that head. They suppose this Atheist to have said so because he believed the Calvinistical sect to be so abominable, that all those who took a near view of it would rather chuse to profess no religion than that. *Cur autem dixit eum, qui atheus esse vult, oportere prius Calvinistam fieri; nisi quod putaret, tam scdam ac profligatam esse Calvinistam, ut qui eam prope apessisset, mallet nullam, quam talem sectam profiteri* (3)? These are the words of the Jesuit Becanus. He adds, that the fruits of Calvinism are more pernicious than those of Atheism, and that tho' the Atheists do not believe a Providence, yet they in many particulars observe the rules of virtue. They are not guilty either of robbery or murder; they abhor a lie, they keep their word, they abominate unjust wars, and love peace: but, on the contrary, Calvin's disciples are instructed not to regard lying, perjury, adultery, and sacrilege; for they believe that God hath imposed on them a necessity of committing them, and that the Elect cannot perish whatever they are guilty of. *Si ex fructu doctrina cognoscenda est; peiores fructus Calvinii, quam Atheorum doctrina parit. Hi tamen negent Deum aliquem orbi præsidere, bonestatem tamen, & rectæ rationis ductum ac directantem in multis sequuntur, & multa rectè agunt, quæ laudari possunt. Cavent furta, homicidia, rapinas, à mendacio abhorrent; juramenti religionem colunt; servant fidem alteri promissam; bellum injustum detestantur; pacem ac tranquillitatem amant. At contra docentur à Calvinio discipuli, parvi pendere mendacia, perjuriam, adulterium, rapinas, libidines, sacrilegia. Unde hoc? Quia Deus, inquit, æterna sua prædestinatione necessitatem, &c.*

(2) In suo libro *de Arte nihil credendi*, fule contendit eum qui Atheus futurus est, Calvinistam prius esse debere. Henricus Fitz Simon, Brittonom. pag. 107.

(3) Martinus Becanus, Opusculorum Theologicorum, Tom. i, pag. m. 175.

(4) Id. ibid.

lowed his original. I do not pretend that in arguing as Maldonatus hath done, he would have reasoned justly; I only say his objection had been less absurd. Maldonatus's reflexion runs thus: that Calvinism having once shook off the yoke of tradition with regard to the Real Presence, under pretence that it is an opinion clogged with a thousand difficulties contrary to sense and reason, hath put all sorts of Heretics in the way of rejecting all mysteries; and that some of the most subtle and incredulous Calvinists have made use of the same arguments to deny the Trinity, which they had formerly used against Transubstantiation (5). Some, adds he, advance farther, even so far as to believe nothing, and the road they have got into must necessarily lead them so far. He goes on thus: what I have observed is not designed to injure the Calvinists, but to shew them the precipice that is at their journey's end, that a view of this imminent danger may divert them from the way of perdition. Two things in this common-place of Maldonatus deserve to be censured; for, in the first place, to grant that preferring the light of reason to the authority of those councils, which have determined the Real Presence, leads to Atheism, is giving too great an advantage to Libertines and Free thinkers. Is it not avowing that the doctrine of the existence of God is not less contrary to common sense than that of Transubstantiation? Is it not asserting that to believe this existence, we ought blindly to sacrifice the clearest light of Philosophy to the authority of tradition; as we ought to sacrifice it to the same authority, in order to believe the Romish opinion concerning the Eucharist? But what can be more pernicious to religion than such an avowal? It is therefore very necessary to limit this objection. He ought only to have said that such a breach being made in the decisions of the councils by denying the Real Presence, may grow so wide, as to extend to other incomprehensible opinions of the Church of Rome. 2. Maldonatus was ignorant of the principles of those whom he calls Calvinists. They are so far from teaching, that we ought to reject a doctrine because our reason cannot comprehend it, or is capable of offering almost invincible arguments against it, that they are the first who assert, and are always ready to maintain, that nothing can be more pernicious, than to regulate ourselves by reason in the choice of some particular doctrines. This is what they incessantly alledge against the Socinians, always urging the necessity of subjecting our understanding to the obedience of faith. So that tho' the opinion which this Spanish Jesuit attacks, was as dangerous as he represents it: yet what he advances against the Calvinists by endeavouring to take an advantage of la Vallée's book against them, would be absolutely unjust. In such a critical work as this, it is necessary that not only errors in fact, but also the ill use of true facts should be handled in this manner.

(5) Multos jam Calvinistas videmus qui ingeniosiores & magis increduli, id est magis Calvinistæ ceteris erant, eò jam pervenisse, ut quæ ratione hoc prius mysterium (Eucharistia) non credebant, nunc Trinitatis mysterium non credant, ceteroque Calvinistæ sicut Calvinistæ nos tanquam nihil simpliciter & credulos rideant. Maldonatus, ibid.

VANDER-LINDEN (JOHN ANTONIDES) Professor of Physic at Leyden, was not the first learned man of his family. Some of his ancestors distinguished themselves in the republic of letters, as we are informed by his funeral oration, where we find a very exact genealogy of his family [A]. He was born at Enckhuysen (a) on the 13th of January, 1609. He was sent to the university of Leyden in the year 1625, to study Philosophy; and afterwards wholly applied himself to the study of Physic. From Leyden,

(1) It is the chief town of Goyland, on the borders of the provinces of Guelderland, and Utrecht.

(2) Sacris Papiæ diu immixtus, nisi quod de justitia Dei, h. e. jure filiorum Dei, quod in Christo per fidem, per Spiritum ipsius unum corpus cum semper habuerit

[A] We find a very exact genealogy of his family. It reaches as high as his abavus, or his great-grandfather's father, who was Hen. REGNIER, a burgher of Harderwick, whose house being burnt in the conflagration which consumed that town, he removed to Naerden (1). There his son ANTONY was preferred to be master of a class, chanter in the choir, and secretary to that city: he was a strict Papiist, but orthodox in a point which, according to Cocceius, is of the highest importance to Christianity (2). I mean the right which the children of God obtain in JESUS CHRIST by faith, as being made one body with him by his Spirit. Antony ipso facti obtinemus (qui religionis Christianæ apex est) integrum sententiam. Cocceius, in Orat. funebri.

VOL. V.

left a son named Henry, born in 1546, who acquainted himself thoroughly with the learned languages, and with a Christian constancy suffered a great many afflictions for the Reformed religion. He was very young when he first approved of the Reformation, and applied himself to the instruction of the persecuted Protestants, and even of little children. Being in a boat where the passengers refused to make room for a young gentlewoman of Guelderland, each urging they could not crowd themselves any closer; he, notwithstanding, by pressing, made room for her to sit (3). He discovered such a solid piety in this lady, that he fell in love with her, and, with the consent of her relations, married her. She was the faithful companion of his travels.

(a) It is a town in North-Holland.

(3) Eam Virginem primum in navi cum eam receperit in multitudine, ut solet archius federe reनुente, ob pietatem amavit & conjugem optavit, ac deinde à parentibus impetravit. Ibid.

Leyden he went to Franeker, in order to continue his studies there in the year 1629, where he took his degree of Doctor of Physic some months after. His father, who had practised Physic at Amsterdam ever since the year 1625, called him home in order to instruct him in the method of practice, and died in 1633. Our Vander-linden continued in the exercise of that Faculty, of which he acquitted himself with so much reputation, that in the year 1639 he was invited to be professor of Physic in the university of Franeker. He very worthily filled that place for almost twelve years. He read lectures on the theoretical and practical parts, on Anatomy and Botany, and it was to his care that the enlargement of the university garden, and the building of an house there were owing. The library was not less indebted to him; for whilst he had the direction of it, he supplied it with a great many books, by an address which engaged the nobility to that good work. The university of Utrecht offered him a professor's place in 1649, which he refused; but two years after he accepted of that which was offered him by the curators of the university of Leyden. He worthily discharged all these functions till his death, which happened on the 5th of March 1664 (b). He was author of several books [B], and editor of others [C]. His employment remained vacant till May 1668, when Mr Drelincourt was called to succeed him. See Guy Patin's 501st letter, in the 464th page

(b) Taken from his funeral Oration, pronounced by John Cocceius, professor of Divinity.

travels and dangers. He lost his father, father-in-law, his relations and friends at the Spanish massacre at Naerden in 1572. After this fatal accident, he exercised the ministerial function at Enckhuysen, till the year 1585, when he was invited to be professor of Divinity at Franeker. He was the first who read lectures in that university, and it was he who pronounced that inaugural oration of the university, *Quam Academicam ipse initiavit oratione prima & lectione* (4). Hence, by the way, we are informed, when that university was founded. He continued in this professorship till he died, which was in 1614. He left several children. Antony, the eldest, was a learned man; whose great knowledge of classic learning engaged the magistrates of Enckhuysen to make him rector of their college. He was besides, a good Musician, and a good Organist; he was no novice in Theology; but what he excelled in was Physic, of which he commenced Doctor at Franeker in the year 1608, and practised it with great success and reputation, first at Enckhuysen, and afterwards at Amsterdam (5). I have already said (6) that he died in 1633, and that the Leyden professor, John Antonides Vander-Linden was his son. Cocceius enlarges very much on the maternal relations of the deceased: herein doubtless he is too particular; but in general the funeral orations in the northern universities are of this sort. I believe the word *Antonides* was formed in imitation of the patronymical names of the ancient Poets. Tho' I own that there are some families in Holland of the name of Antonides. Yet probably it was at first no more than a patronymical name.

(4) Id. *ibid.*

(5) He wrote several books about Physic, and other sciences. His son has given a catalogue of the books of Physic, in his tract *de Scriptis Medicis*: I do not think that they have been printed. He left several others imperfect.

(6) In the text of this article.

[B] He wrote several books. The titles of them are: *Univerſe Medicinæ Compendium, quinque centuriis ſub Clypeo Clariff. viri D. Menſei Winſhemii Med. Doct. & in illuſtri Friſorum Academia ejusdem Facultatis & Anatomie Profeſſoris, publico examini decem Diſputationibus propoſitum. Addita eſt centuria inauguralis poſtitionum Medico-prædicarum de virulentia venerica, ibidem propoſita & deſenſa ad diem 18 Octobris 1630.* These are properly the Theſes on Physic which he maintained in order to be admitted Doctor in 1630. *Medulla Medicinæ partibus quatuor comprehenſa.* Printed at Franeker 1642, in 8vo. *Medicina Phyſiologica novâ curatâque methodo ex optimis quibuſque Autoribus contracta, & propriis obſervationibus locupletata.* At Amſterdam 1653, in 4to. *Seleſta Medica & ad ea exercitationes Batavicæ.* At Leyden in 1656, in 4to. But this book more properly falls under the following remark than under this, it being a collection of ſeveral pieces of Hippocrates, and other antient authors. *Diſſertatio de Lactæ,* this is amongſt Deſingius's, diſſertations, published at Groningen 1655, in 12mo. *De Hemierania menſura, hiſtoria & conſilium.* Printed at Leyden 1660, and 1668, in 4to. *Meletemata Medicinæ Hippocraticæ.* At Leyden 1660, and at Francfort 1672, in 4to. *Hippocrates de circuiſu ſanguinis.* At Leyden 1661, in 4to. *De Scriptis Medicis Libri duo, quibus præmittitur Manuſcriptio ad Medicinam.* This piece was three times printed at Amſterdam by John Blæu, in 1637, 1651, and 1662, in 8vo. It is a catalogue of books written on Physic. The author improved it at every edition; and after his death Merklinus, a German, very conſiderably enlarged it, and published it in

a large volume in 4to, intitled *Lindenius renovatus.* It is printed at Nuremberg 1686. It is from this edition that I have taken the catalogue of Vander-Linden's books, which I have inſerted in this remark.

This book of Vander-Linden, *de Scriptis Medicis*, hath had the fate of all works of this nature; they be very much corrected, and enlarged in every new edition, yet they remain imperfect ſtill. See Voglerus's cenſure on this book of Vander-Linden (7). How large ſo ever the additions of Merklinus are, we are yet far from finding in his edition all thoſe authors who have writ books on Physic. This I will prove by an example: there are in it five authors named MARTIN, and yet BERNARDIN MARTIN, born at Paris on the 8th of January 1629, is omitted. He was the ſon of Samuel Martin, Apothecary to Mary de Medicis, Queen of France, and published a treatiſe of the uſe of Milk, and another upon the breeding of Teeth, both which were very well received and approved by the Faculty of Paris (8). He alſo wrote a relation of his travels in Spain, Portugal, Holland, and Germany, the &c. which contains ſome very remarkable things. The Prince of Condé deſired his attendance on his perſon in 1669. Martin, from that time to the death of that great prince, diſcharged his function very well, and received ſeveral marks of his highneſs's affection. The preſent Prince of Condé (9), only ſon of the late Prince, had him always in his houſe (10). Since Merklinus's edition often contains an abridgment of the lives of the writers on Physic, this may, on ſeveral accounts, be ſerviceable to thoſe who ſhall make additions to the *Lindenius Renovatus*.

[C] He was editor of others. Let us continue our extracts from the book juſt now cited (11). *Adriani Spigelii Opera quæ extant omnia, reſenſuit & cum addita præſatione edidit,* at Amſterdam 1645, in folio. *Hier. Cardani, de utilitate ex adverſis capienda libris iv. ſerio emendatos edidit,* at Franeker, 1648, in 8vo. *Cornel. Ceſſi de Medicina libros octo recognovit & edidit,* at Leyden, 1657, and 1665, in 12mo. *Hippocratis Cui Opera omnia Græcè & Latinè duobus voluminibus comprehenſa, & ad omnes alias editiones accommodata, edidit,* at Leyden 1665, in 8vo. This edition of Hippocrates was not entirely finiſhed when Vander-Linden died. He beſtowed a great deal of care on it. The *Journal des Sçavans* ſpoke of it thus: 'This new edition . . . hath the advantage of anſwering all the former, by the help of the figures in the margin, which ſhew in what page and place every thing is to be found. So that it is preferable to all other editions, and remedies the conſuſion introduced by their diverſity, when a paſſage was to be looked for. It is alſo the moſt correct of them all, for Mr Vander-Linden having carefully compared all the old editions with ſeveral manuſcripts, hath reſtored a great number of places, not before corrected even Foëſius's edition. The Latin verſion he hath choſen is that of Cornarius, becauſe it is the oldeſt, and that which is commonly uſed. Death ſurprized him a little before this edition was finiſhed, which prevented his publiſhing the remarks he deſigned to make on Hippocrates (12). Cocceius touches on this laſt particular: 'Scio τὸν μακαρίτην multa

(7) Voglerus Introduct. in Notitiam bonorum Scriptorum, pag. n. 48.

(8) They have been printed at Paris for Deslys Thierry.

(9) I write this in the year 1696.

(10) Taken from a Memoir imparted to the Bookſeller.

(11) *Lindenius renovatus.*

(12) *Journal des Sçavans*, of the 22d of February 1666.

page of the third tome ; and observe that Guy Patin who was a friend to Vander-Linden, hath frequently mentioned him in his letters [D].

(13) Corceus, ubi
supra.
multa de variis locis Medicorum principis esse medi-
tatum, & magnam sibi supellecilem collegisse ob-
servatorium ad hunc auctorem illustrandum utilium,
quas non potuisse ab ipso edi dolendum est (13). --
I know he designed to write notes on several places of
Hippocrates the prince of Physicians, and had collected
great store of materials for that purpose, but death
prevented him from publishing them.
[D] Guy Patin . . . hath frequently mentioned him

in his letters.] I shall only cite one passage (14). ' I
' know nothing new concerning Vander-Linden's Hip-
' pocrates. This author died at Leyden, aged fifty-
' three years (15) of a fever and defluxion on his
' lungs, after having taken antimony, and without
' having been blooded. What pity it is, he should
' write so many books, understand so much Latin
' and Greek, and die of a fever and suffocating catarrh
' without being blooded.

VAQUERIE (JOHN DE LA) First President in the Parliament of Paris, in the reign of Lewis XI, had been Pensionary of the city of Arras (a). He was deputed by that city in 1476, when they were obliged to answer the deputies of that prince, who demanded the submission of the inhabitants to him, as their lawful sovereign, after the death of the Duke of Burgundy. The king's deputies declared that his majesty pretended to have Arras and Artois by way of confiscation, and that if the citizens did not open the gates, it would be in danger of being taken by force. La Vaquerie replied, that the county of Artois belonged to the Princess of Burgundy, daughter of Duke Charles, on whom it devolved in a direct line, from Margaret, Countess of Flanders, the consort of Philip the first Duke of Burgundy ; and he supplicated his majesty, that he would be pleased to observe the truce betwixt him and the late Duke Charles (b). This answer was to no purpose, Arras was obliged to submit to the yoke of France. There has been much talk of a remonstrance made by La Vaquerie to the same king [A]. Nor is the answer much less talked of which he made when they endeavoured to engage the parliament to interpose their authority in the choice of a regent of the realm [B]. Chancellor de l'Hospital said

(a) That office is much the same with that of Syndic. See the second edition of Furetiere's Dictionary, at the word Pensionnaire.

(b) Taken from Philip de Commines, book 10, chap. xi, pag. m. 298.

[A] There has been much talk of a remonstrance made by La Vaquerie to the same king. I shall here make use of John Bodin's words. ' Lewis XI had terribly threatened the court of parliament, for refusing to publish, ratify, and register, several just edicts : the president Lavacrie, accompanied with a great number of counsellors, in scarlet robes, went to offer their complaints and remonstrances on account of those menaces. The king observing the gravity, stateliness, and dignity, of those gentlemen, who were resolved to quit their posts rather than ratify the edicts sent to them ; was surprized, and dreading the authority of the parliament, caused the said edicts to be annulled in their presence, desiring them to continue in the administration of justice, and swore to them that he would never send any edict to them which was not just and reasonable. This action was of very great importance in order to keep that king within the just bounds of reason, who had always exercised an absolute power ; and when he was only Dauphin, he sent for the presidents of that court, and told them that they should raze out the clause DE EXPRESSO MANDATO, BY EXPRESS ORDER, which the court had inserted into the ratification of the privileges granted to the count du Maine, otherwise he would not leave Paris till it was done, and that he would surrender the commission which the king had given him. The court ordered that those words should be blotted out, but that what was blotted out might plainly appear, the register was ordered to be kept, as it is at present, in pursuance of that order, with the date of the xxviiiith of July MCCCXLII (1). ' The Latin edition of this book of Bodin contains a circumstance which I must not omit. It is, that the king commanded the parliament to ratify his edicts on pain of death, and that the first president at the head of that senate declared to the king, that they had rather die than obey. ' Rex sua iussa ingeminans minas adjecit, capit etiam indicta poena nisi curia paruisset. Lanacrius (2) praefes re intellecta regem adit corona judicum purpuratorum stipatus, non ut culpam dedecaretur, sed ut mortem precaretur, cum diceret se suosque collegas mortem malle quam legis propositionem promulgationem pati (3). -- The king reiterated his orders, and even threatened the parliament with death if they did not obey. Upon which the president Lavacrie, accompanied with a great number of counsellors, in their scarlet robes, went to the king, not to excuse their fault, but to desire to be put to death, for he said, that he and his colleagues chose rather to suffer death than ratify the proposed edicts. ' It was not a needless thing to relate in this place

what was done by that prince in the year 1442 (4). This enhanceth the merit of la Vaquerie ; for it is much more glorious to shew one's courage in resisting an imperious person, than to make use of it in opposition to those who have never discovered any obstinate resoluteness in the maintenance of arbitrary power. Tho' Bodin forgot to mention the year when this first president made this resolute and undaunted declaration, it is certain that we are informed, by another proof, how absolutely this monarch resolved to be obeyed. Pasquier relates (5), That in the year one thousand four hundred sixty-five, the same Lewis being king, caused his grant to the Count de Charolois, to be forcibly published by his Chancellor in full court ; and notwithstanding the Protestations made against it by the greatest part of the counsellors, he would have endorsed on the instrument, ' Registrata, Audito Procuratore Regis, & non contradicente. -- Registered, the King's Attorney-General being first heard, and not opposing it. ' La Vaquerie was still Pensionary of the city of Arras, in the year 1476. And therefore he was not first president of the parliament of Paris, till long after Lewis XI had exacted this form of registering. Observe carefully Pasquier's words (6) : ' Such protestations have been very frequent in this court ; and several edicts have this clause, De expresso & expressissimo mandato Regis, pluribus vicibus reiterato. -- By the express and most express order of the king, several times reiterated. Which clause, as it is added for a good end, so several people could with (perhaps not without cause) that this honourable society would sometimes be more flexible, according as the public necessity requires. ' This confirms what I have said above (7) concerning the evils which the parliaments have frequently occasioned by their refusing to register edicts, or by the clauses which they added to the ratification of them. Pasquier had not talked in this manner, if he had not known that the stiffness of those sovereign courts had been sometimes prejudicial to the state. Let us also confirm, by an observation of Bodin, a particular which I have mentioned in another place (8). ' Now the words DE EXPRESSO MANDATO, & expressissimo mandato, and sometimes multis vicibus iterato, which are frequently found in the registers of sovereign courts, about the publication of edicts, occasion such edicts to be neglected, or soon after forgotten and slighted by the connivance of magistrates (9). ' There is no greater encouragement to disobedience, than to suffer the transgressors of an edict to hope for impunity : but this is in effect what the parliaments did, when they disgraced the princes edicts in such manner. [B] The answer . . . which he offered when the attempt was made to engage the parliament . . . In the choice

(4) Pasquier, Recherches, livr. 11, chap. 10, pag. m. 61, gives a larger account of it than Bodin.

(5) Pasquier, ib.

(6) Id. ibid. pag. 62.

(7) See the remark [K], of the article of Chancellor de l'HOSPITAL.

(8) Above, in the same remark.

(9) Bodin, ubi supra, p. 418.

(1) Bodin, de la Republique, livr. iii, chap. 10, pag. m. 417. See also Matthieu, Hist. de Louis XI, livr. xi, pag. m. 668.

(2) It should be Lanacrius.

(3) Bodinus, ubi supra, pag. 454. Edit. 1601.

(c) Le Bret, de la Souveraineté du Roi, *livr. ii, ch. v, pag. 182*, 'one day in a speech, ' That the poverty of the President de la Vaquerie was much more commendable than the riches of a Chancellor of Burgundy, to whom his master said, ' *Rolin, 'tis too much (c).*'

183.

[choice of a regent of the realm.] After the death of Lewis XI, the Countess de Beaujeu, his eldest daughter, had the administration of the government, during the minority of Charles VIII. The Duke of Orleans, who desired to dispossess her of the regency, applied to the parliament of Paris; but Mr de la Vaquerie, first President, declared to him, that affairs of that nature did not fall under their cognizance (10). The author of the book, intituled, *The Ministry of Cardinal de Richelieu* relates it thus: ' The parliaments are ' not less obliged by the laws of justice than by those

of prudence, never to differ from the king in affairs of state: I say they are obliged to it by justice, because it is to usurp a power which doth not belong to them, to attempt to judge of such things, they being only created by the king, to administer justice to the people; as the President de la Vaquerie told the Chancellor of the Duke of Orleans, who formerly desired the parliament, on the part of his master, to press the king to come to Paris and make use of their counsel in the most important affairs (11).'

(11) Histoire du Ministère du Cardinal de Richelieu, *Part. ii, pag. 219, Disc. Edit. an 1631.*

(10) Le Grain, Hist. de Louis XIII, *pag. 4.*

VAUBRUN (THE MARQUIS OF). See BAUTRU (NICOLAS).

(a) Rocolles, Introduction à l'Histoire, *Tom. ii, pag. 339, Paris Edit. 1664.*

(b) The abbot de Marolles, Denombrement des Auteurs, *pag. 441.*

(c) See the Journal des Scavans, of the second of February 1688, *pag. 268, Dutch Edit. and l'Histoire des Ouvrages des Scavans, March 1688, pag. 388.*

VAUMORIERE (PETER DORTIGUE SIEUR DE) of noble extraction in the city of Apt in Provence (a), lived in the XVIIth century. He settled at Paris, and there published some Romances which did him honour [A]. He wrote politely in verse and prose (b). He was Sub-director to the Academy of the Abbot d'Aubignac [B], composed of persons of merit and learning. He collected a great number of harangues on all kinds of subjects, and published them at Paris in 1688 in 4to, with a treatise on the Art of writing such Pieces. The Journalists spoke advantageously of it (c). He was at variance with Fortune [C], if we may believe Richelet. The letters he published on all kind of subjects, with directions on the manner of writing them, were well received by the public. The first edition was finished on the 12th of November 1689, and the second on the last of September 1694. I have seen a third in two volumes in 12mo, to which are added several precepts and some letters, it bears the date of the year 1695. The Elogy of Mr de Vaumoriere is prefixed to it, and contains a very particular account of the good qualities of his mind and soul; but nothing is said either of his country, or fortune, or time of his birth, &c. He was dead when that elogy was made.

[A] He published some Romances which did him honour.] He wrote the great Scipio, and finished the last work of Mr de la Calprenede, I mean the Pharamond. The author being prevented by death had only carried it to the seventh tome: Mr de Vaumoriere continued it to the end. He declared in the preface to the twelfth volume, which is the last, that some had wronged him in saying that he had made use of Mr de la Calprenede's memoirs, who, added he, never made any for himself. The Journal des Savans was at that time pretty sparing in the commendation of authors, and criticised them freely: but, however, it spoke of the first tome of the continuation of Pharamond in advantageous terms. There is reason to hope from what appears of the eighth volume which Mr de Vaumoriere has composed, that the death of him whose footsteps he follows will not be long regretted. He has thoroughly entered into the spirit of that author. He preserves to the heroes and heroines the same sentiments, and the same characters, which he had given them: and in his stile he has assumed that grand and lofty air which was peculiar to him. It may even be said without wounding the memory of that illustrious deceased person, that the discourse of Mr de Vaumoriere is smoother and more correct than his: and that he knows better how to check the sallies of the sublime (1). Mr Gueret does not judge of this first tome of the continuation with the same indulgence: but as for the rest he is liberal of his encomiums on the substitute of la Calprenede. I am not dissatisfied with his labour, he makes Pharamond say: I wish only he had not made an entire volume of the history of Constantine; it languishes a little too much: and were it not for the beauty of his language which keeps up the attention of his reader, it would be tedious. He was well apprised of it himself; for he has corrected that fault in the following tomes: and what I reckon a good omen for all the rest, he still gathers strength as he goes forward, and now treads firm and sure in the steps of his illustrious predecessor (2). When small Romances were in vogue, Mr de Vaumoriere conformed to that taste; he wrote some which might be read

from beginning to end in less than two hours. Such was that which he intituled, *Diane de France*, and which was printed in the year 1674, if I remember right. He wrote also *La Galanterie des Anciens; Adelaïde de Champagne; Agatidis: L'Art de plaire dans la conversation.*

[B] He was sub-director to the Academy of the Abbot d'Aubignac.] You will see it by the list, which the *Mercur Galant* has given of those who composed it (3). You will also find there some circumstances concerning this Academy, and amongst others that it had been broke after the nomination of the Abbot de Villeferain to the bishopric of Sens. Another book informs me that they met at the house of that Abbot. I shall recite the passage, because it is curious. It is Henrietta Silvia de Molere who speaks: ' Every thing I heard seemed to me to be a coach that came to carry me away: and I was in an house where I frequently had such kind of frights; it was the *Hôtel de Hollande*. The Abbot de Villeferain lived over against it, and the assembly of Wits, which afterwards met at his house, was projected at that time. I saw nothing but people of a stern countenance stopping at his gate, and passing along my street, and I took them for so many people sent from the devout ladies (4).'

[C] He was at variance with Fortune.] Those are the words of the Sieur Richelet in the index of one of his books (5). The words he uses in the body of the book at the place to which the index refers, are still more emphatical. Mr Conrart was exceedingly pleased that people said he understood persons of merit, and that he did them good offices like a gentleman. If in this age the favourites of fortune were of that temper, *Cassandra, Vaumoriere*, and many other unhappy wretches would not run pest to beggary (6). I believe he had a grudge against him; for in another book he speaks thus: ' The Continuator of Pharamond who has been in prison these three weeks is just set at liberty (7).'

(1) Journal des Scavans, of the 23d of February, 1685, *pag. 156, 157, Dutch Edit.*

(a) Gueret, *Par-nasse Réformée*, *pag. 174, 175.*

(3) *Merc. Galant*, of the year 1672, *Tom. i, pag. 81, Dutch Edit.*

(4) Vie de Henriette Sylvia de Molere, *Part. i, pag. 99, Dutch Edit. 1674.*

(5) *Intituled, Les plus belles Lettres des meilleurs Auteurs François.*

(6) Richelet, *Lettres, &c. pag. xiv, Dutch Edit. 1694.*

(7) Item, Remarques sur les D'écrites, *pag. 33, at the end of l'Eloge, Geneva edition 1680.*

VIDELIUS

VEDELIUS (NICOLAS) a noted reformed Divine, who lived in the XVIIth century. He was born in the Palatinate, and was professor of Philosophy for twelve years at Geneva, and minister of the church in the same city for ten years (a). He was invited to Deventer in 1630, in order to be Divinity and Hebrew Professor; having accepted the invitation, he commenced Doctor of Divinity at Basil, in his journey from Geneva to Deventer, on the 24th of June the same year (b). He acquitted himself very well of his duty, and discovered a great zeal against the Arminians [A]. He exercised provisionally the function of Professor of Philosophy in 1634 (c). He removed from Deventer, and became Divinity Professor at Franeker, about the year 1638 (d). This was his last station; for he died at Franeker in 1642. He was sorry that death did not permit him to publish the answer, which he had prepared to his adversaries [B], concerning the power of the magistrate in Ecclesiastical affairs [C]. I shall give a catalogue of his works [D]. I have in another place (e) spoken of his quarrel with Barleus.

The Programma, which I have quoted, supposes he was only twelve years professor at Geneva; and yet he himself in the inaugural oration, which he pronounced at Franeker on the 25th of November 1639, says he had been professor at Geneva and Deventer twenty-three years. Therefore as he had been at Deventer only since the year 1630, he must have been at Geneva fourteen years. His son NICOLAS VEDELIUS died minister of the French church at Heusden towards the beginning of the year 1705.

[A] He discovered a great zeal against the Arminians. He published a book in 1631, intitled *De Arcanis Arminianismi*, in which he maintains that explicitly and professedly, they endeavour to introduce a subtle sort of Atheism into the Church; and that though they do not immediately attempt to bring in a gross Atheism, they open a great and wide gate for its admittance. The beginning of one of his chapters runs thus: 'Propoliumus hactenus doctrinam Remonstrantium, qua omnis generis hæreses & sectas in Ecclesiam Dei, adeoque Libertinismum hoc est Atheismum subtilem ex PROFESSO introducere conantur (1). . . . I have hitherto laid open the doctrine of the Remonstrants, whereby they professedly attempt to introduce sects and heresies of all kinds, and consequently Libertinism, that is subtle Atheism, into the church of GOD.' A little after he hath these words: 'Scopus meus non est gravare Remonstrantes accusatione ea, ac si Atheismum crassum introducere data opera seu ex professo molirentur. Nequaquam vero, prout eodem cap. primo monui. Sed tantum offensurus sum, præter alia effecta pestilentissima quæ nova ipsorum Theologia & Religio producit; etiam fenestram & portam aperiri ea Atheismo crasso patentissimam atque amplissimam (2). . . . It is not my design, as I have already said, to load the Remonstrants with this accusation, as if they industriously or professedly attempted to introduce gross Atheism. But I was only to shew, that besides other most pernicious effects which their new Theology or Religion produces, a very large window or gate was thereby opened to gross Atheism.' He adds that he has no other design than to convert the Remonstrants by shewing them the danger which attends their doctrine. *Quæ nimirum unusquisque eo magis ab ea sibi convocat: Et ipsi Theologi Remonstr. lucri sunt, qui etiam noster in hoc labore scopus est (3).* We have seen something like this in Maldonatus's Commentaries (4). The Arminians furiously inveighed against him in a book intitled *Vedelius Rhapfodus*. He replied in the fourth part of his work printed in 1634. The second and third part were published in the year 1633.

[B] He was concerned that death did not permit him to publish the answer which he had prepared to his adversaries. This circumstance you will find in one of Vossius's letters. You will there see also that in case this reply of Vedelius had been printed, they would have left out all the violent and injurious expressions dispersed in that book by way of return to his antagonists. 'Vedelius Theologiæ apud Franekeranos Professor, dum in Frisia sum, satis concessit. Moribundum cruciabat, quod terris eriperetur, priusquam potuisset Revio & Triglandio respondere. Horum uterque acerbe satis scriptis adversus scriptum ejus de Constantini Episcopatu; quo Magistratus jura circa res Ecclesiæ defendit. Collegæ defuncti mihi & Franekeræ aiebant, fortasse responsum sic etiam edendum; sed deletis, quæ ut par pari redderet hostilitatem, virulentius chartis illervisisset adversus Revium (5). . . . Vedelius, Professor of Divinity at Franeker, died whilst I was in Friesland. He was extremely concerned that death prevented him from answering Revius and Triglandius. Both of them wrote very sharply against his treatise of Constantine's Episcopacy; wherein he maintains the power of the civil magistrate in ecclesiastical affairs. The colleagues of the deceased told me at Franeker, that the answer would perhaps be published, but that those virulent things he had said in it against Revius would be left out.'

[C] Concerning the power of the magistrate in Ecclesiastical affairs. Several disputes arose concerning this question in Holland after the synod of Dort; for some Divines endeavoured to withdraw the ecclesiastical authority from the sovereign, and others would confer on the magistrate all ecclesiastical authority. At least thus each party interpreted the other's intention and doctrine. Vedelius engaged in this dispute, and in the beginning of the year 1638, published a *Disputatio Theologica de Magistratu adversus Bellarmini librum de Laicis*, where he extended the magistratus power much farther than others would have it. Some time after knowing that they were preparing to refute him, he published (6) a second edition of his disputation, to which he added several explanations. The whole title of this piece is, *De Episcopatu Constantini magni, seu de potestate Magistratum Reformatorem circa res Ecclesiasticas, dissertatio repetita cum responsione ad interrogata quædam*. He foresaw that he should irritate his adversaries, and draw on himself a great deal of abusive language (7); but for all this he had courage enough to enter the lists. His foresight was just, and it was not necessary to be a great prophet in order to predict an event of that nature. He was attacked in his life-time and after his death. Several Zealant ministers caused him to be refuted, when he was dead, making use of the pen of a minister of Middleburg (8). His friends in Friesland defended him, and treated the Zealant ministers with the utmost contempt. See the book intitled, *Grallæ seu vere puerilis coturnus sapientie, quo se jactat apud imperitos Guillelmus Apollonii, &c* (9). Apollonius answered: they replied by a book whose title is comical enough (10).

[D] A catalogue of his works. I have already mentioned three; the rest are, *Notæ in Epistolas Ignatii*. Those notes are partly critical and partly controversial, and are joined with the epistles of S. Ignatius which he caused to be printed at Geneva in the year 1623 in 4to. *Commentarius de tempore utriusque Episcopatus, S. Petri, Antiocheni & Romani*, at Geneva 1624. *Rationale Theologicum, seu de necessitate & vero usu principiorum rationis ac Philosophiæ in controversiis Theologicis*; at the same place 1628. *A Remedy against Apostasy in French*, printed also there in the same year. *Panacea Apostasie*, at the same place 1628. This is a translation of the former. *S. Hilary, or an antidote against sorrow*, in French, at Geneva 1630. *S. Hilarius, seu Antidotum contra tristitiam pro sancta Hilarietate*, at Leyden 1632, it is a translation of the former. *De prudentia veteris Ecclesiæ*, at Amsterdam 1633. *De Div Synagoga contra Cass. Barleum* at Harderwick 1632. *Opuscula Theologica* at Franeker 1641 in 12mo.

VOL. V.

5 U

VEGIUS

(a) See the Programma mentioned by Revius, in his History of Deventer, pag. 686.

(b) Revius, in Historia Daven-trienſi, ibid.

(c) Id. ibid. pag. 694.

(d) Id. ibid. pag. 713.

(e) In the remark [D], of the article BARLEUS.

(1) Vedelius, de Arcanis Arminianismi, lib. ii, cap. x, pag. m. 243. Edit. 1631, in 8vo, and pag. 86, Edit. 1632, in 4to.

(2) Ibid. pag. 243.

(3) Ibid.

(4) See the article VALLE, remark [A], about the middle.

(5) Vossius, Epist. ecclesiæ, pag. m. 409. col. 2. It is dated the 24th of October 1642. It is among those of the Arminians, pag. 86, of the edition in folio.

(7) Jam prævidere temerarius & superbis ingeniis nihil magis in votis fore, quam ut spiritus salutari- bus pacis & concordie consilia ac monitis in me inveniunt, & virum suum contra me evocant. Nicol. Vedeli, Præf. de Episcopatu Constantini.

(8) Called Galileus Apollonius.

(9) It was printed at Franeker, in the year 1646.

(10) Grallator faciens de novo in scenam productus, cum pantomimo suo bomachide Viliſſimo. At Franeker 1647.

(a) Jovius Elog. cap. ciii, pag. m. 250.

(b) Moreri says he was canon of Lateran.

(c) Taken from Ghilini, Teatro d'huomini Letterati, Part. ii, pag. 188.

(d) See the remark [C].

VEGIUS (MAPHEUS) Born at Lodi in the Milanese in 1407, was a famous Orator, and the greatest Latin Poet that had been seen for several ages (a). He went through his classical learning at Milan, from whence he removed to Pavia to study the Civil Law; but the plague soon obliged him to return to Lodi, where he applied himself entirely to polite learning, and particularly to poetry, and began to write books very early (A). Going to Rome he made himself beloved and esteemed by Pope Martin the Vth, who made him Secretary of the Briefs. He discharged that office so faithfully that he was raised to a more considerable post by the same Pope; which was that of Datary. At the same time he bestowed on him a canonry in the church of St Peter (b). He was so thoroughly contented with these preferments that he refused a rich bishopric. The respect which Eugenius IV, and Nicholas V, had for him, obliged them to continue him in the post of Datary. He was very much esteemed by Panormitanus, and Æneas Sylvius, and shewed a great devotion for St Augustin [B]. His morals were very exemplary. He died at Rome in 1459 (c). Among those authors who mention him, I find scarce any, who do not pass over in silence the finest passage of his life; for they do not tell us any thing of the alteration of his taste. The poetical fictions were at first his greatest delight (d); he thought of nothing but of making of verses, and placing the Pagan divinities in them. Virgil was one of his great gods. David's Psalms seemed to him but old womens songs, and he mortally hated the profession of a priest. But at last he was disgusted at the profane beauties of poetry; the psalms of David appeared to him admirable, and he was touched with an extream pleasure in the sacerdotal functions, and employed himself in the instruction of the nuns [C]. I shall speak of his books [D].

I could

(1) See the notes on the Naudreana, pag. 194, 195.

(2) Dopo esser egli a somma perfezione arrivato in ogni genere di lettere humane andò a Pavia. Ghilini, Teatro, Part. ii, pag. 188.

(3) Diede nell'età di sedici anni appena a scrivere. Id. ibid.

(4) Giesner, in Bibl. fol. 491, speaking of Vegius's treatise, de Educatione Puerorum, printed at Basil with other such small books in the year 1541.

[A] He began to write books very early. At the age of sixteen, if we believe Ghilini; and we must believe him (1) though his authority in this case ought to be of little weight; for it is certain that he is tainted with the Enthusiasm of a Panegyrist, and that he has not well adjusted the parts of his narrative. Doth he write judiciously when he relates, 1. That Vegius being arrived at the highest perfection in all sorts of human literature, went to Pavia in order to study the Civil and Canon Law (2)? 2. That having scarce began to study there, he was obliged to leave the town on account of the Plague? 3. That he returned into his own country, where he applied himself again to the study of polite learning, and to writing, being scarce yet sixteen years old (3)? Doth not this relation imply that Vegius understood perfectly all the parts of literature before he was sixteen? This hyperbole is absurd. He died before he nearly approached that perfection; how then was he arrived at it in his younger years?

[B] He shewed a great devotion for St Augustin. He built a chapel in the church dedicated to that Saint at Rome on the right hand of the great altar, and having caused the bones of St Augustin to be put into a very fine shrine with those of his mother Monica, he removed them from Ostia to this chapel. He wrote Poems in honour of those two saints, which he also very much praised in the preface of his book, de educatione puerorum & claris eorum moribus. In that work he confirms his precepts concerning the education of children by as many proper instances as he could possibly find in the life of St Augustin and his mother Monica. In præfatione postquam D. Augustini & matris ipsius Monice laudes pluribus prædicavit, subiungit: Enitemur ostendere omnem bene educandorum filiorum rationem, & convenientissimis subinde etiam sanctissimisque tam parentis Monice quam filii Augustini exemplis, singula quibus idonee ea applicari poterint confirmare studebimus (4). In the preface, after he had much commended St Augustin and his mother Monica, he adds, We will endeavour to shew the whole method of educating children well, and confirm every thing by applying most suitable and holy examples in the life of Monica and her son Augustin.

[C] But at last he was disgusted at the profane beauties of Poetry; the psalms of David appeared to him admirable, &c. Such excellent conversions, such holy metamorphoses, are so rare that they should not have been forgotten by those who mention this writer. Most Poets retain till death their passion for the beauties of profane Poetry. Vegius is an exception to this general rule, his confession runs thus. Priora recolens tempora, scilicet he, quibus inhiabam quotidie condendis carminibus, nihil præter Musas & Poetarum lusus pulchrum ducens, mirari non satis possum, adeo IMMUTARI affectus meos, adeo vim animo

meo [ut ita dixerim] fieri potuisse, ut à dulcibus prurientibusque fabulis, ad studia severiora conversus sim, & qui decantandis ingentibus rerum gestis, confictisque tot incertorum Deorum numinibus, ardentius instabam, nunc ad exhortandas sorores, ad docendas virgunculas descenderim, ut pro Ovidiis & Flaccis, nunc Augustinos & Hieronymos, pro Virgilio, quem alterum in terris Deum esse arbitrabar, nunc David fideliores Vatem colam, suscipiam amplectarque, & ejus mihi carmina, quæ tanquam animalia deliramenta tordebant, nunc mira adpurgant animum suavitatem, atque unde magis etiam oblitiscam] quod tantopere detestabar exhorrebamque instar mortis, nunc sacerdotio dulcius nihil putem (5). When I reflect on former times, when I was constantly intent on making verses, and took no delight but in the Musæ and poetical fictions, I am amazed to find such an alteration in my temper, and my mind so forcibly turned [if I may say so] from sweet and agreeable amusements to grave and severe studies; and that I, who used to be so earnest in celebrating the glorious exploits, and fabulous excellencies of so many unknown gods, should now descend to instruct sisters and teach nuns; that instead of an Ovid and Horace, I should now admire an Augustin and Jerom, and instead of a Virgil whom I looked on as another god upon earth, I should now adore and care for a David, a more faithful Poet; and that his psalms, which formerly seemed to me like old womens tales, should now affect my mind with wonderful pleasure; and [what surprises me most of all] that I should esteem nothing so delightful as the priesthood, which before I detested and abhorred like death.

[D] I shall speak of his books. Some of them are in prose, others in verse, some are printed, others not. The Poem for which he is most famous is his supplement to the Æneid; he imagined that Virgil had not concluded that work. He resolved therefore to add a thirteenth book which is usually printed with the twelfth of that Roman Poet. His performance hath been censured (6). His dialogue de Felicitate & Miseria for some time passed for a piece of Lucian (7). It was printed with the book de Educatione Puerorum, the Philalethes, and the Disceptatio inter terram, solem, & aurum. All these tracts are in prose. Ghilini falsely believes that the seven books de Perseverantia Religionis ad Sorores, were never printed. They were printed at Paris in the year 1511 (8) with some of those pieces whose titles I have mentioned. They were inserted in the great Bibliotheca Patrum. His Poem on the frauds of the peasants must needs be very curious. You will find in Ghilini the titles of a great many pieces of this author, which were never printed. Paul Jovius hath not forgot to praise him on account of some monuments of the application of his pen to sacred subjects, which he left behind him. Ne quid ad cumulatum eruditionem vero Christiano deest, quædam

254

(5) Vegius & Perseverantia Religionis, in Tom. xxvi, Bibl. Mus. in Lib. 689, 494

(6) See Mr. Boddie's note, in the 1212, Tom. iv, pag. 13, 14. Edit. 1755, 12

(7) See the catalogue of the Bodleian Library, pag. 224

(9) Jovius, Elog.
cap. cvii, pag.
n. 350.

perfect the learning of a true Christian, he left some
pious annotations on the holy scriptures, and a very va-
luable book on the memorable antiquities of St Peter's
church, wherein he gives an account of the offerings
and sepulchres of the Popes.

(1) From his receiving a yearly pension from the public.

(2) They are very well explained in Furetiere's Dictionary corrected by Mr de Beauval.

(3) This appears from Raderus, who dedicated his *Martial Nobilissimis & amplissimis VVV. Dominis Velleris, MARCO Duum viro, Urbis Praefecto, MATTHEO Aedili, PAULO Consuli Matthaei FFF. Antonii NNN. Patricii Augustini, B. R. nat.*

(4) Sepultus in agro Sedunensi ubi arcem Valerianam cum suis longe possedit. *Arnoldus, in Dissertatione de Marci Velferi vita, genere, & morte, pag. 6.*

(5) They have been called Valli-fii, or Walliseri, & Velferi, Ibid. pag. 5.

(6) Ibid.

[B] *He was of a very antient family.*] Some will have it to be defended from Beliaricus, the famous General of the Emperor Justinian. It is said that FRANCIS BELIARIUS about the year 564, married Antonia, Pompey's daughter, and cousin to the fiftier of the Emperor Anastasius I. He left two sons, PETER, and CHARLES, the first of whom married Mary Colonna, and died without issue at Milan; the other, in order to live secure from the incursions of the Barbarians, retired into the country of Vallais, and had a castle in the territory of Sion (4), which he left to his descendants (5). Such is the genealogy of a citizen of Augsburg! But what is very surprizing is, that we are told that authentic proofs to make good all this, are ready to be produced. For, say they, JOHN BARTHOLOMEW VELSERUS, Counsellor to the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria, and Canon of Strasburgh, wrote a letter to that Emperor in 1336, when the Diet was assembled at Spire, to supplicate him earnestly, to affix his signet by way of approbation to the German translation of a book, which Cardinal Stephen Colonna the Pope's Vicar had written concerning the genealogy of the Velferi. This Emperor had himself ordered the writing of this book; and the author therein produced an exact series of proofs founded on publick acts and deeds, from 545, to JOHN VELSERUS the brother of John Bartholomew. *Pro vetustissima familie Jue gloria ac dignitate non rogans Joham, verum etiam obsecrans, ut Germanicam libelli versumque sigillo annali suis confirmaret, quem auctoritate ac iussu ipsius Imperatoris Stephanus Colonna, Summi Pontificis tunc Vicarius & Cardinalis, ex omnibus instrumentis, tabulis, literisque publicis ab a. c. 545, usque ad Johannem Vellermum, Job. Bartholomei fratrem germanum, omni cura & diligentia complexus est* (6). This book had been translated into Latin at Rome in 1327, by the same John Bartholomew. We are told that EMMANUEL VELSERUS Canon of Basil in 1671, writing to his brother OCTAVIAN, mentioned CHARLES BELIARIUS, with whom by his wife Paula de gli Ursini retired from Rome into Vallais in 620. 'Agitata inibi mentione de Caroli Beliarici. cui una cum conjuge Paula Ursina

'Vallefiam verius ad Rheni fontes A. C. 620 ex urbe
 Roma ob seſſivissimos & violentissimos in omnem no-
 bilitatem Longobardos, exemplo aliorum egressus
 est (7). - - - *Charles Belſarius is mentioned in it,* (7) *Ibid. pag. 80.*
who after the example of others retired from Rome
with his wife Paula de gli Urfini to the country of
Vallais near the head of the Rhine in the year 620,
because the Longobards were most violent and cruel to
all the nobility.' This OCTAVIAN VELSERUS
 already mentioned was the first of the family, that
 has been Patrician of Augſburg. He was also Captain
 in that city, Director of the military affairs, and be-
 sides Counsellor to Conrad Duke of Franconia. He
 died in 1074 (8). JAMES VELSERUS was the
 first of the family who settled at Nuremberg, whither
 he came in 1493. He married and died there in
 1544, being the father of six sons and eleven daugh-
 ters. The alliances of the Velsers have been very il-
 lustrious, in Switzerland, and several provinces of the
 empire : but the greatest honour which they received
 on this account was doubtless the marriage of PHILIP-
 PINA VELSERUS with Ferdinand Archduke of Aus-
 tria, son of the Emperor Ferdinand I, and brother
 to the Emperor Maximilian II. That Prince
 fell desperately in love with Philippina in the time of
 the Diet at Augſburg in 1548, and married her pri-
 vately (9). She lived with him as his lawful wife
 till his death, above twenty-four years (10). She was
 a very handsome woman, and endowed besides with
 a rich store of good qualities. She was daughter to
 FRANCIS VELSERUS, Baron of Zinnenberg; and
 sister to CHARLES VELSERUS, Governor of the
 marquisate of Burgaw (11). She died at Inſpruck on
 the 24th of April 1580, and left two sons, whom
 their father Ferdinand could never entitle to succeed
 him. He was obliged to content himself with the
 marquisate of Burgaw for the elder; and the younger
 being an Ecclesiastic, became a Cardinal (12). Arn-
 oldus cites an author (13) who affirms that Andrew,
 the eldest son of Ferdinand and of Philippina Velsers,
 was a Cardinal, and that Charles his younger brother
 Marquis of Burgaw, married Sybilla sister to John-
 William Duke of Cleves. These two brothers died
 without issue. It is said that Charlemagne gave three
 flowers-de-luce for arms to PHILIP VALISERUS,
 who behaved himself very bravely in the war of Lom-
 bardy. They add (14) that he was honoured with
 several other prerogatives, and that Otho the Great
 confirmed all those privileges in favour of JULIUS
 VELSERUS grandson of Philip Valisfers, whom he
 made his counsellor in the council of war in 950,
 and a knight in 971 (15). Charles V ranked
 this family amongst the immediate noblemen, whose
 causes are cognizable before the Emperor only (16).
 The Archduke Ferdinand made CHARLES VEL-
 SERUS, Philippina's brother, a free baron (17).

Observe that Julius Velferus saved the Emperor Ortho's life in a battle against the Huns, and that he died of a continual fever in the camp at the age of 96, in the Emperor Henry the IIId's Time (18). The author whom I cite speaks of several Velferus's, who signalized either their valour in the army, or their prudence in the magistracy.

[C] and *whicb had possessed vast riches*.] Melchior Adam relates that Francis I, being by a treaty of peace obliged to pay twelve tons of gold to Charles V, the Fuggers and Velfers promised to advance that great sum of money (19). Martin Crusius saith that in the year 1528, BARTHOLOMEW VELSER and his partners armed several ships in Spain, and sent them into America, where they discovered a very rich country, on the frontiers of Peru, called Venezevela.

[C] . . . and *wubib* had possessed vast riches.] Melchior Adam relates that Francis I, being by a treaty of peace obliged to pay twelve tons of gold to Charles V, the Fuggers and Velsers promised to advance that great sum of money (19). Martin Cruisus faith that in the year 1528, BARTHOLOMEW VELSER and his partners armed several ships in Spain, and sent them into America, where they discovered a very rich country, on the frontiers of Peru, called Venezuela.

(a) Bonciarius, lib. ix, Epist. xii, apud Arnoldum, de Marci Velsi vita, genere, & obitu, p. 42.

and being a lover of the *Belles Lettres*, he was, when very young, sent to Rome to study under Antony Muretus (a). He was there in the year 1575. With the study of Antiquities he intermixed that of the Italian tongue, in which he became so great a proficient, that he wrote that language like a Florentine [D]. Returning home he applied himself to the Bar in the year 1589. He obtained the senatorial dignity in 1592. He was preferred to the little council in the year 1594, and elected Prætor in 1600. He discharged all these offices with a great deal of honour, and was an ornament to his country. He was both a lover and a protector of learning and learned men. He published several good books [E], and afforded helps to several authors

nezuela, of which they made themselves masters, and kept it twenty-eight years, according to the treaty which they concluded with Charles V. But a difference arose betwixt the farmers of Elizabeth King Philip's Queen, and George of Spire, who governed that country in the name of the Velsers. At first they disputed only about tolls, and then about the limits, and at last it was pretended that those Germans ought not to possess any part of Venezuela. The cause was pleaded in Spain, and they were dispossessed of all they held in Venezuela, by virtue of the sentence pronounced in Spain in the year 1555. The first Governor whom the Velsers established there was Ambrose Dalsinger, born at Ulm, whom the Spaniards killed; but Charles V caused the authors of this murder to be punished (20). Arnoldus is very angry because Jerom Benzo calls the Velsers (to whom the Emperor engaged the country of Valentia) (21) merchants. 'Vano istius judicio & Reges & Principes magnarii negotiatores erunt, & delicatior mercium infitores. Hercules tuam fidem! . . . In his foolish judgment forsooth! Kings and princes are great merchants, and dealers in choice commodities.' Thus Arnoldus exclaims against the word Merchant. He abridges what Herrera hath said concerning the exploits of those Governors, whom the Velsers sent to that country.

(20) Crusius, Part. iii, Annal. Suevicor. lib. xi, cap. iii, iv, apud Arnoldum, ubi supra, pag. 24.

(21) Valentia ditissima provincie oppidum, quam Cæsar anno 1528 Velzaris mercatoribus Germanis oppignoravit. Benzo, lib. i, Historie novi Orbis, cap. xxv, apud Arnoldum, ibid. pag. 25.

(22) Ubi supra, pag. 43, 44.

(23) Nella Risposta all' Antic. del Beni, cart. 16.

(24) It should be Guarini, and it is probably an error of the press.

(25) Rispost. cart. 112, 113.

(26) Concerning the vicissitude of human affairs.

'che se fossero scritte del piu purgato stile Latine, e parci nel legger lettere di locuzione tanto propria che Firenze estenda i suoi confini, anzi il recinto delle sue mura, fino in Augusta (27). . . . But besides I had another particular interest in view, viz. That I might not be deprived of your answers in the Italian tongue, which my friends and I read with much more pleasure and admiration, than if they had been writ in the purest Latin stile; and in reading letters of such propriety and elegance, it seemed to us that Florence extended its confines, nay the very circuit of its walls as far as Augsburg.'

[E] He published several good books. His first work, according to Melchior Adam, was that which he published at Venice in the year 1594. The bare title discovers the uncommon learning of the author; it runs thus. 'Rerum Augustanarum Vindelicarum libri octo, quibus à prima Rhætorum ac Vindelicarum origine ad annum usque 552. à nato Christo nobilissimæ gentis historia & antiquitates traduntur, ac antiqua monumenta tam quæ Augustæ, quam quæ in agro Augustano, quin & quæ alibi extant ad res Augustanas spectantia, æri incisa & notis illustrata exhibentur. . . . Eight books of the affairs of Augsburg, containing the history and antiquities of that noble country from the first original of the Rheti and Vindelicii, to the year of Christ 552, with cuts of the ancient monuments in the city and country of Augsburg or elsewhere, relating to the affairs of Augsburg, illustrated with notes.' Melchior Adam had reason

to call this a happy prelude (28). Velsers conferred the first fruits of his labours to the glory of his country. 'In Italian progressus edidit antiquitates Augustanas, felix famæ surgentis auspiciis & piis. . . . Going into Italy he published the Antiquities of Augsburg, which was an happy and pious omen of his rising fame.' In the year 1602, he published at Augsburg, *Rerum Boicarum libri quinque, historiam à gentis origine ad Carolum Magnum complexi* (29).

He afterwards published at several times the lives of some Martyrs of Augsburg, that of St Uldaric, Bishop of that city, and of St Severinus and Apollonius of Tyre. As for the antient Itinerary, which Peutinger possessed, whence it was called *Tabula Peutingeriana*, he published it at Venice in the year 1591 (30). Most of those pieces are illustrated with Velsers's commentaries. All the works of this author have been collected into a body, and reprinted in folio at Nuremberg in 1682. Christopher Arnoldus, Professor at Nuremberg, had the care of this edition, and adorned it with preliminary discourses, in which he informs us of a great many particulars, concerning the family of the Velsers in general, and the life of Mark Velsers in particular; together with the judgment which the learned have passed on his works, and the funeral eulogies with which they honoured him. And as he kept a great correspondence with the learned of Italy, and of several other countries, the editor hath collected several of his Latin and Italian letters which he hath added to this edition.

Velsers passed for the author of the *Squittinio della Liberta Veneta*, which was printed about the year 1612. Gassendus having observed that several authors ascribed that book to Mr de Peirese, adds that they were mistaken, and that it is very probable Velsers composed it. He grounds this conjecture on Velsers's great learning and singular affection to the house of Austria: 'Non disquiro quidem an auctor hujusce libri fuerit Antonius Albizius, nobilis ille Florentinus, qui Christianorum Principum Stemmata ediderat ante duos annos, ut nonnullis persuasum est; an, ut videtur verifimilius, insignis ille Marcus Velsers, cujus sæpius meminimus, ob consummatam eruditionem, propensionemque singularem erga domum Austriacam (31). . . . I shall not examine whether

(27) Letters torn, cart. 109, 104, apud Arnoldum, p. 44.

(28) It ought to be remembered that Velsers had published a little book in 1591, see, below, citation (30).

(29) In the *Vita* of Justicandell. pag. 420.

(30) He says to himself in his xxvth letter, ad Itale, pag. 379.

OPINIONS concerning the author of the *Squittinio della Liberta Veneta*.

(31) Gassendus in *Vita Peirese*, lib. iii, ad ann. 1612. pag. 279.

authors [F]; and no man ever had more friends than he in the republic of letters. He would never suffer himself to be drawn [G]; but his picture was taken unknown to

- (32) In *Præfat.*
'whether the author of this book was Antony Albinus, that noble Florentine, who published above two years ago the genealogies of Christian princes, as some believe; or, which is more likely, whether it was the illustrious Marcus Velsus, whom we have often mentioned on account of his consummate learning, and singular attachment to the house of Austria.' Mr Arnoldus (32) declares that he knows nothing of this affair, and blames their temerity who pronounce so decisively concerning a fact so uncertain as this is. He cites Ernſtius (33), Rhodius (34), Scavenius (35), Placcius (36), who affirm that Velsus was the author of this book. He owns that Octavius Ferrarius wrote to him that Scioppius had frequently assured him, that Velsus was the author of the *Squittinio*. 'M. Velsus scripta eo plausu à studiosis excipitur, quem ingens viri fama & celebre nomen meretur. Nolle tamen illis inferi Venetæ Reip. Scrutinium, cuius illum auctorem fuisse scire mihi Scioppius firmavit (37). - - - The writings of Velsus will be received by the learned with that applause, which his great fame and reputation deserve. But yet I would not insert amongst them the *Squittinio della Liberta Veneta*, of which Scioppius has often assured me he was the author.' The authority of Scioppius in this case seems to me to be of great weight, for besides that he was generally very well acquainted with all things of this nature, he enjoyed a large share of Velsus's friendship, and kept a very strict epistolary correspondence with him (38). Mr Arnoldus was not ignorant that the author of the book, intitled, *The Conspiracy of the Spaniards against the Republic of Venice*, attributes the *Squittinio* to the Marquis of Bedemar; but he hath not rightly chosen the passage of that piece, which most clearly ascribes the *Squittinio* to the Marquis. His proof is grounded upon these words: *The other point was, that in all affairs which he was to negotiate concerning the right and prerogatives of the Republic, he should make use of the Memoirs of the Squittinio della Liberta Veneta, to which the Marquis of Bedemar refers in several places of this instruction, and that in terms which the somewhat modest, yet discover plainly enough his paternal love for this Libel.* The Abbot de St Real, author of the *Relation of this Conspiracy*, saith this in the last page but one; and in the thirty-fifth, thirty-sixth, and thirty-seventh, he had related the history of the *Squittinio*, and how the Marquis of Bedemar had conceived and executed the design of this work. From whence, and not from the last page save one, Mr Arnoldus ought to have drawn his necessary proofs. But this is a very little fault compared with that which I am going to observe. He pretends that the relator of that conspiracy is very much mistaken, when he supposes that the Marquis of Bedemar, in his instruction to the ambassador, who was to succeed him, very much recommended the reading of the *Squittinio*. This is false, saith Mr Arnoldus, for the Marquis decried this piece, as a work abounding with falsehoods. The entire passage of the Professor of Nuremberg runs thus: 'Verum quam falsus etiam hic auctor fuerit ex instructione secreta ab Alfonso della Cueva Hispanico apud Venetos legato successoris suo Lud. Bravo data, cuius uni ad oculum statim apparuit, prout Laur. Bank eandem cum Scrutinio evulgavit (39). E porche in tempo mio fu divulgato un libretto intitolato Squittinio della Liberta de Veneziani, oretta veramente degna d'esser letta. Deinde omnem isti derogat fidem, ob multas fallacias veritati inimicas quæ inibi occurrunt, ac vivos magistros mortuis longe præferendos censet. Questo ancora vorrei che si trovasse appresso di lei, scoprendosi per la lettura di quello molte fallacie introdotte da gli historici moderni, che trascurando la pura verità contenuta nelle Chroniche antiche, hanno dato ad intendere à posteri tutto quello che gli è parso à proposito per stabilire la loro liberta. Ne minor profetto sarà che Vostra Eccellenza potrà trarne da libri vivi, che s'hara cavato da Volumi morti: voglio dire che l'informazione à bocca di persone pratiche solite à frequentar la casa nostra, &c. Sed quid pluribus verbis opus est? Mentis acies se ipsam intuens nonnunquam hebetescit. - - - But it is obvious to every one, how much this author was mistaken, about the secret instru-

(33) See the remark [G], of the article BONGARS.

THE Abbot de St Real, unjustly censured.

(39) Bizar. Polit. num. 14, 15, pag. 85, & seq.

tion given by Alphonso della Cueva, the Spanish ambassador at Venice, to his successor Lewis Bravo, as Laur. Bank has published it with the *Squittinio*. And because in my time a small book was published, intitled, *Squittinio della liberta de Veneziani*, a piece truly worthy to be read. Afterwards he entirely decries the credit of it, because of the many falsehoods that occur in it, and thinks that living instructors are much preferable to dead ones. I wish your Excellency had this by you, for by reading it you will discover many impostures introduced by modern Historians; who, neglecting the naked truth contained in ancient chronicles, have represented to posterity whatever seemed to them proper to establish their liberty. It will be no less advantageous, if your Excellency can draw from living books, what you have drawn from dead volumes: I mean that an information by word of mouth from skillful persons who used to frequent our house, &c. But what occasion is there for many words? The edge of the mind turning on it's self is sometimes blunted.'

The reflexion contained in these last words, seems to be made only to be turned against it's author; for it is plain that Mr Arnoldus is dazzled with too bright a light. The passage, which he cites out of the instruction, clearly shews that the *Squittinio* ought to be consulted by the ambassador, because by reading it he might be informed of several impostures of several modern Historians. Therefore far from saying that it is filled with lies, Bedemar recommends it as a corrective of the fallacies of others. What is most blameable in the Abbot de St Real, is, perhaps, that he too warmly engages in the affirmative, in ascribing the *Squittinio* to Alphonso de la Cueva. This hath occasioned others to declare too decisively on this head (40). He had, indeed, better have suspended his judgment: and we have here an instance which proves that some books which make a great noise, are falsely ascribed to various persons, without ever discovering the true author (41). A French Historian, who wrote, when the *Squittinio* appeared, makes no scruple to ascribe it to our Velsus, whose name he spells very ill. The second, saith he (42), is a treatise composed by one Valsus, concerning the liberty of Venice.

[F] And afforded helps to several authors.] No body contributed more than he to the large collection of inscriptions, which Gruterus published. See the elogy of Velsus in Gruterus's preface. Melchior Adam gives (43) us a long list of several ancient books, the publication of which was procured by Velsus. Mr Arnoldus enlarges (44) on the detail of the services, which this learned man did to several authors, and doth not forget the two manuscripts of Anastasius, which he sent to the Jesuits of Mentz, after having borrowed them out of the Palatine Library, by the interest of Marquard Freherus. The story of Pope Joan was in those manuscripts. Nor doth he forget to observe that Velsus was security for one thousand Florins, in order to procure for Conrad Ritterhusius a manuscript of the Epistles of Isidorus Pelusiota out of the Duke of Bavaria's library, which could not be obtained but under such security (45). But the generosity of this action would not sufficiently appear, if we did not know that Velsus paid that sum without pretending any obligation from Ritterhusius, for he did not so much as give him notice of it.

[G] He would never suffer himself to be drawn.] We are informed of this in Peiresius's life. There was a great and amicable Epistolary Commerce betwixt these two learned men: but Peiresius could never obtain this friend's picture. He was obliged to have recourse to a stratagem, which he practised more than once: he payed a Painter to watch an opportunity of placing himself in a convenient place, where, unseen, he could easily have a full view of Velsus. 'Hoc uno ipse durus fuit (Velsus) quod sui effigiem constantissime denegavit, pro eo quod omnibus aliis ardentissime flagrantibus denegaverat intuitu. Et Peiresius tamen ut alios nonnullos, sic illum nescientem pingi procuravit, conducto artifice qui ipsius vultum è clandestino loco spectaret. Sic obtinuit quod illi Occo sperare nefas prædixerat, cum id abs Velsus tulisset responsum, Cato major posteros volebat querere cur sibi statua nulla posita: 'hi,

(40) See the Nouv. de la République des Lettres, for May, 1684, 1^{re} 316, of the 2^{de} edition.

(41) See the Catalogue chimérique, pag. 214, of the second edition.

(42) Le Grain, Decade de Louis XIII, livr. x, pag. 449. The author of the Vitez François, printed in the year 1643, says pag. 318, that Valsus published his treatise of the Liberty of Venice.

(43) In Vitis Jurisconsult. pag. 482.

(44) De vita . . . Marci Velsus, pag. 58, & seq.

(45) Georg. Ritterhusius, in Vita Coaradi patris, Salviano præmissa, apud Arnold. pag. 59.

VOL. V. No. CXXXI.

§ X

VELSERUS. VELSIUS.

450

(b) See *Sebastus*, in the Epistle Dedicatory to *Photius*, and the remark [A], in the margin.

(c) *Eximitor rebus humanis...* memoria nominis sui relicta immortalis, perturbationis nonnullis suis facultatibus. *Melchior Adam*, in *Vitis Juris*, confult. pag. 481.

(d) Arnold. de *Velferi vita*, &c. pag. 54.

to him. He died on the 13th of June 1614, and left no children by his marriage. He had several brothers, distinguished as well by their great merit as by their considerable posts (b). See his life prefixed to the new edition of his works, for which we are beholden to the care of Christopher Arnoldus Professor at Nuremberg. An author observes that Velsus left his domestic affairs in an ill posture (c), at which I am not at all surpris'd. When a man consecrates himself as he did to the service of the learned, and a general correspondence with authors, it is extremely difficult for him to avoid expences, and neglecting his private affairs. One Roserius censured him, to whom he did not vouchsafe the honour of an answer. Scaliger and others advis'd him thus to despise his adversary. Cluverius, who censured him in some particulars, deserv'd an answer; but Velsus had been dead a year before Cluverius's book came out (d). Pignori wrote a very good epitaph on him, which is to be seen in the church of the Jacobins at Augsburg, and in John Tonjola's (e) appendix to the *Basilea sepulchra retecta continuata* (f).

(g) Minister of the Italian church of Basil.

(f) Printed at Basil in the year 1661. That work was begun by John Grefius, and carried as far as the year 1619.

(46) *Gassendus*, in *Vita Peirefci*, lib. i, ad ann. 1602, pag. m. 254.

hi contra, quantum video cavendum ne quis aliquando miretur, si non & indignetur, qua ambitione confortio magnorum virorum, quorum imagines se colligere Fabricius ostendit, irreperim (46). . . . This was the only thing in which Velsus was not content; he was so much attached to let him have his picture, as he had constantly denied it to all other persons who earnestly begged it of him. However, Peirefcius found means to have him drawn without his knowledge, as he had some others, by hiring a Painter for that purpose, who, without being seen, had a full view of his face. And thus he obtained what Occo had told him it was in vain to hope for, when he received this answer from Velsus: Cato, the elder, would have posterity to enquire, why a statue had not been erected for him; but I, on the other hand, as far as I can see, must take care that none hereafter may wonder, or perhaps resent, that I should ambitiously intrude myself into the company of great men, of whose pictures Peirefcius designs to make a collection. This

shews that Velsus was not more complainant to others than to Mr de Peirefci, and that he very modestly excus'd himself to him. I cannot tell whether the picture of Velsus in the library of Milan, was copied from that drawn for Mr de Peirefci; or whether it was taken by the same stratagem that Mr de Peirefci used: But I know that the picture of this illustrious German was placed in that library. Bosca informs us of this, when he mentions the interview of Olgiati and Velsus. Et quidem nos cum pictam tabulam quae expressam ipsius imaginem refert, in Ambrosiano Museo speculamus, gravitatem eam ex oculis conjicimus, & ex oris ipsius majestate vim literaturae ac consilii in administranda Vindelicorum provincia deprehendimus (47). . . . And indeed when we behold his picture, which is perfectly like him, in the Ambrosian library, we may see gravity in his looks, and discover, by the majesty of his countenance, his great learning and wisdom in governing the province of Augsburg.

(47) Petrus Paulus Bosca, Bibliothecarius ex Sodalitio Sacerdotum oblatorum, de origine & statu Biblioth. Ambrosianae, pag. 21, apud Arnold. pag. 44.

VELSIUS (JUSTUS) in Dutch *Welsens* was born at the Hague. He received the degree of Doctor of Physic at Louvain in the year 1542, and sometimes gave public lectures in the room of Peter Nannius his good friend, and professor in the college of the three languages. He was suspected of Lutheranism, and fled from Louvain to avoid the Inquisition, and retired to Strasburgh. He wrote a book intituled *Κρίσις, five vera Christianae Philosophiae comprobatoris atque amulsi & sophistae per comparisonem Descriptio*, which was condemned by the divines of Louvain in the year 1554. Being come to Cologne, and having declared that he had left Strasburgh on account of religion, he was honoured with a professorship in Philosophy, and in Philology (a). The chief of his works is a commentary on the picture of Cebes. He was a man of learning but very inconstant in point of religion [A]. He was successful in the practice of Physic, and excelled in Botanic (b). He is very much praised by Nigidius in some Latin verses, which Paul Frecherus has cited (c), and which shew that he staid but a little time at Marburg, where

(a) Extracted from Valerius Andreas, Bibl. Belg. pag. 605, 606.

(b) Merckl. in *Lindensio renovato*, pag. 727.

(c) Fröh. in *Theatro*, pag. 1247.

[A] He was a man . . . very inconstant in point of religion.] The fear of the Inquisition made him leave Louvain, where he found he was suspected of Lutheranism, and obliged him to go to Strasburgh, the asylum of Protestants (1). Nevertheless he wrote a book there which was not favourable to them, and the title runs thus: *Justi Velfii Hagani in Cebetis Thebani Tabulam Commentariorum Libri sex totius moralis Philosophiae Theaurus*. In quibus nonnulla per occasionem tum de Studiorum, Artium, & Scientiarum abusu & corruptela: tum contra ea quae nostra hac aetate in Religione exorta sunt falsa & absurda dogmata, ad Catholicam & orthodoxam veritatis propugnationem & defensionem differuntur. . . . Six books of commentaries on the picture of Cebes the Theban, being a treasure of all moral Philosophy. In which some things are treated occasionally, both concerning the abuse and corruption of studies, arts, and sciences: and against those false and absurd doctrines in religion, which have been broached in our time, in defence of the Catholic and Orthodox truth, by Justus Velfius of the Hague. This work was printed at Lyons in the year 1551, in 4to: the Epistle Dedicatory to Antony Perrenot, Bishop of Arras, is dated at

(1) *Deflexit ad Argentinenfes ubi asylum haeretici habebant. Velfius, Bibl. Belgic.*, pag. 605.

Strasburgh on the first day of the year 1550, and shews that the author very much condemned the new sects. However, what he advanced to attack the Protestants on the doctrine of Justification, did not please the Spanish inquisitors: for they gave notice, in their Index, to read it with caution (2). They put Justus Velsius in the first class of the authors *damnatae memoriae*, the authors condemned. They desire this censure may be applied to all the works of Velsius, which they permit to be read, and they absolutely and forever condemn his *Epistola ad Imperatorem & Electores*, & *ad Judices terrae*, &c. and his *Crisis Christianae Philosophiae*. Hospinian observes (3), that in the year 1556, Calvin being gone to Francfort for some important reasons, publicly disputed with Justus Velsius on Free will. The divisions of the church of Francfort were the cause of Calvin's journey, as we learn by his letters (4), and by his life (5). It is not to be doubted but that Velsius then lived in the communion of Protestants, but with some peculiar opinions of his own. This is the more probable, as we know he wrote a confession of faith, which was printed, and which is looked upon as a proof of the divisions that reigned among the sects separated from Popery (6).

(2) Index Librorum prohib. pag. 677. (3) *Hospius*, Hist. Sacrum. Tom. ii, p. 422. (4) Calvin, *Epist. occid.*, &c. (5) *Beza*, in *Vita Calvini*, ad ann. 1556. (6) *See Broussier*, in *Defensione Cathol. Trinitatis*, pag. 51, 52.

VERDIER

VERDIER (N. Du) Historiographer of France, author of several books [A], which as they are not excellent, are not inferior to several which have supplied their authors with bread. Notwithstanding he had the misfortune not to be able to subsist on the fruits of his pen, tho' very fertile: as I am informed by a very long parenthesis of John Baptiste de Roccolles [B], Historiographer of France, and of Brandenburg, which I have inserted in a remark. We may learn from it at what time Du Verdier lived.

[A] Author of several books.] Besides others, he had published abridgments of the History of England, France, Spain, and of the Turks, &c. The abridgment of the History of France was printed at Paris for the third time, in the year 1655, in two volumes in 12mo.

[B] As I am informed by a very long parenthesis of John Baptiste de Roccolles.] The author whom I cite having related the death of Basila Geduc Acomat, according to the narrative of the Turkish Pandects, extracted from the Italian of the Secretary of Sigismund Malatesta Prince of Rimini, adds, immediately after:

'But poor du Verdier, who wrote in a concise but elegant stile, an abridgment of the History of the Turks, relates it after several others. (I call this celebrated writer poor, because whilst I write this, he and his poor wife are in the hospital of the Salt-Peter-House at Paris, where they have been for seven or eight years past, where I have visited him, and found true what fame had long since divulged concerning his great probity: this made me deplore the fate of several learned men in this flourishing age, in which virtue and merit ought to be more valued.) This author saith, &c (1).

(1) Roccolles, Vie du Sultan Gemes, printed at Leyden in 1683, pag. 132, 133.

VERGERIUS (PETER-PAUL) One of the learned men of the XVth century, was born at Capo d'Istria (a) on the gulph of Venice. He was a good Philosopher, and so happily intermixed polite learning with the Law, that he was esteemed the most eloquent Civilian of his time (b). He learned Greek under Emanuel Chrysolaras at Venice (c), and the Canon Law under Francis de Zabarellis at Florence (d). He was very much respected by Prince Carrari Lord of Padua, who chose him preceptor to his children (e). He was not less considered by the Emperor Sigismund, at whose court in Hungary he died (f), and whom he accompanied to the council of Constance, if I am not mistaken [A]. He wrote several books [B].

(c) Leand. Albert. Descript. Ital. pag. m. 777.

(f) Volaterr. lib. iv, pag. 133.

(b) Jurisconsultorum suo tempore eloquentissimus, five maxia dicere eloquentium Jurisconsultissimus, simul & philosophus fuit. Volaterr. lib. xxi, pag. m. 773. (c) Paul. Jovius, Elog. cap. cxi, pag. m. 254. (d) Panisrolus, de claris Legum Interpret. lib. iii, cap. xxviii, pag. m. 444.

(1) Andrea Divus, Prefat. in Iliada Homeri a se versam.

(2) Gesner. in Biblioth. fol. 551, vers. 10.

(3) Vossius, de Hist. Lat. pag. 553.

(4) Panisrol. de claris Leg. Interpret. lib. iii, cap. xxviii, pag. m. 444.

(5) Vossius, ubi supra, pag. 552.

(6) Gesn. ubi supra, fol. 552.

(7) Jovius, in Elog. cap. cxi, pag. 254.

(8) Vossius, de Hist. Lat. pag. 552.

(9) In Prefat. super sua Translat. eorumdem Librorum apud Gesn. ubi supra.

(10) Leand. Albert. in Descript. Ital. pag. 455.

(11) I set down those words with the errors of the press in Albertus.

[A] He had accompanied the Emperor Sigismund to the council of Constance, if I am not mistaken.] I make use of this reserve, because the expressions of those, who inform us that he appeared with a great deal of lustre in that council, *claruit in Concilio Constantensi* (1), do not prove that he was a domestic to the Emperor. Perhaps the proof he gave of his merit during the holding of that council, determined Sigismund to take him into his service.

[B] He wrote several books.] The History of the Princes of Carrari, and that of the Princes of Mantua. An Elogy of St. Jerom. A treatise de Republica Veneta, printed at Rome in 1526 (2). An Invektive against Malatesta, who caused Virgil's statue at Mantua to be taken down (3). A letter de vita & obitu Francisci Zabarellae Cardinalis Florentini (4). The Life of Petrarch. A treatise de ingenio moribus ac liberalibus studiis, which was printed at Venice in 1502, with some other small tracts of the like nature, cum commentariis Joannis Bonardi Veronensis & aliorum de pauperum educatione opusculis (5), and re-printed at Basil in the year 1541, cum L. Vitruvii Rofcii de docendi studentique modo, & claris pauperum moribus libello (6). This was read in the schools, when Paul Jovius was a young scholar (7). Add to this, that he was the first who translated *Arrianus de rebus gestis Alexandri Magni* (8). But this version being designed for the use of the Emperor Sigismund, who was not very learned, he therefore made use of very barbarous Latin, as Bartholomew Flaccius observes (9). We may here, by the way, observe a mistake of Leander Albertus; he clearly insinuates that Marius Equicola is the first, who mentioned that Charles Malatesta caused Virgil's statue to be thrown into the river. 'Quamquam, saith he (10). à Mario Equicola in commentariis lingua vernacula de Mantuanis principibus conscriptis injuria hercle carpatur, ac si statum Virgilii poetæ in flumen abjici jussisset: Etenim (11) ipso auctori huic rei Equicolæ fides tribuitur exigua, modice nimirum opinionis scriptori. . . . Tho' he be unjustly censured by

'Marius Equicola in his Italian Memoirs concerning the Princes of Mantua, as if he had ordered the statue of the Poet Virgil to be thrown into the river: for Equicola, who says this, being an author of no esteem, is very little credited.' It is certain that our Vergerio lived before this Equicola.

I desire it may be observed that Vossius, when he wrote his book concerning the Latin Historians, remembered very well, that our Vergerius was author of the invective against Charles Malatesta; but he had forgot it when he composed his treatise of the Latin Poets: for he there declares that he did not know whether this invective was written by Guarini of Verona, or one of his disciples. 'Statuam Mantuae constitutam Maroni ante hos annos ducentos Carolus de Malatestis, tanquam quæ nihil ad religionem Christianam pertineret, deici curavit. Hæcque orationem Manuscriptam adversus Carolum iis temporibus super hoc exaratum, satis sanè acerbam: Et tamen auctor ait, acerbius se scripturum fuisse, si tutum fuisset in eos scribere, qui possent proficere. Nomen auctoris non apponitur: Sed permitta legitur orationibus, libellisque Guarini, ac discipulorum, qui auctore magistro hujusmodi oneris aliquid suscipere solerent. Ut videri possit scripta ab ipso Guarino Veronensi, clarissimo sui temporis viro, vel saltem discipulorum aliquo (12). . . . (13) Vossius, de Charles Malatesta, above two hundred years ago, ordered Virgil's statue, at Mantua, to be taken down, &c. as being a thing foreign to the Christian religion. And I have by me a pretty smart invective in manuscript, which was then written against Malatesta on that account: and yet the author says he would have written more sharply, had it been safe to write against those, who had power to banish. The author's name is not put to it: but it is inserted amongst the orations and tracts of Guarini and his disciples, who, by his order used to undertake something of this nature. So that it may probably have been written by Guarini of Verona, or at least by one of his disciples.'

(12) Vossius, de Poëtis Latin. pag. 27.

(a) Fra-Paolo, Istor. del Concilio, lib. 1, pag. m. 30.

VERGERIUS (PETER-PAUL) of the same city (a) and family with the foregoing (b), flourished in the XVIth century. He studied the Civil Law, and took his degree of Doctor in Law; but he made himself more famous by his embassies, and by ecclesiastical affairs, than by his learning in the Civil Law. He was sent Nuncio into Germany to the King of the Romans (c) by Clement VII, in the year 1530, and had orders to use

(b) See what Andrew Divus tells him, in dedicating to him his Latin translation of the Iliad. You will find his words in Gesner's Bibliotheca, fol. 552, and in Vossius, de Hist. Lat. pag. 553. (c) Ferdinand, brother to the Emperor Charles V.

all possible means to hinder the assembling of a national council. He supported the interest of Popery with a great deal of vigour and address, and opposed the progress of the Lutherans as much as he could. He was re-called by Paul III, who desired to be thoroughly informed of the dispositions of Germany, and was sent thither again in the year 1535, with orders to promise the holding of a council, and with some other instructions. On this head he conferred with several Protestant princes, and with Luther himself at Wittemberg [A]. He gave to the Pope an account of his negotiation the following year, and was immediately ordered to Naples to treat with Charles V. He was raised to the episcopal dignity in the same year 1536 (d), and in conjunction with eight other commissioners he drew up the papal indiction or promulgation of a council. He returned into Germany in the year 1541, to assist at the assembly of Worms: he appeared

(d) Tunc primum factus Episcopus Modru-
siensis, ac non multo post Justopolitanus.
Msch. Adam,
ubi infra, pag.
118.

[A] He conferred with Luther himself at Wittemberg. Father Paul and Pallavicini relate this very differently. The first assures us that the Pope ordered Vergerius to treat with Luther, and the chief of his party, and to endeavour to regain them by promises and caresses (1), and

(1) Father Paul, Hist. of the council of Trent, lib. i, p. m. 69.

(2) Id. ibid. pag. 70.

deavour to regain them by promises and caresses (1), and treated him very obligingly, according to his orders (2). He recites the discourse the Nuncio made, and Luther's answer. He shews the magnificent promises and most engaging behaviour of the former in his discourse. But Luther's answer is full of an holy contempt of all those advantageous offers: he discovers an admirable firmness and resolution. Pallavicini relates this story in a quite other manner, and accuses Father Paul of having stuffed his history with more lies than Homer had invented concerning the Trojan war. He complains that Father Paul disgraces the Pope by representing him as making such shameful advances, and that he bestows so much piety, wisdom, and greatness of soul on a Heretic. He maintains that Vergerius unexpectedly saw Luther. This Nuncio, faith he, being obliged to pass through Wittemberg, was there very honourably received. The commander of that town waited at his table during his supper, and came to him next morning to do him the same service at his breakfast, bringing with him two doctors, Martin Luther and John Bugenhagen, and telling him that the court and university were both absent (3), and that he could find no other persons but these two, who were able to converse with him in an intelligible language, and keep him company; and he begged of him to converse with them whilst he breakfasted. The Nuncio could not deny it, he found that Luther expressed himself barbarously in Latin; he suffered him to say several things without answering scarce one word, and took him for a very haughty, malicious, and imprudent man, whose manners were very unpolite.

(3) The professors had removed elsewhere by reason of the plague.

Have you heard any thing in Italy, concerning the character I have there of being a drunken German (4)? was one of the questions which Luther asked Vergerius. He said several things of the same nature, which the Nuncio mentioned in his letter to the Pope's secretary, in which he did not forget to describe Luther's habit and manners. This is the substance of Pallavicini's relation (5), which he took from Vergerius's letter written to the Pope's secretary on the 12th of November 1535, and he concludes from hence, that Father Paul is mistaken when he affirms that the Pope gave Vergerius order to make large promises to Martin Luther. This inference is incontestable, and there is no other way left to bring off Father Paul than to prove the falsity of the Nuncio's letter; for if it be owned to be authentic, it plainly appears that the Pope did not order Vergerius to gain Luther by endearing persuasions and hopes of honours; for if he had, Vergerius, by this relation of his discourse with Luther, which he sent in his letter to the Pope's secretary, had rendered himself as ridiculous as any of the most senseless wretches that are shut up in a mad-house.

(c) Pallavicini, ibid. num. 6, § seq.

Perhaps it may be said, that it is at least true that Vergerius held, of his own head, this discourse with Luther, which Father Paul relates, from whence it will naturally follow, that Luther's answer, related by the same author, is not a pure invention. I wish, at least, that Father Paul's fidelity on this last head could be justified; but I cannot see how: for in the first place, according to Father Maimbourg's remark, *These fine discourses of Father Paul are not found in the writers of those times; not even in Sleidan, who faith only in one word, that Vergerius saw Luther at Wittemberg* (6). In the second place, the curious and indefatigable

(6) Maimbourg, Hist. du Luthérisme, Tom. i, livr. iii, pag. 229, Dutch Edit.

betwixt the Nuncio and Luther, says nothing concerning the Nuncio's promises (7); and this relation being made by a very good friend to Luther, it is not credible that he should forget the most considerable passage in this narration, I mean, the Nuncio's advantageous offers, and the heroic and entirely apostolical contempt of them which Luther shewed. And therefore the silence of the relation, is a demonstrative proof against Father Paul. It ought not to be objected that the author of this relation informs us, that he has omitted several particulars; for since what he relates is less important and honourable than Father Paul's fine discourses, he would doubtless have inserted them into his narrative, rather than any of the rest, if they had really been spoken. He hath not omitted Luther's jesting answer to his Barber, and would he then have forgot an answer more worthy of St Paul than of a Doctor of the XVIth century? Luther, before he made a visit to Vergerius, caused himself to be shaved very early in the morning. At which the Barber was very much surprized. Do not wonder at this, replies the Reformer (8), I have been sent for to talk with the Nuncio of the holy Father, and I would not be seen in a slovenly manner; and shaving will make me appear younger, and I shall the more terrify my adversaries with a fear of my living the longer. The author of the Relation does not forget even this particular. Observe, that this account very plainly insinuates, that this interview was not unexpected on the Nuncio's side, and that it expressly says, that they talked much concerning the holding of a council. From whence we may infer that Vergerius did not write an exact account of all the particulars of this conversation with the Pope's secretary: so that one of Pallavicini's reasons is very weak; he faith, the Nuncio dared not disguise the truth, since the contents of his dialogue with Luther before a whole table full of auditors, might be sent to the Pope by other hands (9). Observe also that Spondanus relates, that Paul III charged his Nuncio, Peter-Paul Vergerius, to treat with Martin Luther in a very engaging manner, and to make him a great many promises (10). Once more, this is inconsistent with the Nuncio's letter, and perhaps we should not be in the wrong to subscribe to the judgment of a Jesuit in this particular. I believe, faith he (11), that the most certain thing that can be said upon this, is, that Father Paul diverted himself at the expense of truth, by making these two persons speak as he pleased, so as to whom, as it appears, he was no enemy.

(7) Sackendorf, Hist. Lutherana, lib. iii, pag. 93.

(8) Jacobus dixit: se ad sanctissimi Patris Nuncium vocatum esse, nec incultum accedere velle; ita fact, ut pro juniori haberetur, & longioris vite metu adversarios terret. Sackendorf, Hist. Lutherana, lib. iii, pag. 95, col. 1.

(9) Pallavicini, ubi supra, num. 10, pag. m. 352.

(10) Spondanus, ad ann. 1535, num. 10.

(11) Maimbourg, ubi supra, pag. 230.

Will it be objected, that the order to tempt Luther by magnificent promises, was a secret whispered in the ear, that only Vergerius and the Pope were acquainted with, and therefore it was not mentioned in the long letter written to the Pope's secretary by Vergerius, which Father Pallavicini cites? This is the last shift of a cavilling man, which may be easily forced; for if this particular instruction of the Nuncio was only whispered in his ear by the Pope; if the Nuncio durst not write any thing to the Pope's secretary, which should hint that his Holiness had given him such an instruction, how came Father Paul by this large account of the Nuncio's offers? Had he seen Vergerius's letters, which were to be read by the Pope only? This is what he should inform us of, and till we know it, we have reason to believe Vergerius's dispatches, that are still in the archives, and to affirm that the Pope burnt all those letters which were written for his perusal only; which is a new reason to ask how they then reached the hands of this Servite at Venice. And when all is said, may we not object to Father Paul the silence of the Relation which Mr Seckendorf found amongst the Wittemberg manuscripts?

[B] This

appeared there as a person employed by the King of France; but this is said to have been only a feint [B], and that he took that character in order to render himself the more serviceable to the court of Rome. He published an oration on the Unity of the Church, chiefly to prove that a particular council ought not to be held. Being returned to Rome, he found that some persons had so far rendered him suspected of Lutheranism, that the Pope hearkening to their calumnies, had given over his design of making him a Cardinal (e). This news threw him into a consternation, and he resolved to justify himself. For this purpose he retired into his own country, and there began a controversial book against the German apostates. He examined their books, he weighed the force of their objections, he attentively considered the ways of refuting them; but this diligent study only served to convince him, that they were in the right. From that time he renounced all hopes of a cardinal's hat, and went to his brother (f), who was Bishop of Pola, to whom he declared the condition he was in; he asked his advice, and without any regard to the compassion he had excited in him, he exhorted him to confute the scripture, and above all with respect to the doctrine of Justification. The Bishop of Pola having followed his counsel, was convinced of the truth of the Protestant doctrine, and agreed with his brother to teach the truth for the future. They executed their design; but the Monks perceiving it, alarmed the Inquisition, and made a great stir about it. One of the Inquisitors prodigiously harassed the citizens of Pola and of Capo d'Istria [C]; inasmuch that our Vergerius, not believing himself safe, retired to Mantua, to Cardinal Hercules de Gonzaga: there he did not long find a secure retreat; for John della Casa, the Pope's

(e) See the remark [D].

(f) John Baptist Vergerius.

[B] This is said to have been only a feint. Sleidan and, after him, Melchior Adam affirm it. 'Erat etiam hoc in conventu (Wormatensi) Petrus Paulus Vergerius, episcopus Justinopolitanus, verbo quidem, tanquam Gallie regis causa, sed revera missus a pontifice, qui suis rebus illum infervere magis posse putabat, si quidem alieno nomine ibi versaretur (12).

(12) Sleidanus, lib. xiii, fol. m. 318, verso.

--- Peter-Paul Vergerius, Bishop of Capo d'Istria, was also present at this assembly of Worms, in the name of the King of France, as it was indeed pretended, but in truth was sent thither by the Pope, who thought he might be more serviceable to him under a foreign character. Father Paul affirms the same thing. The Bishop of Capo d'Istria, saith he (13), was present at this conference, not as the Pope's minister, though really sent by Paul as a man very well versed in the knowledge of that country, but in the name of France, that he might be less suspected by the Germans, and more capable of serving the Pope under a foreign character. He adds, that several persons there made it their business to prolong that affair, to which they were induced by the Nuncio Campegio, and the secret practices of Vergerius. Cardinal Pallavicini, according to his custom, here complains of the malignity of Father Paul; he accuses him of falsely charging the Pope with a spirit of fraud; and to convict him of falsity, he tells us that Vergerio had been long suspected at the court of Rome. Cardinal Alexander's letters had produced this effect; he had informed the Pope that Vergerio spoke disadvantageously of the Holy See, and held correspondence with Luther's disciples. It was believed at Rome, that this Bishop's continuance in Germany was a sign of the venom of heresy which he had swallowed, wherefore they endeavoured to oblige him to residence, and made it a request to the Emperor, that a Prelate so much suspected as he, should be obliged to live far from the Empire, and not assist at the conferences concerning religion. If this be true, we may suppose that he assumed the character of Envoy of France, without any collusion of the Pope. Pallavicini's words and proofs run thus (14). 'Il qual racconto è sì falso, che molto prima il Cardinal Aleandro haveva ammonito segretissimamente il Pontefice, come il Vergerio parlava con poco onore della Sede Apostolica, minacciava contra di essa, e teneva amicizia con Luterani; del che allegò per testimonii il Nunzio Morone, e quel di Venezia. Ed inconformità d'una tale opinione formata di lui, nel quale trasparivano i semi di quelle serpi ch'egli covava nell'animo, e che poi uscirono nelle scritture e nell'azioni: era il senio che havevansi a questo tempo in Roma della sua dimora in Germania: Tantoche gli s'era anch'essibito lo sgravamento della pensione per indurlo alla residenza nel Vescoavato. E tuttocio fè significare il Pontefice all'Imperadore dal Nunzio Poggi, affinche l'autorità Cesareia (quando ciò fosse possibile) il tenesse lungi da quelle Provincie, e da que' trattati. ---

(13) Father Paul's History of the Council of Trent, book i, pag. m. 87.

(14) Pallavicini, ubi supra, lib. xiv, cap. xii, num. 11, pag. m. 433, 434. See also ch. xiii, num. iii, of the same book, pag. 635.

Lettera del Card. Aleandro al Cervino, a 12 di Marzo 1539, della quale il Cervino accusa la ricevuta in una all'Alessandri sotto i 23 dell'istesso.

Lettera del Card. Farnese al Poggi dell'ultimo di Febbraio 1541.

This account is so false, that Cardinal Alexander had long before privately acquainted the Pope, that Vergerio spoke dishonourably of the Apostolic see, threw out measures against it, and maintained a friendship with the Lutherans: for which he alleged the testimonies of the Nuncio Morone, and of the Nuncio to Venice. Accordingly it was believed at Rome, that his continuance in Germany manifested the seeds of that poison which were sown in his mind, and afterwards sprung forth in his writings and actions: so that the taking away of the pension was intimated to him, in order to induce him to reside in his bishopric. And moreover the Pope ordered the Nuncio Poggi to desire the Emperor to use his authority (as soon as possible) to keep him at a distance from the empire, and from such conferences. Observe that the Cardinal doth not deny what Father Paul says concerning Vergerio's conduct: he doth not deny the artifices of this minister of the King of France, which were so conformed to the court of Rome. He saith nothing on that head, but tells us that Vergerio was a man of a lively and bold genius, and of the humour of certain persons who cannot live without being in the management of public business, and who fancy that it cannot be carried on without them. *Uomo quanto vivace, tanto audace, e frà la condizione di coloro che nè possono vivere senza maneggiar negozii, nè pensano che i negozii possano maneggiarsi senza di loro* (15). As for the rest, what Sleidan saith, that Vergerio at his return from the Diet of Worms, had been created Cardinal, if some persons had not altered the Pope's mind, he calls (16) it a fable, and maintains that in 1539 the Pope was displeased with that bishop.

(15) Id. ibid.

(16) Idem, lib. vi, cap. xiii, num. 3.

[C] One of the Inquisitors prodigiously harassed the citizens of Pola, and of Capo d'Istria. We can never too often represent the villany and injustice annexed to the profession of Inquisitor. Wherefore I shall here give a short account of that man's conduct, who exercised that office in the dioceses of the two Vergerio's. His name was Annibal Grison. He entered the houses of the inhabitants to search for suspicious books; he excommunicated those who did not detect the persons that appeared to them suspected of Lutheranism; he promised to mitigate the punishment of those who should renounce their heresy, and apply to him to ask pardon; but he threatened those with fire, who did not prevent their accusers by an humble confession of their crime. He denounced his threats from door to door, and spread terror every where. Some accused themselves: he severely censured those, who had read the Bible in the vulgar language, and forbade their continuance in that crime. Soon after nothing was seen but accusations, every one engaged in them without regard to the laws of confanguinity or gratitude. The wife did not spare her husband, the son his father, nor the client his patron; several persons were brought into trouble for trifles, such, for example, who had only ventured to speak against the bigotry of others

Ingster
vile

V O L . V .

5 Y

Pope's legate at Venice, made so many instances to the Cardinal, to oblige him to rid himself of such a guest, that Vergerius found it very proper to leave Mantua. He went to Trent in order to purge himself before the council [D]. The Pope would very willingly have seized him, but being loth to give occasion to any complaints that the assembly was not free, he wrote to his legates to forbid this Bishop taking his place there, and that they should order him to depart. Some reasons that were given for that prohibition are pitiful [E]. Vergerius retired to Venice, where he took care not to conform

to

others. *Deinde promiscua multitudo, timore percussis animis, deserebant quosque certatim, nulla neque propinquitatis neque necessitudinis aut beneficiorum habita ratione: non parenti filius, non uxor marito, non cliens patrono parcebat. Delationes autem erant plerumque de rebus frivolis; ut quisque forte aliquid ob superstitionem in aliquo reprehenderat* (17). On a solemn day this Inquisitor celebrated Mass in the cathedral of Capo d'Istria, and told the people: of late years you have lain under many calamities; your olive-trees as well as your corn-fields and vineyards have been barren; your cattle have been afflicted with distempers. Your Bishop and other Heretics have exposed you to these evils. Do not expect any relief, unless you suppress those Heretics, and what have you now to do but to fall upon and stone them immediately? *Hoc tempore, & hinc aliquot annis, multæ vos premunt calamitates: quæ nunc oleas, nunc segetes, modò vineas, modò pecudes, aliisque facultates graviter affligunt: his verò malis causam præbet Episcopus vester & hæreticorum turba reliqua: nec est quod levationem ullam speretis, nisi coercantur: proximum autem est, ut impetu facto lapidentur* (18). You will find all this in Sleidan's History (19). Observe, that Vergerius had so much prudence as not to trust himself to the mercy of a populace thus animated by a furious persecutor. *He made his escape, as Father Paul observes, from the fury of the people of his diocese, which the Inquisitor Hannibal Grison had irritated against him by charging him with being a Lutheran, and the cause of the sterility of the earth* (20). I cannot tell whether this Hannibal had ever read the writings of the Fathers, wherein we find the ridiculous reproaches of the Pagans, that the followers of JESUS CHRIST were the cause of all the calamities which befel the people (21). I do not know whether he had read this excellent passage of Tertulian: 'At è contrario illis nomen factionis accommodandum est, qui in odium bonorum & proborum conspirant, qui adversum sanguinem innocentium clamant, prætexentes sanè ad odii defensionem, illam quoque vanitatem, quod existiment omnis publicæ cladis, omnis popularis incommodi Christianos esse causam. Si Tyberis ascendit in mœnia, si Nilus non ascendit in arva, si cælum stetit, si terra movit, si fames, si lues, statim Christianos ad leonem (22). . . . But, on the contrary, the name of faction ought to be given to those who concur in their enmity against good and upright men, and thirst for the blood of the innocent: alledging foolishly in their own vindication, that the Christians are the cause of all public calamities, and of every public misfortune. If the Tyber overflows its banks, or the Nile does not cover the lands, if there is a drought, an earthquake, famine or pestilence, the Christians must immediately be thrown to the lions.' But I am persuaded that though the Inquisitor had perfectly known all this, it would not have hindered him from saying, when provisions were dear, or there was a mortality amongst the cattle, that the Heretics were the cause of it. Such a man consults his false zeal more than reason, and consequently may very well be so blind as not to see the absurdity of casting the same reproaches on Lutheranism which the Pagans did upon the primitive Christians, and which all Protestants may return on Papists in the countries where they are strongest. But which is more, though such a man had been sensible of this absurdity, yet he was bad enough to have used it, because he thought nothing would enrage the people against the Lutherans, and make them stone them more than this. Is it astonishing that a Monk should use this contrivance? Do not we see that as soon as the Christians were able to persecute, they reproached the Heathens with the same things which the Heathens had imputed to them, that is to say, with being the cause that they had not good crops, and that the seasons changed their natu-

ral course. I do not cite a private inconsiderable author to prove this, but a very authentic piece and imperial authority. Read what follows, 'An diutius perferimus mutari temporum vices, iratâ cœli temperie? quæ, Paganorum exacerbata perfidia, nescit naturæ libramenta servare. Unde enim ver solitam gratiam abjuravit? unde æstas messe jejuna, laboriosum Agricolam in spe destituit aristarum? unde hyemis intemperata ferocitas, ubertatem terrarum penetrabili frigore sterilitatis læsione damnavit? nisi quod ad impietatis vindictam transit lege suâ naturæ decretum (23). . . . Shall we any longer suffer the seasons to be inverted; or the course of nature changed through the perfidy of Pagans? Whence is it that the spring denies its usual delights? that the summer deprives the laborious husbandman of his expected crop? or that the rigorous winter by its penetrating cold destroys the fruitfulness of the earth? but because nature, to be revenged on impiety, departs from its common course.' Mr Van Dale hath made some very good reflexions on this head (24). When we consider these preposterous judgments, it is not easy to refrain from saying that there are certain faults which cling fast to sects, not as they are sects, but as they are predominant. Hence it is that the same communions alter their sentiments and maxims, as they acquire or lose superiority. The maxim, new honours new manners, holds very true here, and we may very well invert the sense of that of Cornelius Nepos (25), without falsifying it.

[D] *He went to Trent in order to purge himself before the council.* Melchior Adam ought to be blamed for not mentioning the year in which Vergerio went to Trent. He hath taken from Sleidan all that he hath said concerning the conversion of this bishop; but though that author successively relates these things under the year 1548, we ought not to believe that Vergerio was at Trent in that year. He was there according to Father Paul in 1546. 'He believed that the most honourable and commodious way of justifying himself was at the council. But the Legates would not admit him into the congregation, because he had not cleared himself to the Pope, to whom they earnestly pressed him to go; and if they had not been afraid of raising a report against the liberty of the council, they had not contented themselves with bare exhortations. So that Vergerio, after some days stay, departed from Trent, intending to return to his bishopric, where he hoped the troubles were appeased. But when he was at Venice, the Nuncio forbade his return thither, having received orders from Rome to prosecute him, which obliged him to quit Italy within a few months, either induced to it by resentment, or fear, or some other motive (26). I cite this passage, as well because it contains some facts not touched on by Sleidan, as because Father Paul's Chronology wants a little correction. What he tells us of Vergerio's leaving Italy in 1546 is not true. He did not quit that country till after having seen the miserable end of Spira at Padua, who died in 1548 (27). If we will add to this Pallavicini's censures, we must say that Vergerio finding himself cited at Rome, where he had been accused as suspected of heresy, went to Trent (28), where he expected a safe refuge, and hoped to enjoy his right of sitting amongst the Bishops as judge of that faith which he was charged with having deserted. But being excluded from this right, he obtained, by the intercession of the Legates, a dispensation from appearing at Rome; and his case was committed to the Nuncio and Patriarch of Venice, according to his request: but being sensible that he could not justify himself, he retired to the Protestants.

[E] *Some reasons that were given for that prohibition are pitiful.* Vergerius intending to retire from the council,

(17) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. Exter. pag. 119.

(18) Id. ibid. ex Sleidano, ubi infra.

(19) Sleidan, livr. xxi, fol. m. 589, ad ann. 1548.

(20) Fra-Paolo, ubi supra, lib. ii, pag. 141.

(21) See Origin contra Celsum, lib. iii, & in Mathæum, cap. xxiv; Arnobius, lib. i; St Cyprian, lib. ad Demetrianum, and among his letters the laxus; Orosius, lib. vii, cap. xxxvii; St Augustin, de Civit. Dei, passim; &c.

(22) Tertul. Apologet. cap. xl.

(23) Novella III Theodori de Judæis, Samaritanis, & Hæreticis.

(24) Van Dale, de Oraculis, pag. 21, 22.

(25) He says Sicut mores leguntur fortunam. . . . A man's manners make his fortune. See, above, citation (50), of the article TIMOLEON. But it may be said with much reason, that corrupt mores. . . . A man's fortune makes his manners.

John della Cui, Archbishop of Benevento, who was Secretary of State under Paul IV.

(26) Fra-Paolo, ubi supra, pag. 141.

(27) Sleidan, lib. xxi, fol. m. 588.

(28) Pallavicini, lib. del Concilio, lib. vi, cap. xxi, nam. m. He quotes the letter written by the Legates to Cardinal Grison, the 27th of February 1546, and to Cardinal Farnez, the 28th, and the 1st of March 1546.

Spira

to the desires of John della Casa, who advised him to go to Rome. A few days after he was forbid in the Pope's name to return to his bishopric. He went to Padua, and there became a witness of the deplorable death of Francis Spira. This example of despair, to which those expose themselves, who hold the truth in unrighteousness, made him resolve to undergo a voluntary exile, that he might be thereby enabled to make an open profession of the pure religion. He went to the Grisons, and was a minister amongst them for some years, as well as in the Valteline: after which, he was invited to Tubingen by the Duke of Wirtemberg, where he died on the 4th of October 1565. He published several books which proved very prejudicial to the Romish communion [F]. Before

(19) He was one of the Legates, and afterwards Pope Marcellus II.

(20) Crepin, *État de l'Eglise*, pag. m. 570.

(31) Chemnitius, *Exam. Concilii Trident. Part. iii.*, pag. 576, Edit. Francf. 1609, in fol.

(32) Crepin, *ubi supra*, pag. 569.

(33) *Ibid.*

(34) Note, that several of them were only Italian translations.

(35) Here is a pseudonymous work not mentioned by Placcius. Mr Baillet in his list of pseudonymous writers, pulls off this mask as well as that of Athanasius, under which Vergerio appeared sometimes.

(36) This book was translated out of Italian into French in the year 1556, by PAUL VERGERIUS, the author's nephew.

council, went to Cervinus (29), and asked him for what reasons he was rejected out of the company of the other Bishops in the council. Cervinus then answered: because I have heard that you denied the truth of the Legends of St George and St Christopher. It is true, replied Vergerio, I did, and do yet deny them; but I ground that denial on the authority of Pope Paul III, who commanded them both to be left out of the Breviary. And in the Preface to that book, he saith that he had commanded that all those Legends should be left out which are not true. Cervinus being at a stand, could think of no other answer than this: those persons ought not to pass for good men, who seem to agree with the Lutherans in any particular whatsoever, and therefore do you retire from our council (30). Those who believe it utterly improbable, that Vergerio's despising those Legends could be the only reason which the Legate urged, will be at least satisfied with the Historian, when he owns that at last the Legate quitted that reason and alledged another. But they will never pardon Chemnitius for saying, That Vergerius ran the risque of his life by venturing to declare, that he did not approve all that was contained in the Legend of St George. 'Nota est Vergerii historia, qui cum in Tridentina synodo Georgii legendam, quam Gelasius distinctio. 15. diserte auctoribus hæreticis tribuit, sibi non per omnia probari ostenderet, in discrimen dignitatis, imo vitæ & capitis adductus fuit (31). -- The story of Vergerius is well known, who having declared at the Council of Trent that he did not approve all that was contained in the Legend of St George, which Pope Gelasius expressly ascribes to heretical authors, ran the risque not only of his dignity but of his life.' It must be allowed that this account is not exact, and that at least there plainly appears in it the sophism 'à non sufficienti enumeratione partium. -- A defective enumeration of parts.' He reduces several reasons to that, which in all likelihood was looked upon as the most inconsiderable.

What I am going to say is not one of the circumstances which concern the text of this remark. Crepinus affirms (32), that several Bishops being informed that Cervinus, contrary to the opinion of his two colleagues and of some cardinals, persisted in his refusal to admit Vergerius into the council, resolved to write upon it to the Pope: 'Jerom Vida of Cremona, Bishop of Alba, an excellent Poet, had already drawn up the letters as well in the name of himself as of others (33), but this Legate's severe advertisement hindered his sending them to the Pope.

[F] He published several books which proved very prejudicial to the Romish communion. As he was well acquainted with the intrigues carried on in Italy, and the most secret abuses committed in that country, he was better able than another to render Popery odious. Besides he scarce wrote any but small tracts, which could easily be dispersed throughout Europe, and chose such subjects as were susceptible of a particular turn which very sensibly touched the readers. You will find in the catalogue of his writings (34), *Relatio de persecutione facta contra Evangelium in urbe Justinopolitana*. *Contra librum cui nomen Flosculi sancti Francisci*. *Contra librum cui titulus Rosarium*. *Contra librum cui titulus Miracula Virginis*. *De libro cui titulus Lux fidei*. *De libro cui titulus Flosculi Biblie*. *De statu ac imaginibus*. *De coronatione Julii Papæ III*. *Quid sperandum ex papatu Julii III*. *De literis Ottonis Cardinalis Augustani scriptis de creatione Julii III*. *Quatuor Literæ sub nomine Bonini de Boninis* (35). *De statu Romanæ Curie*. *De nugis & fabulis Papæ Gregorii I*. *De Idolo Laurentiano* (36). *Scholæ in orationem Cardinalis Poli ad Cæsarem qua illum ad arma contra eos qui Evangelio nomen dederunt, instigat*. *Nova editio libri Cæremoniarum Romanæ Ecclesiæ cum præfatione & scholæ*.

liis. Quot modis vir pius qui in Italia degat sepe Deum & Christum negare compellitur. I omit several others, whose titles may be found in the epitome of Gelfner, and in Verheiden (37); but I shall take notice of that piece of his intitled, *Epitome libri cui titulus, Anatomia Missæ ab Antonio de Adamo*. I never saw this abridgment of the anatomy of the Mass, and cannot tell whether those who mention it, write well the name of the author of this anatomy; for I find in the Latin edition of this work, that the author's name was *Antonius ab Æda*. A passage in the Preface runs thus: 'Quoniam igitur Anatomie cognitio non solum medicis chirurgisque, verum etiam aliis summo opere commendatur: eam ob causam, Anthonium ab Ædam Italum imitatus, hanc missæ ac missalis Anatomiam Gallicè, ut ab omnibus percipi posset facilius, in lucem edere statui. -- Since therefore the knowledge of Anatomy is very much recommended not only to Physicians and Surgeons, but also to others: for that reason, in imitation of Antonius ab Æda, an Italian author, I resolved to publish this Anatomy of the Mass and Missal in French, that it might be the more easily understood by all.' These words inform us that this piece was first published in Italian and then in French. It was translated into Latin in the year 1561. The title of the Latin version is: *Missæ ac Missalis Anatomia. Hoc est dilucida ac familiaris ad minutissimas usque particulas Missæ ac Missalis enucleatio*. Nunc primum (ut ea res prioris fidei cultoribus scitu necessaria, ad alias quoque nationes deveniret) è Gallica lingua Latine versa anno Domini M. D. LXXI. This book contains one hundred and seventy-two pages in octavo, besides an errata of fifteen pages. The place where it was printed is not expressed. The person who made the errata says that a very urgent occasion obliged him to it. It was, saith he, to prevent the artifices of the devil; for he supposes that Satan, to ruin the effects of this book, had made use of two very malicious frauds; the first of which was before, the second during the time of the impression. The first was, that the manuscript was thrown into the mire, and reduced to a miserable state. The second was, that the Printers committed a great many faults. So that to defeat this double machination of Satan, he was obliged to revise the work very carefully, and to make a long list of the errors of the Press. I know very well that some may suspect me of imposing on my readers; wherefore I cannot help citing part of the prologue to the errata. 'Maledictus Sathan, ut totam Missæ (excecrandæ filiæ suæ) Tragœdiam in hoc instituit, & gubernavit hætenus, quò Christi meritum prorsus in hominum pectoribus extingueret, ac mendaciorum tenebras pro veritatis luce obtruderet: ita jam quoque, dum hic ipse libellus excuderetur, rursus artes suas egregiè adhibuisse videtur, dum tot eum mendis conspurcari (ut multis in locis non modò nullam sententiam, sed inversam plane colligere liceat) curavit, quò ejus lectionem vel prorsus è manibus piorum excuteret: vel mendarum tedio ita lecturos afficeret, ut ad finem usque lectionem deducere non nisi summa cum nausea possent. Idem verò etiam antea quam ad Typographum libellus perveniret, alia via aggressus, eum in lacunam alicubi projectum ita decurparat, ut non paucis foliis in itinere, antequam afferretur, ex cæno ac humore illo jam corruptis ac putridis, scriptura etiam passim ita oblitterata fuerit, ita multis in locis lacerata omnia, ut non modo non legi restet, sed ne aperiri quidem alicubi absque detrimento, ac solia à se mutuo separari poterint. Huic itaque Sathanæ fraudulentie occurrere studens, libellum jam typis absolutum denuò percurrere, atque errata, quamlibet multa, tamen ea (nam in nullo unquam libro, vel centuplo hoc quidem majore, tot esse unquam commissæ puto) hic subnotare, quo cuivis lectionem sibi,

(37) Verheiden, in *Effigies præstant. aliquot Viros*, pag. 154, 155.

Before he left Italy he lost his brother, who died by poison, as was suspected (g). The account I have given, and which I have extracted from Melchior Adam, is defective in many

(g) Taken from Melchior Adam, in *Vitis Theologorum Exterorum*, pag. 116, & seq.

libi emendare in promptu esset, operæ pretium duxi. --- *As that accursed spirit Satan first framed, and has hitherto managed the whole Tragedy of the MASS (his execrable daughter) that he might utterly extinguish the merit of CHRIST in the hearts of men, and obtrude the darkness of lies for the light of the truth: so likewise during the impression of this book, he seems again to have employed his arts, in contriving to have it stuffed with errors (for in many places it is not only unintelligible, but the sense is plainly perverted) that pious persons might be entirely disgusted from reading it, or else quite tired out before they get through it. And even before this treatise was brought to the Printer, the same evil spirit made use of another stratagem; for he so ordered it that the manuscript fell into the mire, by which means not a few of the leaves were marred and spoiled, the writing was often defaced, and many places so torn that it could not be read well, nor could it even be opened or the leaves separated from one another without damage: and therefore to defeat the fraudulent intention of the devil, I thought fit to revise the book after it was printed, and for the benefit of the reader to subjoin an Errata, though numerous, and indeed I believe there never was a book, though an hundred times bigger than this, so full of faults.* Observe that the Corrector hath stumbled at the very threshold, for he reckons the first fault to be the word *Gallicè* in the passage of the Preface cited above. He would have it read *Latine*; his correction is ill grounded: is it not indisputable that a person who translates a Preface into Latin, in which it is said, for good reason a French translation was made, ought to make use of the word *Gallicè*, and not *Latine*? See however the remark [2]. We must also observe that du Moulin, who called one of his books the *Anatomy of the Mass*, is not the inventor of that title. Nor by the way did he invent that of the *Buckler of Faith*; for I have a book printed at Avignon by Francis Tachet 1549 (38), and intitled *the Buckler of Faith, by way of dialogue, extracted from the holy Scripture, the holy Fathers, and most ancient Doctors of the Church*. Of which, Nicolas Grenier, Canon of St Victor, is the author.

(38) This is not the first edition, for it is said in the title, that the book was revised and enlarged by the author. La Croix du Maine mentions only the edition in 2 volumes, which came out at Paris in 1566, and 1567. It is true that a little after he says that the second volume was printed in 1565. This is not very exact.

(39) Thuanus, lib. xxviii, pag. m. 570, col. 2, ad ann. 1561.

(40) Thuanus is mistaken in that: Vergerius had professed himself a Protestant above twelve years before.

(41) Spondanus, ad ann. 1545, num. 13.

made all the acts of the Council of Trent, the subjects of his sermons: he diligently collected all the disputations of that assembly; he communicated them to other ministers; he wrote books concerning them, and dispersed his calumnies on the whole conduct of the council (42). I am surprized not to find in the Epitome of Gesner, what Vergerius wrote against his countryman and violent persecutor Mutius. I find only, *ad Papam Julium III qui librum Mutii approbavit*. This Mutius was an assistant to Annibal Grifon in the function of Inquisitor at Capo d'Istria, and published an invective against our Prelate. 'Huic (Annibaldi Grifonio) adjunctus Hieronymus Mutius qui & Vergerianam scripsit investivam postea, nec id modo, sed evulgato quoque libello Germaniam, odio religionis, maledicentissime tradidit (43). --- (44) Sleidanus, lib. xxi, fol. 359r. To this Annibal Grifon was associated Jerom Mutius, who afterwards wrote an invective against Vergerius, and likewise published a book wherein he maliciously traduces Germany out of hatred to the Protestant religion.' But the following words seem to hint that Vergerius and Mutius wrote letters against each other: 'Finalmente accorgendosi il Vergerio ch'el suo delitto non haveva difesa, si ricoverò fra Grigioni eretici, e di là mandò fuori contra la Religione, contra il Concilio, e contra'l Papa libri tanto indotti quanto audaci; e che non piaceranno se non a que' palati sì pravi che con essi il fele, come già la manna, fa ufficio di tutti i più delicati sapori. Ed intorno à quest' huomo ed alle sue azioni basti di leggere oltre agli altri le Vergeriane e le lettere cattoliche del Muzio suo compatriota (44). --- At last Vergerius perceiving he could not justify himself, retired to the heretical Grifons, and there put out books both unlearned and impudent against religion, the Council 656, and the Pope: and which pleased none but people of a depraved taste, to whom gall, as manna was formerly, is of all things the most delicious. With regard to this man and his actions, you may read the letters of Vergerius and of his Catholic countryman Mutius.' I have given this whole passage of Pallavicini, to shew that I had reason to say that Vergerius's works cruelly galled the court of Rome and its devotees. They affected to speak of them with contempt and to represent them as performances wherein confidence, passion, and ignorance were notorious. This affectation is not disadvantageous to his works. See Stanislaus Hosius's Epistle Dedicatory of the *Propagatio verae, Christianae, Catholicæque doctrinæ* (45). Our Vergerius is there treated very violently; Hosius, among other things, complains that he had the assurance to dedicate a book of Brentius to his Polish Majesty, and to challenge Lipomannus (46) to a disputation on all the doctrines contained in that book, which disputation should be decided by that monarch. This is not all, he complains of some tracts which he had dispersed amongst the people, during the last diet at Warsaw, Tracts, faith he, full of impudence and fallacies: 'Ego verò, quod illius tam eminent, tamque projecta est audacia, minus miror, quem & frontem pridem omnem perdidisse, & ab omni Dei metu prorsus remotum esse, vel ea sola scripta satis indicant, quæ in proximis hinc Varshaviensibus Comitibus in vulgus spargi curavit. Illud non possum non mirari, quod inveniuntur nihilominus, qui non sine quadam animorum assensione commenta legant ejus hominis: qui sic ad omnem levitatem incubuisse videtur, nihil ut caverit diligentius, quam ne quid usquam veri scriberet (47). --- But I the less wonder at his matchless impudence, since those writings alone which he dispersed among the people, during the last Diet at Warsaw, sufficiently shew that he had long before lost all shame, and had no fear of GOD. And I cannot but wonder how some people can read his forgeries with a kind of approbation: for he seems to have been so much given to lying, that his greatest care was to exclude all truth from his writings.' Add to this the passage I shall cite below (48) from Cardinal Pallavicini.

I conclude with a reflexion which seems to me to deserve a place here. I am certain that in Vergerio's time

(42) Adis Concilii omnibus detrahens. Id. 3.

(43) Sleidanus, lib. xxi, fol. 359r.

(44) Pallavicini, lib. xxi, fol. 359r.

(45) It is dated the 15th of October 1557.

(46) He was then Nuncio in Poland.

(47) Hosius in Epist. dedicat. ad Sigismundum Augustum Polon. Regem.

(48) In the remark [K].

many particulars. We do not find there the service which Vergerius did to Henry II [G] nor his conferences in Alfatia with the Apostolical Nuncio [H]. We are not informed by it that he bought a collection of reliques for an Elector of Saxony [I], &c. He was the cause that the Capitolo del Forno (b) exposed its author to many invectives, which obliged

(b) See the remark [M].

time few books were read more than his. They were very satirical, they contained a vast many personal particularities which easily passed for true, because it was very well known what opportunity he had to be thoroughly informed of them, having been so long engaged in public employments by the court of Rome. Yet these pieces so much esteemed when new, could not maintain their reputation. They were favourites with whom fortune did not long continue, they quickly lost their credit, and became so neglected, that scarce any books are at present harder to find. We scarce meet with one piece of Vergerius in the catalogues of the most numerous libraries. It was in vain that an edition of his works was published at Tübingen in 1563 (49). So many small tracts reduced into one volume, are not less lost than if they had continued in their former dispersed condition: scarce any of them more sensibly affects my curiosity than his critic on Leander Alberti (50), and on the letters of Claudius Ptolemaeus (51).

(49) It is in quarto. See Seckendorf, Hist. Lutheran. lib. iii, pag. 601, col. 2.

(50) In Gessner's epitome the title is contra Leandrum Albertum Monachum Dominicanum, et jamque mendacia quae ille scripsit in libro cui titulus, Descriptio Italiae.

(51) The title is De Epistolis Italicae scriptis à Claudio Ptolemaeo.

(52) Fra-Paolo, ubi supra, lib. iv, pag. 327, ad ann. 1551.

† He was then minister in the country of the Grisons: he turned Protestant because he had missed a cardinal's hat.

† Thuanus speaks of it in the 8th book of his History, Ann. 1561. Mr. Amelot is mistaken for the book mentioned by Thuanus, was written against the indication of the council in the time of Pius IV. I have quoted his words above, citat. (39). Father Paul mentions that book of Vergerius in the fifth book, pag. m. 419.

(53) Spondanus, ad ann. 1551, num. 18, pag. 537.

Princes

[G] The service which Vergerius did to Henry II. Before I come to the proof, I shall cite a passage of Father Paul (52). 'The Pope by his letter invited the Catholic Swiss to come to the council . . . and Jerom Franco, his Nuncio, incessantly solicited them on his part, and made pressing instances, which were supported by the good offices of the Emperor. But the most Christian King dissuaded them by his ambassador Morlot; and Paul Vergerio † perfectly acquainted with the secrets and artifices of the court of Rome, gave that minister so good instructions, besides the book he wrote on that subject †, that at the Diet then held at Baden, the Catholic and Evangelic Cantons unanimously resolved, not to send any person to Trent: And the Grisons suffering themselves to be persuaded by Vergerio, that the Pope was contriving something against them, recalled Thomas Plante, Bishop of Coire.' These words do not prove that the King of France employed Vergerius: Ambassadors frequently conceal from their masters the name and character of those persons whose assistance or advice they make use of; so that it may be pretended, that Morlot made use of Vergerio without ever mentioning any thing of it to Henry II. But an Annalist, a French Bishop, owns that that Prince was well informed of Vergerius's intrigues, and made use of his assistance to obtain his ends, which were to vex the Pope and the Emperor. 'Rex . . . ut Pontifici & Caesari agere faceret, cum Helvetiis, quos Pontifex hortatus fuerat ad Synodum suos dirigere legatos, egit ne tam Catholici quam Sacramentarii, nec item Rheti mitterent, & qui jam missi fuissent revocarentur: in his, quod turpis fuit, industria usus Petri-Pauli Vergerii Episcopi olim Justinopolitani, qui ad haereticos delapsus inter Rhetos agebat (53). . . . The King . . . in order to vex the Pope and the Emperor, treated with the Swiss, whom the Pope had invited to come to the council, that neither the Catholic nor Protestant Cantons, nor likewise the Grisons might send any, and that those who had been already sent might be recalled: and, which is more scandalous, to obtain those ends he made use of the assistance of Peter-Paul Vergerius formerly Bishop of Capo d'Istria, who revolting to the Heretics then lived in the country of the Grisons.' Spondanus justly says that it was very scandalous for Henry II to employ a Protestant minister, who had formerly been a bishop. If Vergerius had been in France, that Prince would have caused him to be burnt, and yet he caresses him in a foreign country, employs him against the Pope, and makes use of his craft and artifice to overthrow the council, and probably rewards him for all these good actions. Doth not this plainly discover the genius of sovereign Princes? Their conduct towards Heretics is not of a piece, they persecute them in one place, and encourage them in another. Their conduct is void of all principles, or rather is uniformly directed by the maxim, that all things ought to be sacrificed to the temporal glory of the state, which requires that a jealous neighbour should be crossed by all possible means, on all occasions.

V. O. L. V.

[H] His conferences in Alfatia with the Apostolical Nuncio.] This happened in the year 1561. He was then in the Duchy of Wirtemberg: he first spoke with the Nuncio Delfino at Zabara (54), and afterwards at Strasburgh, and the neighbouring places, sometimes alone, and at other times in company with John Sturmius: when he was with the Nuncio alone he talked more freely (55), but when in company with Sturmius, he was very reserved both in the choice and turn of his words. On the one side he discovered an ardent desire to return into Italy, and on the other he broke out into slanders against those who had persecuted him, and even against the Pope himself. He chiefly accused John della Casa of having forced him to turn Protestant. The Nuncio exhorted him to reunite himself to the Church, and to recommend himself to the Legates (56) his old patrons. Vergerius acknowledged his infinite obligations to them, but utterly rejected the proposal of making a recantation. He wrote two letters to the Cardinal of Mantua, one of the Legates, and gave them to the Nuncio Delfino, who sent them to Rome before they were transmitted to the Cardinal. In these Vergerius testified a great zeal for his country, and for the peace of the Church; he offered his endeavours towards this great work, and said he might give some advantageous overtures if he could speak with that Legate. He did not shew any design of repenting of his errors, he only requested a safe conduct both from the council, and his Imperial Majesty. The Nuncio passionately desired the recovery of this lost sheep. He believed that in all Germany, there were not two persons whose conversion was of so great importance as that of Vergerius. Not but that he took him to be an ignorant man, but because he found his pen very pernicious to the Holy See. 'Il Delfino era cupidissimo di ricuperarlo: imperòche quantunque, secondo ch'egli scriveva; il Vergerio niente affatto sapeffe; onde mentr'era soggiornato in Elvezia haveva solo spesa l'industria nel trasportare i libri eretici in Italiano; ciò non ostante riputava, in tutta Alemagna non esser due Teste il cui acquisto fosse stato di pregio uguale à quel di costui: tanto riusciva la sua penna à diservigio della Sede Apostolica per una certa sua eloquenza popolare, e audacemente maledica de' più invidiati Perlonaggi (57). . . . Delfino was very desirous to regain him: for though, as he said, Vergerius was grossly ignorant, and therefore unable to live in Switzerland spent his time only in translating heretical books into Italian: yet he believed there were not two persons in all Germany, whose conversion would be equivalent to that of Vergerius: so successful was his pen against the Holy See, on account of a certain popular eloquence he employed in slandering the most eminent men.' The Cardinal of Mantua, to whom the Pope absolutely referred the management of this intrigue, did not think it proper to answer Vergerius. He thought that a letter from a Legate would render Vergerius too vain, and that he would make use of it to persuade the Protestants, that he was esteemed in the Church of Rome as a person of great merit, whose conversion they were willing to purchase with a large reward. The Cardinal cautioned the Nuncio to have a particular regard to this: Such an advice was necessary, for the Nuncio had made use of Vergerius's ambition in order to gain him by the offer of a glorious recompence. The Pope was extraordinary well pleased with this conduct of the Legate. The Nuncio at last declared that Vergerius's impudence and arrogance increased daily, and he received orders to see him no more. The Legate would have had Vergerius come to the Council of Trent, not alone, but accompanied by John Sturmius, and Jerom Zanchius, and that new expedients should be taken by their means to confer with the Sectaries; but the Pope disapproved all those proposals. This is what I find in the Historian here cited (58).

(54) So it is in Pallavicini: perhaps it should be Zaberna, Savenna.

(55) Take notice that all this is extracted out of Pallavicini.

(56) The Cardinal of Trent, and the Cardinal of Mantua.

(57) Pallavicini, ubi supra, lib. x, cap. 2, num. 13, pag. m. 644, 645.

(58) Cardinal Pallavicini.

(59) Seckendorf, Hist. Lutheran. lib. i, pag. 223, garet

[I] He bought a collection of reliques for an Elector of Saxony.] This was the Elector Frederic, surnamed the Wise. He collected as many reliques as he possibly could (59). He begged some of Francis I, and Margaret

5 Z

obliged John della Casa to write a small tract, that has been published in 1688, wherein Vergerius is cruelly treated [K]. Prudence will not allow us to believe what an enemy publishes of another without proof, and therefore we ought at least to suspend our judgment

(60) It was in Thuringia.

(61) Called Burcardi. He was of the family of the barons of Schenck.

(62) Taken from Seckendorf, *ibid.*

(63) Seckendorf, *ubi supra*.

(64) *Id. ibid.* quoting a letter of Spalatin, to the Monk Burcard, dated the 28th of July 1522.

(65) *Id. ibid.*

(66) In the article ORICEL-LARIUS, remark [D].

(67) In the article MOLZA, remark [D], and in the article VAYER, remark [E].

garet of Austria, Governors of the Low-Countries, and obtained them. He had several sent from Mantua, Colmar, Basil, and the monastery of Ilmene (60). A German Monk (61) was collecting some for him in Italy, and employed our Vergerius, who had delivered this collection into the Elector's hands if he had not fallen sick in his journey. James Vergerius, his brother, who accompanied him, and who, as well as he, had served the German Monk, was also stopped by a like occasion: He also fell sick by the way (62). I believe that Peter-Paul hoped, as a reward, to be made a professor in the university of Wittemberg: for he had been recommended as a learned young man, who desired a maintenance that would enable him to finish his studies under the professors of that university. Here are the words of this Monk's letter from Venice to Spalatin, the 29th of October, 1521. 'Intendit ipse Petrus Paulus, frater Jacobi, permanere & complere in Wittembergae studium suum, si potuerit & sit beneplacitum Principis nostri. Rogavit quoque me, ut tibi supplex fierem pro eo, & certe credo, magni honoris & utilitatis esset illi Universitati; habet enim nobilissimum ingenium & memoriam, ut experientia videre licet, reputaturque præcipuus de humanitate & jure, inter juvenes studii Patavini. Rogo propterea T. Dom. suscipe eum, & commenda eum Principi Ser. ut filium, & primo in Universitate, ut inveniat locum legendi, vivendi, & proficiendi (63). - - - Peter-Paul himself, the brother of James, designs to continue and to finish his studies at Wittemberg, if he can, and if it be the good pleasure of our Prince. He desired me to intercede with you in his behalf, and I really think it would be a great honour and advantage to that university: for he has given proofs of his excellent genius and memory, and he is reckoned to outdo all the young students at Padua in Philology and Law. I beg therefore you would take him under your care, and recommend him heartily to his most serene Highness, that he may have a maintenance to enable him to prosecute his studies in the university. Spalatin answered, that he could promise nothing to the two Vergerios; and as for the reliques which had already been received, and the payment of which the Monk solicited; he answered that he would send them back again, the price of them being fallen since Luther's Reformation, and that doubtless they would be more esteemed, and sell better in Italy than in Germany: 'Reliquias nobis missas, una cum cruce, recipies omnes, à te, quancunque poteris, vendendas; credibile enim est, istic quam hic majoris esse tum pretii tum honoris. Hic enim vel vulgus ita respuit, ut verbo Dei edoctum satis sibi esse putet, ut & revera est, fide & fiducia erga Deum & charitate erga proximum (64). - - - You shall have back again all the reliques you sent us, together with the cross, that you may sell them for as much as you can get; for I believe they are more esteemed, and will sell better there than here. For even the common people here are so much altered, that being instructed from the word of GOD, they think it sufficient, as it really is, to have faith and trust in GOD, and charity towards their neighbour.' The person who wrote this letter had told the Elector, his master, that it had been very well if the dispute concerning Indulgences had begun sooner, for it had saved him a great deal of care and money (65).

[K] Wherein Vergerius is cruelly treated.] When I mentioned his books, I did not speak of that, intitled, *Contra Catalogum Joannis della Casa Sodomitæ Patronum*. He bestowed the epithet of Apologist for Sodomy on John della Casa on account of his *Capitolo del Forno*. He so defamed him throughout Germany, that this author thought himself obliged to address a Poem to the Germans, to remove those sinister impressions which our author had made on them against him. I have elsewhere (66) observed the mistake of a Modern, who was of opinion that Casa wrote this poem by way of answer to the invectives of Naogeorgus. It is certain that it was only aimed at Vergerius. I have also said somewhere (67), that the reason why John della Casa was so defamed, when several Italian Poets remained undisturbed, whose poems were more detestable

than his, was, that he persecuted Vergerius at Venice, which other Poets did not. But let us here speak of the small tract, which Mr Menage printed in 1688, at the end of his *Anti-Baillet*. It is a piece written in very good Latin, which Mr Menage received from the celebrated Magliabechi, and in which Casa reviles Peter-Paul Vergerius at a strange rate. He accuses him of long and violent quarrels with his brother John Baptist, Bishop of Pola; of perjury to avoid the payment of his debts, and of killing his wife, in order to advance himself to benefices; he charges him with having intreated Cardinal de Tournon to carry him into France, and with having offered to write concerning Germany and the Swifts, and concerning religion, whatever should be prescribed him. Observe that Vergerius was then in the Grison's country. This Cardinal, who at first took him for a Butcher, at last knowing who was, very severely reprimanded him, and took no notice of his offers to repent. 'Qui cum te squalidum, fordidum, pannis oblitum, conspiciat, visulque sibi videre lanionem aliquem esset; quæsit de te qui tu es: atque ubi Vergerium esse dixisti, multis, homo gravissimus, te verbis male accepit (68). - - - When he saw you in a rasty and tattered condition, and thought you was a Butcher, he asked you who you was; and upon your telling him that you was Vergerius, he severely reprov'd you.' This small tract informs us (69), that Vergerius, in his younger days, professed Poetry; that he was afterwards admitted advocate; that he practised as such; but in pleading, he rendered himself insupportable to the Judges, to the litigants, and in general to the whole court, by his fallacies, calumnies, and prevarications: 'Lingua atque audacia fretus, causas agere te velle dixisti: sed cum, quoties diceres, toties malediceres, mentireris, pejerares, calumniarieris, pravaricareris, neque litigatores tibi, jam neque corona, neque Judices, fidem habebant; nemoque ferre te, ac ne aspicere quidem poterat (70). - - - Trusting to your tongue and impudence, you said you would be an advocate; but as in pleading you were always guilty of reviling, lying, perjury, calumny, and prevarication, neither the Litigants, nor the Bar, nor the Judges gave credit to you: no body could endure you, no body could bear the sight of you.' That getting no money, and being a widower, (thanks to the poison he had given his wife,) he cast his eye on spiritual benefices, and went to Rome, where his brother Antony recommended him to Clement VII, and obtained for him the Nunciature of Germany. He adds, that Francis Spiera (71), whom he represented to the world, as a man inspired, one day put him into an extreme confusion by calling him bankrupt, poisoner, and heretic (72). To conclude; he accuses him of flying to the Grisons, in order to shelter himself from the pursuit of his creditors (73). The Leipzig Journalists, in their extract of the *Anti-Baillet*, exactly quote most of the accusations against Vergerio; but they suppose that Matius had praised him, and that Casa refuted that elogy: 'Mutii laudes Vergerio tributas, p. 377 evertit Casa (74). This they ground on these words of Casa, de Mutio verò affirmare tibi hoc possum non tibi illum honorem cum de te scripsit, habuisse, sed patriæ vestra. Which import that Mutius had not done Vergerius the honour to re-fute him, if he had not had a particular regard to the country which produced them both. And he was so far from praising Vergerius, that he published most injurious invectives against him.

Two things are to be further observed concerning this tract of John della Casa. He makes two exceptions against the infamies with which Vergerio had charged Paul III. The first is, that those crimes which he imputed to that Pope were of such a nature, that they could never come to his knowledge: the second is taken from the enmity bewixt Paul III and him: 'Obsecro te quid tu tibi voluisti, aut quicunque ille fuit, qui de PAULI III vita scripsit? Putastine quemquam fore qui tibi de tot tantisque criminibus ac sceleribus crederet? Qui tu isthæ scire potuisti? Prefertim cum tam multa sint intestina ac domestica, de quibus vix unus aut alter ex intimis familiaribus etiam si maximè vera sint, suspicari aliquid signis quibuldam

(68) *Anti-Baillet*, Tom. vii, pag. 253, in the bottom of the page by Baillet of 1725, in 4to.

(69) *Ibid.* pag. 256.

(70) *Ibid.*

(71) He does not name him, but doubtless he means him.

(72) *Anti-Baillet*, Tom. vii, pag. 257.

(73) *Ibid.*

(74) *Acta Emendat. Lips.* 1689, pag. 497.

I

(83) Joh. Val.
Andreas, in Vita
avi sui Jacobi
Andreas, pag.
130, apud Sec-
kendorf. *ibid.*

VERGERIUS.

460

In the authors which I have consulted concerning him, I do not find any mention of his journey to France after he was made a Bishop: I am informed of this part of his life only by a collection of letters printed at Venice in 1558. In that collection there are some of his letters which acquaint us that he admired the piety and excellent qualities of the Queen of Navarre, sister to Francis I, and began to disrelish his course of life, and to think of residing in his bishopric [M]. There is also (i) one written by his brother AURELIUS VERGERIUS (k) to Julia Gonzaga. I have not much to object against Moreri on this article [N].

I perceived too late, that the words which I quoted from the preface to a book ascribed to him, are capable of another sense than what I gave them. I shall set down that

(i) At folio 124, of book I.

(k) He was a learned man. See Seckendorf, ubi supra, in Sup. ptem. Index 1, num. 80.

(84) Seckendorf, ibid.

(85) Surius, in the edition of the year 1567, says only what I mention; but in that of the year 1574, pag. 733, he adds this, Sanè aiant viri graves, hunc apostatam Vergerium sub mortem teterissimos exhalasse fœtores, ac bovis infar horrendos edidisse boatus: & alia quædam, quæ spero quodque certius proditor eos, qui morientur adjuce. Mihi necdum licuit omnia exactè cognoscere. . . . Some worthy persons affirm, that this apostate Vergerius at his death, sent forth most offensive stinks, and uttered dreadful bellowsings like an ox: and they relate several other things, which I hope those who were present at his death, will give a more certain account of. For I have not been able as yet to get an exact information of every thing.

(86) Surius, Comment. Rerum in Orbe gest. ad ann. 1567, pag. ult. Edit. 1567.

(87) Jo. Paulus Windeck, Prognostic. futuri stat. pag. 113. He quotes Ederus.

(88) Languet. Epist. lviij, lib. ii, pag. 143.

(89) Dicitur mittendus brevi, aut saltem hoc agere ut mittatur. Cuperem eum manere domi. Idem, Epist. ix, pag. 151.

flood religious controversies (84). Surius says that Gablerus, Professor of Physic, was present at the death of Vergerio, and made some observations, which determined him to turn Catholic (85). 'Adfuerat in Petro Paulo Vergerio è corpore migranti apud quem mira quædam viderat quæ illi animum videntur perferisse, ut non modo Catholicus sed piissimus quoque Catholicus fieret (86). . . . He was present at the death of Peter-Paul Vergerius, and observed some wonderful things, which seemed to affect his mind prodigiously, so that he became not only a Catholic but a very pious one.' Observe, that Surius is no classical author in point of History. Much more ought we to distrust those who magnify this story. They assure us, that the horrible death of Vergerius caused several Protestants to return into the bosom of the Church. Here follows the moderate expressions of those authors: 'Petrus Paulus Vergerius, infamis Apostata ob horrendam mortem qua defunctus est, multis attonitis vicinarum civitatum hominibus salutare præbuit documentum, ut plerique sese collegere, et ad pacem ac unitatem Ecclesiæ reverſi fuerint, frustra frementibus lupis infernalibus (87). . . . Peter-Paul Vergerius, an infamous Apostate, by his horrible death, gave a salutary warning to many persons of the neighbourhood that were astonished at it, so that several returned to the peace and unity of the Church, the infernal wolves in vain raging on that account.'

By a letter of Hubert Languet written from Paris on the ninth of October 1561, we learn that the Duke of Wirtemberg had sent into France our Vergerius, who was the most proper man in the world to imbroil things, Languet thought it strange that this Prince should be desirous to put ubiquity and other fancies of Brentius among the doctrines of the French Reformation. 'Miro etiam Virtembergensem nobis velle obtundere ubiquestatem & alias nugas Brentii, nec religionis apud nos infantiam considerare, quæ non sit obtruenda istis spinosis & futilibus disputationibus, quas ne quidem intelligunt qui eas proponunt, sed omni indulgentia fovenda, & tanquam lætis potu alenda, donec magis in Christo adoleſcat. Præterea huc misit Vergerium, hominem quo nullus est magis idoneus ad res turbandas (88). . . . I am surprised that the Duke of Wirtemberg should be desirous to obtrude upon us Ubiquity and the other ridiculous fancies of Brentius, and that he does not consider the infant state of religion amongst us, which ought not to be oppressed with such knotty and vain disputations, which even those that propose them do not understand, but should with all tenderness be nursed up, and, as it were, fed with milk till it grow up and be strong in CHRIST. Besides, he has sent Vergerius hither, the fittest man in the world to embroil affairs.' Languet wrote another letter eight days after, and says that Vergerius was not yet come to the French court, but that it was reported he would be sent quickly, or at least that he endeavoured it. I wish, says he, he would stay at home (89).

[M] That he admired the piety . . . of the Queen of Navarre . . . and that he began to disrelish his course of life, and to think of residing in his bishopric.] See what he wrote to Lewis Alamanni the day after he had conversed with that Princess: 'Ne la Signora Marchesa di Pescara, ne la Signoria vostra, che sapete tanto ben tutti due in vive voci, e tanto bene ne i scritti vostri dir cio, che volete, ne il Cardinal nostro Illustriss. ne tutta Roma, predicandomi l'altrezza & la bellezza dell' animo, & dell'ingegno, & il fervor dello spirito acceso in Christo, & la carita ardente della serenissima Regina di Navara, me ne havete saputo dire tanto, quanto io nel vero ho tro-

vato hieri, che sua maestà degno di fare, che io udisſi un pezzo quelle sue rare voci, il qual giorno mi ha portato una letitia inenarrabile, & senza dubbio la maggiore, che io habbi havuto gia molto tempo (90). . . . Neither the Marchioness of Pescara, nor you, who both know so well to express whatever you please either in conversation or in writing, nor his eminency our Cardinal, nor all Rome, speaking of the greatness and excellency of mind and temper, and fervent zeal in CHRIST, and ardent charity of the most serene Queen of Navarre, I say, you have not been able to tell me so much as in truth I found yesterday, when her Majesty was pleased to let me hear some of her excellent discourse; which day has given me unspeakable joy, and undoubtedly the greatest I have had this long time.' The rest of the letter turns on the pious sentiments, which the great knowledge of that Queen excited in the heart of that Prelate. He was in France when he wrote a letter to Ottonello Vida, in which he deploras the progress of Lutheranism, and the little care that was taken of the Lord's vineyard. He declares that having weighed these words of the gospel, What doth it profit a man to gain the whole world, and lose his own soul, against all those reasons which encouraged him with hopes of making his fortune, he found the scale turn on the side of the words of JESUS CHRIST. Wherefore, faith he, it will be best for me, for the future to apply myself to the culture of that portion which is allotted me, Perciò dico, che farà meglio, ch'io venga à coltivare quelle poche viti, ch'io su quel confine Tedesco, & veder di circondarle con un buon siepe, & tenerle difese, per poterne coglier qualche frutto da offerire a Dio; che stare fuori, & otioso ad aspettare, che altri si risolvino a voler mettere in lavoro tutta la vigna insieme (91). . . . Therefore I say it will be better for me to come, and cultivate those few vines which I have on the confines of Germany, to surround myself with a good hedge and defend them, that I may be able to gather from them some fruit to offer unto GOD: than to be idle and wait, till others resolve to undertake the care of the whole vineyard together.' Vida's answer (92) to confirm him in this resolution is very pertinent and excellent.

[N] I have not much to object against Moreri on this article.] I. The two articles of Verger (Peter Paul) are transposed; for he places the Bishop of Capo d'Istria before Emanuel Chrysoloras's disciple. As for the last he refers us to the authors of the following article, that is, to those which he cites after having amply spoken of John Verger de Haurane Abbot of St Cyran. This absurdity has been left out in the Dutch edition of Moreri (93). II. What Moreri (94) affirms, that Paul III intended to make Vergerio a Cardinal, is contradicted by Pallavicini (95). III. What he adds, that he took along with him one of his brothers, who was also a Bishop, is disproved by Sleidan, who affirms, that before the Bishop of Capo d'Istria left Italy, the Bishop of Pola was dead. 'Antequam ex Italia decederet, jam erat mortuus ejus frater Episcopus Pola: suspitioque fuit veneno sublatum esse (96). . . . Before he left Italy, his brother, the Bishop of Pola was dead, and was suspected [D]. to have been poisoned.' IV. To what end doth he cite Paul Jovius, Volaterranus, Jacobus de Bergamo, Vossius, &c. to confirm what he had said concerning the Bishop of Capo d'Istria, of which they make no manner of mention, and which could not be known to some of them. V. What is the meaning of these words, for the second consult Spondanus? They seem to direct us to some places wherein mention is made of John-Baptist Vergerius Bishop of Pola: but that would be a false direction, and is not

(90) Lettere volgari di diversi nobilissimi Huomini, lib. i. fol. 81. See also fol. 101, what he writes to the marchioness of Pescara.

(91) Ibid. fol. 83 verso, & fol. 83.

(92) You will find it, ibid. fol. 83, & 94.

(93) There it is the preceding, instead of the following.

(94) He says so after Spondanus, ad ann. 1548, num. 23.

(95) See the end of the remark [D].

(96) Sleid. lib. xxi, fol. 590.

that other sense, tho^t at last I find it is not the true one [O]. It concerns the book, intituled *The anatomy of the Masi*. AURELIUS VERGERIUS, brother to him of whom we speak, was knight of Malta, and was employed in some negotiations in which he acquired much glory (l). LEWIS VERGERIUS, his nephew, fled to Basil on account of his religion. He wrote some letters in the year 1549, which were inserted in the Cosmography of Munster (m).

(l) Munster, in Cosmographia, lib. iii, pag. m. 694.

(m) Pag. m. 693, 914.

not Moreri's meaning. It must be a typographical blunder.

[O] I shall set down that other sense, though at last I find it is not the true one.] Let us repeat here the words inserted in the remark [F].

Quoniam igitur Anatomia cognitio non solum medicis, chirurgisque, verum etiam aliis summopere commendatur: eam ob causam, Anthonium ab Adam Italum imitatus, hanc Missæ ac Missalis Anatomiam Gallicè, ut ab omnibus percipi posset facilius in lucem edere statui. . . . Since then the knowledge of Anatomy is very much recommended, not only to Physicians and Surgeons, but also to others: for that reason, in imitation of Anthonius ab Adam, an Italian author, I resolved to publish this Anatomy of the Masi and Missal in French, that it might be the more easily understood by every body.

I took the meaning of those words to be, that he intended to copy or translate Anthonius ab Adam, an Italian author: and I supposed they were the version of the Preface to the French edition: and upon that foot I thought the Corrector should not have advertised that it ought to be read *Latinè* and not *Gallicè*: but afterwards I perceived that it might perhaps be more reasonable to suppose, that those were the words of the Latin translator, and that he considered Anthonius ab Adam, as the Italian translator of the book, and not as the author: from whence it would follow that the work had been first composed in French. This supposition appeared to me altogether probable: but having at last recovered the French edition, I am intirely convinced that my first conjectures are the best. The Epistle Dedicatory to this edition informs me, that the Anatomy of the Masi was first published in Italian, and that the Marquis del Vico desired somebody to translate it into French. This somebody having complied with his desire, dedicated his translation to the same Marquis, and caused it to be printed at Geneva for John Crespin. His Epistle Dedicatory is dated from Geneva the eleventh of May 1555, and subscribed C. D. J. It is followed with a pretty long Preface, wherein the translator sets forth why this excellent Italian person called Anthonius d'Adam (97) (who some time ago thoroughly canvassed the abominations of the

Masi and Missal, which he distinctly pointed out) thought fit to give this title of Anatomy to a book which he wrote upon them, the better to express briefly what he had written (98). This translator took some liberties, and owned it in the following manner: 'As for the rest, I shall make no long apology, for not confining myself so much as to translate this book verbatim from the Italian, without adding or leaving out any thing. For that was not my intention, when I undertook to translate this Anatomy. I persuaded myself that the readers would not take it amiss, if I endeavoured to accommodate myself to the capacity of those, who are not at all instructed in the knowledge of the truth, just as the other did, in writing for the ignorant of his own nation. For I have sometimes explained more fully what he had expressed in a few words (99).'

Observe that this Anatomy was refuted by a Doctor of Paris, and that some ascribe it to Calvin. 'Scripfit Calvinus in contemptum Missæ librum quem inscribit Anatomem Missæ, in quo totam Missam membratim dissectat, ac medicorum more & philosophorum in suas partes resolvit ac egregiè irridet, subfannat, ac traducit. Hanc Anatomem confutavit Jacobus Faber Molinensis Doctor Theologus Parisiensis. Liber impressus est Parisiis Anno 1563: Libri inscriptio est talis; Pro sacrosancto Missæ sacrificio adversus impiam Missæ & Missalis Anatomem, diffictorum Laniorum, Misoliturgorum Calvinianæ familiæ perditè excogitatum Hyperaspistes, &c (100). . . . Calvin wrote a book in contempt of the Masi, which he intituled the Anatomy of the Masi, wherein he difficts the whole Masi by pieces, and after the manner of Physicians and Philosophers resolves it into its parts, and ridicules, derides and traduces it egregiously. This Anatomy was confuted by James Le Fevre of Moulins, a Doctor of Divinity at Paris. The book was printed at Paris in the year 1563: and is intituled, A Defence of the Holy Sacrifice of the Masi, against the impious Anatomy of the Masi and Missal, wickedly contrived by those butchering diffictors and liturgy-baters, the Calvinists, &c.

(98) Preface to the Anatomy of the Masi, p. m. 13. I use an edition of the year 1562, in 16mo. The Printer's name (John Martin) is put to it, but not the place where it was printed.

(99) Ibid. pag. 29, 30.

(100) Cornelius Schultingius Bibl. Cathol. Tom. iv. pag. 227.

(97) The Latin translation ought then to have called him Anthonium ab Adam, or ab Adam, and not ab Adam. He does not say, it is a typographical error.

VERGERIUS (ANGELUS) born in the isle of Candia (a), translated out of Greek into Latin the tract *de Fluviorum & Montium Nominibus*, ascribed to Plutarch. He wrote the Greek letters so exquisitely, that his writing was made use of as an original, or pattern, by those who engraved the types of that language, for the royal impressions in the reign of Francis I (b) [A]. He was still living in Charles the IXth's time [B]. He

(a) See the remark [A].
(b) Mr Chevallier, Origine de l'Imprimerie, pag. 259, speaks of those fine Letters, that were cast in the matrices, which Francis I. caused to be made with a royal magnificence. See the remark [CC], of the article FRANCIS I.

[A] He wrote the Greek letters so exquisitely, that his writing was made use of as a pattern . . . for the royal impressions in the reign of Francis I.] This I find in the *varie lectiones* of Rutgerius. 'Duos, scilicet (1), (interpretes) mihi videre contigit, Italum unum, Natalem de Comitibus, alterum Cretensem, Angelum Vergerium eum qui tam eleganter Græcè pinxit, ut ejus manus pro archetypo iis fuerit, quorum opera in sculpendis regis characteribus Rex Franciscus usus est. . . . I happened to be acquainted with two translators, one Natalis Comes, an Italian, the other Angelus Vergerius, a Candian, who wrote the Greek character so finely, that his writing served for a pattern to those, who were employed in casting types in the reign of Francis I.' The two translations mentioned here are those of the little book *de Fluviorum & Montium Nominibus*.

[B] He was still living in Charles the IXth's time.] I have no other proof of this but the Epistle Dedicatory to the Poems of Jan Antoine de Baif. Which is inscribed to that monarch, and besides other things contains the following lines.

VOL. V.

Charles Etienne premier, disciple de Lazare
Le docte Bonamy, de mode non barbare
M'a prunt à prononcer le langage Romain:
Ange Vergece Grec, à la gentile main
Pour l'écriture Gréque, Ecrivain ordinaire
De vos Granpere & Pere & le VOSTRE, ut salère
Pour à l'accent des Grecs ma parole dresser,
Et ma main sur le trac de sa lettre adresser.

Charles Stephens, who was disciple
To Lazarus, the learned Bonamy,
Taught me to read the Latin tongue with grace.
Angelus Vergerius, a Grecian born,
Who wrote that language finely, and who was
To your grand-father, father, and your self
Writer in ordinary, was engaged
To form my tongue to th' accent of the Greeks,
And after his own copy to lead my hand.

You

6 A

He is too violently censured by a Dutch Critic [C]. NICOLAS VERGERIUS [D], his son, was a learned man, and made some verses on the death of Hadrian Turnebus.

(2) In the remark [D].

You will also find another place below (2), where this Candiot's name is written Vergece as well as here. Which makes me apt to suspect that instead of calling him Vergerius in Latin, he ought to be called Vergecius.

[C] He is too violently censured by a Dutch Critic. We have seen in the remark [A], that Natalis Comes, and our Vergerius translated into Latin the tract *περί ποταμῶν καὶ ὁρῶν ἐπανυμίας*. These words are to be found in it (3): *Καδμῶ τὸν κρηνοῦλακα δρέκοντα τοξέυσας, καὶ εὐρὺν ὥσπερ παφραμακτενὸν φέβει τὸ ὕδωρ, πεινέχοντο τὴν χώραν ἡτῶν πηγῶν*. They are thus expressed in Latin by Natalis Comes: 'Ubi Cadmus serpentem fontis custodem jaculis confodisset, invenissetque aquam quasi ob timorem veneno infectam, regionem lustravit fontem in-

(3) In the second chapter, where the river Iteneus is mentioned.

quens. . . . After Cadmus had killed with darts the serpent, which guarded the fountain, and found the water, as he apprehended, infected with poison, he went all over the country looking for a spring. Vergerius's version runs thus: 'Cum Cadmus fontis custodem draconem jaculis confecisset, & aquam ejus veneno infectam cerneret, eam abhorrens circumivit regionem ad investigandum fontem. . . . When Cadmus had pierced with darts the dragon that guarded the fountain, and saw that the water was infected with poison, he dreaded it, and went about the country to search for a spring.' Rutgerius's judgment of these two versions is: I believe, saith he (4), that Vergerius was drunk when he talked in this manner; and it is not to be wondered that Natalis Comes hath ill translated a corrupted place, for he did most times spoil even such places as were correct. This censure is so unjust with regard to Vergerius that it is less capable of hurting his memory than that of Rutgerius. For his translation is not only better than that of Natalis Comes, though this Critic mentions the latter much more tenderly than the former, but is the best which could possibly be made, supposing the Greek text not corrupted. The learned Maussac understood this place just as Vergerius did, and thus translates it: 'Cum Cadmus sagittis confixisset draconem qui fontem custodiebat, VERITUS ne aqua veneno infecta esset, circumivit regionem alium fontem quo sitim levaret, querens. . . . When Cadmus had pierced with arrows the dragon that guarded the fountain, fearing lest the water should be infected with poison, he went about the country in quest of other water to quench his thirst.' So that Vergerius's fault lies only in not having conjectured as Rutgerius hath (5), that instead of φέβει the reading ought to be ἐκ φόνου, hoc est, à sanguine five tabo, . . . with the blood or gore. Maussac did not think of it neither; wherefore I wonder that Rutgerius did not censure his version, which makes me believe he knew nothing of it. Though according to the time of its publication, he might have seen it (6); but how many printed books are there which remain unknown, even to the most learned? Mr Maussac had never heard of any version of this tract when he undertook to translate it (7), and afterwards he saw indeed the version of Natalis Comes and Turnebus, but not that of Vergerius. An hundred examples of this nature might be alledged.

[D] NICOLAS VERGERIUS . . . made some verses on the death of Hadrian Turnebus. This you find in these words of Thuaus. 'Ei (Hadriano Turnebo) Joan. Auratus. . . . Nicolaus denique Vergerius, Angeli illius Cretensis elegantiorum & Græcæ linguæ characterum ad omnem admirationem & oculorum jucunditatem formatoris F. . . . & alii epitaphiis carminibus parentarunt (8). . . . Joan Auratus. . . . And lastly Nicolas Vergerius the son of Angelus the Candian, who wrote the Greek character so exquisitely, that it was wonderfully beautiful. . . . and others made some verses on the death of Hadrian Turnebus.' He was born in Candia, from whence he went into France about the year 1540. This I infer from two passages of John Antony de Baif, one of which informs me, that the same John Antony was committed to the tutorship of Tufan, and the other that he contracted at Tufan's house a friendship with Nicolas Vergerius, then lately come from Candia (9).

(4) Equidem Vergerium cum hæc scriberet sobrius fuisse non puto. Nam in Natali mirandum non est si correpta non recte transulit cum illi pene fatale fuerit, male vertendo, ut ille ait, etiam ex Græcis bonis Latina facere non bona. Rutgerius, ubi supra, pag. 236.

(5) Ibid. p. 235.

(6) The book de Fluviis ac Montium Nominibus, translated into Latin by Philip James de Maussac, was printed at Toulouse in 1615, and that of Rutgerius, at Leyden, 1618.

(7) See his preface.

(8) Thuaus, lib. xxxviii, pag. 769, ad ann. 1565.

(9) John Antony de Baif, epistle to the king, prefixed to his Poems, printed at Paris, in the year 1573, in 2vo.

Amy qu'en la prime jeunesse
J'acointay chez le bon Tufan,
Voicy cinq fois le cinquieme an
Tout nouveau venu de la Grece.

Bien jeune tu vis escumer
Deffous toy la rouslante mer
Tiré de l'isle ta naissance
Qui vit de Jupiter l'enfance (10).

When in my youth to good Tufanus' care
I was committed, I contracted there
With him just come from Greece a friendship fast,
Since which, now five and twenty years are past.

You was but young and in your tender age,
When you beheld the sea beneath you rage.
The very isle, which gave an infant saw,
Is that in which, you first your breath did draw.

These lines are taken from the *Contretreue* à Nicolas Vergece Candiot, in which you will find the following elegy on his Muse,

FIE, ces mignardises laisse,
Je ne puis entendre à tes jeux;
Lachons un peu couvrir nos feux,
A fin que m'acquie à Vergece,
Qui m'a mis en soucy plaissant,
M'étreuant d'un mignard presant
Que la Muse avec la Charite
Ont ourdi de fleurons d'eslite.
Ces beaux vers en langue Latine
Confits au miel Catullien,
Vers de bon heur, meritent bien
Que beusse de l'eau Cabaline (11).

(10) John Antony de Baif's Poems, fol. n. 119.

(11) Ibid.

My Fairy, these caresses cease,
Your toying I cannot approve,
Let us not now indulge to love,
That I from debt may get release.
Vergece's gift, which is most rare,
Has put me in a pleasing care,
'Tis by the Graces and the Muses
Adorn'd with ev'ry beauty curious.
Verse of such sublime a nature,
That he in Latin did compose,
Which with Catullian honey flows,
Merit Hyppocrene's water.

John Antony de Baif, before he finishes this Poem, takes notice of his own poverty, and of that of his friend.

Pauvreté mes espaulles presse,
Me foule & jamais ne me laisse.
Je suis pauvre, & tu n'es pas riche:
Vien-t'en me voir, Amy trefdoux:
Embrassons-nous, consolons-nous:
Le ciel ne fera toujours chiche
Envers nous du bien qui des mains
De fortune vient aux humains:
Or vivons une vie estroite
En pauvreté, mais sans souffrette (12).

(12) Ibid. fol. n. 119, verso.

Poverty my shoulder presses,
And to haunt me never ceases,
I am poor, you don't abound,
Come to see me, dearest friend,
Let's embrace, and put an end
To grief. For Heav'n will not be found.
Still sparing to us of its gifts:
Fortune's fickle and often shifts:
Tho' we live in poverty
Yet let us still contented be.

VERON

VERON (JOHN) a French Protestant lived in the XVIth century. He published in English divers books of controvery, and amongst others one on Pur-

(a) See the Calvinico Turcismus, lib. iv, cap. viii, pag. m. 834.

VERONA, a city of Italy, which some writers say, was built, and others that it was only rebuilt by the Gauls. Pompey's father led a Roman colony thither (a). It was sacked by Attila, and successively possessed by Odoacar King of the Heruli, Theodoric King of the Goths, and his successors down to Totila, by the Lombards, by Charlemagne, and his posterity; but when his descendants lost the empire, several lords made themselves sovereigns of several cities of Italy. This sort of government continued till Otho I re-united to the empire several States, which had been alienated from it. Amongst these Verona was one, but it obtained the power of electing its own magistrates: So that it was properly an independant republic, under the name of an imperial city. In this state it continued till Actiolinus seized the sovereign power, which he could not obtain but by great bloodshed. He enjoyed his tyrannical power thirty-three years, and died in the year 1269. After him the Veronese elected Martin della Scala their General, whose conduct they so well approved, that five years after they created him perpetual Dictator. His descendants governed Verona with great reputation, and were created princes by the Emperor in the year 1310. They rendered themselves formidable by their conquests, and were driven out of Verona in 1387, by John Galeazzo Duke of Milan. They re-entered it in 1404, but did not keep possession long, for the Venetians seized the city in 1409 (b), and have so carefully kept it, that they enjoy it to this day. It is not known whether any of the illustrious family della Scala remained, who left any children. Julius Cæsar Scaliger, one of the most learned men of the XVIth century, pretended to be descended from this house. But that honourable descent is disputed; and few at present believe his pretension to be well grounded. Some are of opinion, that the letters of naturalization which he obtained in France, contradict his claim, since he there bears only the character of a Physician born at Verona (c). The public doubtless will be very glad to see those letters of naturalization here [A] wherefore I insert them.

(a) Taken from Cluverius, in Italia antiqua, lib. i, cap. xvi.

(b) Taken from Leander Alberti's Descript. Italix, pag. 716, & seq. He made use of the antiquities of Verona, published by Torellus Sarayna.

(c) See the Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, February 1686, pag. m. 164, & Menagiana, pag. 25, of the first Dutch edition. Primers, a Physician quoted in Ritsan's Curiculæ Recherches sur les Ecoles de Medecine, affirms that the Physicians of Bourdeaux refused to admit Julius Cæsar Scaliger into that town, unless he underwent an examination; which Scaliger being unwilling to submit to, for fear of exposing his reputation in a quodlibetical disputation, he retired to Agen.

[A] The public will doubtless be very glad to see those letters of naturalization. Mr Baluze, one of those extraordinary men, who are born for the good of the Republic of Letters, and who besides the productions with which they enrich it, are pleased to furnish other authors with all sorts of assistance, did me the favour to lend me what follows.

An extract of an original register of Francis I, which is in the Repository of Records at Paris.

' Francis, &c. We give to understand, &c. that we have received the humble supplication of our dear and well beloved Julius Cæsar de l'Esclle de Bordeaux, Doctor of Physic, native of the city of Verona in Italy, setting forth that about four years past, or thereabouts, he came into this our kingdom to the city of Agen in Agenois, with intention and full resolution to end the remainder of his days there: in which city, and the country about it, the said suppliant has purchased an house, and several other possessions. But because he is a stranger and not a native of our realm, he is in doubt whether the possessions which he may have purchased, or hopes to purchase, likewise the inheritances which may devolve on him hereafter from his relations or others, may not be claimed, as belonging to us by escheat or otherwise, and our officers may not accordingly give him some trouble or hinderance, if he be not qualified and dispensed with on that account, and humbly requesting us to impart to him our favour and liberality. Wherefore we, these things considered, generously inclined to grant the supplication and request of the said suppliant, given and granted, give and grant leave and licence: willing by our especial grace, full power and royal authority, by these presents, that he be freely permitted to inhabit, and dwell in our said realm, and in it hold and possess all such estates moveables or immoveables, which he hath already acquired, or shall for the future lawfully acquire;

and likewise that he may succeed to all those goods and inheritances which in our said realm, territories, lands, and lordships, shall devolve on or belong to him by good and just title, and that he may dispose of them by his last will, as his proper goods and inheritance; and that his heirs or others to whom he may dispose of them, may be enabled to succeed and take possession of and enjoy the said goods, and in general that he shall enjoy entirely all the honours, privileges, prerogatives, franchises, liberties, and rights which are customarily enjoyed by the originary natives of this our kingdom, and that he shall be held and accounted our subject, in all cases as a native of our realm; and therefore we have qualified and dispensed, and do qualify and dispense him, of our said grace by these presents, he paying us a moderate sum for once only. We give in command by these same presents to our trusty and beloved officers of our accounts and treasurers at Paris, baillies, seneschals, and to all our other justiciaries and officers, and to their lieutenants for the present and for the future, and to every one of them whom it may concern, and we will that the grace, licence, habitation, and all the effects by these presents granted, be by them suffered and permitted to the suppliant to enjoy and use, fully and peaceably without giving or suffering to fall on him any arrest, disturbance, or hindrance, in what manner soever on any occasion, &c. For such is, &c. Notwithstanding all statutes, ordinances against strangers, and any other ordinances, &c. Given at Paris in the month of March in the year of Grace, one thousand five hundred and twenty-eight, and the fifteenth of our reign. Thus signed. By the King, Gedeon. Vija. Contentor. des Landes.'

(1) Joannes PINUS, his article is to be seen above.

(2) His family, which is that of Bertier, has afforded many eminent men. His father, first President in the Parliament of Toulouse, was called Mr de Montrave. He was a man of great merit. See Balzac, Lettres Choises, pag. 270, Dutch edition.

I expected from Mr Baluze a memoir which I have not received concerning Du Pin (1), Bishop of Rieux. The Bishop of Rieux (2), one of the most learned and illustrious Prelates of France was to send it to him.

VERSORIS

VERSORIS.

464

VERSORIS, (PETER DE) Lord of Fontenai le Visconte, of Marilli, and part of Montoger, and head of the council of the Dukes of Guise (a) in the XVIth century, was an Advocate in the Parliament of Paris, and one of the most famous and illustrious of his profession. He was born at Paris on the 16th of February 1528 (b), of a noble family, and one that had been considerable for a long time (c) [A]. He was designed by his father to be an officer in a sovereign court; but having extravagantly spent, whilst he was young, the money that was laid aside for that use, he endeavoured to repair that fault by hard labour, whereby . . . he became one of the chief advocates of his time: he was so much master of all the things which were necessary to him, that he hardly used any books (d). He pleaded for the Jesuits in the year 1564, in the famous trial which they had with the university of Paris; and, to speak properly, he gained the cause. He was deputed to the states of Blois in the year 1576, and spoke in the name of the third state. He was assigned a chamber counsellor as a pleader (e). He was very zealous for his clients, particularly for the house of Guise . . . And he died with grief in less than four or five hours, on the 25th of December 1588, after he had heard that the Duke of Guise [B] had been killed at Blois (f). It is said, that this duke took his advice only in his domestic affairs, killed at Blois (f). We shall see below wherein his talents lay [C].

(a) Manuscript Memoir.

(b) Opusc. de Loisel, p. 556.

(c) Manuscript Memoir.

(d) Opusc. de Loisel, p. 751.

(e) See the remark [C].

(f) Loisel, ubi supra, pag. 527.

(g) See the remark [B].

[A] Of a noble family, and one that had been considerable for a long time.] The proof of this is given by Mr Joly in his notes on the alphabetical Index of the Advocates, printed with divers pieces of Antony Loisel, in the year 1652. Mr Peter Versoris, says he (1), Advocate in Parliament, was sprung from a noble family, which came originally from gentlemen in Normandy about Falaize, as he himself observed in his genealogy which he wrote with his own hand, during the leisure which the contagious distemper that raged in the year 1582, afforded him in his retirement in his house of Clichy la Garenne near Paris. Their name was le Tournour, which they have since changed into Versoris. John le Tournour called Versoris, coming to Paris about the eighth year of Charles VII, was one of the first Doctors of the University, and writ several books in Latin, some of which, as this genealogy observes, are to be seen in the library of the Minimes, at Nigeon. He changed his French name le Tournour into the Latin one Versoris, as men of letters were wont then to do. He took his nephew with him, made him a Lawyer, and married him to Jane Fournier, of a good family, and nearly related to the Lieutenant-Civil Charmolue. From this marriage are descended all the Versoris's, who have most of them exercised the function of Advocate with great reputation both in the Palace and the Chatelet. There is something wanting in this relation of Mr Joly, we do not find by it that the nephew whom JOHN LE TOURNOUR had with him, was called FREDERIC LE TOURNOUR, and that in imitation of his uncle, he called himself Versoris. He left one son, WILLIAM VERSORIS, who was Lord of Gerge, and a famous Advocate; and father of our PETER VERSORIS (2). It is without doubt the same William Versoris, we find in the list of the Advocates pleading in the court of parliament in the year 1524 (3); and who died at five and twenty, after he had been married five times, as Mr Peter Versoris observes in the genealogy which he made of that family in the year 1582 (4). Mr Blanchard mentions this family in his catalogue of the Counsellors of the Parliament of Paris.

(1) Opuscules d'Antoine Loisel, pag. 751.

(2) From a manuscript Memoir.

(3) It is in pag. 574, 575, of the Opuscules de Loisel.

(4) Opusc. de Loisel, p. 750.

(5) Ibid. pag. 751, 752.

(6) Ibid. pag. 751, 752.

(7) Ibid. pag. 751, 752.

(8) Ibid. pag. 751, 752.

(9) Ibid. pag. 751, 752.

(10) Ibid. pag. 751, 752.

(11) Ibid. pag. 751, 752.

(12) Ibid. pag. 751, 752.

(13) Ibid. pag. 751, 752.

(14) Ibid. pag. 751, 752.

(15) Ibid. pag. 751, 752.

(16) Ibid. pag. 751, 752.

(17) Ibid. pag. 751, 752.

if the king had not prevented it, he would have been much embarrassed. However he was perfectly composed, and went to bed, desirous to communicate at the midnight mass, having already been confessed; but finding himself ill, he could not go: Mr de Verthamon, Counsellor in Parliament, his son-in-law, and his daughters, coming to see him, at their return about five o'clock in the morning, found him dead in his bed. The eldest of his sons, Frederic Versoris was then young, and was admitted into the court as a Counsellor a long time after. His two sons-in-law Mr Rancher, Master of the Requests, and Mr de Verthamon, also Counsellor in Parliament, followed the King's person and interest during all those commotions, as well in the states of Blois, as in the parliament sitting at Tours. [C] We shall see . . . wherein his talents lay.] Antony Loisel made a sort of parallel between John le Maitre and Peter Versoris. The first, says he (6), was really a very able Advocate, well versed in points of law, customs and practice, very prudent and deliberate in his causes, which he made appear as well as the Bar as in the administration of his places. After he had resigned that of President to Mr de Sillery, he desired to live and die privately in his own house, where he was consulted without going to the Bar, and often employed in arbitrations. After this he adds, that it was not quite the same with Mr Peter Versoris; for although they went to him, it was chiefly to mend some faults which happen sometimes in preparing a case for a hearing; for he was really full of fine and subtle inventions, and understood the affairs of the Bar so well, that tho' he had in a manner quitted it, yet the Bar never quitted him, for his house was frequented as much as the Bar; that he kept not only his days, his mornings and afternoons, but his hours also, which he so managed that there were always people attending at the great hall, whilst he gave his advice in the little one. And as he was much solicited in his latter years for advice, so he had been employed in his younger days more than any body else for pleading, as one who spoke with a sprightly ready and natural eloquence, and with a great facility and wonderful art of persuasion, which was the reason of his being employed in the greatest and finest causes of his time, as that of the Jesuits, which we pleaded together, he for them, and I for the University of Paris, of which I shall say nothing, because since both pleas are printed, every body may pass a judgment on them. Only this I shall say, that having read his some years since, I did not think it near so good as when we pleaded; which proceeds from the grace, the force, and the weight that is given to a discourse by the voice, and way of delivery, especially by his, which was fine and agreeable, in comparison to what a meer, dull, mute, and inanimate reading is. It is true he had one fault, which was generally pronouncing A for E and E for A, and those who knew what he quoted out of classical authors, might perceive that he was not well versed in them; but take him altogether he was a great Advocate.

[D] I shall

Mornac made an encomium upon him in his Ferie forenfes (b), I fhall fpeak of his iffue [D]. (b) *Id. pag. 754.*

[D] *I fhall fpeak of his iffue.* He married Margaret Coignet, by whom he had two fons and two daughters, FREDERIC, JAMES, CATHERINE, and MARY. The latter was wife of Francis de Vertamont, Counfellor in the Parliament of Paris, and died in Auguft 1625. Catherine was married the 5th of September 1580, to Antony Rancher Seigneur de la Foucaudiere, Counfellor in the Parliament, Mafter of the Requefts, and afterwards Prefident in the Parliament of Paris.

FREDERIC DE VESPASIAN, Counfellor in the Parliament, February 19, 1601, left among other children FRANCIS FREDERIC Lord of Pontenai le Vicomte, (who left only one daughter) and LEWIS Lord of Marfills, Lieutenant of the guards, who left only two daughters. They died without iffue. The youngelt was married the 10th of September 1689,

to her fecond coufin, and died on the 6th of November 1691.

JAMES DE VESPASIAN, the other fon of our Advocate, was Lord of Coulommiers, Counfellor and Secretary to the King, and Father of PETER DE VESPASIAN, Lord of Coulommiers, Beauvoir, and Malmuffe, the King's Steward in ordinary. This Peter de Veforis left five children, three daughters who are Nuns, and two fons, Charles and Peter, CHARLES DE VESPASIAN, Lord and Patron of Agi and Beauvoir, was married firft to his fecond coufin, daughter of LEWIS DE VESPASIAN, Lieutenant of the guards; and afterwards on the third of March 1695, to Genevieve Bourgoin, by whom he has no children. PETER DE VESPASIAN, Lord of Beauvoir, married Mademoifelle Tonnelier at Orleans the 22d of February 1700 (7).

(7) Taken from a manufcript Memoir.

VESPASIAN (TITUS FLAVIUS) fon of an honeft Publican [A], and grandfon of a collector, who had been captain of a company of one hundred men in Pompey's party (a), and who having efaped from the battle of Pharfalia, rofe to the higheft dignity on earth, being created Emperor of Rome, in the year of Chrif 69. He was born in a village of the country of the Sabini, near Reate (b), on the 17th of November, in the year of Rome 761 (c). He was brought up in the country by Tertulla his grandmother by his father's fide, and preferved fo great a refpect for her memory, that at great folemnities he always drank in her goblet (d). He paffed gradually through all the dignities of the empire. He was made tribune of the foldiers in Thrace, on account of his fervices. Crete and the province of Cyrene fell to his lot when he was Quæstor. He was refused the office of Ædile the firft time he stood for it. He obtained it afterwards, but was the laft of the fix Ædiles, and even could not arrive at that place without fome difficulty. He was a more fucceffful candidate for the Prætorship; he obtained the firft rank the very firft time he stood for it. He made ufe of a great many arts to gain Caligula's favour, and stood very well with Narciffus under the Emperor Claudius. By the intereft of which favourite he was fent into Germany at the head of a legion. He was afterwards fent into Britain (e), where he fought the enemy thirty times, fubdued two potent nations, above twenty towns, and the ifle of Wight. In

(a) Sueton. in Vefpaf. cap. i. See the remark [A] citat. (1).

(b) *Id. ib. cap. ii.*

(c) It is ninth year of Chrif.

(d) Avie memoriam tantopere dilexit, ut folennibus ac feftis diebus pocillo quoque ejus argenteo potare perleveraverit. *Id. ib.*

(e) Now called England.

[A] *Son of an honeft Publican.* That is to fay, of a Publican who was a virtuous man, and behaved himfelf generously in his employ, and fo juftly withal, that the cities gave a public and lafting testimony of his probity. 'Hujus (1) filius cognomine Sabinus . . . publicum quadragesima in Afia egit. Manebantque imagines à civitatibus ei pofitæ sub hoc titulo, ΚΑΛΩΣ ΤΕΛΩΝΗΣΑΝΤΙ. Poftea fœnus apud Helvetios exercuit, ibique diem obiit, fupervivens uxore Vefpafia Polla, & duobus ex ea liberis: quorum major Sabinus ad præfecturam urbis, minor Vefpafianus ad principatum ufque profecit. . . . This man's fon, furnamed Sabinus . . . was a public tax-gatherer in Afia, and had ftatus raised to him by the cities with this infcription, TO THE HONEST PUBLICAN. He was afterwards an ufer, in Switzerland, where he died, leaving behind him his wife Vefpafia Polla, and two children by her. The elder, Sabinus, came to be made Governor of the city, but the younger, Vefpafian, was preferred to the dignity of Emperor. Satirical men cannot here come in with their glofs on this text, they cannot object that Vefpafian's father was an honeft Publican in the fame fenfe that one of thofe who was crucified with JESUS CHRIST, is called the good Thief. The latter did not deferve that character in fenfu compofito, as the Logicians fpeak, but only in fenfu divifo. He was not good and a thief at the fame time, but from a thief he became a good man. The fame may be faid of Zachæus: He was not an honeft man when he gathered the public imposts: He became fo by acts of reftitution and repentance (2). This cannot be faid of our Emperor's father; for he united the character of an honeft man with that of a Publican, fo much decried in the Gofpel, and profane authors. Nay, the Satisfiers, who cannot deny this, would ftretch things too far, if they fhould make ufe of the application of this thought, thefe two words are very much furprized to find themfelves together, for in all likelihood they never met before. I have formerly touched on this (3), in obferving that a great extent of learn-

ing is very rarely accompanied with a great modefty. Nevertheless we meet with fome examples in which they are united: Some Farmers of the revenues are alfo honeft men, tho' it ought to be owned that from all antiquity thefe two qualities have been feparated. The opportunities they have of gaining, procures them riches, which are liberally expended on whatever luxury infpires; but to defray thefe extravagant expences, new and more exorbitant extortions are neceffary. Julian the Apoftate knew very well that the Financiers love luxury. 'Evenserat iifdem diebus, (they are Ammianus Marcellinus's words) (4), ut ad demendum Imperatoris capillum tonfor venire præceptus, introiret quidam ambitiofe veftitus. Quo vifo Julianus obftupuit: Ego, inquit, non Rationalem jufti, fed tonforem acciri. . . . It happened much about the fame time that a Barber being fent for to fhave Julian, there came in a man very finely drefsed, at which the Emperor was aftonifhed: I gave orders, faid he, to call a Barber, and not a Receiver of the revenues.' This is the venom which poifons the minds of thofe concerned in the management of the Treafury. See feveral remarks againft them in the firft part of la Mothe le Vayer's *Profe Cbagrine* (5).

We may obferve that Vefpafian's maternal anceftors were more illuftrious than the paternal; for Vefpafia Polla, his mother, was a Senator's fifter, and daughter of Vefpafianus Pollio, who went through confiderable offices in the army. 'Polla Nurfia: honefto genere orta, patrem habuit Vefpafianum Pollionem, ter Tribunum militum, præfectumque caftro- rum, fra- tremque Senatorem prætoriz dignitatis (6). . . . Polla was born at Nurfia of a good family. Her father was Vefpafianus Pollio, who had been three times a Tribune in the army, and Quarter-Mafter-General. Her brother was a Senator who had alfo enjoyed the Prætorian dignity.' Several monuments of this family were obferved at a place called Vefpafiaz, on the top of a mountain fix miles from Nurfia, in the road to Spoleto, which difcovered its ancient luftre. *Ubi* (Vefpafiaz)

(4) Ammian. Marcellinus, *lib. xxii. cap. iv. pag. m. 300.*

(5) Pag. 327, of Tom. ix, Edit. in 12mo. See alfo Tom. i, page 70, & feq.

(6) Sueton, ubi fupra, cap. i.

(1) Sueton. in Vefpaf. cap. i. *Thst is of Titus Flavius Petro Municeps Reatinus bello civili Pompejanarum peritum centurio . . . deinde . . . conditiones argentarias facilitavit.* *Id. ib.*

(2) See St Luke's Gofpel ch. xix.

(3) See the Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, for June 1685, Art. 2, at the end.

VOL. V.

6 B

In recompence of which he obtained the triumphal ornaments, two priesthoods, and the consulship. He lived in a sort of retirement whilst Agrippina continued in favour, who hated all Narcissus's friends. Returning to public employments, he became Proconsul of Africa, which post he very honourably discharged [B], without enriching himself. He accompanied Nero in his travels through Greece; but not having the complaisance to applaud that emperor's singing [C], he was utterly disgraced, and concealed himself in an obscure town. He did not believe himself safe there, he feared the fatal effects of Nero's rage, when he received the news that the government of a province, and the command of an army were bestowed on him. No person was found so proper as he to reduce the Jewish nation, which had presumed to revolt. This expedition in which Titus his son served him as Lieutenant-General, gained him great glory, and opened his way to the throne. He began to hope for that exalted station during the civil war betwixt Otho and Vitellius (f). Several prefages which promised him a most eminent fortune, were very powerful engagements to his resolution of seizing the imperial authority; for besides the impreffion which they made upon himself, they supplied his friends with a good opportunity of animating him to this enterprize. Tacitus (g) and Suetonius (h) who have related the prefages, have not omitted the answer made him on mount Carmel. It was given by the true God, if we may believe the Carmelites, who build on the authority of these two historians, the chimerical antiquity of their order, and the pretended succession of the disciples of the prophet Elias continued to the beginning of their institution [D]. Vespasian

(f) Taken from Suetonius, ubi supra, cap. ii, & seq.

(g) Tacit. Hist. lib. ii, cap. lxxviii.

(h) Sueton, in Vespasiano, cap. v.

(7) Id. ibid.

(8) In the remark [D], of the article Suetonius.

(9) Sueton. ubi supra, cap. iv.

(10) Tacit. Hist. lib. ii, cap. xcvi.

(11) Sueton. in Nerone, cap. xxii. See also Tacitus, Ann. lib. xvi, cap. iv, v.

(12) Suet. ibid. cap. xxiii, & seq.

(Vespasii) Vespasiorum complura monumenta exstant, magnam indicium splendoris familiaris & vetustatis (7). Now 'since Vespasian's elder brother took the surname of Sabinus, we must conclude that in that age, the younger brothers sometimes took a surname borrowed from their mothers family, and terminated like those which indicated adoption.

[B] He very honourably discharged the Proconsulship of Africa. We have here a proof of what I said above (8), that Suetonius was not prompted by a satirical genius to speak ill of people. He here bestows encomiums on Vespasian which are very contrary to the testimony of Tacitus; this shews that he had thoroughly examined what had been said for and against Vespasian's conduct, and having found the ill reports concerning him false, he rejected them, in order to do that Proconsul the justice which was due to him. An Historian ill-natured and satirical does not act in that manner. 'Exin sortitus Africam, integerrime, nec sine magnis dignatione administravit: Nisi quod Adrumeti seditione quadam, rapa in eum iacta sunt. Rediit certe nihilo opulenter, ut qui prope labefactata jam fide, omnia prædica fratri obligavit (9). . . . Afterwards the province of Africa falling to his share, he governed it with great integrity, and was greatly respected; excepting only that in a sedition at Adrumetum he had turneps thrown at him. It is very certain that he came back no richer than he went; for his credit was so sunk that he was under a necessity of mortgaging his whole estate to his brother.' You see that Suetonius doth not conceal the insurrection of the inhabitants of Adrumetum, nor that they threw turneps at Vespasian. He is then so much the more to be credited in the eulogies he bestows upon him, and we may reasonably believe that Tacitus was neither just nor exact enough, when he tells us only that Vespasian was decried, and drew on himself the public hatred during this Proconsulship. 'Integrum illic ac favorabilem Proconsulatum Vitellius; famulum invivumque Vespasianus egerat (10). . . . Vitellius believed in his Proconsulship there with integrity, and so as to be liked; but Vespasian in his was decried and hated.'

[C] Not having the complaisance to applaud Nero's singing. This Prince's passion for Music was a ridiculous extravagance. The principal cause of his travelling in Greece was his ardent desire of signaling himself in the Musical disputes in several cities of that country, and to bear away the prize (11). Suetonius relates upon this subject a great many circumstances which are very surprizing (12). He saith amongst other things that no person was allowed to retire from the theatre whilst Nero was singing, and that some women were forced to be delivered there, and that the gates of the cities being shut, some persons were so fatigued and tired with hearing and praising this Prince, that they secretly escaped over the walls, or feigned themselves dead, that they might be carried out of the town under pretence of being buried. Cantante eo, ne necessaria quidem causa excedere theatro lic-

tum erat. Itaque & enixe quedam in spectaculis dicuntur, & multi tardio audiendi laudandique, clausi oppidorum portis, aut furtim desiluisse de muro, aut morte simulata funere elati (13). It is easy to conceive that Nero was extremely incensed against Vespasian, who very often went out of the theatre, or fell asleep whilst his master was singing. Peregrinatione Achaica inter comes Neronis, cum cantante eo, aut discederet sepius, aut præsens obdormisceret, gravissimam contraxit offensam: prohibitusque non contubernio modo, sed etiam publica salutatione, secessit in parvam ac deviam civitatem, quoad latenti, etiamque extrema metuenti, provincia cum exercitu oblata est (14). Some will ask why Suetonius saith here, that Vespasian frequently retired from the theatre? Hath he not elsewhere (15) affirmed that no person was permitted to go out of the theatre on any pretext whatsoever? I answer, that indeed he did not very well remember to render all the parts of his relations exactly consistent; but to justify him in some sort, we may suppose that the prohibition of leaving the theatre was a consequence of the liberty of not staying till the spectacle was ended, which several had taken. Vespasian, before the prohibition, was one of those who laid the least constraint upon himself; by which he began to displease that Prince, and his disgrace was completed after the prohibition. He indeed obeyed, but fell asleep on the theatre. I cannot think of a better way of reconciling these two places of Suetonius. It may perhaps be imagined that he confounded the times, I would say that instead of applying this to the year of the Musical victories which Nero obtained at Rome, he placed it in the year of his victories amongst the Greeks. We are informed by Tacitus that it was at Rome that Vespasian fell into disgrace for sleeping at the Musical disputes of the Emperor. 'Ferebantque Vespasianum, tamquam fomno conviveret, a Phœbo liberto increpitum, ægreque meliorum precibus obsecrum: mox imminentem perniciem majore fato effugisse (16). . . . And they said that Vespasian was reproved for sleeping by the freed man Phœbus, and that he was with great difficulty saved through the intercession of the better sort of people. It was soon after believed that he had escaped the present danger, being reserved for a bigger destiny.' Mr de Tillemont thinks that Vespasian twice committed this crime of sleeping at Nero's Music; first at Rome, and afterwards in Greece (17). This is not very probable: a courtier who hath once run the risk of his life, would take more care to avoid a relapse, especially, when it may be easily done.

[D] The answer made him on mount Carmel. . . . The Carmelites who build . . . the chimerical antiquity of their . . . institution. Tacitus's words are: 'Eli Judæam inter Syriamque Carmelus, ita vocant montem, deumque: nec simulacrum deo, aut templum, (sic tradidere majores) ara tantum & reverentia. Illic sacrificanti Vespasiano, cum spes occultas versaret animo, Basilides sacerdos, inspectis identidem extis, Quidquid est, inquit, Vespasiane quod paras, seu domum exstruere, seu prolatare agros, sive ampliari servitium datur

Vespasian tho' animated by pæfages, and the follicitations of his friends, hesitated for some time, and the concurrence of several fortuitous events (i), and the most preffing reasons of Mucianus (k) were wanting to change his uncertain thoughts into a fixed resolution of declaring himself emperor. It is very probable that the lies, which were artfully spread about contributed very considerably to the success of his enterprize [E]. He was the first who grew better, after he had ascended the throne (l); and it would be unjust not to own that he remedied several evils, and did some very good actions. The desire of amassing treasures was his great vice, which he took no great care to hide; yet there is reason to believe that he contrived it so, that part of his extortions were imputed to his

(i) Ambigua de Vespasiano facta: solique omnium ante le principum in melius mutatus est. Tacit. *ibid.* lib. i, cap. l.

concubine

(18) Tacit. Hist. lib. ii, cap. lxxviii.

datur tibi magna sedes, ingentes termini, multum hominum. Has ambages & statim exceperat fama, & tunc aperiebat, nec quidquam magis in ore vulgi; crebriores apud ipsum sermones: quanto sperantibus plura dicuntur (18). - - - Between Judea and Syria his Carmel: that is the name which they give both to the mountain and to the god. The god has no temple nor image, (for such is the religion of the country handed down from father to son) he has no more than an altar and reverence paid to him. While Vespasian was sacrificing there, and revolving in his mind his secret hopes, the priest Basilides, every now and then looking upon the entrails, spoke to him in this manner: Vespasian, whatever your designs be, whether to build a house, to extend your lands, or to increase the number of your slaves, a great seat is provided for you, large bounds, and a vast multitude of men. Fame presently took up this dark oracle, and even then explained it; nor was any thing more talked of by the vulgar. To himself it was still more frequently mentioned; for the more people hope the more they are entertained with the like discourses. I thought I ought not to suppress the last words of this citation, for they contain an excellent instruction, or rather a lively image of the deceits and illusions of ambition. The people discoursed of those pæfages, but those who approached Vespasian talked more of them still; for the more such discourses create any hopes, the more frequently are they repeated. I proceed now to Suetonius: 'Apud Judæam Carmeli Dei oraculum consulente, ita confirmare fortis, ut quidquid cogitaret volveretque animo, quantulumlibet magnum, id esse preventurum polliceretur (19). - - - When he consulted the oracle of the god Carmel in Judea, he was encouraged by this answer, viz. that the meditation and purpose of his heart, however great it was, should be accomplished.' Those who weigh the circumstances of these two Historians words, and understand the religion which God delivered to the Jews, will without any difficulty be convinced, that the oracle consulted by Vespasian upon that mountain, was a deity full as false as that at Delphi. Nevertheless the Carmelites maintain, that this was the oracle of the same God who was worshipped at Jerusalem. Hermenigildus à Sancto Paulo, a Spanish Monk, refuted this opinion, and shewed the Paganism of the god Carmelus mentioned by Tacitus and Suetonius: but Laurence Angelus Espin, a Carmelite, could not bear this truth; he published a tract at Saragossa in answer to it, with the pompous and insulting title of *Ruina Idoli Carmelitici quod somniavit Reverendiss. P. Fr. Hermenigildus à S. Paulo*. This bold writer did not maintain his presuming character; he was silenced by the Marquis of Agropoli, who printed a piece at Seville in the year 1678, in which he with a great deal of solidity and learning proves, that his good friend, Father Hermenigildus à S. Paulo, had the right side of the dispute: the Carmelites resolved to do him an ill turn for it, and to gratify their resentment with the more address, they prosecuted the Marquis for denying the pretended Haubett of Seville. Eodem actu contra Marchionem mihi consentientem procedunt; eandem quidem pretendentes causam, reapse verò stomachantes quod suum Laurentium Espin conatum Carmelo vindicare pro ætate Vespasiani decorem indebitum, fecerit obmutescere (20). - - - The same stratagem is employed against the Marquis, for thinking as I do. They do indeed pretend the same reason; but the truth is, they are angry with him for having put to silence their Advocate Laurence Espin, who claims an unjust honour for Carmel in the time of Vespasian.' They brought him into the Inquisition, as an accomplice of Papebroch, a French

writer, and hired, said they, to write against Spain. They pretended that he had betrayed Spain, and that his crime was downright treason. Neque scimus, inquit, utrum major sit audacia quod homo Francus (qualem me fingunt) eo stylo utatur contra scriptores Hispanos, quam quod Agropolitanus Marchio homo mere laicus, scriptis suis ignorantia plenius, patriæ honorem prodatur, favens auctori Franco, quem novit conductum ut scribat contra Hispaniam. . . . quod grave Marchionis illius delictum est, perduellionis etiam crimine exaggeratum, adeoque facit eum sacro Tribunali delatabilem, sicut eum delatamus in præfentiarum, una cum Papebrochio, ut eorundem peccatorum complices (21). This is what they did in the year 1691. By which we see that the most eminent characters are no security against Monkish persecutions; for a man can scarce have more titles of honour than this Marquis: I can only give part of them, for I am stopped by an *Et cætera* from citing the whole. Gaspar de Mendoza, Ibanes de Segovia & Peralta, Eques Ordinis de Alcantara, Marchio de Mondaxar, Comes Tendilla, & utroque titulo ex Primatibus Hispaniæ; nec non Marchio de Valbemoso & Agropoli, Dominus Provinciæ de Almoquera, Toparcha Oppidorum Corpæ, Mecí, Fuentonobilæ, Lorancæ, Avionis, Vianæ, &c. Observe that his book was printed in Spanish at Seville, and translated into Latin by Father Papebroch, a Jesuit of Antwerp, and not a Frenchman as these accusers most ignorantly pretend. This Latin translation was printed at Antwerp in the year 1698. See the Utrecht Journalists (22).

Besides other reasons which this Marquis uses, he refutes the Carmelites by an argument drawn from the person of Vespasian; for he cites (23) several authors who are of opinion that this Emperor was the boar of the forest, of which David spoke by a prophetic spirit (24). He saith that he is called *Cæsar pium* - - - the murderer of the saints in the Sibyl's verses, and that he and his son Titus are the types of Antichrist according to Malvenda. What probability then, concludes he, is there that the true God should honour such a man as he with his answers? He solidly refutes Marcellus Donatus (25), who was of that opinion.

[E] It is very probable, that the lies . . . contributed very considerably to the success of his enterprize.] Copies of a letter from the Emperor Otho to Vespasian were dispersed, by which the latter was constituted that Emperor's avenger, not to say that Otho therein expressed an ardent desire that Vespasian would relieve the Republic. A report was also industriously spread that Vitellius had resolved to remove the German legions to Syria, and those of Syria to Germany. *Plurimum captis contulerunt, jactatum exemplar epistolæ, veræ sive falsæ, defuncti Othonis ad Vespasianum, extrema obtestatione ultionem mandantis, & ut Reip. subveniret, optantis, simul rumor dissipatus, destitisse Vitellium victorem permutare hiberna legionum, & Germanicas transferre in Orientem ad securiorem mollioremque militiam* (26). These two particulars which doubtless were forged by the enemies of Vitellius, very much conduced to Vespasian's interest. The pretended letter of Otho passed for a sort of last-will, which afforded Vespasian a lawful pretence. The Syrian legions charmed with their pleasant quarters in so agreeable a climate, and forming to themselves a terrible idea of the German ice and snow, were easily gained to the Emperor's party, who would prevent the change of their winter quarters. The Syrians also used to these legions, had been very sorry to part with them for others ordered thither from a barbarous country (27). This encouraged them to favour Vespasian. This is the fate of revolutions: they require the assistance of a thousand

(21) *Id.* *ibid.*

(22) In the months of September and October 1698, pag. 730, & seq.

(23) Exam. Divinitatis, Art. xxv.

(24) Psalm. lxxix, ver. 15.

(25) Marc. Donatus, Schol. in Histor. Roman.

(26) Sueton. ubi supra, cap. vi.

(27) See Tacitus, ubi supra, cap. lxxviii.

concubine Cænis [F]. This was a poor way of clearing himself; for even those who believed that he knew not that she sold all places, would have accounted this ignorance as a most shameful fault. He was the first who had a tax on urine (m). I have said something elsewhere (n) concerning some miraculous cures of which he passed the author. He died on the 24th of June, in the year 79, after a reign of ten years wanting six days, aged a little above sixty nine years. It ought not to be forgotten that he behaved with great moderation towards those who had offended him (o), and bestowed many presents and many favours on ingenious men, and those who cultivated the liberal arts (p). He never was ashamed of the meanness of his first condition, but ridiculed the vain efforts of some Genealogists who would make him to be descended from one of Hercules's companions [G]. He was too fond of raillery, which he carried even to a great degree of buffoonry, and made no scruple of using the most obscene expressions. He very frequently

(m) Sueton. *ibid.*
cap. xxiii.

(n) In the Nou-
velles de la Re-
publique, des
Lettres, June
1686, Art. i, p.
630.

(o) Sueton. *ibid.*
cap. xiii. & *seq.*

(p) Id. *ibid.* *cap.*
xviii.

thousand forged writings and false alarms to affect the minds of the people. Without that, two in a thousand will never succeed.

[F] He contrived it so that part of his extortions were imputed to his concubine Cænis. Xiphilin in abridging Dion Cassius left out several things that were doubtless of great importance: but if I mistake not, he hath not done so in those facts which concern this concubine: I am apt to think he hath kept the whole. His abridgment acquaints us when she died (28). We there find that Vespasian loved her tenderly, and was indebted to her for the great power he acquired, and the vast treasures he amassed. She sold all the offices in the law, in the army, and those which related to religion, besides the very decisions of Vespasian himself. Under that Emperor no body lost his life for being rich; but many saved it with the help of their purses. Cænis received all those sums, and he was suspected, not without reason, to be privy to it. The Historian offers two reasons which obliged him to mention this woman: first, she was very faithful; and in the second place, she had a very extraordinary memory: Ἐμνημόνευσα δὲ αὐτῆς ὅτι τὴν αἰσθητικὴν ἔν καὶ ὅτι μνήμης ἀείσα ἐπεφύκει. Cujus propterea mentionem feci quod maxima fide & excellenti memoria fuit (29): For proof of which, he quotes the answer which she returned to Antonia, her mistress (30), who had obliged her to write some secret passage relating to Sejanus, to be communicated to Tiberius, and who had ordered it to be immediately blotted out, to prevent all inconveniences from the discovery. It is in vain, replied she, that you give me that order, for this, and all other things which you speak of to me, are so firmly fixed in my memory, that they cannot be blotted out (31). I admire this in her, faith the Historian. Τῷτο τὴν αὐτῆς ἰθαύμασα. Id igitur in ea admiratus sum (32). It must be owned that such an answer deserved a place in this author; but it must at the same time be allowed that it was not pertinent. It could only have been just, if Antonia had desired that all ideas of this letter might be blotted out. But this was not what she desired, her intention was only to prevent all external evidences of her secret, and that no discovery should be confirmed by proofs: she did not distrust Cænis, nor was she apprehensive of accusations purely verbal, and destitute of the strong supports of written testimonies. To what purpose then was it to say, that blotting out the letter was no effectual way to prevent the inconvenience against which Antonia's precaution was levelled? Cænis's happy memory did not give Antonia any uneasiness, when she knew the writing was not in being. Observe, that Cænis was made free by this lady, and was her Secretary. Vespasian kept her in his house before he married, sent her away when he married, and took her again after the death of his wife, and treated her almost like a wife. Post uxoris excessum, Cænidem Antoniae libertam, & a manu dilectam quandam sibi, revocavit in contubernium: habuitque etiam Imperator pene justae uxoris loco (33). After her death he took several concubines (34), which shewed that he thought no other sufficient to supply her place, and that he had recourse to several to compensate the loss he suffered in this one mistress. It is observed as an evidence of Domitian's pride or incivility, that Cænis at her return from a journey offering to kiss him according to custom, he presented her his hand to kiss (35).

[G] He ridiculed the vain efforts of some Genealogists, who would make him to be descended from one of Hercules's companions. Most of these people are prodigiously impudent (36); and when a favourite or minister gives them the least encouragement, they present him with whatever pedigree he pleases. A Superintendent of the Finances needs only choose, and if he is disposed liberally to reward those genealogy makers, he shall descend, if he please, from the ancient Trojans.

Tunc licet à Pico numeres genus, altaque si te Nomina delectant, omnem Titanida pugnam Inter majores ipsumque Promethea ponas: De quocunque voles proavum tibi fumito libro (37). (37) Juven. Sat. VIII, ver. 131.

Then trace your birth from Pico, if you please: If be's too modern, and your pride aspire To seek the author of your being higher, Choose any Titan who the gods withstood, To be the founder of your antient blood, Prometheus, and that race before the flood, Or any other story you can find From Herald, or in Poets, to your mind.

DRYDEN.

Pegnafel Contreras of Granada, . . . not content to particularize . . . one hundred and eighteen successions from Adam to Philip III, hath deduced one hundred and twenty-one from the same original to the Duke of Lerma, on whose account this fine piece was written. To accomplish this, the author, as others have done, rakes up the ruins of old Troy, where he finds (even before its destruction) two brothers Illus and Asaracus, from the first of whom he makes the King of Spain to be descended, and from the other his Excellency; who by this means being a very distant relation to his Catholic Majesty, he hath obliged him with a much nearer affinity by his maternal line, which he hath also drawn. And because it would not be proper to leave a Duke so highly descended without some sovereignties in his family, he makes Æneas one of his ancestors. . . . A little after Æneas he crowds in Brutus, who is said to have given his name to Great Britain (38). The number of cheats and bubbles was not less in former times than at present. If Vespasian had pleased, the Genealogical stem of the house of Flavia had been so drawn, that the greatest names in old Rome had infallibly been inserted in the male or female line. He would have seen in it,

. . . . Stanteis in curribus Æmilianos, Et Curios jam dimidiis, humerisque minorem Corvinum, & Galbam auriculis nasoque carentem? Fumosos equitum cum dictatore magistris (39).

(39) Juvenal. Sat. VIII, ver. 2.

The brave Æmilii, as in triumph plac'd, The virtuous Curii, half by time defac'd; Corvinus, with a mouldring nose that bears Injurious scars, the sad effects of years, And Galba grinning without nose or ears.

Old Captains and Dictators of their race.

DRYDEN.
He

(28) Xiphilin.

(29) Mother of the Emperor Claudius. See the remark [C] of the article ANTONIA, the elder.

(31) Xiphil. *ubi supra.*

(32) Id. *ibid.*

(33) Sueton. in Vespas. *cap. iii.*

(34) Id. *ibid.* *cap. xxi.*

(35) Cænidis patris concubine ex litris reverse oculumque ut affuerat offerenti manum præbuit. Idem, in Domit. *cap. xii.*

(38) La Motte le Vayer, Discours de l'Histoire, ii, pag. 160, 161.

frequently made use of this turn of thought to elude the just reproaches to which his avarice and the rigour of his exactions exposed him [H].

He would therein have found Murranus who was killed in Æneas's time, from whom the most ancient Latin kings were descended.

Murranus hic, atavos & avorum antiqua sonantem
Nomina, per regesque, actum genus omnem Latinos,
Præcipitem scopulo, atque ingentis turbine faxi
Excutit (40).

(40) Virgil.
Æneid. lib. xii,
ver. 549.

Murranus, boasting of his blood, that springs
From a long royal race of Latian kings,
Is by the Trojan from his chariot thrown,
Cruel'd with the weight of an unwieldy stone.

DRYDEN.

Some laboured to prove that the founders of the city of Reate, and a certain hero whose monument was in a street of Rome, and who had accompanied Hercules, were also the founders of the family of Vespasian; but this Emperor was the first who laughed at their endeavours, he never concealed the meanness of his extraction, but frequently spoke of it himself. *Mediocritatem præstinam neque dissimulavit unquam, ac frequenter etiam præ se tulit. Quin & conantes quosdam originem Flavii generis ad conditores Reatinos, comitemque Herculis, cujus monumentum exstat via Salaria, referre, irriti ultro* (41). It is not strange that such a Genealogical labour should be undertaken to flatter an Emperor, since more than this was done for a person who was only Quæstor to Augustus. I speak of one Quintus Vitellius, to whom it was proved by a book written expressly to that end (42), that his ancestors had reigned over all Latium, and that they owed their original to Faunus King of the Aborigines, and to Vitellia, who had been worshipped in several places as a goddess. Notwithstanding which, according to several other authors, the Vitellii sprang from a Freedman, or even from a Cobar (43). It is incredible how many families boasted of an elder date than the famous siege of Troy. The Glabrio's pretended to be descended from Æneas (44). The pious Paula fo celebrated in St Jerom's works, gave out that she issued from Agamemnon; and that Genealogy was mentioned in her epitaph written by St Jerom:

Scipio quam genuit, Pauli fudere parentes
Gracchorum Soboles, Agamemnonis inclyta proles.
Hoc jacet in tumulo (45).

(45) Hieronym.
Epist. ad Euthochium Virginem,
pag. m. 514.

Here lies intomb'd within this place
A lady of great Scipio's race;
She from the Pauli and the Gracchi springs,
And from old Agamemnon, King of Kings.

(46) See Balzac's
Dissertations at
the end of the
Socrate Chrétien,
pag. 63, 64.

Synesius, Bishop of Cyrene in the beginning of the Vth century, said he was descended from Hercules, and maintained that the archives of Cyrene contained sufficient proofs of this extraction (46). The observation of these things is not useless; for it shews, that our age doth not go beyond the most venerable antiquity in this sort of chimeras (47). Our age affords us an example which runs parallel with that of Vespasian. Read Naudé's words: 'Cardinal Mazarin,

(47) See la Bruy-
ere's Characters
in the chapter
intitulée de quel-
ques usages, pag.
m. 599. See also,
remark [H], of
the article BZO-
VIUS.

saith he (48), above five years ago in the presence of several persons of honour and probity, from whom I have it, ridiculed a certain flatterer, who would trace the original of the family and arms of Mazzarini, from the old Roman Consuls T. Geganus Macerinus, M. Geganus Macerinus II, Proculus Geganus Macerinus, M. Geganus Macerinus III, which the ancient chronicle of Haloander, Panvinus in his Fasti, and the Roman Historians mention, in the years à Regifugio XVIII. & ab urbe condita CCCVII. CCCXIV. & CCCXVII: And that almost at the same time he threatened a certain Priest of Avignon named Thomas Bonnet, to send him to the Bastille, if, contrary to the strict charge which had been several times repeated to him, he published a Genealogy or History di Casa Mazzirini, because he said wonderful things of it without any proof, and without shewing by some authentic records the affinity of many illustrious families he spoke of.'

[H] He was too fond of raillery . . . made no scruple of using the most obscene expressions . . . to elude the reproaches to which . . . his exactions exposed him.] Being accustomed to this in his private condition, it would have been very difficult for him to have abstained from it on the throne, for the itch of jesting is the most incurable that can possibly infect any body.

However, it is infinitely below the character of a great monarch to debase himself by low jokes as Vespasian did. 'Super cœnam autem, & semper alias comissus, multa joco transigebat. Erat enim dicacitatis plurimæ, & sic scurrilis ac sordidæ, ut ne prætextatis quidem verbis abstinere. Et tamen nonnulla ejus facetissima exstant, in quibus & hoc: Menstrum Florum, consularem, admonitus ab eo plaustra potius quam plostra dicenda, die postero Flaurum salutavit. Expugnatus autem à quadam, quasi amore sui deperiret, cum productæ pro concubitu festertia quadraginta donasset: admonente dispensatore quem admodum summam rationibus vellet referri, Vespasiano, inquit, adamato (49). . . . Maxime tamen dicacitatem in deformibus lucris affectabat, ut invdiam aliqua cavillatione dilueret, transferretque ad sales (50). . . . At supper, and indeed at all other times, he was very free in his conversation, and delighted much in jokes. For he was above measure fond of raillery, and that too of such a low and scurrilous kind, that he did not even scruple to make use of obscene words. Nevertheless, some humorous sayings of his are still preserved, and among the rest this: Being once at a time admonished by Menstrum Florus, a consular person, that he should rather say plaustra than plostra, the next day he saluted him by the name of Flaurus. At another time having yielded to a lady, who pretended to be desperately in love with him, after he had gratified her passion, and made her a present of forty festertia, his steward asking him how he would have that sum placed in his accounts; Set it down, said he, to the dearly-beloved Vespasian. . . . Above all, he affected to be witty on those occasions when he made profits out of low and sordid things; and in order to avoid the shame of such gains, he turned the matter into a jest. Did he believe these railleries would make people insensible of the oppression of his exorbitant exactions?

(48) Naudé Dia-
logue de Mac-
curat, pag. 26,
27. That book
was written in
1649.

(49) Sueton. in
Vespas. cap. xxii.

(50) Id. ibid. cap.
xxiii.

VIGERIUS (MARK) Cardinal of the title of St Mary on the other side the Tyber, was of Savona. He was taken from a monastery of Franciscans, and created Cardinal by Julius II. He was afterwards made Bishop of Præneste, and Archpriest of the Vatican church. He had taught Theology at Padua and Rome. He died on the 18th of June 1516, aged seventy years, and was buried without an epitaph at St Mary's beyond the Tyber (a). He wrote several books, one of which was to prove that JESUS CHRIST'S tunic ought to give place to Longinus's spear [A].

(a) Taken from
the Athenæum
Romanum, of
the Jesuit Au-
gustin Oldoini,
pag. 431.

[A] He wrote several books, one of which was to prove that JESUS CHRIST'S tunic ought to give place to Longinus's spear.] The occasion of this work is singular. Bajazet, Emperor of the Turks, having two very precious reliques, viz. the seamless coat of our Saviour, and the spear which pierced his heart, presented the latter to the Pope, and kept the

former for himself (1). On this occasion a great dispute arose in Italy, whether the present made to the Pope was better than that which the Grand Seigneur reserved for himself. They carefully examined whether a Turkish Prince had a good taste in point of reliques. Our Vigerius was ordered to make it appear, that the Sultan was no nice judge in things of this

(1) See the ar-
ticle of INNOCENT VIII,
remark [F].

VOL. V.

6 C

this kind, since the seamless tunic ought to give the precedence to the lance. In effect, the spear penetrated to the heart; and was tinged with the very vital blood; but the tunic only touched the external parts. Bartholinus mentions this dispute. *Insedit hæc opinio,*

(4) Thomas Bartholinus, *Differentiæ de lateris Christi*, pag. 21, 22.

saith he (2), Marco Vigerio *Episcopo Præfinito & Cardinali Sennegallensi in Controversia quam jussu æqualium suorum de præstantia & dignitate lanceæ Longini Pontifici Romano à Turcarum Imperatore missæ, præ tunica inconsultis, quam ipse Bajazetes sibi reservarat, olim ipse conscriptis, post à Simone Begnio Modrusensi Episcopo per prælatum Ascanianum typis divulgatum.* Tractatu quarto fol. 10. *primas lanceæ defert, quia non extrema solum, ut tunica, sed sanctissimi corporis medium attingit & nobilissima; vel forte loca cordis; & ipsum attingit cor; ad quæ in morte Christi omnis vigor vitalis humoris, in exhausto corpore reliquit, ut ad arcem munendam, & ad proprium domicilium se contulerat: qua forte de causa sanguis defluxit & aqua per lanceam. Postea paucis interjectis: Ferrum autem aqua perfrusum est; quam de fonte intimi cordis eduxit, & de micanti mucrone rubens & sanguinolentum spiculum regio sacerdotilique sanguine cruentatum extitit.*

Calvin had not heard of this present of Bajazet, for he takes no notice of it in that place where he observes that the iron point of that lance was actually in four different places, if we believe the Papists (3).

(3) Calvin. *Inventaire des Reliques*, p. m. 29.

He did not forget that the Turks boast of having the tunic. His words are (4), 'Concerning the seamless garment for which lots were cast, because it was thought very proper to excite the devotion of the ignorant, there are several of them. For at Argenteuil near Paris, there is one; and another at Triers. And if the Bull of St Salvador in Spain speaks truth, the Christians, by their inconsiderate zeal, have done worse than the Infidel soldiers. For these not daring to tear it in pieces, cast lots for it: But the Christians have divided it in order to adore it. Besides, what answer will they make to the Turk, who laughs at their folly, and pretends it is in his possession? But we need not make them quarrel with the Turk; let them end the debate amongst themselves. In the mean while we shall be excused from believing what is said by the one as well as the other side, that we may not favour one party more than the other, without being well apprized of the matter. For that would be contrary to all reason.'

Oldoini mentions the following books of our Vigilius: *Apologiam contra Pifanum Conciliabulum scriptam, & libellum unum decachordum Christianum prænotatum, & alterum de ferro lanceæ, & Christi indumentis, eorumque dignitate* (5). I omit the list of books not printed (6).

(5) August. Oldoinus, in *Athenæo Romano*, pag. 481.
(6) It is in Oldoini, *ibid.*

VIGILANTIUS, Rector of a parish in the diocese of Barcelona in Spain, was by nation a Gaul [A], and lived about the beginning of the Vth century. He composed some books, in which he discovered a zeal for religion; but suffering himself

to

[A] He was by nation a Gaul. Gennadius asserts it in express terms (1); but he is thought to be mistaken by some who ground their opinion on St Jerom, who gives Vigilantius the epithet of Calaguritanus. 'Fuit ipse natione Hispanus, patriâ Calaguritanus, ut idem S. Hieronymus tradit, ex quo Gennadius redarguitur (2). --- He was a Spaniard by nation, of the city of Cataborra, as St Jerom relates, by which Gennadius is proved to be in an error.' But I should rather chuse to justify Gennadius from St Jerom's words; for an author, who mentions several monsters, and saith particularly that Geryon was born in Spain; *triformem Geryonem Hispaniæ prodiderunt* (3). --- Spain produced Geryon, that monster, with three shapes, and adds, that Gaul alone never had any monsters, and that it had always abounded with great and eloquent men, but that all of a sudden Vigilantius arose, and fought against the Spirit of our Lord; a writer, I say, who places his periods in this manner, would he have us believe that this Heretic was born in Spain, and not in Gaul? It is certain that if a person designed to signify that Vigilantius was a Gaul and not a Spaniard, he would express himself like St Jerom. *Cæcum describit Virgilius, triformem Geryonem Hispaniæ prodiderunt. Sola Gallia monstra non habuit, sed viris semper fortissimis, & eloquentissimis abundavit. Exortus est subito Vigilantius, seu verius Dormitantius, qui immundo spiritu pugnet contra Christi spiritum* (4). Another passage of St Jerom more expressly points out Vigilantius's country, and that so exactly, that no room is left to doubt that he makes him a native of the country which is at present called *Cominge*. 'Nimirum respondet generi suo (*Vigilantius*) ut qui de latrocinio & convenarum natus est semine: quos Cn. Pompeius, edomitâ Hispaniâ, & ad triumphum redire festinans de Pyrenæi jugis deposuit, & in unum oppidum congregavit; unde & convenarum urbs nomen accepit. Huc usque latrocinetur contra ecclesiam Dei, & de Vescionibus, Arrebacis, Celtiberisque descendens incurset Galliarum Ecclesias, portetque nequaquam vexillum Christi, sed insigne Diaboli. Fecit hoc idem Pompeius, etiam in orientis partibus; ut Cilicibus & Isauris piratis, latronibusque superatis, sui nominis inter Ciliciam & Isauriam conderet civitatem. Sed hæc urbs hodie servat scita majorum, & nullus in ea ortus est Dormitantius. Gallie vernaculum hostem sustinent, & hominem moti capitis, atque Hippocratis vinculis alligandum, sedentem cernunt in Ecclesia' (5).

(1) Vigilantius presbyter natione Gallus. Gennadius, de Scriptis Eccles. cap. xxxv.

(2) Baronius, ad ann. 406, num. 42.

(3) Hieronymus. Epist. adv. Vigilant. pag. m. 548.

(4) *Id. ibid.*

(5) *Id. ibid.*, pag. 551.

--- Vigilantius behaves in a manner quite suitable to his pedigree; since he is descended from a mixed breed of robbers; whom Cneius Pompey, having subdued Spain, and returning with all speed to his triumph,

brought down from the tops of the Pyrenean mountains, and placed them together in one city, which from thence took its name (Comminges). Hisbert therefore has Vigilantius, like a robber, harassed the Church of GOD; and descending from the Vescions, the Arabaci, and the Celtiberi, made incursions upon the Churches of Gaul, carrying with him not the standard of Christ, but the ensign of the Devil. Pompey did the same thing in the East; for when he had subdued the Cilician and Isaurian pirates and robbers, he built a city between Cilicia and Isauria, and called it after his own name. But the inhabitants of this city still adhere to the maxims of their forefathers, and no Dormitantius, [that is a name derived from slumbering, as Vigilantius is from watching] has ever appeared among them. But Gaul entertains a home-bred enemy, and behold sitting in the church a man of a disturbed brain, who deserves to be bound with the fetters of Hippocrates. But it will be asked why then does he use the epithet Calaguritanus, in such a manner as discovers that he took that word in the same sense as if he would have expressed Quintilian's country (6)? For an answer to this difficulty, I refer you to the learned Mr de Marca, who, I believe, have not read, nor do any otherwise know than by the following words of the Abbot de la Roque: 'As it is no dishonour for a man to be of a country which hath produced ill men, and an Historian is always obliged to speak truth, Mr de Marca, in a discourse which he wrote concerning the country of Vigilantius, which this monster hath dishonoured by his errors, corrects the blunder which almost all Historians have committed concerning this Heretic, by proving that his birth-place was not Calaguris, a city in Spain, but Calaguri, a village near the city of St Bertrand in the diocese of Cominge. This is what Baronius was ignorant of, and which they may certainly correct in Moreri's new Dictionary' (7).

I shall pass over Hadrian Valeus's observations against St Jerom, that learned Critic shews (8) that this Father contradicts himself, since the situation of the places will not allow that the same person should be descended from the Vescions (9), the Arabaci, the Celtiberi, and those robbers whom Pompey gathered into a body. Father Pagi promises to answer, in favour of St Jerom, the objections of Valeus (10), and saith beforehand that instead of Vescionibus, it ought not to be read *Vescionibus* (11), but *Vasconibus*. This correction will not remove the difficulties as to the Arabaci Celtiberisque. This is only by the way.

Observe that James Valdes, the Cilician, conjectures that the epithet Calaguritanus might be taken from some

(6) *Id. ibid.*, pag. 549.

(7) Journal des Savans, of the 31st of March 1681, pag. 120. Dutch edition of the *opuscule* of Mr de Marca's *opuscule*, published the first time in 1681.

(8) Hadrian. Valeus, Notit. Galliar. p. 15.

(9) Or Vescionibus.

(10) Pagi, letter to the Abbot Nicaise of the 5th of October 1696. It was first printed in 4to, and then in the *Marcellus de la République de Lucerne*, the July 1699.

(11) It is Valdes's conjecture, and is supported.

to be seduced by the love of praise, and presuming too much on his strength, and having acquired more politeness of stile [B], than knowledge in the scripture, he explained ill one of the visions of the Prophet Daniel, and vented some other trifles, which they placed in the catalogue of heresies (a). St Jerom refuted him (b). This is what Gennadius saith of him; from whence we may conjecture that he did not altogether approve the vehemence with which St Jerom wrote against Vigilantius; for one would think, by what St Jerom says of that priest, that he was the most accursed heretic that ever was [C]. The Protestants judge otherwise of it, they are persuaded that Vigilantius very justly condemned vows of celibacy, the use of wax-candles at the sepulchres of the martyrs, the honour paid to faints, prayers for the dead, and nocturnal assemblies for devotion, &c. Several disorders were committed in those assemblies, and at last it

(a) Exposuit pravo ingenio secundum visionem Danielis, & alia locuta est frivola que in catalogo hereticorum necessario ponuntur. Gennadius, de Scriptor. Ecclesiast. cap. xxxv.

(b) Taken from Gennadius, ibid. WAS

some town in Gaul; for he will not allow Vigilantius to be a Spaniard: 'Gallus, saith he (12), à Gennadio de script. Eccles. dicitur, & quamvis Calaguritanus à B. Hieronymo nuncietur in princ. adversus Vigilantium, & à Varonio 5. tom. anno 406. & Pamplonensem dicat Mariana de reb. Hisp. lib. 4. c. 20. tamen non Hispanum appellant, sed potius videntur Gallum nunciare, cum tunc monstra Gallie nasci hereticorum dixerint, & potuit esse Calaguritanum aliud oppidum Gallie, vel ibi presbyterum fuisse, ut Barcionem, non tamen natum. --- Gennadius says that he was a Gaul; and the St Jerom and Baronius give him the epithet of Calaguritanus, and Mariana that of Pamplonenis, yet they do not call him a Spaniard, but seem rather to say that he was a Gaul, by saying that Gaul did then produce monsters of Heresy. Besides, there may possibly have been another town in Gaul, which bore that name of Calaguris, or he may have been a Presbyter there as he was at Barcelona, without being born in any of these cities.' In another place he alleges St Jerom declaring that Spain never produced any Heretic besides Priscillian. Regio enim Hispana ut B. Hieronymus c. 17. in Esaiam, inquit, monstra hereticorum non generavit & unum parvum Priscillianum ut abortivum & impium pia mater procul à se abiecit, pariterque abiecit (13).

[B] More politeness of stile. For so with Mr du Pin (14) we may translate the *lingua polita* of Gennadius. I observe this to the end that we may more clearly see the difference betwixt St Jerom and Gennadius. The former saith that Vigilantius wrote very ill: 'Miseruntque libros per fratrem Sisinnium quos inter crapulam sterens evomit. . . . Est quidem imperitus & verbis & scientia, & sermone inconditus, ne vera quidem potest defendere (15). --- They sent books by Sisinnius, which he had shewed out in his drunken fits. . . . He is a man truly ignorant both of stile and matter, and so disagreeable in his discourse that he could not even defend a good cause.' Gennadius, who knew what character St Jerom had given him, yet doth not scruple to acknowledge the polite language of Vigilantius. He meant, doubtless, not that this Heretic spoke elegantly, and wrote barbarously, but that there appeared a politeness in his writings. He then judges quite otherwise of him than St Jerom, and ought more to be credited; for when an adversary refutes a man with that bitterness, which clearly appears in St Jerom, it is hardly possible for him to own that he writes well; he chiefly aims to expose him, in all respects, to the readers contempt.

[C] One would think, by what St Jerom says of this Priest, that he was the most accursed Heretic that ever was. St Jerom calls him Samaritan and Jew, a filthy wretch, whose tongue ought to be cut out, and a furious monster that ought to be bound. *Ati, Vigilantium, qui κατ' αντιρροσιν hoc vocatur nomine, nam Dormitantis rectius diceretur, os fatidum rursus aperire, & potorem spurcissimum contra sanctorum martyrum proferre reliquias; & nos, qui eas suspicimus, appellare cinerarios & idololatrias, qui mortuorum hominum ossa veneremur.* O infelice hominem, & omni lacrymarum fonte plangendum, qui hæc dicens, non se intelligat esse Samaritanum, & Judæum (16). . . . O precidendam linguam à medicis, immò insanum curandum caput: ut qui loqui nescit, dicat aliquando reticere. Ego vidi hoc aliquando portentum, testimonii scripturarum, quasi vinculis Hippocratis, volui ligare furiosum: sed abiit, excessit, evasit, erupit, & inter Hadrie fluctus, Cotique regis alpes in nos declamando clamavit. Quidquid enim amens loquitur, vociferatio & clamor est appellandus (17). He calls Vigilantius's words a most filthy drunken vomit (18). He saith, in another place, that the conduct of his followers is not so much their own action,

as that of the Devils which dwell in them. *Quales nuper sub Magistro cerebroso in Gallia pullularunt, qui basilicas martyrum declinantes, nos qui ibi orationes ex more celebramus, quasi immundos fugiunt. Hoc autem non tam illi faciunt quam habitantes in eis demones, fortitudinem & flagella sancti cineris fugientes (19).* He saith so particularly of Vigilantius, *Sentio, sentio, infelicissime mortalium, quid delectas, quid times. Spiritus iste immundus, qui hæc te cogit scribere, sæpe hoc vilissimum tortus est pulvere, immò bodieque torquetur: & qui in te plagas dissimulat, in ceteris confitetur (20).* Observe that Vigilantius's diocesan acquiesced in his doctrine: this St Jerom disliked, and would have had this earthen vessel broken with an iron rod. *Miror sanctum Episcopum, in cujus parochia esse presbyter dicitur acquiescere furori ejus, & non virgâ Apostolicâ, virgaque ferrea confringere vas inutile, & tradere in interitum carnis, ut spiritus saluus fiat (21).* If these invectives are very exorbitant, I do not think that St Jerom's description of Vigilantius's opinions is less so. I believe he was treated with the same injustice as the Protestants are treated. He disapproved the religious honour paid to relics, and therefore he was accused of abhorring the memory and the dead bones of the martyrs, and avoiding their sepulchres, as places filled with carrion. But who is ignorant of the difference betwixt hating an object, and refusing to pay religious worship to it? I cannot believe that Vigilantius's opinions concerning celibacy, were what they are represented. Undoubtedly he contented himself with asserting that marriage ought not to be forbidden to Ecclesiastics, and that they ought not to engage in vows of continence. To render this doctrine odious, it was given out that he condemned and detested celibacy, and looked on those as incapable of the Priesthood who had no wife. This false gloss was yet further improved; it was affirmed, that, according to Vigilantius, incontestable proofs of a consummated and fruitful marriage, ought to be given to qualify a person for ordination, and that no man ought to present himself to be ordained without being attended by a wife big with child, or who carried one in her arms. There is no appearance that he either taught or caused to be practised such fooleries as these. What judgment then would you have us form of the sincerity of St Jerom, or of those accusers who informed him concerning this Heretic? Consider very well the words of that holy doctor. 'Proh nefas, Episcopos sui sceleris dicitur habere consortes (Vigilantius); si tamen Episcopi nominandi sunt, qui non ordinant diaconos, nisi prius uxores duxerint, nulli coelibes credentes pudicitiam, imò ostendentes quam sanctè vivant, qui malè de omnibus suspicantur. Et nisi prægnantes uxores viderint Clericorum, infantæ que de ulnis matrum vagientes, Christi sacramenta non tribuunt (22). --- O shame! They say Vigilantius has Bishops who are accomplices of his crime; if, indeed, such persons deserve the name of Bishops, who refuse to ordain Deacons, unless they be first married; believing that no single man can be chaste, and plainly showing what a bad living they themselves lead who have such a bad opinion of every body else. And unless a Clergyman can produce his wife big with child, or having one or two in her arms, these people will not give him the sacraments of CHRIST.' He repeats the same thing at the end of his book. *Tota nocte vigilabo, & feci illius, immò discipulis, vel magistris, qui nisi tumentes uteros viderint seminarum, maritus earum Christi ministerio arbitrantur indignos (23).* If these tales had been stretched a little farther, Vigilantius would have been accused of a discipline which revived the *jus trium liberarum*, -- the privilege of those who had three children, in favour of the Ecclesiastics, I mean which allowed exemptions and privileges to the Clergy

(12) Jacobus Valdesius de Dignitate Hispanie, cap. ix, num. 17, pag. m. 204.

(13) Id. ibid. cap. xix, num. 72, pag. 398.

(14) Du Pin, Bibl. des Auteurs Eccles. Tom. iii, pag. 138, Dutch Edit.

(15) Hieron. advers. Vigilant. pag. m. 550.

(16) Hieron. Epist. ad Riparium, pag. m. 543.

(17) Ibid. pag. 543.

(18) Eusebius in immundissimum crapulam. Ibid. Compare with this what is above in citat. (5).

(19) Idem. in Isaiam, cap. lxxv. Apud Baron. ad ann. 406, num. 43.

(20) Idem. Epist. adv. Vigilant. pag. 558, 559.

(21) Idem. Epist. ad Riparium, pag. 545.

(22) Hieron. adv. Vigilant. pag. m. 549.

(23) Id. ib. pag. 564.

was thought necessary to do as Vigilantius advised [D]; to suppress those assemblies, and to give another form to that sort of devotion. The ardour which St Jerom shewed, was perhaps intermixed with some personal resentment; for Vigilantius had traduced him as a favourer of Origen, and this was at the instigation of Rufinus [E]. He had discovered several marks of esteem for Vigilantius, whom Paulinus had recommended to him (c). This was when Vigilantius made a voyage to Jerusalem. An earthquake which happened whilst he was in the Holy Land, so much affrighted him, that he immediately ran stark naked to a church for shelter [F]. Leaving this country he took a view of Egypt (d), and when he returned into the west, he sowed his opinions amongst the Gauls.

(c) See the last remark.

(d) Hieron. Epist. lxxv.

Clergy whose wives were fruitful. They would have asserted, that the laws of his discipline assigned the best bishoprics and benefices not to the most virtuous and learned, but to those who had most children. They would have said that he subjected those Clergymen to canonical penalties, who could not shew any heirs of their bodies. They would have maintained that even with regard to the laity, all the ancient rules of Paganism were revived, which annexed a sort of real damage and scandal to celibacy. They would have published a hundred more extravagancies of this nature.

[D] Several sins were committed in those assemblies, and at last it was found necessary to do as Vigilantius advised.] In those times it was customary to pass whole nights in the churches on occasion of the celebration of certain festivals. The youth applied these opportunities to amorous ends, and several women were hereby debauched, which had not been possible if they had staid at home. It is then certain that Vigilantius justly condemned those nocturnal assemblies, which afforded so many tempting opportunities to sin. See what I have said in the remark [D] of the article THESMOPHORIA. St Jerom doth not deny that these meetings were attended with several disorders, but he asserts that this ought not to interrupt the frequency of their celebration: he alleges that those who perverted these opportunities to sinful purposes, would without them find means to defile themselves; that people are more careful to take hold of occasions which very seldom offer themselves; and that the Easter-eves were not exempt from this lewdness, and consequently ought to be abolished, if his adversary's reasons were just. But that after all, tho' wicked men abuse good things, it does not follow that the use of them ought to be abolished. His words are: *Error autem & culpa juvenum, vilissimarumque mulierum, qui per noctem sæpe deprehenduntur, non est religiosi hominibus imputandus; quia & in vigiliis Paschæ tale quid fieri plerumque convincitur: & tamen paucorum culpa non præjudicat religioni; qui & absque vigiliis possunt errare vel in suis, vel in alienis domibus. Apostolorum fidem Judæa proditio non destruxit. Et nostras ergo vigilias male aliorum vigilie non destruant: quin potius pudicitie vigilare cogantur, qui libidini dormiunt. Quod enim scisse bonum est, non potest malum esse, si frequenter fiat: aut, si aliqua culpa vitanda est, non ex eo, quod sæpe, sed ex eo, quod fit aliquando, culpabile est. Non vigilemus itaque diebus Paschæ; ne expectata diu adulterorum desideria compleantur; ne occasione peccandi uxor inveniat, ne maritali non possit recludi clave. Ardentius appetitur, quicquid est rarius (24). It would be very easy to shew the sophistry in every one of St Jerom's arguments, but it is sufficient for me to say that the event refuted him, and justified Vigilantius; for these nocturnal assemblies were at last abolished, to put a stop to the impurities there committed (25). The reader may here remember the mandate which the Archbishop of Paris published in the year 1697, to remedy a like abuse. Let us occasionally observe that the assemblies of the Faithful in the churches of the martyrs were exposed to another inconvenience; the Christians brought with them wherewithal to make good cheer, and made themselves drunk. This abuse prevailed still in Africa in St Augustin's time (26); but that custom had been then abolished in several places: men are so corrupt that even the exercise of devotion itself is perverted to an occasion of evil.*

(24) Id. ibid. pag. 557, 558.

(25) See the article THESMOPHORIA, citat. (37).

(26) See the xivth Epistle of St Augustin. He says, chap. xxvii, of the villth book, de Civitate Dei, that the wisest people did not carry their suppers to the churches of the Martyrs. See also the second chapter of the sixth book of his Confessions, and St Ambrose, lib. de Helia & Jejunio, cap. xvi.

(27) Baronius, ad ann. 406, num. 41, ex Hieronymi Apologia II.

[E] Vigilantius had traduced him as a favourer of Origen, and this was at the instigation of Rufinus.] The proofs of all this are to be found in Baronius: You will there see that Rufinus being at Jerusalem, instigated Vigilantius against St Jerom (27). You will there find that after Vigilantius's departure from Palestine, he traduced St Jerom in all places. Di-

misisti Egyptum & cunctas provincias reliquisti in quibus sectam tuam libera plerique fronte defendunt, & elegisti me ad infectandum qui omnia contra Ecclesiam dogmata reprehendo, & publica voce condemno (28). - - - You have left Egypt and all the other provinces where your sect is openly embraced by most people; and you have chosen to persecute me, who disapprove and publicly condemn all such doctrines as are contrary to the tenets of the church. You will there find that this sect of Vigilantius has no relation to the particular opinions, which he did afterwards publish in Gaul, but to the calumnies he dispersed against St Jerom, whom he accused of Origenism, to impute to him an inconsistent conduct (29), and a way of proceeding very common among zealous, who condemn in their neighbour what they are themselves guilty of. You will there besides find that this holy Father denies that he accused Vigilantius of Heresy. Unde adversus Rufinum, illum in se concitantem, ipsemet Hieronymus hæc ait: In Vigilantii nomine quid somniet, nescio. Ubi enim eum scripsi hæreticæ apud Alexandriam communione maculatum: Da librum, profer epistolam; nusquam omnino reperies; & inferius; Ego in Vigilantio tibi respondi. Eadem enim accusabat, quæ tu postea & amicus laudas, & inimicus accusas. Nimirum quod ille diceret sanctum Hieronymum Origenis errores sectari; nam subdit: Scio à quo illius contra me rabies concitata sit, novi cuniculos tuos. Hæc Sanctus Hieronymus. Agebat enim id astute Rufinus, ut esset qui Origenis hæresis accusaret Hieronymum, qui ipsum Rufinum & alios omnes Origenistas ejusdem Origenis errorum infimularet; ipsique talionis poenam subire cogeret, ut quem in Origenistas ipse gladium exaceruat, in sua se præcordia converteret non ignoraret (30). - - - Wherefore St Jerom himself makes this answer to Rufinus, who had stirred up Vigilantius against him. As touching Vigilantius, says he, I do not know what you dream of. For where did I write that he was stained with an Heretical communion at Alexandria: Shew the book, produce the letter; you will no where find any such thing; and a little after, In answering Vigilantius I have answered you. For he accused me of the same things, which you afterwards praised as a friend, and now blame as an enemy. This relates to his saying, that St Jerom followed the errors of Origen; for he subjoins: I know by whom his rage has been stirred up against me, I am acquainted with your undermining arts. Thus St Jerom. For Rufinus cunningly endeavoured to get St Jerom accused of Origen's Heresy, because he had charged Rufinus and all the other followers of Origen with the same errors. He did this by way of retaliation, and to make him sensible that he had turned upon himself the sword which he had whetted against others. I have cited (31) a passage in which St Jerom complains, that Vigilantius had traduced him between the Adriatic sea and the Alps. From all which let us conclude, that it was possible a personal resentment might enflame the zeal which he shewed for the truth.

[F] He immediately ran stark-naked into a church for shelter.] St Jerom reproaches him with this fear, and the discovery of his nakedness to the eyes of the faithful. In hac provincia cum subito motus, noctis medio omnes de fomno excitasset, tu prudens & sapientissimus mortalium, nudus orabas, & referebas nobis Adam & Evam de paradiso. Et illi quidem apertis oculis erubuerunt, nudos se esse cernentes, & verenda texerunt arborum foliis; tu & tunica, & fide nudus, subitoque timore perterritus, & aliquid habens nocturnæ crapulæ, sanctorum oculis obsecram partem corporis ingerebas, ut tuam indicares

(28) Hieronymus, Epist. lxxv, epist. Baron. ibid. num. 42.

(29) St Jerom very much indignant against the Origenists.

(30) Hieron. Apologia II.

(31) Baronius, ubi supra.

(32) In the remark [C], citation (17).

Gauls. His sect was of no very long continuance; the irruption of the barbarous nations quashed it; the irruption, I mean, which the Barbarians made not long after into that country, and of which the errors of this heretic were the cause, if we believe the Ecclesiastical Annalist [G]. I have only two faults to charge Mr Moreri with [H].

(32) Hieron. advers. Vigilant. pag. m. 559.

'indicares prudentiam (32). . . . In that province when an earthquake had awaked every body at mid-night, you, that you might prove yourself to be the wisest of all men, were seen to pray stark-naked, and resembled Adam and Eve in Paradise. But they, when their eyes were opened, blushed to see themselves naked, and covered their shame with the leaves of a tree; whereas you, stripped of your cloaths and faith, struck with a sudden fear, and having not quite slept out your debauch over night, exposed your obscene parts to the eyes of the faithful, that you might thereby show your prudence.' Observe, that he continually, as well as here, accuses him of being a drunkard.

[G] The errors of this Heretic were the cause, if we believe the Ecclesiastical Annalist. I mean Baronius. He and an hundred other famous writers have made it a common place to assign Heresies as the cause of the heavy strokes of Divine Justice; I mean those strokes which indifferently fall upon the followers of error, and the opposers of it: for example, the misfortunes with which Gaul was oppressed, gave no more quarter to the orthodox than to the disciples of Vigilantius. All parties please themselves with this common-place, without remembering that the Pagans made use of it against the primitive Christians (33). However we shall cite Baronius's words: they inform us that St Jerom's books did not silence the followers of Vigilantius: it was necessary that God should make use of other means to repress this Heresy. 'Porro quod posthac siliuerit infamis heresis, nec amplius ad multa secula audita fuerit: haud scias brevem illam Hieronymi scriptiorem esse veritatem, ut caput tollere amplius ausa non fuerit. Non enim ea est natura haereticorum, ut victi cedere sciant, & dent manus ratione convicti: sed prostrati licet, pertinationi audacia furgent, resiliuntque acriter certamina. Sed unde accidit ut sileret? audi: *Terribilis Deus in consiliis super filios hominum, vocavit gentes ab extremis terrarum: immisitque in Gallias, in eamque potissimum partem grassari sivit, in qua haereticis nefanda plantata est: adeo ut sub barbarico gladio magis de vita tuenda contendere, quam de dogmatibus licuerit disputare. Creduntur autem à barbaris illi esse sublati, quorum nulla umquam fuit postea vox audita. Ecce tibi quod soleant vehere secum, vel post se ducere hereses, clades nimirum provinciarum; quod multis exemplis saepe omnibus saeculis, & hoc ipso infelicius contigit demonstrari (34). . . . If you ask how that infamous Heresy came to be suppressed, and not to be heard of again for many ages, know that it was not the short consolation of St Jerom which frightened it from lifting up its head any more. For such is the nature of Heretics, that they will not yield when they are overcome, nor submit to the conviction of reason; but after they are thrown down, they will rise again with greater presumption and obstinacy, and renew a sharper engagement. How then came it to be suppressed? The Lord who is a great God, and a great King above all gods, called in the nations from the extremities of the earth, and suffered them to ravage Gaul, chiefly that part of it where this abominable Heresy had taken root, so that now it was more necessary for them to defend their lives from the sword of the Barbarians, than to dispute about the articles of Faith. It is believed that they were entirely destroyed by the Barbarians, so that their voice was never heard afterwards. These are the usual attendants or consequences of Heresies, viz. the ruin and devastation of provinces. Many examples are to be found of this in all ages, but in none more than in the present.' Could not Vigilantius's friends assert, that the Gauls were thus afflicted, because they did not embrace the truths which he declared to them? What answer could an adversary make to them? He would be obliged to come to this thesis? I am in the right, and you are in the wrong. But will not every one make use of this language? Has not one as much right as another to beg the question, if such a thing be once allowed? Nothing is then more frivolous than Baronius's reflexions.

[H] I have only two faults to charge Mr Moreri with. The first is, that he said that St Paulinus entertained Vigilantius when sick at Barcelona. He here mistakes

(33) See the article VERGERIUS, remark [E].

* Psalm. xcv.

(34) Baronius, ubi supra, num. 52, pag. m. 330.

the place. For St Paulinus's words as cited by Baronius are (35): 'Vigilantius quoque noster in Campania, & antequam ad nos veniret, & postquam pervenit vi febrium laboravit, & aegritudini nostrae qui & ipse sociale membrum erat, salativo (36) dolore compassus est. . . . Our friend Vigilantius had a fever in Campania, both before and after his coming to me. Thus did he sympathize with me in my sickness by a social affliction.' We do not find there, that St Paulinus entertained Vigilantius: we are only informed that they were both sick at the same time. I am nevertheless willing to believe that St Paulinus received him with great respect and kindness. His goodness, civility, and piety, persuaded me to it; and besides, he had a great esteem for Vigilantius, and had been very intimate with him at Barcelona (37). He recommended him to St Jerom; and his letter proved effectual, as appears by these words of the answer, 'S. Vigilantium Presbyterum qua aviditate susceperim, melius est ut ipsius verbis quam meis dicas literis (38). . . . It is better that you should be informed by his own words, than by my letter of the fondness with which I received the Presbyter Vigilantius.' St Jerom gave credit to the testimonial in favour of Vigilantius, contained in the letter of recommendation. But some time after writing against him, he said that he repented of the credit he had given to Paulinus's testimonial. We shall cite this passage somewhat at length: 'Credidi sancti presbyteri Paulini Epistolae, & illius super nomine tuo non putavi errare iudicium. Et licet statim accepta epistola, ἀσυναρτητος sermonem tuum intelligerem: tamen rusticitatem & simplicitatem magis in te arbitrabar, quam vecordiam. Nec reprehendo sanctum virum: maluit enim apud me dissimulare quod noverat, quam portitorem clientulum suis litteris accusare. Sed memetipsum arguo, qui alterius potius acquievi quam meo iudicio; & oculis aliud cernentibus, aliud schedulae credidi, quam videbam (39). . . . I gave credit to the letter of the holy Presbyter Paulinus, and had no notion of his being mistaken in the character which he gave of you. And although immediately after the receipt of his letter I perceived the confusion and incoherency of your discourse, I nevertheless did not so much impute it to the badness of your heart as to a clownish simplicity. Neither did I find fault with the holy man for rather abusing to pass by what he knew than to accuse his client the bearer. But I am angry with myself for having trusted less to my own judgment than to that of another, and for having believed a letter rather than my own eyes.' Moreri's second fault is saying that Vigilantius called the miracles wrought at the tombs of the holy martyrs, illusions. This is calumniating Vigilantius, and I admire that Baronius hath advanced such a calumny, since he needed only to consider the words he cites of St Jerom, to be informed that it was false. 'Idem nebulo respuens sanctorum reliquias addebat illud horrendum dictum, signa apud eas fieri solita, demonum esse praestigias (40). . . . That villain, rejecting the reliques of the saints, adds this horrible expression, viz. that the miracles usually wrought by them were diabolical illusions.' This is Baronius's enormous accusation levelled at this Heretic, and see how he proves it, 'Nisi forte in morem Gentilium, impiorumque Porphyrii & Eunomii has praestigias demonum esse confingas (41). . . . Unless perhaps after the example of the Heathens, and of such wicked fellows as Porphyrius and Eunomius, you pretend that they were diabolical illusions.' It is clear that these words of St Jerom shew that Vigilantius did not call the miracles wrought at the tombs of the martyrs, diabolical delusions. St Jerom would not have expressed himself as he did, if he had found either in the book of his adversary, or in the letters against him, what Baronius imputes to this pretended Herefarch. He would have refuted it as a positive opinion of Vigilantius, and not as a subterfuge to which he supposed he might have recourse. When one anticipates an objection, when one speaks thus to one's adversary, perhaps you will alledge such a thing, how do I know that you will not affirm as the Heathens did, &c. it is certain that the adversary hath said no such thing. Observe, that Baronius's

(35) Paulinus, Epist. i. ad Severum, apud Baron. ubi supra, num. 40, p. 324.

(36) In some manuscripts it is *facile*.

(37) Baronius, ubi supra.

(38) Hieronym. Epist. xiii, apud Baron. ibid.

(39) Idem, Epist. lxxv, apud eundem, Baronium, ibid. num. 41, pag. 324, 325.

(40) Baronius, ibid. num. 50, pag. 329.

(41) Hieron. adv. Vigilant. apud Baron. ib.

ronius's calumny is to be found in many authors. Lindanus had already advanced it. I cite him to show his want of judgment. Porphyrius, Eunomius, Eustathius, Vigilantius, alique Hagiomastigis (sanctorum miracula aiebant esse demonum præficias (42). . . . Porphyrius, Eunomius, Eustathius, Vigilantius, and other defamers of holy things said

(41) Lindanus, in Dubitantii Dialogo II, pag. m. 207.

that the miracles of the saints were diabolical illusions. Prateolus adopts this whole passage (43), as doth the Jesuit Gualterius (44) upon the authority of Prateolus. But what more surprizes me is, to see that Mr Godeau has asserted this calumny (45). Mr Moreri took it from him.

(43) Prateolus, in Elencho Hæref. pag. m. 512.

(44) In Tabula Chronograph. pag. m. 372.

(45) Godeau, Histoire de l'Eglise, ad. an. 476.

VILLAMARINI, (ISABELLA) wife of the prince of Salerno. See the remark B in the article CAPYCIUS.

VILLAREAL (EMANUEL FERNANDES) the Plagiary author of a book, which procured him a pension from Cardinal Richelieu, was burnt at Lisbon for Judaism [A]. He had been Consul for the Portuguese nation at Rouen; and wrote a book against Caramuel whilst he was in that post.

[A] The Plagiary author . . . was burnt . . . for Judaism. All these particulars I learn from Mr Le Laboureur: he relates them immediately after an observation which he had made against the Genealogists, who published, that Cardinal Richelieu was descended from the marriage of Guyonne de Laval with Frances du Pleffis. He proves it a falsity, and consequently, adds he (1), the whole book ought to be suppressed, which was written in Spanish by a Portuguese named Villareal, afterwards burnt for Judaism at Lisbon; a famous Plagiary, who copied it from du Chefus, in order to make Cardinal Richelieu descend by the alliance of Laval, from the Kings of Castile and Portugal, for which ser-

(1) Le Laboureur, Addit. aux Mémoires de Camilleus, Tom. ii, pag. 303.

vice he enjoyed a good pension. I wonder that Don Nicolas Antonio faith nothing concerning the tragical death of this author; he only gives the titles of the two pieces mentioned in the text of this article, and observes that they were written whilst the author was Consul for the Portuguese merchants at Rouen (2). The first of these books is intituled, *El Politico Cristiano, à Discurso Politico de la Vida y Acciones del Cardinal de Richelieu* (3); and the other, *Anti-Caramuel* (4), *Defensa del Manifiesto del Reino de Portugal*. See the Anti's of Mr Baillet (5).

(2) Nicol. Antonio, Bibl. Script. Hist. Tom. i, pag. 257.

(3) It was translated into French and printed at Paris in 1643, in 4to. 16. id.

(4) It was printed at Paris, in 1643. 16. id. (5) In Tom. vi, Art. cxxii, §. i, in the edition of the Jugemens des Savans, of Baillet, in 1725, is 4to.

(a) Andr. Schottus, Bibl. Hist. pan. pag. 265.

(b) Elffius, Encyclopædic. Augustin. pag. 426.

(c) In the remark [C], of the article HYPERIUS.

(d) Elffius, ubi supra.

VILLAVICENTIUS (LAWRENCE) a Monk of the order of St Augustin, and preacher to Philip II, King of Spain, was born at Xerez in Andalusia. He continued a long time in the Low-Countries, and took his degree of Doctor of Divinity at Louvain, before he was called to the court, in order to be preacher to the King of Spain (a). In the year 1561 he made his last visit of the province of the Lower Germany, of which he was Vicar-General (b). We have already spoken (c) of some of his writings, which cost him only the trouble of striking out of the works of other authors, what did not favour enough of Catholicism. We are not certain that he had even such a share as this, in all the other works attributed to him. He flourished until the year 1581 (d).

(a) Theod. de Beze, Hist. Ecclesiast. Ivor. ii, pag. 158.

(b) Id. ibid.

(c) Id. ibid.

VILLEGAIGNON (NICHOLAS DURAND DE) a Knight of Malta, a native of Provins in Brie (a), served a long time in the galleys, and was in several naval expeditions, so that having besides some learning [A], he rendered himself considerable as a person of merit, and was promoted to the vice-admiralty of Bretagne, in the reign of Henry II (b). He quarrelled with the governor of the castle of Breft, and fearing the consequences of this difference (c), he thought of an enterprise, which frequently serves for an episode in controversial books, and which has not been forgot by Mr Maimbourg [B]. He resolved to establish a colony in Brasil, and knowing that Admiral de Colligni favoured the Reformed religion, he gave him to understand that his design was to advance the kingdom of God in that country, and procure a refuge

[A] Having besides some learning. This is pretty rare in persons of his condition, he was very well versed in polite literature, as appears by the fine description he wrote in Latin of the unfortunate Algerine expedition, in which he was wounded, in the service of Charles V who was then at peace with France (1). Mr Maimbourg adds in the margin, that this description is inserted in the second tome of the historical pieces which Schardius hath collected. He might have told us that it was printed by itself at Strasbourg in the year 1542, in 8vo (2). His treatise *de Bello Melitensi & ejus eventu Francis imposita*, was printed at Paris by Robert Stephens in the year 1553, in 4to. La Croix du Maine faith that the same piece was printed in French, in the same place and year, by Charles Stephens (3). I shall say something below concerning Villegaignon's controversial works. John de Leri tells us: That he never heard a man talk better concerning religion, and a Christian Reformation than he did then (4).

(1) Maimbourg, Hist. du Calvinisme, Ivor. ii, pag. 100, Dutch Edit.

(2) Du Verdier, Bibl. Franç. pag. 909.

(3) La Croix du Maine, B. bl. Franç. pag. 342.

(4) Jean de Leri, Hist. d'un Voyage fait au Brésil. l. vi, pag. 75.

[B] Which has not been forgot by Mr Maimbourg. What he says of it in the second book of his History of Calvinism, hath been followed by the Continuator of Moreri. I might then have a very particular right to examine it, but I must own that the Continuator hath taken nothing which I desire to contradict. I shall only observe, 1. That in the Dutch editions

they have been in the wrong to change the date of 1557 into 1558, concerning the arrival of the Genevois at the isle of Colligni. 2. That Moreri had no reason to say that Villegaignon did not return into the Romish communion till after he came back into France. But to come to Mr Maimbourg: his first falsity is saying that there was also a division between the Protestants, and even amongst the ministers themselves (5); for, adds he, some would have the Lord's Supper administered in the Romish way, as Jesus Christ had instituted it, with unleavened bread; and others affirmed that it ought to be celebrated in the Greek manner with leavened bread. The former were for retaining the ceremonies of the Catholic church, and the other rejecting them as superstitious. He cites the ecclesiastical History of the Reformed Churches, and that alone confounds him; for we find there that it was only Villegaignon and a Student of Sorbonne who raised the dispute. A person named John Contat, a Student of Sorbonne, secretly aspiring after I know not what episcopal dignity as fantastical as Villegaignon's kingdom, came on the day appointed for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and asked where the sacerdotal habits were, and began to dispute concerning unleavened bread, which he said was necessary, as well as to mix water with the wine, and other such like objections he raised. Nevertheless the Sacrament

(5) Maimbourg, ubi supra, pag. 100.

a refuge for the faithful who were persecuted in France. The Admiral with his accustomed prudence concealed this excellent motive from Henry II, and only representing this enterprize on the side of the advantages it might bring to his kingdom, obtained two large ships well equipped for Villegaignon; besides the sum of ten thousand livres (d). This knight embarked on the 15th of July 1555 (e), and in the month of November following arrived at the mouth of the river Ganabara, in the 23d degree of south latitude (f). He endeavoured to settle his colony in the Continent, but several reasons engaged him to retire into an isle (g), which he called Colligni in honour of the Admiral (h). He appeared extraordinary zealous for the Reformed religion (i), for most of those who followed him were Protestants, and were only induced to make this voyage by the hopes which he had given them of promoting the work of God, and procuring for them that liberty of conscience which Henry II deprived them of. He wrote to the Church of Geneva by the returning ships, to desire some ministers and other persons, who might successfully labour in the instruction of the savages (k). His letter being read, they first of all gave thanks to God for the amplification of Christ's kingdom in such a distant country, and afterwards chose two ministers, Peter Richier, and William Chartier, who with some other persons proper for his intentions were sent to him (l). They departed from Geneva on the 10th of September 1556 (m), and embarked at Honfleur on the 19th of November of the same year (n), and landed in the island of Colligni on the 10th of March 1557 (o). Richier preached the same day, and Villegaignon heard him with marks of an extraordinary zeal (p). Some days after, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was celebrated, and he was observed to communicate very devoutly, after he had recited two long prayers, so fervent that no minister could have dictated better (q). It was soon perceived that all this was meer ostentation, and that he only desired to act the controvertist; for he and one Cointa who had studied in the Sorbonne, fell a disputing concerning the Real Presence. They maintained that though Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation were absurd doctrines, it was nevertheless true, that the body of JESUS CHRIST was included in the signs of the Eucharist (r). It was agreed that this dispute should be referred to the decision of the German and French churches, and that Chartier the minister should be sent into Europe to consult them (s). Villegaignon promised to submit to their

(d) *Id. ibid.*
pag. 159.

(e) *Id. ibid.*
but according to
Leri's relation,
pag. m. 3, it was
in May.

(f) *Yean de Leri,*
Histoire d'un
Voyage fait au
Bresil, pag. 4.

(g) *Idem,* in
the preface.

(h) *Beza,* ubi
supra. Leri, *cb.*
vii, pag. 88.

(i) Leri, *cb. i,*
pag. 2, & seq.

(k) *Id. ibid.*

(l) *Id. ibid.* p. 5.

(m) *Id. ibid.* p. 7.

(n) *Id. ibid.* p. 8.

(o) *Id. ibid.* *cb. vi,*
pag. 55.

(p) See the ar-
ticle RICHIER.

(q) You will
find them entire
in Leri, pag. 60,
& seq.

(r) *Id. ibid.* pag.
67.

(s) *Beza,* ubi
supra, p. 160.

' sacrament was administered according to the plain ordinance of Jesus Christ, and as it is administered in the Reformed Churches of France: but the difference still increased, and came to such a pitch that as Richier was baptizing a child and condemning what superstition has added to the primitive institution. Villegaignon openly gave the lie to the minister, protesting that he would come no more to his sermons, nor adhere to the Calvinistical sect, as he called it (6). The second falsity is saying that the minister Richier asserted against the Calvinists, that Jesus Christ ought not to be either adored or prayed to, and that the Lord's Supper or Eucharist, in what manner soever we there receive the body of Jesus Christ, doth not at all conduce to the good of the communicants (7). I have elsewhere (8) mentioned the particular opinions imputed to this minister. It is easy to perceive that he only taught that Jesus Christ's humanity, being a creature, ought neither to be adored nor prayed to; but this doth not signify that Jesus Christ, both God and man, ought not to be adored, and prayed to (9). If Peter Richier had embraced the opinions which Mr Maimbourg charges on him, Calvin would have caused him to be ignominiously deposed: nay I know not but that he would have been forced to undergo a more rigorous punishment; for he would have been looked upon as a wretched Anti-Trinitarian; but we know he was respected as a worthy minister of the gospel after his return from Brasil (10). Observe that the Jesuit Gaultierius doth not charge him with this monstrous opinion concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper which Maimbourg speaks of. The third falsity is his saying that continuing to preach his blasphemies Villegaignon gave him the lie (11). The author whom he cites, saith expressly (12) that the lie which was given, only regarded the minister's condemnation of those superstitions which the Papists have added to baptism (13).

The minister who answered Maimbourg, should have censured this part of his History of Calvinism in the above manner; but instead of doing so, he hath amused himself with observing (14), 1. That Admiral de Colligni pitched upon Villegaignon in order to send him to prepare a retreat in America for the Protestants. 2. That Villegaignon promised to grant them liberty of conscience. 3. That after having kept his word for some time, he hanged, drowned, and threw into the sea all those who would not follow his Apostasy.

4. That he confined the rest to a moving prison, which was an old rotten ship, without provisions and arms, to which he sent as many of the Reformed as he could stow there. The first of these four things is contradicted by Beza, and John de Leri, who assure us that Villegaignon was the first that made this overture to the Admiral. They also affirm that he promised to endeavour, to the utmost of his power, the advancement of the kingdom of God in that country, and that he publicly declared himself a good Protestant. This confutes the second particular, which supposes Villegaignon to be a Catholic who promises to tolerate the Protestants. The third is a lie, which as justly at least deserves to be condemned as those of Maimbourg; for it appears by John de Leri's relation, 1. That Villegaignon punished with death only three Protestants, who returned into his island after the departure of the Genevois (15). 2. That he either durst not or could not hinder the ministers from preaching (16), nor use any authority with respect to the Genevois (17). 3. That if he was cruel or barbarous, it was either towards the savages or his domestics, or those who violated his laws; religion had no hand in this (18). The fourth is no less false than the foregoing, since John de Leri owns (19), that he and the others who returned into France in this old ship, treated with the master thereof (20) for the expences of their passage, without Villegaignon's interposing in the least, and that when they were out of his island and jurisdiction. Compare with this the remark [D] towards the end. Besides, this adversary of Maimbourg hath ill glossed this passage: he easily rid himself of all the Protestants, who would not follow his example. This is plainly enough to confess, saith he, that he was their cruel executioner. But we shall see hereafter (21) that John de Leri acknowledges, that during the time the Genevois staid in the isle of Colligni, no Frenchman was put to death, and that after their departure, Villegaignon caused only three Protestants to be put to death (22). These were part of those five, who after they had embarked with Richier, John de Leri, &c. chose rather to return to Brasil than continue their voyage. But since Villegaignon spared the lives of the two others, it seems probable either that these three did not suffer death barely for their religion, or that the remaining two apostatized, which no author that I know of has mentioned. Let no body say that I set up for a defender of Villegaignon;

(6) *Beza,* Hist.
Eccles. lib. ii.
pag. 160.

(7) Maimbourg,
ubi supra.

(8) In the re-
mark [C], of
the article RI-
CHIER.

(9) See the pas-
sage I have quot-
ed from Mr
Suarin, in the
remark [C], of
the article RI-
CHIER.

(10) See the re-
mark [A], of
his article.

(11) Maimbourg,
ubi supra, pag.
104.

(12) *Beza,* ubi
supra.

(13) That is,
their mixing
salt and oil with
water. See *John*
de Leri, ubi su-
pra, pag. 73.

(14) Jurieu, A-
polog. pour la
Reformat. Tom.
i, pag. 552.

(15) See the re-
mark [E].

(16) Leri, ubi
supra, pag. 82.

(17) See the re-
mark [D].

(18) Leri, *ibid.*
pag. 77, & seq.
item pag. 85.

(19) *Id. ibid.*
cb. vi, pag.
84, & *cb. xxi,*
pag. 339.

(20) He was
not a native of
Bretagne, as *Be-*
za says, ubi su-
pra, pag. 160,
he was born at
Havre de Grace.

(21) In the re-
mark [H], at
the end.

(22) See the re-
mark [E].

(r) Leri, ubi supra, pag. 68.

(u) Id. *ibid.* pag. 73.

(x) Id. *ibid.*
pag. 76.

(y) Ibid. pag. 82.

(x) Beza, ubi
supra, *cb. xxi*,
pag. 341.

(aa) Ibid. ch.
xxii, pag. 373.

(bb) Taffin,
Etat de l'Eglise,
pag. m. 580,
ad ann. 1558.

their decision, and particularly to the opinion of John Calvin, for whom he pretended a great respect (r) [C]. He contrived new cavils, when the administration of the sacrament came on the second time, and at the expiration of some days, publicly declared that he had changed his opinion (u), and without expecting the answer *which he had sent* (*x*). *Charrier the minister to France in quest of, he declared that Calvin was a wicked heretic* (*x*). From that time they gave the sacrament by night unknown to him, and some told him that they would no longer depend on him (y). They were those who had agreed at Geneva to follow the two ministers. He was not strong enough to force them to obey his orders, and therefore contented himself with commanding them to leave his island. They could with impunity have disobeyed him, but they thought it more proper to return [D]. And accordingly they embarked on the 4th of January 1558 (z), and arrived at Port Blavet on the 26th of May following (aa). The horrible misery and scarcity of provisions which they underwent during this voyage is described by John de Leri, who, being one of them, published a relation of it. Villegaignon, who as some writers say, was the cause of this famine, was guilty of a much more villainous design against them, which they happily escaped [E]. He himself some time after returned into France, without providing for the defence of his fort Colligni (bb), which the Portuguese seized, and transported

gnon; have not I related whatever John de Leri hath said against him? But the laws of History will by no means suffer me to be silent concerning falsities published against any person whatsoever.

lifted against any person whatsoever.

For the rest, if the subject were not too serious and melancholy, could one read without laughing, that a man caused *A L L* those to be put to death who would not follow the example of his apostasy, and put the rest on board of a vessel? Who says *all*, excepts no body. To make sense of these words, the *rest* should have followed his *Apostasy*, than which nothing is more false; as the sequel of this author's discourse sufficiently proves. Hence we may conclude that this author wrote with a great deal of precipitation, and for the most part without knowing what he said.

[C] Particularly to the opinion of *John Calvin, for whom he pretended a great respect.*] Calvin wrote a letter to him by the two ministers who were sent to him. Villegaignon answered him in Latin, *and not only informed him at large of his condition in general, but particularly making use of Brazil ink he wrote to him with his own hand what follows.* ‘ I add the advice which you have given me by your letters, using my utmost endeavours not to depart from it in the least. For indeed I am fully persuaded, that no way can be more holy, just, and perfect. Wherefore we have caused your letters to be read in the assembly of our council, and after that to be registred, in order that if we should ever turn out of the right way, they may be reclaimed by the reading of them

(23) Leri, ubi
supra, *cb. vi*,
pag. 68.

(24) Id. *ibid.*
 pag. 69.

(25) *Id. ib. pag*
68.

(26) Beza, ubi
supra, pag. 150

(27) Leri, ubi
supra, p. 69.

'(23).' John de Leri adds: *Nicolas Carmeau who was the bearer of these letters . . . taking his leave of us told me, that Villegaignon had commanded him to say by word of mouth to Calvin, that he begged of him to believe that to perpetuate the memory of the advice he had given him, he would cause it to be engraven on copper* (24). 'I have frequently heard him, says John de Leri (25), repeat these words: Mr Calvin is one of the most learned men since the time of the Apostles; nor have I read any Doctor, who, in my opinion, hath more purely explained the holy scripture.' *Theodore Beza observes that Villegaignon caused these letters which came from Geneva to be registered in the rolls of his imaginary kingdom* (26). He is mistaken in the date of Villegaignon's answer, which he fixes on the last of February 1557, instead of the last of March (27); and since he had just told us, that the Genevois arrived on the 7th of March 1557, it was easy for him to see that the answer to the letters which they brought with them could not be dated on the last of February 1557. I only observe this in order to give a specimen of the errors into which the greatest authors and the best correctors sometimes fall by reason of the many things they have to distract their attention. Those of the lower rank are not so subject to them; nevertheless I am very much afraid that some such will be found in this Dictionary.

[D] *They could with impunity have disobeyed him but they thought it more proper to return.*] The Genevois having signified to him that since he rejected the gospel, they were not willing to continue any longer in his service, he caused the two goblets of meal of roots, which was daily distributed to them, to be withheld (28). They were very glad of this refusal, because it entirely rid them of any subjection to him. If he had

(28) Ibid. p. 80.

been strongest, and if part of his people, and even some of the chief, had not taken their part, he would have endeavoured without doubt to subdue them by force. He designed one day to put John de Leri and another in irons, under pretence that, notwithstanding his order, they went out of the island without his leave. He pretended to be ignorant that his lieutenant had granted them liberty to make this voyage. *They plainly declared that they would not suffer it, after which he grew milder* (29). The chief of their reasons was that they had intimated to him, that since he had broken his promise of maintaining the exercise of the Evangelical religion, they would no longer depend on him. . . . The chief of his people being of our religion, faith John de Leri (30), and consequently dissatisfied with him on account of his Apostasy; if we had not been apprehensive that the Admiral, who under the King's authority (as I said in the beginning) had sent him, and was as yet ignorant of his carriage, might have taken it ill, some of us would very vain have thrown him into the sea, that his flesh and brawny shoulders might have served as food for the fishes. About the end of October, he told them that he would no longer bear with them, and commanded them to depart his island (31). It is indeed true, adds John de Leri (32), That if we had pleased we were able to have driven him out himself. But as well to deprive him of any just reason of complaint against us, as because France and other nations, knowing that we came hither only to enjoy the free use of the gospel, we would not cast any scandal upon it, we chose rather to obey Villegaignon, and depart without any farther contest.

From all this we may conclude, that a certain author whom I have already censured, was not very well informed, when he tells us that Villegaignon *put them up in a floating prison, and that they preferred embarking in a ferry vessel on the most treacherous of the four elements, to staying any longer exposed to the fury of this merciless tyger, who was more faithlesse than the sea* (33).

sea (33). [E] Villagaignon, who as some writers say, was the cause of this famine, was guilty of a much more villainous design against them whicb they happily escaped.] Theodore Beza assures us that he so managed it, that the master of the vessel had not one fourth part of the provisions necessary for his voyage, hoping by this means that they would die of want and hunger, before they arrived in France (34). Mr Jurieu affirms the same thing (35): but John de Leri says nothing of it; he was however as well acquainted with this affair as any person, and much better than any other not concerned in it, and he was not likely to spare Villagaignon. As for the other perfidiousness, let us see how he relates it: ‘ Villagaignon not only sent us our licence to depart, signed by himself; but also wrote to the master of the ship, to let him know that he should make no difficulty of carrying us on his account:’ For, said he, (fraudulently) as I was very glad of their arrival, hoping to have met with what I aimed at; in like manner since we cannot agree together, I am content that they return. So that under this fair pretext he had contrived a most villainous piece of treachery; for having given the master of the vessel a little chest, covered with an oil-cloth in the sea fashion, and filled with letters to several persons,

(33) *Jurim.*, vol.
supra, p. 553.

e (34) Bez, ubi
supra, p. 160.

(35) Jurico,
ubi supra.

transported the artillery to Lisbon. At his return he engaged in a vehement paper war against the Protestants. They on the other side wrote against him in such a manner as did not much turn to his advantage [F]. He died in the month of December 1571 (cc), in a Maltese Commandory, called Beauvais, and situated in the province of Gastinois, near St John de Nemours, and managed his own affairs so ill, as well during his sickness as before, and had so little affection for his relations, that they reaped no advantage from his estate, neither in his life nor after his death (dd). Some of his adversaries have owned that he did not defile himself with any of the female savages of America [G]: an elogy which several other governors in the like situation have no pretence to. I shall observe some faults in Thevet [H].

(cc) Saint Remond Journal Chronol. Tom. i, pag. 442.

(dd) Leri, ubi supra, pag. 442.

The

- (36) Leri, chap. xxi, pag. 340.
- (37) Idem, ib. xxi, pag. 377.
- (38) Idem, chap. xxi, pag. 346.
- (39) Idem, chap. xxi, pag. 379.
- (40) Ibid. pag. 380. See also Beza, ubi supra, pag. 161.

[F] He engaged . . . in a paper war . . . against the Protestants. They on the other side wrote against him in such a manner as did not much turn to his advantage.] Du Verdier Vau-Privas gives me the following catalogue: *An answer to the Remonstrances made to the Queen-mother*, printed at Paris in the year 1561, in 4to. *The controverted propositions betwixt the Chevalier de Villegaignon, and John Calvin, concerning the truth of the holy Eucharist*, Paris 1562, in 4to. *The Chevalier de Villegaignon's answer to John Calvin's resolution concerning the Sacraments*, Paris 1562. *An answer to the libels and calumnies published against him: at Paris, and afterwards at Lyons in the year 1561. De cana controversia Phil. Melanchth. judicio: at Paris 1561 in 4to. Liber ad articulos Calvinianus: at Venice 1565. De confederatione mystici Sacramenti, & duplici Christi oblatione adversus Vannium Lutherologum Professore: de Judaici Paschatis implemento adversus Calvinologos: de poculo sanguinis Christi, & introitu in sancta sanctorum adversus Beza: at Paris 1569 (41). His adversaries of the opposite religion, continues du Verdier, wrote defamatory libels against him, of which were *La Suffisance de Maître Colas Durand. Alsé Espoussette de ses armoiries, and several others*. See the article RICHER.*

I have seen only three of his books, viz. *Ad Articulos Calvinianos, de Sacramento Eucharistiae, traditionis ab ejus ministris in Francia Antaeolica evulgatae Responsiones*, per Nicolaum Villagagnonem Equitem Rhodium, ad Ecclesiam Christianam: printed at Paris, by Andrew Wechel, 1560, in 4to. *De cana controversia Philippi Melanchthoni judicio*: printed at Paris, by the same Wechel, 1561, in 4to. *The Chevalier de Villegaignon's Paraphrase on Mr Calvin's Resolution concerning the Sacraments*: printed at Paris, by Wechel, in 1561, in 4to. All these three books are extraordinarily well printed.

- (42) Jean de Leri, ib. vi, p. 71.

[G] His adversaries have owned, that he did not defile himself with any of the female savages.] (42) Not to conceal any more what redounds to his praise than what tends to his discredit, I shall, by what way, inform you, that certain Normans, who escaped shipwreck, long before he came into that country, living very impiously, and committing all manner

of leudness with the female savages, (by whom I knew some that had children four or five years old) in order to suppress this abuse and prevent it for the future, among those who lived in our island and fort, Villegaignon, with advice of his council, made a law, that no professed Christian should co-habit with the female savages on pain of death. But if any of them were converted and baptized, the marrying of them was hereby freely permitted. . . .

(43) As this law was doubly founded on the word of God, it was also so well observed, that Villegaignon's people and ours religiously and strictly abstained from any such pollution; and tho' since my return I heard that he was guilty of a leudness of that nature, I bear him witness that he was not suspected to be so whilst I was there. And further, he so strictly observed this ordinance, that it was not without the most pressing instances of several of his chief favourites, that he so far mitigated the punishment of an interpreter, who had committed this crime with a female savage whom he had formerly debauched, as only to punish him with the chain, and condemn him to slavery; for Villegaignon would have had him hanged. And, as far as I know of him, he was very strict in this particular, as well with regard to himself as others, and was really to be recommended for it. I have cited this long passage to have an occasion of making two remarks. The first is, that we ought to be very cautious how we give credit to ill reports of men. How many are there who believe what hath been said of Villegaignon's impurities, and nevertheless he is acquitted of them by the evidence of a person, who, very far from sparing him, would have been fond of uttering all the disadvantageous truths against him. My second observation is, that there is no passion more incorrigible or brutal than that of uncleanness. All Christians know that the law of God forbids their commerce with infidel women: and they are educated in principles which inspire horror at the thoughts of such a commerce. Human laws, which punish this crime, fortify the impressions of education. And yet to what degrees of impurity hath the lasciviousness of the Christians, who discovered the new world, transported them? Could the shocking deformity and barbarity of the savages, restrain men from this crime, prohibited, as it also is, by divine and human laws? Let us go no farther than John de Leri's relation. Are we not there informed that some Normans escaping a shipwreck, gave themselves over to this vice, and obliged Villegaignon to make a law in order to punish this crime with death, which, nevertheless, was not sufficient to curb the lust of an interpreter. If we consult other relations we shall find the same punishment was requisite to hinder men from defiling themselves with certain amphibious animals, which in some sort resemble women. A horrible depravation, an incorrigible passion, which hurries men on to the commission of the sin against nature, and bestiality (44); and, perhaps, to a lascivious commerce with dead bodies. Herodotus informs us (45), that after it was discovered in Egypt, that one of the embalmers of dead bodies, had defiled himself with a woman a little while after her death; they kept the corpses of beautiful women three or four days before they trusted them in the hands of those men. *Τὸ δὲ ποιεῖναι ὕτω τῆς εἰνενκα, ἵνα μὴ σὺ οἱ ταχεῖναι μισογυνταὶ τῆσι γυναιξί. λαμβάναντες γὰρ τινὰ φάτι μισογόμενον νεκρῷ περὶ σφατῶν γυναικὸς κατέπειτα δὲ τὸν ὁμότεχνον. Ea de causa facientes, ne cum feminis isti salnarii concumbant. Deprehensum enim quemdam amentem cum recenti cadavere muliebri, delatumque ab ejusdem artificii socio (46).*

(43) Ibid. pag. 72.

(44) See the advice given by Æliop, in *Plautus, Fab. xlii*, pag. m. 49.

(45) Herodot. lib. ii, cap. lxxxix.

(46) Id. ibid.

[H] I shall observe some faults in Thevet.] Let us first of all lay down this foundation. In the year 1558,

The addition which I have to make to this article is curious, as it concerns two exploits of Villegaignon in the year 1560, the one in war, and the other in controversy, both which did him little honour [I]. I likewise add that a writer who despised him promised a thing, which, as far as I can learn, he has not performed [K]. It was to publish very soon memoirs of the life of Villegaignon, and of his principal relations (ee).

(ee) La Popelinere, Histoire des Histoires, pag. 451.

(47) See John de Leri's Preface: he quotes the 1st, 24th, 25th, and 60th chapters of those Singularities. (48) Thevet, Cosmographie Universelle, livr. xxi, fol. 909. (49) Id. ibid. ch. viii, fol. 925.

1558, a book was printed, intituled, *des Singularitez de l'Amerique*, digested into order by Mr de la Porte, according to the Memoirs of Brother Andrew Thevet. He says there (47), that Thevet arrived at Cape de Frie on the 10th of November 1555, and four days after at the river of Ganabara, from whence he departed on the 31st of January following, in order to go for France. From which it follows that he tells an untruth, when he avers in the XXIst book of his Cosmographie, printed in 1575 (48), that the factiousness of four ministers of the new religion, the chief of which was called Richier, raised a sedition, which brought some of the mutineers to capital punishment, that the rest, and namely Richier, escaped, and that the savages, irritated by this tragedy, designed to put the remainder to death. He reckons himself amongst those who were in this danger: *We narrowly escaped their revenging it on us*, faith he. He tells, in another place (49), that he quitted the enterprize of converting the savages, as well because he was not well versed in their language, as on account that the Calvinist ministers undertook this charge, envying my design, says he. These two passages shew that he pretends to have been there whilst the Geneva ministers were there. But it is a notorious falsity. For they did not arrive there till March 1557, and he left that place on the 31st of January 1556. He himself refutes those who would have us believe that he made a second voyage. Observe his own words: *I very much wonder what excited Calvin to tax me in his Apology, printed at Geneva, with being one of the principal abettors of the death of those said ministers whom the Sieur de Villegaignon caused to be thrown into the sea, since that was done three years or thereabouts after my return into France, as appears by my book of the Rarities, &c. which is a sufficient evidence in point of time, besides several other of my writings.* He confesses therefore that from the 31st of January 1556, to the time that Villegaignon caused some Heretics to be drowned, he was absent from that country. Consequently he was not there, during the stay of the Genevois, which was from March 1557, till towards the end of the year. His own words discover therefore that he was, and was not there. Not to take notice of his other falsities, it is not true that those whom Villegaignon caused to be drowned were ministers, nor that there were above two ministers sent from Geneva, or any other place. I shall only observe, the better to convict him of his importunes, that the sedition he speaks of proceeded the arrival of Peter Richier, and that no minister before Richier had seen Villegaignon in his isle of Colligni. The proof of all which is drawn from the letter which the said Villegaignon wrote to Calvin on the 31st of March 1557: in which he declares (50) that Richier and his brethren found him reduced to that extremity, that he was obliged alternatively to perform the offices of magistrate and minister, which, adds he, put me in great anguish; for the example of King Uzziab was sufficient to deter me from this practice. He there relates the conspiracy formed against him, and how the authors of it were discovered and punished.

(50) Villegaignon's letter to Calvin, apud John de Leri, in Preface.

(51) Leri in his preface.

John de Leri (51) pressed those arguments against Thevet, and maintained that while the ministers and their companions of Geneva continued at Colligni, there was neither any sedition, nor conspiracy, nor any Frenchman killed there. To confound times is a great fault, but to make use of these confusions to calumniate the innocent is yet a much greater. Both which Thevet is guilty of.

[I] Two exploits in the year 1560 . . . both which did him little honour.] I shall borrow this narrative from

a Protestant Historian, who speaking of the persecutions exercised by the House of Guise against the Protestants in the reign of Francis II, has the following words: 'Villegaignon . . . believing that he had found a proper opportunity to be revenged on those who had published an account of his cruelties committed in America under the reign of Henry, trumped up in the middle of this tumult, whilst he accompanied the Grand Prior, brother to the afore-said Messieurs de Guise (52), a fantastical naval war, as if the matter had been to resist a great and powerful army, and by such means to render the river Loire of so little use, that the water thereof should not even be sufficient for drink to the enemy's horses. This work, begun at a great expence, was found so ridiculous that it redounded wholly to their shame and confusion. Villegaignon seeing how the matter was, that he might not continue idle, undertook a journey to Tours, to dispute with Simon Broslier, the Minister of Loudun, who had formerly been his school-fellow, and was then a prisoner in the hands of the Archbishop of the family of Breſay, another apostate. To this purpose he had letters from the King and Cardinal: but he executed this scheme as ill as the former; so that not being able to explain his arguments by word of mouth, he reduced them into writing, particularly the dispute upon the Lord's Supper. Broslier answered him in such a manner as gave full satisfaction to the learned. Among other things, he remonstrated to him that he did not argue like a Sorbonnist, much less like a Divine, but resembled more the Academics, and such people, who having no knowledge of God, dispute about things unknown to men. That if he had a mind to follow the true method of disputing by the Scriptures, (as all the ancient Divines had done, and even several Heretics, however presumptuous they were) he was ready to give him satisfaction, and yet that he might not go away without an answer, he confuted his whole doctrine by arguments taken from Scripture. Last of all, he prayed him to correct that vice in writing of which he was guilty, viz. of becoming perplexed and obscure, that he might not seem to be at a nonplus, when he could alledge no solid reason for his opinion (53).'

[K] A writer, who despised him, promised a thing, which, as far I can learn, he has not performed.] His words are as follows: 'Nicolas Durand, born in Provence, and surnamed Villegaignon, was more famous by the writings of the Protestants than for any thing else. They writ several pieces, wherein they bitterly inveighed against him for the wrong he had done them in that part of America called Brazil. He has left some books which discover him to be a bad Divine, and a poor warrior; notwithstanding he assumed the name of Knight of Malta. He writ a book on the expedition of the Emperor Charles V against Algier in Africa; and in another, which he dedicates to the same Prince, he vindicates the French from what was laid to their charge concerning the event of the Maltese war. I shall shortly publish some Memoirs which I have of his life and of his principal relations (54).' La Popelinere, from whom I take this passage, is in the wrong to call him a native of Provence. The cause of this error might very well be, that some author having not regularly formed the letters of the word *Provens*, the Compositor to the press put down *Provens*, and the Corrector changed it into *Provence*. La Popelinere having just read that Villegaignon was of Provence, did thereupon stile him a native of that country.

(52) That is to say the Duke of Guise, and the Cardinal of Lorraine.

(53) La Planchette, Histoire de François II, pag. 229, 230.

(54) La Popelinere, Histoire des Histoires, livr. viii, pag. 450, 451.

VILLENA, a Marquisate on the confines of New Castile [A], and of the kingdoms of Murcia and Valencia, did belong to Don John Emanuel, the most potent lord

[A] Villena, a Marquisate on the confines of New Castile. Mr Baudrand faith that Villena, the chief place of the territory of that name, caput agri cognominis, is in the kingdom of Murcia (1): but having just

now consulted a map of Sanſon, printed in 1663, I graph. Tom. 2, there find Villena placed in New Castile. Mr du Puy, pag. 344.

(a) Mayerne
Turquet, *Hist.*
d'Espagne, *livr.*
xv, pag. 647.

(b) *Id. ibid.*

(c) *Id. ibid. pag.*
691.

(d) Mariana, de
Rebus Hispanie,
lib. xvii, cap.
vii, pag. m.
209.

(e) *Idem, lib.*
xviii, cap. v,
pag. 143.

(f) Mayerne
Turquet, *livr.*
xvii, pag. 765.

(g) *Id. ibid. pag.*
764.

in Spain, next to the king (a) in the XIVth century. He had a daughter, who, in the year 1350, married Don Henry Count de Transtamara, natural son of Don Alfonso XI, King of Castile (b). The Count becoming King of Castile by the deposition of Don Pedro the Cruel, in the year 1366 (c), gave the Marquisate of Villena to Don Alfonso of Arragon, Count of Denia, and cousin to the King of Arragon (d). This new Marquis of Villena grew very great. King John I, being desirous to make a Constable in his kingdom of Castile, as there was one in France, and another in Arragon, created that dignity in the year 1382, and conferred it on this Marquis (e). And by his last will, in case he should die during the minority of his son, the government of the young King and of the kingdom, was intrusted to this Constable in conjunction with some other lords (f). He died in the year 1390, and his son Don Henry III, being scarce eleven years of age (g), guardians were to be chosen for him, and a council was requisite to be appointed in order to govern the realm. Several difficulties arose from the King's will, on account of which it was not observed; nevertheless our Marquis of Villena was one of those to whom the regency was intrusted (b). He was then in Arragon (i), and because he adhered to the malecontents, and demanded the execution of the deceased King's testament, he was deprived of the office of Constable of Castile (k). He asked it again of King Henry III, at Illeca, in the year 1393, the first time he had the honour to congratulate him (l); and was promised it, provided he would accompany the King to Castile; but excusing himself from this, he never recovered that dignity (m), but received also other ill treatments [B]. He was created Duke of Gandia by the King of Arragon in the year 1399 (n), and had two sons (o), who married two aunts (p) of Don Henry III, King of Castile. One of the sons was the father of a Marquis of VILLENA, who was a lover of learning, and passed for an egregious Magician [C]. This Marquisate in the year 1445, was given to John Pacheco the favourite of Prince Henry, son of John II, King of Castile (q). The son of this Pacheco having endeavoured to make the kingdom of Castile devolve on the Portuguese by the marriage of the King of Portugal with the pretended daughter of King Henry IV, thereby exposed himself to

(b) *Id. ibid.*
pag. 766.

(i) Mariana, ubi
supra, *lib. xviii,*
cap. xv, pag.
165.

(k) Mayerne
Turquet, *ubi*
supra, pag. 770.

(l) *Id. ibid.*
pag. 785, 786.

(m) Mariana,
lib. xix, cap.
iv, pag. 180.

(n) *Ibid. cap.*
ix, pag. 190.
Note, that per-
haps this passage
of Mariana
ought to be un-
derstood of the
son, and not of
the father.

(o) *Idem, cap.*
viii, pag. 183.

(p) They were
two natural
daughters of
Don Henry II.

(q) Mariana,
lib. xvii, cap.
iv, p. 294.

in his History of the Favourites relates, that in the reign of John II, King of Castile, and while *Alvaro de Luna* was in great favour, the Prince Don Henry of Arragon, in the year 1420, married the *Infanta Catherine* sister to that king, on whom was bestowed the Marquisate of Villena, which was created into a Dutchy (2). I believe this creation became null, because I find in the same Mr du Puy that Pacheco, the favourite of Don Henry, son of John the second, was made Marquis of Villena about the year 1445 (3). Mariana, and other Historians, do not give this Pacheco, or his son, any other title than that of Marquis of Villena.

[B] He received also other ill treatments. I shall set down the words of Mayerne Turquet. 'The Marquis having cleared himself to the king of whatsoever was alleged against him, and advanced several excuses why he did not come to court, requested the restoration of his office of Constable of Castile, of which he had been deprived by his Majesty's guardians, in order to make room for D. Pedro, Count of Transtamara, in prejudice of his honour and dignity: to which the King made a tender and gracious answer, assuring him that he would take all just and equitable care of his affairs: after which he desired him to go with him into Old Castile, from which the Marquis excused himself, alledging that he was not come thither with a proper equipage to serve his Majesty as he desired, but, if he pleased to enable him, he would very willingly serve him. He then returned to his seat somewhat disgusted at King Henry, who took no care of the restoration of his office of Constable of Castile, but some time afterwards, by advice of the Archbishop of Toledo, deprived him of the title of Marquis of Villena, by reason it seemed unsafe and disadvantageous to the state of Castile, that a Marquisate bordering on a foreign realm, should remain in the hands of a gentleman who was so engaged, and nearly allied to the king and kingdom of Arragon as the Marquis D. Alfonso was (4).'

[C] He had two sons who married . . . one of them was . . . father of the Marquis of VILLENA an egregious Magician. One of the two sons of the Marquis of Villena was called Alfonso, and the other Peter. Their wives portions were paid to the English to ransom their father, and in order to release Alfonso who was hostage on that account. This Alfonso caused himself to be divorced, not being able to suffer the public lewdness of his wife (5). His brother Peter was killed in a battle. The king, Don Henry, taking the wives of these brothers under his protection, and resenting their refusal of restoring their

portions, seized all their lands except the castles of Villena and Almanza, which being fortified both by their situation and an Arragoneze garrison, held out against him (6). Peter of Arragon, the Marquis of Villena's son, left a son known by the name of Henry de VILLENA, who applied himself much to learning, and wrote some very learned books, tho' in an unpolished stile: *Petrus ad Alubarrotam ceciderat, ejus Henrici pater, cui à Villena cognomen fuit, eruditissimi tantum studium, ut magica etiam sacra, carminaque caluisse fama sit. Extant ingenii monumenta: In quibus multa reconditaque eruditio est, elegantie parum quippe affectate, sed cum Hispana lingua Latinam miscuit* (7). He died at Madrid in the year 1434, having born with constancy, even to his old age, the injuries of Fortune, such as the loss of his estate and dignity (8). It was believed that his too great zeal after knowledge, engaged him in the study of Magic: his books, by the king's order, were submitted to the examination of Brother Lopez de Barrientos, a Dominican, who was preceptor to the Prince of Asturias, and the greatest part of them were burnt. This displeased several persons who were of opinion, that a library which had been collected at such a great expence, might, without any danger, have been preserved for the use of the learned. The Dominican published a defence of his conduct alledging the King's pleasure for his apology. Mariana relates this fact in beautiful expressions: *Henricus Villena Madriti, ubi Rex erat, extinctus est, amissas opes, atque amplissimos honores ablatus, injuriarumque fortunæ bonis solatus extremam senectutem toleravit, tanto eruditissimi studio, ut ne à magicis quidem sacris abstinuisse feratur. Libri jussu Regis Lupo Barriento Dominicano, Henricique Principis magistro examinandi sunt traditi, quorum parte combusta, multorum vituperationem incurrit, libros existimantium magno comparatos, eruditiorum usus sine periculo noxae servari debuisset. Regiam ille de scripto concepta defensione, voluntatem excusavit, cui repugnare fas non esset* (9). Mayerne Turquet supposes that only the magical manuscripts of the Marquis's own composition were burnt, and farther he says, that even all of them were not committed to the flames (10). But had he taken the trouble to examine Mariana, he would have been more exact, and would have informed

(6) Taken from
Mariana, *lib.*
xix, cap. viii,
pag. 188.

(7) *Id. ibid.*

(8) Mariana,
lib. xx, cap. vi,
pag. 221, says
that to make way
for his being made
great master of
the order of Cal-
trava he dis-
posed his wife
Mary Alborn's
who was very
rich, and yielded
to king Don Hen-
ry the marquis-
ate of Villena
and other lands,
and that the
King was of the
Order created a-
nother Great Ma-
ster, who was
confirmed by the
Pope about the
year 1413, after
a contestation that
lasted six years.
Henricus, adds
Mariana, in tan-
tis litteris tanta-
que eruditio-
nem sibi fa-
puisse visus est:
repetitque con-
jugio egenus vi-
tæ reliquum exe-
git. . . . Henry,
notwithstanding
all his learning
and knowledge,
seems not to have
judged very wisely
by his wife's
and having mar-
ried a second
time, he passed
the remainder of
his days in po-
verty.

(9) Mariana, *lib.*
xix, cap. viii,
pag. 264.

(10) A prince who made an ill use of his learning, applying himself to the detestable art of Magic, about which he wrote several tracts, which were most of them burnt by the King's order, and by virtue of the censure of Brother Lopez de Barrientos, who was then preceptor to Don Henry, Prince of Asturias. Mayerne Turquet, *Hist. d'Espagne, livr. xix, p. 359, ad ann. 1434.*

(2) Peter du
Puy, *Histoire*
des Faveurs,
m. 146. Du
Chaineau says
the same thing in
his History of D.
John II, King
of Castile, pag.
19, of the Paris
edition, 1640.

(3) *Id. ibid. pag.*
229.

(4) Mayerne
Turquet, *Hist.*
d'Espagne, *livr.*
xviii, pag. 786.

(5) Alfonso con-
jugium diremp-
tum ob male-
fectas uxoris li-
bidity. Mari-
ana, *ubi supra*.

great troubles. His own vassals of the Marquisate of Villena favoured the troops of Ferdinand, King of Arragon: the castle of Villena was taken, and by that means the Marquisate was re-united to the crown in the year 1475, with a promise never to alienate it (r).

(r) Mayerne
Turquet, *l'ouv.*
xxii, pag. 1019.

ed us that almost the whole library of this Lord was burnt. How absurd is it to pretend that part of the magical books were spared? It is scarce possible to commit only one fault. This Historian having mistaken the question, hath improperly made use of a restrictive clause: and as he could not go on in his wrong position without being inconsistent with himself, he has committed a double error. There goes a pleasant story in Spain relating to this Marquis, of which I am informed by perusing the relation of the differences betwixt Don John of Austria, and the Jesuit Nitard. This Jesuit published a manifesto, to which an answer was made wherein the author feigns, 'That the Marquis of Villena accompanied by Don Pedro the Cruel, and the ghost of Pedro Hernandez, three persons very well known, were come from the other world on purpose to refute him with the greater liberty (11).' I need not say any thing of the speech ascribed to Don Pedro: I shall only set down the beginning of what the second actor says. 'The other

(11) A relation of the differences which happened in Spain betwixt Don John of Austria, and Cardinal Nitard, *Tom. i, pag. 97, Dutch edition, 1677.*

(a) Peter de Villars, Archbishop of Vienne, *Tom. ii, of his Opusc. Epist. Clm. VIII.*

VINAY (ALEXANDER DE), minister of the Reformed Church of Annonay, published a book in the year 1626 [A], and in the Epistle Dedicatory he observed that a famous prelate (a) about thirty years before had wrote that the town of Annonay was older in Herefy than Geneva (b).

[A] He published a book in the year 1626. It was printed at Geneva, contains 634 pages in 8vo, and is intitled, *The acts of the conference held at Annonay, from the 10th of December 1625, to the 25th of February 1626, betwixt Alexander de Vinay minister of the gospel, and John Francis Martinecourt, a Jesuit, concerning the opinion of the Fathers, on the sufficiency of the Scripture, and on the Eucharist: To which is added, a continuation of both articles, and a treatise of Purgatory by the said Vinay.* I could not find this Jesuit in Ale-

old man taking up the discourse told him, for my part, my Lord, I am the Marquis of Villena, who rendered myself famous in the world by Astrology, and the invention of the bottle, into which it is reported I caused myself to be put piece-meal, in order to discover the events of future ages through the glass, and what should happen at this present time; and indeed it is so, for it was impossible that a man of my quality and humour should forbear causing himself to be cut in pieces to see the present events, the subversion of this monarchy by a private man. . . . It is true I caused myself to be cut to pieces, I cannot conceal it, to see a man born in Germany, where the laws are so different from ours, become the arbitrator of our faith. I caused myself to be cut to pieces, out of curiosity to see a Queen, who should have governed Spain according to our laws, choose for her Director, (12).

(12) *Id. p. 100.*

(b) Compare what is said in the remark [D] of the article RICHER.

(a) In the Pais de Vaud.

(b) Melch. Adam, in *Vitis Theol. Exter.* pag. 120, 121.

(c) Spanhemius, in *Geneva restituta*, pag. 65.

(d) Leti, *Historia Genevrina*, *Tom. iii, pag. 70.*

(e) In the year 1538.

(f) In the year 1541.

VIRET (PETER) a Protestant minister, was born at Orbe (a) a small town in the canton of Berne in the year 1511. He studied at Paris where he became acquainted with Farel, whose fellow-labourer he was afterwards in the establishment of the Reformation in some towns of Switzerland (b). He went with him to Geneva in the year 1534, and strenuously seconded him in whatever was requisite for the abolition of Popery (c). The city of Lausanne having embraced the Reformation in the year 1536, Peter Viret was called to exercise the ministerial function there. He discharged it so well, that he acquired the love and esteem of the inhabitants. This appeared by the difficulty they made of lending him to the Church of Geneva for six months, when the absence of Calvin made that Church ardently desire the presence of Viret (d). To make this the more intelligible, I ought to mention that Calvin being resolved to return to Geneva, from whence he had been banished (e), could not come back at the desired time, being engaged to go to the conferences at Ratibon (f). During this time Viret very successfully served the Church of Geneva (g). Calvin being re-united to his flock, passionately desired Viret for his colleague (b), but had not that satisfaction. Viret was recalled to Lausanne, where he admirably well discharged all the duties of his office, until the Protestants of France by their entreaties obtained him for the Church of Lyons (i) [A].

Which

[A] *The Protestants of France by their intreaties obtained him for the church of Lyons.* Melchior Adam hath here left a gap, which ought to be supplied. He did not know that Viret served the church of Nismes, and afterwards that of Montpellier, before he went to be minister of Lyons. Of all which we are informed by Viret himself in an Epistle Dedicatory, dated from Lyons the 7th of December 1563. He there acquaints us, *That two years before that, he fell into a distaste, which brought him so low, that he thought he had nothing to expect but the grave. . . . that GOD had, as it were, plucked him by the hair of the head from amongst the people, with whom he had passed the greatest part of his life (1).* . . . I know very well, adds he, that my Lords, and also my brothers and companions, and the whole Church of which GOD had appointed me minister, would not easily have consented to my departure, and sent me away, if they had not seen and known the necessity which the Lord was pleased to put upon me, and chosen rather that I should serve in another place for the edification of the Church as weak as I am, than make an unprofitable stay amongst them, without

(1) Viret, Epistle Dedicatory of the first volume of his *Infructio Christiane*.

being able to serve either one Church or the other, as I desired to do. . . . This is the method by which the Lord drew me from that Church which I had reason to love, as if he had taken me by the hand, in order to lead me faint and trembling with weakness and half dead, and bring me to you (2), who are the first in Languedoc, with whom I resided after my departure from Geneva. He very much praises his good reception at Nismes, though I looked, continues he, like a dry skeleton covered with skin, who had brought my bones to be buried there: in so much that even those who were not of our religion, but very contrary to it, pitied me, crying out, wherefore doth this poor man come into this country? Dost he come for any thing else than to die in it? Nay, I have heard that the first time I ascended the pulpit, several seeing me in that condition, feared that I should faint before I had finished the sermon.

Here are some things which I cannot comprehend nor explain; and perhaps Viret did not desire they should be manifest. He saith that he could no longer serve his old Church, which was the only reason why his superiors gave him leave to depart. That reason could

(g) Leti, *ubi supra*, *Tom. ii, pag. 70.* See also Bera, in *Vita Calvini*, ad ann. 1541.

(b) See the remark [B].

(i) Melch. Adam, *ubi supra*, pag. 121.

(2) He directs his speech to the Reformed church of Nismes.

(k) *Id. ib.*

which he served very faithfully in the midst of a thousand difficulties, it being in the time of civil-wars, and the Plague (*k*). He was obliged to quit Lyons when Charles IX, by an Edict explanatory of the peace concluded in March 1563, prohibited his Protestant subjects the having any ministers born out of the realm (*l*). Viret then retired to Orange, from whence the Queen of Navarre sent for him to Bern (*m*). He made a good use of his talents there till such time as he died in the year 1571 [*B*]. He was a little man, and of a weak constitution (*n*), which was yet impaired by the blows he received from a Priest, and the poison which was put into his victuals [*C*]; but he had a great share

(l) The true and complete History of the Troubles, book i, fol. 6, verso, ad ann. 1564.

(m) Melch. Adam, ubi supra.

(n) *Id. ibid.*

(3) See, the remark [*FF*], of the article CALVIN.

could not be the state to which his distemper had reduced him; for notwithstanding that, he was able to serve the church of Nismes. We might conjecture that this church was smaller than that of Lausanne or Geneva, and that the same person who was not strong enough to preach in a large church, might yet be able to perform that function to a small auditory. But this conjecture is scarce satisfactory (*3*).

His Epistle Dedicatory to the second tome of his *Christian Instruction*, is a proof that he was afterwards minister of the church of Montpellier. This epistle is dated at Lyons the 12th of December 1563, and addressed to that church as a grateful acknowledgment of the favours he had received from them during the exercise of his ministerial function there; and he takes notice of it as a happiness that several of the Physicians and Surgeons of Montpellier were Protestants. Amongst others, he mentions the Physic Professors, *Rondellet, Saporis*, and their associates, *Joubert, Feynes, Trial*, and *Michael Herouart a famous Surgeon*. I infer this particular, because it is unknown to several who are very well acquainted with the merit of those illustrious Professors.

(4) In the fifth book, pag. 886, & seq.

In the ecclesiastical History of the Reformed Churches of France (*4*), we find a very excellent letter of Viret written from Nismes on the 15th of January 1562 (*5*), to the ministers of Languedoc assembled in the colloquy of Montpellier, in which he exhorts them to comply with the desire of the court. By both the Epistles Dedicatory which I have cited, it appears that he was no trumpet of sedition; but rather a man of a peaceable and moderate temper, who always dissuaded the people from violence and popular commotions, to the utmost of his power. The same History informs us (*6*), that he went to Montpellier to recover his health, and began the exercise of his ministry there, the edit of January having been published on the 7th of February 1562. Pasquier is certainly mistaken when he saith that Viret preached at Paris towards the end of the year 1561 (*7*).

(5) It is 1557, in Bess's History of the Reformed churches of France, which is an error of the press.

(6) *Ibid.* pag. 888.

[*B*] He made a good use of his talents in Bern, till such time as he died in the year 1571. He taught at Orthez, as Melchior Adam observes (*8*). Some say he died there (*9*), but Moreri and several others affirm that he died at Pau: and very few authors there are who tell us, that he was for some time imprisoned in that country. D'Aubigné is the only one who informs me of it. He saith that the Governor of a town which the Protestants took by assault in 1569, was discharged from his imprisonment on promise that he should ransom Peter Viret a minister, who was prisoner in Bern (*10*). What is certainly to be depended on, is that this minister ended his days in the territories of the Queen of Navarre, and consequently there is a falsity in the following words of Mr Ancillon. Viret taught for some time at Orthez, from whence he returned to Lausanne, where he published books enough to make up a small library (*11*). Most of his works were published before he went into Bern, and therefore Mr Ancillon would be mistaken, though he were in the right as to Viret's return to Lausanne.

(7) Pasquier's Letters, book iv, pag. 201.

(8) Melch. Adam, in Vitis Theolog. exter. pag. 121.

(9) Paulus Freherus, in Theatro, pag. 225.

(10) D'Aubigné, Hist. Universelle, Tom. i, lib. v, ch. xii, pag. m. 412, ad ann. 1569.

(11) Ancillon, Vie de Farel, pag. 217.

(12) Partim vulgata in agro Paternacensi à sacroculo ipsius per insidias invadente infesta ut adeo gravis, ut joentem pro mortuo reliquerit. Melch. Adam, ubi supra.

[*C*] By the blows which he received from a Priest, and the poison which was put into his victuals. He was so violently beaten by a Priest, who treacherously attacked him, that he was left for dead on the spot (*12*). In the punning ages, they would have said, that this Priest did not know how to form any other argument than those in *Feris*, and in *Barbara*. If he was unjust in having recourse to such means to prevent innovations, he was not less imprudent in giving over beating before he was sure that the minister could never escape with life. On such occasions the maxim, 'Nunquam tentabis ut non pericias, - - - Nothing ought to be attempted which cannot be accomplished, ought to be well remembered. The same consequence

was drawn against the Church of Rome, from an unfinished assassination, which would have been inferred from a completed one. All those who were capable of going by this rule, a cause must be very bad, whose defenders murder those who attack it, drew the same conclusions from their ministers being confuted by the blows of a cudgel or the fist. Wherefore the Priest who beat Viret, did as much mischief to his cause by raising prejudices against it as if he had killed him; and by not killing him he left his cause exposed to great dangers. For Viret armed with resentment more vigorously endeavoured the destruction of Popery, and took very effectual measures to that purpose. He fought out the absurdities of their errors, and compiled in French, several diverting books filled with ralleries on that head. Books of this sort are of all others the most dangerous that can be published (*13*); so that if we consider it only on the side of interest, the Swiss Priest would have done very well not to have reckoned Viret dead, without unquestionable proofs. The certificate of two Surgeons perhaps would not have been too much.

But to come to the poison. Some say, it was given to Viret by a servant of a Canon of Geneva (*14*); others charge this crime on a woman suborned for that end by the Canons. However it be, the life of this good minister was endangered by it, and it is said that this ill action completed the ruin of the Roman Catholic cause at Geneva. And indeed at a critical time when both parties were almost equally strong, nothing could more contribute to turn the balance in favour of the Reformed. A people wavering in their opinions, and full of suspicions, will scarce ever find fault with this argument, viz. if these people maintained the cause of God, they would never make use of infamous ways in order to destroy their adversaries. The author whom I am going to quote, adds, that there was a current report, that the Priests had resolved to cause all the Reformed to be killed at once by poisoning the bread which they used at the Lord's Supper. I am fully persuaded that a report of this nature, spread all over the city, whether it were true or false, might have a more forcible effect on the minds of a great many people, than a hundred demonstrative reasons.

Cum præterea venefica quædam, è Bressæ comitatu vicino oriunda, quæ nigros succos verbi divini Ministris tollendis miscuerat, P. Vireti lethali morbo in scelere deprehensa, sed ad id flagitii à Canonicis conductam, fateretur, mirum quantum omnium animi à nefandarum artium institoribus fuerint averti, præsertim cum in vulgus innotesceret, à sacrificiis deliberatum de inficiendis symbolis sacris, Cænæ Dominicæ celebrandæ destinatis, quò Evangelicis omnes facili operâ in sacratissimo suæ Religionis actu, ad generum Cereris non sicca morte vel descenderent, vel deducerentur. Cujus flagitii, quod ne Thetis quidem ipsa universis suis undis abluerit, sola cogitatio ingenti horrore & indignatione omnium animos confudit. Experimentis id genus alius compluribus compertum omnes Clericorum machinas ad subruendam Evangelii instaurati structuram compatas, occultæ Dei directione in summum ejus incrementum cessasse (*15*). Moreover a certain Sorceress, born in the neighbouring county of Bresse, had made up a Spanhemius, ist poison, by which she designed to cut off the Ministers of the word of God: but when she was detected in this crime by the dangerous disease with which the poison infected Peter Viret; and when she confessed that the Canons had prompted and encouraged her to it, it can hardly be imagined how much the authors of these wicked arts were abhorred, especially when it came to be known among the common people that the Priests intended to poison the holy symbols appointed for the celebration of the sacraments.

(13) See, shortly the remark [*G*] of the article SAINTE-ALDEGONDE.

(14) Fuit corpusculo per se imbecillo: quod naturæ vitium vehementer auxerunt partim venenum ipsi à Genevensis cujusdam Canonici servo propinatum, partim vulnera, &c. *Id. ibid.* These words and those of the foregoing quotation, are taken from Bess's in Iconibus.

(15) Fridericus Spanhemius, ista, pag. 74, 75.

share of learning, accompanied with a charming eloquence. He published a vast number of books [D]. He was pretty well skilled in the knowledge of the Pagan authors. This appears by a book (o) he published at Geneva in the year 1560, intituled, *Of True and False Religion, concerning lawful and unlawful vows and oaths, and especially the vows* of

(o) It is a book in 8vo, of 864 pages.

sacrament, and to destroy all the Protestants when engaged in the most sacred act of their religion. The very thoughts of this vile and execrable design struck the minds of all men with the greatest horror and indignation. By several instances of this kind it appeared, that all the machinations devised by the Priests for the overthrow of the Church, did, by the secret direction of the Almighty GOD, greatly conduce to the increase and establishment of it. The conclusion of this passage is very judicious; the ill conduct of the Romish Clergy hath been a very successful instrument for the increase of the Protestants. The Church of Rome could not have been attacked at a more favourable opportunity: her clergy were very ignorant, and very vicious, and, on the contrary, those who preached up a reformation, were most of them eloquent and learned, and more or less acquainted with the Hebrew and Greek tongues; by virtue of which they got the better of the Priests in almost all disputes. The Priests were not able to hold up against disputants, who threatened them with the original languages of Holy Writ, and who easily made it appear that the religious practices, to which the people were subjected, were not prescribed by the Scripture. Two or three sermons of these ministers in some parishes, served to convert half the inhabitants. And what should hinder it? Would the Romanists have offered reason against reason? But was it possible for a Priest or an ignorant Monk to succeed against Viret, or Farel? Not in the least. They were then obliged to have recourse to violent measures, to poisoning, assassination, and other detestable means, which fully confirmed that a cause which defended itself in this manner was not of GOD.

Mr Leti informs us, that the name of the woman who poisoned Viret was Mary Navau; that she was born at Bourg in Bresse; that at the solicitation of some Ecclesiastics, who promised her a good reward, she fled to Geneva on pretence of being persecuted for her religion; and acting the devout part, she very effectually insinuated herself into the good opinion of Farel, Viret, and Saunier, the three Geneva Ministers; by which means she found an opportunity of poisoning the dish of soup when Farel's two colleagues dined with him; that Farel and Saunier disliking this soup did not eat of it, as Viret did, who was very well pleased with it, and immediately found the effects of the poison; that this woman was imprisoned on suspicion, and that without being put to the torture, she accused a Canon, and having confessed the whole crime, was hanged on the twenty-second of April 1535; and that the Canon, out of respect to his family, was only banished (16).

(16) Taken from Leti's Historia Genevrina, Tom. ii, pag. 541, 542.

(17) You will find the catalogue of them, in Gessner's Epit. in Melchior Adam, ubi supra, pag. 122, and in Verheiden, ubi infra, pag. 120, 121.

(18) The Bishop of Condom in his Exposition de la Doctrine Catholique.

[D] He published a vast number of books (17). I have already said that he exposed the ridiculous absurdities of the adverse party, and put on an air of humour and raillery. He examined their Ritual and Ceremonial; in a word, he engaged the Church of Rome rather on the practices she permits in her Priests and Monks, than on her decisions in her œcumenical councils. This was attacking her weakest side, for in our days those who laboured with the greatest address to defend her (18), have requested us to distinguish betwixt what the councils prescribe as an article of faith, and what is not obligatory, or is perhaps an abuse. I shall here cite a long passage of Verheiden. Sic ut Ecclesia Lugdunensis frequentissima, alique vicinarum regionum, ob egregiam operam quam præstitit in proleminando Dei Verbo, hunc virum maxime coluerint, scriptaque temporum ingenio risu Papismum excipientibus summâ voluptate perlegerint. Is autem Viretus erat, qui Mysticam illam Papistaram Theologiam cognitam habebat: quam variis libris explicans lectori risum sæpe movet, propter mira illa miracula & ridicula quæ continet. Ethnicam præterea Theologiam cum ex prophanis Scripturis hausisset, eandem cum Papistarum Sacris ita contulit, tamquam hæc Romana Sacra Parellela essent Veterumque Romanorum horrendâ Idololatriâ plenius responderent. Fortè inter sinceriores Theologos nullus fuit, qui mysticum illud Romanum Jovis Regnum ita aperuit & perlustravit atque hic

Viretus, quod vel uno illo Centone (ut alia multa mittam) de Theatrica Mistæ Saltatione, ex veteribus Poëtis confarcinato, probari potest: qui lectorem, præcipuè in Poëtis versatum, novo genere voluptatis (ut apud Belgas decantatum illud Apiarium Romanum) perfundit & recreat (19). - - - So that the church of Lyons, and others in the neighbourhood, had the greatest veneration for this man, on account of his extraordinary diligence in propagating the word of GOD; and it was with the biggest degree of pleasure that they read his books, which were adapted to the humour of the times, people being then very much disposed to laugh at Popery. Now Viret was a man who thoroughly understood the mystical Divinity of the Papists, and in such a height does he set it forth in the various books which he has written that he often moves the reader's laughter at the wonderful and ridiculous miracles contained in it. As he had likewise learned the Heathen Theology from prophane writers, he compared it with the Popish ceremonies in such a manner as if those were just parallel, and fully came up to the abominable idolatry of the ancient Romans. Among all the true Divines, perhaps, no man has explained and revealed the mystical kingdom of the Romish Jupiter so well as Viret; which might be very easily proved from that one poem of his, which he patched up and collected from the ancient Poets (not to mention many more of his reflexions upon the theatrical ceremony of the mass). This piece (like the Apiarium Romanum, so much talked of in Holland) will give a new pleasure to the reader, especially if he is much conversant with the Poets.

For the rest, we ought not to imagine that all this author's works are of the character I have mentioned, nor that amongst those which are, any of them are tainted with buffoonry. He always observed a wise moderation. Take notice, that he did not confine himself to superstitions only, a very fit subject for raillery, but very seriously, and, with all due gravity, attacked the unbelievers. To this purpose I shall cite a long passage in the Epistle Dedicatory to the second tome of his Christian Instruction, where we are informed that the multitude of unbelievers determined him to turn his arms against Deism. There are several who indeed profess to believe that there is some Deity or God, as the Turks and Jews do: but as for Jesus CHRIST, and all those things which the doctrine of the Evangelists and Apostles testifies concerning him, they take them for fables and dreams. . . . It is much more, or at least as difficult to deal with these people as with the Turks. For they entertain some opinions concerning religion, which are more extravagant than those of the Turks, or any other Infidels. I hear that some of this band call themselves Deists, a new word in opposition to that of Atheists. For the word Atheist signifies one that is without GOD, so they would hereby signify, that they are not without GOD, because they believe that there is one, whom they even acknowledge for creator of Heaven and Earth, as well as the Turks: but as for JESUS CHRIST, they do not know who he is, nor do they believe in him or his doctrine. These Deists of whom we speak, adds Viret, ridicule all religion, tho' they accommodate themselves to the religion of those with whom they are obliged to live, out of complaisance or fear: some among them have a kind of notion of the immortality of the soul; others agree with the Epicureans on that as well as on the Divine providence with regard to mankind: they think he doth not intermeddle with human affairs, and that they are either governed by fortune, or by the prudence and folly of men, according as things happen. I am struck with horror, when I think that there are such monsters among those who bear the name of Christians. But my horror is redoubled, when I consider that several of those who make profession of learning and human Philosophy, and even are frequently esteemed the most learned, most acute and subtil genius's, are not only infected with this execrable Atheism, but also profess it, teach it, and poison several persons with this venom. Wherefore we live in a time when we

At what time the Deists began to be talked of.

of perpetual continence, anathema, and execration, the sacrifices of human victims, and excommunication in all Religions. Item, Of the Jewish, Pagan, Turkish, and Popish Monks, and the corporal as well as spiritual sacrifices to Moloch. His article in Moreri is confused, and false in several places [E].

I will mention a thing which I have read since the second edition came out. It is that Viret employed the authority of the Papists to curb some dangerous sects that were formed among the Protestants at Lyons. The author who tells me this draws a proof from it against Toleration, and in favour of the maxim *Compelle intrare*, - - - *Compel them to come in* [F].

'are in danger of having more difficulty in contending with these monsters, than with the superstitious and idolaters, if God doth not, which I hope he will, prevent it. For amongst the present differences in religion, several very much abuse the liberty given them of chusing which of the two contending religions they will adhere to. For several are of neither, and indeed live without any religion. And if those who have no good opinion of any religion, would content themselves to perish alone in their error and Atheism, without infecting or corrupting others by their wicked discourses and examples, and leading them into the same perdition with themselves, this evil would not be so deplorable as it is. For this reason, in revising my Christian Instruction, formerly printed, I have very much enlarged it, especially on the head of the creation of the world, and the Divine providence towards all creatures, and particularly man, for two reasons: First, because the Holy Ghost frequently in holy writ, proposes this visible world, as the great book of nature, and of true natural Theology, and all the creatures as preachers, and universal witnesses of God their creator, and of his works and glory . . . The other reason, which moved me to treat of these subjects so amply, is the present Atheism and its professors: of which I have already spoken (20).'

[E] His article in Moreri is confused and false in several places. I. It is false that Viret and Farel joined with Calvin in order to preach up their new doctrines at Geneva, and drive out the Catholics in year 1535. Calvin did not go to Geneva till 1536. II. Moreri says, that when Calvin departed for the conference at Worms, Viret was called to preach at Geneva, whereby he gives us clearly to understand, that Calvin set out from Geneva. But that is false. He had been at Strasbourg two or three years, when he went to those conferences. III. It is ridiculous to bestow the title of preference on Viret's vocation, for the people of Geneva had recourse to Viret only, because they could not oblige Calvin to return home before the holding of the Conferences. This shews us that Moreri was persuaded that Calvin went from Geneva at that time; for his meaning is, that this minister was very sorry that he was deputed to the conferences, and that, during his absence, Viret should perform the ministerial function. IV. It is very false that Calvin testified a displeasure at the calling of Viret. V. It is very false that he managed it so well that they sent back his competitor. VI. It is very false that the people of Lausanne had much ado to receive Viret (21). Calvin was so far from being desirous that his pretended competitor should be sent back to Lausanne, that on the contrary he made pressing efforts to retain him at Geneva. Melchior Adam, one of the authors whom Moreri cites, clearly testifies it (22). The same is attested by Theodorus Beza (23), and we have a literal proof of this under Calvin's own hand, for thus he wrote to Farel: 'Quod bene vertat Deus, hic retentus sum ut volebas: superest ut Viretum quoque mecum retineam, quem à me avelli nullo modo patiar. Tuæ quoque omniumque fratrum partes me hic adjuvare, nisi vultis me frustra ex cruciari, ac sine commodo esse miserum (24). - - - What

you desired is come to pass, I am kept here: God grant it may be for some good end. It remains that I should likewise keep Viret, whom I will by no means suffer to be taken from me. In bringing this about, it becometh you, and all the brethren to assist me, unless you would have me to undergo a great deal of uneasiness and trouble to no manner of purpose nor advantage.' I shall, by the way, observe a mistake of Mr Hofman. He saith, that Viret being Minister at Lausanne in the year 1535, was called to Geneva: than which nothing is more false. He was Minister at Geneva in the year 1534, and before he was at Lausanne.

[F] He employed the authority of the Papists to curb some . . . sects . . . The author who tells me this draws a proof from it . . . in favour of the maxim . . . *Compel them to come in*. The first edict of pacification was no sooner published in France than instantly there sprung up a sect of Arians at Lyons, which had been long hatched there, and in other places, by a German and an Italian, who were the heads of it. For this reason Mr Peter Viret, then a Minister of Lyons, was pressed to have recourse to Mr Buatier, great Vicar of the Archbishop of that city, in order to quench that growing fire, which threatened a great conflagration, if it should be allowed time to gather strength. And indeed, the Postellians, the Trinitarians, or Servetians, and others, even the Atheists and Deists, were ready to shew themselves; all of them pretending that they ought to enjoy the benefit of the edict, which in general provided, that no man should be molested for the sake of his conscience. It is likewise said that all the forementioned sectaries, and others, boasted that their faith was grounded on texts or reasons, as pertinently drawn from Scripture as any which the Calvinists could alledge to prove their opinions: to such a height of impudence does a presumptuous assertion come when it invades the place of truth. Such was the extremity to which the desire of liberty of conscience had almost reduced us. Such was the prodigious confusion in which religion was very near swallowed up; and in this manner was the different variety of opinions ready to extinguish the faith of several, and to raise doubts that could not be solved in the minds of believers. These reasons induced me to believe that we ought to be very humble in our opinions, and wholly submit them to the determinations of the holy, apostolical, and Roman Catholic church (25). . . . I say, that we ought to give up our senses and our human understandings, in order to believe through faith what, by reason of our infirmity, we cannot otherwise comprehend. We ought also to obey our superiors, according to the Scripture; without seeking to find them guilty of faults, which are not subject to our correction: . . . But if some men are so hard to work upon, that they will obstinately persist in despising and separating themselves from the true Church, in that case we should follow the advice of the Prophet (26), who says; *Coge eos intrare*, - - *compel them to come in*. Compare with this what I have quoted from the same author in the article S T E L L I N G I.

(25) Pierre de St Julien, Melanges Paradoxales, pag. 202, 203, 204, and more false. He was Minister at Geneva in the year 1534, and before he was at Lausanne. (26) He should have said of Jesus Christ in the Gospel according to St Luke, ch. xiv, ver. 23.

(20) Viret, Epistle Dedicatory of the second volume of his Christian Instruction. It was printed in 1563.

(21) They could hardly be prevailed upon to send him to Geneva for half a year.

(22) Reverfus Calvinus omnem quidem movit lapidem ut ne Vireto spoliaretur, quo sublatum ecclesiam salvam retinere se posse negabat: sed Viretus apud suos Lausanenses agere maluit. Melch. Adam, ubi supra, pag. 121. See also, pag. 73.

(23) Beza, in Vita Calvini, ad ann. 1541.

(24) Calvin. Epist. l. pag. m. 109, 110. That letter is dated on the 16th of September, 1543, but this date seems to be false; it should be 1541, for it were an absurd thing that Calvin writing to a minister of Neuchâtel, should tell him as a piece of news that he was returned to Geneva, two years after his arrival.

(a) Called Ander, See Donatus, in Vita Virgilii.

VIRGIL, in Latin Publius Virgilius Maro, the most excellent of all the ancient Roman Poets, flourished in Augustus's time. He was born on the fifteenth of October, in the year of Rome 683, in a village (a) not far from Mantua. He spent his first years at Cremona (b); after which he made some stay at Milan, and then went to Naples, where he studied with the greatest diligence the Latin and Greek Literature, as he did afterwards the Mathematics and Physic. Some authors say, that he was far from being chaste in his youth; others, on the contrary, assure us that he was so modest, so reserved, and regular in his words and deportment, that the inhabitants of Naples gave him

(b) Initio ætatis, id est usque ad septimum annum, Cremonæ egit. Donatus, ibid. Du Verdier Vau-Prives, Preface, Tom. i, pag. 766, and several others say that he studied at Cremona, when he was 17 years old.

him a firname, derived from Virginité [A]. This affords me matter for a long remark,

[A] A firname derived from Virginité.] The life of Virgil, ascribed to Donatus, informs us, that he was very sober, but that he was reported to be inclined to the unnatural sin; that equitable persons gave no credit to this rumour, and believed he had no other affection for youth, than what resulted from his intention of instructing them (1); that his lying with Plotia Hieria was talked of, but that he frequently said that he always refused the share in that mistress which Varius offered him. *Vulgatum est consuevisse eum cum Plotia Hieria. Sed Asconius Pedianus affirmat ipsam postea minoribus natu narrare solitum, & invitatum quidem se à vario ad communionem mulieris, verum se pertinacissime recusasse* (2). The following words are very remarkable, for they affirm, not as a report, but as a certain truth, that the inhabitants of Naples gave him the firname of Virginal, by reason of the purity of his words and manners. *Cetera sane vita & ore & animo tam probum fuisse constat, ut Neapoli Parthenias vulgo appellaretur.* Here follows a manifest proof of his modesty. He preferred living retired in the country, to residing at Rome, where he was admired. He seldom went thither, and so little affected appearing there, that when he observed that he was followed and shewed, he ran into the first house he found open. *Si quando Romæ, quod rarissime commeabat, viseretur in publico, scitantes demonstrantesque se subterfugere solitum in proximum telum* (3). What is certain, is, that in his youth he wrote some lascivious verses. This is not to be doubted, since Pliny (4), who had likewise done so, justifies himself by many great examples, and namely by that of Virgil. *Nec vero moleste fero hanc esse de moribus meis existimationem, ut qui nesciunt talia doctissimos, gravissimos, sanctissimos homines scriptitasse, me scribere mirentur.* Ab illis autem quibus notum est quos quantotque auctores sequear facile impetrari posse confido (4). An ego verear . . . ne me non satis deceat quod decuit M. Tullium, Caium Calvum. . . . Neronem transeo, quamvis sciam, non corrumpi in deterius, quæ aliquando etiam à malis; sed honesta manere, quæ sæpius à bonis fiunt. Inter quos vel præcipue numerandus est P. Virgilius, Corn. Nepos, & prius Ennius, Acciusque, non quidem hi Senatores, sed sanctitas morum non distat ordinibus (5).

(1) Cibi vinique minimi: fama est cum libidiniosis prœtoris in pueris fuisse. Sed boni ita eum pueros amasse putaverunt, ut Socrates Alcibiadem. Donatus, in Vita Virgiliti.

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) Id. ibid.

(4) That is, Pliny the younger.

(5) Plinius, Epist. iii, lib. v.

(6) Joannes Maria Catanæus is one of them. See his Commentary upon Pliny the younger, pag. 290.

(7) In the article VAYER, citation (25).

(8) Aufonius, in Centone nuptiali, sub finem, pag. m. 519.

decent expressions? Wherefore if any man shall censure my jocose way of writing out of a pretended severity, let him know that I have Virgil for my pattern.' He had better have imitated Pliny the younger, who doubtless aimed at some particular small poems, in which Virgil expressed himself too licentious on wanton subjects. The passage of the *Æneis* which Aufonius points out, contains nothing too bold for those times: those who censured it deserve rather the title of Cavillers than of Critics: and it is very observable, that part of those who did not entirely approve it, bestowed great eulogies on the Poet, as Aulus Gellius informs us. 'Annius poeta & plerique cum eo ejusdem Musæ viri summis assidue laudibus hos Virgilii versus ferebant; quibus Vulcanum & Venerem junctos mixtosque jure conjugii, rem lege naturæ operiendam, verecunda quadam translatione verborum quum ostenderet demonstraretque, protexit: sic enim scripti:

..... Ea verba locutus
Optatos dedit amplexus; placidumque petivit
Conjugis infusus gremio per membra foporem.

Minus autem difficile esse arbitrabantur in istiusmodi re dicenda verbis uti uno atque altero brevi tenuique eam signo demonstrantibus. . . . Tot verò & tam evidentibus ac tamen non prætextatis, sed puris honestisque verbis venerandum illud concubii pudici secretum neminem quemquam alium dixisse (9). . . . (9) Aulus Gellius, lib. xii, cap. 2.

The Poet Annianus, and several others with him, bestowed the greatest praises on these verses of Virgil, wherein he describes Venus and Vulcan in the height of conjugal familiarity; a thing which the light of nature forbids to be exposed, and which for that reason he veils under a modest and discreet metaphor, at the same time that he gives a strong and lively representation of it; for in this manner does he write:

Trembling he spoke, and eager of her charms,
He snatch'd the willing goddess to his arms;
'Till in her lap infus'd he lay pass'd
Of full desire, and sunk to pleasing rest.

DRYDEN.

They thought it less difficult in a thing of this kind to make use of one or two words which give a short and slight hint of it. . . . But that no man besides himself had ever told the venerable secrets of the marriage-bed in so many words, which were so clear, and at the same time so pure and chaste without the least mixture of obscenity. Let us see how he hath censured a more rigid Critic. 'Annæus Cornutus, homo sanè plerique alia non indoctus neque imprudens, in secundo tamen librorum, quos de figuris sententiarum composuit, egregiam totius istius verecundie laudem insulsa nimis & odiosa scrutatione violavit. Nam quum genus hoc figuræ probasset, & satis circumspicte factos esse versus dixisset; membra tamen, inquit, paulò incautiùs nominavit (10). (10) Id. ibid.

Annæus Cornutus, a man who in most other things wanted neither learning nor sense, has nevertheless in his second book on the figures of speech, sought to diminish the noble praise that is due to the modesty of this passage, by an infipid and odious scrutiny. For where he had approved this kind of figure, and owned that the verses were wrote with great circumspection, he adds notwithstanding that the word membra was introduced somewhat too rashly. To which may be added likewise the following, 'Quod Annæus Cornutus versus Virgilii, quibus Veneris & Vulcani concubium pudice aperteque dixit, reprehensione spurca & odiosa inquinavit'. . . . That Annæus Cornutus has with an unclean and odious censured that passage of Virgil, where he chaste and covertly describes the conjugal familiarities of Venus and Vulcan. The gravity and modesty which reign throughout the *Æneis* are indeed admirable. Was it possible for any body to have used fewer words than Virgil has done, on the cave where Æneas and Dido consummated their marriage? His Bucolics are not so modest; he there relates very criminal passions, but that is no proof that he was tainted with them. The passion for boys was not less common in the

Pagan

remark, and an opportunity of refuting an observation, which we find in the *Anti-Baillet*

Pagan times than that for girls, so that a writer of Eclogues might make his shepherds talk according to this curled fashion, as we at present make the heroes and heroines of Romances speak; that is to say, without its being a sign that he related his own adventures, or approved the passions he mentioned. Our best French Romances have been composed for a long time by maids or married women. Would it be reasonable to say that they write the History of their own amours, or that they approve their heroines suffering themselves to be so sensibly affected with the passion of love (11)? Is it not certain that they may write these books only to discover their wit, and their art of painting the passions, and representing characters? We may suppose the same thing in favour of Virgil, since on other accounts we have reason to believe that he was endowed with a great share of virtue. I own that there went several stories not much to his reputation; but those who relate them represent them only as rumors (12), whilst they assure us as a certain truth that his modesty and probity were extraordinary. Besides the stories already related, we are told (13) that Varus the tragic Poet married a very learned woman, who lay with Virgil, and to whom he gave a tragedy of his composition, which she made her husband believe was her own, and that Varus recited it as his own performance. It is farther added that Virgil obscurely hints this adventure in three verses of his third Eclogue:

An mihi cantando victus non redderet ille,
Quem mea carminibus meruisset fida, caprum?
Si nescis, meus ille caper fuit.

An honest man may freely take his own;
The goat was mine, by singing fairly won.
A solemn match was made, he lost the prize:
Ask Damon, ask, if he the debt denies.

DRYDEN.

But Servius rejects this as a thing which no author had mentioned, and which was repugnant to the nature of pastoral Poetry. *Superfluum voluit esse allegoriam, dicentes rem nusquam lectam de Virgilio. Melius simpliciter accipimus: refutandæ enim sunt allegorie in bucolico certamine: nisi, ut supra diximus, ex aliqua agrorum perditorum necessitate descendunt* (14). And it plainly enough appears to be a vain imagination of some perverse genius, who hunt after allegories and mysteries every where, and are never pleased with any thing which is natural. The most forcible objection against Virgil would be to represent him as the author of some *Priapeia*. But that reason alone is of no great weight against his manners; for as there are men of honour and virtue, who read obscene books without any ill design, so there are such who may compose lascivious verses without corrupting their mind. It is reported that St Chrysostom frequently read Aristophanes, and it is certain that St Jerom often read Plautus. See the remark [B] in the article LONGUS, and the Epistle Dedicator to Scippius's notes in *Priapeia*. Will any one presume to rank Joseph Scaliger, Janus Douza, Daniel Heinsius, and the President Mainard amongst the debauchees, and urge as reasons for it that the first wrote notes on the *Priapeia* and Catullus; that the second very curiously commented on Petronius (15); that the third published some lascivious verses; and that the fourth wrote a *Priapeia* (16)? When we believe it impossible for another to touch upon such things without being infected, we too plainly discover the weak efforts which we find ourselves capable of making against the like objects. 'In iis, quæ turpicula & lasciviuscula sunt, ille qui, ut ait Aristoteles, bonâ institutione præmunitus est, offendere nequit. Adeo ut, molliculos istos, qui vel una tali & altera lectione verberantur, & ad nequitiam abducuntur, sua sibi culpa & in Venerem putredine, perire videas. Haud secus, ac si terribili objecta re timidus expavescat, fortis non adficiatur' (17).

(16) Menagiana, p. 32, of the first Dutch edition.

(17) Scippius, *Ep. Dedicat.* cap. 3.

these effeminate creatures who are struck and hurried on to lewdness by reading one or two things of this kind, perish, as you see, through their own fault and lascivious disposition: just like a coward who is frightened out of his senses at the sight of a terrible object, while a brave man is not at all moved. This makes me remember a thought of Moliere. His Tартuffe, being just ready to hear a young woman speak, pulls out a handkerchief, and says;

. . . Ah! mon Dieu, je vous prie,
Avant que de parler, prenez-moy ce mouchoir.

Couvrez ce sein, que je ne saurois voir.
Par de pareils objets les âmes sont blessées,
Et cela fait venir de coupables pensées.

. . . Let me beseech you e'er you speak,
First take this handkerchief, and hide from me
That youthful bosom which I cannot see.
Such objects set the very soul on fire,
And raise in us a culpable desire.

But observe the young woman's answer:

Vous êtes donc bien tendre à la tentation;
Et la chair, sur vos sens, fait grande impression?
Certes, je ne fais pas quelle chaleur vous monte:
Mais à convoiter, moy, je ne suis point si prompte;
Et je vous verrois nû du haut jusques en bas,
Que toute vostre peau ne me tenteroit pas (18).

Strongly your sense obeys the carnal lure,
And you are easy to be tempted sure.
The meaning of such heat I cannot find,
To which myself so little am inclin'd:
For I could view your naked skin all o'er,
Yet still remain unttempted as before.

(18) Moliere, in his *Imposteur*, Act. iii, Scene ii, Tom. iii, of the Amsterdam edition 1725.

There may be some Poets, Casuists, and Critics, hardened in the same manner against those dangerous objects, which others cannot read with impunity. Lipsius protests that the reading of Petronius affected only his mind, and left no more traces in his heart, than a boat does on a river. 'Vidistis' quidquam venustius, argutius (Petronio) post natus Mulas? Non ego: abesse tantum nuda illa nequitia; quâ tamen nihil offendor. joci me delectant, urbanitas capit: cetera nec in animo nec in moribus meis magis labem relinquunt, quam olim in flumine vestigium, cymba. Ut vina apposita vinorum movent; invinium, ut antiqui loquebantur, non movent: sic ista animum jam ante improbum fortasse incitent; casto & castigato non adherent (19). . . . Have you ever seen any thing from the birth of the Muses to this time more elegant and witty than Petronius? For my part I have not; excepting only his barefaced obscenity, which nevertheless does not shock me. I am delighted with his humour, charmed with his politeness; and as for the other things they leave no more any stain upon my mind or manners than a boat leaves a trace upon a river long after it has passed. For as wine transports the drunkard when it is set before him, but does not at all affect the sober man; so these things may possibly inflame a mind that was virtuous before, but they make no durable impression upon one that is chaste and well-disciplined. If this be true, I dare aver that he might have made verses or prose narratives according to the model of this Romance, and preserved his mind pure and untainted. Be pleased to apply this, *positis ponendis*, to the poetical amusements of Virgil, which served as an apology for Pliny the younger.

I ought not to forget the Bishop of Avranches's ingenious conjecture concerning the name of Parthenias given to Virgil. Having observed that this appellation was perhaps bestowed on him, because it was believed of him as well as of Homer, that he was born of a virgin, he adds, that it is more probable that the name of Virgilius was confounded with that of Virginius; that is, in effect to say that the inhabitant

6 G

Baillet [B]. Those who tell us that his Eclogues were admired by Cicero, are mistaken [C]. He was not envious of other men's glory, and discovered such a large share of good nature and

bitants of Naples being neither acquainted with the Etymology, nor meaning of the word Virgilius, and very well knowing the import of Virginius, a word which that this Poet's name was Virginius, a word which answers to the Greek word Parthenias. *Cur Virgilius Neapolitanis dictus sit Parthenias, causam hanc esse significari quis possit; non quod virginali esset modestia, ut vulgo fertur, sed quod virgine natus, perinde ut Homerum, credi voluerint. Probabile sane hoc est; sed ne quid dissimulem, longe est probabilius ac simillimum veri, esse dictum esse à Græcis, pro eo quod Romana lingua appellatum eum putabant Virginium, non Virgilium, cum ignorarent nominis huius significationem & originem, à virgulis, hoc est, ramis seu furculis, petitam; unde & virgeta Ciceronis dicuntur arborum seminaria; prioris vero nominis vim notionemque probe callerint* (20).

(20) Petrus Daniel Huetius, *Alnetan. Quest. lib. ii, cap. 15. pag. 239, Edit. Lips. 1692.*

(21) Of whom mention is made above, in the article RAMUS, at the end of the remark [O].

(22) Menage, *Anti-Baillet, Part. i, Art. lxi.*

Mr Des Maizeaux (21) hath been pleased to communicate to me some observations on the article of Virgil, amongst which there are some wherein he confutes this whole passage of Huetius, and gives a contrary account of the surname Parthenias. I had willingly made use of his conjectures, if I had not thought that I ought to stay for the new observations, which I know he hath sent me, and I have not yet received.

[B] An opportunity of refuting an observation which you find in the *Anti-Baillet*.] Mr Menage pretends that there are numerous obscenities in Virgil. 'His Eclogues,' saith he (22), are full of unnatural love.

Novimus & qui te, transversa tuentibus hircis, &c.
Formosum Pastor Corydon ardebat Alexin.

*We know who did your business . . .
And what the goats observ'd with leering eyes, &c.
Young Corydon, th' unhappy shepherd swain
The fair Alexia lov'd . . .*

DRYDEN.

'He loved this Alexis, as Apuleius informs us in the following passage of his apology: "Quanto modestius tandem Mantuanus Poeta, qui iudem ut ego, puerum amici Pollionis Bucolico ludico laudans, & abstinens nominum, sese quidem Corydonem, puerum vero Alexin vocat. . . . How much greater is the modesty of Virgil, who writing in the strain that I do, and praising his friend Pollio's minion in one of his pastorals, forbears to mention their true names, but calls himself Corydon and the boy Alexis. But Apuleius mistook when he said that Alexis was Pollio's minion: he was Mecænas's darling, as we are informed from the fifty-sixth epigram of the eighth book of Martial." Mr Menage had no reason to infer from this passage of Apuleius that Virgil was in love with Alexis; for, on the contrary, from thence I shall prove that he was not, and that so much of his Eclogue as relates to this particular was a meer piece of wit. Apuleius's accusers besides other crimes objected against him several amorous verses on boys, whom he disguised under feigned names. He replies (23) that it was customary with the Poets to alter the name of the beloved object: which he proves by several examples, and dislikes the conduct of Lucilius, who did not make use of that disguise (24). To this conduct he opposes Virgil's modesty, who, says he, praising, as I have done, his friend's minion, made use of fictitious names, &c. If he had pretended that this Eclogue of Virgil expressed the real amorous sentiments of its author, he had directly owned that he was guilty of the same crime, and instead of refuting his accusers, would have acknowledged the justice of their accusation. But nothing can be more absurd than to suppose him guilty of this blunder. Let us then say that he declares that this Eclogue of Virgil was only a witty amusement, in which his affections were not in the least engaged. And it is what he says with respect to the Poems for which he was prosecuted. He is surprized that any person should presume to summon him before the Judges on this occasion. Making verses, says he, by way of diversion, is no indication of manners. The guilty do not usually boast of their crimes; but those who publish

(23) Apuleius, in *Apologia*, pag. m. 279.

(24) C. Lucilius, quamquam sit Iambicus, tamen improbari, quod Gentium & Macedonem pueros directis nominibus carmine suo profutuerit. d. *ibid.*

Amours, are not engaged in them, otherwise than by way of sport; they are only poetical fictions. 'Sed summe ego ineptus, qui hæc etiam in iudicio? an vos potius calumnioli, qui etiam hæc in accusatione? quasi ullum specimen morum sit, veribus ludere.' Catullum ita respondentem malevolis non legitis?

Nam castum esse decet pium poetam
Ipsam, vericulos nihil necesse est.

Divus Hadrianus, cum Voconii amici sui poetæ tumulum verbis muneraretur, ita scripsit:

Lascivus versu, mente pudicus eras.

'Quod nunquam ita dixisset, si forent lepidiora carmina argumentum impudicitiae habenda. . . . Cum (Platonis) versus, quos nunc percensui, tanto sanctiores sunt quanto apertiores: tanto pudicior compositi, quanto simplicius professi. Namque hæc & id genus omnia dissimulare & occultare, peccantis: proferri & promulgare, ludentis est. Quippe natura, vox innocentiae, silentium maleficio distributa (25). . . . But is it not foolish in me to take notice of such things before a court of judicature? Or rather are not you slanderers for mentioning them in the indictment? As if forsooth writing verses for diversion were any indication of one's morals. Have you not read the answer which Catullus made to his malicious detractors.

*The Poet in his morals should be chaste,
But in his verse he need not . . .*

'The Emperor Hadrian, when he composed an epitaph for his friend Voconius the Poet, made use of this expression;

Chast in your mind, but wanton in your verse.

'He never would have said so, if merry and jocose verses were to be looked upon as an argument of unchastity. . . . Plato's verses, which I have just mentioned, are so much the more virtuous and pure for their being extremely plain; and the greater simplicity is which they express the more chaste is the composition. For to hide and dissemble things of this kind is the mark of an offender; but to profess and publish them is an argument of a sporting mind; since nature in her distributions gives speech to innocence and silence to villany.' These maxims of Apuleius are disputable, and it may reasonably be said, that he ought to have restrained them, and that they are very liable to exception; but what I assert against the author of the *Anti-Baillet*, that Apuleius's words clearly signify that Virgil did not find his own amours, is beyond contradiction.

[C] Those who tell us that his Eclogues were admired by Cicero, are mistaken.] Donatus's words are (26): 'Bucolica eo successu edidit, ut in scena quoque per cantores crebra pronuntiatione recitarentur. At cum Cicero quosdam versus audisset, & statim acriter iudicio intellexisset non communi vena editos, iussit ab initio totam eclogam recitari: quam cum accurate pernotasset, in fine ait: Magnæ spes altera Romæ, quasi ipse linguæ Latinæ spes prima fuisset, & Maro futurus esset secunda. Quæ verba postea Æneidi ipse inseruit. . . . His pastorals were so well received by the public, that they were frequently sung on the stage. Now when Cicero had heard some of the verses, presently discovering by his acute penetration, that the author was no ordinary genius, he ordered the whole Eclogue to be rehearsed from the beginning: which having strictly attended to, he said at the conclusion: The other hope of mighty Rome; as if he himself were the first hope of the Latin tongue, and Virgil would be the second. These words were afterwards inserted in the *Æneid*. Here is an error in Chronology; for it is certain that Virgil did not write his Eclogues, till after the Triumvirate of Octavianus, Marc Antony, and Lepidus, during which, as it is well known, Cicero was cruelly massacred. I do

(26) I say this without pretending to depart from the opinion of those who declare that Donatus is the true author of Virgil's life that goes by his name.

and civility, that the other Poets, who continually envied one another, almost unanimously agreed in their great value and love for him [D]. Those who say that a secret jealousy was the reason that he never mentioned Homer, and preferred a less known Poet before him, are guilty of a great absurdity [E]. He was none of those authors who are easily

do not claim this discovery as mine; Father Vavasseur long since refuted the compilers of Virgil's life on this head (27). He also refuted Servius, who tells us that the sixth Eclogue being recited by the author himself was received with great applause, and afterwards sung on the stage by the Courtesan Cytheris or Lycoris, and that Cicero one of the audience was surprised to a very great degree, and asked who was the author of it, &c. (28).

(27) Vavasseur, de Jodica Dictione, pag. 172, & seq.

(28) Servius, in Eclogam, VI, ver. 11.

(29) Instituted in Auctores pene omnes, antiquos potissimum, censio.

(30) Tacit. de Orator. cap. xliii.

(31) In libro quem contra obstrictores Virgili scriptit. Donat. in Vita Virgili.

(32) Donat. ubi supra.

Claudius du Verdier took notice of this fault of Servius, in a book (29) which he published in the year 1586. Peter Ramus had before confuted the same error, which Father Vavasseur confutes. 'Hoc Donatus affirmat, sed chronologia repugnat: quatuor enim aut quinque annis antea jam Cicero triumvirali proscriptione perierat. . . . *This Donatus affirms, but it is repugnant to Chronology: for Cicero had lost his life four or five years before that by the proscription of the 'Triumviri.'* These are Peter Ramus's words in his life of Virgil, before his *Lectiones* on the Bucolics. To which words he very properly adds a passage of a dialogue ascribed to Tacitus; which shews that all the people rose up, at the recital of some verses of our Virgil on the theatre, and that this excellent Poet being accidentally there was saluted and honoured like the Emperor himself: 'Malo securum & secretum VIRGILII secessum, in quo tamen neque apud divum Augustum gratia caruit, neque apud populum Romanum notitia. Testes Augusti epistolæ, testis ipse populus, qui auditus in theatro verbis Virgilii, surrexit universus, & forte præsentem spectantemque Virgilium veneratus est, sic quasi Augustum (30). . . . *I prefer the private and safe retirement of Virgil, in which notwithstanding he neither wanted a share in the favour of Augustus, nor in the esteem of the Roman people. Witness the letters of Augustus, witness the people themselves, who having heard some verses of Virgil recited on the stage, rose up, &c.*

[D] The other Poets . . . almost unanimously agreed in their great value and love for him.] This is a great eulogy, which commands my admiration for Virgil more than the beauty of his works, or the excellency of his Muse. He exceeded all the Poets, and yet they loved him. Certainly nothing can be more extraordinary than this; and if the author who relates it had not prepared the way by describing Virgil's amiable character, he never could have prevailed on us to believe it. He represents him endowed with a great deal of goodness, he says that he was extremely careful to cultivate the acquaintance of honest and learned men, and to acknowledge their merit, without either envying or blaming any person. All he had was at the service of his friends: a fine thought in the writings of other men pleased him as much as if he had been the author of it; and he was never concerned at being robbed of the glory of his performances, or that another claimed them for his, and reaped the advantage of them. This is his picture drawn by Alconius Pedianus. Refert etiam Pedianus (31) benignum, cultoremque omnium bonorum atque eruditum fuisse, & usque adeo invidiæ expertem, ut si quid eruditum dictum inspiceret alterius, non minus gauderet, ac si suum fuisset: neminem vituperare, laudare bonos: ea humanitate esse, ut, nisi perversus maxime, quisque illum non diligere modo, sed amaret. Nihil proprii habere videbatur. Ejus bibliotheca non minus aliis doctis patebat, ac sibi: illudque Euripidis antiquum sæpe usurpabat, τὰ τῶν φίλων κοινὰ, hoc est, communia amicorum esse omnia. . . . *Gloria vero adeo contentor fuit: cum quidam versus quosdam sibi adscriberent, eaque re docti haberentur, non modo ægrè non ferebat, immo voluptuosum id illi erat (32).* Does not this prepare us to find a great probability in the following words of the same author: 'Quare cœvos omnes Poetas ita adjunctos habuit, ut cum inter se plurimum invidia arderent, illum una omnes colebant? . . . *For which reason he lived so well with all his contemporary Poets, that whilst they burnt with envy at one another, they all unanimously agreed in their great value and love for him.*' Perhaps it may be asked why the text of this remark is not conform

to those Latin words; I having inserted the exception almost, which is not in the Latin. To this I answer that I had just reason to make use of that limitation, since immediately after I find in my author, that the Poets Anser and Cornificius were Virgil's enemies. It is he then who is to be blamed for having twice successively said omnes, . . . all, instead of *ferè omnes*, . . . almost all. And he is the more blameable, since he could not but know that Virgil had more than two enemies. Bavius and Mævius hated him, so that here are four Poets against him.

Qui Bavius non odit amet tua carmina Mævi (33).

Who hates not living Bavius, let him be

(Dead Mævius) damn'd to love thy works and thee.

DRYDEN.

An anonymous author is said to have censured his Eclogues (34), and Carbillus Picior his *Æneis*; besides we are told that one Herennius collected his faults, and Perilius Faustinus his Plagiarisms (35). And it ought indeed to be owned that this great Poet was exposed to the Criticisms of his contemporaries, since Alconius Pedianus wrote a book in his defence (36). And if he had not been thus exposed, it ought to be registered amongst the greatest wonders that ever were: *Urit enim fulgore suo qui, &c.* (37).

[E] Those who say that a secret jealousy was the reason that he never mentioned Homer . . . are guilty of a great absurdity.] Virgil supposes, in his description of *Æneas's* descent into Hell, that the Sibyl desirous to know where Anchises was, enquired of Mufæus, the most illustrious of all the Poets, and of all the choice men, who had an apartment in the retreat of the blessed.

Hic manus, ob patriam pugnando vulnera passi;
Quique sacerdotes casti, dum vita manebat,
Quique pii vates, & Phœbo digna locuti,
Inventas aut qui vitam excoluere per artes,
Quique sui memores alios fecere merendo:
Omnibus his niveâ cinguntur tempora vittâ.
Quos circumfusus sic est effata Sibylla:
(Mufæm ante omnes: medium nam plurima turba
Hunc habet, atque humeris exstantem suspicit altis.)
Dicite felices animæ, tuque optime vates,
Quæ regio Anchisen, quis habet locus (38)?

Which Mr Dryden renders thus:

Here patriots live, who for their country's good,
In fighting fields, were prodigal of blood;
Priests of unblemish'd lives here make abode;
And Poets worthy their inspiring God:
And searching wits of more mechanic parts,
Who grac'd their age with new invented arts.
Those who to worth their bounty did extend;
And those who knew that bounty to commend;
The heads of those with holy fillets bound;
And all their temples were with garlands crown'd.
To these the Sibyl thus her speech address'd:
And first to him surrounded by the rest;
Tow'ring 'his height, and ample was his breast;
Say happy souls, divine Mufæus say,
Where lives Anchises, and where lies our way
To find the Heroes

DRYDEN.

The French translator of Virgil makes the following judicious remark: 'Some Commentators ask why Virgil does Mufæus the honour to place him in the Elysian fields, and to address the Sibyl's words to him, rather than to Homer. I once saw a company of very learned men, almost unanimously agree, that Virgil ought indeed to have bestowed this honour on Homer, but that his jealousy of him prevented it. I did not at that time reflect on it, and yet nothing

(33) See Servius upon the ninth verse of the third Eclogue.

(34) Proletis Bucolicis innotatus quidam rescriptit Antiballica, duas modo eclogas, sed infinitissime tam parvas. Donatus, ubi supra.

(35) Id. ibid.

(36) Id. ibid.

(37) Horat. Epist. i, lib. ii, ver. 13.

(38) Virgil. *Æneid.* lib. vi, ver. 660.

easily pleased with their own productions; he polished and revised his verses with an extreme severity [F]; and we are told that his *Æneis*, which we look upon as a finished piece, was very short of perfection in his opinion, and that he earnestly desired it might be burnt, because he had not been able to put the last hand to it [G]. He designed to bestow a retirement of three years in polishing it (c); after which he intended to apply the remainder of his life solely to Philosophical studies; but he died in the mean while at Brundisium on the 22d of September 734 [H]. His corps pursuant to his order was transported to Naples (d). The Emperor was infinitely pleased with his poems

(c) Donatus, ubi supra.

(d) Id. ibid.

is more ridiculous than this, and the answer to this objection is obvious; which is, that Virgil would have been guilty of a horrible fault in giving this commission to Homer in *Æneas's* life-time, since he was not born till a long time after. Wherefore to answer the Sibyl, this wife Poet has chosen Musæus who being Orpheus's disciple was much antienter than Homer, for he lived about the time of the Trojan war itself. It is scarce credible that Scaliger the Father should be so much mistaken as he is, when he takes Musæus, the author of the small poem of Leander and Hero, who, as many learned men believe, was later than Virgil himself, for this antient Musæus; and that he should alledge, to shew how much this Poet was superior to Homer, that it was for that reason that Virgil preferred him to Homer in the honour which he did him in the Elysian fields, without ever thinking how impertinent it would have been to place Homer in hell before the death of *Æneas*, Ulysses, and so many heroes, whose adventures and exploits he sung. If Homer had lived during the Trojan war, he had never chosen it for the subject of his poem; and he must have dispatched his *Iliad* and *Odyssey* very hastily in seven years, in order to be ready to hold this dialogue with the Sibyl. But it is plainly proved that he did not live till long after; and as no reason obliged Virgil to be guilty of this error in Chronology, and it being impossible for him to be ignorant of it, he therefore avoided such a gross fault: which would be, in a word, to make Homer die before he was born. I believe, on the contrary, that if he could handsomely have mentioned him, he would very willingly have done him that honour, nothing appearing in his character, as I have observed in my Preface, unworthy of a generous mind (39).

(39) Segrais, remarks upon the sixth book of the *Æneis*, p. 164, & seq. Amst. 1700.

(40) Turneb. Adversar. lib. xxviii, cap. xxxvi, pag. m. 631, col. i.

(41) Donat. ubi supra.

(42) Id. ibid.

(43) Aulus Gellius, lib. xvii, cap. x, pag. m. 459.

she-bear brings forth her young; for as that beast is delivered of a shapeless cub, which she afterwards reduces into a proper form by licking, so the productions of his mind as their first appearance had a rude and unfinished aspect; and that it was an after-polishing which gave them their true lineaments and features. Experience itself shews that there was a great deal of candour and truth in the confession of this exquisite judge; since those things, to which he gave the finishing stroke, are set off and enriched with all the beauties of poetry; whereas those that he left to be revised afterwards, and which he could not finish, because death prevented him, are by no means worthy of the name and judgment of a man who is deservedly esteemed the most elegant of all Poets.

[G] We are told . . . that he earnestly desired his *Æneis* might be burnt, because he had not been able to put the last hand to it. This is affirmed in his life ascribed to Donatus. See below remark [L] (44). This life contains a great many fallacies, wherefore it would be very excusable to call this a lie (45), if other authors had not mentioned it also; but since Pliny, Aulus Gellius, and Macrobius have said it, we may safely allow the fact, without any danger of passing for too credulous. Pliny's words are: 'Divus Augustus carmina Virgilii cremari contra testamenti ejus verendum vetuit: majusque ita vati testimonium contigit quam si ipse sua probavisset (46). - - - The Emperor Augustus forbade that the poems of Virgil should be burnt, as he had out of modesty ordered in his last will; which is a higher commendation to the Poet than if he himself had approved of his own works.' Aulus Gellius immediately after the words, cited in the preceding remark, goes on thus: 'Itaque cum morbo oppressus adventare mortem videret; petivit oravitque à suis amicis impense, ut *Æneida*, quam nondum satis elimasset, adolerent (47). - - - There fore when the violence of his distemper increased, and he foresaw that death was near, he earnestly besought his most intimate friends, that they would burn the *Æneis*, because he had not sufficiently polished it.' See Macrobius in the twenty-fourth chapter of the first book of his *Saturnalia*.

[H] He died . . . at Brundisium on the twenty-second of September 734. Father la Rue saith it was in the year 735, and that he was born in 684. I have followed their chronology, who have placed his birth in 683, and his death in 734. They agree with Father la Rue in the consulships of Virgil's birth and death, but not in the years of those consulships. The like variations run through almost all parts of the antient Consular Fasti. This diversity is of no great consequence here. They all make Virgil live the same number of years. The following variation is of another nature. Pliny seems to have placed his death in the year 740. 'Hæc, saith he (48), Virgilii vatis ætate incognita à cuius obitu XC aguntur anni. - - - These things were unknown in the time of Virgil, who died ninety years ago.' When Pliny wrote the Epistle Dedicatory to his work, Titus had been but six times Consul; he therefore wrote it before the year 832, which was that of the seventh Consulship of Titus (49); and it is very probable that he wrote it in 830, under the sixth Consulship of this son of Vespasian, and that having revised his work, he inferred that date throughout. Now he reckons but ninety years from the death of Virgil, which therefore should be placed in the year 740. Observe, that on such occasions, he generally aims at an exact supputation, not contenting himself with an even number. Notwithstanding which I believe that in this place he made use of an even number, or rather that he compiled the fourteenth book of his Natural History in the year 825 (50), when, in a literal sense, it was ninety years since Virgil's death. In revising his work he proposed to reduce all the particular dates which he had used to that of the year 735.

(45) I suppose here that the year in which Virgil died, is not the 734th, as I have put it in the text of this article, but his

poems (c). Nothing is more ridiculous than the stories of his Magic, and the pretended wonders which he shewed the Neapolitans [I]. The versions of, and the commentaries

(c) See the remark [L], numb. IV.

his revival, but probably forgot to alter the date of the fourteenth book, and left the number XC. Those who have corrected their own writings will bear witness, that notwithstanding all their attention several things have escaped them, which obstruct the perfect uniformity of a large book (51).

(51) See, above, the remark [K], of the article Tacitus, towards the middle.

But tho' we should suppose that there were really but ninety years betwixt the death of Virgil and Titus's sixth consulate; and that those who fix his death in the year of Rome 735, ought to stand corrected by this passage of Pliny, where it is determined to the year 740, we could not help discovering a gross error in Trifan's commentaries. This Antiquarian imagines (52) that at the time of Caius Cæsar's expedition against the Parthians, Virgil intimates that he finished his *Georgicks*; for it is our Caius Cæsar, whom he certainly mentions in these verses towards the end of the last book of that work,

(52) Trifan, Comment. Hist. Tom. i, pag. 137.

Hæc super arborum cultu, pecorumque canebam,
Et super arboribus : Cæsar dum magnus ad altum
Fulminat Euphratem bello, victorque volentes
Per populos dat jura, viamque afficit Olympo.

Thus have I sung of fields, and flocks, and trees,
And of the waxen work of lab'ring bees;
While mighty Cæsar thundering from afar,
Seeks on Euphrates banks the spoils of war:
With conqu'ring arms asserts his country's cause,
With arts of peace the willing people draws:
On the glad earth the golden age renews,
And his great father's path to Heaven pursues.

DRYDEN.

and not Augustus, as it hath been hitherto thought: for it ought to be considered, that Augustus was not in this war, but Caius his nephew (53), and adopted son, who forced Phraates, King of the Parthians, to resign Armenia to the Romans. If this author had been at the trouble of looking into chronological tables, he would have found that the consulate under which Virgil's death is placed, is too far distant from the time of Caius Cæsar's expedition, to countenance any supposition that this great Poet was composing his *Georgics* during the said Caius Cæsar's war with the Parthians. His expedition happened in, or about, the year of Rome 752. If after that Virgil had wrote his *Æneis*, he must then have lived at least till the year 763. This doth not want a refutation. I shall only say that Father Noris alledges the common opinion concerning Virgil's dying in 735, against Trifan (54).

(53) Trifan should have said his grand-son. He did not consider that the word nepos spoken of Caius with respect to Augustus, does not signify nephew.

(54) Noris Cœnotaph. Pisân. pag. 249.

(55) See the preface to the Apologia des grans Hommes accusés de Magie.

(56) Naudé, Apologie des grans Hommes, cb. xxi, pag. 607, Paris 1625, in 8vo.

[I] The stories of his Magic, and the pretended wonders which he shewed the Neapolitans. I think it was in the year 1625, that a book was published under the title of, *A new Judgment concerning what hath been said and written for and against the book of the curious doctrine of the wits of this age*. Virgil is there accused of having been a celebrated enchanter, and necromancer, as well as having performed innumerable wonders by the assistance of his Magic (55). This was transcribed verbatim from the book which the Sieur de Lancre published against the disbelief of Sorcery. This induced Mr Naudé to write an apology for all those great personages, who were falsely suspected of Magic. He upbraids Bodin and de Lancre, who put Virgil into the number of Magicians, with the unreasonableness of their copying this falsity from the most scandalous and dirty writings of certain authors, who were the very sink and sediment of the most barbarous writers (56). . . . This phoenix of Latin poetry, continues he, is not accused of that Magic and poetical fury, which, by the perfection of his works, charmed all the polite wits . . . but of the superstitions and criminal Magic, of which this ornament of Par-nassus would never have been suspected, by a less degree of impudence than that unbounded one of these mustrooms and fabulists, for which I cannot tell whether they or the two modern authors, and some others, quos fama obscura recondit, are more blameable; since those last are so ridiculously credulous as to admit such cheats as legal evidences of a calumny, which turns much more to their prejudice than to that of Virgil. . . . There is indeed reason to

VOL. V.

wonder at those, who at present make use of the lies and fabulous inventions of seven or eight slaves to barbarism, and the opinions of the populace, in order to draw this Poet's name in their catalogue of Magicians, and relate a thousand stories, which, if true, would only cause him to be esteemed one of the most expert that ever was in that art (57). After which he retracts what he had said (58), that we were beholden for all these fables to Helinandus the Monk. He took it on Gefner's authority, that this Monk flourished in the year 1069: but being convinced that he lived about the year 1209 (59), I am, adds he (60), obliged to confess ingenuously that I was mistaken, and that the first author of all these idle fancies, was, in my opinion, that Gervasius, who, as Theodoric à Niem + faith, was Chancellor to the Emperor Otto III (61), to whom he presented his book, intitled, *Ocia Imperatoris, which is really so stuffed with absurdities and fables, as I remember to have already observed, that I can hardly persuade myself that he was in his senses when he wrote it*. This author relates (62);

That Virgil made a copper fly, which, for the space of eighty years, remained on one of the gates of Naples, to which he had fixed it, and prevented any fly entering the city; where he also built shambles, in which flesh never stank or putrified; that on one of the gates of the said city he placed two large stone statues, one of which he called merry and beautiful, and the other melancholy and hideous; that these statues were of that virtue, that any person entering the town by the side where the first stood, was blessed with a happy success in all his affairs, whilst he who came in on the side of the gate where the other was fixed, found himself unfortunate, and that every thing crossed his intention; that he caused a brass statue with a trumpet in its mouth to be erected on a high mountain near the city of Naples, which sounded so loud when the north wind blew, that the fire and smoke of Vulcan's forges, which are at present to be seen near Pozzuolo, were driven towards the sea, without doing any damage to the inhabitants; that it was he who caused the baths of *Calatura di petra bagno* & *adusto di l'omo*, to be made, with the beautiful inscriptions in gold letters, which were after broken and defaced by the Physicians of Salerno, who were displeased that by them the people were instructed what disease each bath would cure; that he prevented any person being injured in the wonderful grotto cut out in mount Paupillippo to serve as a way to Naples; and lastly that he made a public fire, at which every person was free to warm himself, near which he placed a brass archer with his arrow fixed, and his bow bent, and this inscription, *whoever strikes me, I let fly my arrow*; that it afterwards happened that a madman struck the archer, who did not fail to shoot his arrow directly into the fire, which immediately went out. Let us now take a view of the transcribers and improvers of these ridiculous fables. All these

absurdities were first transcribed from this author by Helinandus a Monk of Frefmont, in his Universal Chronicle +, and afterwards by Alexander Neckam an English Benedictin Monk, who relates some of the fore-mentioned stories in his book of the nature and property of things; besides which, he adds, that Naples being afflicted with an infinite number of contagious horse-leeches, was delivered from that plague instantly, upon Virgil's throwing a golden horse-leech into a well; and that he had encompassed his house and garden, in which it never rained, with an immoveable air, that served instead of a wall, and that he there built a bridge of brass, by means of which he transported himself whether he pleased; that he also built a miraculous Belfry, which, though of stone, moved in just proportion to the vibrations of the inclosed bell; that he made the statues, called the *Salvation of Rome*, which were watched night and day by the Priests, because as soon as any nation designed to revolt, and to take up arms against the Roman Empire, the statue which by its mark represented that nation, and was adored by it, immediately moved itself, and thereby rung a small bell which hung about its neck, and pointed with its finger to the rebellious

6 H

(57) Id. ibid. pag. 609.

(58) In the first chapter, pag. 27.

(59) He says, pag. 611, that he has read in the lives of the Virtuous Monks of Cîteaux, that Vincentius Bel-lucentis, in his Speculum, makes him live in 1209.

(60) Naudé, ib. pag. 611.

(61) Lib. 2. de schismate, cap. 19, 20.

(62) It should be Otto IV.

(63) Naudé, ib. & pag. 59.

+ Lib. 16.

on, his works are numberless (d). Those who have disguised them in burlesque verse [K], have

(d) See the list of them prefixed to the Commentary which the Abbot de Marolles added to his translation of Virgil. Mr de Segrais, who died in 1701, had promised a translation of the Georgics, which was expected with great impatience; as his performance upon the *Aeneis*, had been very much esteemed. It is a version in verse with a very fine Preface, and very curious Notes. A second edition of it, corrected by the author, and printed in Holland, came out in the year 1700.

† Cap. 103.

• Lib. de claris
Medicine Scrip-
torib. tract. 2.

nation, so that its name might be seen written, which the Priest carried to the Emperor, who immediately prepared an army in order to subdue and reduce it to reason. This is likewise taken notice of by an anonymous author, who above one hundred and twenty years ago, collected the lives of the Philosophers and Poets; for when he comes to Virgil, he positively tells us, † Hic Philosophia naturali præditus etiam Necromanticus fuit, & mira quadam arte hæc fecisse narratur: - - - He was an adept in Natural Philosophy, and likewise a Necromancer; for he is said to have performed all these things by some wonderful art. After which, he recites the above-mentioned stories, which were afterwards copied verbatim from the Latin of this anonymous writer, by Symphorian Champier*, and Albert of Eib, who was so weak as to insert them in the second part of his *Margarita Poetica*, under the title of sentences and authorities excerpted from Diogenes Laertius, and yet not content with this, hath enlarged them with the story of a Roman Courtesan, who having hung up Virgil in a basket in the middle of a tower; he in revenge so extinguished all the fires in Rome, that it was impossible to light any of them, any otherwise than by kindling them at the privy parts of this female derider; and besides the fire being so incommunicable, that no one could light at another's fire, every person was obliged to see and visit her: and this fine story was scarce published but one Gratian du Pont thought it worthy of being inserted in his controversies betwixt the female and male sexes, printed at Toulouse in the year 1534, as a very manifest proof of the malice and malignity of women: his verses shall conclude this long deduction of follies.

Que dirons nous du bon homme Virgile,
Que tu pendis si vray que l'Evangile,
Dans ta corbeille jadis en ta fenestre,
Donc tant marry fut qu'estoit possible estre.
A luy qui estoit homme de grand honneur,
Ne fis tu pas un tres-grand deshonneur?
Helas si feis, car c'estoit dedans Rome,
Que là pendu demeura le pauvre homme,
Par ta cautelle & ta deception,
Un jour qu'on fit grosse procession
Parmy la ville, donc dudit personnage,
Qui ne s'en rit ne fut estimé sage (63).

(63) Naudé, ubi
supra, ch. xxi,
pag. 614, & seq.

What shall we say of Virgil, who
Was in a basket hung by you,
And pendant from your window seen,
Which gave the best man the spleen.
Did you not foul dishonour fix
On this great Poet by your tricks?
Most certainly you did, since he
Was by your fraud constrain'd to be
A hanging spectacle in Rome
Unto the gazing vulgar, come
To see a huge procession pass,
Where he that laugh'd not was esteem'd an ass.

Naudé doth not trouble himself with refuting these fooleries, but takes some notice that in the life of Virgil, ascribed to Tiberius Donatus, St Jerom's master, it is said that this great Poet's father was first servant, and then son-in-law to a certain Magus (64). He answers, that according to Delrio and La Cerda, this life such as we now have it, was not written by that ancient Donatus. What we find there concerning Virgil's father, adds he (65), is sufficient to shew that the piece is supposititious. This is a strange blunder; for it is taking the word *Magus*, which the best Critics correct by *Magius* or *Majus*, for a Magician. The authority of Johannes Sariberienus, who mentions this

(64) Ibid. pag.
621.

(65) Ibid. pag.
622.

brazen fly which drove all the flies out of Naples, does not seem of any great weight. Toftatus †† who places Virgil amongst the practitioners of Necromancy, is in error. D. Hieron. ad Paulinum. †† Commens. in epist. D. Hieron. ad Paulinum. (66) Naudé, ubi supra, pag. 614. of Virgil's Magic, are so numerous, that it is impossible to treat of them particularly one after another, without losing a great deal of time, and admitting abundance of tautologies, I ought to imitate the Civilians, who take authorities per futuram, and making but one article of all the rest, to shew, that though Le Loyer †† mentions his echo ††, †† Liv. 1. Paracelsus his magical images and figures **, Hel- des Spectra ch. 6. moldus his representation of the city of Naples †† Tom. 1. que- tract. de imagi- nibus cap. 11. which he shut up in a glass bottle, Sibyllus † and the author of the book intitled, *The image of the world*, the head which he made in order to be informed of future events †; Petrarch and Theodorice † Lib. 4. Hist. à Niem † the Grotto at Naples which he caused to be cut out at the request of Augustus; † Vigenere † Peregrin. his alphabet; †† Trithemius his book of tables and † quest. decise 3. calculations, to discover the genius of all persons, † c. 4. questionibus 3. and lastly, those who have visited the Duke of Florence's cabinet, a mirror said to be that which this great Poet made use of in Catoptromancy: yet all these authorities are too modern, absurd, or ill grounded, to turn the scale against the silence of all the authors who lived during the space of a thousand years, and who would be greatly to blame, † Pag. 170. f. not to have mentioned or observed any of all those †† Anselm. wonders, if there had really been any such, since † c. 1. cap. 3. they have taken notice of a great many particulars of less moment. I pass by some reasons which he alleges, and what he observes as a fable, *That all the Sodamites in the world died on the night of JESUS CHRIST's nativity, and that as the famous Civilian is, lib. de Ex- salm. lect. 2. Salicetus assures us, Virgil was one of them* (67). †† Salicetus assures us, Virgil was one of them (67). c. 4. mem. 12. But I ought not to omit what follows. As for the preceding authorities, it ought not to be imagined †† Naudé, ubi supra, pag. 614. that Petrarch, Theodorice à Niem, Vigenere, and Trithemius, were so foolish, as scandalously to prostitute their credit and reputation to the censure of those that are not easily imposed on by such fables; for it is certain that whatever they have said, was in order to refute them, and give us to understand that they were not so easy and credulous as the other authors, whom I have cited, who can never atone for the fault which they have committed, in suffering themselves to be misled by the scandalous and weak influences of hear-says, street-ballads, and the vulgar opinion of the inhabitants of Naples, and the circumjacent places, who always ascribed every thing to Virgil's Magic, which seemed somewhat extraordinary or surprising, and for which they could not find another cause; as it is very easy to judge from the wonderful grotto hewn out of the mountain Paullippo near the city of Naples, which Strabo (who according to Athenæus, lived in the time of Scipio, and the taking of Carthage, or, according to Patricius, in Augustus's and Tiberius's time) mentions as very ancient; notwithstanding which, the peasants thereabouts affirm, that it was hewn out by Virgil at the pressing instances of Augustus, because the top of the mountain under which it is cut, was so pestered with serpents and dragons, that he must be a very bold man who ventured to cross it (68). In fine, He inquires (69) (68) Ibid. into the first cause of this suspicion, and believes he hath found it in the mathematical learning which Virgil acquired. This is what confirmed all the weak and credulous in this erroneous opinion, which they had already entertained of him by reason of his *Pharmaceutria*, - - - the *Sorceries*, or eighth Eclogue, where, says Apuleius, he hath learnedly represented, Vitas molles & verbenas pingues, & thura mascula, & licia discolora, - - - The soft fillets, the fat vervains, the male incense, and threads of different colours, and whatever belongs to Magic; so that he could not avoid being suspected of the practice of it, by those who were hindered by their ignorance

have raised the choler of some learned men; and it must be confessed that it is not altogether without reason. The commentary in *usum Delphini*, by Father de la Rue, the Jesuit, is a very good one. There is prefixed to it a life of this Poet, digested according to the order of the consulships, and adorned with very judicious remarks. I shall censure some faults in Mr Moreri [L]. I have avoided mentioning a certain poplar, called Virgil's tree; which, according to the custom of the country, was planted when his

ignorance and the barbarity of their age, from knowing that it was translated *verbatim* from Theocritus (70).

(70) Ibid.

Gaffarel endeavours to defend the authority of Gervasius Tilberienfis, and to answer Naudæus (71); but his endeavours are very ridiculous.

(71) Gaffarel, Curiositez inouïes, ch. viii, num 13, pag. m. 169, & seq.

[K] *Those who have disguised them in burlesque verse.* Scarron hath succeeded herein much better than all the rest; but the majesty of this Poem deserves more respect than to be so daringly prophaned. Vavassor the Jesuit complained of it, and observed that Italy first made way for this liberty: 'Vide, Balzaci, de

istorum hominum consiliis, & instituta ratione quid sentiam, quidve primum venerit in mentem, cum personatos aliquot ejusmodi, & e mentitis Virgilios, neque enim hanc ab uno duntaxat contumeliam passus est, in manus lapsi. Mihi visi sunt, qui nobilissimum & clarissimum poetam foeditate interpretationis suæ turpârunt, eodem illum modo tractare voluisse, quo Didonem tractavit prius, adeoque vices innocentis & calamitose reginæ ulcisci. Ut is enim Didonem Æneæ turpiter indigneque profuit, neque ullam rationem habuit vel temporis, cum ab Æneæ Dido distaret ipsi trecentis annis; vel famæ & exclamationis publicæ, quod eadem omnes ætatis suæ feminas pudicitia laude anteiret: ita isti nulla ingenii artis præstantia, nulla principis poetæ dignitate deterriti sunt, quo minus puram & castam poemam, corruptam & adulteratam extruderent in publicum, diffamarent malis dictis suis, eique quantum possent, petulantur illuderent (72). . . . Quamquam hic ego nostris hominibus non habeo quid præcipue succenseam, cum nihil in isto genere per se ac primi, sed exemplo & imitatione peccarint. Sicut nec ipsi præter ceteros succensere mihi debent, si commune factum, & aliorum potius, quam Gallorum, reprehendo. Fecerunt videlicet flagitium antea & Joannes Baptista Lallius, cujus Æneis travestita mihi casu super occurrit, & alii, ut audio, recentes Itali scriptores (73). . . . Hear, Balzac, what my sentiments are concerning the designs and proceedings, of these men, and what my first reflexions were on seeing some false and counterfeit Virgils of this kind; for he has suffered the like indignity from more than one person. It appeared to me that they who had disgraced this noble and renowned Poet by their vile contrivances, had resolved to treat him in the same manner as he himself treated Dido, and thus to revenge the quarrel of that innocent and unfortunate Queen. For as Virgil prostituted Dido to Æneas in a base and unworthy manner, without having the least regard either to the distance of time betwixt them which was three hundred years, or to her fame and character in the world, which allowed her to have been the most virtuous woman of her age; so these men were neither deterred by the noble excellency of the art, nor by the dignity of the Prince of Poets, from corrupting and adulterating, and, in that manner, publishing to the world his pure and chaste Poetry, from disgracing him with their scandalous expressions, and from putting the highest affront upon him, which it was possible for them to do. . . . Though I have no reason to be chiefly offended at my countrymen, since they were not the first to transgress, but were led into it by imitating the example of others. Neither have they any reason to be particularly angry with me, since I only find fault with a general offence, which concerns other nations more than it does them. The crime was committed before by John Baptista Lallius, whose Æneis burlesqued, I accidentally saw not long ago, and by some other late Italian authors, as I am informed.

(72) Franc. Vavassor. De ludicra Dictione, pag. 180.

(73) Id. ibid. pag. 182.

[L] I shall censure some faults in Mr Moreri. I. His manner of placing his words in this sentence, the two first words were written in favour of Mæcenas and Pollio, would make one believe, that his Bucolics were composed in favour of Mæcenas, and his Georgics in favour of Pollio. But he either designed, or ought

to have said the contrary. And if he had postponed Mæcenas to Pollio, he had yet been guilty of expressing himself wrong; for a person who should say that Virgil's Eclogues and Georgics were written in favour of Pollio and Mæcenas, would speak illogically (74), and contrary to the laws of our Grammar. This sentence signifies that each of those pieces was written for Pollio and Mæcenas. But that is false. In the Dutch editions this passage is altered thus: *The two first works are full of the praises of Mæcenas and Pollio.* But this doth not mend the two faults which I have noted, and introduces a third, since it is certain that Mæcenas is not praised in the Eclogues, and that he is mentioned in very few places of the Georgics, and always very succinctly, and sometimes without any praise. Nevertheless it might be said, that this Poem was composed in his favour, because it is dedicated to him; and it is to him that the author addresses himself in the first and last book, and in several other places. I do not deny but that Pollio is praised in the Eclogues; but as several others have a good share in the commendations, what Donatus distributes amongst four persons (75), should not have been bestowed upon one; and I should rather have said, as he doth, that they were composed by the encouragement of Pollio (76). I said in my first edition of this book, that Donatus making Virgil to be twelve years in compiling the Æneis, Mr Moreri should not have said *eleven years*: but at this time I renounce my former censure, for several editions have

(74) Logic teaches us that in all compounded and copulative propositions, all the attributes ought to agree with the subject. See the Art of Thinking, Part. ii, ch. ix, where they have neglected to set forth such an example as this.

it annis undecim, and not annis duodecim as mine hath, which is the Virgil Variorum printed at Leyden in 1680 (77). II. Virgil did not die going to meet Augustus as he returned from his eastern journey. He went into Greece and Asia in search of a retirement, in order to be at leisure to polish his Æneis; and in this journey, he met Augustus at Athens; Augustus, who was returning from the east. This determined him to return into Italy with the Emperor: but the disease which seized him in a journey, which out of curiosity he undertook to Megara, increasing upon him in his passage, he arrived at Brundisium in such an ill state of health that he died in a few days. Thus the story is told in his life. III. Since according to Moreri, he was born in the year of Rome 684, and died in 735, he could not possibly live fifty-two years. This fault of Moreri is also in the life of Virgil. The day, and the consulships of his birth and death are noted in it. Those two intervals do not quite make up fifty-one years, and Donatus nevertheless supposes that Virgil went into Greece at the age of fifty-two years. IV. These words: *As he was dying, he ordered that his Æneis should be burned, but Augustus preserved that admirable Poem, and commanded Tucca and Varius to correct it*, are very fallacious, and it is very necessary they should be rectified. The fact is thus. Virgil finding that his distemper increased, earnestly asked for his manuscripts in order to commit his Æneis to the flames; and because no body was so complaisant as to bring them, he ordered by his last will, that they should be burned as an imperfect work. Tucca and Varius represented to him, that Augustus would not permit it. Whereupon Virgil bequeathed his writings to them on condition that they should add nothing to them, and should, if they found any unfinished verses, leave them in the same condition. Cum gravari morbo sese sentiret, scripserat sepe & magna instantia petiit, crematurus Æneida: quibus negatis, testamento comburi jussit, ut rem in emendatam imperfectamque. Verum Tucca & Varius monuerunt, id Augustum non permittiturum. Tunc eidem Varius, ac simul Tucca, scripta sub ea conditione legavit, ne quid adderent quod a se editum non esset, & versas etiam imperfectas, si qui erant, relinquerent (78). So that Augustus was no farther the cause of the preserving of this Poem, than that the author desisted from his resolution, being told, that this Prince would not suffer the execution of it. It redounds to the glory of

(75) Cum res Romanas inchoasset, offensus, materia & nominum asperitate, ad Bucolicam transiit; maxime ut Asinium Polionem, Alphenum, Varium, & Cornelium Gallum celebraret; quia in distributione agrorum, qui post Philippensem victoriam veteranis, triumviro rum jussu, trans Padum dividebantur, indemnem se præstitit. . . . Wien be had begun to treat of the Roman History, he was so displeased with the subject and the barbarity of the names that he laid aside that design, and took to writing Pastorals; chiefly that he might have an opportunity of praising Asinius Pollio, Alphenus, Varius, and Cornelius Gallus; because in the distribution of the lands on the other side of the Po, which were shared among the veterans, judicium by the command of the triumviri, after the victory at Philippi, they had saved his lands. Donatus, ubi supra.

(76) Bucolica triennio Asinii Polionis iussu perfectæ. . . . He completed his Pastorals in the space of three years, by the advice of Asinius Pollio. Id. ib.

(77) Duodecim is to be found in several other editions.

(78) Donat. ubi supra.

his mother was delivered of him, and was observed to grow so fast, that in a few years it equalled poplars much older. Such women as were with child or newly brought to bed made it an object of religion (f).

Among Caligula's follies, we may undoubtedly reckon his contempt and hatred of Virgil; whose writings and effigies he endeavoured to remove out of all libraries (g). He had the confidence to say that Virgil had neither wit nor learning (b). The Emperor Alexander Severus judged quite otherwise; he called him the Plato of the Poets, and placed his picture with that of Cicero in the Temple, in which he had placed Achilles and other great men (i). Cæcilius the Grammarian was the first who read lectures on the poems of Virgil, whose cotemporary he was (k).

(f) Sueton. in Calig. cap. xxxiv. Severo, cap. xxxi, pag. m. 936.

(b) Nullius ingenii minimæque doctrinæ. Id. ibid. (g) Sueton. de Illust. Gramm. cap. xvi.

(i) Lampadius, in Alex.

(f) Accessit aliud præfagium: siquidem virga populeæ, more regionis in puerperis eodem statim loco depacta, ita brevi coaluit, ut multo antea fatis populos adquerit. Quæ arbor Virgili ex eo dicta atque con-

secrata est; fama gravidam & fecundam religionis, fulgentium ibi & solventium vota. Donatus, ubi supra, initio.

(79) Nihil igitur auctore Augusto Varius addidit, quod & Maro præceperat, sed summam emendavit, ut qui versum etiam imperfectum, si qui erant, reliquerit. Id. ibid.

(80) It is in the Life of Virgil.

(81) Id. ibid.

(82) In the first article OCTAVIA, remark [C].

(83) Donatus, ubi supra.

(84) See Pliny, Epist. xv, lib. iii.

(85) Martial. lib. i, Epig. xxxix.

Quem recitas meus est, ô Fidentine, libellus;
Sed male cum recitas, incipit esse tuus (85).

The book thou read'st was, Fidentinus, mine,
But when thou read'st it ill, then mak'st it thine.

When an author reads his Play to the Actors to whom he is about to sell it, we be to him, if he doth not read it well. This is what Mr Chappuzeau observes in his French Theatre. Virgil was therefore very happy, having the talent both of making charming verses, and of reading them well. Mr Corneille re-

sembled him but in one of these excellencies (86). I return to Moreri. His Vth fault is his saying that Augustus ordered, that whatever was superfluous in the *Æneis*, should be struck out without adding any thing to it. Is this rightly to understand Donatus's *summatim emendavit*? To correct a book in some places, and with respect to some things, doth it signify only to strike out of it what is superfluous? May it not signify that some words are inserted in the place of others? VI. Moreri's Virgil, a Roman, and a comic Poet, is a sign that he was a blind transcriber. He had read in Vossius, *Trojani temporibus fuit Virgilius Romanus, Poeta Comicus* (87), and mistrusting nothing he imagined this to be the real name of this Poet; but if he had consulted the originals, he would have found that Pliny, the younger, cited by Vossius, speaks of one Verginius or Virginius, and not of one Virgilius. Besides, Romanus ought not to be translated as an epithet denoting his country, but as the name of his family. Huettius hath observed this mistake of Vossius in Gyrardus, and Glandorp: *Hæc autem nomina duo sæpe confundi indicat Virgini Romani Poetæ Comici Plinio in Epistolis memorati nomen, qui à Lilio Giraldo, Glandorpio, & Vossio Virgilius appellatur* (88). Mr Cousin mistakes this passage of the Bishop of Avranches. We ought not to be surprized, saith he (89), that these two names have been confounded, since several learned men of these last ages have called a certain comic Poet, Virginius Romanus, whom Pliny calls Virgilius Romanus in his Epistles. I cannot conclude without observing, that when Pliny the younger is commending Virginius Romanus, he informs us that the same disease was observable at Rome, which reigns amongst our modern wits; for he declares that he was none of those who despised the present time, and admired only the Antients. 'Sum ex iis, qui mirer antiquos: non tamen, ut quidam, temporum nostrorum ingenia despicio. Neque enim quasi lassæ & effæta natura, ut nihil jam laudabile pariat. Atque adeo nuper audii Verginium Romanum paucis legentem comœdiam, ad exemplar verteris comœdiæ scriptam, tam bene, ut esse quodamque possit exemplar (90). - I am one of those who admire the antients, but without despising the moderns, as some people do. For nature is not so weary and worn out, but that she can still produce something praise-worthy. As a proof of this I lately heard Verginius Romanus reading a Comedy to some few persons, which is written after the manner of the Antients, and so well done that it might serve for a pattern.'

The passage above quoted (91) concerning the reading of the Georgics to Augustus, wants some correction. That Prince after the battle of Actium, in the year of Rome 724 returned into Italy, and met the Senate at Brundisium, where he staid twenty-seven days according to Suetonius, or thirty according to Dion Cassius, and then went into Asia, where he spent all the winter in making preparations for his expedition to Egypt. It is not then true, that at his return from the war of Actium, our Poet's Georgics were read to him at Atella (92). If he heard them read at this place, it was after the Egyptian war, and not when he returned to Italy, after the battle of Actium (93). I borrow this remark from Father la Rue. I could alledge another reason, which is, that Virgil observes at the end of his Georgics, that he composed this work during Augustus's Oriental war; but it may be objected against me, that this Poem having cost Virgil seven years labour (94), nothing hinders but part of it might be read to Augustus before he went to attack his enemy on the banks of the Nile.

VIRGIL.

(12) Blanc, Hist.
de Baviere,
Tom. i, pag.
323.

those of our times, and if that be true, how many they fortify historical Pyrrhonism, which daily lies are we obliged to believe? and how strongly do they create (13)?

(13) I have just now read two Dissertations of Father Daniel, wherein most of the things that are related of the Kings of France before Clovis, are said to be false.

VIRGIL, or VERGIL (POLYDORÉ) was born at Urbino in Italy in the XVth century. He did not want either parts or learning. I take his first book to be a collection of proverbs which he published in the year 1498: before which time none of the Moderns published any thing of that nature; wherefore he boasted of having preceded Erasmus, whom he reproached in a very unhandsome manner [A]. His second work, which treats of the Inventors of Things, was published in the year 1499 [B]. He was sent to England in the beginning of the XVIth century (a), to collect the Papal tribute, called Peter-Pence. He recommended himself so well there, and liked the country to such a degree, that having obtained the dignity of Archdeacon of the cathedral church of Wells (b), he resolved to pass the remainder of his life in England, and quitted his office of collector of the Peter-Pence. He undertook a great task, in the performance of which he laboured several years. It was the History of England. He dedicated it to Henry VIII, in the year 1533. This book is not much valued by the English [C]. He put his last hand to his treatise of Prodigies in the year 1526 [D]. He was no very rigid

Papist

(a) See the remark [I].

(b) See the remark [E].

[A] He boasted of having preceded Erasmus, whom he reproached in a very unhandsome manner. I find in the Epistle Dedicatory to his treatise of Inventoribus Rerum, that he declares, that both with respect to that subject, as well as to the Proverbs, he had beaten the path for all other authors. Non inficior

(1) Polyd. Virgilius, Epist. Dedic. Libri de Inventoribus Rerum. It is dated from Urbino, the fifth of August, 1499. libellum proximo anno Guidoni Principi, Urbini Duci in scriptum, copiosius tradere. Verum quicunque hoc vel illud posthac ingreditur iter, quia nos primi stadium currimus, ita fortasse nostris vestigia sequi non gravabitur (1). If you read Erasmus's epistles, you will there be informed that Polydore Virgil had said several harsh things to him in the Preface to a new edition of his Proverbs: he accused him of vanity and envy (2); he called him a Plagiary (3), and took it very ill that his book was not mentioned in the Preface to Erasmus's first edition. He charged him with attempting to rob him of his due honour. Ubi nam est ista veritas quam in præfatione scribis procul eminere? quæque fretus boni consulis quod ego callidus dissimulatore conatus sum in gloria tuâ possessionem irrepere (4)? Erasmus justified himself very well in a letter he wrote to him in December 1521 (5). See also his twelfth letter of the first book, page 50. He did an action too glorious to be omitted, and so exemplary, that it ought to be proposed to the imitation of all authors. The Bookseller at Basil designing to reprint Polydore Virgil's book, resolved to suppress the Preface, because it reflected on Erasmus. But this great man would not consent to it, but ordered him not to leave out any part of it, whatever the import of it was: Vel hinc colligas licet, quàm non fuerimus iniqui tuo libro. Frobenium, ut dictum est, abhorrentem ab editione perpulsi. Præfationem tuam, quâ me fugillas, ad me miserant, velut execrandam. Remissi justique, ut bonâ fide, sicut abs te fuerat descripta, excuderetur: deleverunt mentionem Lei, quam tu de illo sanè quam honorificam facis. Jussi ut reponerent. Utrum hæc sunt faventis an non (6)? Two years after he advised the author himself to correct it, that there might be no appearance of any jealousy betwixt them. Mibi videris consule salutaris, si primam illam præfationem totam retexas. Primum faciet hoc ad operis commendationem ob novitatem. Deinde faciet ad opinionem utriusque nostrum, quod insunt in illa priore quædam, quibus ego quidem non offendor, sed tamen suspensionem præbent eruditi alicujus inter nos æmulationis (7). In my edition of this treatise of Proverbs there is nothing against Erasmus (8). This trifling quarrel did not break off their friendship. See Erasmus's letter to him in the year 1526 (9). Observe that Polydore Virgil had formerly made him a present to buy a horse (10). As also that he dedicated to him his translation of a piece of St Chrysostom in the year 1528 (11).

(2) Inclementius est etiam quod hujus argumenti primum apud Latinos tractati laudem sic tibi vendicas, ut mihi coneris cenodoxias simul & livoris suspicionem impingere. Erasmus, Epist. iii. lib. xvi. pag. 748. We shall see in the remark [L], the very words of Polydore Virgil.

(3) Priusquam hac præfatione infirmulæ . . . livoris simul & plagii. Id. ibid. pag. 749.

(4) Id. ibid. (5) That which I have just now quoted.

(6) Erasmus ubi supra.

(7) Idem, Epist. xlv. lib. xx. pag. 1007.

(8) It is of Basil, 1541, in 8vo, from the fourth revival of the author.

(9) It is the xvth of the xxi. book.

(10) Idem, Epist. xxv. lib. xxi. pag. 1093.

(11) Idem opusculum (Chrysostomi in Monachum) in Angliâ verit. Virgilius Polydorus satis feliciter, mihi dicatum. Excusum est autem Lutetie. Idem, Epist. xlv. lib. xxv. pag. 1354.

(12) Vossius, de Hist. Latinis, pag. 678.

(13) That Epistle Dedicatory is dated at London the 5th of December 1517.

to John Matthew Virgil, his brother, professor of Philosophy at Padua. So that Sir Thomas-Pope Blount is mistaken when he saith that these eight books were printed at Straßburgh in 4to, in the year 1509 (14). Mr Moreri hath committed the same error as Vossius.

[C] This book is not much esteemed by the English. Sir Henry Savil says of it; 'Polydorus, ut homo Italianus, & in rebus nostris Hospes, & (quod caput est) neque in Republicâ versatus, nec magni alioqui, vel judicii, vel ingenii; pauca ex multis delibans, & falsa plerumque pro veris amplexus, Historiam nobis reliquit, cum cætera mendosam, tum exiliter sanè, & jejune conscriptam (15). - - Polydore, as being an Italian, and a stranger to our affairs, and (which is the chief thing) being neither acquainted with public business, nor otherwise a man of any great parts or judgment, touches upon a few things among many, and, generally speaking, embraces falsehoods for truths. By this means he hath left us a history which, besides being faulty in every other respect, is written in a manner that is both dry and barren.' Another English writer calls him a malicious detractor: 'Nominis Britannici gloriam non solum obfuscare, sed etiam Britannos ipsos mendacissimis suis calumniis infamare totis viribus conatur (16). - - He hath endeavoured, as much as possible, not only to diminish the glory of the British, but also to defame the Britons themselves by his lying reproaches.' But there is a complaint against him of a different nature: Paul Jovius observes that the French and Scots charged Polydore Virgil with flattering the English to an excessive degree, 'Conscriptis Historias rerum Britannicarum, ea fide ut Scotis, & Gallis sæpe reclamantibus, alieno potius arbitrio, quam suo intexuisse multa in gratiam gentis exitimetur, quod in recensendis minorum Ducum nominibus, tanquam gloriæ avidis plurimum indulerit (17). - - He wrote the History of England with such particularity, that the Scotch and French pretend, he has inserted many things in favour of the English nation, more to please others than in compliance with his own judgment. They alledge, as a proof of this, the great pains he takes in reckoning up the names of inconsiderable captains, as if they had been very desirous of glory.' John Leland hath censured several faults of Polydore Virgil, as Vossius observes (18).

[D] His treatise of Prodigies. It is composed of several dialogues, wherein he strongly opposes the art of Divining. A small part of the preface, dated at London 1526, runs thus: 'Cujus (Christi) ipsi quoque doctrina instructus confidenter veni in certamen cum ariolis, auguribus, haruspiciibus, vatibus, fortilegis, quos partim divinis, partim naturalibus debilitatos imo atque adeo devictos rationibus, jacere cum suis pestiferis artibus, videre jam licebit (19). - - Armed with the doctrine of CHRIST, I have confidently entered the lists with the sooth-sayers, wizards, and fortune-tellers; whom, together with their pernicious arts, you may now see weakened, or rather entirely destroyed, by reasons partly natural and partly theological.' This is therefore a work of a very different nature from that of Julius Obsequens, which was enlarged by Lycothenes. We are told of

(14) Pope Blount, Conf. Author. p. 434.

(15) Henrius Savilius, Prefat. ad Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores, apud Pope Blount, Conf. Author. pag. 431.

(16) Homford, Libry, in Descriptione Angliæ, apud Pope Blount, ibid. pag. 431.

(17) Paulus Jovius, Europ. cap. cxxxv. pag. 279.

(18) Vossius, ubi supra, pag. 679.

(19) Polyd. Virgilius, Prefat. ad Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores, apud Pope Blount, ibid. pag. 431.

Papist in all particulars [E]; he was not at all disgusted at England on account of the change of religion which was brought about in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI. He did not desire to leave that kingdom in the year 1550, on any other account than that his age required a warmer and more southern climate. He obtained leave to depart, and was permitted to receive the revenue of his benefices during

(20) Vossius, ubi supra, pag. 678.

(21) De Patientia & ejus fructu Libri II; de Vita perfecta Liber I, de Veritate & Mendacio Lib. I.

(22) In the margin of the text of this article.

(23) These words of Paul Jovius, ubi supra, Is 26 Henrico Rege fortunis adactus flammæ Londini creatus, are fallacious; they seem to imply that he was Canon of London.

(24) Joan. Baleus, de Scriptur. Britann. Centur. XIII, apud Pope Blount, ubi supra, pag. 451.

(25) See the Index librorum prohib. & expurg. pag. 850, & seq. Edit. 1667, in folio.

(26) Polyd. Virgilus de Inventor. Rerum, lib. iv, cap. xiii, pag. m. 190.

an edition at London, in 1526 (20): but Gefner knew nothing of it; for he mentions only that of Basil, printed by Bebelius, in 1531. I have the Basil edition in 1545, 8vo, per Mich. Isingrinum. To it are prefixed three other tracts of Polydore Virgil (21); the Epistle Dedicatory, written by him, is dated at London in 1543.

[E] He was not very rigid Papist in all particulars.] He approved the marriage of the Clergy, and condemned image-worship. I shall here cite at large what John Bale saith of him; it furnishes me with a proof which I promised (22).

Ob insignem in omni bonarum literarum genere eruditionem, Wellensius Ecclesiæ Archidiaconus (23) postmodum factus, prioris officio Pontifici resignato, constituit Romam non petere, sed deinceps in nostrâ permanere Insulâ. Et licet in plerisque scriptis suis veræ Religionis superstitionem præterierit, piæ nihilominus Christianorum Ministrorum conjugia defendebat, piæque statuarum cultum damnabat, cum quibusdam aliis Romanensium Rabbinarum imposturis. Quod antiquitati Britannicæ in Anglorum Historiâ, quam par est, iniquior sit, ex veterum illius Gentis Chronicorum & Historiarum ignorance provenit. Quod præterea Reges aliquot ab impietate pios, & alios è diverso ab ipsâ æquitate iniquos etiam promulgaverit, communi ante agnitam veritatem per Dei verbum, erroris ac cæcitatibus imputandum esse judico. . . . Erat certe Polydorus ob erudita illa de Rerum Inventoribus, Sacrorum Ritibus & Prodigis Opuscula, ab ipsis etiam piis suspiciendus (24). . . . Being made Archdeacon of Wells, on account of his remarkable skill in all the different kinds of learning, he resigned his former benefice to the Pope, and resolved not to return any more to Rome, but to pass the remainder of his life in our island. And tho' in most of his writings, he preferred superstition to the true religion, he nevertheless piously stood for the marriage of Christian ministers, and zealously condemned the worship of images, together with some other impostures of the Romish Rabbies. . . . to his being somewhat injurious to the antiquity of Britain, in his History of England, it proceeded from his not knowing the ancient chronicles and histories of that nation. And as to his calling some kings pious from their impious conduct, and others again unjust from their equitable actions, I think it should be imputed to the general error and blindness which prevailed before truth came to be discovered by the word G O D Certain it is that Polydore deserves to be admired even by good and religious men, for his learned works, de Rerum Inventoribus, Sacrorum Ritibus & Prodigis.

The treatise de Inventoribus Rerum contains several things which the Inquisition disliked; wherefore it approved of no edition but that which Gregory XIII caused to be printed at Rome in the year 1576, which was purged of all those passages which displeased the inquisitors. And as for the other editions, they ordered the blotting out of several passages (25). The Spanish Index expressly commands the expunging of Polydore Virgil's reflexion on St Peter's not permitting the Centurion to kiss his feet. And indeed it contains a very sharp censure on the pride of the Ecclesiastics; the words are: 'Pater mansuetudinis plenus id fieri non est passus, qui elevans eum sibi ad pedes jacentem, dixit: Surge, & ego ipse homo sum. O vocem memorabilem, atque salutarem, si bene multi hodie sese quoque homines tantum esse perpenderent, qui propterea quoddam sacerdotio præditi sint, planè se reliquorum mortalium, longè post hominum memoriam imperiosissimos dominos præbent, non communis patres, uti fieri deberet (26). . . . St Peter, full of meekness, would not suffer the Centurion to do it, but raising him up while he lay at his feet; Rise, said he, for I myself am a man. O how remarkable an expression is this, and how full of wholesome morality, if it was now a-days duly attended to by those who, forgetting that they are men, do, because they are invested with the priestly office, behave like the most imperious of all masters, and not like com-

mon fathers, as they ought to be.' But this author did not take the same liberty with respect to the Popes; for, on the contrary, he justifies and commends the custom of kissing their feet. And yet some writers cite him as disapproving it. 'Non possum, quin ad dam, quæ hac de re occurrunt apud Polydorum Virgilium, hominem Papistam, de Rerum Invent. lib. IV. cap. 13. Romani Pontifices, inquit, deosculandos pedes exhibendi morem à Christo se accepisse contendunt. At Christus non Magdalene osculandos pedes obtulit; sed sponte peccata fatentem, & suam misericordiam non solo amplexu genuum, ut ethnici, sed etiam osculo pedum implorantem, ejus consolandæ causâ admisit: hoc ipsum honoris genus alioquin non minus repudiaturus, etsi sibi re verâ debitum, quam appellationem Magistris boni. Sic quoque Petrus Cornelium centurionem ad genua procidentem manu sua sublevavit, SURGE, inquit, HOMINI SIMILIS: tantum absuit ut osculandos pedes exhibuerit. Decipimur specie recti, & sæpe cum Caligula pedes protendimus, dum Christi humilitatem vel spernimus, vel fucato conservandæ Apostolicæ autoritatis titulo exornare laboramus (27). (27) Anton.

I cannot help adding what we find upon this subject in Polydore Virgil, tho' a Papish writer. He says, in his book de Rerum Invent. that the Popes pretend to derive from CHRIST the custom of presenting their feet to be kissed. But CHRIST, says he, did not offer his feet to Mary Magdalen in order that she should kiss them; but while she made a voluntary confession of her sins, and implored his mercy, not only by embracing his knees after the manner of the Heathens, but also by kissing his feet, he suffered it for her consolation: in any other case he would have been no less for rejecting this kind of honour than he was for refusing the title of Good Master. Thus also did Peter take up the Centurion, when he fell at his feet: Stand up, said he, for I myself am a man: so far was he from offering him his feet to kiss. We are cheated by the appearance of right, and we often stretch out our feet with Caligula, while we either despise the humility of CHRIST, or study to set it off with the specious pretence of keeping up the Apostolical authority. It is a Remonstrant Minister who cites Polydore Virgil's words in this manner, and that too after having assured us in his preface, that excepting only twice or thrice, he hath always examined the passages which he cites. This passage of Polydore Virgil must then be one of the two or three which he has not examined, for there is an enormous difference betwixt what he really says, and what this minister ascribes to him. Consult Mr Crenius (28), who hath very smartly set forth this mistake, and compared the two places together, that just now cited, and as it really is in Polydore Virgil in the Strafsburgh edition, printed in 1606, in 8vo. I have consulted my edition which is that of Lyons apud hæredes Seb. Gryphii 1558, in 8vo, and I find that the words exactly agree with those alledged by Mr Crenius. I have also consulted the French version of Polydore Virgil, published by Francis de Belleforest at Paris in 1582, and I find that he made use of an original which was exactly the same with my Latin one. I cannot therefore be sufficiently surprized at the prodigious depravations which are crept into the quotations of this passage.

I shall quote an author who assures us that Polydore Virgil died in the year 1562, and that, in Lippomanus's judgment, the treatise de Inventoribus Rerum is a wretched book. 'Mors etiam Polydori Virgilii contigit Suæviæ †, ubi natus erat. Multa scripsit, sed non omnes docti ea existimant. Imperitissimum vocat eum & vanitatis redarguit doctissimus Lindanus †, atque hominis hujus scripto, quod de rerum inventoribus finxit, nihil extare nostrâ ætate in lucem editum, pluribus, quod scateat magis, aut futilibus perfluat conjecturis (29). . . . Polydore Virgil died at Urbino, where he was born. He wrote a great deal; but his writings are not all esteemed by the learned. Lindanus calls him a most ignorant author, and accuses

him

† It is the town of Urbino in the Marca d'Ancona.

† Panop. Evangelic. c. 98.

(29) Petrus à Sancto Romualdo, in Continuacione Chronici Ademari, pag. 326.

(c) Thevet, *Elog. des Hommes illustres*, Tom. vii, pag. 309, 310. See the remark [E], towards the end.

during his absence [F]. It is said he died at Urbino (c) in the year 1555. He is accused of having burnt several manuscripts in order to prevent the discovery of the faults of his history of England [G]. It was printed several times [H], which shews that the world was more easily imposed on in that age than they are at present, or else more addicted to study; since an impression of the best Historians in folio will hardly go off at this time.

Since the second edition of this Dictionary, I have been informed of the following particulars. Polydore Virgil was so successful in his first essay, which was his collection of proverbs, that there were three or four impressions of it in a very short time. This good fortune encouraged him to set about a more difficult enterprise, which was to write a treatise upon the Inventors of Things. I have said before that he published it in the year 1499. After that he was sent into England by Pope Alexander VI, and being desired by Henry VII to compose a history of that country, he set his hand to it in the year 1505 [I]. He himself gives an account of these things in an Epistle Dedicatory which

'him likewise of vanity. He says, that in our time no thing has been published which abounds more in trifling conjectures than his treatise de Inventoribus Rerum.' It is certain that he did not please the bigots.

[F] He did not desire to leave that kingdom in the year 1550, on any other account than that of his age. . . . He obtained leave to depart.] This I take from the History of the Reformation of England: 'Polydore Virgil, after having lived almost forty years in England, asked leave to go and end his days, a little nearer the sun, he being very old. Which was granted him, on the second of June, and in consideration of the services, which it was thought he had done to the public, by his history, he was allowed, during his absence, to hold the Archdeaconry of Wells and the Prebend of Nonninton (30).' Mr de

(30) Burnet, History of the Reformation of England, Part. ii, book i, ad ann. 1550, pag. 374.

(31) De Larrey, Hist. d'Angleterre, Tom. i, pag. 682, ad ann. 1550.

(32) In an English book against Dr Burnet's History of the Reformation.

(33) De Larrey, ibid. pag. 683.

(34) In the remark [I].

(35) Job. Caius, de Antiquitatibus Cantab. lib. i, pag. 52, apud Pope Blount, ubi supra, pag. 451, 452.

(36) He was not sent for out of Italy by Henry VIII, but the Pope sent him into England to collect what went by the name of Peter-Pence.

'work he caused all those to be burnt which by the king's authority and the assistance of his friends he could possibly come at) than for the stile, truth, care, or judiciousness of his performance. Our Frenchmen tell us the same thing of P. Æmilii, his neighbour and co-temporary, and of several others, who, greedy of equal fame with Plato and Aristotle, burnt, as they did, several books after having extracted the quintessence of them, in order to make up books, which they afterwards published under their own names (37).'

[H] It was printed several times.] I have already said that the date of the Epistle Dedicatory is of the year 1533 (38). And I doubt not but the edition mentioned by Gesner, I mean that printed at Basil by the Bebelius, in 1534, in folio, is the first edition. The month of August

author revised his work, and corrected several places. In the second edition, which was in 1536. I make use of that of Basil apud Mich. Isingrinum, in 1556, in folio, which contains but twenty-six books. But

I find in the epitome of Gesner (39), that this history in twenty-seven books ab auctore recogniti ad amicum expoliti, was printed by Isingrinus, and afterward by Thomas Guerin in folio, in 1570. I wish the year of Isingrinus's edition had been mentioned, and I cannot believe that it contains twenty-seven books, since that which Thyfius published at Leyden in 1649 (40) contains no more than twenty-six; and doubtless Thyfius followed the best and most complete of all the foregoing editions. However it be, the twenty-six books of this History ended with the death of Henry VII.

Therefore I cannot well understand the author who accuses our Virgil of having falsified the relation of affairs concerning the reign of Henry VIII, in order to insinuate himself into the favour of Queen Mary, when it is certain that he left England before there was any probability that Mary would come to the crown. It is also certain that his History, printed at Basil (41) a year after his death, contains but twenty-six books, which reach no farther than the death of Henry VII. And therefore the following passage is somewhat obscure to me. 'Maxime erravit Polydorus in describendis temporibus Henrici VIII.

Nam præter quod linguæ nostratæ profus ignarus, plurima eorum temporum nescire habuit necesse: plurima etiam, ut Mariæ Reginæ gratiam promptius demereri posset, scripsisse, non sine causa perhibetur.

Priorum verò temporum, eadem non est suspicio (42). Polydore has chiefly mistaken in describing the reign of Henry VIII. For besides that, he was an entire stranger to our language, there were many particulars relating to those times of which he must have been ignorant. It is likewise not without cause reported that he writ many things with a view to insinuate himself into Queen Mary's favour. But in the preceding reigns there is no room for this suspicion. Besides it is probable that Polydore Virgil did not stay so long at London, being during that time employed in preparing his History of England without learning English. At the worst it was less difficult for him to be acquainted with the reign of Henry VIII, than with those of the preceding kings. For what reason therefore do they suppose that he knew less of this reign than of the others?

[I] After that he was sent into England by Pope Alexander VI, and being desired by Henry VII to compose a history of that country, he set his hand to it in the year 1505.] All these facts are related, with divers particulars, in the following words. 'Placuit (Commentarius)

'into Queen Mary's favour. But in the preceding reigns there is no room for this suspicion. Besides it is probable that Polydore Virgil did not stay so long at London, being during that time employed in preparing his History of England without learning English. At the worst it was less difficult for him to be acquainted with the reign of Henry VIII, than with those of the preceding kings. For what reason therefore do they suppose that he knew less of this reign than of the others?

[I] After that he was sent into England by Pope Alexander VI, and being desired by Henry VII to compose a history of that country, he set his hand to it in the year 1505.] All these facts are related, with divers particulars, in the following words. 'Placuit (Commentarius)

'into Queen Mary's favour. But in the preceding reigns there is no room for this suspicion. Besides it is probable that Polydore Virgil did not stay so long at London, being during that time employed in preparing his History of England without learning English. At the worst it was less difficult for him to be acquainted with the reign of Henry VIII, than with those of the preceding kings. For what reason therefore do they suppose that he knew less of this reign than of the others?

he writes to JOHN MATTHEW VERGIL, his brother [K]. He likewise says there that ANTONY VERGIL, his great grand-father, was very well versed in Physic and Astrology, and had taught Philosophy at Paris. For the rest, as the reproachful things he said of Erasmus are contained in an Epistle Dedicatory which has been left out of most of the editions, I shall quote them below [L].

(43) Polyd. Vergilius, Epist. Dedicat. Librorum de Inventoribus Rerum, ad Joan. Mattheum fratrem, Edit. Basil. 1521 in folio.

riolus de Proverbiis sua præsertim novitate usque adeo, delectavit usque adeo, ut brevi mox terque quaterque (sicuti Poëta ait) fuerit formis excusul. Hac levi aura (fateor ingenue) evectus, tum majus aggressus opus, de rerum inventoribus, negotium suscepi, naviterque minus mensibus novem, confeci. Sic Polydorus ego primus apud Latinos, utriusque rei argumentum attentavi, id quod in præfationibus unius & alterius operis assatim docuimus. Veni posthæc missu Alexandri sexti Romani pontificis in Britanniam quæ nunc Anglia est, ut quæsturam pontificiam apud Anglos gererem. Ubi ne bonum otium tererem, rogatu Henrici ejus appellationis septimi Regis præstantissimi, res ejus populi geitas scripsi, in historiæque stilum redegei. Quod hercle opus duodecim annos sub literaria incude laboratum, obstant fæto, nondum absolvere licuit (43).

--- This little book of *Proverbs* was so well liked, particularly for the newness of the thing, that it presently underwent three or four editions. I freely own that I was encouraged by this slight success to undertake a work of a more difficult nature, I mean my treatise on the *Inventors of Things*, which I finished, with great application, in less than nine months. Thus I Polydore was the first among the Latin writers, who ventured to write upon both these subjects, as I have shewed at large in my preface to each. I was afterwards sent into England by Pope Alexander VI, to collect the Papal tribute in that country. That I might not be idle, I undertook, at the desire of Henry VII, to write the *History of England*. But though I have been twelve years employed about this work, I have not yet been able to finish it. This passage is found prefixed to his book *de Inventoribus Rerum*, printed at Basil in the year 1521, in folio, and it is in this manner that the author speaks to his brother. His letter is dated from London on the fifth of December 1517, and is to be seen at the beginning of the fourth book of the same treatise in several other editions; but the passage I have quoted is wanting, which is one of my reasons for inserting it here. It will likewise be the more acceptable, as it affords a proof, that if Polydore Virgil staid in England till the year 1550, or 1551, he was there in all near fifty years (44).

(44) Correct therefore what has been quoted in the remark [F].

(45) Polyd. Vergilius, ubi supra.

[K] JOHN MATTHEW VERGIL, his brother.] He was a learned man both in Greek and Latin. He practised Physic in Ferrara, there taught Logic publicly, and after that was Professor of Philosophy in the university of Padua (45). Before the age of thirty, he was a good Philosopher, a good Physician, and a good Orator, and was besides a man of the strictest probity. It is his brother who gives him this character in the Epistle Dedicatory which I have already mentioned: *Tibi negotium damus & juvandi tuo labore studiosi, & nomini familie nostræ consulendi, cui propè uni seculi nostri contigit ante sextum ætatis lustrum, cum tanta morum probitate, esse philosopho, medico, ac oratori perfectio. Ex qua doctrinarum scintilla, tota jam Italia lucem maximam maturissime erupturam auguratur* (46). These words are wanting in most of the editions.

[L] The reproachful things he said of Erasmus . . . I shall quote them below.] They are in the Epistle Dedicatory of his treatise upon *Proverbs*, printed at Basil for John Froben in the year 1521, in folio. This Epistle is inscribed to a Secretary of Henry VIII, and dated at London on the fifth of June 1519. 'Ita Polydorus tuus apud Latinos primus hujusce rei argumentum attentavit: & quicquid id laudis fuit, jam pridem citra cujuscunque injuriam, jure sibi optimo vindicavit. At post aliquot annos quàm ita de proverbiis commentariolum ædideram, ecce tibi, suc-

cessorem habui nostrum Erasmus, id quod ob singularem hominis doctrinam pergratum fuit, & si ille ceu ejusmodi commentarioli nostri minime sciens, utrumque decus, inventæ scilicet rei atque auctæ ad se trahere est conatus, quem tamen vix potuit ignorare, si unquam suum ipsius Adagiorum opus Argenterati, quod est sæ Germaniæ oppidum, apud Matthiam Schurerium formulis excusum vidit: vidit haut dubio procul, cum illud postmodum bis terve adauxerit. Quippe in ejus operis fronte Matthias attestatur se paulo ante nostra adagia in apertum protulisse. Ipsi etiam eum cum aliquando apud nos pranderet per jocum, nostri hujus instituti æmulatorem appellavimus. Ita ille rei sæ intentus nuper in novissima præmiarum suarum editione, est palam professus, primum se apud Latinos id genus argumenti attentasse, ut cui tum non venit in mentem nostri libelli imaginis. Etenim penè incredibile est Erasmus tot titulis redundantem, velle cuiquam tam modicæ inventionis gloriolam invidere. Quancum sunt nonnulli sagaciores, qui adfirmant eum idcirco illud dissimulasse, ut qui præter adagiorum multitudinem nihilo plus præstiterat, ne videretur esse imitatus, atque sic primas ferret partes. Ego tamen (quia veritas procul eminet) totum istud æqui bonique faciens, tantum apud te, qui utriusque nostrum es ex æquo amantissimus, testatum esse volui quo nihil ex eo offensionis posthac esse habiturus. Nam (ut Martialis ait) qui velit ingenio cedere, rarus erit. Ceterum sum gavisus (uti dixi) tali successore (47). --- Thus your Polydore was the first among the Latin authors who attempted to write upon this subject: and whatever praise was due from such an undertaking, he has long ago secured it to himself, without wronging any man. But a few years after I had published my small treatise on *Proverbs*, a successor appeared: and who should that be but our friend Erasmus? This was very agreeable to me, on account of his singular learning, notwithstanding that he claimed the honour both of the invention and improvements that were made upon it, as if he had known nothing at all of my treatise: which is nevertheless scarce possible, if he ever saw his own book of *Proverbs*, printed at Strasburg in Germany for Matthew Schurerius: and that he saw it is certain since he enlarged it twice or thrice afterwards. For in his advertisement prefixed to that book, the said Matthew declares, that he had published my *Proverbs* a little before. Likewise at a certain time when Erasmus did me the favour to dine with me, I told him, by way of joke, that he was my rival in this undertaking. But he was so intent upon the affair, that when he published the last edition of his *Proverbs* not long ago, he openly pretended to be the first Latin writer who had treated on that subject. In all likelihood he had no thought nor remembrance of my little book at that time: for it is scarce credible that Erasmus, who has so many things to value himself upon, would envy another person the small glory of such an ordinary invention: altho' some very judicious men affirm that he dissembled his knowledge of it for this reason, lest he should seem to have imitated another, and not to have deserved the first praise, as he was sensible that he had done nothing more than collected a multitude of *Proverbs*. But I (because the truth is very well known) taking all this in good part, thought fit only to protest to you, who are alike a friend to us both, that it shall never give me any trouble for the time to come. For, as Martial says, The man who yields the prize of wit is rare. But, as I said before, I was pleased with such a worthy successor. Compare with this what has been quoted in the remark [A].

(47) Id. ibid. Epist. Libri Adagiorum ad Ricardum Patrum.

VITELLIO, or VITELLO, author of a treatise of Optics, which is pretty much esteemed, lived after the middle of the XIIIth century [A]. Some authors say that

[A] He lived after the middle of the XIIIth century.] William de Morbeta, who wrote a treatise of Geomancy in the year 1269. This date was expressed by the

VOL. V.

6 K

(a) Vitellio Opticam edi curavit, Norimb. An. 1535. König. Bibl. pag. 850.

(1) Fredericus Riferus, Prefat. in Vitellio Opticam, pag. m. 163. Prefationis Epitoli. & Oratorum Petri Rami.

(2) In Epistolâ Opticis Vitellio præpositâ.

(3) See Riferus ubi supra, pag. 162.

(4) Ibid.

(5) See Riferus, ibid. pag. 163.

(6) Id. ibid.

(a) Monconys, Voiage, Part. i, pag. 130, ad ann. 1646, Lyons, 1665.

(b) He had composed eight books on this subject. The propositions contained in them were collected by Pappus. But of these books there remained only the first four. Fontenelle, ubi infra, citat. (f).

(c) Nevertheless the eighth book was entirely wanting.

that he was born in Germany, but others make him a Polander [B]. It is very probable that he composed his book in Italy [C]. The edition which Frederic Riferus procured in the year 1572, is incomparably better than that of Nuremberg in 1535. We shall see below the praises which he bestowed on the labours of Vitellio [D]. Mr König knew of no other edition than that of Nuremberg, which he believed to be published by the author himself (a).

the author himself, as Frederic Riferus, who had read that treatise in manuscript, informs us (1). Whence we ought to conclude that Tanstetter (2) mistook in placing Vitellio in the Xth century. Erasmus Reinhold, Gauric, Peucer, Blancanus, Vossius, &c. agree in placing him after the middle of the XIIIth.

[B] Some authors say that he was born in Germany . . . others make him a Polander.] The last opinion is the most eligible, for in the seventy-fourth theorem of the tenth book of Vitellio we find these words: *In nostra terra, scilicet Polonia habitabili, &c.* (3). . . . In our country, viz. Poland, &c. In the title of his book, the surname of *filius Polonorum & Thuringorum*, is given to him; which, according to Riferus (4) signifies, that his father was a Polander, or a Thuringian, or that his mother was a Thuringian, or a Polander. Regiomontanus, in his Preface to Alphanagoræ expresses himself thus, *Vitellio autem noster Thuringus* (5), which is intimating that Thuringia was Vitellio's country.

[C] It is very probable that he composed his book in Italy.] See the proofs of this fact which Riferus hath collected. *Quædam sunt in Opticis notæ Vitellionem in Italiam venisse, Italique bibliothecis adjutum fuisse.* Etenim Vitello ipse de se testis est lib. 10. theor. 42. *se primum omnium in Italia Cubalum (qui locus est inter Paduam & Vincentiam) contemplatione aquæ tenuissimæ ac limpidissimæ ad Opticas artes incensum atque inflammatum esse: harum enim formarum intuitu (ait) & mirabili transmutatione primum nos amor hujus studii allexit: & lib. 10. theor. 67. ubi scribit ex Iride, quàm in aqua è scopulo Viterbio proximo vehementius præcipitata sæpenuero vidisset, pleraque iridis affectiones & proprietates sibi animadvertas & observatas esse: illud (inquit) nobis principium cogitationis fuit, ut præsentis negotio studium applicarem.* At quod Vitello in Italia, quod Romæ tum cæteris liberalibus honestisque studiis, tum verò Opticis operam navavit, majus fortasse argumentum videatur, quod Guilielmo de Morbeta (qui tum Romani Pontificis penitentiarius, ut appellant, Romæ agebat) suafore & hortatore, ut ipse in proœmio testatur, optica primum conscribenda suscepit, eidemque absoluta postea nuncupavit (6). . . . There are some things in Vitellio's Optics, which seem to denote that he went to Italy, and was assisted by the libraries of that country. For he says concerning himself, that he was first of all inflamed with a desire of studying Optics, by seeing at Cubalo in Italy (which is a place situate between Padua and Vicenza) some water that was extremely thin and clear; for, says he, by viewing the form of it, and the wonderful changes it underwent, I first conceived a strong inclination for that study: and elsewhere in the same book he says, that he had observed and collected most of the properties of the rainbow, from that rainbow which he had often seen formed in the water falling impetuously down from a

rock hard by Viterbe; that, says he, made me first think of pursuing the present study. As to Vitellio's having applied himself in Italy, and at Rome, to the liberal arts, and particularly to the study of Optics, what he himself says in his preface may perhaps seem a stronger proof of this. He there acquaints us that it was by the advice and earnest exhortation of William de Morbeta (who was then the Pope's penitentiary at Rome) that he first undertook to write his Optics, and afterwards dedicated them to him, when they were finished.

[D] The praises which Riferus bestowed on the labours of Vitellio.] The passage which I am about to transcribe informs us that Vitello wrote other books besides his Optics: *Quid & quantum viribus ingenii perfecit, præclara ejus monumenta sempiterno testimonio erunt: non solum in Physiologicis, quæ citat lib. 5. theor. 18. & lib. 10. theor. 80. in libris de ordine entium: de elementatis conclusionibus, qui nominantur in præfatione, & lib. 1. theor. 28. in libris de scientia motuum celestium, quæ allegat lib. 10. theor. 53. sed multò maxime in decem libris Opticis: quos ut ex Alhazeno imprimis, deinde è Græcorum auctorum fontibus hauserit, ceterè mirandis accessionibus amplificavit.* Alhazeni, Euclidis, Ptolemæi axiomata, hypothesæ, theoremata omnia collegit; id laboris infiniti fuit. Sed ex Apollonio, Theodosio, Menelao, Theone, Pappo, Proclo, & aliis firmamenta permultarum demonstrationum singulari judicio repetivit: singulari ordine maxime naturali per sua genera, speciesque Opticam, Catoptricam, Meoptricam disposuit, atque totam mirabiliter absolvit. Quid plura? Si artis opifex atque author habendus sit, qui arti formam, animamque dedit: Vitello jure optimo Opticæ artis autor habeatur (7). . . . What and how much he has been able to accomplish by the strength of his genius will appear by these eternal monuments which he has left behind him, not only in Physiological matters, but above all in his ten books of Optics, which as he took first from Alhazenus, and then from the Greek authors, so hath he enlarged them with wonderful additions of his own. He collected all the axioms, hypotheses, and theorems of Alhazenus, Euclid, and Ptolemy; which was a work of infinite labour. He likewise, with great judgment, borrowed the grounds of many demonstrations from Apollonius, Theodosius, Menelæus, Theon, Pappus, Proclus, and others: he has ranged Optics, Catoptrics, and Meoptrics, in a singular and most natural method, according to the different kind and species of each. In short, he has given an admirable system of the whole art. What need is there for any more words? If the man who gives life and form to an art is to be looked upon as the author and finisher of that art, then Vitellio ought justly to be esteemed the author of Optics. It appears by this that Vitellio's glory was not that of invention, but that of digesting borrowed matters.

VIVIANI (VINCENTIO) a noble Florentine, disciple of Galileo, and a great Mathematician, who in the year 1659 published a book in folio intitled, *De maximis & minimis Geometrica Divinatio in quantum Conicorum Apollonii Pergæi*. His opinions in point of religion were very bad; for he believed the necessity of all things, the nullity of evil, and the participation of the universal soul, as he owned to Mr Monconys (a).

Consult the *Italia regnante* of Mr Leti, page 411 of the third part.

The first work he undertook was his *Divination upon Aristeus*, the Cotemporary of Euclid, and author of five books of problems de locis solidis, the bare propositions of which were collected by Pappus of Alexandria. These books are entirely lost. Mr Viviani interrupting his *Divination upon Aristeus*, set himself to restore the fifth book of the Conic sections of Apollonius (b). While he laboured at this, the famous Borelli found in the library of the Great Duke of Tuscany, an Arabian manuscript with a Latin inscription which signified that they were the eight books (c) of Apollonius's Conic sections He carried this manuscript to Rome, to translate it with the assistance of a famous professor of the Eastern Languages (d). Mr Viviani being not willing to lose

(d) See the remark [B], of the article APOLLONIUS Pergæus, and the remark [D], of the article ECHENESE.

lose the fruit of his labour demanded a certificate that he knew nothing at all of the Arabic tongue, and that he was an utter stranger to that manuscript. He would not even suffer Borelli to write any thing to him which concerned his book. At last he finished it, and it appeared that he had more than divined or conjectured, and that he was superior to Apollonius himself. He was obliged to interrupt his labours for the service of his prince in an affair of very great importance [A]. He had a pension given him by the King of France, and thereupon he resolved to finish his *Divination upon Aristeus*, which he proposed to dedicate to that Prince. He was honoured by Ferdinand II, Great Duke of Tuscany with the title of first Mathematician to his highness a title so much the more glorious for him as it had been conferred on Galileo. He gave the solution of three Geometrical problems, which had been proposed to all the Mathematicians of Europe, and dedicated that piece to the memory of Mr Chapellain under the title of *Enodatio Problematum*, &c. He himself proposed the problem of the squarable arch, which Mr Leibniz and the Marquis de l'Hospital solved by the differential method. He was chosen in the year 1699 to fill a place among the eight foreigners who are fellows of the royal Academy of Sciences. This new favour re-animated his zeal; and he published three books of his *Divination on Aristeus* (e) [B], which he dedicated to the King of France. He laid out the fortune he had acquired by the bounties of that Prince in building a bouse at Florence which for a private person may be called magnificent. There he gave an honourable place to the bust of Galileo, to which he added several inscriptions to the glory of that great Mathematician, striving by all possible means to signalize his gratitude towards his illustrious master: and in this he may be said to have followed the inclination of his heart, which was naturally full of goodness. He died in the month of September 1703, aged fourcore and one years (f).

(e) See the Mémoires de Trevoux, February 1703, pag. 142, of the Amsterdam edition.

(f) Taken from Mr de Fontenelle, in the *Elogy of Mr Viviani*, Extracts of which are to be found in the *Mémoires de Trevoux*, June 1704, pag. 1007 & seq. of the edition of France.

[A] He was obliged to interrupt his works for the service of his Prince in an affair of very great importance. To prevent the inundations of the Tyber it was a long time . . . since they thought of diverting the course of one of those rivers which fall into it, particularly the river *Chiana* (called by the Latins *Clanis*) as being that which contributes most towards these inundations. They were ready to execute this design under Tiberius, when the neighbouring colonies being heard upon that affair, the Florentines represented that by turning the course of that river into the Arno both their city and their country would be laid under water. Regard was had to these remonstrances . . . and in order to put a stop to these floods they contented themselves with building a wall, in which there was an opening, so calculated that it would receive no more than a certain quantity of water which could not do any damage. There are still some traces of this work to be seen. Under Alexander VII, the contest was renewed between the Romans and the Florentines, touching the project that was in hand for diverting the course of the river *Chiana*. Deputies were appointed on each

side. His Holiness pitched upon Cardinal Carpegna with Mr Cassini, and the Great Duke nominated Michelozzi the Senator, with Mr Viviani. While these two gentlemen, Cassini and Viviani, were jointly employed in the affair that was committed to them, they had an opportunity of making several observations upon Natural History, and among other things upon the insects which prick the oak, and thereby produce what goes under the name of a gall-nut. The plans which they drew up for preventing the floods, occasioned by the sudden overflowings of the *Chiana*, were not executed, as it generally happens in all those things which are undertaken for the public service (1).

[B] He published three books of his *Divination on Aristeus*. This book was printed at Florence in the year 1701. It contains 128 pages, in folio, and is intitled, *De locis salubris secunda Divinatio Geometrica in quinque Libris injuria temporum amissis Aristae senioris Geometrae*. This is a second edition enlarged: the first edition was printed at Florence in the year 1673 (2).

(1) Taken from the *Mémoires de Trevoux*, June 1704, pag. 1010, 1011, in the *Extracts of the Elogy* which Mr de Fontenelle made on Mr Viviani, before an assembly of the Royal Academy of Sciences, on the 11th of April 1704.

(2) See the *Journal des Savans*, of the 12th of March 1703, pag. 162, of the Paris edition, and the *Mémoires de Trevoux*, Febr. 1703, pag. 142, of the Amsterdam edition.

ULEFELD, or ULFELD (JAMES) a Danish gentleman, and a senator of that kingdom, was sent ambassador to the court of Muscovy in the year 1578, by Frederic II, King of Denmark. He wrote a relation of his voyage, and gave it to a Bookseller at Leyden to print, who so neglected it, that it fell into the hands of a Grocer, and would have undoubtedly served to wrap up sugar, &c. if Goldast had not bought it. He caused it to be printed at Francfort in the year 1608, with the title of *Hodeporicum Rutbenicum Jacobi, Nobilis Dani*, and in 1627, with the same title and the addition of *Ulfeldii*, after *Jacobi* [A]. This James Ulfeld published (a) a Danish translation of David Chytræus's treatise of the four last things, Death, Judgment, Heaven, and Hell. He also wrote the history of some of the kings of Denmark, but it was never printed (b). Goldast acknowledges (c) that he was not very elegant, but he faith that he judged of things with great prudence.

(a) At Copenhagen, in the year 1591, and in the year 1593.

(b) Taken from Mollerus, Hypomn. ad Albertum Bartholinum Bartholinum de Scriptis Danorum, pag. 255, 256.

(c) In *Epist. Dedicat. apud Mollerum*, ibid. pag. 255.

[A] With the same title, and the addition of *Ulfeldii* after *Jacobi*. He did not know the author's name, till after the first edition, when Claudius Christopher Lyfchander, a Danish Divine, acquainted him that the author of this voyage to Muscovy was of the noble family of Ulfeld; that he was very learned, rich, and a Senator of the kingdom; but that he fell into disgrace for treating of some affairs without the King's consent; that his two sons MAONUS and JAMES were in a flourishing condition, and that James, who was a Senator, was ambassador at the Hague in the year 1608 (1). I believe this is the same who was promoted to the dignity of Chancellor of Denmark, in the year 1610, and died on the twenty-fifth of June 1630 (2). I also believe that the Count Ulfeld, of whom I speak in the following article, was the son

of this Chancellor. Observe that the same Lyfchander in another letter (3) informs Goldast, that the two sons of the author of the *Hodeporicum Rutbenicum* had seen the book. Whence I conclude that the author was not then alive.

Observe, that Mr Konig is much in the wrong concerning our James Ulfeld. He makes him the author of an embassy to Poland, written in the year 1627 (4). Here are no less than two mistakes; for James was dead at the time of the publication of the first edition in 1608, and his book is not a relation of an embassy to Poland. But as he on one hand ascribes a relation to him which he did not write, on the other he robs him of the *Hodeporicum Rutbenicum*, to bestow it on an imaginary person called *James Danus* (5). I mean, that Mr Konig mistakes *Danus*, a *Dan*, which here is

(3) It is the sixth of the above mentioned collection.

(4) Konig, *Bibl.* pag. 851.

(5) Konig, *ibid.* pag. 855.

(1) Taken from the sixteenth letter of the collection of Letters written to Goldast, and printed in the year 1682.

(2) See Mollerus, Hypomn. ad Alb. Barthol. de Script. Dan. pag. 255.

is a national epithet given to the writer of this *Hodeporicum* by Goldast, for the surname of an author. | Mr Mollerus hath noted almost all these mistakes of (6) Mollerus, ubi supra, pag. 255.

ULEFELD, or ULFELD (CORNIFIDS, or CORFITS) grand-son to the foregoing (a), was one of the greatest genius's of the XVIIth century; and if he had not tarnished his reputation by the want of fidelity to his sovereign, he might justly have been reckoned amongst the greatest men. Christian IV, King of Denmark, made him *Viceroy of Norway, High-Steward of his realms, and beaped on him all the marks of kindness that a favourite could hope for* (b) [A]. He chose him for his son-in-law, by marrying him to Eleanor his natural daughter [B]. This son-in-law of the king was his Ambassador-Extraordinary in France in the year 1647. Frederic III, the son and successor of Christian IV, could not bear the spirit and conduct of Count Ulfeld; he observed too much ambition in him, and it was scarce possible for the king to avoid resenting the vigorous zeal of the Count for maintaining the privileges of the nobility at his accession to the throne [C]. However that be, the High-Steward was sent Ambassador to Holland in the year 1649, in order to make a treaty there concerning the passage of the Sound (c); and his negotiation not happening to please at home, he grew disgusted, and kept his chamber above six months on pretence of sickness [D]. He was accused in the year 1651 of having attempted to poison the king (d) [E]; but the woman who

(a) Observe that I do not affirm it; I only believe it.

(b) Sorbiere's Relation of England, pag. 147.

(c) Sorbiere, ibid. pag. 149.

(d) Parival's Hist. du Siecle de Fer, Tom. 1, pag. 490.

[A] Christian IV . . . beaped on him all the marks of kindness that a favourite could hope for.] The Historical Novel which I shall hereafter cite, informs me that he became the favourite of Christian IV, not only on account of his own merit, but likewise by the interest of his father, who was Great Chancellor, and governed the kingdom. This High-Chancellor was descended from one of the first and most ancient families of the realm, and the only one that was honoured with the dignity of Count by a grant from the Emperor. Cornif Ulfeld was the tenth son: the manner how he came to be known by his father, who thought for a long time that he was lost, is romantic. See the Historical Novel. I cannot tell whether it is possible to reconcile what has been just now said concerning the dignity of Count, with a little Latin book (1) which says, that Cornif Ulfeld, flying for refuge to Christina Queen of Sweden, and having lent her great sums of money, acquired her protection and favour, and the title of Count.

(1) It is intitled Machinatum Cornifici Ulfeldi fucincta Narratio.

[B] . . . And married him to Eleanor, his natural daughter.] 'The King after the death of the Queen fell in love with a beautiful lady, whose name was Christina, of the ancient family of Monch, and not being able to obtain any favour from her, married her with all the formalities requisite to a lawful marriage, in the presence of the court and Senate; but one clause of the contract was, that the children which should proceed from this marriage should not be Princes, but obliged to content themselves with the quality of Counts of Sleswic and Holstein, of which dignity they should bear the name and arms (2).' This Prince attempted to divorce her for certain things she had done out of jealousy: the cause lay before the Senate. Annibal Seestled pleaded the King's cause; and the Count of Ulfeld pleaded for the Queen, and carried the cause (3). The Latin book which I have cited says that she was actually divorced, and that the King afterwards grew in love with the bed-chamber lady (4) to his divorced Queen (5), and had a son and a daughter by her. The son called Ulricus Christian Guldenleew bore arms under the King of Spain, and did wonders at Copenhagen when it was besieged by the Swedes. The daughter was married to Claudius Alfeld, a gentleman of Holstein. The same book informs us that the reason why the King hated his wife, and loved her bed-chamber lady, was because she discovered to him that the Queen designed to poison him: which was revenged on this accuser after her death; for Count Ulfeld would not permit the celebration of her funeral, but sent her out of town at night to be buried in the burying place of the poor. She survived the King but few days, dying with melancholy (6), as it is reported.

(2) An Historical Novel, intitled Le Comte d'Ulfeld, Printed at Paris in 1677.

(3) Ibid.

(4) Her name was Wibicha.

(5) Fuit hæc Christiane cuius supra meminimus à cubiculo; quæque Regi revelasset ipsi à Domina sua venenum parari, Rex illam, re-pudiata Christiana ejus loco amavit.

(6) Ex Machinatum, fucinctâ Narrat.

(7) Sorbiere, Relation d'Angleterre, pag. m. 149.

[C] For maintaining the privileges of the nobility.] An author whom I have cited (7) saith, that the mildness of Christian IV, and the charms of peace, made the nobility and the people neglect many privileges which they propoed to re-establish in full force, when they elected Frederic III, and that then the High-Steward was obliged by his post . . . to stand up for

the nobility of the kingdom; for he represented them, and had a negative voice in council: so that as nothing could pass without his consent, the file of the placards ran, and the ordinances were notified as made by the King and the High-Steward. He adds (8) as a consequence, that besides the interest, which Count Ulfeld had in supporting the privileges of that body, he also considered those of his own family, and the enmity betwixt the children of the royal family, by reason of the inequality of their rank, and of the jealousy which the late King's passion for the Countess Eleanor had sown. The author of the Historical Novel, notwithstanding the part of a Panegyrist and Apologist which he all along acts, still owns, that the Count, at his wife's persuasion, had some thoughts of causing himself to be elected King after the death of Christian IV, and that he made some attempts that way: but finding his measures broken, he desperately turned the course of affairs, and promoted the election of Prince Frederic on such conditions as allowed him to share the authority with him, under pretext of preserving the privileges of the nobility, of which, as High-Steward, he was chief.

[D] He kept his chamber above six months, on pretence of sickness.] Sorbiere calls this a blunder; for at court, saith he (9), no man ought ever to quit an advantageous post, nor retire on any pretext whatsover; he ought not to lose the train of affairs, nor use people to go on without him, much less give them the advantage of his absence. But his blaming this conduct, did not hinder him from taking his part so zealously, that his Danish Majesty's Ambassador complained of it at the court of France: the consequence of which was that Sorbiere was banished to Nantes. This author had formerly dedicated a book (10) to Count Ulfeld, for which he had doubtless received a good reward; which engaged him to insert in his voyage an episode in justification of this Lord. He was not well informed of all the particulars of this cause; the detention of the Count in the island of Bornholm, and the liberty granted him to go and live in the isle of Funen, were unknown to Sorbiere.

[E] He was accused of having attempted to poison the King.] The author of the Historical Novel, pretends that a woman, named Diana, was suborned to declare that the Count and Countess of Ulfeld had solicited her to poison the King, the Queen, and all the royal family; and that the Count so judiciously defended himself in full council, that Diana and Captain Weller, who had introduced her, were fully convicted of bearing false witness, and condemned, she to be beheaded, and he to perpetual banishment; which sentences were executed. If this relation be compared with that of a modern Historian (11), who tells us, That one Colonel Valter was also suspected, who having defended his innocence, caused the said Count Ulfeld to be summoned; but instead of appearing before his Majesty, he privately retired with his wife, and went into Holland, and from thence afterwards into Sweden: If, I say, such a comparison be made, it will appear that the Historian gives a very indistinct account of the affair. He seems to affirm, that the Count and the

(8) Ibid. pag. 150.

(9) Ibid. pag. 151.

(10) The French translation of Hobbes's treatise de Cives, in 1649.

(11) Parival, Tom. 1, p. 492.

accused him [F] not being able to make good her accusation, was beheaded. That did not hinder his secretly retiring with his wife and children out of the kingdom, and going to Sweden, where he was extraordinary well received by Queen Christina [G]. He discovered a great deal of zeal for the service of Sweden, which would not have been criminal, if he had not endeavoured to serve it to the prejudice of his country. His counsels were wonderfully advantageous to Charles Gustavus [H]; and it is inexpressible how effectually the politic intrigues which he carried on, advanced that prince's conquests in Denmark. He was one of his commissioners at the treaty of Rotschild, as he would have been afterwards at Copenhagen, if the French Ambassador had not entreated that king to name another [I]. At last he fell into disgrace with the Swedes [K]; who imprisoned him: He

Colonel were both suspected of the same crime; but that is not true. The Historical Novel doth not say that the Count first retired into Holland; it says that he would have gone into Poland, but that being informed at Dantzic that the King of Poland refused him his leave, he went into Sweden. The Latin book makes him first retire to Amsterdam, and afterwards to Sweden, and adds, that at Stralsund, he published an apology for his conduct; and that after the abdication of Christina, he went to live in Pomerania.

[F] *The woman who accused him.* Her name was Dina; she was a beautiful woman, and by profession a lady of pleasure, for she declared before the Judges, that she had had a child by Count Ulefeld. The little Latin tract relates these particulars, not as Parival does, but in the following manner. Dina used to wait on the Count by means of a private stair-case, and lay with him unknown to the Countess. Early one morning the Countess entered her husband's chamber, and shewed him a poison which Sperlingius, a Physician, had prepared. 'In quam confilio Ottonis Sperlingii, Med. D. in perneciem Regis Danie Friderici III, tentati veneficii suspitionem Corfitz Ulfeld, Magister Palatii Regii quoque venit, de quo Relatio Hafniensis Anno 1651, publicata videri potest, nec non ejusdem (Ulfeldi) Apologia Relationi opposita, Annoque sequenti 1652 Stralsundie in 12mo edita, cui causas subjungit quæ necessitatem sibi imposuerunt & adegnerunt, ut ad tempus Dania excederet (12).

(12) Putschius de novis inventis, pag. 424.

--- Which suspicion, viz. of having attempted to poison Frederic III, King of Denmark, by the advice and aid of Otto Sperlingius, Doctor of Physic, did likewise fall upon Corfitz Ulfeld, High-Steward: concerning which, see the account published at Copenhagen in the year 1651; as also the apology of the said Ulfeld in answer to that relation. It was published in the following year, 1652, at Stralsund, in 12mo; and to this apology he subjoins the reasons which obliged him to leave Denmark for a time. They mutually concerted the means to give it to the King. Dina heard all this discourse, being hid very close in the bed, in order to avoid being surprized by the Countess. She imparted this story to a Colonel (13), on whom she bestowed her favours. This Colonel made his court with it to the King, his master, who caused Dina to be brought before him, from whom he heard all the particulars. The Judges examined her, before whom she owned the same thing, and particularly confessed that she had a child by the Count; but when the thing came before the Council of state, where the Count defended his own cause, Dina retracted all she had said, was declared guilty of calumny, and condemned to lose her head; which was afterwards placed upon a pole without the city (14). It is highly probable that she was suborned; for must not the Count have been excessively stupid, to have talked of such a dangerous affair when he knew it was in the hearing of a whore? This is indeed the prerogative of sovereigns: they give serious attention to the depositions of a whore, when their lives are concerned; and it is even true, that these sort of creatures have sometimes revealed conspiracies (15). It is just that monarchs should enjoy this prerogative, for the public good is preferable to the observance of formalities; and consequently we ought not to be shocked at the sight of twenty or thirty conspirators cut into quarters on the evidence of their accomplices, tho' the accusers loaded with riches and rewards, are sometimes greater criminals than the accused, and have, by numerous artifices, engaged the latter in the conspiracy. The whore, say some, ought to be punished, but the bawd who informed against her ought to have some share in her punishment. I answer, that this maxim should not be extended to

(13) George Walker.

(14) Ex Machinat. succincta Relat.

(15) Fulvia, for instance, who discovered that of Catiline, apud Sallustium. See the article FULVIA, remark [D].

privileged cases, such as the punishing of state crimes. 'Salus Populi suprema Lex esto. -- Let the safety of the people be the supreme law.'

[G] He was extraordinarily well received by Queen Christina.] To this purpose Mr de Wicquefort relates two remarkable stories. I shall content myself with mentioning one of them: it is an artifice by which that Queen so far imposed on the Danish Ambassador, as to gain an opportunity for Ulefeld to say all that he could for his justification in his presence (16); but the other story I shall relate without curtailing it. *The Danish ambassador, to prove that Ulefeld was unworthy of Christina's protection, one day told that Queen that the High-Steward had converted to his own use the sum of five and twenty thousand crowns, which the King, his master, had ordered to be remitted to him, that he might therewith supply the King of England in his necessity. The Queen said, that if the High-Steward assured her, that he of the Historical bad caused that sum to be paid to the King of England, she would believe it; and that if the latter denied it, she would say he lied; and that if a dozen of such kings as he should affirm it, she would say they all twelve lied. And since the King of Denmark would not re-establish the High-Steward in the possession of his estate, she would give him so much that he should not repent his loss in Denmark. The Danish Ambassador boldly replied, that her Majesty might, if she pleased, give him the half of her realm without the King his master's saying any thing against it; but that would not hinder his taking Ulefeld for the most infamous and perfidious of all men. This happened in the year 1654 (17). Mr de Wicquefort doth not cite his author; but I find he took this from Mr Chanut's Memoirs, where these two stories are told with more circumstances necessary to be known, than in Mr de Wicquefort's book. We are informed of several other particulars relating to Count Ulefeld in those Memoirs (18).*

(16) De l'Ambassadeur & de ses Fonctions, Tom. ii, pag. 147. See Chanut's Memoirs, Tom. iii, from pag. 342, to pag. 349, Dutch edition. The author of the Historical Novel, relates this quite otherwise, and to the Ambassador's confusion.

(17) Wicquefort, ibid, pag. 171. See Chanut's Memoirs, Tom. iii, from pag. 292, to pag. 295.

(18) See Tom. iii, pag. 74, 97, 98, 100, 240, 364.

[H] His counsels were wonderfully advantageous to Charles Gustavus.] See pag. 98, 99. of the Chevalier de Terlon's Memoirs; see also pag. 151, where you will find these remarkable words. 'Count Ulefeld, who knew the humour of the nation, advised the King of Sweden religiously to preserve the people of Schonen in the privileges which they enjoyed under the King of Denmark. This was a good advice, and perhaps if it had been followed this fecond war had been more successful.' Terlon had before told us, that the King of Sweden was very angry when he heard that these privileges were violated: 'But that the displeasure which he shewed did him no service at Copenhagen, where it was only taken for a bait to induce them to surrender that city.'

[I] If the French Ambassador had not entreated that King to name another.] The relation of this story, with a few more circumstances, will not be disagreeable. The Marshal and Duke of Grammont, and Mr de Lyonne, who were then at Francfort, your Majesty's Ambassadors Extraordinary, and Plenipotentiaries for the election of the Emperor, wrote to me to dissuade the King of Sweden from nominating Count Ulefeld for the negotiations of Copenhagen, as he had been for those of Rotschild: to which this prince was pleased to consent, when I spoke to him of it, and would not give the King of Denmark the uneasiness of seeing one of his disaffected subjects treat for his enemies in the very city of his residence, and brave his sovereign in his misfortune; what I de Terlon, pag. 112. said to the King of Sweden engaged him to substitute the Sieur Coyet instead of the Count (19).

[K] At last he fell into disgrace with the Swedes.] Some authors report (20), That the Swedes, to rid themselves of Count Ulefeld, whose great abilities they feared

(19) Mémoires de Terlon, pag. 206, but it should be pag. 210.

(c) Mémoires du Chevalier de Terlon, pag. 301, Dutch edition. See the remark [K].

(f) Mémoires de Terlon, ibid.

(g) That letter is dated the 27th of October, 1661, and is to be found entire in Parival, Tom. iii, pag. 580.

(b) Sorbierre, ubi supra, pag. 153.

He would have recovered his liberty in a glorious manner, if he had not been so impatient, and given credit to some reports that the Swedes designed to bring him to his tryal (e). These were false reports; for they had given their word to the French Ambassador that he should be set at liberty. The Ambassador had written about it, because the King of Denmark demanded that Count, as being included in the treaty (f). The impressions which this false report wrought on the mind of the prisoner, made him try several expedients to deceive his guards, in which he succeeded [L]; for he escaped out of the prison of Malmoe, and went to Copenhagen, without having obtained the remission of all that he had done against his prince. His Countess came thither some time after, when Frederic III, who had very cunningly dissembled his design of securing their persons, caused them both to be arrested, and sent them to the isle of Bornholm; but out of his clemency, he permitted them to live in the island of Funen, after the receipt of a letter which the Count wrote to him (g). In it he acknowledged his crimes, and only implored the mercy of his sovereign, to whom for the future he promised absolute submission. Some time after he was permitted to travel out of the kingdom; he went to the Spaw-waters (b), from thence to Paris incognito, and afterwards to Bruges, where he resolved to winter with his family; but he was obliged secretly to quit that place. His son killed Colonel Wolf [M]: his wife, who retired to London, and quitted that city privately, was seized at

A LIBRARY seized upon.

(21) Mémoires du Chev. de Terlon, pag. 105, 106.

fear'd, and without being able to recompense his good services, accus'd him of treason, in order to seize his great riches. The author, who speaks thus, had been saying that the Swedes had condemn'd this Count to a perpetual imprisonment; and therefore he must needs have been ignorant of his being included in the treaty of peace; see the text of this article. Now amongst the things taken from him by the King of Sweden, we must not forget the library which formerly belonged to Sepheldt, a Danish Senator (21). The King of Sweden found it in the castle of Reinstedt, of which this Senator, who was Count Ulfeld's mortal enemy, was governor, and presented it to the Count, who at the entreaty of the Chevalier de Terlon, was willing to restore it to the Senator for six thousand crowns. The Senator would not give that sum, tho' his library was valued at fifty thousand crowns, on account of the great number of very rare manuscripts and curiosities which it contained. On his refusal, Count Ulfeld caused it to be removed to Schonen, and after his confinement it was seized by the King of Sweden and transported to Stockholm.

(22) Mémoires du Chevalier de Terlon, pag. 303. He had said pag. 99, that the Count had a vast estate, a great interest with the nobility, and above all had an infinite deal of wit, and that he was one of the ablest men in the kingdom.

(23) Her speech may be seen in the Historical Novel.

[L] In which he succeeded.] The circumstances of this fact being very singular, I shall be particular in the relation of it. Count Ulfeld was a man of great abilities, and very much considered in Denmark, and he was very sensible of it, since he ventured to go to Copenhagen, without knowing beforehand whether his sovereign would be pleas'd with it. The prisoner, from the day of his confinement, so naturally acted the mute, and seem'd so insensible of all the injuries done him, that it was impossible to draw one word from him, when they question'd him in order to bring him to his trial; and the methods he took to deceive his guards, who were always near the bed in which he pretended to be sick, are almost incredible. And yet he himself made the cloaths in which he escap'd to Copenhagen, which was his ruin; for if, pursuant to what I caus'd to be said to him, he had relied on the goodness of the King of Sweden for his liberty, he had avoided the disgrace which fell on him; and his estate in Sweden had not been confiscated, as well as that which belonged to him in Denmark 'was afterwards (22).' The Historical Novel assures us; 1. That by the treaty of Rotchild, the Count obtained a general amnesty, and was to be re-inflated in his places and estate. 2. That the King of Sweden having granted him leave to defend himself publicly before the Senate at Malmoe, and his indisposition not permitting him to appear, his Countess Eleonora pleaded for him so strenuously, and with so much eloquence (23), that the Judges pronounced sentence of absolution. 3. That the King of Sweden confirm'd this sentence, and that Annibal Seefeld, the Count's ferret enemy, made him afraid of a more close confinement, and advis'd him to endeavour by all means to escape. I ought not to omit that according to the small Latin book, the Count's disgrace happened after the death of Charles Gustavus. It was after that King's death that the Count, with some Senators of Malmoe, endeavour'd to restore Schonen to the Danes. The same book also faith, that he feign'd himself af-

fect'd with a palsy in the tongue during his confinement. In custodiam traditus est in qua quamdiu fuit, hemiplexia morbum & vitiatam loquelam raro patientie exemplo simulasse dicitur (24). This confirms what the (24) Machin. Chevalier de Terlon relates, and what follows concerning. Name. 'in eo fuit (Ulfeldius) intercedente apud Regem Sueciæ Christianissimi Regis legato, si unicum tantum ostiduum diutius in custodia se continuisset, ut liberati restitueretur. Quin literæ quarum beneficio dimittendus esset à Regina matre Hedviga Eleonora filii tu-trice ac proceribus regni subscriptæ eodem quo evaserat momento, & hinc paulo serius allatæ circumferantur (25). - - The affairs of Ulfeld were already (25) Ibid. p. 30. at such a pass through the intercession of the French Ambassador with the King of Sweden, that if he had but staid eight days longer in prison, he would have been set at liberty. Nay the very letter upon which he was to be released, was signed by the Queen-mother Hedviga Eleonora, as guardian to her son, and by the Peers of the realm, at the same hour in which he made his escape; so that it was but a little too late in coming.

I shall clear this up as much as possible by Mr Puffendorf's account of the affair. He informs us that the stratagem which Annibal Seefeld made use of to prevent the Count's re-establishment in Sweden, and enjoyment of his estate, was to persuade the King of Denmark, his master, who was sending him into Sweden, to give him orders to recommend the Count's case to the Senators. He imagin'd that such a thing would render him the more suspected, because he was accus'd of a traitorous plot in favour of the King of Denmark; so that no better means could have been thought of to make him appear guilty, than the intercession of that King. This stratagem of Seefeld fell to the ground. The Swedes took no notice of it, and as they were not willing to examine things rigorously after the war was ended, and after the King's death, they declared Ulfeld acquitted. Then his enemy had recourse to another stratagem; he went to Count Brahe, and desired that the Senate's sentence of absolution might not be published, but put into his hands in order to endear himself to his brother-in-law (26). But as soon as he had the sentence in his possession, he made the Chevalier de Terlon (27) and Mr Sidney (28) believe, that the Senate of Sweden had condemn'd Ulfeld, and entreated them to give him immediately notice of it, that he might think of some means to make his escape. The letters which they wrote to him produc'd the effect that Seefeld expected. The prisoner escap'd and went to Copenhagen, where he lost that liberty which he had just recovered (29). Mr Seefeld seems to me to have run a bold rîque; for if these two Ambassadors, whom he deceived, had mentioned what he told them, the Swedish Senators would have known his malicious frauds, and made a noise about it: and consequently he would have lost his reputation. Observe, that it is impossible to reconcile the relations of the Chevalier de Terlon and Mr Puffendorf: one of them is certainly false.

[M] Colonel Wolf.] A modern Historian (30), whom I have already cited, faith, that Colonel Wolf being

(26) Count Ulfeld.

(27) The French Ambassador.

(28) The English Ambassador.

(29) Taken from Puffendorf, in the life of Charles Gustavus, lib. vi. num. 32. See the Acta Eractorum, 1697, pag. 190.

(30) Parival, Tom. iii, pag. 584.

at Dover, and carried to Copenhagen, where they pretended to have discovered a horrible conspiracy, which he had formed against his prince [N]. And accordingly sentence passed against him at Copenhagen, on the twenty-fourth of July 1663, by which, as convicted of high treason, he was condemned to death. The sentence was executed in effigie. They made a waxen figure representing him, which was carried on a sledge to the public place; where the executioner cut off his hand and his head, and divided the body into four quarters, which were carried to the four corners of the city (i). The Count received notice of this at Bruges, and departed the next day for Basil [O], *where he lived four or five months unknown, and almost always sick* (k). He left that place, being informed that search was made after him in order to take him; and tho' very ill, at night he went into a small bark on the Rhine, in order to go to Brisac; but had scarce advanced two leagues before the piercing cold killed him. He was sixty years of age or thereabouts, and left three sons, the eldest of whom turned Roman Catholic, and lived with the Queen of Sweden. The second was a Knight of Malta; and the third, who was one of the handsomest and most learned gentlemen in Europe, lived in England. I have extracted the account of these last facts from an historical novel, intituled, *Le Comte d'Ulfeld*, printed at Paris in the year 1677, and dedicated to the Duke of Montausier, by an author who calls himself *Rouffeau de la Valette*. I might have extracted a thousand curious things from it; but I was afraid of confounding history with romance [P]. I have nevertheless made use of that book in my remarks. For the rest, this Count is frequently mentioned in Charles Ogier's travels [Q].

(i) Parival, Tom. iii.

(k) See the book cited at the end of this article.

The

being in a coach with his wife, Count Ulfeld's son came up to him, and saluted him very courteously, and stabbed him to the heart with a dagger at the instant that he was telling his wife, who it was that had accosted them. The assassin was so fortunate as to escape. The Colonel being governor of the isle of Bornholm, had not so strictly guarded Count Ulfeld, but he found an opportunity to get away; but he was seized just as he was embarking, and closely confined to a prison, very much below a man of his quality (31); and no compassionate regard was had to him, for fear he should once more escape. This was the cause of the hatred which the Count and his family had conceived against the Colonel.

(31) The Historical Novel gives a dismal description of the count's ill treatment, even before he had attempted to make his escape.

[N] *A horrid conspiracy . . . against his Prince.* It has been said that the Elector of Brandenburg acquainted King Frederic III, that Count Ulfeld had wrote to him, *That if he would lend him a vigorous assisting hand, he would dethrone the King and his heirs, and cause the crown to devolve on his head.* For, said he, *I have so many of the Clergy and Laity, who will declare on my side, that it will render this enterprise easy* (32). The sentence of death pronounced against him, mentions their having proofs of this; but this Elector is not therein named.

(32) Pariv. ubi supra.

[O] *Departed for Basil.* According to the small Latin tract, he there pretended to be governor to three Dutch gentlemen, and was not known till one of his sons had a quarrel with a Captain of Zurich. He had his three sons and a daughter with him. His lady was in prison at Copenhagen. When he found himself discovered he embarked on the Rhine alone, and died in the boat in February 1664, not far from Newburg. The watermen carried him to a convent near that place, whither his sons came with the utmost expedition, in order to save the jewels he had about him, and caused him to be buried under a tree in the middle of a field.

[P] *Of confounding History with Romance.* Though the author of the Historical Novel assures us, *That all there is very true, and that he hath written nothing but what he had from the information of the most able and disinterested persons of that country.* I cannot help believing that there are some romantic embellishments in that work. The Countess Eleonora owned that *the account of her life favoured very much of a romance* (33): He who heard her say this, having related something of that History, adds, that this, *with some episodes, might be a very fit subject for a romance* (34). Doubtless, the author of the Historical Novel wrote according to that idea. I will not thoroughly examine the facts, which this author always turns to the advantage of his hero, and sometimes so severely against the person of King Frederic (35), that he, a thousand times more than Sorbiere, deserved the complaints of the Danish Ambassador at the court of France: but I may probably be allowed to take for a romantic thought, that severity sufficient to make the boldest man tremble, with which the Count was looked on when he made

(33) Relat. de Sorbiere, p. 146.

(34) Ibid. pag. 153.

(35) In the Memoirs of the Chevalier de Terlon, some encomiums are bestowed upon that Prince, which are directly contrary to the flanders of the Historical Novel.

his first declaration of love to the Countess Eleonora, to whom, faith the author, *the name of love appeared so shocking, that she formed a dismal idea of it.* I do not make the same judgment of the Count's exclamation, when, born down with misfortune, he cried out, *O GOD! when wilt thou cease to afflict me?* Nature is too visible here, this looks like a true History, whilst the other looks like invention only. The proposal of an under-match, or of a dishonourable love, might have occasioned this terrible menacing severity; but the Count, a person richly endowed with all the perfections of body and mind, and one of the best matches the Countess could ever hope for, courted her with a view to marriage. Whence then could proceed this thundering severity which our author mentions but from a romantic humour? where, and where only, *a declaration of love is followed by an immediate resentment, which appears by our blushes* (it is thus that Moliere makes a precise lady speak) and *which, for a time, banishes the lover from our presence. But at last he finds means to pacify us, and insensibly enures us to the discourse of his tender passion, and extorts from us the consent which we have much ado to give* (36).

[Q] *The Count is frequently mentioned in Charles Ogier's travels.* Charles Ogier, the worthy brother of that great preacher Francis Ogier, travelled to Denmark and Sweden with the Count d'Avaux, Ambassador from Lewis XIII. They left Paris on the eleventh of July in 1634. The relation of this voyage is very curious, and well written. Among other things we find in it that Count Ulfeld being contracted to the daughter of the King, his master, and being afflicted with an ulcer in his thigh, made a very great scruple of approaching a lady of the blood-royal before he was cured. Wherefore he took a journey into France in order to put himself into the hands of an able Chirurgeon, to whom Mr d'Avaux recommended him. *Ulfeldius crure laborabat insanabiliter, ex sententia scilicet omnium suæ nationis Medicorum, qui tamen anno postea, cum se ex consilio Legati nostri Lutetiam contulisset, ab eximio Chirurgo P. Judæo sanatus est. Alter mihi videbatur ille Philoſtates, adeo acutis interdum doloribus cruciatur; alioquin, cum per benigniorum temporum intervalla, vis mali paululum recederat, innitebatur baculo. Cæterum tanta hominis virtus ac dignitas fuit, ut dilectissimam illi Rex Daniæ Filiam Leonoram desponderit: at ille tam eximie puellæ thalamis cruce putridum inferre reveritus, antequam nuptiæ celebrarentur, operæ pretium duxit, si se laboriose curationis carnificinæ, ac periculis devoveret* (37). . . . *Ulfeld had an ulcer in his thigh, which was deemed incurable by all the Physicians of his country. Nevertheless as he went next year to Paris by the advice of our Ambassador, he was there cured by that excellent Chirurgeon P. Judæus. Such was the acuteness of the pains which he now and then suffered, that he seemed to me like another Philoſtates: at other times*

(36) Moliere, in his Précieuses ridicules, Act. I, Sc. iv.

(37) Carol. Ogierius, in Itinere Danico, pag. 679 Edit. Paris. 1656, in 8vo.

(k) Taken from
Sebastian Kortholt,
pag. 2.
de Puellis Poetriis,
Edit. 1700.

The Countess, his widow, died on the sixteenth of March 1698. She could make verses, and she has left a piece, which perhaps will be printed. It is the life of some illustrious women (l).

* times when the violence of the distemper abated, and
* he felt some intervals of ease, he used to walk about
* with the help of a stick. But so great was the virtue
* and merit of the man, that the King of Denmark con-
* tracted his well-beloved daughter Eleonora to him:
* nevertheless he was ashamed to carry a sore leg to such
* a fine lady's bed, and for that reason before the mar-
* riage was celebrated, he thought proper to submit him-
* self to all the painful and dangerous operations of a dif-
* ficult cure.* This was very well done.

ULYSSES, one of the most celebrated Generals of the Grecian army at the siege of Troy. Dr Drelincourt (a) hath imparted to me so many excellent memoirs concerning this hero of the Odyssey [A], that I am extremely sorry I cannot here give them that extensive place which they deserve. And it being better to say nothing on great subjects, than to speak of them by halves (b), I have deferred this article to another time, and am sorry this learned man himself could not enrich the public with this excellent portraiture of Ulysses, as he hath already obliged the world with that of Achilles, of which we have seen three editions.

(a) Professor of
Physic at Leyden.

(b) De Carthagine flere me-
lius puto quam
parum dicere.
Sallustius, de
Bello Jugurthino.

[A] So many excellent Memoirs concerning this hero of the Odyssey. He hath collected whatever hath been said for or against the Prince of Ithaca, and hath very methodically digested it. It is a mixture of erudition and criticisms, which would surprize even those who

are best versed in the antient Greek and Latin authors. Copiousness and exactness, sagacity and method, memory and judgment, shine so brightly in this work, that it is impossible to determine which of these excellencies appear in the greatest lustre.

U L M, in Latin *Ulma*, an Imperial city, and the capital of the Circle of Suabia, is situated upon the Danube, where it begins to be navigable for boats. That name was given to it because of the vast number of elms which grow in its neighbourhood. It is a rich, populous, and trading city, regularly fortified, and embellished with a great many fountains: it's stone bridge over the Danube is extremely beautiful. . . . It was formerly no more than a market-town, which Charlemagne had given to the abbey of Reichenaw, and which Lotharius II afterwards entirely demolished. But the inhabitants of the country settling there again, redeemed at last from the abbey of Reichenaw, by paying a very considerable sum of money, their liberty and their independence, and caused themselves to be matriculated among the Imperial cities (a). . . . The Roman Catholics there are not very numerous, and have only two churches, the Protestants having taken possession of all the rest. The senate is composed of forty-one persons, of whom the two elders, together with the five first, make the Privy-Council, into which the Roman Catholics are not admitted (b). The Elector of Bavaria surprized this town on the eighth of September 1702, by a stratagem that was admirably well executed (c). The citizens having put themselves under arms, and being divided into eighteen companies of two hundred men each, marched on with their colours, and the very women of the city run there like so many priestesses of Bacchus, making weapons of every thing that came in their way; but notwithstanding all this the Bavarian troops still maintained the posts they had taken (d). The Imperialists under the command of General Thungen besieged that place in the month of September 1704. The garrison, after a short and very feeble resistance, capitulated on the eleventh of the said month, and obtained terms that were in all respects favourable and glorious to them. The Dutch Gazeteers, deceived by the news-mongers of the Imperial cities, who generally upon all occasions are very great liars, gave out that after the garrison was come forth in an honourable manner, they were made prisoners of war, and that by way of reprisals for what had been done some weeks before by the Duke of Vendome to the garrison of Verceil in Italy. The falsity of this piece of news came soon to be known; and in truth the two cases were not parallel, since the garrison of Verceil was treated, not contrary to the tenor of the capitulation as the same Gazeteers published, though they afterwards retracted it (e), but precisely according to the articles of the capitulation as it was signed by both parties.

(a) Heiss, History of the Empire, Tom. ii, pag. m. 456.

(b) Id. ibid. See also the *Mercure Galant*, of September 1702, pag. 392, in the *Extraît* of a letter from an officer in the army of the Elector of Bavaria.

(c) See the letter which is in the same volume of the *Mercure Galant*, pag. 395, & seq.

(d) Ibid. pag. 402.

(e) See the *Nouvelles des Cours de l'Europe*, for the month of August 1704, pag. 150, & seq. & pag. 163, & seq.

VOLKELIUS (JOHN) a Socinian Minister (a) born at Grimma in Misnia, was one of the most learned men of that sect. Some letters which Socinus wrote to him are published, the first of which is dated the third of April 1593 (b). He wrote one to him in the year 1596, upon Volkeli's intimating that he did not think Socinus had fully refuted Francis David's arguments (c). He published in the year 1613 an answer (d), and a reply (e), to Smiglecius; but his principal work is that *De vera Religione*, of which a great many copies were burnt at Amsterdam by order of the magistrates, on the twentieth of January 1642 [A]. I have something to offer concerning this fact, which is not exactly represented

(a) Ecclesius Philippovienfis, post Smiglenfis Pastor. Bibl. Antitrinit. p. 96.

(b) Ibid.

(c) Hoornbeek, Apparatu ad Controuers. Socinian. pag. 65.

(d) *Inuicem*, Nodii Gordii à Martino Smiglecio neci Dissolutio.

(e) *Inuicem* Rel-
pocilio ad rem
refutationem dis-
solutionis Nob
representat Gordii.

[A] That *De Vera Religione*, of which a great number of copies were burnt . . . in 1642. It was printed at Racovia in the year 1630, after the author's death. The sect judging it proper that this book should contain a complete system of the Socinian doctrine, and finding it defective in some particulars, appointed Crellius to add as a supplement, a treatise of God

and of the Divine Attributes. Crellius executed this commission; what he wrote made the first part of the work, and is the first of the six books which compose it. Several are of opinion that Socinianism hath not produced any thing more dangerous than this volume, and for that reason doubtless it was, that being reprinted at Amsterdam it was thought very necessary

represented in the book intitled *La Religion des Hollandois*.

- (1) In 1200 Gilders.
- (2) Steph. Curcellæus Epistola ad Ruarum. It is the last will of the first century of Ruarus' letters, p. 407.
- (3) See the sixteenth letter of the first century of Ruarus' letters, pag. 408, 409.
- (4) Ita illo contenti casu (Cæsi, that is, the Sieurs Blæw) ut non facile posthac ejusmodi sint libros excuturi. Idem, pag. 409.
- (5) Ibid. pag. 408.
- (6) Of whom mention is made above, in citat. (31), of the article VIRGIL. See also the *Nouvel de la Rep. des Lettres*, for August 1701, pag. 151, & seq.
- (7) The Italian translator of Mr Stoupp's book has committed here a great fault by suppressing the words, which import that the author had only a suspicion. *A forza di suppicche*, says he, *dello stesso Guglielmo Blæw*.
- (8) Stoupp, Religion des Hollandois, letter iv, dated the 13th of May 1673.
- (9) Jean Brun, Apologie pour la Religion des Hollandois, pag. 216, & seq.
- (10) Id. ibid. pag. 218.

necessary to use it with all the severity of the law. The Scout of Amsterdam seized 450 copies which he found in the Bookseller's hands; and prevailed with the Judges to confiscate them, and fine the Book-feller (1); eight days after which they were publicly burnt (2). Curcellæus having written this news to Ruarus on the eighth of February 1642, informed him on the twelfth of April following, that the new Schepens had annulled the sentence of their predecessors (3), and ordered it to be taken out of the registers; inasmuch, that the Bookfeller who had not yet paid his fine, came off with the loss of his books only. Notwithstanding this, he was so terrified thereby, that it was thought he would not easily be induced to publish any book of that nature again (4). Curcellæus passionately desired that some able person would write against these proceedings of the Schepens of Amsterdam. 'Utinam vestrum aliquis præcepit Scabinorum notrorum judicium vellet expendere, & illos librorum incendiarios peccati sui coarguere. Si quem noveris ei rei idoneum, urge ut aggrediatur (5). - - - I wish that some one among you would strictly examine the rash judgment of our Schepens, and censure those burners of books for the fault they have committed. If you know any person fit for that task, press him to undertake it.'

The two letters of this Remonstrant minister, written openly and in confidence to Ruarus, shew the falsity of Mr Stoupp's conjecture. Read what follows, I cite it from the copy which Mr Des Maizeaux (6) has been pleased to send me, and not as it was in my first edition, where I inserted this passage exactly as Mr Arnauld published it in the forty-sixth page of the second part of his Apology for the Catholics. He hath curtailed and altered several places, and yet makes use of the Italic character, without taking notice of any deficiency: this is not like an exact author. 'The Socinian books were very scarce till a few years past. Those which were published, were printed in very distant places, and in small numbers, so that they could not be got but at a very dear rate, and most of them were not to be come at on any terms. The States-General by their goodness and special favour, and a very particular tenderness of confidence, remedied this inconvenience. To satisfy the Socinians, and those who were willing to embrace their opinions, they gave leave that they should print at Amsterdam, four of their principal authors, viz. Socinus, Crellius, Slichtingius, and Wozogenius. This collection of Socinian writers in eight volumes in folio, is at present publicly sold at Amsterdam for a hundred gilders. It is but a very few years since an inconsiderable part of these books would have cost two hundred pistoles, whereas all of them may be had at present for less than ten. It is indeed true that some time since a Socinian book was burnt at Amsterdam, doubtless (7) at the request of Blæu himself who printed it. A few days after this execution he publicly exposed the same book to sale; and to recommend it to the buyer, and enhance the price, inserted in the title page, that it was the same book which by order of the States, had been burnt by the hands of the common executioner (8).'

Several particulars of this passage deserve to be considered. In the first place, Mr Stoupp ought to have known that the States-General do not meddle with the government of Amsterdam; it does not belong to them to permit or prohibit any thing to the Bookfellers in the province of Holland. II. It is not true either that the States-General, or the States of Holland, permitted the printing of Socinian books. The works of the four principal Divines, whereof Mr Stoupp speaks, were privately printed; of which see the particulars in the Apology for the religion of the Dutch (9). III. It is utterly false that William Blæu solicited the burning of this Socinian book: Curcellæus's two letters clearly prove that the Sieurs Blæw were very sorry for the burning of Volkelius's book; I shall borrow some fresh evidences of this truth, from the author who refuted Mr Stoupp. (10) 'It was not William, but John Blæu who printed it. But how impertinent it is to conjecture that this Blæu entreated the magistrates to burn this book? If only a dozen copies had been burnt, it might be said, that your narrow suspicious soul had some excusable

VOL. V.

pretext for this malicious conjecture: but you ought to know that the officer who had orders to burn this book, seized Mr Blæu at a friend's house, where he then was, and caused him to be guarded by some of his men, whilst he went directly to the ware-house, where he found all the copies, and caused them to be immediately burnt (11). Half a day was entirely spent only in throwing the books into the fire, till the flames had consumed the whole number, which redounded to the great damage of Mr Blæu, besides, he was fined two thousand gilders (12). By this you may judge if it was Blæu who solicited the burning of this book, and whether he could have any great advantage by it.' IV. It is false, that a few days, or any time after this public execution, the same Bookfeller publicly sold this book of Volkelius, and that he inserted in the title, that it was the same book which had been condemned publicly to be burnt by the hands of the common executioner. The person that furnished Mr Stoupp with memoirs confounded the fact, and the whole foundation of this fable was; Volkelius's book was printed in Dutch at Rotterdam in the year 1649, and it was mentioned in the title that the Schepens had ordered it to be burnt in Holland in 1642 (13). The apology for the religion of the Dutch observes that one Colom, and not the Sieurs Blæu, put this in the title; but that this translation was likewise prohibited by the States (14). Marefius observes, that this additional clause in the title was a bait which the secret emissaries of the Socinians laid, to promote the sale of the book: *Quantum prædii in eo reponant clancularii terrime hæreses emissarii & promotores, palam fecerunt ante biennium, illo in Belgicum idioma translato, & quod ad ejus lectionem magis invitarentur homines præposterè curiosi, quibus solenne niti in vetitum semper cupereque negata, præfixo hoc Elogio, quod opus illud esset, in Hollant by Schepen vonnisse gedoemp, openbaerlijck geexecuteert, en met vyer verbrant anno 1642, in Januario (15). The Synods of Holland did not forget this addition to the title, in the remonstrance which I have mentioned in another place (16): they complained that several books were translated into Dutch; and in the last place they quoted Volkelius. 'Denique Crellius de Deo & ejus attributis & Volkelii quinque libri de vera religione: & ad irridendum zelum piorum judicium pro Deo, perver- & solque homines eo magis alliciendum, in frontispicio posuerunt in Hollandia sententia Scabinorum eum librum damnatum & publice combustum esse anno 1642, mense Januario. - - - Lastly, Crellius's book de Deo & ejus Attributis, and Volkelius's five books de Vera Religione: and to ridicule the zeal of pious judges in the cause of GOD, and thereby to entice the more men of perverse dispositions, they took care to have it inserted in the title page, that by the sentence of the Schepen in Holland the said book had been publicly condemned and burnt in the month of January in the year 1642.'*

It is certain that this book of Volkelius was never printed by itself in Latin, after the burning it in the year 1642. But it was printed entire in the *Hydra Socinianismi expugnata*, published at Groningen by Samuel Marefius (17). This orthodox professor intending to refute the Socinian system, was resolved to leave no room to suspect that he had weakened his adversary's arguments. Therefore he published them at large without any omission, and subjoined his refutation in the same pages. By this means his readers had a fair opportunity of comparing Heresy and Orthodoxy, without there being any room left to complain that Heresy was not there expressed in full force and vigour. It must be owned this is the most frank and ingenuous way of answering an adversary. It shews that the author relies on the goodness of his cause, and the strength of his pen: it prevents all suspicions of artifice; and we indeed have reason to be suspicious on this head in many thousands of cases; for it happens but too often that an author unfairly represents the arguments which he designs to confute. He makes as if he had not perceived what he thinks he is not able to refute; and when he cannot avoid mentioning some particulars, he omits some essential terms. In a word, suppose as long as you please that a controversialist acts fairly, you will never be able to persuade the world, that loose passages which he cites out of the piece he refutes, are an impartial representation

6 M

(11) Curcellæus says there was an interval of eight days.

(12) Curcellæus says only 1200.

(13) Bibl. Antitrit. pag. 96.

(14) Jean Brun ubi supra, pag. 219.

(15) Samuel Marefius, *Præfat. Hydre Socinianismi expugnatae*, Tim. i, printed at Groningen in 1651.

(16) In the article SOCINUS (FAUSTUS) remark [L].

(17) The first Tome was published in 1651, the second, in 1654, and the third, which is the last, in 1663.

unfair
Stoupp
represents

tation of the strength of the work, which commonly consists in the connexion of it's parts. Wherefore Marefius took the most proper measures in the world by inserting in his answer the whole book which was burned. He silenced the heretical boasters, and deprived them for the pretext of reproaching the true Church with mean shifts, or insulting the orthodox, as men who not daring to look their enemies in the face, and knowing themselves unable to make head against them, implored the assistance of the secular power, to burn by a sentence of the magistrates a book whose objections they could not overthrow. Some satirical wits have ventured to say, that this Professor took this method only in compliance to the Book-feller, who positively insisted upon it, from an opinion that the text of Volkelius would make any refutation whatsoever fell. This is a malicious falsity. And it is infinitely more reasonable to acquiesce in the reasons which the author himself alleges. 'Mihi autem, *scilicet* be (18), vitio verti non debet quod textum integrum libri nefarii curarum recedendum. Cum enim supprimi per hominum curiositatem & malitiam nequeat, nec in eo voti sui compos existerit Amplif. Magistratus Amstelodamensis, malui illum integrum sistere Lectori, ne crederet suffragari velle victoriam, quod nolebat Alexander, & data opera delumbare atque extenuare Adversarii mei argumenta; Ubi Lector ipsam Bestiam sua verba respondentem audierit, (ut hic adhibeam dictum Aeschini de oratione Demosthenis in re habita, relatum Hieronymo Epist. ad Paul. de lib. Divino cap. 2.) & simul nostras ad illam censuras & Annotationes ἀντιμαχίας expendit, facilius de totius Cause natura & merito iudicabit. Opposita sibi mutuo apposita magis eluceant. Et sicut vinum dulcius est quod prope mandragoras crescit, & suavius olent lilia & rosæ quæ juxta cæpas & allia carpuntur, sic ex hac antithesi plus accedet suaveolentia illi veritatis Cause quam suscepi propugnandam. Ita videntur Lectores nihil nos meture nobis ab istorum hominum strophis & cavillationibus, quandoquidem eas integras, omnibusque suis vestitis coloribus, proponimus & expendimus, consiliu bonitati nostræ causæ, & quod eorum Sententias prodidisse superasse est, ut loquitur Hieronymus ad Ctesiph. --- It ought not to be charged upon me as a fault that I have taken care to publish the entire text of a wicked book. For as it could not be suppressed, by reason of the curiosity or malice of mankind, and since the magistrates of Amsterdam could not succeed in that design, I rather chose to present it entire to the reader; that it might not seem as if I desired to steal a victory (which Alexander scorned to do), or took pains to weaken and extenuate my adversary's arguments. But when the reader shall hear the beast himself bellowing out his own words, (if I may be allowed to apply here what Aeschines said touching a speech which Demosthenes had pronounced against him, as the thing is related by St Jerom) and shall at the same time weigh the censures that we pass upon him and our wholesome remarks, he will be the better able to judge of the merit and nature of the whole cause. Opposite things are the more clearly discerned for being set by one another. For as that wine is sweeter which grows near mandrakes, and as those lilies and roses have a more fragrant smell which are gathered in the neighbourhood of onions and garlic, so this opposition will give an additional flavour to the cause of truth, which I have undertaken to defend. Thus the reader will perceive that we are not in the least afraid of the quirks and cavils of those men, since we represent and consider them entire and dressed in their own colours; trusting to the goodness of our cause, and for that, as St Jerom says to Ctesiphon, in order to confute their opinions, it is sufficient to shew them as they are.' He adds, that he herein imitated Francis Junius (19), Sibrandus Lubbertus (20), Paul Tarnovius (21), John Junius (22), Alstedius (23), and Bitterfeldius, son-in-law to Alstedius (24). He represents in his Preface to the second tome, that he would not be sorry if the magistrates should make use of an answer different from his, that is, burn the Socinian system. And as he praises the pious zeal of the English, who condemned

the Catechism of this sect to the flames (25); so he complains of the toleration which Cromwell allowed these Heretics. He bewails with tears of blood the confusion of England, which was become their metropolis (26), and that a Catechism, containing all their blasphemies, was suffered to be printed at London. Maref. Pref. 'Modo enim ex Anglia allatus est Anglicæ linguæ confcriptus Catechismus duplex, major & minor, Londini publice excusus hoc anno 1654, apud J. Cottrel pro Rich. Moore, ad insignem septem stellarum, in Cæmeterio Paulino, auctore Johanne Beddle, five Biddello, Magistro Artium Oxoniensi, editus, ut præ se fert, in eorum gratiam qui merè Christiani nullique sectæ addicti esse volunt. (quamvis nequeant se tales profiteri, quin eo ipso sectam specialem ab aliis omnibus discretam constituent,) & omnes Socinianismi impietates ac blasphemias continet, erudat, propugnat (27). --- There are just come from England two Catechisms, viz. a larger and a smaller one, written in the English language, and publicly printed at London this very year 1654, by James Cottrel for Richard Moore, at the seven Stars in Paul's Church-yard. The author is one John Biddle, a Master of Arts, of the university of Oxford. He pretends that they are composed for their sakes, who would be mere Christians, and not of this or that sect (although they cannot profess themselves to be such, without setting up a particular sect of their own, distinct from all others). These Catechisms contain, propagate, and defend, all the impieties and blasphemies of the Socinians. Having answered Volkelius's book paragraph by paragraph, he might have laughed at those sectaries, if they had alledged against him the reflexions which Arnobius made on the request of the idolaters, that the Senate would prohibit some books of Cicero (28), in which the vanity of their false gods was demonstrated. Re-fute them, saith Arnobius, if they contain any impieties, for to forbid the reading of them, is not to maintain the cause of the gods, but to be afraid of the evidence of truth. 'Cum sciam esse non paucos qui verentur & fugiant libros de hoc ejus, (Ciceronis) nec in aurim velint admittere lectionem opinionum suarum præsumpta vincentem? cumque alios audiam mustitare indignanter, & dicere: oportere statui per Senatum, aboleantur ut hæc scripta, quibus Christiana religio comprobetur, & vetustatis opprimatur auctoritas? Quinimo si fidiis exploratum vos dicere quicquam de Diis vestris, erroris convincite Ciceronem, temeraria & impia distat resellite, redarguite, comprobate. Nam interciperi scripta, & publicatam velle submergere lectionem, non est Deus defendere, sed veritatis testimonium timere. (29). It is certain that Socinus took advantage of his adversaries forbidding the reading of his writings (30).

It must not be forgot that the English complained of Marefius's accusing their nation, of favouring Socinianism, and of their country's becoming it's metropolis. Read the following passage of John Owen, Doctor of Divinity and Vice-Chancellor of the university of Oxford: 'Ille (Marefius) universam gentem nostram, ejusque Gubernatores Socinianismi accusat, & qui viri mos est, horrendos clamores excitat, affirmans hæresin ibi sedem Metropolitancam fixisse, &c. De temeritate hujus censuræ & de impendia ejus ignorantia in statu rerum apud nos gestarum, quas tamen referre, judicare, & condemnare præsumit, scripsi ad ipsum epistolam (31). --- This Marefius accuses our whole nation, and those who govern it, of Socinianism, and, as the manner of the man is, he raises a horrid clamour, affirming that Heresy has fixed her metropolitan seat here. But I have written a letter, wherein I represent to him the rashness of this censure, and his stupid ignorance of our affairs, which he nevertheless presumes to relate, judge of, & condemn.' Mr Daille made use of this complaint of Dr Owen, when he writ against Marefius. Marefius answered, that he never received this doctor's letter, and that he was very well pleased to hear that things were not in that state in England that they had been (32). This he tells us in a Preface written in April 1658. But it is to be observed, that the Preface to the second tome of the *Anti-Volkelius* is dated the 12th of August 1654.

V O L S I U S (PAUL) Abbot of the monastery of Haugshofen (a), of the order of the Benedictines near Schlestadt in Alsatia, lived in the XVth century. He had a great deal of merit, and was highly praised by Erasmus (b) who dedicated to him in the year 1518 the new edition of his *Enchiridion Militis Christiani*. At length he accomplished his

(18) Marefius, Prefat. Vol. i. Hydræ Socinianismi expugnator, fol. 2.

(19) In his De-fensio Catholica.

(20) In the refutation of Faust Socinus's book De Christo Secutore.

(21) In the refutation of the same Socinus's book contra Bullarum & Wickham.

(22) In the refutation of the same Socinus's Praelectiones.

(23) In the refutation of the Catechism of Raccovia.

(24) In the refutation of Crelius's book de uno Deo & patre.

(a) Erasmus expresses this word in Latin by Hugonis Curia.

(b) See the seventh letter of the first book of Erasmus, p. 81.

(c) See the xxiid letter of xiiith book of Erasmus, and the xliid of the xviith.

his design of throwing aside the Monkish habit, and renouncing Popery (c). He embraced the sect of the Anabaptists; but being converted by Calvin about the year 1539, he was Minister of the Church of Straßburg to the day of his death (d).

(d) Beza, Preface to the Commentary of Calvin upon Joshua, pag. m. 11.

VORSTIUS (CONRAD) was born at Cologne on the nineteenth of July 1569. His father who was a Dyer, had not yet left the Church of Rome; wherefore he caused him to be baptized at his parish church. Soon after he privately joined with the Protestant Church, to which he brought over his wife. They had ten children, and designed this Conrad for a scholar. He learned Grammar, and a little Rhetoric at the village of Bedberdyk, where he staid five years, after which he went to Düsseldorf in the year 1583, where he continued his school studies, till 1586. He spent the following year at Cologne in Saint Laurence's College, where he learned several things. Two reasons prevented his taking the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy [A], and interrupted his studies. The poverty of the family induced them to breed him a merchant. He spent two years in learning what might be useful to him in trade, as Arithmetic and Italian languages. Afterwards he returned to his studies, and was sent to Herborn in the year 1589. Where Piscator had read Divinity three years. Vorstius studied under him with great success, and applied himself to the instruction of some children of quality. With some of these he went to Heidelberg in March 1593, where he was created Doctor of Divinity in July 1594. A year after he went to visit the academies of Swisserland [B], and that of Geneva. He read Theological lectures in the latter, at the instigation of Theodore Beza, and acquitted himself so well that he was offered a professor's chair there; which he would not accept, some reasons inducing him to return home, for he was offered to be Divinity Professor at Steinfurt (a). The letter of invitation was delivered to him at Geneva in February 1596. He accepted that preferment, and discharged the functions of it in a manner which made him very famous, and courted by other academies [C]. In the year 1605, besides his professorship, he was made Minister of Steinfurt: and as if those two places had not been sufficient to employ him, he had other preferments bestowed on him, whereby, as it was but reasonable, his salary was increased (b). He was invited to Leyden to succeed Arminius in the year 1610, and after a year's consideration

Synodus & visitationibus Ecclesiarum. In quorum onerum solutium extraordinarium ei stipendium constitutum. - - - He had likewise other places conferred upon him by the generous Count of Bentheim. For he together with two counsellors and a court minister was appointed to preside at the trial and decision of matrimonial causes and disputes, and at the examination of young clergymen, and lastly, in synods, and at the visitation of churches. And as a recompence for these painful employments, he was allowed an extraordinary salary. Marcus Gualter, ubi infra, citat. (c).

(a) At that time the Count of Bentheim founded an illustrious school in that town.

(b) Aliis quoque muneribus a generoso Dn. Comite (Bentheim) auctus est. Cum duobus enim Confilariis & Ministro aulico cognitioni ac iudiciis causarum & questionum matrimonialium praefectus est; tum examini novitiorum Ministrorum, denique

[A] Two reasons prevented his taking the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy. One was, that he would not betray his conscience, by swearing that he would submit to the decisions of the Council of Trent, the other was, that they designed to withdraw him from his studies in order to breed him a Merchant, by reason of the ill posture of the affairs of his family. *Instabat tempus promotionis ejusdem ad Baccalaureatum, & magistrum philosophiae, sed quae fieri non poterat nisi pro more solemmiter juraret in decreta Concilii Tridentini: itaque honorem illum licet ejus potiri posset & forte vellet, tamen cum & conscientia propter illud juramentum obstarat, & jam parvum res magis ac magis inclinarent, repudiavit, & deliberatum est de studiis ipsius abruptendis, ipsoque mercaturae addicendo (1).*

(1) Marcus Gualtherus in Oratione de vita & obitu Conradi Vorstii.

(2) See Marcus Gualtherus, ibid. I cannot note the pages; for the Printer has not numbered them.

(3) Id. ibid. pag. 13.

[B] He went to visit the academies of Swisserland. He twice maintained public theses at Basil (2); 1. *De Sacramentis. 2. De Causis salutis.* He was preparing a third disputation against Socinus, *de Christo Salvatore*; but hastening his journey he did not finish this piece. He left the original with Grynaeus, and received it back again when he returned by Basil. The first work ascribed to him is a collection of these sort of theses containing above twenty, defended at several times, beginning with the year 1594. He places first in this collection, his thesis *de Sancta Trinitate, hoc est, de Deo Patre, Filio, & Spiritu sancto*, and the thesis *de Persona & Officio Christi*; which he some time after made use of as an apology against those who accused him of Socinianism in these two points; for to stop the mouth of calumniators, he reprinted these two theses apart in 1612. *Quas postmodum Apologiae vicem esse voluit, cum maligne quidam Tribunitii sententiae ipsam traducere inciperent, quasi haeretice de duobus illis capitibus sententiam aut docerent. Ideoque anno 1612 denuo & seorsim excudi curavit, ad os calumniae obturandum (3).* We shall find by the following remarks that he was soon suspected of that Heresy.

[C] He discharged his functions in a manner which made him courted by other Academies. Mr du Pleffis Mornai, and the Church of Samur, wrote to him in July 1602, and desired him to accept the Theological professor's chair in the Academy which they had newly erected in that place. Vorstius gave no positive answer: but the Count of Bentheim being resolved at any rate to keep him, answered Mr du Pleffis, and the affair stopped there. In the year 1606, Maurice Landgrave of Hesse offered Vorstius the place of Divi-

nity professor at Marburg (4); and after having several times written to him, he sent a coach and a trumpet for him, that the Professor might make his journey in a manner that should be both convenient and honourable. *Missa praeter diversas literas singularis honoris causa tubicines & rheda qua illuc veheretur (5).* The Count of Bentheim would not give leave for his departure; Vorstius's relations desired him not to remove; so that this invitation proved as ineffectual as that of Saul mur. If the call to Leyden had succeeded no better, it is very probable that Vorstius had died with an orthodox character; for it ought to be observed that the suspicions raised against him before the year 1599, were sufficiently quashed by his conduct in the Palatinate. And, in effect, Mr du Pleffis Mornai would not have desired to have him at Saumur, if he had not been thoroughly convinced of his innocence: nor could he be ignorant of what was done at Heidelberg. The Count of Bentheim being informed that his Divinity was suspected, desired to have that affair cleared up; and therefore he ordered Vorstius to go immediately and purge himself of that accusation at the university which had created him doctor, and convince them of his orthodoxy. Vorstius accordingly went to Heidelberg, where he gave an account of his faith, and returned home perfectly justified (6). The faculty of Divinity admitted him *ad osculum pacis*, - - - to the kiss of peace, and gave him *testamentum hospitalitatis*, - - - the token of hospitality, having told him that he was to blame for advancing certain assertions which favoured the Socinians, and having made him promise, that for the future he would abstain from the use of any suspicious expressions. He was also obliged to protest that he abhorred Socinus's opinions, and that he was very sorry that the heat of youth had drawn him into expressions which seemed to favour that Heretic, and shock the doctrine of the Reformed Churches. *Testetur etiam sibi dolere quod impetu juvenili abreptus nonnulla scripserit & sparserit quae Socini erroribus favere, doctrinaeque Ecclesiarum reformatarum, in quam juravit in sua promotione ad Doctoratum, adversari videbantur (7).* This happened on the twenty-sixth of September 1599. The instrument drawn up on that occasion is to be found in the life of David Pareus: where you will find likewise the following relation, which will not be disagreeable to those who are fond of being acquainted with a great many particulars concerning

(4) Ibid. pag. E 3.

(5) Ib. verso.

(6) See Vorstius's letter to the Divines of Heidelberg, among those of the Arminians, p. 46, of the edition in folio.

(7) Vide David. Parei Vitam. pag. m. 59.

consideration he accepted that employment [D], and with his family removed to Leyden, carrying with him the most authentic testimonials of orthodoxy [E], and of a good as well as prudent conduct; but he met with insurmountable difficulties. The ministers who maintained the old doctrine of Calvin in opposition to the Arminians, were persuaded that if Vorstius, who was not of their opinion, should be professor of Divinity at Leyden, he would do an irreparable injury to their cause. Wherefore they warmly represented the

concerning the lives of learned men. 'Non ita pridem supremos in S. Theologia honores, five Doctorum Facultas Theologica contulerat Viro Clarissimo Domino CONRADO VORSTIO Colonienſi, qui poſtea à D. PAREO ob fingularem eruditionem, diſputandi acumen, & docendi ſapientiam, commendatus fuit ad Profeſſionem Theologicam in nova Schola Steinfurtenſi, Illuſtri & Generoſo Comiti D. ARNOLDO, Comiti in Bentheim, &c. In qua cum aliquandiu Orthodoxam doctrinam cum magna laude propoſuiſſet, abreptus tandem ingenii εγχειρίδια, aut καὶνοδοξία docendi, animum applicuit ad lectionem nefarii libri FAUSTI SOCINI de Servatore: immo & authoris amicitiam affectavit ac coluit. Hinc cothurnos corrumpendi receptam doctrinam, de lytro & ſatisfactione JESU-CHRISTI, ſubdole excogitavit, quos & Diſputationibus tam publicis quam privatis in Schola habitis addebat, tanquam ὕψιστον venenum nonnunquam inſperſit, ac juventutem non parum turbavit. Sed fraus diu latere non potuit ſagaciores Theologos, qui fermentum illud odorati, magno conatu & zelo hominem monuerunt, ut reſpiceret: juxta illud: *Retundat me juſtus: benignitas erit: & corripiat me: unguentum erit præſantiſſimum.* Quin & ipſe Generoſus Dn. Comes, admonitus à viris gravibus, Doctorem ſuum ſerio hortatus fuit, ut in gratiam rediret cum Eccleſiis & fratribus, quos ſua καὶνοδοξία magno totius Eccleſiæ ſcandalo non ceſſaret offendere: nec ante ad munus docendi in ſua ſchola rediret, quàm Teſtimonium Ὁρθοδοξίας auferret, ab iſi præſertim, qui publicam docendi facultatem in Academiis ei fuiſſent largiti (8). - - - Not long before the faculty of Divinity had conferred the higheſt honours, viz. the degree of Doctor on the famous CONRAD VORSTIUS of Cologne. He was afterwards on account of his ſingular erudition, acuteness in diſputing, and perſpicuity in teaching, recommended by DAVID PAREWS to that noble Lord ARNOLD Count of Bentheim, in order that he ſhould make him Profeſſor of Divinity in the illuſtrious ſchool newly erected at Steinfurt. For ſome time that he taught there he was in high reputation for his orthodoxy, but at laſt being hurried away by the ſubtlety of his genius, or by a deſire of teaching a new doctrine, he ſell a reading that impious book of FAUSTUS SOCINUS de Servatore: nay he did more, for he courted and cultivated the author's friendſhip. From that time he cunningly beſought himſelf of the means to corrupt the received doctrine concerning the propitiatory ſatiſfaction of JESUS CHRIST, and both in his private and public diſputations he did now and then mix the hidden poiſon, and not a little corrupt the youthful ſtudents. This fraud could not long eſcape the notice of judicious Divines, who diſcovering the leaven did with great zeal and earneſtneſs admoniſh him to repent: according to that ſaying; Let the righteous man ſmite me; it ſhall be a kindneſs: let him reprove me; it ſhall be as a moſt precious ointment. Nay the noble Count abovementioned, being informed of it by ſome conſiderable perſons, did ſeriously adviſe his Divine to return into favour with the churches and his brethren, whom he did not ceaſe to offend with his new opinions to the great ſcandal of the whole church. He likewiſe exhorted him not to reſume his office of teaching till ſuch time as he had obtained a teſtimonial of orthodoxy, particularly from thoſe perſons who had conferred on him the privilege of teaching publicly in academies.'

[D] After one year's conſideration he accepted that employment. Nothing was wanting in this invitation: it had been approved by the States of Holland, and by Prince Maurice, who alſo ordered the deputies, one of which was his own miniſter, to preſs Vorſtius to the utmoſt, to come and ſerve the univerſity of Leyden. Adeo quidem benigne, ut illuſtriſſi Principi reverendum virum D. Joannem Wienbogaardum (it was his miniſter) una cum viro clariff. Dn. Nicolao Zeſſio Synodice Leydenſi, cum mandatis mitteret, ut hortaretur quantum poſſet Dominum Vorſtium, ne petitionem ac vocatio-

nem hanc Ordinum & Curatorum fruſtraneam eſſe vellet (9). But I believe without the earneſt and preſſing ſolicitations of the Arminians, Vorſtius had never embarked in that boiſterous ſea. He was beloved and honoured at Steinfurt, he there enjoyed a perfect eaſe, and had a very great reputation, and as the ſtate of the controverſies betwixt Arminius and Gomarus then was, he doubtleſs foreſaw the many oppoſitions which he was like to meet with in Holland. They tempted him, if I am not miſtaken, with the glory of ſupporting a party, which the death of Arminius had weakened. To this were added the motives drawn from conſcience: it was repreſented to him that he would one day be obliged to anſwer for the ill uſe of his talents, if the love of eaſe made him loſe ſuch a favourable opportunity of eſtabliſhing the truth where it had already taken root. However that be, it was his ill ſtars made him leave the county of Bentheim, and remove to Holland, where being toſſed betwixt a thouſand ſhoals and rocks, he at laſt was miſerably ſhipwrecked, and loſt both his reputation and fortune, being branded with diſhonour both by the ſecular and eccleſiaſtical tribunals. This was a good argument againſt Arminianiſm; this was what would oblige one to acknowledge the fatality of events. His panegyriſt affords me this thought. 'Vir optimus, ſaith he (10), jam litium Theologicarum quæ in Belgio inter Eccleſiaſticos exortæ erant, gnarus & ob eas non temere tam duram provinciam capiendæ ratus, non quidem prorſus quod offerebatur repudiavit, fed toto nihilominus pene anno aſſenſum ſuſpendit. Idque eo magis quod tenſo ac tenaci quodam germaniſimæ benevolentie vinculo alligatus à ſuis ægerime avelli poſſet, certatim contra adnitentibus omnibus ut decus illud ſcholæ novellæ retineretur: ſed currebant jam propinqua viri FATA, quæ ipſum quoque communi & immeritæ cladi involvendum DESTINAVERANT.' If Vorſtius had continued quiet at Steinfurt, the errors of his treatiſe de Deo had not ſignified much, and he had eaſily recovered that falſe ſtep: but the queſtion being whether he ſhould teach Theology at Leyden or not, that is, whether one growing party ſhould ſupplant the other, nothing was pardoned in him; his treatiſe de Deo grew worſe than the Alcoran. This parallel is not of my invention; I find it in the author juſt now cited. 'Reipſa comperimus, ſaith he (11), vehementius & acerbius librum iſtum opugnante quam unquam quiſquam Chriſtianorum Mahumedis Alcoranum, aut recutitorum Talmudica deliria invaſit. Neque unquam Lucianus, Porphyrius, Julianus, Libanius aut quiſquis ſimili in Chriſtianos maledicentia fuit, tam crude & barbære exceptus à veteribus ſcriptoribus, qui tamen etiam habebant acetum in pectore, atque hic Noſter ab infrunitis adverſariis ſuis male multatus ob ſerium & ſolidum illud ſcriptum. - - - In effect, we found that this book was more violently attacked than ever the Alcoran of Mahomet, or the nonſenſical notions in the Jewiſh Talmud had been by any Chriſtian. Nor were Lucian, Porphyry, Julian, Libanius, and the like ſcurrilous writers againſt Chriſtianity, ſo cruelly and barbarouſly handled by the Fathers, who by the by did not want their own ſhare of gall, as this Vorſtius has been ill treated by his injudicious adverſaries, on account of that grave and ſolid performance.' We ſhall ſee in the remark [O] the prejudice which the Arminians did their cauſe by calling in Vorſtius.

[E] The moſt authentic teſtimonials of orthodoxy. In his Hiſtory we have the teſtimonial which the Counts of Bentheim gave him, and that with which the illuſtrious ſchool of Steinfurt preſented him. I ſhall only cite a very ſmall part of the elogies which thoſe teſtimonials beſtow upon him (12). 'Poſt exceſſum nominati pientiffimi Domini parentis noſtri hæctenus fidelem ipſius operam, vitam irreprehenſibilem, Chriſtianam & puram doctrinam atque institutionem, & inde conſecutam propagationem & ædificationem Eccleſiæ & Scholæ reipſa experti ſumus. - - - After the

(8) Philippi. Pareus, in Vita David. Parei, pag. m. 55. 56.

Arminian's fate & destiny

(11) Ibid. fol. M. 2.

(12) Ibid. fol. P.

tius (14) But if this
en, wretched Vor-
in stius should deny
or use any equi-

the States, earnestly exhorting them to banish that man, though at the same time he should deny the errors laid to his charge; for if he owned, and was convicted of them, his Majesty did not doubt in the least, but that he ought to be burnt (14). He declares, that if vigorous attempts are not made in order to extirpate this growing Atheism, he will publicly protest against those abominations, and separate himself from the union of such false and heretical churches, and as defender of the Faith, he will exhort all other Reformed Churches to take a general resolution, in order to extinguish, and send back to hell those abominable heresies lately sprung up, and particularly he will forbid any of his subjects to frequent such an infectious place as the university of Leyden.

den. Vorlius was intalled at Leyden before the letter of King James was delivered to the States. Wherefore the English Envoy, when he presented it, made a very vehement speech against his installation, and threatened the United-Provinces with the enmity of the King, his master, if they tolerated Vorlius. He was answered, that this Professor had received orders to desist from the exercise of his function, till he had answered the accusations against him: and that this affair would be examined before the States of Holland in February next. The Ambassador very little satisfied with this answer, made another speech to protest against those proceedings, and threatened the States not only with the enmity, but also with the pen of King James (15). He was answered as before, and told that the States were certain that his Majesty would be content with the proceedings of the States of Holland. Notwithstanding this answer that Prince published a book, in which he gave the world an account of his conduct, and the reasons of it, and very zealously argued against Vorlius; Vorlius published a short answer to the extracts which that monarch had communicated to the States out of the book *de Deo*. This he dedicated to the States, on the fifteenth of December 1611. It is written with all due deference and respect to King James.

(15) He will make it appear by the manifesto he intends to publish how much he abhors and detests the Atheism and Heresies of Vortius, and all those who maintain them. In the *Mercur* François, *ibid.* pag. 468.

(17) See the remark [K].

the famous conference of the Hague (18) propofed their grievances againſt Vorſtius on the twenty-ninth of April 1611. They accuſed him of ſeveral Socinian doctrines, and maintained that his book de *Deo*, favoured more of an Atheiſt than of a Divine. The States ordered them to make good their accusations againſt Vorſtius to his face in their preſence, and Vorſtius to defend his own cauſe. This was done in preſence of fix Miniſters whom each party had deputed, and of the Curators of the univerſity of Leyden: and after Vorſtius had been heard, the States determined that there was no reaſon why his call to the Profeſſorſhip ſhould not take place in it's full extent (19). So that though the Contra remonſtrant-Miniſters rejected his

(18) Compoſed of fix Calviniſts, and as many Arminian miniſters.

(19) See the *hypoſtenuſed*, Pacificatorum diſſecti Belgii, per Solomonem Theodorum, pag. 614 & ſeq.

6 N

answers.

in order to expect elsewhere a definitive sentence concerning this dispute. He retired to Tergou about May 1612, where he lived quiet [H] till the year 1619, when he was forced to leave Holland: for the Synod of Dort having declared him unworthy of the Professor's chair [I], the States of the Province deprived him of that employment, and condemned him to a perpetual banishment. I do not certainly know where he went; but

answers, Vorstius had triumphed, if an unhappy accident had not come in the way: this is the second thing the Historian ought to have related. Some of Vorstius's disciples published, in Friesland, a small tract *de officio Christiani hominis*, containing several Antitrinitarian doctrines. This tract was publickly burnt: Some of those who caused it to be printed were discovered, and some letters were found upon them which were published, containing a great many encomiums on Vorstius, and several suspicious things relating to several other Divines. Those who published these letters added a warning to all Reformed Churches to give them an alarm. They canvassed all Vorstius's books, what he had dictated, and his manuscripts, in order to find matter to charge him with. The States of Friesland informed those of Holland and the Curators of the university of Leyden of all this. It was therefore necessary that Vorstius should solemnly clear himself, and declare, that though he had wrote sometimes to the Polish Socinians, he was very far from being of their opinion; and that whatever he did was only to inform himself better of their opinions, and that he did the same thing with respect to the Jesuits, to whom he never scrupled to write. He delivered the profession of his faith signed by himself, concerning the mystery of the Trinity, and the divinity of CHRIST; and on the twenty-second of May 1612, he pronounced an apologetical oration before the States of Holland (20). We shall see, below, that all this engaged him to publish several books.

[H] He lived quiet at Tergou.] This appears by the testimonial of the magistrates of that city, dated on the 20th of July 1619, which certifies, that for the space of seven years and three months that he lived there, he behaved himself like an honest and good man (21). His Historian producing this certificate, observes, that the magistrates who gave it, were of the modern establishment, that is, very averse to the Arminians. Let us here observe two faults of which Paul Freherus is guilty. He saith (22), that Vorstius being removed to Holland, and finding the troubles there increase every day, gave over acting as Professor, and retired to Steinfurt, till the magistrates decided the difference. This is his first error; for Tergou, and not Steinfurt, was the place of retreat which he chose. Freherus adds, that because Vorstius succeeded Arminius, he had great disputes with Gomarus. This is another mistake; for it implies, that besides, and after the differences which obliged Vorstius to retire, he had some particular quarrels with Gomarus. But this is false in two respects: for he had no difference with Gomarus, who retired into Zeland, because he would not have him for his colleague (23); and if there had been any disputes betwixt them, they must doubtless have been the same which forced him to retire to Tergou.

[I] The Synod of Dort having declared him unworthy of the Professor's chair.] His Historian odiously exaggerates this circumstance; he tells us, that they condemned Vorstius without any regard to his petition to be heard, before he was sentenced. And there is so much rancour and ill language in this part of his history, that I am not willing to soil my paper with it; and shall cite only what is a meer narrative, or what is so closely connected with it, that to omit it would make all the rest obscure. And if I cite any disagreeable expressions, they shall be those which have the least harshness. 'Procurante . . . Bogermanno effectum est ut Vorstius absens inauditusque condemnatus & professoris titulo ac honore indignus declaratus sit . . . ut cujus doctrina in Ecclesiis & Scholis reformatis nequaquam toleranda, sed cum detestatione penitus eliminanda atque extirpanda esset. Non obstant quod tam serio rogatu per literas ambierit ut Synodus ipsum audire, errorum ac hæresum (quas clamabant) legitimè ac liquè ex verbo Dei convincere, & Christiana lenitate rectora docere vellet. Cuius equidem iudicii ac sententiæ damnatoris, quam nihil aliud quam crassa invidia confavit, & Vorstii ad ceterum istum epistolæ satis serie

& proluxæ, si vel minimam adhuc honesti sanguinis guttam habent, sacro sancti scilicet Concilii illius togatos patres æternum pudere debet. Maxime cum tam probas colloqui conditiones, itemque alia pro veritate adversus hæreticos præstanda offerret. Sed viri hujus linguam ac legitimam cum eo disputationem pejus isti lucifugæ formidabant, quam fullo ululam. . . . As the solicitation . . . of Bogermannus, Vorstius being absent and unheard was condemned, and declared unworthy of the title and dignity of Professor . . . as a man whose doctrine was by no means to be tolerated in the Reformed churches and schools, but deserved to be rooted up and cast out with abhorrence. This was done to him notwithstanding his having earnestly begged in his letters that the Synod would bear him, correct him of those errors and heresies, which they raised such a clamour about, fairly and clearly from the word of GOD, and set him right with such meekness as became Christians. If they have the least spark of honesty left, the reverend Fathers of that most holy Council ought ever to blush when they reflect upon their judgment and sentence of condemnation, proceeding from nothing else but rank envy, and upon the long and serious epistles which Vorstius sent to their assembly: especially since he offered such reasonable conditions for a conference, and to come into other measures that were necessary for the support of truth against Heretics. But these sons of darkness feared this man's tongue, and the having a fair dispute with him, more than an owl dreads the light.' Thus Vorstius's friends accounted it a glorious thing for him that the Synod would not hear his defence: they pretended that the Synod was terribly afraid of his great ability, of the force of his eloquence, and of the weight of his reasons; in short, that they feared to be overcome in a dispute. But now let us see what this Historian saith concerning the sentence of the States of the Province. 'Post hunc sacri fulminis fragorem, alia Vorstium & immitior tempestas, quod necessum erat, excepit. Mox enim à promulgata Flaminum sententia in suffragium eunt Senatus populi Belgarum, & de capite innoxii Vorstii statuunt in hunc modum. 'Juxta sententiam venerande Synodi Dordracenæ Vorstius functionibus suis in Academia Leydensi movetur, salariumque suum deinceps ibidem ei procedere vetatur. Præterea Hollandia & Westfrisia ei interdicitur, illaque infra sex septimanas excedere jubetur, & in eam non redire sub pæna arbitraria illi, ut perturbatori publicæ pacis, irroganda. Scilicet quia judicatum est ejus in isto tractu commorationem Reip. damnosam esse. . . . After the violent crack of this sacred thunderbolt, another and a more severe storm must necessarily fall upon Vorstius. For immediately after the sentence of the worthy Clergy was published, the States of Holland came to a resolution, and passed judgment upon the innocent Vorstius in the following manner: According to the sentence of the venerable Synod of Dort, Vorstius is removed from his office in the university of Leyden, and thenceforward deprived of his salary. He is likewise banished out of Holland and West-Friesland, and ordered to depart from the former within six weeks, and not to return to it under the penalty of undergoing, as a disturber of the public peace, what punishment shall be thought proper to be inflicted upon him; and that because his further stay in this country is judged detrimental to the Commonwealth.'

Some persons having told me, that I ought to cite the express terms of the synodical condemnation of Vorstius, I shall here insert part of it. 'The High and Mighty States-General, having by their noble and honourable Deputies, enjoined this Synod to declare summarily their opinion concerning the Theology or Doctrine contained in the writings of Conrad Vorstius, Doctor of Divinity; and likewise whether it may be safely taught, to the edification and advantage of the Reformed Churches, or whether the toleration of it can consist with true piety: this venerable Synod, after having, in the fear of God, well and duly considered and examined all things, hath, and doth unanimously by these presents

(20) Ex eodem Pacificatorio Belgii diffusi, pag. 64, & seq.

(21) Sæpe in omni conversatione & actionibus gesserit honeste, probe, modeste, & ad exemplum, nec quicquam nisi aliud quod ad mores & vitam ejus attinet observaverimus. Apud Marcum Gualtherum.

(22) Theatr. Virorum illustrium, pag. 163.

(23) See the Life of Gomarus among those of the Professors of Groningen, pag. 77.

but he continued concealed for the space of two years, and his life was more than once in danger [K], there being several persons who, transported by a furious zeal, thought that a man of his character ought not to be suffered to live. At last a Duke of Holstein having received the scattered remnants of the Arminians, and assigned them a place in his dominions, in order to build a town, Vorstius found some security and repose: for he retired into that country in June 1622. But he fell sick shortly after, and died at Tonningen on the twenty-ninth of September following. He discovered very signal marks of a pious resignation to the Divine will in his last moments; and we are told that he was always very devout, and very fervent in prayer (c) [L]. His corps was carried to Friderichstadt,

(c) Taken from the *Oratio de Vita & obitu* Conradi Vorstii, pronounced at Friderichstadt by Mark Gualtherus, and printed in 1624, in 4to.

(24) Acts of the Synod of Dort, Session clii, pag. 388, translated by Richard John de Neve, printed at Leyden, 1624, in 4to.

prefers declare, that the said Conrad Vorstius, in his last writings, namely in that concerning God and his Attributes, besides defending the errors of the five articles of the Remonstrants, which are rejected by this Synod, hath partly called in question not only one or two articles of the Christian and Reformed religion, but also doubts of several of the principal of them, for example, the following; that of the Trinity (24) . . . and that he partly affirms and lays down several assertions, which are wholly and diametrically opposite to the truth which God hath revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures, and to the confessions of all the Reformed Churches. . . . Besides, in several places he has dangerously enervated and weakened the chief and strongest arguments, which the venerable Fathers, as well as the modern Divines of the Reformed Church, have justly drawn from the word of God, and made use of to establish and maintain the orthodox doctrine, especially of the eternal Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, without either producing or substituting any others in their room to prove more powerfully, and support the doctrine which he opposes. That he industriously advances, and to the utmost of his power several sophisms, and vain arguments, which intangle and obscure truth, without ever endeavouring to resolve them, but leaves them as they are, that they may the more easily be fixed in the minds of the readers; whence clearly appears his subtle design of preparing the way, and clandestinely opening a gate, in order to infiltrate the wicked and impious Heresies of Socinus and others; and consequently to seduce and deceive the world, under the specious pretext of a search after truth. That in vain, and to no effect, he has hitherto disguised and varnished his opinions, with several impertinent distinctions, frivolous excuses, miserable subterfuges, deceitful and fraudulent dissimulations and glosses. Wherefore the preposterous and inordinate liberty which he makes use of to dispute and question the most important articles of the Christian religion; and the wavering, dubious, and uncertain way of instruction which he practises, are very dangerous and pernicious to the Church, and by no means fitting and agreeable to such sacred and sublime subjects, and consequently unworthy of an orthodox Professor (25) . . . And declares the said Conrad Vorstius . . . utterly unworthy of the employment and title of Professor or Doctor in the Reformed Churches. Finally, this synodical assembly seriously and earnestly petitions the High and Mighty States-General, that, by virtue of their sovereign authority, they would be pleased to remove from the Reformed Churches, that scandalous and common stumbling-block, and to take care for the future, that the Churches of the Low-Countries may not be polluted and defiled with such pernicious principles, heresies, and blasphemies, and to that end use all necessary prudence and caution entirely to suppress all the writings of the said Vorstius, and of those who are tainted with the same leaven (26). Vorstius wrote a very well turned answer to this synodical sentence: It is printed at large in the book which I cite (27).

(25) Ibid. pag. 589.

(26) Ibid. pag. 590.

(27) Epistole Ecclesiasticae & Theologicae praestantium ac eruditum Virorum, pag. 588. 6^a 7^a Edit. 1684. It is the same book which I call sometimes barely the Letters of the Arminians.

words, which are: *Ut ut quietem & securitatem aliquam in isto suo latibulo speraret, tamen fieri non potuit quin singulis pens diebus & noctibus centenis mortibus encaretur, cum turpissimi proditores (genus hominum publico exitio repertum) jugem operam darent uti virum latitantem investigare, extrahere, in manus persecutorum tradere, & nefario indicii premio exhiberari possent. Quoties istic domum mutasse, quoties noctes in somnes ex metu jamjam irruentium duxisse, quoties scalas fenestris suis applicatas ad subitum effugium habuisse putatis? Quoties in extrema conseruatione arbitramini constitutum fuisse, cum non raro omnes cum domibus suis recipere negarent periculi timore? Cum Ibrajones martii & anticam & posticam cum schopetis oneratis observarent adium quibus tegi putaretur? In tantis angustiis biennium circiter assumpsit* (28). It was then that he had much reason to wish for the epitaph, which a Poet that was one of his friends, uli supra, p. N. supplied that he desired several years before.

At vos posteritas tumulto hæc inscribite verba,
Posthuma fortunæ signa futura meæ.
Nulla Reformatæ mihi pars dilectior unquam,
Nulla Reformatæ pars minus æqua mihi (29).

The Protestants above all sects I lov'd,
No sect to me less equitable prov'd.
This epitaph let after-ages see
Inscrib'd upon my tomb, for it shall be
A sign to them, when I shall be no more,
Of what my fortune was

We may make a remarkable observation on the ill effects of a religious zeal, viz. It takes away all remorse of crimes, and disables a man from making use of the sole way of obtaining pardon of God for his sins, which is only to be effected by repentance. Those who designed to beat, rob, or assassinate Vorstius, to throw him into a dungeon, or load him with invectives, thought they did a very good action, and an acceptable service to God: they were not therefore touched with any remorse, and thereby induced to apply to the Divine Mercy; and consequently died in their impenitence. This is a precipice which ought to be fully considered by every one who makes it his business to inflame the minds of the populace against erroneous Divines.

[L] And very fervent in prayer.] His Panegyrist says very surprizing things concerning his patience, in the midst of the invectives, which were showered on his head. 'Possem, auditores, ad singulas istas patientiæ seu species seu proprietates viva exempla proferre, maxime ad devoratas cum patientia nulli linguæ dicenda osorum, zelotarum, hostium insolentias, distentia, scommata, convicia, calumnias quas à prima vigore ἀμύν faci furoris Corybantum in Belgio aliquot annis libenter & bono ex assuetudine stomacho concocit, propter conscientiam & celestem veritatem, tam à devotis illis religiosi ordinis capitibus, quam à promiscua populi fece, & quibusdam thrafonibus qui se Martii pullos & Bellonæ filios, festivo, Hercules, elogio ornare solent, possem, inquam, hujus rei viva & vera & admiranda exempla vobis referre, nisi me tempus, &c (30). . . . I could, my hearers, (30) Gualtherus, alludge lively examples to illustrate all the different kinds and qualities of his patience, particularly as to his bearing, with unspeakable temper, the insolence of his bigotted

(29) These few verses are the conclusion of an Epigram containing eight Distichs at the end of an Elogy upon Vorstius, in the book intitled, Illustrium Hollandiæ & West-Frisiæ Ordinum alma Academia Leidensis, printed at Leyden in the year 1614. The six foregoing verses are:

Nunc fratrum in me verba cohors, & prodiga scilicet
Æmula civili prælia Marte gerit.
Nec calemio stant bella virum: depositur ipsa
Victima, & infantis supplicium fidei.
Sed mediis erecta malis mens conscia rebus,
Freta Deo, nulli succubat invidia.

My brethren now my persecutors are,
And zealously promote a civil war;
Nor yet contented with a paper strife,
They for my guiltless faith, demand my life.
But be, that his own innocence knows,
Still rests untroubled in the midst of woes,
In God his pious confidence doth place,
And neither yields to envy nor disgrace.

act
horse
with

Friderichstadt, the new city of the Arminians, where he had an honourable burial. He had published several books [M], as well against the Roman Catholics as against his Protestant adversaries. The disputes raised against him, were doubtless intermixed with a great deal of passion; but after all, those who suspected him to be strongly inclined to Socinianism, were not much in the wrong [N]; and perhaps he had made a public profession of that doctrine, if he had not followed the maxim which the Roman Catholics alledge

'biggotted enemies, their reproaches, taunts, railings, and calumnies, which, proceeding from the fresh and holy fury of the mad Priests in Holland, he has, for some years, been accustomed to digest, for the sake of truth and a good conscience; being treated in this manner not only by these devout ringleaders of the Clergy, but also by the promiscuous rabble, and by certain bullies, who are used with a mighty pretty sort of vanity, forsooth, to stile themselves the sons of Mars and Bellona: I say, I could alledge lively, true, and wonderful examples of all this, if it were not that the time, &c.' He adds, that he was often found on his knees in the exercise of prayer. *Quam multos esse eos putatis qui illum inter precandum humi in genua abiectionem, & in conclavi alicubi solum de improvviso non semel oppræsserunt?* There is no Christian virtue, in which he is not represented to excel; but above all we are told he made a pious end: to which purpose consult not only our Gualtherus, but also a letter which the author of Vorstius's funeral oration (31), wrote to one of his friends, which is amongst those of the Arminians, pag. 684, of the edition in folio.

(31) This Oration was made in Dutch by John Grevius. See the Letters of the Arminians, pag. 684.

(32) Printed at Steinfurt, in 1610.

[M] He had published several books. Of these I have already mentioned two, one of which is a collection of several Theological theses, and the other the famous and pernicious tract, *de Deo, seu disputationes decem de natura & attributis Dei, diverso tempore Steinfurti publicè habitæ* (32). Before this book appeared, he published his *Idea seu brevis Synopsis totius sacre Theologie*: A book of prayers in the German language: his disputationes de causis deferendi Romani Papatus: his *Index Errorum Ecclesie Romanæ, subiecto cuique capiti Antidoto*: his German treatise of Indulgences: his *Tessaradecas Anti-Pistoriana, seu Responsi ad Librum Johannis Pistorii de quatuordecim articulis in Religione controversis*: his Apology pro Ecclesiâ orthodoxis contra Jesuitas, and his *Antapodixes de tribus primis fidei articulis, sive contrariæ Demonstrationes tres quibus totidem Jesuiticæ Apodixes à B. D. adversus Apologiam emissæ confutantur*. In the year 1610 came out his *Anti-Bellarminus contractus, seu brevis Refutatio quatuor tomorum Bellarmini*. His other works were written after his removal to Holland, and relate to the Arminian disputes, or rather to his book *de Deo*. Many writers appeared against him, whom he opposed, as well as he could for some time: but he was at last forced to give way to number, and he grew weary of continually repeating the same things. The Frieslanders were his most violent enemies, as Bogerman, Minister of Leeuwarden, and Sibrandus Lubbertus, Divinity Professor at Franeker. Against the latter he wrote *Catalogus Errorum Sibrandi: Prænesti ad Sibrandum: & Scholia alexicaca ad Commentarios Sibrandi*. I do not mention his *Exegesis Apologetica pro Tractatu de eodem*, which he published in 1611; nor his *Prodromus adversus criminationes quorundam fratrum*; nor the *Pleuius Responsum ad easdem illas criminationes*: but I shall say something of his dispute with Piscator. It contains, 1. *Paraservæ ad amicam Collationem cum Joanne Piscatore, super notis hujus ad loca quedam ex illius Tractatu de Deo & Exegesi apologetica pridem excerpta*. 2. *Amica Collatio cum eodem Piscatore*. 3. *Amica Duplicatio una cum Appendice sive Paralipomenis ad tripartitam Responsonem apologeticam Piscatoris*. 4. *Examen Tractatus Piscatoris de divina Prædestinatione*. He did not make any answer to Sopingius a Friesland Minister, nor to Brokerus, a Minister in North-Holland; but he took other measures with Matthew Slade, an Englishman, who fell upon him with a terrible fury. He printed an answer to him at Tergou, in the year 1615. This Slade was Rector of the public school at Amsterdam, and took pen in hand in defence of his sovereign the King of England, who desired the States to banish Vorstius. It was impossible for any book to be written more angrily, one only excepted, which indeed was more outrageous, and published by another of that Prince's subjects; I mean George Eglishem, a Scotch

Physician who lived at the Hague, and wrote *Crissi & Hypocrisis Vorstiani Responsi*, where, in a juridical manner, he accused him to the States of Atheism, Paganism, Judaism, Turcism, Heresy, Schism, and Ignorance (33). He sent him several challenges to appear and defend himself; and addressing himself to the States, he tells them that he requests and expects a strict examination to be made, and that either Vorstius or his accusers should be punished (34). This was to come close to the point, and nothing can be more just, than such an alternative: and nevertheless nothing is more rare than to see calumniators on the score of Heresy and impiety, brought to condign punishment. It is thought sufficient to absolve the innocent, and instead of punishing the accuser according to *Lex Talionis*, he is sometimes thanked for his great zeal, or at most admonished that he ought not to have gone so fast. However, this Physician made very fair proposals, but he was sure that he ran no risk, how absurd and contradictory soever his accusation might be found: for King James's menaces to the Republic of the United-Provinces, if they protected Vorstius, entirely rid his accusers of all manner of fear. It is not therefore surprizing that Vorstius suffered the challenges of this Scotchman to fall to the ground; he might easily have confounded him in three words. It had been sufficient for him to have barely said, *You accuse me of Atheism; but according to your own words my doctrine is Judaical, Mahometan, and Heretical; and the light itself is not more clear, than it is that the Jews, Mahometans, and Heretics, are not Atheists; whence it plainly follows, by the express terms of your accusation, that I am innocent of Atheism; and if you make good your charge of Heresy, I ought to be deprived of the professor's chair, but the Lex Talionis directs that you should be put to death*. But the Scotchman would have laughed at an answer of this nature, and without being ashamed of his calumnies, have relied on his impunity, and consequently would have fully triumphed if they had only convicted his adversary of Heresy. There are several posthumous works of Vorstius, some commentaries on the scripture, &c. See the *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum* (35).

[N] Those who suspected him to be very strongly inclined to Socinianism were not much in the wrong. The Socinians offered him a professorship of Divinity in the year 1601, and deputed Jerom Moscorovius to treat with him on that affair (36). This I own is no convincing proof of his Socinianism, and his apology on this point may be seen in a letter to Uytenbogaard (37). But what can be alledged against Sandius, who assures us (38), that having for some time been in doubt whether he should rank Vorstius among the Unitarians, he was no longer in suspense after he had seen the confession signed by Vorstius on his death-bed: 'In qua, *sait* he, haud obscure prodit quæ ejus de Deo ac Christo Domino fuerit sententia. . . . In which he plainly enough discovers his opinion concerning God and the Lord CHRIST.' He adds, that when Vorstius published the treatise of Faustus Socinus de *Autoritate Sacre Scripturæ*, he prefixed to it a preface of his own, and he ascribes to him the book intitled *Compendium Doctrinæ Socinianorum*, which Cloppenburg refuted, and ascribed to Ostorodius and Voldovius. But none of these evidences are of any force except his own confession of faith, written and signed by himself on his death-bed.

It must indeed be owned that a writing of this nature very strongly confirms the suspicions which had so long prevailed concerning him: but yet this doth not deprive us of the liberty of conjecturing, that the oppositions and disgraces which he suffered, might complot what a too inquisitive and innovating genius had began. I mean, that perhaps the accusing him of being a Socinian, and treating him ill on that account, made him turn one in good earnest; and that he would have been cured of these particular whims, if he had found an honourable repose in the Reformed Church.

(31) See de Pœdicatorem Belgici diffidit, p. 74.

(34) Super his alijsq. ita Oratio effatur: Rigidissimum etiam rursus expecto de expetito. Aut enim Vorstius à me aliq. que pene omnibus Atheismi accusatus plectendus est, aut accusers tum penam temere litigationem, tum calumniarum multam passuri, aut penam de decore afflicti. See the same book pag. 71.

(35) Pag. 98, 99. See also the remark (P), of the article SOCINUS (PAR. 1701).

(36) Sandius, in Biblioth. Antitrinitariorum, pag. 98. Says that the *Polis* brethren rejected in the year 1600. in Synodo Lubberti, exco. Vorstium ad synodum Lugdunensem repudium.

(37) It is the preface to the folio edition of the letters of the Arminians, pag. 917.

(38) Bibl. Antitrinitariorum, p. 94.

alledge against the Reformers; viz. That when we are convinced the Church wants reforming, we ought to continue in the communion of it, the more successfully to eradicate its errors. He very much prejudiced the Arminian party (d) [O]. The English deputies at the Synod of Dort were the principal promoters of the proscription of this professor [P].

Their

(d) See his letter to Pareus, among those of the Arminians, pag. 302, Edit. in folio.

Suspicion
marks of
in point
(39) Seneca,
Epist. iii.
become
in mind

Church. For nothing in the world so naturally disguises a man against orthodoxy, as being persecuted by orthodox men. And I am of opinion that what but too commonly happens in cases of friendship and fidelity, is also very frequent in the case of Heresy. We teach people to be false when we suspect them to be so. Fidelem si putaveris facies. Nam multi fallere docuerunt dum timent falli, & alius jus peccandi fupicando fecerunt (39). -- Esteem a man faithful and you shall make him so. For many have taught others to deceive while they were afraid of being deceived, and have given them a right to transgress by suspecting them. A jealous husband often draws on himself the disgrace which he might have prevented by a conduct free from suspicion. And thus it fares with clamorous people, who when any difficulties are proposed to them, or any person happens to differ from the common opinion, cannot see it without raising virulent suspicions against that person, and endeavouring to render him suspected by the whole world; and thus they are the cause of his becoming what indeed he never was. Several causes produce this change: it would be more advantageous and less scandalous not to proceed to a rupture. Yet there are some junctures wherein clamours against suspected persons prove very serviceable to a cause. It is when under the specious disguise of friendship, and assisted by a great reputation, they endeavour to pervert every body. How difficult is it to lay down good rules, when the very same conduct proves sometimes pernicious, and sometimes advantageous!

[O] He very much prejudiced the Arminian party.]

The obtaining of Vorstius to succeed Arminius in the Professor's chair, at Leyden, was believed to be a master-stroke of that party, and yet, on the contrary, nothing redounded more to the advantage of the enemies of the Remonstrants. Vorstius gave them such a handle by his new way of dogmatizing on the Divine Attributes, and made it so easy to raise public suspicions against him, that his adversaries were not at much trouble to render him odious. After this it was not difficult for persons who wanted neither zeal, nor tongues, nor pens, to cast on the whole Arminian party, all the odium raised against the new Professor; for that end, they had no more to do but urge the pressing instances made by Arminius's friends to get this man to Leyden. Thus Divine Providence is daily pleased to confound human prudence: what we toil at the most indefatigably, as the most substantial of all our hopes, most frequently proves our ruin. We ought to observe, that when Arminius's friends cast their eyes on the Professor of Steinfurt, they believed him entirely clear of the Socinian Heresy (40); but was it easy to convince prepossessed persons, or to hinder the very same people from urging the contrary? I am of opinion that what I have several times heard repeated is probable enough; to wit, that Arminius and the Divines of his opinion would have done a great service to their cause, if they had kept a profound silence. Their five articles are of an insinuating nature; and the Calvinists as well as the Lutherans would insensibly have grown Arminians, if nature only had been left to work. The ancient Church was not of St Augustin's opinion. That Father was the occasion of its embracing that doctrine, which is at present called Calvinism; but it insensibly returned to its pristine state. And if the doctrine of Predestination and its consequences are vigorously maintained by those of the Reformed party, it is because disputes have occasioned two factions, and a schism which is yet in being. The Church of England, which looked upon her self as a separate body, and disengaged from that wherein this schism was formed, was not prepossessed with the flaming zeal raised by this dispute in the minds of the Contra-remonstrants; whence it is that by slow degrees they have inclined to mitigated hypotheses, which are very different from Calvinism: the same would have happened in Holland, if Arminius had not formed a party. This is what I have frequently heard from

very judicious men; I do not pretend to examine whether they are in the right or not.

I shall only observe, that it would be a great mistake to assert that the Arminian disputes have not raised several troubles among the English Divines; for the time hath been, when those who were suspected to be of that side suffered persecution in that kingdom (41). Mr Des Maizeaux (42) has communicated to me several curious particulars on this head, which he has extracted from some English books, and perhaps I shall publish them in the Supplement to this Dictionary. We ought not then to imagine that the Church of England hath been exempt from contests on the subject of Grace; no, she hath had her share in that controversy, and even before the Synod of Dort. But two things must indeed be owned, one of which is, that before that time the English Divines enjoyed a greater liberty of rejecting Calvin's hypothesis concerning Predestination, and the extinction of Free-will, than those of other countries: the other is, that since the re-establishment of Episcopacy, under Charles II, the controversies on these points have made little noise in Great Britain; nor were there any great quarrels concerning them, and it is to the favourable opportunity which this calm afforded, that the growing and spreading of Arminius's hypothesis is to be ascribed. Those who relished his opinions, did not disturb others, and this sort of moderation lessened their zeal for the Synod of Dort. The following citation will confirm the former of these observations, and inform us what was said at Oxford on a solemn occasion, by a Professor of Divinity in the presence of a numerous assembly: 'Quæ sit in Anglia Calvinianæ auctoritatis, dicam. Anno 1608 Mense Julio, in publicis comitiis, ut vocant, quæ quotannis semel in florissimum istius regni Academiis, quibus nescio an in toto terrarum orbe possint esse antiquiores, & Collegiorum numero, amplitudine, & structura magnificentia præstantiores, habentur, ac tum solennis in omnibus facultatibus promotio celebratur, quæ res ibi maxime visu digna est: Oxoniæ, Doctor Olandus, Theologus, & Promotor tum designatus, hoc de Calvino judicium testimoniumque ex altâ cathedrali, in mille hominum præsentia, proferebat: Calvinus vir fuit doctus, sed non scriptis in omnibus Catholicis: item paulo post: Calvinianæ sententiæ de Deo peccati auctore neque defendi, neque excusari potest: quia ille aperte Catholicorum nudam permissionem deridet, & efficacis Dei voluntatis cum peccato concursum introducit (43). -- I shall shew what authority Calvin has in England. In the month of July 1608, at a public assembly, which is held once every year in the universities of this flourishing kingdom, (and I know not whether any other universities in the world can be said to surpass these, either for their antiquity, or for the number, largeness, and stately structure of their colleges) on which occasion there is a solemn promotion made in all the Faculties, which is a thing that greatly deserves to be seen. Dr Holland, an Oxford Divine, who at that time was named to the office of Proctor, pronounced the following censure upon Calvin from the chair in the presence of a thousand hearers. Calvin was a learned man, but he did not in all his writings preserve the spirit of an orthodox Catholic: and a little after: Calvin's notion of God, as being the author of sin, is neither to be defended nor excused; because he openly derides the bare permission of the Catholics, and introduces the effectual will of God as concurring with sin.'

[P] The English deputies at the Synod of Dort, were the principal promoters of the proscription of Vorstius.] Here are some particulars on this subject. A report being spread that this Professor would be summoned to appear before the Synod, one of the English deputies immediately wrote to King James's Ambassador at the Hague, and earnestly pressed him to make use of his interest with the Prince of Orange, and Count William, that this proceeding might not retard the proscription of Vorstius. He suggested to him the expedient that was to be made use of to that purpose,

(41) See, above, the remark [D] of the article FORBES (WILLIAM).

(42) Of whom mention is made above, in the article RAMUS, near the end of the remark [O], and in the article VIRGIL, citat. (21).

(43) Petrus Cod. senius de despecta Calvinianæ Causâ, pag. 125, 126.

(40) This appears from the letter which Uytenbogaard wrote to him on the 24th of June 1611. See the sixteenth letter of the Arminians in the edition of 1684.

Their master's glory and the reputation of his learning were concerned in it.

pose, which was to advise those two Princes not to suffer the Synod to engage in the discussion of any points with that Divine, or receive any explications of his opinions from him. This would have occasioned the loss of too much time. The English Deputies wished that the assembly would declare that all the members of it had read Vorstius's book, and condemned it, and that nothing remained for him but to retract his opinions, and ask pardon of God and his Church there assembled. He also farther advised, that in case Vorstius retracted, and asked such a pardon, he should be acknowledged for a brother; but otherwise the Synodical assembly should punish him at pleasure. This Deputy also wished that the Synod would publicly excommunicate Vorstius; and all those particulars he recommended to King James's Ambassador. Having but imperfectly expressed the contents of the letter, I shall subjoin the express words of the book which serves me for an original. Spargitur hic rumor de Vorstio citando, & Festus Hommius beatus vespera mihi dixit, se ea de re tecum fuisse loquutum. Si citatur, tua apud Principem Aragonensem & Comitem Gulielmum gratia nobis in ejus causa opus erit, aliqui non minus diu, quam Remonstrantes, Synodum detineret. Spero te, Vir Illustris, illis hoc consilium daturum; si Vorstius tempus petiti tradendi apologiam ac elucidationem de duris loquendi modis in ipsius libro de Deo, ac velis rationibus convinci, suorumque argumentorum confutationem, quod brevi fieri non poterit, ne Synodus de iis rebus cum illo loquatur: sed ut plane dicat, omnes, qui sunt in Synodo, legisse ipsius librum, ac multa in eo invenisse, quæ proxime ad blasphemiam accedunt, & sine dubio Ecclesiam Reformatam valde offendunt: explicationem rerum, quas nemo in questionem vocat, non esse satisfactionem: itaque se omnino cupere, ut illas retractet & palinodiam canat, Deumque veniam roget, & Ecclesiam Dei ibi congregatam, cui eo libro scandalum dederat. Si hoc facit, eum nostrum fecimus; sin minus, Synodus hominem pro libito castiget. Velim eum aliis in exemplum palam à Synodo excommunicari. Harum aliarumque rerum curam tibi potissimum committimus, ut rite dirigantur (44). The president of the Synod having asked the English Deputies whether they approved

that Vorstius should be cited to appear in the assembly, and what the King of England's pleasure was in that point; they answered that they must consult his Ambassador, and that they thought it would look very ill to condemn a man without hearing him: they added that, to avoid delays, Vorstius ought not to be permitted to defend himself, or explain his blasphemous propositions; and that he ought not to be answered any otherwise than by yes or no, nor asked any question but whether he was ready to abjure (45). Afterwards when the opinions were asked concerning the sentence to be passed upon Vorstius, they declared him unworthy of the name and office of an orthodox Professor, desired that his book *de Deo* should be burnt, and read the decree which condemned that work to the flames in England. *Se itaque non modo ipsum Vorstium Orthodoxi Professoris munere ac nomine indignum judicare, sed etiam persuadere, ne hujusmodi ejus libri in bibliopoliis proflare permittantur: Denique rogare, ut in exemplum, & in sancti, Dei causa, tali testimonium, Vorstii de Deo tractatus summi Magistratus jussu, aut Synodi decreto eadem munito, palam solenniterque flammis absumatur: simulque hujusmodi infamis holocausti specimen, à Britannis coram Synodo legitur authenticum, Procellarii Cantabrigiensi sigillo munitum, decretum XXI Septembris MDCLXI. Cujus vi, etiam Serenissimi Regis nostri judicio præeunte, publice flammis ultricibus expurgatus est liber prædictus: ejusdemque decreti Cantabrigiensi exemplar inter Synodi acta lectum (46). From this and several other places the continual correspondence betwixt the Synod and the court plainly appears. The Arminians loudly complained of this sympathy betwixt the two empires, the Civil and Ecclesiastical, and of this concord betwixt the Royalty and the Priesthood, against which they frequently say that as large a book might be written as that of Mr de Marca (47). But how can it be helped? Such is the condition of human affairs, that without the concurrence of the two powers, it is scarce possible to succeed in such matters (48). This redounds to the advantage of a good cause in certain countries, and prejudices it in others. No help for it!*

(44) G. Balcenquallus Epist. ad Dudleium Carletonum. It is the ecclesiastical Epistola Ecclesiastica & Theologica Printed at Amsterdam, in folio, in the year 1684, pag. 560.

VORSTIUS (WILLIAM-HENRY) son to the foregoing, was minister of the Arminian congregation at Warmond in Holland. He wrote some books which have been printed (a) [A]. Mr Chevreau cites him on a very curious particular (b).

(a) Ex Biblioth. Anticrit. pag. 143.

[A] He wrote some books which have been printed. The following account is given of them in the Bibliotheca Anticritica. Disceptatio de Verbo vel Sermonis Dei, cujus creberrima fit mentio apud Paraphrasas Chaldaeos, Jonathan, Onkelos, & Targum Hierosolymitanum. Irenopoli apud heredes Jacobi Laringhii, 1643, 8vo. Idem Belgicæ. a. 1649, 4to. Transfuit & Notis illustravit Maimonidis constitutiones de Fundamentis Legis. Editæ ex sunt Amstel. apud Blavius, a. 1638, 4to. Item Chronologiam sacram profanam Rab. David Ganz. & Pirke seu capitula R. Eliezer. Editæ hæc sunt Lugd. Bat. 1644, 4to (1).

(1) Bibl. Anticrit. pag. 143.

I take the book intituled *Bilibra veritatis*, which was printed in 1700, to be written by our William Henry Vorstius. In the Leipzig Journal (2) it is ascribed to him, and it is observed that was refuted by the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and more fully still by Mr Edzard Professor at Hamburg. See the remark [A] of the article RITTANGELIUS, and Mr Bernard's *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (3).

(3) For the month of August 1699, pag. 214, and for September 1699, pag. 314. See the *Journal de Trevoux*, for the month of March 1704, pag. 33, of the edition of Trevoux, where it is said that the 14th letter of Mr Nye is against the *Bilibra* of William Vorstius.

VOSSIUS. The learned men of this name, afford me such an ample field of matter, that the few sheets which I have left, will not allow me room to digest it. Wherefore I refer it to another time, together with the memoir communicated to me, which contains a confutation of what is said against Isaac Vossius in Moreri's Dictionary.

URCEUS (ANTONY CODRUS) one of the most learned, and most unfortunate men of the XVth century, was an Italian [A]. He was so sensibly afflicted with the loss of his manuscripts, that he not only uttered execrable blasphemies, but also like a savage retired to the woods, and all human society became insupportable to him [B]. It is reported that

[A] He was an Italian. Of Ravenna, if we may believe Pierius Valerianus (1); but Gesner (2) citing Bartholomew of Bologna, says he was born in the year 1446, at Herberia a little town in the territory of Reggio, seven miles distant from Modena.

[B] He uttered execrable blasphemies . . . he retired . . . and all human society became insupportable to him. He lost what he had prepared for the Pre

in the following manner. He lived at Forlì, in an apartment of the palace. His chamber was so dark as to require a candle at noon-day. And happening to go out and leave it burning, his papers took fire, and his library was reduced to ashes. As soon as he heard this ill news he ran in a distracted manner to the palace, and stopping at his chamber door cried out, JESUS CHRIST, What great crime have I been guilty

(45) Non permissum Vorstio, ut vel de fide, vel ex ipso blasphemus blasphemum, sed respectandum ipse per illi vel non; regulamque, an parum sit heterodoxia abjurare. Idem ad cardem, Epist. cccxviii, ubi in praef. pag. 560, col. 2.

(46) Idem ad cardem, Epist. cccxviii, ubi in praef. pag. 575, col. 2.

(47) Mr de Marca coram auctoritate Concilii Imperii & Imperatoris.

(48) Alterum de Altera potestatem non habet, ut operemur & consilium amittit. Hic aut de An. Pict. cor. 410.

(b) In Tom. II. of the *Cheremonia*, pag. 106, of the Dutch edition.

(1) I shall cite his words in the remark [D].

(2) Gesner, in Biblioth. fol. 55, verso.

in his last moments he acknowledged his sin, and devoutly implored the mercy of God [C]. Some say that he was killed by assassins [D]. His works, printed at Basil in 1540, consist of orations, letters, and poems. His life is to be seen there written by Bartholomew Blanchinus of Bologna. He had entertained doubts concerning the immortality of the soul [E].

According to Leander Albertus (a), he died at Bologna, when he was seventy years of age, and was buried there in the cloyster *di Santo Salvatore* in the tomb which he had caused to be prepared for himself with this short epitaph, *Codrus eram; --- I was Codrus*. Now since he was born in the year 1446 (b), we must conclude that he died in the year 1516.

(a) Leand. Albert. Definit. d'Italia, fol. m. 364, verso.

(b) See the remark [A].

guilty of? Which of your followers have I ever offended, that you treat me so cruelly? Mind well what I am going to say, I speak deliberately and with a composed mind. If by chance I address myself to you when at the point of death, do not hear me, for I have resolved to pass my eternity in hell. *Quodnam ego tantum scelus concepi Christe, quem ego tuorum unquam lesi, ut ita inexpiabili in me odio debaccheris? Audi ea (pergebat ad quoddam conversum simulachrum) quæ Tibi mentis compos & ex animo dicam. Si forte cum ad ultimum vitæ finem pervenero supplicem accedam ad Te opem oratum, neve audias neve inter tuos accipias oro; cum infernis diis in eternum vitam agere decrevis.* (3). Those who heard these blasphemies endeavoured to comfort him, but in vain: he left the town and run to a forest. *Adeo insuper ira & indignatio hominem oppresserat, ut extra portam urbis egressus, amientie frenos non ante imposuerit, quam in vastum sese nemus proripuisse, ingentique cum molestia ibi lotos dies transieisset.* (4).

(3) Spizellius, in Felice Literato, pag. 12. Hecite Barthol. Bono-nienis in Vita Codri.

(4) Idem, Spizellius, ibid. pag. 13.

(5) Id. Ibid.

(6) Id. Ibid.

[C] It is reported . . . that he devoutly implored the mercy of GOD. The author whom I cite mentions our Urceus's prayer. 'Ultima tandem aliquando appropinquante horâ miser ille oculis ac manibus ad cælum sublevis; Qui cælum incolis, (exclamavit) ser quæso opem peccatori, noli me, qui tuum in sinum confugio supplicem rejicere. Si unquam peccantem hominem voti reum fecisti, sic mihi extrema oranti dextram ab alto porrigas oro' (5). --- This unhappy man when his last hour drew near, lifted up his eyes and his hands to heaven, crying out; O thou who dwellest in heaven, help a sinner, I beseech thee, and do not reject me while I thus fly in a suppliant manner to thy bosom. If ever thou didst hear a miserable sinner, stretch out, I beseech thee, thy right hand to me from on high, now that I am making my last prayer. After having uttered these words, he saw a tall man, with a torch in each hand, and trembling all over his body. Astonished at this vision he sprung out of his bed, and asked the apparition what he did there at such an unseasonable hour, and conjured him not to do him any mischief. 'Ad hunc modum se animamque suam Deo commendans, quendam conspexit ingentis staturæ virum, capite raso, barba ad terram usque promissa, ardentibus oculis, facies utraque gestantem manu, ac toto corpore tremebundum, quo viso in hæc à pavore dictata verba erupit: Quisnam tu es, qui solus furiali habitu ea noctis parte, quâ mortales somno premuntur, deambulas, noli ad me qui DEI amicus sum infestus accedere, effare quid queras, quo ire pergas? Hæc cum dixisset, è strato prostravit, quasi illum in se irruentem vitaturus (6). --- Whilst Urceus was in this manner recommending himself to GOD, he beheld a man of a huge stature, with his head shaven, his beard reaching down to the ground, his eyes flaming, holding a torch in either hand, and trembling all over his body. Upon the sight of this apparition, he broke forth into the following expressions. Whoever thou art, who thus walkest alone in such a dreadful shape, and at this midnight time when mortals are oppressed with sleep, do not approach to hurt me who am the friend of GOD. Speak what thou wantest, and whether thou wouldst go?

'Having said this, he sprung out of his bed, as if he would avoid the spectre which was rushing upon him.' My author breaks off here; he did not know whether Urceus perished upon this occasion or not (7). This makes me suspect that he as well as myself wanted the book of Bartholomew of Bologna, and only quoted several scraps of it which others had quoted before him; for it is not at all probable that our Codrus's historian should leave his reader in suspense concerning the consequences of this accident. But be it as it will, Spizellius swayed by a charitable principle judges very favourably of the state of this learned man's soul, in consideration of his last exhortation to his disciples. He recites it, and it speaks a man who had a true sense of the fear of GOD, and of the vanity of the world.

[D] Some say that he was killed by assassins. Pierius Valerianus who hath not forgot him in his catalogue of unfortunate learned men, expresses himself thus concerning him: 'Codrus autem Urceus Rave-nas multa, varique doctrinæ vir, eruditissimis ple-risque scriptis, quæ nunc edita sunt, omnibus in-notuit. Is quoque sanguinarum peremptus est morte, ab adversæ factionis latronibus sceleratissime trucidatus' (8). --- Urceus Codrus was a man of great and various erudition, as appeared to all the world by his many learned performances which are now published. He too was killed in a base and bloody manner by the assassins of the contrary faction.

[E] He had entertained doubts concerning the immortality of the soul. His friends asked him what he thought of it, he replied that he did not know what would become of him after death, or whether the soul exists after this life or not. But he was not in doubt concerning the doctrines commonly asserted about hell, but positively affirmed that they were meer tales invented to terrify mankind. Spizellius mentions also this particular. 'Cum ejusdem, scilicet be (9), de animæ mortalitate opinionis pestilens, fidus olim infelicem illum Codrum Urceum [cujus tragediam supra memoravimus] afflisset, parum ab-fuit, quin & ipse in atheismi voraginem fuerit præ-cipitatus. Rogantibus enim amicis, quid de im-mortalitate animæ sentiret? nescire se respondebat, quid post mortem de se futurum esset, viveretne ani-mus, five anima, an interiret una cum corpore, quæ-que de inferis homines prædicarent, anilia quædam tericulamenta esse dicebat: hinc ipsi amarissimo epigrammate post fata etiam fuit exprobratum, quod non rectè de Christo, inferis, animarumque immor-talitate sentiendò, latentis atheismi sui haud obscura documenta dedisset. --- The pestilential influence of that same opinion concerning the mortality of the soul had infected the miserable Codrus Urceus [whose tragical end we have mentioned above] to such a degree that he wanted but little of falling into the gulf of Atheism. For when his friends asked him what he thought of the immortality of the soul, he answered, &c. . . . This gave occasion to a most bitter epigram being written upon him after his death, wherein it was reproachfully insinuated, as if by his erroneous opinions concerning CHRIST, Hell, and the Immortality of the Soul, he had given manifest proofs of his lurking Atheism.'

(7) Utrum extremum hoc e-valet periculum, & post tantam tempestatem in perpetuæ felicitatis portum sit delatus, dicere non habemus, Id. ibid. p. 14.

(8) Pierius Va-lerianus de Li-teratorum Infel-icitate, lib. 1, pag. 21, 22.

(9) Spizellius, ubi supra, pag. 174, 175. Hecite Barth. Bono-nienis in Codri Urcei Vita.

URGULANIA, a Roman lady, favourite of the Empress Livia. Her interest with that Empress rendered her extremely insolent, inasmuch that she refused to appear before the Senate in order to give evidence (a): The Prætor waited on her to interrogate her, and a greater deference was paid to her than to the Vestal Virgins [A], who were obliged

(a) Tacitus, Annal. lib. ii, cap. xxxiv.

[A] A greater deference was paid to her than to the Vestal Virgins. I shall quote Tacitus, 'Urgu-

lanæ potentia adeo nimia civitati erat, ut testis in causa quadam quæ apud Senatum tractabatur, ve-

obliged to come to the bar, when they gave testimony. But Urgulania's great interest and haughty demeanor did not prevent Lucius Piso's suing her for debt in the year of Rome 769, she refused to appear, and retired to the Emperor's Palace. But Piso could not be persuaded to stop his proceedings by the remonstrances of his relations, nor by all the complaints of Livia, that it was a violation of the respect due to her; and Tiberius would no farther interpose in this process, than by promising his mother to solicit the judges in favour of Urgulania, so that the suit was no otherwise ended than by Livia's causing Piso to be paid the sum which Urgulania owed him. She was still living in the year 777, when her grand-son Plautius Silvanus the Prætor was accused of the murder of his wife; for we find in Tacitus (b) that there being no hopes that the criminal should escape condemnation, she sent him a dagger, which being unable to use, he caused his veins to be opened.

(b) *Iidem, lib. iv, cap. xxii.*

nire dedignaretur; missus est prætor qui domi interrogaret, cum Virgines Vestales in foro & judicio audiri, quotiens testimonium dicerent, vetus mos fuerit (1). - - - The power of Urgulania was grown so excessive, that being summoned to appear as a witness in a cause depending before the senate, she scornfully refused to come. Upon this a Prætor was sent to examine her at home, whereas by an old custom even the Vestal Virgins were obliged to appear in the Forum, and in the courts of judicature, when they had any evidence to give in. Mr du Boulay had no reason to take Urgulania for a Vestal. The Vestal Urgulania, says he, did a thing unprecedented by desisting the summons of the senate, to give evidence in a cause depending before them; and that court was obliged to send the Prætor to her house to examine her. As Cornelius Tacitus (whose words are worth reciting) informs us lib. 2 (2). He afterwards cites the passage which I have quoted above: if he had read it with due attention, he would have been satisfied that Urgulania

(1) Tacit. Annal, lib. ii, cap. xxxiv.

URGULANIA, falsely taken for a Vestal Virgin by du Boulay.

(2) Du Boulay, Théor. des Antiquités Romaines, p. 316.

was no Vestal; he would, I say, have been convinced of it without having any occasion to consult the other passage of Tacitus, which shews that she was the grandmother of a Roman Prætor, who was accused of killing his second wife. This supposes an old age worthy that Historian's observation, (for the very earliest time that a Vestal Virgin was permitted to marry was at the age of thirty-seven) and doth not very well agree with Mr du Boulay's observation that few Vestals married after thirty years observance of their vow, and those that did proved very unhappy (3). A favourite, who had as great an interest as Urgulania, who should have been married after having been a Vestal, would have been an illustrious instance of good fortune. I can easily believe that this author never saw the passage of Tacitus any where else than in Traquellus's commentaries on Alexander ad Alexandro (4), where being separated from the thread of the narration it may make one believe that Urgulania was a Vestal Virgin.

(3) Du Boulay, *ibid.* pag. 308.

(4) In Lib. V. Genial. Dier. cap. xii, pag. 109, Edit. Lugd. Batavor. 1673, where instead of Cornelius Tacitus, there is Cornel. Celsus.

(a) Sueton. in Claudio, cap. xxi.

URGULANILLA, grand-daughter of the preceding lady [A], was married to the Emperor Claudius before he became Emperor (a). He had two children by her [B], and divorced her because she had made herself infamous by her leudness, and was also suspected of murder (b).

(b) Ob. Hædemon probra & homicidii suspiciones. *Id.* *ibid.*

[A] Grand-daughter of the preceding lady.] This is the opinion of Reinesius, a person who studied the Roman families better than any man in the world. He saith that Urgulania, Livia's favourite, was the wife of Marcus Plautius, the son of Aulus Plautius, who was tribune of the people in the year of Rome 698. That Marcus Plautius Silvanus the son of Marcus Plautius and Urgulania was consul in the year 752, and honoured with the triumphal ornaments in 762. That Plautius Silvanus the son of that consul was Prætor of Rome in the year 777, and that he had a sister who was our Urgulanilla, and two brothers, viz. Publius Plautius Pulcher, and Titus Plautius Silvanus Ælianus, who was consul in 799, and afterwards again in Vespasian's time (1). There is yet extant a very long inscription (2) expressing the offices and actions of this Titus Plautius, and particularly his consulship in Vespasian's reign: notwithstanding which Lippius (3) has been so inadvertent as to apply this inscription to that Plautius Silvanus who killed himself in the year of Rome 777, and was Urgulania's grandson. It is observable that in my edition of Lippius's Tacitus (4), the text hath it *Urgulania*, and it is *Virgulanilla* in the commentary, and the commentator observes that the surname *Virgulanias* was appropriated to the Plautian family, which he proves by an inscription, and by Suetonius's authority, who, saith he, calls one of the Emperor Claudius's wives Plautia Virgulanilla. But all the authors who produce this inscription, express the name to be Urgulanius: whence then can it proceed that Lippius alledges it to prove his Virgulanus? I believe I may venture to say that the Printers are entirely innocent of this blunder, and that Lippius not perfectly remembering the word Urgulania thought that Tacitus said Virgulanilla, and continued this first error throughout. He had done much better, not to have written proper

(1) Reinesius, Epist. xxvii ad Rupertum, pag. 206.

(2) It is to be found in Glan-dorp. Onom. pag. 683; and in Rijk in Tacitum, pag. 440.

(3) Lipp. in Tacit. Annal. lib. iv, pag. m. 200.

(4) That of Geneva, 1619, in 8vo.

names without book, but to have kept the original before his eyes. And if we who are authors would always be so prudent as to distrust our memory, and only rely on an exact view, our writings would be more accurate.

Our Urgulanilla perhaps owed her name to its being a diminutive of that of Urgulania her grandmother.

[B] He had two children by her.] A son and a daughter. The son was named Drusus, and died before the age of fourteen, by a very odd accident: for throwing up a pear into the air in order to catch it in his mouth, it fell in and choaked him. He was contracted to one of Sejanus's daughters, notwithstanding which the same Sejanus was reported to have caused him to be killed (5). So true it is that many more crimes are imputed to favourites than they are really guilty of. Suetonius rejects this impertinent accusation (6). Claudia, the daughter of Claudius and Urgulanilla, was born before the expiration of five months after her mother's divorce: and the late husband acknowledged her at first, but not long after his mind altered, and he caused her to be exposed naked at her mother's door: on pretence that Botes his freed-man was the true father of this child. Mr Chevreau mistook Suetonius's words, *quamvis ante quintum mensem divortii natam*, in believing they signified though she was born five months before their divorce (7). He seems to intend a criticism on Reinesius, for saying that Plautia Virgulanilla was Claudius's first wife (8), but indeed here is no room for censure; for Lepida and Medullina were only contracted, but not married to Claudius. Wherefore Mr Chevreau deserves to be blamed for not observing Suetonius's distinction. He bestows six wives on that Emperor, whereas Suetonius allows him but four, and two contracted ladies, *quatuor uxores & duas sponsas* (9).

(5) Sueton. in Claudio, cap. xxi.

(6) Quo magis miror fuisse qui tradiderant fratri à Seiano necatum. *Id.* *ibid.*

(7) Chevreau, Hist. du Moede, tom. ii, pag. 170, Dutch Edit. 1687, & pag. 203, 205, Dutch Edit. 1698.

(8) Reines. *ubi supra*, pag. 109.

(9) Sueton. *ubi supra*, cap. xxi.

URRACA,

U R R A C A, daughter and heiress of Alfonso VI King of Leon and Castile was first married to Raymund of Burgundy whose widow she became in the year 1100 (a). She was afterwards married to Don Alfonso King of Arragon and Navarre in the year 1106 (b). This marriage proved the cause of the re-union of almost all the Christian kingdoms of Spain under one sovereign; for after the death (c) of Don Alfonso VI, King of Leon, Castile, and Toledo, &c. these realms fell into the hands of Don Alfonso King of Arragon and Navarre; they devolved on him I say by virtue of his marrying Urraca. The Lords of Castile had been against that marriage; wherefore the King did not go to claim his Queen's succession, without a good number of troops in order to reduce the Castilians to reason in case of necessity (d). The preparatives for his journey and other things retarded his taking possession; but in the interim he increased the splendor and magnificence of his court, and connived at the scandalous conduct of Urraca [A]. He went along with her to Castile, and met with no manner of resistance (e); nevertheless he acted like a man who very well knew how to provide against all events [B], and was soon obliged to remedy the ill effects of his Queen's ambition, who would have ruined a great lord as a punishment for having given the title of King of Castile to her husband (f). She grew so dissolute that he was forced to confine her to the *fortress of Castellor*; from whence she finding ways to escape, retired into Castile, and endeavoured to annul her marriage. The Archbishop of Toledo, and several other prelates assisted her in that attempt, for which they were severely punished by the King. The great Lords and the States of Castile opposed this divorce, and by submissive means brought Urraca to the King her husband in Arragon, who *graciously received her*; but as she continued her vicious course of life, and daily more and more forgot her own honour and the honour of her house, he at last caused her to be conveyed to Soria, and banished her for ever from his company (g). It was then that her adherents applied more vigorously than ever to dissolve the marriage. She alledged not only the common excuse on the like occasions, that she was married against her consent, but that her near relation to Don Alfonso rendered her marriage with him unlawful (h). Application was made to the Pope, who committed this affair to Don Diego Gelmirio, Bishop of Compostella (i). It terminated in a dissolution of the marriage. Some Historians praise Alfonso for that having put away Urraca, he at the same time renounced all authority over the kingdom of Castile; but they plainly contradict themselves [C], by relating several facts, which make it appear that he did his utmost to keep that authority.

[A] He increased the splendor and magnificence of his court, and connived at the scandalous conduct of Urraca. Both these things were natural consequences of the inheritance which this Princess brought with her. Two or three kingdoms left her by her father were very well worth the concealing a resentment at her ill deportment. Mariana's words plainly signify that the tide of Urraca's lewdness run very high. 'Præterea varia Aragonii regni negotia distinebant (Alfonsum) ne novam & amplissimam cerneret hereditatem. Cuncta tamen ad novi imperii decorem composita, dilatae voluptates, dissimulatæ Reginæ libidines: quæ non sine sigillatione majestatis nimium in levitatem atque turpitudinem incubuerat (1). . . . Besides various affairs relating to the kingdom of Arragon hindered Alfonso from taking possession of this new and ample inheritance. Nevertheless every thing was ordered in such a manner as became the dignity of a new kingdom. Alfonso postponed his pleasures, and winked at the unchastity of his Queen, who to the shame of Majesty shewed too great an inclination for levity and lewdness.'

[B] He acted like a man who very well knew how to provide against all events. As soon as ever he had set foot in Castile he began to consider what might happen, if his Queen should die without issue by him; wherefore he put the principal places and strongest forts into the hands of Navarrese and Aragonian Governors and Captains, to the end that if he should be obliged to quit the kingdoms of Castile, Leon, Toledo, and their dependencies, he might in some measure keep those people in awe, and evacuate them on honourable and advantageous terms: this practice somewhat disgusted the Castilian Lords. He also knew his wife Urraca to be proud, ungrateful, inconstant, and libidinous; wherefore like a considerate man he fortified himself against whatever events time might produce. This woman, on a trivial occasion, conceived a most inveterate hatred against the Count D. Pedro Ansures, Lord of Valladolid, who had educated her, as well as preserved and protected her dominions after the death of her father; it was only because in the letters he wrote to the King her husband, and to her, desiring them to come and take possession of their heritage, he gave her husband the title of King of Ca-

stile. For this reason she undertook to deprive him of his estate at Valladolid and other places; but the King immediately re-established him, and the better to secure him from the rage of this woman, he sent him to Arragon, with Donna Elo his wife, intrusting to them the government of the young Count of Urgel his nephew (2).

[C] Some Historians praise Alfonso for that having put away Urraca, he at the same time renounced . . . but they plainly contradict themselves. These two contradictory assertions follow one another in the History of Mayerne. Don Alfonso, saith he (3), 'banished Urraca for ever from his conversation: notwithstanding which he retained several strong places in Castile, without being much desirous of the government or administration of that kingdom. It is certain that this King's spirit was very great, and he plainly shewed that he put a higher value on virtue and honour, than on worldly goods, by giving up such ample territories as those of Castile, Leon, Toledo, and others which Urraca brought him.' This Historian in the same page begins to relate Don Alfonso's repentment against those who had restored to Urraca the towns and fortresses which he had in Castile. This repentment we find in the same History to be one of the motives, which engaged him to make war against the Castilians. It appears from Mayerne's words, that Urraca's lewdness is assigned as another cause of the war: 'From that time Donna Urraca continued her immoralities; for re-assuming her former design of a divorce, she obtained it by the authority of Pope Paschal. . . . So that finding herself without any check, and no restraint laid upon her lust, she loosely indulged it to an exorbitant degree. She gave up herself to a familiar and unchaste conversation with Count Gomez de Candepina, who formerly pretended to be her husband, and had by her a son, of whom she was delivered clandestinely, whence he was named Don Fernando Hurtado, or a clandestine child; from whom the house of the Hurtado's, an illustrious family in Spain is said to be descended. Though some doubt the truth of this, yet it is certain that the Count Don Gomez, in a short time had the sole government of the kingdom, and entirely disposed of the affairs of war and peace at his arbitrary will and pleasure, and enjoyed

(1) Mariana de Rebus Hispanie, lib. x, cap. viii, pag. m. 419.

(a) Mayerne Turquet, Hist. d'Espagne, liv. viii, pag. m. 331.

(b) Mariana de Rebus Hisp. lib. x, cap. viii, pag. m. 418.

(c) In the year 1103.

(d) Mariana, ubi supra, cap. viii, pag. 419.

(e) Mayerne, ubi supra, lib. ix, pag. 335.

(f) See the remark [B].

(g) Taken from Mayerne, ubi supra, pag. 340.

(h) Id. ibid.

(i) Id. ibid. pag. 341.

(2) Mayerne Turquet, Hist. d'Espagne, liv. ix, pag. 336.

(3) Id. ibid. pag. 340.

authority. He fought battles to maintain it, and his enemies were obliged to force him to restore the places which he detained (*k*), even after the Castilians had elected Alphonso Raymund of Burgundy, Urraca's son by her first husband, for their king in the year 1122 (*l*). They made this choice when they found that the Queen continued to give up her self to the most scandalous amours, and also countenanced the tyrannical government of her favourite (*m*). Her own son was obliged to declare war against her, and to besiege her in the Castle of Leon; out of which difficulties she no otherwise extricated herself than by a promise to renounce her dominions, and reduce her self to a private life with a pension suitable to her dignity (*n*). The year of her death is not certainly known; some say that she died about the year 1125 (*o*), in child-bed lying-in of a bastard; others tell us that her death was the punishment of a sacrilegious crime [*D*]. She had a sister who might very well have disputed with her the pre-eminence in lewdness [*E*], and brought a

(*k*) See the remark [C].

(*l*) Mayerne, ubi supra, pag. 342.

(*m*) Id. ibid.

(*n*) Id. ibid. pag. 344.

(*o*) *Septimo decimo circiter anno à morte patris, Mariana, ubi supra, cap. viii, pag. 425. But ch. xiv, p. 413, he affirms that she died in the year 1126.*

the same privacies with the Queen, as if he had really been her husband; notwithstanding which Don Pedro de Lara another gallant . . . so far insinuated himself into the Queen's favour, that he soon became one of her darling minions, of whom Count Gomez proved very jealous. The dissolute and lascivious deportment of Donna Urraca, was so universally and publicly known, that King Alfonso excited by a just indignation, as well on that account as by reason of the above-mentioned divorce, resolved to enter Castile with a great army, and put all to fire and sword that he met in his way, being irritated as well by the lewdness of the Queen as by the base pusillanimity of the Castilians, who tamely obeyed her: he bore them a grudge, because they had restored to her the places which he had intrusted to their keeping. The Queen's two amorous darlings Don Gomez and Don Pedro took the field against him with the forces of Castile and Leon, and meeting the royal army, composed of Navarrese and Arragonians, they came to a close engagement near Candespina, not far from Sepulveda.

(4) Id. ibid. pag. 341.

(5) Id. ibid.

(6) Id. ibid.

(7) Id. ibid. pag. 344.

(8) Id. ibid. pag. 345.

Don Pedro who led the van was first attacked (4), and immediately fled and retired to the Queen at Burgos, carrying the news of the defeat which he was not at leisure to see (5). Don Gomez her other paramour was killed in the field of battle. The victorious Alfonso penetrated as far as Galicia, making a merciless slaughter and devastation wherever his army passed (6). He obtained a second victory betwixt the towns of Leon and Astorga, and forced Alfonso Raimund, Urraca's son, to save himself by flight into Portugal. The Queen being deposed, the King her son resolved to recover the Castilian fortresses, which his father-in-law Don Alfonso King of Navarre kept from him (7). Accordingly he raised a great army: Alfonso did the like, and entered the kingdom of Castile, when the Prelates of both kingdoms foreseeing the great calamities which were inevitable, if these two potent Princes should once make war, earnestly endeavoured to negotiate a peace betwixt them; and their attempts were so successful as to engage the new King of Castile, to address himself by way of request to the King of Navarre and Arragon, in order to obtain his cities and castles (8). By this means he obtained part of his demands; but Alfonso would not restore the countries situated betwixt Villorodo and Calaterra, nor the provinces of Guipuzcoa and Alava: &c. Pretending that they ought to be re-united to Navarre, and that they were usurped by Don Alfonso VI King of Castile.

Does it become an Historian who relates all these particulars to assert that Urraca's husband would not detain the patrimony of the wife he had divorced? Does not a man confuse himself when he writes in this manner? What follows is another error of the like nature. An author whom I here cite, blames Don Alfonso for divorcing Urraca, 'and by that means depriving himself of the possession of three kingdoms. For though the history of Spain praises him for having preferred his honour to those three great realms, I cannot help thinking that if on one side this be taken for a generous action, on the other it must pass for very weak and impolitic, as was that of Lewis VII King of France, who lived at the same time, and who by divorcing his wife Eleonora, sowed the seeds of a perpetual war in his kingdom (9).' This comparison betwixt Don Alfonso and Lewis VII is not just; for the French King entirely dispossessed himself of the territories of his divorced Queen, and exactly followed Marcus Aure-

(9) Campion, *Hommes illustres*, Tom. i, pag. 129, 130. *Edit. of Rouen* 1657.

lius's maxims (10): but Don Alfonso did not at all follow the same rule, and is on that account censured by one of the best Spanish Historians (11): 'Alfonso Aragonius eo nuncio (12) percussus repudio facto, Reginam Soria dimittit, in cujus urbis arce custodiaturus mancipata erat: imperandi tamen dulcedine illectus, dotalem ditionem non deponit. Id iniquum esse omnibus videbatur. . . . Struck with that news, Alfonso King of Arragon, divorced his Queen, and sent her away from Soria, the castle of which town had been a second prison to her. Nevertheless he was so charmed with the sweets of empire that he would not resign the dominions which she brought him. This to posterity every body seemed an unjust action.'

[D] Some say that she died . . . in child-bed lying-in of a bastard; others tell us that her death was the punishment of a sacrilegious crime.] She took up her residence in St Vincent's church, being very strictly guarded: notwithstanding which it is reported that she one day went to the church, dedicated to St Isidore of Leon, in order to seize the treasures, which her father and grand-father had given to that place, and that as she was carrying off her prey, being just going out, and having advanced one foot out of the church, her intrails burst out: a just punishment for the adulteries of which she had been guilty, and the murders which they occasioned, to the injury and dishonour of the royal families, and all the Christian part of Spain, as well as for her sacrilege. Others say that she died in the castle of Saldania in the delivery of a clandestine child (13). Mariana mentions both these opinions, and owns that this Queen will be the eternal ignominy of Spain: *Pudicitiam sane dum vixit baud satis honeste habuit. in Saldania arce ex parte extinctam ferunt. æternum Hispaniæ dedecus. alii Legione affirmant, cum thesauros D. Isidori expulisset, quos auferre nefas erat, in ipso templi limine ruptis visceribus, manifesta numinis vindicta expirasse* (14).

[E] She had a sister who might have disputed with her the pre-eminence in lewdness.] It was Theresia the bastard daughter of Don Alfonso VI, who married her to a French lord in acknowledgment of the services he had done him in his wars against the Moors. This lord according to some writers was Henry of Lorrain, but others call him Henry of Burgundy. And the latter are divided whether he was descended from the Dukes or the Earls of Burgundy. Some say that (15) he was son to Henry Duke of Burgundy, and grand-son to Robert of France, the first of that name Duke of Burgundy, and that he was consequently a Prince of the royal blood of France; and others say that he was (16) the Earl of Burgundy's son, and brother to Pope Calixtus II. However it was, this valiant lord rendered himself so considerable, that Don Alfonso VI King of Castile marrying him to his daughter Theresia, gave him those parts of Portugal which he had conquered from the Moors, with the title of Hereditary Count, for him and his legitimate successors, proceeding from this marriage and also promised to add to those lordships the conquests which he should for the future make on the Moors, with the same successive and hereditary right . . . on condition that he and his heirs should acknowledge the Kings of Leon for their sovereign lords, and hold the said lands of them in fealty and homage (17). Theresia was a widow in the year 1112, and mother of three children, one son and two daughters (18). Soon after she married for her second husband . . . Bermund Pasz de Transtamara (19), and after she had lived some time with him, she left him, excited thereto by a prevailing lust, or some other

(10) See, above, the remark [A], of the article LEWIS VII.

(11) Mariana, ubi supra, pag. 421.

(12) Viz. that Alphonsus Raimund, son of Urraca had been crowned as Com-paignon.

(13) Mayerne, ubi supra, pag. 427. Campion, ubi supra, pag. 136, 137, has transcribed this almost word for word.

(14) Mariana, ubi supra, pag. 423.

(15) See Feiler Anselmo, Hist. de la Maison Royale, pag. 454, 483, 484, and the citations (16), (17), in this remark.

(16) See Louis Gallart's *Mémoires Historiques de la Franche Comté*, pag. 305, 306.

(17) Mayerne, ubi supra, lib. viii, pag. 322.

(18) Idem, ibid. ex, pag. 337.

(19) Id. ibid. damnable

load of evils on Portugal. After this, I am surprized that the name of Urraca should ever be given to the Infanta's of Castile, and I do not wonder that the French Ambassadors, who were sent to bring into France one of the daughters of Don Alfonso IX, whom he had promised to their master, chose the less beautiful, whose name was Blanche, and could not bear the very mention of her sister, because named Urraca (p). They undoubtedly looked on that name

as

(p) La Mothe le Vayer, letter xxxiii, pag. 265, of Vol. x. He quotes Ant. Herrera, Tom. ii, lib. xvi, cap. xvi. See the Penates diversas sur les Cometes, num. 32.

(20) Campion, ubi supra, pag. 134, expresses it thus: who (Bermund Paiz), not satisfying her according to her mind, that mad and leud woman left him to marry his brother Ferdinando Paiz de Tranlamara. *damnable occasion* (20), and married Don Fernando Paiz de Tranlamara, brother to the husband the left. On the other side, Don Bermund being thus left, as if he designed to emulate his countess's incest, married her eldest daughter Donna Theresa Henriquez, sister to Don Alfonso Henriquez. These scandalous inter-marriages were contracted between Christians, in the infant house of Portugal. . . . But the young Earl Alfonso Henriquez being extremely afflicted at these exorbitances, and besides finding himself despised, rejected, and disgraced, and that the adulterous and incestuous Don Fernand assumed the title of Count of Portugal, on account of his wife, he raised an army against him (21). . . . Pursuing him as a tyrant and incestuous adulterer; and their forces engaged near Guimaranes, where Alfonso was beaten, by his falling too rashly on the enemy. . . . Having afterwards recruited, and rallied their forces, they fought a second battle, which proved more successful to Don Alfonso: for Don Fernando's army was utterly routed, he and the Countess, Don Alfonso's mother, were taken and confined to a strong prison: . . . And this was the fruit which these two leud sisters, daughters of King Alfonso VI, reaped in reward of their lust, and almost at the same time (22). Theresa was treated very severely by Count Alfonso Henriquez her son. 'She found a way to discover her sufferings to Don Alfonso Raimund King of Castile, her nephew, and desired him to espouse her cause, and deliver her from her harsh confinement, in reward of which she offered to settle the county of Portugal on him. King Alfonso desirous to re-unite that country to his territories, came in person with an army, in order to deliver this lady, perfectly forgetting that the Earl had assisted him in his wars, against his mother Donna Urraca, Queen of Castile and Leon (23); but he was beaten and wounded in the foot. After he was cured, he re-entered Portugal, and besieged the city of Guimaranes, in which Count Alfonso Henriquez had shut himself up. 'This siege proved very tedious, and if the attacks were brisk on one side, the defence was brave on the other; inasmuch that they were grown weary of it, when Egas Nunnez came out of the town, having first obtained a safe conduct, and made proposals of peace which was concluded on condition that the Count of Portugal should be obliged to come into Alfonso's kingdom and take an oath of allegiance to him as his sovereign. Thus the king drew off his army, and marched back to Toledo, without remembering his aunt's interest, on whose account he undertook the expedition, either being struck with horror at her detestable course of life, or having perhaps engaged in this enterprise by ambition only (24).'

(21) Mayerne, ubi supra. parallel that could be found for her, would be that of her sister Theresa. They were both very leud; the tyranny which both their paramours exercised, was owing to them, as well as a thousand civil and foreign hostilities thereby occasioned, and they were both degraded and poisoned by their own fons. II. This confirms what I have already said of the disorders which those countries are exposed to, where the Salique Law doth not take place, and concerning the pernicious consequences of the leud inclinations of a female sovereign (26). Urraca could not bear that her subjects should acknowledge her husband's authority: that she had her gallants was obvious to the whole world: the husband was obliged to put a stop to this inordinate licentiousness; this he could not do without making room for factions, and this occasioned a war. The Castilians disgusted at him and their Urraca's gallant, turned to the rising-sun, and stirred up the son to dethrone his own mother; and he readily complied with their inclination. This shews of what importance it is for a Queen to avoid at least all public impurities; for if she once grows shameless, no bounds can restrain her. She will place her affection on despicable objects; she will not have any regard to merit in her choice, nor value any thing besides the beauty and vigour of a young giddy-headed fellow, who will abuse her credit, and occasion a hundred pretexts for a civil war; and besides, become so insolent as to use his mistress ill, and render his assassination necessary (27). She will not consider the regular example which she owes to her children, when a premature or untimely succession may raise them to the throne. In one word, it is a chain of ignominy and confusion.

(22) Id. ibid. pag. 343. III. It is an aggravation of Urraca's crimes, that she not only took no care to save appearances, but also that she was married to an illustrious Monarch. He was first named El Bataillador, - - - the Battle-Fighter (28), because he had fought twenty-nine battles, and been victorious in all of them, two only excepted. He was King of Arragon and Navarre, by a right independant of Urraca, which rendered his condition equal to that of this Queen. Notwithstanding all this he did not escape the matrimonial disgrace. So true it is that the personal bravery of a husband is not sufficient to avert that storm (29).

(23) Id. ibid. pag. 347. IV. Lastly, I observe that Don Alfonso Raimund, King of Castile, who had dethroned his mother Urraca, and kept her in prison, did nevertheless engage in a war in favour of his aunt the Countess of Portugal, who was treated in the same manner by Don Alfonso Henriquez her son. This aunt promised the King of Castile to declare him her heir to the prejudice of her son. 'Doloris illa impatentia Alfonso Castellæ Regem eo nomine septimum, ut propinquæ, miseræ & captivæ matri opem ferat, per litteras obtestatur adversus impios filii conatus. Navatæ operæ mercedem, Portugaliz principatum pollicetur Alfonso filio, pro eo ac par erat, abdicato. Annuit ille five ambitione dominandi corruptus, five materteræ calamitatem miseratus: validoque exercitu conflato in Portugaliz fines irruit (30). - - - Being not able to bear her grief, she wrote a letter to Alfonso VII King of Castile, beseeching him that he would succour his miserable relation, and deliver a captive mother from the wicked attempts of her own son. She promised him as a reward the principality of Portugal, by excluding her son Alfonso as he deserved. The King of Castile consented to it, either from an ambitious desire of extending his dominions, or out of pity to his aunt's distress; and having raised a great army he invaded Portugal.' This was sufficient to invite him into Portugal with sword in hand, and it is very probable, that amongst other pretexts, he urged that of his aunt being dispossessed and oppressed by an unnatural son: for where are the men who are ashamed to condemn in another what they do themselves? Don Alfonso Henriquez might very justly have vindicated himself by an argument

(24) Campion, ubi supra, pag. 135, 136. This might be the subject of many reflexions; but I shall offer only a few. The first is,

I. That most authors who write lives, chose for their subjects only illustrious persons; and if some of them intermix ill men with the good, it is because they are resolved to give a perfect history of an entire order or class of men. I know no author who has attempted to write the lives of great criminals only. There is no want of encomiums on illustrious women; libraries swarm with them; but I question whether there ever yet appeared a particular collection of those women who were a scandal to their sex and country. It is a copious subject which deserves an author's pains, and it might be handled in Plutarch's manner: I mean, that as this famous writer chose the most illustrious Romans and the most illustrious Grecians in order to parallel them; in like manner the queens and princesses of different nations might be compared together. I have mentioned in another place (25), the comparison which the English made betwixt Mary Stuart Queen of Scots, and Joan Queen of Naples. Many such parallels might easily be made. Our Urraca might be compared to the heiress of Guienne, or Margaret de Valois, wife of Henry IV. But the most exact

(26) See, remark [G], of the article NA-PLES, (JOAN II, Queen of).

(27) See the remark [X], of the article ELIZABETH.

(28) Gollut, Mémoires de la Franche-Comté, pag. 341.

(29) See, above, the remark [B], of the article BAUTRU (WILLIAM).

(30) Mariana, ubi supra, pag. 433.

(25) In the remark [K], of the article NA-PLES, (JOAN J, Queen of).

as a scandalous and most unfavourable one, after the vicious life of the Queen who is the subject of this article.

(51) See the article LAMECH, remark [E].

(12) Lequien de la Neuville, Hist. Générale de Portugal, Tom. i, pag. 84, Edit. of Paris, 700.

a) This name is a translation of the German word *Bear*, which was the name of his family, and is the same as the Latin word *Ursus*.

(b) Freherus says the 29th of June, tho' he follows the same author as I do. Bucholcer says also the 29th of June.

(c) Ibi statim Ursinus Sacramentarius à Demagogis proclamatus, & adversarius expertus est quos prius amicos & fautores habuerat. Melch. Adam. in *Vitis Theol.* pag. 531.

(1) It is 529th of the volume containing the Lives of the German Divines.

[A] He was sent to Wittemberg in the year 1550, Melchior Adam is guilty of two contradictions in the same page (1). The first is, that Ursinus was sent to the university of Wittemberg at the age of sixteen; the second, that he entered Wittemberg on the first of May 1552. One of these particulars must necessarily be false, since the same author informs us, that Ursinus was born on the eighteenth of July in 1534. I reject the second, tho' the author hath not expressed the year 1552 in numbers, but in words at length. *Ingressus est Wittembergam anno quinquagesimo secundo, Kalendis Maii.* The reason why I reject it, is because he tells us also in the same page, that Ursinus having studied above two years at Wittemberg, left it on account of the Plague, and went first to Torga whither Melanchthon was then retired, and afterwards to Breslaw, carrying with him an advantageous testimonial from Melanchthon. Melchior Adam cites at large this testimonial dated on St James's day in the year 1552. He also mentions another, wherein the same Melanchthon on the first of October 1557, positively saith that Ursinus had been about seven years at Wittemberg. I have therefore reason to place his going thither in the year 1550, and to have more regard to the evidences that Melchior Adam hath furnished me with against himself than to his own text. We may very well infer from hence, that he did not much examine what he compiled. He hath confounded Ursinus's second journey with the first; and Freherus, without either examining or rectifying any thing, barely saith that

Princes (33). He places himself among those who did not believe her to be a bastard (34), and saith that Theodorus Godefroy evidently proves, that Don Henry her husband, was great-grandson to Robert the devout, King of France (35). Father Anselme, who espouses the same opinion, refers us to Godefroy's tract concerning the original of the Kings of Portugal, printed in the year 1624. I have not this edition, but if it affords no stronger proofs than that printed in 1612, which I have just now examined, I dare venture to say, that learned Historiographer doth not evidently prove this genealogical assertion.

URSINUS (a) (ZACHARY) one of the most celebrated Reformed Divines of the XVIth century, was born at Breslaw, the capital city of Silesia, on the eighteenth of July (b) 1534. He had already made a considerable progress for his age, when he was sent to Wittemberg in the year 1550 [A]. There he studied seven years; and his father not being rich, he was assisted by public and private gratuities, and he had also recourse to tutorship. He so closely followed his studies, that at Wittemberg he acquired a great knowledge, as well in Poetry [B] and the languages, as in Philosophy and Divinity. Melanchthon, the ornament of that university, conceived a very particular esteem and affection for him. Ursinus accompanied him in the year 1557, to the conference of Worms, from whence he went to Geneva, and afterwards to Paris, where he stayed some time in order to learn French, and perfect himself in the Hebrew under the learned John Mercerus. He had scarce returned to Melanchthon at Wittemberg, when he received letters from the magistrates of Breslaw in September 1558, containing an offer of the Mastership of their school. He accepted it, and so worthily acquitted himself in that post, that he might have continued in it as long as he pleased, if it had not been for the persecution which the ministers raised against him, as soon as they discovered that he was not a perfect Lutheran. In effect, when he explained Melanchthon's book *De examine ordinandorum ad Ministerium*, he treated the subject *de Cena Domini* in such a manner, that he gave occasion to the Demagogues (so the author of his life calls them (c)) to term him *Sacramentarian*. He justified himself by writing down his sentiments concerning Baptism and the Lord's Supper: but this attempt for the restoration of peace proving ineffectual, Ursinus who hated quarrels of this sort, chose rather to go away than to be embroiled in them; accordingly he obtained an honourable dismissal of the magistrates, and it being impossible for him to retire to his dear master Melanchthon, who had been lately dead in April 1560, he went to Zurich, where Martyr, Bullinger, Simler, Gesner, and several other great men received him with the greatest kindness. He was soon drawn from thence by the university of Heidelberg, which then wanted a learned man. He reached that city in September 1561, and was settled in the *Collegium Sapientiae*, to instruct the students who had their education there. He also attempted to preach [C], but finding himself scarce fit for the exercise of that function, he quitted all thoughts of it. The want of that talent, was fully made up by his

Ursinus went to Wittemberg in 1552. He cites the epitaph wrong, the year LXXXII is inserted instead of LXXXIII, and the XIth of March instead of the VIth. At this rate how can one rely upon the printed copies of inscriptions?

[B] He acquired a great knowledge . . . in Poetry. Ursinus, in his younger years, must needs have distinguished himself in that particular; for I observe, that Melanchthon in his two testimonials, seems chiefly to value him on that head; and to confirm the praises which he bestows on him in the first, he calls in as an evidence his Greek and Latin verses that were published. *Cum extent Latina & Græca Carmina Zacharie Ursini Uratislaviensis eruditè scripta, prudentes & docti viri lectis illis suo judicio probant ingenium, studia, & voluntatem ejus, &c.* (2) Ursinus was then but eighteen years of age. He published, in 1560, a collection of epigrams, which he dedicated to John Frisius, in whose house he lodged at Zurich.

[C] He also attempted to preach. Thuanus was misinformed when he said that the Protestants of the diocese of Cologne, assembled in the year 1582, to hear Zachary Ursinus, a preacher whom Prince John Casimir had sent them (3). Ursinus gave over preaching after a few essays, with which he himself was not pleased. Nor did he stir from Neustadt after he was established there: besides which, he was so broken and infirm in 1582, that he was by no means capable of exercising that function. It was John Sibelius who

his qualifications for a professor; for he had a lively genius, a rich stock of knowledge, and a happy dexterity in clearing up matters. Wherefore keeping the preferment he had already, he was, besides, made Professor of the Common-places. In order to this the statutes of the university rendered it necessary for him to commence Doctor of Divinity; which he did solemnly on the twenty-fifth of August in the year 1562, and continued in the discharge of this post till 1568. He composed the Chatechism of the Palatinate, and by order of the Elector Palatine Frederic III, wrote an apology for it against the clamours which Flacius Illyricus, Heshufius, and some other rigid Lutherans published in 1563, on account of that work. The Elector finding himself not only exposed to the complaints of the Lutheran Divines, but also to those of some Princes, as if he had established a doctrine concerning the Eucharist, condemned by the Augsborg Confession, was for that reason obliged to order an exposition of the true doctrine concerning the sacraments to be printed: this piece was written by our Ursinus, who, the following year (d), assisted at the conference at Maulbrun, where he vigorously opposed the doctrine of Ubiquity. He afterwards wrote on that subject, and against several other Lutheran opinions. The plan and the statutes which he drew up for that Elector in order to the establishment of some schools, and several other services, raised him so high in his esteem, that seeing him resolved to accept of the Divinity professor's chair at Lausanne in the year 1571, he wrote a long letter to him with his own hand, urging several reasons to dissuade him from it. The death of that Prince happening in 1577, occasioned a great revolution in the Palatinate; for Prince Lewis, his eldest son, who succeeded him, would not suffer any minister there that was not a Lutheran. Ursinus, and the students whom he educated in the *Collegium Sapientia*, were obliged to depart (e). He retired to Neustadt, to be professor of Divinity in the illustrious school which Prince Casimir the son of Frederic III, erected there at that time. He began his lectures there on the twenty-sixth of May 1578. He also taught Logic in his chamber, published some books; and was preparing for the composition of several others, when his health, which had been impaired by several great indispositions arising from his incredible application to study, at last entirely sunk under the weight of a tedious distemper, of which he died at Neustadt on the sixth of March 1583, in the forty-ninth year of his age. His works were collected after his death, as well by the care of his only son, who was a minister, as by the care of David Pareus and Quirinus Reuterus, his disciples. To the last of these we owe their publication in three volumes. Ursinus was laborious [D], modest, passionate (f). As for readiness in answering objections, he did not think he ought to aim at it; but he so contrived the matter, that if an explanation of any thing was ever demanded of him, it was done in writing at the end of his lecture, and he answered it the next day (g).

We have elsewhere (b) seen how fatiguing he found the direction of a college.

who went to the diocese of Cologne with Prince John Casimir, as his Minister. Philip Pareus, his nephew (4), has observed this mistake of Thuanus, and informs us at the same time, that this John Stibelius was afterwards Chaplain to the court of Heidelberg, and Counsellor to the Prince, and that he died in the year 1595, being the first Minister at Creutz-nac. It was probably the authority of Thuanus, which moved John Lætus, to represent Ursinus as one of the reformers of the Electorate of Cologne (5). Hofman following Lætus, makes him labour in this part of the Lord's vineyard. I say, following Lætus; for besides, that he refers to him, he could not herein have been misled by Moreri, who hath not said any thing of Ursinus, (misplaced under the name of Zachary,) unless that he was a Silesian, and a Professor at Heidelberg, who left behind him a great many books. He cites Gefner's *Bibliothèque*, which faith nothing of this author. He ought to have quoted the Epitome of that *Bibliothèque*. Several authors have committed the same mistake.

[D] *Ursinus was laborious.* To be convinced of this we need only consider the inscription which he had put upon the door of his study: it runs thus:

Amice, quisquis huc venit
Aut agito paucis, aut abi,
Aut me laborantem adjuva (6).

(6) Melch.
Adam, ubi su-
pra.

Friend, whosoever you be
That come to visit me
Make quick dispatch, and go away,
Or labour with me if you stay.

This was the reason that he passed for an ill-conditioned man (7).

Note, that Aldus Manutius, before him made use of a like inscription. 'Nothing was more uneasy to him than unprofitable visits, which obliged him to lose his time . . . to secure himself from which, in a civil manner, he caused to be writ over his closet door the following words: 'Quisquis es, rogat te Aldus etiam atque etiam, ut si quid est quod a se velis, perpaucis agas, deinde actutum abeas, nisi tanquam Hercules veneris suppositurus humeros: semper enim erit quod & tu agas, & quotquot huc attulerint pedes. - - - Whosoever you are, Aldus earnestly begs of you that if you have any business with him, you would dispatch it in a few words, and then leave him immediately, unless you come to his assistance, like Hercules to relieve Atlas: for there will always be work enough for you, and for as many as shall enter here.' These words that learned Greek Professor, and afterwards Printer at Basil, John Oporinus, borrowed from him, and put them also on the door of his study (8).

(d) That is in the year 1564.

(e) See, above, the text of the article PAREUS (DAVID), after the citation (d).

(f) Fuit tamen cōsolator, ut fit in ejusmodi ingenis. Melch. Adam, ubi supra, p. 531.

(g) Taken from Melchior Adam, who wrote Ursinus's life from the Funeral Oration, which Francis Junius, Professor of Divinity at Neustadt, spoke there, and from another Oration of Quirinus Reuterus.

(b) In the remark [D], of the article PAREUS (DAVID).

(7) See what Junius says concerning this in Ursinus's Funeral Oration.

(8) Chevallier, Origine de l'imprimerie de Paris, pag. 234, He quotes James Zwinger, in the *Theatrum Vitæ humane*, at Basel, 1604, pag. 3713.

URSI NUS (JOHN) a French Physician, who flourished in the XVIth century, wrote some Medicinal tracts in Latin verse [A], and a Commentary on Cato's distichs (a).

[A] *He wrote several Medicinal tracts in Latin verse.* He therefore deserves, what he hath not, a place in the catalogue of poetical Physicians, published by Bartholinus. His *Protopopæia Animalium aliquot*, is a

poem in hexameter and pentameter verse, in which he mentions several particulars, concerning the nature and quality of animals, more especially as they belong to Physic. This book was printed at Vienne in Dauphiné,

(a) See the remark [B].

He is highly extolled by Stephen Roybosius Tulinus [B].

Dauphiné, in the year 1541, in 4to, with the *Scholæ* of James Olivier, a Physician. And in the same city and year was printed his *Elegie de Peste eaque medicina parte quæ in vitiis ratione confistit* (1).

(1) Epit. Bibl. Geineri, p. 509.

[B] He is highly extolled by Stephen Roybosius Tulinus. His words cited by Reinesius, run thus: 'Is est enim, quo cum si congressus fueris, nihil ignotum homini esse putes. Mirus Poeta, eximius & bene fortunatus Medicus, Philosophus summus, Orator facundus. Quorum documentum locupletissimum præstant quæ de re medica carmine scripsit, eruditissima

Comm. in Catonis libellum, ethologus elegans de moribus & alia plura quæ sub ejus nomine circumferuntur (2). - - - He is such a man, that if you were to converse with him, you would think he knew every thing. He is an admirable Poet, an excellent and successful Physician, a Philosopher of the first rank, and an eloquent Orator. All this fully appears from his learned dissertations upon Physic, in verse, his Commentary upon Cato's Distichs, his elegant treatise of Morality, and several other pieces which are published under his name.' (2) Reinesius, Epist. xli ad Daumium, pag. 118.

(a) Part of the Duchy of Holstein.

(b) Justus Burgius, Engineer to Philip and Maurice, Landgraves of Hesse, taught him Mathematics and Astronomy.

URSUS (NICOLAS RAIMARUS) author of some Astronomical tracts, was born at Hensted in Dithmarsen (a). He was a Swineherd in his youth, and did not begin to learn to read before the age of eighteen, when he diligently spent all his spare hours from keeping the hogs, in learning to read and write. After which, he applied himself to the study of the learned languages; and being endowed with a strong genius, soon made a considerable progress in the Latin and Greek tongues. He also learned French, the Mathematics, Astronomy (b), and the other parts of Philosophy, most of them without the assistance of any master [A]. Afterwards, leaving his own country, he gained his subsistence by the instruction of youth: it was the business he followed in Denmark, in the year 1584, and on the frontiers of Pomerania and Poland in 1585. In this last place, he invented a new Astronomical system, not very different from that of Tycho Brahe. He communicated it in the following year to the Landgrave of Hesse, whence there arose a violent contest betwixt him and Tycho Brahe [B], in which our Raimarus discovered that he still retained the manners of his primitive occupation; for he fell into such a brutish passion against Tycho, that he exposed himself to a criminal process [C]. He read private Mathematical lectures at Strasbourg in the year 1588, and in 1589, and also

(1) De Systemate mundano.

(2) Mollerus, Isagoge ad Historiam Chersonesi Cimbricæ, pag. 629.

(3) Id. ibid.

(4) Gassendus, in Vita Tycho. lib. ii, pag. m. 411, ad ann. 1584. See also lib. iii, pag. 428.

[A] He learned . . . without the assistance of any master. It was his good luck to make but one leap from the plough to the Republic of Letters, and he was not like others, obliged to serve an apprenticeship in the schools. *Aliaque scientias Philosophicas, brevis, & persæque quidem αὐτοδιδάκτου, sibi reddidit familiaris.* Scholas enim, ut ipse in Libro (1) paulo ante laudato, Rusticum se vocans Dithmarsum, testatur, uti sus hortum percurrit, & vix à limine salutavit, sed à Stiva illico, singulari quodam fato ac genio, in Remp. literariam irruit (2). This is an undeniable proof of great parts. His works afford several marks of his hasty studies; and his learning was as ill digested as his stile was incorrect: 'Homo certe fuit admodum ingeniosus, & in Antiquorum etiam lectione versatus, sed doctrinæ indigestæ, Styli haud satis castigati, & vere, quod Nasonis de Ennio est Judicium, Ingenio maximus, Arte rudis (3). - - - He was without doubt a very ingenious man, and well versed in the Antients; but his learning was indigested, and his stile somewhat incorrect; and the character which Ovid gives Ennius might truly be applied to him,

'A noble genius unimprov'd by art.

[B] There arose a violent contest betwixt him and Tycho Brahe. Tycho Brahe accused him of Plagiarism. Ursus, said he, coming with his master into my study, saw the scheme of my system on a piece of paper, and not long after arrogated the invention to himself: Cum mense Septembri versaretur apud ipsum nobilis vir Ericus Langius, quidam illius famulus nomine Nicolaus Raimarus, Dithmarsus, delineatam typographis quapiam in charta obiter vidit, ac sibi quasi à se in angulo Poloniæ quodam excogitatum arrogans, illam ut suam biennio post apud Landgrævium vendidit; ubi & impudenter in Tychonem debiterans repressus à Rothmanno fuit (4). Upon this charge, Ursus, in a book he published at Prague de Astronomicis Hypothesibus, outrageously abused Tycho Brahe, who was touched to the quick with this ill usage. Gassendus gives us the particulars of this story. 'Quia superiore anno

Raimarus Ursus, ille Dithmarsus, Librum Pragæ ediderat de Astronomicis Hypothesibus, in quo Rothmannum quidem, & Roëlinum variis probris onerat, sed Tychonem innumeris, occasione eorum, quæ de se in Epistolis ejus legerat: ideò, cum ejusmodi Liber ad Tychonem manus recens pervenisset, illæ occasione ipsius literis inferuit, Vidisti proculdubio Plagiarium mei, impuri illius Ursi, maledicentissimum scriptum, in quo præter alia innumera convitia,

mee, & meorum bonori non parciit. Ego quidem refutatione illum indignum censeo, cum omnes modestie limites, imò honestatis longè transgesserit: efficiam tamen, ut non impunè ferat (5). - - - Raimarus Ursus, (6) Gassendus, a native of Dithmarsen, had published the year before at Prague a book de Astronomicis Hypothesibus, in which he throws out various reproaches upon Rothmannus and Roëlinus, but chiefly upon Tycho Brahe, on account of what he had said of him in his letters. For that reason Tycho, soon after the book had come to his hands, took occasion to insert the following words in a letter. You have seen, no doubt, the scurrilous writing of my dirty Plagiary, Ursus, wherein, besides innumerable other reproaches, he does not even spare the honour of me and my family. I for my part do not think him worthy of a refutation, since he has far exceeded all the bounds of modesty, and even of honesty: I will nevertheless take care to make him suffer for it. These are Tycho's words in a letter to Longomontanus. But more on this head in the following remark.

[C] He exposed himself to a criminal process. In Tycho Brahe's Funeral Oration, we are told that a man of sense and learning, but utterly void of religion or virtue, was not content to arrogate the Astronomical inventions of this great man to himself, but also barbarously injured his reputation with black calumnies. The Orator adds, that if his death had not put a stop to the prosecution commenced against him upon that account, he had been severely punished. This is said of our Raimarus. Ante annos paucos, quidam ingeniosus, & doctus, sed absque religione, & virtute homo, tetricum, & famosum contra præstantissimum hunc Virum divulgavit scriptum, quale in hoc genere non vidit antiquitas, nec fortassis spectatura est unquam posteritas. Non sat fuerat infamatori illi plagium committere litterarum, & TYCHONIS Hypothesin, Uraniburgi repertam, falsari pro proprio invento venditare, nisi etiam Virum aviti generis, summe eruditionis, inculpabilissimæ vitæ, cum tota ipsius beneplacita familia, sexcentis contumeliis, & totidem mendaciis, apud alios, si non deformatum, suspensum saltem reddidisset. Et profecto jure actum cum hoc fuisset, velut etiam jam agi captum fuerat, nisi mors feram illam singulari beneficio affecisset, & pæne subduxisset commertissimæ (6). Gassendus quotes a fragment of a letter, by which it appears, that Tycho Brahe designed to prosecute his adversary. His own words, which inform us that Raimarus Ursus escaped from Prague, run thus: 'Ceterum de fera ista Dithmarica, nimis efferat, & brutat, ut aliqua subjungam, licet indigna sit, cujus recordetur,

(6) Joann. Id. senius, in Oratio. funebri Tycho. Brahe, quod Gassendus in Appendice Vita Tycho. pag. 423.

also published a book. After that he was called by his Imperial Majesty, to teach the Mathematics at Prague. But he silently retired from that town to avoid the presence of Tycho Brahe, in the year 1598, and died some time after (c). He was entirely unknown to Vossius: I shall set down the titles of his works [D].

(c) Taken from John Mollerus's book, intitled, *Ussoge ad Historiam Chersonesi Cimbrice*, printed at Hamburg in the year 1691, p. 628, 629, Part. iv. He quotes for most of those things Ant. Heimreichius, in *Catalogo Autorum Chronico Dithmarico præfixo*.

(7) Tycho Brahe, Epist. ad Longomontanum, apud Gassend. in Vita Tychonis, lib. v, pag. 455.
 recordetur, scias istam ante aliquot septimanas, prout nuper rescivi, Pragâ se subduxisse, sive malè sibi conscia, & quòd iustas penas per leges formidaret; sive quid aliud sinu suo latenter more suo ruminans. Sed investiganda tamen suo tempore per otium, atque in jus pertrahenda, & punienda, quod etiam optimi quique Pragæ suadent (7). - - - As for this wild beast of Dithmarfen, who is indeed too savage and brutal, though he does not deserve to be mentioned, yet I would have you to know that, as I have been lately informed, he left Prague some weeks ago; being either disturbed by an evil conscience, and dreading the just vengeance of the law, or else hatching, as his manner is, some new projects in his head. But care shall be taken to find him out some time or other, that he may be brought to justice and condign punishment; for so the best people of Prague advise me to do. To make the character of this quondam swineherd better known, I add that he had raised a report, that Rothmannus was dead of a scandalous distemper (8). Rothmannus appeared very zealous for Tycho Brahe, when he saw that Ursus calumniated him at the court of Hesse: from that time they became utter enemies, and treated each other with the utmost violence. The following words were written by Rothmannus in the year 1586. Plura scriberem præsertim de impuro nebulone Nicolao Raymaro Ursio Dithmarico, qui superiori hyeme apud tuam Excellentiam typographicam literarum collectionem & ordinationem, ut opinor, exercuit (9). I should say more of that sorry fellow Nicolas Raimarus Ursus of Dithmarfen, who last winter, if I am not mistaken, followed the business of collecting and disposing the letters for the press at your Excellency's court. Fuerat ille quoque Rothmanno ea propter insensatus, quod Cassellus transiens & Tychonem convitiis proficiens repref-

(8) Rumorem sparserat fuisse ipsum podendia nescio quibus morbis pridem infectum, & tandem confectum. Gassend. ibid.
 (9) Gassend. ibid.

fus ab eo vehementer fuisset (10). (10) Id. ibid.
 [D] I shall set down the titles of his works.] He published his *fundamentum Astronomicum* in the year 1589, at Straßburgh, at the expence of his pupils. His book *de Astronomicis Hypothesibus seu de Systemate mundi* was printed at Prague in the year 1597, as was also *Astronomicarum Hypothesium à se inventarum Vindicatio & Defensio: item Problemata totius processus Astronomicæ observationis seu rationis observandi* τὰ φαινόμενα (11). The Oxford catalogue mentions our Raimarus's *Tetragonismus Circuli expeditiori structura productus per Pet. Crugerum*, printed at Leipsic 1607 in 4to. Mr Konig (12) ascribes to him a book *de Doctrina sinuum & triangulorum*, printed in 1588. Mr Mollerus (13) says that he never saw the book *de Civitatibus in Dithmarfia Hansaticis*, printed at Leipsic in the year 1563, and ascribed to Raimarus Ursus by Albert Bartholinus and Lipenius. He doubts whether any such work was ever published, by reason that there is not one town in the whole province of Dithmarfen which ever engaged in the Hanseatic confederacy: 'Impositum illis esse à catalogis, quos frequenter excubunt, proletariis, conjecto (14). - - - I conjecture that they have been imposed upon by the catalogues which are often wretchedly drawn up and transcribed.' I do not know whether he carefully observed Bartholin's words, which run thus: *Nicolaus Reimers. De Civitatibus Hansaticis in Dithmarfia, Gæodesia Rantzoviana*, Leipsic 1583 in 4to (15). Who can certainly conclude from hence that he speaks of our Raimarus Ursus? Is it not more probable that he did not mean him? He was no Dane, nor author in Denmark; and therefore it is not probable that Bartholin should put him into his catalogue. Nor is it true that Bartholin says that this book was printed at Leipsic in the year 1563.

(11) Mollerus, ubi supra, Part. iv, pag. 628.
 (12) Bibliotheca vet. & nova, at the sword Ursus, He speaks of him as of another writer under the word Reimarus, and he mentions one Nicolas Reimarus, who wrote Theatrum temporis, in fol.
 (13) Ussoge, &c. pag. 517.
 (14) Ibid. pag. 628.
 (15) Alb. Bartholinus, de Scriptis Danorum, pag. 109.

USHER (HENRY) Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland in the beginning of the XVIIth century, spent a great deal of time in the composition of a book against Cardinal Bellarmine; but we are told that his wife forced the sheets from him, and threw them into the fire, on pretence that the match was not equal betwixt a man burdened with children, and domestic affairs, and a person disengaged from all worldly concerns. The author who relates this, and who may very well be suspected, adds that Todd Bishop of Down (a) being disgusted at his wife, and desirous to put her away, petitioned this Archbishop for a letter of divorce, but could not obtain it [A]. He conjectures that the sole reason of this prelate's refusal was the fear of displeasing his wife, who would have been very uneasy at any thing which tended to introduce the annulling of marriages, by reason the might her self at some time or other be in danger of falling under the like inconvenience. The reader may believe as much or as little of this as he pleases. I will not answer for the truth of it, and indeed I relate it for no other reason than to make way for the examination of a false suggestion of Father Garasse [B]. Observe

[A] The author who relates this, and who may very well be suspected, adds, &c. . . . Henry Fitz Simon, an Irish Jesuit, relates the matter thus: *Toddus pseudo-Episcopus Dunensis in Ibernica, sue conjugis seu uxoris sortis peritus . . . eam voluit repudiare. Accessit primò symmiam suam (ut loquuntur) totius Ibernicae Primatem, Henricum Usherum; libellum ab eo repudii acriter efflagitans. Nimirum frustra, apud virum integerrimum scilicet, & apprime uxoris (quæ illi viribus suis quam tenuissimis impar onus exantlans, nempe multorum annorum elucubrations contra Bellarminum, extorsit, tradiditque Vulcano, quod iniqua futura esset, ut agebat, concertatio, inter hominem proliis & domesticis curis gravatum, & hominem omnis secularis sollicitudinis expertem) imperio, ac voluntati, obnoxium. Displicuisset autem matronæ gravi (abdominis centum pondio) divoritii Ministræ causaria prætextu, per quam ipsa sortis brevi, technis id generis Ministrælibus, conjugali toro discluderetur (1).*

[B] For the examination of a false suggestion of Father Garasse.] That author's title is so well known that the burlesque expressions in the following quotation will not appear very surprising. 'The ministers

(saith he) as Humphredus tells us in the second part of his Jesuitism, accuse the Jesuits of Magic by reason of their learning. No wonder (say they) that the Jesuits are learned since they are all Magicians, and learn all they know by diabolical assistance (2). . . . Let them remember the story of an eminent Roman citizen, who was accused by his enemies that he made use of Sorcery to attract the fat and substance of the adjoining lands, by reason that he had always a much richer crop than any of his neighbours: a day being appointed, he brought before the court his oxen in good case, his ploughs in good repair, and his children well fed, and offered no other defence to the Judges than, *Gentlemen, these are the charms I make use of, Hæc sunt veneficia mea*. Quirites, nor can I further produce my sweats, my waking nights, and toilsome days. I say the same thing to the Calvinist and Lutheran ministers; the Jesuits are not embarrassed with the family cares of the ministers, they are not clogged with the long train of a wife and a whole nest of ministerial brats; their nocturnal rest is not broken with the cries of ten or a dozen chits, nor are they interrupted in the

(a) In the Province of Ulster.

(2) Garasse, Recherches des Recherches d'Étienne Pasquier, pag. 973, 974.

(b) The Cathedral of Dublin.

Observe that whilst this Henry Usher was only Archdeacon of Dublin, he was twice deputed to Queen Elizabeth, first on an affair relating to St Patrick's Church (b), and afterwards

the day-time with the cares of maintaining fifteen or sixteen craving famished children; any more than they are diverted by usury, luxury, and pleasures. *Hec sunt eorum veneficia.* These are their magical charms, of which I would willingly prepare an amulet to hang about the ministers' necks. I remember to have read in Constantine Bassus's Geoponics in the fourteenth book page 380, that an honest countryman wished to be informed of a charm to prevent the cats, rats, and snakes ever infesting his pigeon house, and was answered by an anonymous author, that he knew a very effectual one to keep out the cats and rats. I. Said he, carefully shut your pigeon-house door. II. Open the windows as little as you can. III. Keep your walls tight and whole. IV. Stop up the chinks of the door, and I will engage neither cat nor rat shall enter your pigeon house. Accordingly I can oblige the Calvinist ministers with a good charm, that they may be as learned as the Jesuits. 1. Let them discharge themselves of their wives, and the brawls of a family. 2. Let them spend less time in combing their hair, tricking themselves up, and setting their starched bands and ruffs. 3. Let them more seriously apply themselves to the study of the gospel than of Rabelais; which advice is particularly directed to the minister Du Moulin. 4. Let not Chamier, Pother, Bonnet, Bonvouloir, and other ministers fill themselves with such loads of wine and meat, in order to keep their minds more free and unclogged. . . . 5. If they take and make use of this amulet, and are endowed with as good capacities as the Jesuits, I promise that they will become as learned as they (3).

Before I make any reflexions on this passage, I shall look back to the original of the story of the Roman citizen, who was accused of fertilizing his land by Sorcery. It is related by Pliny. 'C. Furius Cresinus, says he (4), è servitute liberatus, cum in parvo admodum agello largiores multo fructus perciperet, quam ex amplissimis vicinitas, in invidia magna erat, cum fruges alienas pelliceret veneficiis. Quamobrem a Sp. Albino curuli die dicta, metuens damnationem, cum in suffragium tribus oporteret ire, infrumentum rusticum omne in forum attulit, & adduxit filiam validam, atque (ut ait Piso) bene curatam ac vestitam, ferraamenta egregie facta, graves ligones, vomeres ponderosos, boves saturos. Postea dixit: Veneficia mea, Quirites, hæc sunt: nec possum vobis ostendere, aut in forum adducere lucubrationes meas, vigiliæque, & sudores. Omnium sententia absolutus itaque est. . . . Caius Furius Cresinus having recovered his liberty, was much envied because he reaped far more plentiful crops from a small field than his neighbours did from very large ones, and it was given out that he attracted other peoples corn to himself by charms. Being therefore summoned to appear by the Edile Spurius Albinus, and doubting the issue of the trial, when the votes of the tribes were to be called, he produced all his instruments of husbandry in the Forum, and brought his daughter there in a vigorous state of health, and (as Piso says) well fed and clothed, likewise his iron-tools extremely well fashioned, his heavy spades, his ponderous ploughshares, and his oxen in good case. Afterwards addressing himself to the people, these, said he, are the charms I make use of; nor can I further produce and shew you my sweats, my waking nights, and my toilsome days. Upon this he was acquitted by the unanimous consent of the people.' He doth not mention the time when this happened; but in general we may guess at it, because it is very well known that Spurius Albinus here mentioned was Consul in the year of Rome 568.

(5) J. Vincencius Gravina, in Specimine præludii juris, pag. 53, Oportulorum, Editionis Romæ, 1696, in 12mo.

Take notice, by the by, that the ancient Romans were so fully persuaded that some Magic charms could remove the fruits of the earth from one place to another, that the laws of the twelve tables established a great punishment against those pretended enchanterers. Mr Gravina, who to his polite literature has added the knowledge of the law, very justly laughs at this childish error. 'Sequitur, says he (5), frugum incantatio: cum enim veteres illi omnium bonarum artium & disciplinarum rudes putarent fruges car-

minibus magicis vel averti posse vel traduci (ut enim Tibullus ait,

Carmen vicinis fruges traducit ab agris.)

ideo Decemviri pro sua puerili ac ridicula superstitione sanxerunt, ut qui fruges exantassit, five Carminibus magicis crescere prohibuerit, aut segetem alienam pellexerit, Cereri sacer esset. . . . Next follows the incantation of corn. The Antients, being very ignorant of the Arts and Sciences, imagined that corn might be either blasted or transported from one place to another by magical charms (for as Tibullus says,

By charms the corn is from the neighbour's fields Mow'd and transplanted.)

for this reason it was that the Decemvirs in their childish and ridiculous superstition made a law, that whosoever should enchant the corn, that is, hinder it from growing by magical charms, or remove it from his neighbour's field into his own, should be devoted to Ceres.

The reflexions which I design to make on Garasse's words will not concern his calumnies or comical hyperboles; I leave them to himself, and fix only on that which may in general confirm the maxim or principle of the wife of Henry Usher, Primate of Ireland. That woman supposed that an author who had children was not able to hold up against a Monk. This maxim indeed appears somewhat probable in theory, but is false in practice; for it is easy to prove by numerous examples, that several persons who have been clogged with the cares of a family have been very great authors, whether we consider the quality or the quantity of their productions. If Garasse had writ judiciously, he would not have brought into play, Peter du Moulin and Daniel Chamier, two ministers who were very fit examples to overthrow what he designed to establish. They were both married and had children, and yet they wrote a great many good books, and gloriously disputed *vis à vis*, and in their writings, with the best controversialists of the Romish party. The examples of several other ministers might be added to these two. It may in general be affirmed that the maxim of the Primate's wife is so often contradicted and refuted by experience, that it ought by no means to pass into a rule. For whatever is liable to so many exceptions doth not deserve that name, and whoever would draw up a rule or aphorism upon such a point, must necessarily make use of this limitation, *all other things being equal, an author disengaged from all domestic affairs will exceed one clogged with a wife and children.* But who can suppose this equality, or where is it to be found? Compare an unmarried and a married writer together as long as you please, and if you find that the one hath not less wit, judgment or memory than the other, you will yet perceive that they are not perfectly alike in other particulars. The married man may prove more studious and robust, and thereby make up for the distractions and occasioned by a thousand petty domestic cares. He applies himself to study with more ardor after he hath dispatched the affairs of his family; the strength of his constitution and head allow him to study till midnight, and by that means to retrieve the lost hours of the day. He is obliged to go abroad twice or thrice in the morning, and as often in the afternoon, but he returns to his study as soon as he can, and studies with the greater ardency, because he knows that he hath been and shall be interrupted. Four or five hours of such a close study are very well worth seven or eight of the common languid and lifeless labours of those people, who have abundance of leisure. They study at their ease, without hurrying or fatiguing themselves, and rest from time to time; nor are they so solicitous to avoid the idle spending of some hours: besides, if they did not rest themselves, their way of proceeding on may aptly be compared to that of a messenger, who without ever halting continually moves on his dull pace, but doth not reach the inn where he puts up at night sooner than he, who after frequently stopping, mends his pace and sets up a

WARRERS single men study better and write more good books than married men.

afterwards for the foundation of the university of Dublin. In both these commissions he was successful (c).

(c) Taken from the life of James Usher, in Collectione Bataviana, pag. 735.

The latter is a lively image of the studies of an active author, whose domestic cares frequently divert him from them.

Though some authors, who are free from avocations of this nature, study very hard, you will find on the other side that they want the natural endowments which others have, their frail constitution forcing them to stop. They find themselves exhausted, and are necessitated to keep from their studies till a long repose hath recruited their lost spirits. If they do not lie under this inconvenience, there are others which fall in their way, perhaps the want of books. A thousand real obstacles may be supposed which break in upon the equality, and compensate the disadvantage of interruptions: wherefore Garasse and Henry Usher's wife advanced a very uncertain maxim. It is nevertheless true, that it may be said of some authors, that they would have made a greater figure if they had lived single, or that they would not have published so many excellent books, if they had been embarrassed with a family. We may also assert, that several

persons buried in obscurity had become very learned, if they had lived without a wife, mistress, children, law-suits, &c.

Observe that the Monks have not so much leisure as is imagined; the choir and breviary robs the studious of a great deal of time; and if any of them distinguishes himself by learning or piety, he is loaded with confessions. He cannot exempt himself from the direction of consciences, which frequently draws him from his study; he is obliged to give audience to a thousand devout women, whose scruples often are very ridiculous and very odd. Bellarmine had not so much time as the Archbishop of Armagh's lady imagined. I find in a tract published in the year 1625, that 'Cardinal Bellarmine, of pious memory, frequently said to the most illustrious Cardinal de la Roche-foucault, Mon-
'*ignore veramente ci sono troppo Cristiani al mondo.*
'I assure you that I am crowded with people and visits; and must own that I think there are too many Christians in the world (6).'

(6) Francis de Fontaine, (it is a fictitious name which the Jesuit Stephen Binct took. See Algernon, p. 426) preacher to the king, *Response aux Demandes d'un grand Prelat touchant la Hierarchie de l'Eglise, & la juste Dénée des Privileges des Religieux*, p. 204, 205.

USHER (JAMES), nephew to the former, and Archbishop of Armagh, was one of the most illustrious prelates of the XVIIIth century, as well with regard to his great piety and other virtues, as his profound learning. He was born at Dublin on the fourth of January 1580, and was taught to read by two aunts, though they were born blind: this is very particular. He made such an expeditious progress in the sciences, that at the age of eighteen he was able to dispute with a famous Jesuit, who, like a Goliath, challenged the Protestants [A]. He was ordained priest in the year 1601, though under the age prescribed by the canons. He was chosen Divinity Professor at Dublin about the year 1607, and exercised that employment for the space of thirteen years. He chose Bellarmine's controversies for the subject of his lectures. He was consecrated Bishop of Meath in the year 1620, and Archbishop of Armagh in 1624 (a). He very vigorously opposed the design of the Lord Falkland, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, to permit the

taught by blind

Papists

[A] At the age of eighteen he was able to dispute with a famous Jesuit . . . who challenged the Protestants. This Jesuit was the same Henry-Fitz Simon, whom I have cited in the preceding article. He was kept prisoner in the castle of Dublin, but his confinement did not hinder his challenging all the Protestant Clergy to dispute with him, and his fiercely engaging to maintain what they took for the weakest part of the Romish religion, and to attack what they thought the strongest part of the Protestant doctrine. *Donec ego, faith he (1), cause bonitate sustulit, defendere quicquid inter nos infirmum, vel impugnare quicquid inter ipsos tutissimum reputant, in me recipiam.* James Usher, whilst yet beardless, had the courage to enter the lists with this old experienced stagger, and we are assured that he vanquished him. 'Cum Henrico Simonido Jesuita, pœcente sibi dari adversarios in castro Dublinensi de arce causæ suæ (scil. Antichristo) sæpius ita conflixit, imberbis juvenis cum veterano milite, ut & provocationis eum suæ pœneret, & satis antagonistarum in uno hoc octodenario tyrone experiretur. Ipsum audite Jesuitam in præfatione libri sui quem de Britannomachia ministrorum placuit inscribere. *Prodiit quidem semel, (inquit) octodenarius præcoci sapientie juvenis, de abstrusissimis rebus Theologicis, cum ad hoc Philosophica studia non esset emensus, nec ephēbis egressus, disputandi avidus, &c.* Quem postea cum adoleverat *Acatolicorum doctissimum* idem ille pronuntiabat, amplum sane & insolitum ex id genus ad-versarii ore testimonium (2). . . . When the Jesuit Henry-Fitz Simon demanded that his adversaries should meet him in the castle of Dublin, this beardless youth entering the lists with an old champion, had several disputes with him touching the main point of his cause, viz. Antichrist. The Jesuit was so handled that he heartily repented his challenge, and found antagonists enough in this one youth, who was only eighteen years of age. Hear what he himself owns in the Preface to his book which he has thought fit to intitule, de Britannomachia Ministrorum. Once, indeed, says he, there came forth a youth, not above eighteen years old, but of a forward understanding, who threw a great eagerness to dispute upon the most abstruse points of

'Divinity, tho' he has not as yet finished his Philosophical studies, nor was arrived at the age of a man, &c. When he was grown up, the same Jesuit declared him to be the most learned of all the Protestants, which was truly a high and uncommon testimony from the mouth of such an adversary.' Pray observe the at cetera at the end of the citation out of the Jesuit's Preface, and do not imagine that some words were omitted because they were foreign to the subject; for they were only suppressed because they are inconsistent with what was said just before. The whole passage of Fitz Simon runs thus: *Sed neque in specula eminentem videre, neque in castris, claustrisque Stentoria ut agnoscent voce provocantem, exaudire voluerunt. Prodiit quidem semel in summa vocis vultusque trepidatione, octodenarius præcoci sapientie (non tamen malæ, ut videbatur indolis) juvenis, nescio an auræ popularis cupidior, saltem de abstrusissimis rebus Theologicis cum ad hoc philosophica studia non esset emensus, nec Ephēbis egressus, disputandi avidus. Hunc autem jussi suorum calculos adferre, quibus pugil seu agonista idoneus renunciaretur, & vel cum ipso disputationem me initurum. Sed sicut ipse cum minime tanto honore dignatus sunt, ita me vicissim sua deinceps præsentia dignatus ipse non fuit (3).* The Jesuit assures us that he asked this scholar, who trembling came to dispute with him, *Are you authorized by your superiors?* and that he offered, if he was, to enter the lists with him; but the young man not being honoured with any such commission could produce no credentials, and never came again. Nevertheless it is assured in the life of Usher, which I have already cited, that he frequently disputed with this Jesuit, and got the better of him. We read in another life of this Archbishop, that he engaged in this disputation with the consent of the whole university, and that at the second conference he overthrew and so silenced his antagonist, that, after that time, he never was bold enough to engage again, tho' provoked to it: *Communi Academiæ consensu placuit Usserium, qui tum non nisi Artium Baccalaureus 18 aut 19 ætatis annum agebat, cum ipso committere: qui ut ab initio ab antagonista suo fere pro pueris ac despectui haberetur, post unum tamen alterumque colloquium adeo præfidentiam ejus perdidit, ut ad incitatus se, certe ad sentium*

(a) Taken from his life, in Collectione Bataviana.

(3) Fitz Simon, in Prefat. Britannom. pag. 140

(1) Henr. Fitz-Simon, Episc. Cædicat. Britannomach. Ministrorum.

(2) Vita Jacobi Usserii, in Collectione Bataviana, pag. 737.

(b) From pag. 219, to pag. 244, in the extract of Usher's letters, to which his life written by Mr. Parr, has been prefixed. Another life of Usher came out since, as you may see in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, for January 1701, p. 77.

Papists the public exercise of their religion [B], provided they would pay the necessary sums for the subsistence of the forces. He went to England in the year 1640, and never returned to Ireland, being hindered by the civil wars, which reduced him to a melancholy condition. He died at Rygate in Surrey on the twenty-first of March 1655. His wife, the daughter of Luke Challoner, Doctor of Divinity, died eighteen months before him, having been married to him the space of forty years; he had one daughter who was married to Timothy Tyrrel Esq; Governor of Cardiff in Wales. This article would have been much longer, and would have contained more particulars concerning the merit and the works of this great man, if I had not known that there is in Moreri, and yet more at large in the second volume of the *Bibliothèque Universelle* (b), a good abridgment of his life.

(4) Acta Erudit. Lips. 1687, pag. 115, in the Extract of Usher's Life, written by Mr. Parr. Note that Saldenus de Libris, pag. 368, relying, as I think, upon this passage of the Acta Eruditum, does so far exaggerate the thing as to affirm that the Jesuit himself owned that he was nonplussed. Fastidiosam viri præfidentiam ita perdomuit, ut ad novum provocatus confitium, declinavit, cum non tantum sed & ad exequenda redactum se esse ipse confessus sit.

lentium redactum max agnosceret, nec ulterius configere, ne provocatus quidem auderet (4). Either the Jesuit's relation, or that of the author of Usher's life must of necessity contain some fallacies.

[B] He opposed the design of the Lord Falkland . . . to permit the Papists the public exercise of their religion.]

The Lord Falkland proposed this to the parliament of Ireland in the year 1626. Archbishop Usher, who knew how fatal this would be to Ireland, assembled all the Bishops of his province, and drew up a declaration, which they all signed. It imported, that considering the falsity of the doctrine and worship of the Papists, it would be a great sin to permit the exercise of such a religion. The writing which they signed was read in the pulpit, and put a stop to the toleration which the Lord Lieutenant designed to procure. All this is related in stronger terms, and more particularly, in this Latin passage: 'Reverendissimus Primas facile perspiciens ea res quam fatalis Hiberniæ futura esset, omnes ditionis suæ Episcopos convocavit, qui ejusmodi indulgentiæ impietatem, subcriptis nominibus, unanimi consensu in hanc fere sententiam testati sunt. Quod quum Papistarum religio superstitiosa esset ac idololatrica, fides erronea ac hæretica, Ecclesia utriusque respectu Apostolica, liberum iis religionis suæ exercitium liberamque fidei suæ ac doctrinæ professionem indulgere grave peccatum foret; tum quod hæc ratione omnium Papismi superstitutionum, idolatriarum, hæresium, ac uno verbo abominationum ejus omnium, quin & perditionis omnium, quotquot in istius apostoliæ diluvio perirent, culpa & reatu nos (alunt) involveret, tum vero etiam quoniam hoc facere pecuniæ gratia nil aliud foret quam religionem venum exponere, imo & animas pretio prodere quas saluator noster Jesus Christus precioso suo sanguine redimere non dubitavit. Deum propterea veritatis comprecantes, ut vellet omnes, qui cum imperio erant, zelo Dei gloriæ & veræ religionis propagandæ studio imbueri & contra Papismum, Superstitutionem, ac Idolatriam omnem fortes eos reddere, zelo affectos, & animo quam maxime obarmatos. Episcopi duodecim omnino erant qui huic protestationi subscriperunt; quam Downhamus Derriensis Episcopus, cum postea coram Falklandio & concilio prædicaret, media concione publice recitavit; quin & Reverendissimus Primas eandem proximo die Dominico coram eisdem inter concionandum comprobavit; una in-

gens quam gravis ira Dei ob talem animorum pro-

pensionem ei genti impenderet. Unde tandem effe-

ctum est ut ad alia consilia deflecterent (5). . . . The (c) Batz. Vita

most reverend Primate, easily perceiving how fatal such a

thing would be to Ireland, assembled all his Suffragans,

who, with an unanimous consent, drew up and signed a

remonstrance, wherein they declared how impious it

would be to grant an indulgence of that nature, in words

to the following purpose. That whereas the religion of

the Papists was superstitious and idolatrous, their faith

erroneous and heretical, and their Church in both re-

spects guilty of apostasy, it would be a great sin to in-

dulge them in the free exercise of their religion, and in

the free profession of their faith and doctrine; both be-

cause such a thing would (as they said) involve us in

the guilt of all the superstitions, idolatries, heresies, and,

in one word, abominations of Popery; nay, what is more,

make us accessory to the ruin of all such as should perse-

vere in the flood of that apostasy, and likewise because to do

this for the sake of money would be in effect selling reli-

gion to sale, and even betraying for hire the souls

which our Saviour JESUS CHRIST has been

pleased to redeem with his precious blood. Wherefore

they prayed the GOD of truth, that he would endow

all such as were in power with a zeal for the glory of

GOD and the propagation of religion, and that he

would fortify them against all Popery, superstition and

idolatry, inspiring them with zeal and resolution. There

were twelve Bishops who subscribed this remonstrance,

which Downham, Bishop of Londonderry, when some

time after he preached before the Lord Falkland, and the

Council, took occasion to read in the middle of his sermon;

nay, the reverend Archbishop himself did, the next Lord's

day, preaching before the same persons, approve of the re-

monstrances, insinuating at the same time that the dread-

ful vengeance of GOD threatened that nation for en-

tertaining such a design; whereby it came to pass that

other resolutions were taken. It is observable that

Archbishop Usher and his diocessans acted according to

the most rigid principles of the enemies to Toleration;

for they did not, like moderate men of that party,

ground their declaration on political reasons, but only

on the nature of worship in the Romish communion,

without so much as ever mentioning it's persecuting

spirit, the sole reason urged by the very favourers of

Toleration for not tolerating the Papists.

to be taken down, and carrying them off in their

coaches, buried them with their own hands in

St Martin's chapel under Montmartre: and this

death of la Molle drew showers of tears from his

mistress, who sighed and sung her passionate grief

for him under the name of Hyacinthus, notwith-

standing the frequent and nocturnal consolations of

Saint Luc, who afterwards came often incognito and

disguised to Nerac, till Bully made her forget the loss,

which has been made up to her, tho' he was re-

ported to be more valiant and stout amongst the men

than amongst the women (3), by reason of a sort of

cholic, which generally seized him at midnight.

She being disguised, excited her appetite with variety

of

(a) Hadr. Val-
lesius, Notit.
Galliar. pag.
588.

(b) Baudrand,
Geograph. Tom.
ii, pag. 363.

(1) In the re-
mark [D] of
the third article
NAVARRÉ.

(2) Divorce Sa-
vatrique, pag. m.
191.

USSON, in Latin *Ucio*, or *Uxo* (a), a small town in Auvergne a league distant from the river Allier (b), and six leagues from Clermont, formerly depended on the county of Brive (c). The castle of Usson is very strong by reason of its situation on a high rock naturally cut into round pillars (d). Nothing hath made this place so famous as the long residence of Margaret de Valois wife of Henry IV. She lived there several years, not in order to do penance for her past leudness [A], but to plunge her self deeper and deeper

[A] For her past leudness. I have elsewhere (1) mentioned some part of her leud practices, taken from a book which introduces Henry IV, relating the ill conduct of his wife. The rest of the narrative runs thus: (2) Time . . . provided her with several servants; la Molle, one of them, had cause to repent it, for under pretence of being concerned in a conspiracy with which the Marshals de Montmorency and de Cossé were charged, he left his head at St Jean en Greve, in company with that of Coconas, where they did not grow musty, nor were long exposed to public view; for the night following, my good wife, and Madam de Nevers, her companion, Coconas's faithful mistress, caused them

to be taken down, and carrying them off in their coaches, buried them with their own hands in St Martin's chapel under Montmartre: and this death of la Molle drew showers of tears from his mistress, who sighed and sung her passionate grief for him under the name of Hyacinthus, notwithstanding the frequent and nocturnal consolations of Saint Luc, who afterwards came often incognito and disguised to Nerac, till Bully made her forget the loss, which has been made up to her, tho' he was reported to be more valiant and stout amongst the men than amongst the women (3), by reason of a sort of cholic, which generally seized him at midnight. She being disguised, excited her appetite with variety of

(c) Valid old
supra.

(d) Coconas, Ri-
viera de France,
Part. i, pag.
265.

(3) Add this to
the examples
quoted above, in
the remark [B]
of the article
HENRY IV.

deeper in her impurities [B]. Notwithstanding which she hath met with some panegyrist, who compared this castle, considered as the place of her residence, to the mountain where JESUS CHRIST was transfigured. *To the end that her consolation might be perfect, faith one of them (c), she desired to see the court of Henry the Great and to leave her dear Usson, which had kept her for the space of twenty years, during which time she rendered*

(c) Hilarion de Coste, *Elog. des Dames illustres*, Tom. ii, pag. 306.

of sauces, and took up with Mr de Mayenne, a jolly bulky fellow, as voluptuous as herself; after which they remained very good friends on all occasions, tho' not without a quarrel, which lasted for some time on account of a letter written to Mrs Vitry, in which he promised to prefer the sun to the moon To her former lovers succeeded at several times, (for their great number will excuse my misplacing them) that good fellow the Viscount de Turenne, whom like the rest she soon dismissed, finding him disproportionate in some part or other: she compared him to empty clouds which have nothing but a bare superficial appearance. The melancholy lover being in despair, after a farewell, accompanied with many tears, was going to ruin himself in some distant region, if I, who knew the secret, and for the good of the churches, pretended ignorance of it, had not expressly enjoined my chaste wife to recal him: which she did very much against her will, proudly wishing that some block-head might break his neck on her account. But these fools are grown scarce since they are laughed at; for to eat one's hat-feather in a rage, like la Bole, and to throw an ink-bottle in a passion at the ladies eyes, as Clermont d'Amboise did, are silly frenzies and jealousies, which were but too common amongst us, and which I knew and clearly saw, consenting to my own dishonour, and giving them, by my patience, the courage and opportunity of offending. She knows it very well, as do several of you who have assisted her in her diversions; nor was I so blind in an affair so apparent as not to perceive, as well as others, that Clermont frequently kissed her in her petticoat only, at her chamber-door, when in the evening I either by playing or walking in the hall with my nobility, gave him an opportunity to get into her bed . . . (4) Her beauty drew to me crowds of gentlemen, and her good nature retained them: nor was there any well-born spark or handsome fellow, who once in his life had not been an humble servant to the Queen of Navarre, who never denied any, but like the poor box, received the offerings of all comers. Add to this the passage cited from the same book in the article of this

(4) Divorce Satyrique, p. 194.

(5) Citat. (76), of the third article N A V A R R E.

(6) Divorce Sat. pag. 198.

[B] To plunge herself deeper and deeper in her impurities.] The passages just cited or pointed at, carry our Margaret no farther than Auvergne. Let us go on and hear the author who introduces Henry IV speaking. (6) The King her brother hearing of her flight . . . said aloud in presence of all those who then saw him at dinner, the Gascon sparks being insufficient to satiate the Queen of Navarre, she is gone in quest of the mule-drivers and tinkers of Auvergne This profligate woman being arrived at Carlat, where she long continued, not only without canopy or bed of state, but even without a sufficient number of shifts for every day, began to cast her eyes about, and to consider to which of her domestics she should prostitute her honour; and not to be idle, she pitched upon her cook, being tired with waiting for Duras, whom she had sent to the King of Spain for money, tho' her confident fearing she might deprive her of her own lover, continually inculcated the constancy and merit of the absent gentleman. But her insatiable desire, like the ravenous appetite of a blood-hound, which enfeebles one that is not continually satisfied, could not bear this delay, nor that of Saint Vincent, who was gone home to avoid expences, she took up with the wretched Aubiac, as being the best tricked up of all her domestics, whom she raised from her stables to her chamber, and caused him to ride her, till her belly became plump and swelled like a football, and, in due time, disgorged a boy, by the help of a Midwife, whom this spark's mother, out of pure love to her son, brought thither, and by the assistance of du May, the Physician, who, besides the exercise of his profession in curing her of an imposthume in her backside, served her also in conveying

this young prince Lyfander, wretchedly swaddled, to his nurse in the neighbouring village of Ekoubiac: this was done so soon after his birth, that the cold he endured by the way utterly prevented his ever hearing or speaking: these imperfections deprived him of the love and care of his own mother, who forgetting the pleasure of the conception, for a long time suffered him to keep geese in Gasconne, where Mrs d'Aubiac, his grandmother, (as long as she lived) kept him from starving, and after her, Gesilax de Firmaçon, her son-in-law, who at present shews this pledge of the crown, as a great rarity to all those who come to see him at Birac, where he keeps him for a pension of two hundred crowns, which Goute Raquette has for some time been employed to go to Usson and Paris in quest of . . .

(7) Aubiac, a forry groom, red haired, and more speckled than a trout, when he consulted his

glafe, could never have promised himself to be one day found in bed with a daughter of France, as he was at Carlat, by Madam de Marie (8), who hit on this noble adventure by a too early good morning to the Queen according to her custom, which officious compliment the yet paid for with the death of her husband, whom this virtuous Princess, perfectly acquainted with the potions of her mother's country, caused to be poisoned in hopes that being delivered from this obstacle, and assisted by the soldiers whom Romes, d'Aubiac's cousin, had raised in Gasconne, she should make her self absolute mistress of the place, and ungratefully wrest it out of their hands who had generously received and protected her . . . (9). The guard being re-inforced,

and her Gasconne auxiliaries discovered, she was familiarly advised to leave that place, and take another lodging: which (being thoroughly terrified) she did at that instant, departing with the same precipitancy and confusion, with which she came thither, and after travelling some days she reached Ivoi, the palace of the Queen, her mother; where she was scarce arrived, but by the King's command she was by the Marquis de Canillac, besieged, and taken with her paramour, who was found meanly hid under several ordures without either beard or hair, his mistress having so disguised him with her own

scissars in order to save him . . . Canillac . . . (10) preferring a paltry pleasure to the faith which he owed to his master, danced after the pipe, and suffered himself to be carried away by the artifices

of his prisoner, and forgetting his duty, as well as quitting all pretensions to the making of his fortune, he became enamoured of the Queen, and so very jealous that he sacrificed poor Aubiac to his suspicions, causing his indictment to be drawn up by Lugoly, and afterwards had him hanged at Aigueperie, at which time, instead of considering his salvation, and the state of his soul, he kissed a blue velvet muff which he had yet remaining of the benefactions of his lady . . . Canillac having rather executed his jealousy than my vengeance on this criminal, did not fail to cast glances at her, and the little gentleman began to grow extraordinary careful of his dress, inasmuch, that in a little time, from as great a sloven as my self, he was as nicely set out as an amorous country beau: but at length what did his dress avail him? His inconstant lack one, whose levity he proposed to keep under lock and key, enclosed within the impregnable fortresses of Usson, would become mistress, and indulge her appetite to the highest with its usual variety: to compass this, knowing by experience the power of voluptuous desires, she feigns to return love for love; and yields to the importunity of several addresses, after which she so wrought on, and influenced, her guardian, that at last by her artificial caresses she obtained her liberty, by endearing promises that the favours which hitherto she seemed to grant but sparingly, and by force, should be prodigally bestowed out of choice, when she came to

(7) Ibid. pag. 200.

(8) The author means the same keeper of the castle, whom he calls Muree, pag. 197.

(9) Divorce Satyrique, pag. 201, 202.

(10) Ibid. pag. 203.

rendered that strong castle of Auvergne a Tabor by her devotion, a Libanus by her solitude, an Olympus by her exercises, a Parnassus by her Muses, and a Caucasus on account of her afflictions. It would have favoured much less of calumny to have compared that place with the island of Caprea, Tiberius's retirement, than it favours of flattery to compare it to a place of devotion, and a Holy Temple of God, as another panegyrist does [C]. If this lady's leudnefs were only mentioned in the *Divorce Satyrique*, or in some other libel, we

to be free and absolute mistress of Usson. She de-
luded her spark in that manner; for the garrison
had scarce voided the place, before she filled it with
her own creatures, whilst the easy Marquis retired
to St Cirque to gather his apples; and she proved
to be ungrateful to this servant of her's, that she could
not endure even the bare naming of him: being
heartened by several men sent to her from Orleans,
and who soon after were like to treat her according
to her wishes, she then resolved to follow her own
will, and establish an empire of pleasure within this
rock, where securely enclosed by three walls, and
all the great gates being walled up, God, and all
France know what delicious games were played and
practised there for the space of twenty years. Aretin's Nanna and his holy woman are nothing to it.
It is indeed true that instead of the gallants, who
formerly used to sweeten her life, she was obliged
for want of better to make use of her domestics,
Secretaries, Musicians, and mongrels of the nobility,
whom she drew to her by presents, whose families
and names unknown to their very neighbours, are
unworthy of my remembrance, except only the famous Pominy, the son of a Tinker in Auvergne,
who being taken from the cathedral church, where
he was one of the singing boys, and being distinguished from his equals by a fine voice, was preferred to this Queen's Music, and at last from the chapel to the chamber, and from the chamber to the closet, becoming her Secretary . . . (11). It was upon his account that the bedsteads of her ladies at Usson, were raised so high, that she might see under them without stooping, and not be obliged to crawl on all four in search of him, as she was wont to do to the great prejudice of her back parts. It was he whom she often groped for behind the hangings, expecting to find him there, and it was in too eager quest of him that she frequently hurt her face, by running it against the walls and doors.

(11) Ibid. pag. 205.

(12) Ibid. pag. 210, & seq.

I omit whatever concerns the amours which the author pretends (12) she was engaged in at Paris, after she left Usson. But it will not be improper to see here a passage of Hilarion de Cotte, which, as to several facts, may serve for a confirmation of the narrative we find in the *Divorce Satyrique*. She left Agen in the habit of a plain citizen's wife, riding on horseback behind Lignerac, on whom she bestowed the name of Knight of the Fine Flower, and fled the whole night, enduring a fatigue which tried her courage at the peril of her health. De Marfès came to meet her on the frontiers, accompanied with one hundred gentlemen, and lodging her at his mansion-house of Carlat, returned to Agen in order to secure her jewels, and the scattered remains of her retinue: and after the expiration of eighteen months, his death occasioned her leaving that place, and taking up her station at Yboi, a palace belonging to the Queen, her mother, where she was arrested. The thunder of the King's rage, threatening her every where, spared the sacred lilies, which surrounded her head, but put one of her servants to an ignominious death at Aigueperfe. The Marquis de Canillac conveyed her to, and imprisoned her at, Usson; but soon after this nobly defended Lord became the captive of his prisoner: he thought he had triumphed over her, and the bare sight of her hands, whiter than ivory, vanquished him; after which he lived on nothing else but the favour of the victorious eyes of his charming captive. But the King's threats, the fear of death, the apprehension of destroying his fortune, and of the ruin of his house, made deeper impressions in his mind than any other consideration, and forced him to use rigorous and severe commands against her. The protection of God, her own prudence and address, together with the seasonable assistance of the Duke of Guise, so happily snatched her from the shadows

of death, that at the very instant when she expected to die a captive, she found her self secure to reign free in that strong place, from whence she dislodged them, who had fixed her there, and convinced them that virtue and valour make no distinction of sexes (13). You may see that this Monk owns whatever he thinks he may own without being obliged to blame her.

[C] Compare the castle of Usson . . . to a holy temple of GOD, as another panegyrist does.] This author was John Darnalt, the King's Attorney in the prebend of Agen. Some parts of his elogy on this Queen run thus: 'It is very true, *saith he* (14), that her Majesty, since she is in that place (15), most strictly observes a very laudable custom. After having moderately recreated her self with the exercise of the Muses, she spends the greatest part of her time retired in her chapel, offering up zealous and fervent prayers to God, and communicating once or twice every week: is not this, *stellis infudere & concilio Jovis?* . . . To sit upon the stars, and in the council of Jove? Oh Phoenix! who by extending your wings, elevate the eyes of your understanding to the great bright celestial star, by the light of which you see, live, and revive in it. Phoenix! who are daily born again out of your own ashes, flaming and consuming your self in the Divine love. Great Princess and Queen, who have neither motion, life, nor light, but that which you receive from this primitive light. You live a life different from that of mankind. We read that the bright and noble souls of the Elysian fields, before they made their last flight

(13) Hilar. de Cotte, Elog. des Dames illust. Tom. ii. pag. 301, 302.

(14) John Darnalt, Antiquities d'Agen, chap. xxii. fol. 124, verso.

(15) That is, in Usson Castle.

Illuc, unde negant redire quemquam,

To that same place whence none returns,

to the seat of perfect bliss, and eternal joy and light,

Fortunatorum nemorum, sedesque beatas,

The happy groves and mansions of the blest,

were for a time purified in a clear air, and freed from all manner of corruption. So this most noble royal soul retired to the Elysian castle of Usson, and before her entrance into the glory of the heavens, was willing to make neighbouring approaches to them, and began to take her flight that way: having learned the exercise of the contemplative life, and how to separate her blessed soul, from her most perfect body, in order to die well. For according to Plato τὸ μελέτημα αὐτὸ τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν φιλοσόφων, λύσις καὶ χωρισμὸς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ τῆς σώματος. It is the study of a wise man to disentangle and separate the soul from the body. She is Jupiter's divine eagle, which contemplates and looks with a fixed eye, from an exalted place near the heavens, at the solar rays of the Divine goodness and providence . . . (16). Thou rock of Usson, the honour and wonder of Auvergne, whose snow melts by the eyes, or more properly by the rays of this almost adorable terrestrial deity! Rock, on which the light perpetually shines, where the day never fails, but the rays of the royal presence are perpetually resplendant, and illuminate that place and the circumjacent region! . . . (17) Fair star of Europe, which is fixed at, and never stirs from Usson! Usson the royal residence of the last race . . . of Valois . . . (18) Pious and religious habitation, thou holy temple of God, which serveest not as an inviolable sanctuary, or asyle of refuge, but like righteous Noah's ark, has afforded her Majesty a retreat from the inundations and ravages of France . . . (19) I cannot yet leave Usson, that mountain crowned with this royal castle, that holy hermitage, and devout monastery where her Majesty sequesters her self

In Phaedrus

(16) Ibid. fol. 125, verso.

(17) Ibid. fol. 126.

(18) Ibid. verso.

(19) Ibid. fol. 127.

we might justly suspect the truth of it; but since celebrated Historians are not silent on this head [D], we ought to believe the truth of the fact. Scipio Du Pleix is the person that

'self to study and meditation which only tends to the end of ends, and the most perfect end. Thou rock art an evidence of the voluntary, most laudable and religious solitude of this prince; a place which for the transcendent harmony of its Music, and the melodious songs of the finest voices in France, seems the only terrestrial paradise, and here her Majesty tastes that contentment and ease of mind, which the blessed enjoy in the other world.'

Observe that Mr de Perfixe is in the wrong to say, that Margaret voluntarily shut up her self in the castle of Usson (20).

[D] Celebrated Historians are not silent on this head.]

I have mentioned in another place of this Dictionary (21) what d'Aubigné says, not in a satire, but in his Universal History, I have also quoted a passage out of Mezerai (22), and the reader has been told (23) that Varillas relates the same things. But I shall further quote a more credible Historian in this particular, by reason he was devoted to Catherine de Medicis, and consequently not at all inclined to excuse the conduct of the King of Navarre. I mean Davila, who acknowledges that this Prince did in a manner divorce his consort, by reason of her scandalous reputation of unchastity. And he also owns that in her retreat she led a loose life: 'Movevalo grandemente il rispetto della Reina Margherita sua moglie, perche havendola per la fama delle sue impudicitie, come repudiata, & essendosi lei ritirata in Overnia a certi suoi castelli a vivere con libertà molto licentiosa, vedeva necessariamente, o convenire riceverla di nuovo all' unione del suo matrimonio, o non poter mai stare in sincera amicitia, & in intera confidenza con la suocera, e col cognato (24). - - - The consideration of

Margaret, his Queen, had great weight with him, because having in a manner divorced her on account of her scandalous lewdness, and she being retired to some of her own castles in Auvergne, in order to live very licentiously, he saw that he should either be obliged to take her back again, or else that he never could maintain a sincere friendship, and an entire confidence with his mother and brother-in-law.' He repeats almost the same thing in another place of his book: 'La quale (Reina Margherita) havendo abbandonata se stessa a vita licentiosa per rispetto de' risentimenti del marito, si era fuggita da lui, ma pervenuta per ordine suo, e per commissione del Rè suo fratello, ella fu posta nel castello di Carlat in Overnia come prigioniera, e di là dopo qualche tempo trasferita ad Usson nella medesima Provincia sotto alla custodia del Marchese di Canillac; il quale come si diceva, fatto prigioniero della sua prigioniera l'aveva riposta in libertà, onde ella trattenendosi in alcune sue castella pur in Overnia, e continuando l'istesso modo di vite, era di grandissimo ostacolo alle convenzioni, che trà il marito, & il fratello potessero contrattarsi (25). - - - Queen Margaret having given her self up to a licentious life, and dreading her husband's resentment, had run away from him, but being arrived in Auvergne, she was by his order, and by a commission from the King, her brother, confined to the castle of Carlat, and from thence she was some time after transported to Usson in the same province, under the custody of the Marquis de Canillac. He, as it was reported, being captivated with the charms of his prisoner, set her at liberty; after which she lived in some of her own castles in Auvergne, and continuing the same course of life she was a very great obstacle to any agreement that might have been made between her husband and brother.'

There are some faults in this relation of Davila. I. It is not true that Queen Margaret retired to Auvergne in order to live licentiously. She lived every where in the same manner, and she would have found her account better at Agen from whence she fled, than in Auvergne whither she retired. The truth is, that the fear of being seized at Agen was the cause of her departure thence (26), and if she sheltered her self rather in Auvergne than in any other place, it was not owing to her free choice, but pure necessity. Lignerac, her conductor, had no other place proper for refuge (27). II. It is not true that she retired into some castles belonging to her. III. Nor is it true that she was imprisoned at Carlat by order of her husband, and by a commission from Henry III. Her conductor's brother, pursuant to her own desire, received her (28). It may be that afterwards the governor of the place received orders to be answerable for his guest, and secure her (29); but this doth not excuse Davila. IV. It is false, that being set at liberty by the Marquis de Canillac, she retired to one of her own seats. V. One of these passages of Davila is refuted by the other; for if she retired to her seat when she broke with her husband, as we are told in the first passage, what is affirmed in the second, that she did not retreat thither till after she was set at liberty by the Marquis de Canillac, is not true. Mr de Beauvais Nangis (30) hath censured only this last of Davila's errors, and hath given his approbation to all the rest. But these small mistakes are no just reasons against our believing this famous Historian, when he tells us that Henry III and Catherine de Medicis resolved to annul the King of Navarre's marriage, and abandon Margaret as unworthy of being acknowledged of their blood. 'Deliberarono finalmente, che non era da tener più conto della persona di Margherita, refasi da se stessa poco degna d'esser da loro riconosciuta, nè per sorella, nè per figliuola, e che, poiche la dispensa difettosa ottenuta dal Pontefice al tempo del suo matrimonio, porgeva causa, e pretesto a poterlo disciogliere, si douesse fare questo divorzio, e dar per moglie al Rè di Navarra Christiana figliuola del Duca di Loreno (31). - - - At last they concluded that

no further regard was to be had to the person of Margaret, she having rendered herself unworthy to be acknowledged by them either as a sister or daughter; and that since there was a flaw in the dispensation obtained from the Pope at the time of her marriage, this divorce should be made, and the King of Navarre should marry Christian daughter to the Duke of Lorraine.' The Ambassador Bulbequius, whose authority is as good as that of an Historian, in a letter written from Paris to his Imperial Majesty, dated the twenty-seventh of August, in the year 1583, expresses himself thus: 'Rex foreorem suam, Reginam Navarra, palam multis audientibus graviter increpuit, quod vitam degeret turpem, & flagitiis contaminatam. Commemoravit memoriter moerorum introductiones, quibus illa consueverat. Etiam puerum sine marito opera natum objecit, eaque omnia suis temporibus, & reliquis rebus ita notata, ut ipse interfuisse videretur, & Reginam ea magis confiteri puderet, quam confutare posset. Finis orationis fuit, ut eam statim Lutetiam migrare juberet, urbemque suam contagione liberaret. Sic, illa, collectis raptim farcinis, die sequenti, non modò sine ullo prosequuntium officio, sed sine iusto etiam famulitio, Lutetiam excessit (32). - - - The King severely rebuked his sister, the Queen of Navarre, before a great deal of company, on account of her lewd and infamous way of life. He put her in mind of the intrigues which she had carried on with her adulterers. He likewise upbraided her with having had a boy by one of them. All these things he set forth in such a particular manner, both as to their times and circumstances, that he seemed to have been an eye-witness of them, and the Queen was rather ashamed to own than able to answer the charge. He concluded his discourse with ordering her to leave Paris immediately, and to rid the city of her infection. Upon this she packed up her things in a hurry, and the very next day went out of Paris, being not only destitute of all such attendance as follow out of respect and ceremony, but wanting even a proper number of servants.' You see here that Henry III not only particularized the circumstances of his sister's adulteries, but also charged her with being delivered of a bastard. This author adds, that after this reprimand, Chanvalon, a very handsome young gentleman, who passed for one of Margaret's favourite gallants (33) retired into Germany. He had lost the favour of the Duke of Anjou, on account of some letters which he wrote from Antwerp, but according to others for bragging of the favours of a great lady. Read Varillas's words: 'The Lord, who, above all others in the kingdom, made the most regular court to Queen Margaret, was James de Harley-Chanvalon, who had formerly followed the Duke of Anjou into Flanders, where

(28) Ibid.

(29) Consult Brantome, in his discourse on that Queen, pag. 421, Edit. 1699, & d'Aubigné, in Tom. iii. of his History, book v, chap. iv, pag. 641, where he seems to contradict what he advances in the Divorce Satyr.

(30) In his remarks upon Davila, pag. 144, 149.

(31) Davila, lib. viii, pag. 432, ad ann. 1586.

(32) Bulbequius, Epist. xxi ad Rudolphum II, Imperatorem, pag. m. 517.

(33) Chanvalonius juvenis est dubie nobilitatis, suavitatis morum, etatis flore, & forme venustate præfatus, habitus inter primos ejus Regine proco. Id. ibid. pag. 518.

(34) Id. ibid.

(20) Perfixe, Histoire d'Henri le Grand, ad ann. 1599, pag. m. 301.

(21) In the third article N. A. VARRE, citation (9). See also d'Aubigné, Tom. iii, pag. 641.

(22) Ibid. citation (47).

(23) Ibid. citation (48).

(24) Davila, lib. viii, pag. m. 379, ad ann. 1585.

(25) Idem, lib. viii, pag. m. 432, ad ann. 1586.

(26) Brant. Dames illustres. See his words in citation (74), of the third article NAVARRE.

(27) See citation (76), ibid. and citation (14), in the preceding page.

V O L . V .

6 S

that has given the most particular account of it [E]: for this he was blamed, and justified himself: I shall examine whether the Marshal de Bassompierre's anger is just [F]. However that be, we may say that the makers of elogies are much less to be excused, since

he gave proofs of his valour on several occasions. This Duke frequently received him at his table: but he not being so discreet as he should have been, one day dropped some boasting expressions concerning the good fortune which his beauty and good mien had obtained from one of the greatest ladies of the court of France. The Duke of Anjou hearing him, banished him from his table, and even from the Low-Countries; and it was but one year since Chanvalon was returned from thence. Being not very welcome to the King, because the favourites did not look kindly upon those who had declared for the Duke of Anjou; he applied himself to the service of the Queen of Navarre, from which the favourites took occasion to publish that love was the sole cause of it: and as nothing could be said of the King's sister so scandalous but he believed it; he gave so much credit to this report that he banished Chanvalon from her, without taking care to cover this with some pretence, that it might not reflect upon her. It also appears that the King publicly complained to his sister of her way of living with Chanvalon (35). But now let us turn our eyes to the relation of Du Pleix the Historian: and we shall find amongst other particulars, that Queen Margaret had a child by Chanvalon.

[E] Scipio Du Pleix is the person that has given the most particular account of it. I shall collect together what this author hath dispersed in several places: and begin with these words, *The King of Navarre . . . made love to the maids of Queen Margaret his wife, which she suffered the more patiently, by reason her husband did not controul her own actions: though she complains in her Memoirs, that her maids had done her ill offices with respect to him. But this she says in order to cover the sins which she had been guilty of against the laws of marriage. Written words cannot bluish; but I should blush whilst writing, if I should set down what I have heard her say seriously about it. She was certainly a Princess enriched with excellent and perfectly royal endowments; but she had also great weaknesses, as well as some ill habits. Perhaps I may speak of it more largely and more properly in the reign of Henry the Great, when my subject will oblige me more particularly to it, though with regret, having had the honour to belong to her household for six years, and to be always favourably treated by that illustrious Princess* (36). What follows strikes with horror: 'Henry III . . . treated his sisters with fraternal tenderness, but at last hated Margaret Queen of Navarre, as well because she did not live well with her husband, as by reason she was a continual accomplice in all the conspiracies of the Duke of Alençon. Notwithstanding this he always shewed himself more indulgent to pardon than severe to punish them, till Margaret (either in jest or earnest) let fall an incestuous expression to Queen Louise his Majesty's wife. For this good King finding himself touched in a particular, which most sensibly affects generous souls, never after looked favourably on that brother, or that incorrigible sister. The perfectly chaste and virtuous Princess Louise hearing this infamous discourse of her sister-in-law, suddenly stopped her mouth, by very modestly saying, as though she did not take it seriously, *pray, sister, rally more agreeably*. But yet dreading the artifices of her malice, she related the immodesty of her sister to the King, which very sensibly incensed him against her and his brother, and he loved Louise the more tenderly for it' (37). When Du-Pleix tells the reasons which Henry IV, had to sue for a dissolution of his marriage, he expresses himself thus (38): 'The VI nullity was founded on the manners of Queen Margaret, which were equally insupportable and manifest to the whole world; yet he did not urge this in order to obtain her consent to the dissolution and annulling of their marriage. But the Pope and the sacred Consistory being sufficiently informed of it, did highly commend the goodness of the King, who being able to convict, and cause her justly to be punished, (as some of his council advised) chose rather to procure the liberty of a second marriage another way.' What follows is a very good supplement to the exposition of this sixth nullity: 'Henry the Great was twice married:

first to Margaret of France, a match which seemed very advantageous to the posture of his affairs, if it had been as agreeable to him as honourable. For he knew she had elsewhere fixed her amorous affection, and had no passion for him. . . . Notwithstanding this he loved her, and bore with those actions in her, which when known, are insupportable to all husbands. He had no issue by her; but during her elopement she had two sons: one by the Sieur de Chanvalon, who is yet alive, and is a Capuchin Fryer that goes by the name of Father Ange: the other, who is dead, she had by the Sieur d'Aubiac, I knew them both. The notoriety of the thing obliges me against my will to mention this: it is, besides, a shining proof of the goodness of this most illustrious monarch; who from hence could have drawn an invincible reason to have rid himself of her by the hands of justice, according to the advice of several of his council: but he chose rather to break the marriage without any effusion of blood, by the evident nullities above mentioned' (39).

I omit what he saith that she entertained a more than fraternal correspondence with the Duke of Alençon her brother (40).

[F] . . . For which he was blamed, and justified himself: we shall examine whether the Marshal de Bassompierre's anger is just. Du Pleix speaking of Queen Margaret's return to the court, doth not treat her in an obliging manner, and yet owns, that she was pleased that she should have the honour to be one of her servants in ordinary in quality of master of the request, with a handsome salary (41); and notwithstanding, he, that she was very much addicted to changing, always was very well with her: which being known to several persons, some were surprized that I spoke boldly of her irregularities in the reign of Henry III, as I shall do also in this I am now writing. But for my part, it is more surprizing to me that any man of judgment could not discern that what I have done was grounded upon just and proper considerations, without its being necessary for me to express them. I shall place her elogy after her death, and I shall with truth say some strange and surprizing things. He accordingly discharged his promise, when he came to mention the death of Margaret, under the year 1615. Some passages of his discourse run thus (42): 'All the world representing her as a goddess, the in a manner fancied her self to be so; and during her whole life was very much pleased with the name of *Venus Urania*, or the *Celestial Venus*, as well to intimate that she partook of the divinity as to distinguish her love from that of the vulgar. For in order to keep it up, she formed her self upon different rules from those common to other women: affecting above all to make it the exercise of her mind rather than of her body, and her common expression was: *would you cease to love, possess the beloved object*. I could from this compose a more excellent and surprizing romance than any written in former ages: but I am engaged in a more serious employment . . . The persecution and menaces of her brother (43); the terrible apprehensions she conceived, that her crimes would oblige her husband to attempt upon her life, and the solitude in which she lived for twenty years, so discomposed her mind, that she grew extremely mistrustful of every body: so that her continual vexations and fears made her hypochondriac. In the *Divorce Satyrque* Henry IV is brought in speaking thus: 'Though I pity her, I cannot sometimes forbear laughing at the extravagant jealousies, and mad transports that are told of her amours, which frequently prompt her to slight what she sees, and to believe what is false; looking sometimes for her rustians in every part of the house, though she knows they are somewhere else; and sometimes when she sees and hears them, she fancies they are other men in their shape, who design to deceive and do her mischief. . . . She has brought her self to that pass, that she cannot abide that any body should cough, laugh, or speak with a low voice in her presence: she is grown so suspicious and mistrustful, that she thinks every body speaks of her actions' (44). This weakness at first appeared only by certain things

(35) Varillas, Hist. de Henri III. liv. vii, p. m. 231, 232.

(36) Du Pleix, Hist. de Henri III, ad ann. 1578, pag. 70.

(37) Id. ibid. sub fin. pag. 202, 203.

(38) Id. Hist. de Henri IV, ad ann. 1599, pag. 264.

(39) Id. ibid.

ad ann. 1599, than fraternal correspondence with the Duke of Alençon pag. 411, 412.

(40) Id. Hist. de Henri III, pag. 23.

(41) Id. Hist. de Henri IV, ad ann. 1605, pag. 368.

(42) Id. Hist. de Louis XIII, pag. 53.

(43) That is, Henry III.

(44) Divorce Satyrque, pag. 203, 210.

since they have entirely suppressed the odious passages of the life of this Queen, in order to crown her with the most magnificent praises, that can be bestowed on the most illustrious

things which fell under the cognizance of her domestics; but after her last journey to Court, it was but too much divulged, she herself discovering it to every body. . . . (45) She having as many amorous addresses made to her as he (46) made to other women, they agreed very ill. She hath endeavoured to throw all the infamy upon that great King in her memoirs, which are published, therefore I have been obliged to represent her as bearing her own share of it in this History. For I am not here writing Panegyrics on Princes and Princesses, but a true History, which ought to express their virtues, and not conceal their vices, to the end that their successors, by a fear of the like stain in their memory, may be excited to imitate their praise worthy actions, and avoid their faults. Besides, for political reasons it was requisite to observe, that her bastards were born during her divorce and separation from the King; because they might otherwise pass for legitimate: since his Majesty never would punish the Monk as an impostor, who for so long a time hath been, and is produced as Queen Margaret's son. I am necessitated to declare this for the satisfaction of those, who have charged this important story with 'detraction.' After this he sets forth several encomiums on this Queen.

(45) Du Pleix, ubi supra, p. 54.

(46) That is, the King of Navarre.

The Marshal de Bassompierre hath made the following observation on that passage, which charges her with having had two bastards: 'Infamous Viper, who by thy calumnies hast torn the entrails of her that gave thee life! Thou worm, which gnawest the same flesh that begot thee! Thou mad dog, who bitest thy own master, what moved thee to injure a poor Princess after her death, who cherished thee during her life? Is it the interest of the late King, who, to his own prejudice, chose rather to retard the dissolving his marriage with her, than utter one single word to her disadvantage, and tho' the good of the State hindred him from keeping her any longer as his wife, yet he always honoured her as Queen, loved her as his sister, bestowed large pensions on her, and made her immense presents? Is it truth which obliges thee to it, thou who hast given the title of a History to this book filled with fables, and stuffed with calumnies and scurrilities? What a scandal hast thou cast upon France, by publishing to the whole world, and leaving recorded to posterity, such infamous stories of one of the most noble Princesses of the royal blood, which perhaps are false, or, at most, were only known to very few? Is a private man allowed, under the name of an Historian, to publish the faults of another, to spot and defame the royal race, and defile the memory of the dead? If any attempt had been made to force thee, tho' but lightly to scandalize that poor Princess, (who kept thee from starving) thou shouldst rather have suffered martyrdom than yielded to it; whereas, on the contrary, without any constraint or the least invitation, thou hast hunted after, and advised even improper and unreasonable opportunities to say such execrable things of her, that no Christian can utter without sin, or hear without horror. No, no, there are wheels and executioners to punish thee severely in this world, and a divine justice in the other, to inflict eternal torments upon thee for thy infinite crimes (47). Laying aside abusive reflexions, we find scarce any thing else in this sentence of condemnation, but that Du Pleix ought not to have defamed a Princess, whose domestic he had been, nor published adventures, known to few, which dishonoured the royal family. It is perfectly unnecessary for me to examine the last of these objections. Du Pleix himself hath satisfactorily answered it in one of the passages which I have already cited; and it doth not appear that Bassompierre ever refuted that part of his defence. Wherefore let us only consider the first objection.

CONSIDERATIONS upon the duties of an Historian.

All that are acquainted with the laws of History, will agree, that every Historian, who designs faithfully to discharge his function, ought entirely to dispossess himself of the spirit of flattery and calumny, and put on as much as possible, such a Stoical temper, as is out of the reach of any disturbance from passion. Insensible to every thing else, he ought only to be concerned for

the interest of truth, to which his duty obliges him to sacrifice the resentment of an injury, the remembrance of a favour, and even the love of his country. He ought to forget that he was born in a certain country, that he was bred up in the communion of a certain Church, that he is indebted for the making his fortune to such and such persons, and that such or such persons are his relations or friends. An Historian as such, like Melchisedec, is without father, without mother, and without pedigree. If he be asked, *Of what country you are?* He ought to answer, *I am neither a Frenchman, nor a German, nor an Englishman, nor a Spaniard, &c. I am an inhabitant of the world, neither engaged in the service of the Emperor, nor of the King of France, but only in that of truth: she is my sole Queen, and I have taken no oath of allegiance to any besides her* (48): *I am her sworn knight, and the collar of the order which I wear, is the same ornament worn by the chief justice, and the high-priest of the Egyptians.* 'Εχέει δὲ καὶ ἀγάλμα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ σαρφείρου λίθου, καὶ ἐκαστοῦ ἀγάλμα Ἀληθείας. Circa collum imaginem ex sapphiro gemma consecratam gestabat: quæ vocabatur VERITAS (49). . . . He carried about his neck an image made of sapphire stone, and the image was called TRUTH. So far as he yields to the love of his country, so far does he deviate from the rules of history, and by how much he sheweth himself a good subject, by so much he becomes a bad Historian.

(48) Taus 6 regina quid optes Explorare labor, mihi iusta capere fas est. -- 'Tis yours. O Queen! to will the work which duty bids me to fulfil.

DRYDEN. Virgil. Æn. lib. i, ver. 76.

(49) Ælian. Var. Hist. lib. xiv, cap. xxxiv.

(50) Sannazar. opus Jovium, Elog. cap. x, pag. m. 31.

Dum patriam laudat, damnat dum Poggius hostem;
Nec malus est civis, nec bonus historicus (50).

While Poggius doth his country-men extol,
And blame their enemies with all his soul;
He's no ill subject, that I must confess,
But he's a bad Historian ne'ertheless.

So that the cruel reproaches, which Mr de Bassompierre grounds on the salaries and posts which Du Pleix enjoyed under Queen Margaret, are unjust; for Du Pleix the Historiographer was not bound to discharge the obligations of Du Pleix this Queen's domestic. It was neither proper for him as an Historian, to acknowledge a good office, nor to revenge an injury: his sole obligation was to represent things as they really were, without misrepresenting them either in favour of his friends, or to the prejudice of his enemies. He had the same strict engagements to truth, as the Judges have to justice; and therefore since it would be highly unreasonable to reproach a Counsellor of parliament with ingratitude for having made his benefactor lose a bad cause, we should be equally in the wrong to complain of Du Pleix, on pretence that he hath published defamatory truths of a Princess under whom he was employed. It is to betray an ignorance of the true bounds of things, to maintain, that gratitude should extend even to the disposal of those things which are none of our own; I mean, that to acquit ourselves of our obligations, we may make use of what belongs to others. If you will acknowledge the good offices done you, do it at your own expence, and not at that of your neighbour. Such a one is the cause of your growing rich, that you enjoy the post of Master of the Requests, or President, &c. Assist him with your purse in his indigence, but be not an instrument to make him carry an unjust cause; for if you make him carry it, your gratitude is a downright robbery, and a violation of the most essential duties. You are the minister of justice, and nothing can permit your violation of it; you ought not, as a Judge, to acknowledge the benefits, which you formerly received as steward or tutor. The application of all this to an Historiographer, who is a public minister of truth, is not very difficult.

If during the prosecution of a criminal indictment against Margaret de Valois, Du Pleix had refused to give evidence against her, and had endured the torture rather than reveal the adulteries of this lady, whose domestic he was, he would have deserved high praise; and his silence in that case had been an hundred times more commendable than an ingenuous confession: but in writing the History of France, he was engaged

illustrious princesses. She was thus praised by reason of her liberalities to the monasteries [G], the most sure and infallible means to cover a multitude of sins (f). For the rest, if she diverted her self very agreeably at the castle of Usson, she also suffered several troubles there. 'From the terrais of that castle, she saw her friends cut in pieces, and the Count de Randan, their chief, a lord of the house of Rochefoucaud killed on the same day

(f) See, above, the remark [f], of the article GREGORY I.

gaged from all domestic obligations, and might publicly declare what he ought not to have done to the commissioners appointed to draw up an indictment. I own that he defamed a Princess of the royal blood; but if out of fear of casting some scandal on the royal family, he had been obliged to silence, it must thence be concluded also, that an Historian ought never to mention any of the rebellions and conspiracies of the Princes of the royal blood; and for instance, the Spanish Historians ought never to have spoken of the combinations of Don Carlos, nor of the punishment which was the consequence of them. But as this is absurd, it follows that Mr de Bassompierre hath unjustly censured the conduct of Du Pleix. His other observations are much better; for it cannot be denied that he hath detected an almost infinite number of her ill actions. If I am answered, that the rebellions of Princes are notorious facts, and consequently ought not to be silently passed over by an Historian; I reply, that Queen Margaret's amours were, in their kind, as publicly known as the frequent relapses of the Duke of Orleans (51). All the court was perfectly informed of the reprimand which she received from the king her brother, who, amongst other things, charged her with having a bastard. All the Ambassadors knew it, and undoubtedly they wrote the news to their respective masters, as well as the Emperor's Ambassador did (52). All France was acquainted with the affront which the same king caused to be offered to Margaret in a public road; and the consequences of this affront were blazed abroad by the complaints of the King of Navarre. In a word, to say in an history what Du Pleix hath published concerning the intrigues of the Queen of Navarre, was not to reveal any secret practices. And you may, if you please, observe, that certain reasons of state, which he mentions (53), obliged him to speak of them: which is a good justification. I desire you would also observe that several have censured his inserting these events in his work, but have not affirmed, that they were meer lies. See the margin (54). On the contrary, they never ventured farther than to say that the veil of discretion ought to have been drawn over them. Wherefore since he had no occasion to justify himself on any other account than taking the liberty of publishing truths of this nature, and since after that justification, he left all these passages in his works, so that they were not only printed but re-printed with the royal licence; we may conclude, that these facts ought to pass as undoubted truths; for if they were calumnies, the author would have been obliged to retract and leave them out in the second edition.

We may say that he hath contributed more than any body else to fix the certainty of these facts. The Sieur d'Aubigné's fables did not amount to a sufficient and authentic evidence; but when they appear confirmed by the public attestation of an Historian, who was a domestic servant to this Queen, there is no longer any room for doubting. What defect can you suppose in them? The Historian lived at the time of the events, and was servant to this Princess: he hath not deprived her of the glory which she deserved on other accounts; he was not blamed for calumniating, but for not sparing her; and never retracted or suppressed, in a new edition, what he had said in the first. So that the silence of a thousand and a thousand authors, and the eulogies bestowed on her memory may, at pleasure, be alleged, but can never shake this matter of fact; for we ought to take notice that even her flatterers never presumed to affirm that she was an example of chastity, but contented themselves with silence on this head. If they had affirmed that she was always very chaste, they would have formed a sort of faction and schism in the historical world, and fomented in it that Pyrrhonism which is already but too general on other accounts: a disorder which chiefly owes its propagation to the different accounts of things at the very time of the events (55). A lie is supposed to be always posterior to the truth; but this is not certain with respect to relations; for it

but too frequently happens that the false precede the true; and that the true and false start at the very same instant, and so run through future ages under the auspicious authority of traditions that are alike old. Observe what Tacitus saith on occasion of a very remarkable event, which at first was variously represented. 'Is finis fuit ulciscenda Germanici morte, non modo apud illos homines qui tum agebant, etiam secutis temporibus vario rumore jactata. adeo maxima quæque ambigua sunt, dum alii quoquo modo audita pro compertis habent, alii vera in contrarium vertunt. & gliscit utrumque posteritate (56). - - - (56) Tacit. Ann. This was the end of revenging the death of Germanicus, not only among those only who then lived and interested themselves in it, but likewise in following times, so dark and intricate are all the highest transactions; while some bold for certain facts the most precarious hearsays, others turn fact into falsehood, and both are swallowed and improved by the credulity of posterity.'

It was foretold, that truth would not be stifled by the artifices of mercenary pens and tongues. 'Those, who in hopes of her liberality, praise her in their sermons, dedicate books to, or write eulogies on her, do in vain bestow on her qualities to which she hath no pretence: for true tradition, which in spite of them shall be immemorially preserved from father to son, will plainly prove them liars, and as full of avarice and flattery, as she is an enemy to virtue (57).' This prediction is verified by the event, for which we are not a little indebted to Du Pleix.

[G] She was thus praised by reason of her liberalities to the monasteries. Hilarion de Coite, a Minime Friar, speaks thus of the charities of this Princess: 'At the four most solemn festivals, and on her birth-day, she gave, with her own hand, one hundred gold crowns, and as many loaves to an hundred poor people. She annually maintained one hundred and eleven persons, and forty English, Scotch, and Irish Priests, besides the alms she daily distributed at her palace, and going from mass, as well to strangers, as to the modest uncraving poor. She also contributed several sums to the building of divers churches and monasteries. She built and founded the Jesuits college at Agen, and the convent of the Reformed Augustines near her palace, in the suburbs of St Germain des Prez at Paris. There is no order of mendicant Friars that has not partaken of her annual bounty; amongst others, the Carmelites, Augustines, Franciscans, Jacobins, the Jesuits of St Lewis, the Ave-Maria Nuns, the Bernardines, the Capuchins, Recollects, and Minimes of Nigeon. In the latter years of her life, building all her hopes on God, she daily heard three masses, one high and two low (58); she communicated three times every week, on Thursday, Friday, and Sunday; every Saturday she visited the low chapel of our Lady in St Victor's church; and the hospitals in the holy week, and never gave less than three or four thousand blankets, besides frequently a considerable sum for the marriage of poor girls (58). Scipio Du Pleix relates the same (59), but he adds a reflexion which makes a vast difference betwixt his narrative and that of the Minime. If she, saith he (60), suffered herself to be drawn away by some sensuality in her youth, amongst so many pernicious opportunities as happen in the lives of princes, and the allurements of the court, yet having renounced them in order to return to God, and having redeemed her sins, by large charities, who can doubt but that the prayers of so many religious persons, and the blessings of the people have opened the heavens for her soul, and made way for her reception after her death amongst the blessed angels, considering withal that more especially towards the end of her days, she prepared and disposed herself for it with a truly Christian contrition and resolution.' The Minime took great care not to intermix his relations with any thing of this nature: we find nothing

(51) Brother to Lewis XIII.

(52) See, above, citation (34).

(53) See, above, citation (46).

(54) Bassompierre, pag. 149, of the Journal of his Life, says that, in 1606, Queen Margaret lost the Sieur Sullendat her lover, who had been killed by a gentleman called Charmond.

(55) See, below, my Dissertation concerning Desamatory Libels, paragraph viii.

(57) Divorce Sa- tyrique, p. 112.

(58) Hilarion de Coite, ubi supra, pag. 108, 109. See also Palquier, pag. m. 261, 2.

(59) Du Pleix, Hist. de Louis XIII, pag. 146.

(60) Id. ibid. pag. 155.

* day that the King her husband triumphed over his enemies at Yvry: and though this place fears nothing but Heaven, it being impossible for any thing but the sun to enter it by force, and its triple enclosure despises the efforts of the assailants, as a high rock contemns the billows and surges; yet want got into it and obliged her, in order to avoid its outrages, to pawn her jewels at Venice, to melt down her plate, and to have nothing free but the air, hoping but very little, and fearing every thing: for all round about her was in flame and confusion (g). I shall conclude with this passage of

Brantome:

(g) Hilarion de Coste, ubi supra, pag. 302.

nothing there which tends to insinuate that Margaret had occasion to buy off the sins of her youth by so many alms; and omissions like this are indeed unsufferable. Generally speaking, we cannot complain of his placing her amongst the illustrious ladies; but his ranking her equally and without any distinction, with those whose virtue always remained untainted, is what cannot be excused. He ought at least to have divided his work into three classes, one for the ladies of perpetual and unspotted virtue, one for those unjustly slandered, and another for those whose good qualities compensated their vices, and who, in their wife old age, expiated the sins of their youth. No body would have been offended at seeing Margaret in this last class, nor have taken it amiss that the Monks out of gratitude for her alms, should make her shine amongst the illustrious penitents, and celebrate her wisdom, learning, and the rest of her good qualities. We ought to do justice to every body, and even to bestow those praises upon courtiers, which they deserve when they have distinguished themselves by some virtues, of which there are examples to be found (61). We are not ignorant of the nullity of her alms, by reason they were given at the expense of others and the ruin of her credit.

(61) See chap. xxxv, of book iii, *Miscellaneum Observationum*, written by Peter Petit, a Paris Physician, and printed at Utrecht in 1682.

(62) *Divorce Satyrique*, p. 213.

(63) Perefize, *Histoire de Henry le Grand*, ad ann. 1599, pag. m. 301.

(64) See, above, the remark [O], of the third article N. A. VARRÉ.

Have you ever observed any of her lovers, (Henry IV introduced speaking) a few excepted, grow rich by her liberality? But you see the prisons full of those whom she hath impoverished. . . . I know very well that at my expense she gives the tenth of all her rents and pensions quarterly to monasteries and convents: but then she withholds the salary of her domestics, (whose case I very much commiserate) and of those who for the whole year have furnished her with their provisions as well as their labour (62). If any one should scruple to give credit to this passage on pretext that it is taken out of a defamatory libel, he needs only consult the history of Henry the Great, written by Mr de Perefize, who died Archbishop of Paris. There he will find that the palace which Queen Margaret built near the *Pre-aux-Clercs*, was sold to pay her debts. . . . that she was liberal to prodigality, very pompous and magnificent; but knew not what it was to pay her debts. This is undoubtedly one of the greatest faults in a prince, by reason that nothing is so diametrically opposite to justice, of which he ought to be the protector and pattern (63). This testimony agrees with that of Mezerai (64), and yet one would be apt to excuse the panegyrist who have so extolled this Queen's alms, if like Duplex they had regulated the whole matter of fact; and one would not exact from them a rigorous search into the circumstances of her liberalities to the poor and the monasteries.

[(§x) It is the that is drawn in the following epigram, book iii. chap. 21 of Feneste:

Commune, qui te communis
Ainsi qu'en amours en hosties;
Qui communies tous les jours
En hosties comme en amours:
A quoi ces Dieux que tu consommes
Et en tous temps & en tous lieux?
Toi, qui ne t'es peu fouler d'hommes,
Te penes tu crever de Dieux?

Harlot, that hast an equal share
Of love and sacramental fare;
To whom each day a feast doth prove
Both of the sacrament and love:
Say to what end do you devour
So many gods at every hour?
Is it that you, who never can
Once get your belly-full of man,
Such is your appetite accurst,
Resolve with eating gods to burst?

VOL. V. REM. CRIT.]

I say again, that the Minime Hilarion de Coste ought to have observed in his book, what Robert d'Arbrissel did in his monasteries, one of which was appointed for women of good reputation, and the other for those who had quitted their ill courses (65). That mixture is very scandalous which in the same book presents us with the eulogies of Anne of Bretagne, and Isabella Clara Eugenia, together with those of Bona Sforza and our Margaret de Valois. I add that it is a medley which encourages those to give up themselves to vice, whom an ambition of being one day placed amongst the illustrious ladies, might, perhaps, keep in the right way. Nothing is more pernicious than equally to extol and honour loose and virtuous women (66). This Minime had been left to blame, if his praises had been reduced to the particular description of any single action; but he hath couched them so as to take in the historical series of the Queen's whole life. He mentioned whatever he found excellent, and forgot nothing but what was ill. I make this reflexion only to shew that I never pretended that all those, who have mentioned either the learning or charities of Queen Margaret, ought also to have taken notice of her faults. This never entered into my thoughts, nor do I in the least dislike Stephen Pasquier's contenting himself with hinting what he condemned in general (67), and particularly enlarging on what he admired in her; for he did not attempt a history or an historical eulogy. See what he saith of the meals of this Princess. 'Tho' dinners and suppers are chiefly designed for the nourishment of the body, yet she more highly valuing the aliment of the mind, has commonly four men near her, to whom she first proposes what proposition she pleases for their examination, frequently overthrowing their arguments and never relenting their criticisms, provided they be grounded on good and solid reasons. Thus she nourishes her mind and feeds her body with all sobriety, and after these learned men have ended their discourse, not to abate any part of her royalty, then follows a band of violins, after that a concert of vocal Music, and lastly of lutes, which play successively in emulation of each other (68).'

Give me leave to observe by the by that this Queen, and all other ladies who imitate her, perhaps do more harm to the world, by their frequent communions and extreme assiduity in convents and churches, than if they continued in their scandalous course, and grew old in impenitence. They are immortalized by an hundred artful eulogies, which never mention any of their former sins. Is not this to cause those who live in impurity to hope for an unspotted fame, and expect to be loaded with honour, provided in their decayed and deformed age they turned devout? And why should they not hope for this glory after so many examples before their eyes? For it is the common course of loose women to turn devout when no longer able to charm (69). They are then very constant at sermon and mass, and very liberal to convents; whence it is believed they shall open the gates of Paradise, which had been shut against them, and consequently young ladies may flatter themselves that their debaucheries will not deprive them either of human glory, which the applauses of Monks procure for the dead, or of eternal happiness. What is more pernicious than this security? What can possibly let loose the reins of corrupt nature to a greater degree? The ladies would be terrified at the apprehensions of an infamous character in future ages, and the torments of Hell, if they saw that all or almost all the women of pleasure continue hardened in their crimes till death. This fear would prove a bridle, and a powerful lesson of wisdom, and by this means the damnation of some few would prove a remedy against incontinence, and the means of the salvation of a great number. If in every age there were but one lewd woman, that turned devout in her old days, she alone would so more inspire

(65) See, above, citation (10), of the article FONTEVRAUD.

(66) See, above, the remark [M], of the article LEWIS XII.

(67) If I should tell you that this Queen has no faults, I should be a silly man; for tho' God has been pleased to make her a great Princess, she is made up of the same pieces as all of us are. And consequently we must not pretend that she should be perfect, which no man or woman can be; but we must only consider her lesser imperfections. Pasquier, *Letters*, tom. ii, pag. 739.

(68) *Id. ibid.* pag. 761, 762.

A CONSIDERATION upon the effect of many old devout women, who have been lewd in their youth.

(69) See, above, citation (25), of the article GUEBRIANT.

(b) Brantome, *Mémoires des Dames illustres*, pag. m. 241.

Brantome: *the castle of Usson is a very strong or rather impregnable place, which that cunning and crafty King Lewis XI, partly made so on purpose to lodge his prisoners, and keep them much securer there than at Loches, Bois de Vincennes, or Laignan* (b).

(70) Unus est ne desperes, solus est ne confidas, -- There is one, left you should despair, there is only one left you should be too confident, says a Father of the Church speaking of the good thief.

(71) I mean such women as are false or true converts.

a spirit of security, than the good thief (70), she could only remove despair. But when the number of these Magdalens (71) mounts high, they universally occasion confidence and boldness, so that one may say, that indirectly and contrary to their intention they are the firmest pillars of the Empire of Venus, even when they themselves are retired out of it. What glorious arms would they afford the preachers and confessors, if being become the laughing-stock and execration of the whole town, when grown grey under Venus's yoke, and following their old trade, with all the ridiculous imperfections which attend the conjunction of wrinkles and coquetry, they should at last die blaspheming or in despair; so that their rejection of the sacraments should cause their corpse to be dragged on a hurdle to lie unburied! Such a dismal spectacle would fill them with horror. Little Father Andrew would have frequently taken occasion from thence to cry out in his sermon, *the same fate attends you*.

A famous author, in a letter dated the twenty-third of June 1678, faith, that the disease of which Madam

M**** died, had brought her to repentance, and that she was one of those mentioned in the Gospel, who were as well paid for the last hour, as those who engaged in the morning (72). Father Bourdaloue says (73), that this lady discovered a great share of Christian resolution at her death. This edifies the public, but yet lays a snare for sinners. Note, that we are taught by some that those have a greater interest in the favour of God, who extricate themselves out of great sins, than if they had never fallen into them. This is another snare. The Bishop of Meaux sets this in a proper light, after having observed (74) that when we see in the Gospel the lost sheep preferred by the good shepherd to those, all the rest of the flock, when we read of the happy return of the prodigal son, and the transports of a tender father, which rejoice the whole family; we are tempted to believe that repentance is preferred to innocence itself, and that the returning prodigal receives greater favours than the eldest son who never strayed from his father's house. See the remainder in the author himself.

(a) Olearius, in Abaco, apud Konig Biblioth. vet. & nova, pag. 467, 859.

UTINO (LEONARD DE) a Jacobin Monk, flourished in the XVth century, and was a great preacher. His sermons on the saints were one of the earliest productions of the press, being printed in the year 1446 (a) (α). His other works were printed before the end of the same century [A]. It was probably he, who complained that the confessions which the women made at the confession chair, were defective in some things [B].

[(α) It is generally agreed upon that printing was not used, in the manner that it now is, before the year 1457. Thus what is said here may very well be a mistake either in Olearius, or at least in Konig; and we have much more reason to affirm, with Mr le Duchat, in note 10, on chap. 19 of the first book of Rabelais, that first edition of Leonard de Utino's sermons is of Venice, 1473. REM. CRIT.]

[A] His other works were printed before the end of the same century. His treatise of common-places was printed at Ulm in the year 1478. His Lent and Dominical sermons were printed at Lyons in 1495. See the epitome of Gesner's Bibliotheca, pag. 543.

[B] That the confessions, which the women made at the confession chair, were defective. James Olivier, Lieutenant of the Civil and Canon Law, says, that the learned de Utino observes that womens confessions 'are commonly deficient in three particulars, which they

very seldom or never confess; the profuseness and vanity of cloaths, believing it to be due to their sex; leudness in thought or deed, according to the nature of the sin or its circumstances, either by shame or custom; and immoderate loquacity, which is not free from mortal or venial sin, of which an account must be given before God, even of idle words (1). I do not assert this for a truth, but only say that it is very probable that the author here cited is the Monk I am speaking of.

(a) The name of his family was Swert, which signifies a Smith, the trade of Vulcan according to the Poets.

(b) He was Bishop of Burgos.

(c) Taken from Meursius, Athenae Batavae, pag. 103, & seq.

VULCANIUS (α) (BONAVENTURA) was born at Bruges on the thirtieth of June 1538. He made such expeditious advances in polite literature, that at the age of twenty-one Cardinal Francis de Mendoza (b), chose him, by reason of his learning, to be his Secretary and Library-keeper, and gave him several authorities of the Greek Fathers to translate into Latin. He returned from Spain to the Low-Countries, after an absence of eleven years, and finding his country embroiled in confusions, he went to Cologne, and from thence to Basil and Geneva, publishing in each of these cities a book of his composition. Being returned home he was chosen Professor of the Greek tongue in the university of Leyden in the year 1578, and three years after began the exercise of that employment. He continued in it for the space of thirty-two years (c), and died at Leyden on the ninth of October 1614 [A], after having published several books (d), which discovered his erudition. He had promised an edition of all St Cyril's works [B].

(1) Swert. Ath. Belg. pag. 16a.

(2) Mr Drelin-court, a Physician at Leyden, and a worthy son of the Professor, has been pleased at my request to make several inquiries concerning the time of Vulcanius's death, and has found in the Records of the town-house that he was buried in St Peter's Church, October 23, 1614.

(3) Ghilini Teatro, Part. ii, pag. 49.

(4) Id. ibid, pag. 43.

[A] He died at Leyden on the 9th of October 1614. I am obliged to the *Athenae Belgicae* (1) for the particular day of this date, which I believe right (2), tho' the date of the year which follows it is false, for it is not true that Vulcanius died in 1610, as it is said there. Mr Konig adopts this error. Meursius, Valerius Andreas, and Moreri after them, are mistaken in placing the death of Vulcanius in 1615. Ghilini, who hath only paraphrased, and ill translated Swertius, hath exceeded the fault of his original, by making it 1600 instead of 1610, and yet he tells us, that Vulcanius, born, according to him, and according to truth, on the 30th of June in 1538, lived above seventy years (3). This is not the sole blunder he is guilty of. he tells us besides (4), that Cardinal Francis de Mendoza was Bishop of Bruges, and that Vulcanius having been professor of the Greek tongue in Flanders for three years, went to Lyons, and obtained the same employment in that university, which he exercised for thirty-two years, to the great satisfaction

of the French (5). It is not necessary to tell the reader, that instead of Burgos, a city of Spain, he hath put Bruges, a city of Flanders; and that instead of Leyden, he hath clapt in Lyons, where there never was an university. He did not understand these words of Swertius: 'Lugduno Batavorum iter faceret, à Curatoribus Academiae Professor linguae Graecae designatus est anno Domini MDLXXXVIII. Triennio demum post Lugdunum venit, & Professionem suscepit (6). -- When he was going through Leyden, he was named by the Curators of the university to be professor of the Greek tongue, in the year 1578. He came to Leyden three years after, and accepted of that Professorship.' Since he is mistaken in such particulars as these, we ought to believe that on an hundred more dangerous occasions he hath corrupted the authors whom he paraphrased.

[B] He had promised an edition of all St Cyril's works. Of this Scultetus gives a curious account, speaking of the learned men he visited at Leyden, in the

(4) You will find the titles of some of them in Moreri, and all of them in Meursius, Ath. Belg. pag. 107, 108, or in Valerius Andreas, Bibl. Belg. pag. 116, 117.

(5) Can inter additione de Francis. Ibid.

(6) Swert. ibi. supra, pag. 161.

His funeral Oration raised the murmurs of some Critics [C]. Ghilini hath committed a great many faults (e).

(e) See the remark [A].

(7) Abrah. Scultetus, Narrat. Hist. pag. 55.
the year 1612. 'Quem (Bonaventuram Vulcanium) senem admodum felice affixum, & manibus pedibusque captum inveni. Promiserat ille triginta quatuor annis antè, editionem omnium operum Græcorum Cyrilli hæcenus à multis desideratam: hanc cum frustra hæcenus singulis propemodum nundinis expectassem, & jam coram hominis ætatem valetudinemque perditam considerarem, petii ab eo, ut Cyrillum Græcum fidei meæ concrederet: me non solum operam daturum, ut ex ipsius voto ille in vulgus exiret, sed etiam de Codicis precio ipsi satisfacturum: At ille gratis pro officio actis, tantum adhuc virium sibi superesse ajebat, ut ipsemet promisso se exolvere possit; usque adeo verum est, Neminem esse tam senem, qui, non dico diem, sed annos supervivere se posse, speret. Quanquam erat non nemo in Angliâ, qui Bonaventuram de tanti thesauri possessione magnifice potius se jactasse, quam verè gloriatum fuisset, affirmaret (7). - - - I found the good old man, Bonaventura Vulcanius, confined to his chair, having neither the use of his hands nor feet. He had promised thirty years before an edition of all St Cyril's works, which has hitherto been wished for by many. I expected to see it published almost every fair. But finding myself disappointed hitherto, and considering the age and sickly condition of the man, I begged of him that he would trust me with the Greek copy; and that I not only would take care to have it published according to his mind, but likewise would satisfy him as to the price of the manuscript. He thanked me for the offer, but told me that he had still strength enough left to perform his promise himself; so true it is that there is no man so old who does not expect that he may live not only a day but years longer. It was nevertheless affirmed by somebody in England, that Vulcanius bragged of his possessing so great a treasure with more vanity than truth. Observe that Vulcanius began to translate St Cyril, to assist Cardinal de Mendoza, who was writing a tract de Naturali nostra per dignam Eucharistia sumptionem cum Christo unione (8).

(8) Meurf. A-thenz, Bat. pag. 103.

[C] His funeral oration raised the murmurs of some Critics. They found fault with Cunæus who made it, for not mentioning that the deceased, when dying, recommended himself to the merits of JESUS CHRIST, and such like things. Cunæus justified himself by declaring that he could not have said so without incurring the guilt of an officious lie. It is very well known, added he, that the good old man fell into a passion against those who exhorted him to prepare for death, and that he never was observed to comfort himself by the maxims of piety. I shall insert Cunæus's whole letter; it was never printed, and it will not be unacceptable to the reader. A friend of mine transcribed it from the original, and did me the favour to communicate his transcript to me. I know who hath the original.

* Amplissimo Viro Rumoldo Hogerbetio Petrus Cunæus S. D.

* Vir Amplissime. Ante dies aliquot rogatu Mag. Rectoris, & Senatus Academici laudavi Bonaventuram Vulcanium funebri oratione, in qua reprehendi quedam audio ab ineptis. Et jam perlatus Hagam rumor est. Ego non decrevi orationem publicare, neque enim tanti est. Sed tamen animi causa scripsi brevem disertationem quam legi à vobis cupio, uti intelligatis quam frigida & febriculosa sint, quæ illi culpare. Præcipue illud exagitat est de Lipfio & Erasmo. De Lipfio crimen fati fo-

lide: Erasmus autem ita defendi ut sub illius persona causam ipse meam egerim. Etiam illud culpare quod de Christi meritis locutus non sum. Sed multæ causæ fuere cur hæc & alia multa omiserim. Novimus nos, novere ceteri Vulcanium qui familiariter cum illo vixerunt. Sane quoties aliquis hominem extrema senectute ad mortis meditationem hortaretur, vehementer irascebatur ille. Sermones vero de Christo aut de pietate, adeo nunquam ex fene audivimus, ut sæpe mirati simus quibus ille cogitationibus festam ætatem solatus fuerit. Itaque laudo in funere ea quæ cunctis eruditis literatisque communia. Cætera omisi, ne viderer scenæ inservire. Sermones de Christo non sunt gladii Delphici qui omnibus aptari possunt. Et profecto qui hæc indignanter relegandi sunt ad D. Henfii orationes quibus nobiliss. Douzam & Scaligerum laudavit. Eadem enim illi obijci possunt atque etiam objecta fuerunt. Vale Amplissime Senator, Lugdun. Batav. Kal. Nov. CIO IDC XIV.

* Peter Cunæus, to the honourable Rumoldus Hogerbetius.

* Honourable Sir,

At the desire of the Rector, and the academical Senate, I pronounced, some days ago, a funeral oration in praise of Bonaventura Vulcanius. I hear that some things in it are censured by idle people, and the rumour is already got as far as the Hague. I never designed to publish the oration, nor do I think it worth while. But for my own amusement I have writ a short dissertation, which I should be glad you would read, that you may fully understand how groundless and insipid their exceptions are. They have chiefly dwelt upon what I said of Lipfius and Erasmus. As to Lipfius, they allow that the charge against him is answered with solidity enough; but they pretend that I have vindicated Erasmus in such a manner as to plead my own cause in his person. They likewise blamed me for not mentioning the merits of CHRIST. But there were many reasons for my omitting these and many other things. We knew Vulcanius very well, so did the rest of his familiar friends. Certain it is, that in his extreme old age, when any body exhorted him to prepare for death, he fell into a violent passion: and we were so far from ever bearing him discourse of CHRIST, or Religion, that we often wondered with what thoughts he comforted himself in his old age. For these reasons I praise him in the funeral oration for such things as are common to all learned men; passing over the rest, lest I should seem to have had nothing else in view, but to suit myself to a present occasion. Discourses about CHRIST are not Delphic words, which can be fitted up for any body. To conclude, those who are displeased with these things, should be advised to read the orations of Daniel Heinsius, wherein he praises Scaliger and Douza. For the same things may be and have been objected to him. Most noble Senator, adieu. Leyden, Nov. 1. 1614.

If any one objects that I ought not to have revealed this great fault of Vulcanius, he must be ignorant that the public hath long since been informed of it; to which purpose see what we find in the Scaligerana: Vulcanius's religion is that of dice and cards; he knows not what religion he is of, nor is he acquainted with the difference of religions. . . . Vulcanius pretends to be one of our communion, but he doth not know what religion is (9).

(9) Scaligerana, vo. 6 Vulcanius, pag. m. 255.

WART

W.

(a) At Poitiers.

(b) It is a book in 4to, of 230 pages.



ART (BERNARD) a Dominican Friar, Doctor and Professor of Divinity in the schools of Thomas Aquinas of Poitiers, published (a) in the year 1650 a book intituled *The Heretic overcome and put into his grave* (b). It is an answer to the Motives of Conversion published by Giles Goffart who had turned Huguenot. The Jacobin inserted them entire in his answer. Neither of these two books is of any value.

(a) There are only two faults in the errata of Francis Borana's (a Veronese) Commentary in priora resolutoria Aristotelis, printed by Wechel in folio, in the year 1539. See Chevillier, Origine de l'imprimerie, pag. 141, 142.

(b) Id. ibid. pag. 296.

WECHEL (CHRISTIAN) a famous Printer at Paris before the middle of the XVth century. He was so correct in his editions, that the errata of a book in folio did not sometimes contain above two faults (a). Those who tell us that he first began to print in Greek in the year 1538, are mistaken [A]. There are some Hebrew books which he printed in the year 1533 (b). By the catalogue of the books which came from his press before the year 1548, it appears that he was a diligent man, and that he printed a great many. This catalogue is at the beginning of the thirteenth book of Gesner's Pandects, with a very obliging Epistle Dedicatory. I mean by this that Gesner dedicated his thirteenth book to him. He was prosecuted in the year 1534, for selling a book of Erasmus *De usu interdicti carniū*, which was censured by the Faculty of Divines (c). Some authors say that he became poor, by a particular curse of God, which fell on him, for printing an impious book [B]. ANDREW WECHEL, his son, was also a very skillful

[A] Those who tell us that he first began to print in Greek, in the year 1538, are mistaken. I had mentioned this epoch when I cited the 256th page of Mr Chevillier's tract of the origine of printing at Paris; but I have been informed by Mr Van Dale, that he has some Greek books printed at Paris, by Christian Wechel in the years 1530 and 1531. Of this number are Hermogenes *περί εὐσεβείων τῶν τοι τίσσας* in 4to, and Lucian's Dialogues of the Gods. These two books are in Greek only, and came out in the year 1530. Of this number are also the same Hermogenes *περί μεθόδου διανοίας*, & *περί ἰδίων τῶν τοι δ' οὐ*, printed in Greek alone in 1531. I here return thanks to Mr Van Dale for discovering to me Mr Chevillier's mistake.

[B] Some authors say that he became poor . . . for printing an impious book. Here is my evidence. 'In the year 1530, after the dismal and prodigious leudnesses related by our Historians, and Dr Cochleus, in several places, arose this abortive child of hell, who wrote a book against the Divine Justice, in favour of infants dying without Baptism, of which God be thanked, there is no more at present remaining than the bare title in Gesner's *Bibliotheca*; and several have wisely observed, that the ruin of Christian Wechel and his labours fell out as a punishment for his press and characters, being employed in such an infamous work. It was this wretched anonymous author, who under the borrowed name of Antony Cornelius, traced out the first lineaments of this Atheistical monster, which by little and little, like a venomous serpent, is grown up, and by intricate meanders hath crawled in amongst us (1). That the reader may know more exactly what this book was, I am obliged to recite what Father Garasse saith of it in another place of the same book. 'The second objection is not couched in such elegant terms as the first, but it is incomparably worse and more impious than that of Symmachus, and is taken out of that cursed anonymous author, who took the name of Antonius Cornelius, and composed a Latin discourse against the distributive justice of the Creator, espousing the cause of infants deceased before Baptism, and pleading pro and con, with texts and formal allegations of the law, of which he condemned the Divine Justice, and called it proceeding unjust, wicked, and inhuman . . . Time, the last and most incorruptible judge of our perfor-

mances, hath discovered the impiety of this wretched book; for Christian Wechel who printed it, saw his riches moulder away before his eyes, without being able to stop the course of his ruin; and God be thanked, the book is so vanished, that there is not a single copy to be found in libraries, and at present, nothing but the title is left of that infamous and abominable work (2).'

Several things make me doubt of the principal parts of this story. I. Father Garasse cites no authority, and affirms a fact which is false, viz. That the title of this impious book is preserved in Gesner's *Bibliotheca*. It is certain that there is no such person mentioned there as Antony Cornelius, and that he whom we find in the epitome of that work of Gesner, is not mentioned as the author of the tract, of which I am speaking. II. If Christian Wechel had printed a book of this nature in 1530, had he been left undisturbed? Would he not have been more prosecuted for this attempt, than for selling a book of Erasmus, which had no greater blemish than that of being censured as a suspicious piece (3)? Would this Printer have been suffered to make any figure in Paris from the year 1530, to 1548 at least? I express my self with this restriction, because I have not been able to carry him farther than that year, in which I find that Conrad Gesner dedicated a book to him (4), and represents him as a most thriving Printer in the city of Paris. III. Andrew Wechel, his son, so distinguished himself amongst the Booksellers and Printers of Paris, that it is not at all probable that his father's estate was so miserably impaired. IV. Lastly, it is not perfectly agreed what that accursed book which ruined him was; for some say it was that *de tribus impostoribus*, a chimerical book which was never in being, if we may believe those who are best able to give an account of things of this kind (5). 'Christus Dominus . . . impostor atque adeo mendax & planus audiv non modo à Celso . . . sed etiam ab impio & immemorando homine, imo Dæmone corporato, cuius opus de tribus Magnis Impostoribus, Mose, Christo, Mahumete, exitiale fuisse Wechelo, insigni alias Typographo, sed ejus libri pestifero attacku funditus everto, referunt qui legerunt, digni fide testes. Mihi incestare oculos tam infandæ scriptiōis lectione, ad ingens scelus videtur pertinere (6). . . . The Lord Jesus Christ was called an impostor, and consequently a liar

(1) Garasse, Somme Theologique, pag. 19.

(2) Id. ibid. pag. 298.

(3) Com libellum Erasmi de usu carniū, ab Academia Pacificali tanquam suspectum reprobatum, Christianus Wechel vendendum expositus. Clod. l'Imp, Orig. de l'Imprimerie, pag. 353.

(4) The 13th book of his Pandects.

(5) See the note ARETIN (PATER . . . remark [6]).

(6) Theophilus Raynaud Hystherica, Sect. 4, Ser. 11, cap. 11, pag. 230.

skilful Printer [C]. He retired from Paris to Francfort (d); some writers say, that it

was

(d) Baillet, Jugemens des Savans, sur les Imprimeurs. Art. xviii.

'a liar and cheat, not only by Celsus . . . but likewise by that wicked and infamous writer, or rather that devil incarnate whose book Of the three great impostors, Moses, Christ, and Mahomet, proved fatal to Wechel, who, being in other respects a famous Printer, was utterly ruined by meddling with that pestilential book, as it is affirmed by credible witnesses who have perused it. As for my part, I should look upon it as a very great crime to pollute my eyes with the reading of such an abominable performance.' By these four remarks I do not pretend to deny the whole narrative of Father Garasse; I only call in question Wechel's suffering such terrible effects of the Divine wrath, for having printed a book in the year 1530, and do not believe that the dissertation concerning the punishment of infants, was so impious as he represents it. As for the rest, I agree with him, that there was a book intitled, *Querela infantum in limbo clausorum adversus divinum iudicium*, ab Ant. Cornelio (7) J. U. Lic. If we rely upon the title, it was printed at Paris by Christian Wechel, in the year 1531, in 4to. There are two copies (8) of it in the Archbishop of Rheims's library. Without having read this tract, I conjecture that it is not impious, and that it is like that of Bartolus à Saxoferrato, and that of Jacobus de Ancharana. The first of these Civilians is author of a piece intitled, *Processus Sathane contra D. Virginem eam Judice Jesu*: and the other of a treatise called *Processus Luciferi contra Jesum coram Judice Salomone*. They introduce the devil entering an action, observing the formalities of the bar, and consequently urging all his reasons. Is it possible to represent him speaking without making him utter impieties? And yet these two books are not impious. Every thing ends in the confusion of the plaintiff.

(7) See Bibliotheca Telleriana, pag. 167. He is there called Cornelius, pag. 422, and in the Index.

(8) What Garasse affirms is not therefore true, that it is wholly lost.

(9) Mr Bourdelot did me the favour to send it me from Paris.

(10) Antonio Borg Jodici civilis apud Parisenses.

(11) Prefatus facit Confistorii illustriss. D. Lodovici Galliarum gubernatrix.

(12) Non quod dubitem pueros illos iusta pena condemnatos. Antonius Cornelius, in Pract.

A REFLECTION upon the complaints of some persons, against those who represent the objections of the Libertines with all their force.

Since the first edition of this Dictionary I have read the book in question (9). The entire title of it runs thus: *Exatissima infantum in limbo clausorum Querela adversus divinum iudicium apud equum iudicem proposita. Apologia divini iudicii contra Querelam Infantum. Infantium ad Apologiam divini iudicii Responso. Equi iudicis super hac re Sententia. Auctore Antonio Cornelio Juris utriusque Licentiate Doctore. Lutetiae apud Christianum Wechelium in via Jacobea sub scuto Basilienf, anno MD XXXI. mense Januario*. This tract, containing about seventy pages in 4to, was dedicated by the author to Antony du Bourg, Lieutenant-Civil at Paris (10), and President of the Council of Louise of Savoy, mother of Francis I (11). The Epistle Dedicatory is very short, and precedes a Preface which is a little longer, and dated at Paris on the second of January 1531. Antony Cornelius acknowledges his great obligations to the person to whom he dedicates his book, and that he undertook that performance at the request of one of his friends, who knew that he had dreamed that the infants detained in limbo, complain of being disinherited contrary to the disposition of the law *Plautius*, which enacts *neminem ex facto alterius exheredari posse*. . . . That no person can be disinherited for the fault of another. He declares that their complaints are ill-grounded (12). Where is then the impiety? Doth it consist in his citing some passages of the Scripture, and of the Civil and Canon-Laws which favour the infants cause? But does he not also alledge some that are contrary to them? and at last, after their reply, doth he not bring in the following definitive sentence? 'Penitatis diligentissime in utramque partem legibus, cenfeo infantes iniuste de divino iudicio queri per tex. in c. regenerante de consec. dist. iiii fallit dicit lex. & fallitur qui parvulos non baptizatos praedicat in condemnatione non futuros, cum dicat Apostolus ob unius delictum omnes homines damnari. . . . Having attentively considered the laws on either side, I am of opinion that children have no reason to complain of the Divine Justice. The law, says he, deceives one; and I am of opinion that he is deceived who affirms, that little children, not baptized, are not liable to be damned, since the Apostle expressly says, that by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation.' Thus we see with what temerity Father Garasse mentions Antony Cornelius's book. Who can be sufficiently surprized at his blunder? Perhaps some may reply to me that the infants objections are carried

VOL. V.

too far, and that it makes the faith of their Advocate suspected. I should not vouchsafe an answer to this scruple, if I did not well know that it is in the mouths of an infinite number of people, and objected against those, who, without any disguise, fairly represent the arguments of Heretics, or Libertines. Give me leave to answer those gentlemen with this question: If you were obliged to examine some of the controversies in agitation betwixt the Christians and the Infidels, would you, to the utmost of your knowledge, represent whatever the last could urge with the greatest force in favour of their opinions? Or would you designedly weaken their arguments, that your readers might meet with nothing to render the victory dubious? You will undoubtedly answer me, that you would do the first of these two things, and that the second is a fraud utterly unworthy of a man of honour, and much less excusable in a servant of God. Wherefore then are you surprized to see the objections of the Infidels represented with all the force which natural reason gives them? You say you would do it your self, if you were to refute them, and you agree, that swerving from this rule is to incur the guilt of an ignominious fraud. Learn then not to take all those for prevaricators, who fairly shew the beautiful side of their adversaries cause; and if they are obliged to confess that nothing but the Scripture can furnish arms against certain objections of the Infidels, and that they recur to it as to the immovable foundation of their faith, be very well contented with their conduct; for otherwise the world will be apt to distrust you, and to suppose that you endeavour to triumph by the assistance of a train of military stratagems, which are inconsistent with the Gospel.

I have lately discovered one of the causes, which induce a great many people to suspect those of Libertinism, who propose the objections of the Libertines in their full force. A very honest and truly religious man said to me a few days ago, mentioning some writers, whose zeal for the good cause is known to the whole world; you do not find in their books that the enemies of truth offer any thing considerable; the objections of the Infidels are proposed there in few words, and they are amply and victoriously refuted: but in such and such writers who do not pass for great zealots, they are very prolix and more specious than the answer. I made use of the same question as above. Did those zealous writers know all that appears in the less zealous authors, or were they ignorant of it? If the latter, they are not to be praised for their silence, nor for their victory. But if the first, they deserve a severe censure, as being guilty of a pious fraud, which truth ought never to stand in need of; and I am very sure they would not dare to own that they have passed by the least particular, which could represent in a beautiful light their enemies objections. Wherein then doth their zeal surpass the less devout writer, whom you was speaking of? They said all they could in favour of their adversary before they answered him; hath the less zealous author done more?

We have seen some other mistakes of Garasse in the article CORNELLIUS.

[C] ANDREW WECHEL, his son, was also a very skilful Printer. I have read in the History of Printing (13), first, That he was obliged to retire to Francfort, under the protection of the Count of Hanaw, on account of his religion about the year 1573. In the second place, That his son John, who was married to one of the daughters of Jerom Drouart (14), Bookseller at Paris, going to Francfort with his father, carried with him half the impression of Polybii opera Gr. Lat. cum notis Casauboni, in folio, in 1609; which is the reason why some copies of Polybii are to be seen with his name to them, though it be the same edition with that of Paris. Thirdly, That Andrew Wechel died at Francfort towards the year 1600. In the fourth place, that his son John printed books in the said city of Francfort in the year 1583, and afterwards Diodori Siculi Biblioth. Historiae Gr. Lat. in 1604, and other books which procured him the reputation of one of the most able Printers and Booksellers of his time. On the first of these four things I observe, that Francfort being a Republic, not in the least depending on the Counts of Hanaw, it is not at all likely that Andrew Wechel should,

Clara
fons

(13) Written by John de la Caille, and printed at Paris in the year 1689.

(14) The author says, pag. 208, that it is an error, and that this Jerom was never married.

6 U

(c) Id. *ibid.*

was after the Paris massacre (c). See the remark [B].

should, in that city, have put himself under the protection of those Counts. Perhaps the time is here confounded; at least it is very certain that Wechel's heirs kept Printing-houses at Hanaw, towards the beginning of the XVIIth century; and it was then that they put themselves under the protection of the Count of Hanaw. On the second head I observe, that Casaubon was not yet fifteen years old, when John Wechel retired with his father to Francfort, towards the year 1573. Wherefore it is impossible that this Printer should have carried with him half the impression of Casaubon's *Polihius*. On the third I observe, that Andrew Wechel died on the first of November 1581, as may be inferred from the commentaries of Oplopæus, his corrector, prefixed to the commentaries of Peter Ramus on some of Cicero's orations, printed at Francfort *apud hæredes Andree Wecheli*, in the year 1582. Lastly, I say on the fourth head, that his heirs who continued to print, were Claudius Marni, and John Aubri: which plainly shews, that John Wechel was not what the author of the History of Printing represents him. The edition of Diodorus Siculus in 1604, was printed by Claudius Marni, and the sons of John Aubri.

(15) Oplopæus, Pref. Commentar. Petri Rami in Orat. Cicero-nis. Note, that Oplopæus wrote that preface soon after Andrew Wechel's death.

(16) It is in the collection of Marquard Gudii & doctorum Viro-rum ad eum Epistolæ, &c. which the illustrious Mr. Graevius published at Utrecht in 1696, by the care of Mr. Burman, worthy son of the late Mr. Burman, Professor of Divinity at Utrecht. See pag. 338, of that collection.

(17) Gothofredus Jungerman-nus, Epist. ad Scip. Gentilem, pag. 361, 362, of the collection Marquard Gudii &c. Epistolæ.

Observe, that Oplopæus, speaking of the heirs of Andrew Wechel, mentions only Claudius Marni, and John Aubri, the sons-in-law of that Printer (15); which obliges me to renounce the opinion I once was of, that John Wechel was the son of Andrew. A letter of Frederic Sylburgius, dated on the twentieth of June 1587 (16), informs me, that he did no longer lodge in the house of John Wechel, but with John Aubri. After this man's death, the names of his sons appeared in the titles of books, joined with that of Claudius Marni, with whom they had several disputes. 'Aubriani rationes reddi sibi à Marnio volunt, & hæreditatem prorsus dividi; adeo ut aliquoties officina claudi debuerit, quum alias inter hæc occupationes ad calculos federe quiete nequeant (17). . . . The Aubri's will have Marni to settle his accounts with them, and require that the entire inheritance should be divided. For this reason they have been obliged sometimes to shut up their shop, because their business did not give them sufficient time to settle their accounts.' It is certain, that what they call *typi Wecheliani*, *typographia Wecheliana*, were in the hands of the Marni's and the Aubri's. During that time John Wechel printed separately. I have, amongst other books printed by him, the *Paraphrase and Scholia of Monlorius in Aristotelis analyticorum priorum, seu de ratiocinatione libros duos*, together with the same Monlorius's tract *De Estetlechia, &c. de Universis, Francofurti in officina typographica Joannis Wecheli 1593*. There is a gross error in the French translation of Bongars's letters; there we find the following words: *I have wrote to one of Wechel's men to take great care of them, which answer to this Latin, Commendavi eas*

Aubrio Wecheliano (18). . . . I have recommended them (18) Bongars, to the care of Aubrius Wechelianus; and these, I have ordered one of Wechel's men to send you the tract which you desire, for *Libellum de Murrbinis jussu suo mitti ad te Marnius Wechelianus* (19). . . . I have ordered Mar-nius Wechelianus to send you the tract de Murrbinis.

Bongars wrote this in the year 1597, and his translator hath made him speak as if Wechel had been alive then, not knowing that the original expressed the names of his sons-in-law.

As for the rest, I have very good reasons to believe, that Andrew Wechel left France before the massacre. I find in Melchior Adam, that Laurens Zingref was very uneasy at Paris in the year 1569, on account of money remitted to him, which was seized in Wechel's hands. He adds that Wechel was banished the kingdom, that all his effects were confiscated, and that his books being the greatest part of them Protestant, were seized and carried away from his shop, in order to be publicly burnt. 'Multa hoc in itinere perpeffus est indigna (Zingrefus) tum prepter alia incommoda, tum propter rei pecuniarias penuriam: cum inter peregrinos agens à patre nihil acciperet: & illa, quæ ex principis liberalitate, nec non secretò à matre transmissa fuerant, interciperentur apud Wechelium, Bibliopolam notiffimum; quippe cujus bona omnia confiscata fuerant, ipso regni limitibus proscriptos, reliquique ut plurimum Protestantium libris ab officinâ illius, Lutetie publicè combustis (20). . . . Zingref endured great hardships in this journey, on account of several inconveniences, and especially for want of money. He received no supplies from his father though he was in a foreign country; and what sums were remitted to him by the generosity of the Prince, and privately by his mother, were seized in the hands of Wechel, a very noted Bookseller, &c. . . . Zingref agreed with the Wechels to take in payment some of the books which they had saved from the In-

quisition (21). He afterwards received some other money from home, and went to Orleans, where he was admitted Doctor of the Civil-Law, in the year 1570 (22). These things happened before the Paris massacre.

Notwithstanding all this, it is most certain that Andrew Wechel was at Paris on that cruel day. He fled into Germany in the year 1569, when those troubles were brought on him which Melchior Adam relates, in which he had perished if the President de Harlai had not done him good service (23). He returned to Paris, and re-established his Printing-house there, in the beginning of June 1571 (24). He himself relates (25) the danger which he run in the night of the massacre, and how he was saved by Hubert Languet, who lodged in his house. He testifies his gratitude to him in the Epistle Dedicatory of Albert Krantzius's *Vandalia*.

(20) Melch. Adam. in Vie Juridical. pag. 431. (21) On Wecheliani trans- gress, prope pecuniâ sibi debita libros nonnullis, quos clam adne- illi servavit, ac confiscationibus Regis subme- rant, summe co- actus fuit. Id. *ibid.* (22) M. Bâ. Juridical. pag. 431. (23) Languet, Epist. xlii ad Co- mmentum Po- tronum, pag. 80. (24) Melch. Epist. viii, ad eundem, pag. 104. (25) In the Epistle Dedicatory of Albert Krantzius's *Vandalia*, printed at Fran- cfort 1575.

WEIDNERUS (PAUL) a Jewish Physician in the XVIth century, was invited from Udine a city in Italy, to practise Physic in Carinthia, where he stayed six years, receiving a very handsome pension from the public. During this time he conceived some doubts concerning his religion, which obliged him to compare the Old and the New Testament together, and diligently to examine the expositions of the rabbins; and being convinced by this course of reading that JESUS CHRIST is the Messias, he resolved to embrace openly the Christian Faith. He wavered for about the space of one year after this full conviction (a), and carefully concealed his thoughts, not being ignorant of the dangers to which he should expose himself [A], if he let the Jews know the state of

[A] Not being ignorant of the dangers to which he should expose himself. To be firmly persuaded that a religion is true, to resolve to profess it, and suffer a great many conflicts of mind before the execution of such a resolution, are not incompatible things. Wherefore we ought not to charge Weidnerus's narrative with insincerity. There are very few designs, the execution of which meets with more obstacles than that of the change of religion; for not to mention other hindrances, do not we know that we shall thereby anger the persons whom we love and respect most? Do not we know that we shall become odious and infamous to our relations? I say infamous, for all nations are used to fix an infamous idea on any man's

forsaking his religion. They are not contented with calling him a deserter, an apostate, but he must also be called a renegade (1). They affirm, that his revolt is an ignominious blemish to his family, and I have seen a devout woman who said very seriously, that she had rather see her sisters common whores, than go to mass. These hideous notions are necessary to the temporal good of a communion, and this is the reason why they are fomented. A Casuist will not think it ill for a father to turn his sons out of doors if they apostatize, or that in the like case, one brother should never see the other, and a man should abhor his wife, or a woman leave her husband. The Protestants charge this sort of persecution on the Catholics, who also on their

(1) That note was used among the Protestants in some parts of France, to denote those who turned Papists.

of his soul; but at last the interest of his salvation prevailed over the considerations of the flesh; and leaving Carinthia, he removed to Vienna, where together with his wife and four children he was baptised in St Stephen's Church, on the twenty-first of August 1558. He was made Hebrew Professor in the university of Vienna, and published something concerning the motives of his conversion, and to refute Judaism (b).

(b) Taken from the Epistle Dedicatory to the Emperor Ferdinand, prefixed to his book *De locis præcipuis Fidei Christianæ*, printed at Vienna, in the year 1559. See John Henichius, Professor of Divinity at Rintel, *de Veritate Religionis Christianæ*, pag. 360, & seq.

(2) See Mr. Brucy's book, intitled, *Réponse aux Plaintes des Protestans*; it is mentioned in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, for August 1686, Art. 1. See pag. 879, of those *Nouvelles*.

(3) Arnould, *Apologie pour les Catholiques*, Part. ii, ch. xii, pag. 240; 241.

their side, reproach the Protestants with it (2). Be that as it will, it is certain that this custom very frequently serves as a scare-crow to those who are persuaded, that they ought to quit the church in which they have been educated. Here follows a passage of Mr Arnould on this head. *The design of changing one's religion carries with it something astonishing, faith he (3), and even those who are fully resolved to execute it, can hardly bring themselves to do so I know that a young lady, the daughter of a very zealous Huguenot concealed for seven years from her father that she was a Catholic; and during that whole space of time, she accompanied him to the sermon and service only abstaining from the sacrament, out of fear that he should die for grief at the news of it. She caused me to be consulted in this case, and being informed that I did not approve of this dissimulation, she resolved, though with a great deal of difficulty, to discover her self There may be also some, as it was in St Augustin's time, who are thoroughly convinced of the truth of the Catholic religion, but cannot break the bonds of custom which drags them to the Protestant assemblies, nor expose themselves to the reproach which they fear from their relations and friends, on account of their change, unless some other human consideration, contrary to those which I have mentioned, counterbalances them, and hindering the impression which they made on their minds, enables them to follow more easily the truth of which they are convinced. There are some communities, which believe themselves so much disgraced by the apostacy of a Monk of merit, and are so afraid that it should prove a fatal scandal to the faith of the weak, as well as too great a subject of*

triumph to the contrary party, that they would leave no means unattempted against any person who discovers the least design to desert them. The Jews are of the same disposition. Would they not have murdered Spinoza (4)? And did they not attempt to destroy our Weidnerus after his conversion? Porro, *faith he* (5), *meis secundum carnem non mediocria propter fidei Christianæ suspicionem expectare pericula cogebar, quæ pro dolor! in hunc usque diem mihi intrentari video & experior. Besides, when the thing could be no longer concealed, I was immediately forced to dread no small mischief from my brethren according to the flesh, on account of their suspecting me to be a Christian; and to my great grief I both see and know by experience that I am exposed to the same dangers still.* Let us not forget a very terrible sort of persecution against those, who change their religion. They are loaded with defamatory libels (6); their whole lives are strictly examined; and if any blemishes can be found they are represented to the public with all sorts of artifice in the most hyperbolical manner. The least slips of youth are never forgiven them. If they have written any private letters in confidence to their friends, which may injure their reputation, they are published. In a word, for the interest of the cause, and to discredit the authority of the change, no scruple is made to turn into great crimes, those very things which would never have deprived them of the esteem and affection of any one person in the world; provided they had not changed their religion. See the remark [C] of the article SPONDANUS (JOHN).

(4) See the text of the article of SPINOZA, between the citations (b) and (c).

(5) Weidnerus, Epist. Dedicat. ad Ferdinandum.

(6) Confer with this the words of Peter CHARLTON, which I have quoted in his article, remark [P].

(a) And see Weile, as in König's Bibliotheca.

(b) See the Epistle Dedicatory, of the *Theatrum lucidum*.

(c) Jo. à Lendré, de Pseudo Messias, pag. 63.

(d) Whole name was Aaron Gaby Faro, and to whom in baptism they gave the name of John Rodrigues.

WEILE (a) (FREDERIC RAGSTAT DE) a German Rabbi was an early convert to Christianity; for he was no more than three and twenty years of age when he published a book against the Jews. A little before that he had abjured their religion, and had been baptised in the Protestant church at Cleves. He was named Frederic after the Elector of Brandenburg (b). The book I speak of was printed at Amsterdam in the year 1671 in 12mo, and contains one hundred and fifty pages. The title of it is *Theatrum lucidum exhibens verum Messiam dominum nostrum JESUM-CHRISTUM, ejusque bonorem defendens contra accusationes Judæorum, seu Rabbiorum, in genere, speciatim R. LIBMAN NITZACHON*. We find there some very extraordinary particulars touching the impostures of the false Messiah Sabbathi Tzebhi, who had made a great deal of noise in Turkey a little while before. Mr Lendré has related them, and bestowed praises on our de Weile (c), who was Minister at Spiik near Gorcum in Holland. He baptised a Portuguese Jew (d) there on the tenth of February 1686 [A]. The Flemish sermon which he preached upon that occasion, on the sixth verse of the second Psalm, was printed at the Hague soon after in 8vo.

(1) He shews there that Jesus Christ is the Messiah, and expressly confutes Aburbinel, and Isaac Ben Abraham, and Lipman Nitzachon: The second edition of this book was printed at the Hague in the year 1684, and contains 709 pages in 8vo.

[A] He baptised a Portuguese Jew The writings of Mr de Weile, and particularly the Flemish book which he published in the year 1683 (1), made a great impression upon that Jew, so that he found himself disposed to embrace the Christian Faith, and desired to confer with the author in order to get more

and more light. Mr de Weile, who had at different times been deceived by two Jews, did at first reject the proposals of this, but at last he hearkened to them and made him a Profelyte. We find a narrative of the affair prefixed to a sermon which was preached at Spiik by the said minister, on the day that this Portuguese was baptized.

WERT (JOHN DE) one of the great warriors of the XVIIth century, was born in a village of the province of Guelderland, called Wert. We may see by this that he was a man of no family, since he was only known by the name of his village. . . . He was taken prisoner at the battle of Rhinfeld [A].

For

[A] He was taken prisoner at the battle of Rhinfeld. They carried him to Paris, and put him in 'the castle of Vincennes, and as soon as he had given his parole, they were very glad to leave him at his entire liberty. He went to make his court to the King who received him most graciously. He was regaled by the most considerable noblemen, and went to see all the public

shews. While he staid at Vincennes he had a magnificent table kept for him, and the ladies of the first quality in Paris made it a diversion to go and see him eat. He said a thousand handsome things to all of them; though his compliments did always favour somewhat of the German and soldier He was an admirable drinker, and no less famous

For the rest, his name did not only make a noise in the public news-papers, but refounded also in songs: several were handed about of which he was the burthen, and these latter times have reckoned them so pretty that they have been revived oftener than once [B].

'famous for using tobacco. He smoked, took snuff, and pigtail. He was accompanied by several German officers, who had every one the same talents (1).'

(1) *Mademoiselle l'Héritière, in the Mercure Galant, for the month of May 1702, pag. 77, & seq.*
[B] Several songs were handed about of which he was the burthen, . . . they have been revived oftener than once.] Mr Menage (2) to prove that the word Tudefque is elegantly made use of in familiar conversation to denote a German (3) quotes Mr de Montplaisir who has said in one of his songs,

Faut-il se lever si matin,
Dit le Comte de Fiesque.
On ne dort non plus qu'un Lutin
Avecque ce Tudefque.
Maugré-bieu de la nation :
Le Diable emporte Gaffion,
Et Jean de Vert.

'Blood! must we then so early rise,
Said the Count de Fiesque,
Goblins as well might shut their eyes,
As I with this Tudefque.
A pox upon the Nation. May
The Devil take and run away
With Gaffion and John de Vert.

Several verses were composed to the same tune in the year 1690. Every body sung them. Many more have been published since (4). I have seen in the *Mercurie Galant* for the month of April 1702, a ballad, from which I shall quote two things: the one will confirm what I have said in another place (5), viz. that drunkenness becomes fashionable among women: the other will shew us whether Mr Chevreau, in the passages which I have quoted elsewhere (6), had reason to say that there prevails at this time a chaffity of conversation unknown to our ancestors.

A fe barbouiller de Tabac
Trouvoit-on de la gloire,
Se piquoit-on d'un estomac
Qui fut si propre à boire.
Certaines Dames de ce temps
L'emportent pour ces beaux talens
Sur Jean de Vert, sur Jean de Vert (7) . . .

Dans les cercles les mieux choisis
Fort peu je vous assure
Imitent par leurs tours polis
Sarafin ou Voiture.
Je quitterois tous les vivans
Pour tels defunts l'honneur du tems
De Jean de Vert, de Jean de Vert . . .

Comme l'on se retire loin
De la galanterie
On suit en fa place avec foin
La polissonnerie.
On dit des bons mots plus grossiers
Que les Goujats des officiers
De Jean de Vert, de Jean de Vert (8) . . .

(8) Ibid. pag. 298, 299.

Was it a strife who should be most
Dare'd o'er with snuff like Tinkers;
And did our honest fathers boast
Of being sturdy drinkers?
There are some ladies in our days
Who claim in both a higher praise
Than John de Vert, than John de Vert.

In the best chosen circles you,
After strict search, will find,
Like Sarafin and Voiture few,
Of manners so refin'd.
I'd change the living all away
For such dead men as grac'd the day
Of John de Vert, of John de Vert. . .

The farther still that we remove
From gallantry and wit,
The more we carefully improve
In wagery and smut.
Our dirty jokes would have offended
The very lackeys that attended
The officers of John de Vert. . .

Mademoiselle l'Héritier tells us in the following quotation what the original of those songs was. She says (9) that John de Vert having made himself master of several places in Picardy (10) carried terror to the very gates of Amiens by the parties which he sent out. That terror diffused itself as far as Paris, and as people are ever apt to magnify objects the bare name of John de Vert struck with terror, and became so dreadful, that the sound of it was sufficient to frighten children. When this General was taken prisoner at the battle of Rhinfield (11) the people of Paris, upon hearing the news of it, discovered such transports of joy that it would be difficult to describe them. The Muse of the Pont Neuf celebrated her joy to a trumpet-tune which was then in vogue: she set forth the triumph of the French, and said that they had beat the Germans and John de Vert. She related how they had taken a great many colours, a great many standards, and John de Vert, that they had taken such a number of prisoners and John de Vert. In short, all the couplets of this Savoyard's (12) song, which were very numerous, ended with this burden, and John de Vert. As there was a certain rustic ingenuity in these songs, which at the same time had something cheerful in it, the court and city rung with them, and John de Vert and his songs were so much in fashion that nothing else was talked of (13) . . . That valiant General, whose name had made so great a noise, left in France an everlasting remembrance of his captivity, and they called the time in which it happened, the time of John de Vert. The trumpet tune which I mentioned a little before was called the tune of John de Vert . . . Several men of wit both in the court and city did in imitation of the Pont Neuf make divers pretty songs to that tune, which had all a relation to John de Vert. In short he has made not only himself but his tune immortal, since from his time to this there have not passed ten years together wherein some agreeable songs have not been composed to that tune (14).

(14) Ibid. p. 11.

WESALIA (JOHN DE) a Doctor of Divinity in the XVth century, was very ill treated by the Inquisition in Germany, for having taught some doctrines which disgusted the Catholics. It is pretended that his conversation with some Jews disordered his head, and occasioned his falling into several extravagancies [A]. He was a famous preacher,

[A] His conversation with some Jews disordered his head, and occasioned his falling into several extravagancies. The plague having obliged him to leave Mentz, he retired to Worms, where he conversed with the Jews; as a Rabbi, converted to Christianity, informed Orthu-

nus Gratius. This Rabbi was Victor de Carben, who embraced the Christian Faith in the year 1515, being forty-two years of age, and became a priest, and lived to the age of ninety-two (1). He wrote some tracts in honour of the Blessed Virgin and the Church, which 1690.

preacher, which the Monks, especially the Thomists, did not love, and accordingly they were the principal authors of the persecutions which he suffered. They accused him for certain propositions which they had heard him deliver in the pulpit; and obliged the Archbishop of Mentz to proceed against him (a). That prelate being unwilling to expose himself once more to the indignation of the Court of Rome [B], convoked an assembly of Doctors in the year 1479. John de Wesalia, who was then a prisoner in the convent of the Cordeliers at Mentz, was interrogated by John Elten the Inquisitor, who was president of the assembly. He answered in the negative, to most of the questions put to him, and seemed a little to evade some others. Wherefore on the next day, the Inquisitor declared with a great deal of eloquence [C], that he ought to be interrogated once more. His answers were much the same with those of the fore going day; but he had the confusion to be convicted out of his own writings [D], of having taught principles which he had denied in answering the Inquisitor. He submitted to the punishment imposed on him, which was to retract before all the people. His books were burnt; but some Doctors thought that this venerable old man was used too severely, and that monkish passion had a great share in this affair (b) [E]. He was confined to perpetual

(a) See the remark [B].

(b) Taken from a relation of that trial, inserted by Orthonius Gratius, in the Fasciculus Rerum expendarum & fugiendarum, pag. 325, & seq. Edit. Londinens. 1690.

which Orthonius Gratius turned into Latin. *In Visitationem quum acerbissime adhuc valeret, mihi sapienter retulit prælatum Johannem Wesalicensem à Moguntia ob peccatis metum Wormaciam se contulisse, atque ibidem cum Judæis Christi inimicis frequentem habuisse conversationem, eumque ab illis deceptum in putidam errorum sententiam corripuisse* (2). There is no manner of appearance of truth in this story; for the doctrines, for which John de Wesalia was condemned by the Inquisition did not at all favour of Judaism.

[B] The Archbishop of Mentz . . . being unwilling to expose himself once more to the indignation of the Court of Rome.] The liberty which he had taken of condemning the avarice of that court had been fatal to him, and was the cause that not only he was deprived of his archbishopric, but Mentz was destroyed. The following passage expresses his name and family; 'Reverendissimus præful Moguntinus Dietherus Hsenburgius, militi literarum ad Universitatem Heidelbergensem & Coloniensem instigantibus, imo cogentibus Thomistis quibusdam: veritus ne denuo ab episcopatu ejiceretur jussu Romani Pontificis, quod commeruerat ante levibus verbis Romanorum in vendendis palliis notata avaritia. Et minabantur ei Romani præfuli iram, quam pridem non tam ipse fuerat expertus, quam tota Moguntia & capta & direpta, ac à victoribus nullum non contumeliarum genus passa. Unde ferunt Pium Pontificem ad Moguntiam mentionem semper ingemuisse, quod jus suum tam insigni damno vindicasset' (3). . . . The most reverend Archbishop of Mentz, Dietherus Hsenburgius sent letters to the universities of Heidelberg and Cologne, being incited, or rather forced, thereto by certain Thomists, and steering left he should be again thrust out of his bishopric by the Pope's orders, as he had been before on account of some slight reproaches which he had thrown upon the avarice of the Court of Rome in the sale of preferments. They threatened him with the Pope's indignation, which had formerly fallen not only upon himself but upon the whole city of Mentz; for it was taken and plundered, and suffered all manner of indignities from the conqueror. Hence it is said that Pope Pius always sighed when he heard the name of that city mentioned, because he had asserted his right in such a destructive way. We ought not to be surprized that the agents of the Inquisition, are so greedy of rendering people suspected and amplifying things by malicious interpretations; for those who find themselves suspected, are afraid of losing their posts if they have any, and break out into a thousand violences, in order to take off the ill impressions that have been given of them. The inquisitors do very well know that their odious slanders will produce this effect; wherefore they never make any scruple of calumny. To how many people may justly be applied this saying of Horace, you design to silence envy by forsaking virtue (4).

[C] On the next day, the Inquisitor declared with a great deal of eloquence.] Those who read his speech on that occasion, need not be adverted that I here speak ironically. Adducto Johanne de Wesalia, dixit Inquisitor: Tria jam futura in hoc actu. Primum quia M. Johannes hesternæ die non satis resolutus ad certos responderet articulos, iterum sibi illos proponendos esse, ut luculenter & clare, plus masticando, responderet: deinde ad quosdam alios articulos heri non auditos quid sentiat, respondere deberet: tertio relegi

debere omnes articulos principales cum responsionibus, ut audiatur si adhuc in illis velit persistere aut ab illis resiliere (5). . . . John de Wesalia being brought before the Inquisitor, the Inquisitor said that three things were to be done at that sitting. First, because the said John had not given direct and positive answers the day before to certain articles, they should be proposed to him again, that he might answer distinctly and clearly, by pondering more than he had yet done: next, that he should be obliged to declare his sentiments upon some other points, which had not been mentioned the preceding day: and thirdly, that all the principal articles, together with his answers, should be read over, to see whether he still adhered to them or was willing to depart from them.

[D] He had the confusion to be convicted out of his own writings.] This poor man, broken by age and diseases, was not able to express his thoughts before such a dreadful tribunal, and perhaps did not remember all that he had written. The Inquisitors clearly foresaw his negative plea; and for that reason they were not content with binding him by the most solemn oaths, but first of all they seized on all his papers. Mandavit eidem Johanni (Inquisitor) sub pena obediencie, in virtute Sancti Spiritus, sub pena excommunicationis latæ sentencie (à quo nemo habet ipsum absolvere nisi solus Papa, vel ipse Inquisitor, nisi in articulo mortis) ut diceret plane verba veritatis super interrogandis de sua fide, sine ambagibus, sine verborum sophisticatione (6). . . . The Inquisitor charged the said Wesalia, by his vow of Obedience, in the name of the Holy Ghost, and under pain of excommunication (from which no man should absolve him besides the Pope and the Inquisitor himself, unless at the point of death) that he would plainly speak the truth in these things upon which he was to be interrogated, without any shuffling or equivocation. Conclufum quod M. N. Wesalia jurandum facere deberet, quod præsentare & tradere vellet omnes tractatus, opera, scripta sua qualiacunque quæ condidisset, ut per proprios sermones vinceretur Adjungebatur quod doctores Heidelbergenses cum tribus aliis, scilicet Macario, decano Sancti Victoris, & quodam alio perspicere tractatus ejus, errores exciperent dearticulare (7). . . . It was concluded that an oath should be administered to Wesalia, by which he should oblige himself to present and deliver up all his treatises, works, and compositions whatsoever, that he might be convicted by his own words. . . . It was added that the Professors of Heidelberg, together with three more, viz. Macarius, the Dean of St Victor, and a certain other person, should examine his treatises, extract the errors, and digest them into articles. It was therefore very easy to convict him on those points which he improperly denied: 'Dum certas propositiones negasset se scripsisse, tractatus sui propria manu conscripti ei præsentabantur, quam revera literam esse suam non valuit negare' (8). . . . When he denied that he writ certain propositions, they produced to him treatises written with his own hand, which he was not able to deny.

[E] Some doctors thought that he was used too severely, and that monkish passion had a great share in this affair.] This is testified by the anonymous author of the verbal process; who was present during the whole proceedings. 'Dempto solo articulo, scilicet (9), de processione

(5) Author Examinis Magistratus, apud Orth. Gratium, pag. 330.

(6) Ibid. pag. 328.

(7) Idem, Auctor Examinis, apud eundem, pag. 327.

(8) Id. Ibid. pag. 330.

(9) Id. Ibid. pag. 332.

(a) Id. Ibid.

(3) Author Examinis Magistratus ac Theologus Joh. de Wesalia, apud Orthonium Gratium in Fasciculo Rerum expendarum. pag. 327.

(4) Invidiam placare parvas virtute relictas. Horat. Sat. iii, lib. ii, ver. 13.

perpetual penance in a monastery of the Augustins, where he died soon after (c). The Protestants have placed him in their list of the witnesses of truth; which I am not surprized at, for he was condemned for several doctrines which they have since taught. What Coëffeteau offers in answer to this, hath no manner of solidity [F]. Wesalia taught at Erford (d). Consult the article WESTPHALUS (JOHN).

(c) Trithemius, in Chronico Sponheimensi, ad ann. 1479, apud Coëffeteau, Réponse au My-
stère d'Iniquité, pag. 1213. (d) Wimpfelingus, apud Wolsium, Lect. memorab.
Tom. i, pag. 875, ad ann. 1464.

sione Spiritus Sancti in aliis videtur non ita gravi
censura fuisse castigandus, si induciæ datæ fuissent,
si consultores ei fuissent adhibiti, si non omnes uno
solo dempto, fuissent de via realium. Et nisi forsitan
impetus quidam irrepressisset in religiosos triumphandi
de seculari, & præsertim de eo qui illorum Thomam
peculiariter non coluerat, forsitan poterat cum eo
mitius, humanius, & clementius benigniusque actum
& processum fuisse. Deum testor qui omnia novit
hunc processum qui cum eo servatus fuit usque ad
revocationem & librorum suorum exustionem, vehe-
mentissime displicuisse Magistro Engelino de Brun-
swico, maximo Theologo, & Magistro Joanni Kei-
serbergio, duobus utique viris cum doctis, tum in-
tegris. Præcipue Magistro Engelino visum fuit ni-
tis præcipitanter cum tanto viro actum esse. Im-
mo non verebatur asserere multos articulos ejus, &
majorem partem posse sustineri. Nec obtinuit de si-
mulate Thomistarum contra Modernos, & de gaudio
triumphandi religionum contra seculares. -----

Setting aside one article touching the procession of the
Holy Ghost, he seems in other things not to have deserved
such a severe censure, if they would have given him
some respite, and allowed him persons to consult with,
and if they had not all except one been Realists. Per-
haps too, if the Monks had not been violently set upon
running down a secular man, especially one that had
never shown any particular reverence for their great
St Thomas, they would have proceeded against him in a
more mild, human, merciful, and good-natured way!
I call GOD, who knoweth all things, to witness, that
this process which was carried on against him, till such
time as his books were called in and burnt, did highly
displease Dr Engelino of Brunswick, a great Divine,
and Dr Keiserberg, two men that were famous both
for their learning and integrity. Dr Engelino parti-
cularly was of opinion, that they had proceeded too rashly
with so great a man. Nay he did not scruple to affirm,
that many of his articles, if not the greatest part of them,
might be defended. Neither was he silent concerning
the ill will which the Thomists bear the Moderns, and
the pleasure which the Monks take in triumphing over
secular Priests. He adds, that the Devil sowed the
tares of division betwixt the Divines and Philosophers,
and so alienated their minds, that if any person denied
the reality of the Universalia, he was immediately
thought to have sinned against the Holy Ghost, and
to be guilty of a mortal sin against GOD, Christianity,
Justice, and the State. Can this blindness proceed
from any other cause but the devil, who, in order to
divert us from all that is good, engages us in vain
speculations, which neither inspire us with devotion
towards GOD, nor charity towards our neighbour?

Unde hæc cæcitas mentis nisi à diabolo? qui ne utiliora,
ne boniora, ne moribus, virtutibus, & saluti animarum
conducuntur discamus, phantasias nostras illudit, & tra-
hit ad res minus salubres, & ad gelidas harum inten-
tionem speculationes quibus neque ad Deum devoti reddimus,
neque ad proximi dilectionem inflammamur (10). This
reflexion is very just, and sufficient to mortify not
only the Realists and Nominalists, but also other
factions.

(10) Ibid. pag.
333.

(11) Du Plessis,
Mystère d'In-
iquité, pag. 598.

(12) You will
find the other
propositions of
that Doctor, in
the Mystère d'I-
niquité, pag.
598.

[F] What Coëffeteau offers in answer to this hath no
manner of solidity. Du Plessis Mornai did not forget to
say that (11) John de Wesalia, Doctor and preacher at
Worms, was accused before the Inquisitors of having main-
tained the following propositions, viz. That the prelates had
no authority to institute new laws in the Church, but to
persuade the faithful to observe the Gospel precepts, &c (12).
Coëffeteau having in a different manner represented

the opinions of this man, such, saith he (13), as the (13) Réponse au
Protestants themselves relate them, exclaims thus (14),

These are the extravagancies of the Preacher of
Worms, of which du Plessis hath left out those
he found contrary, as well to his own, as the Ca-
tholic doctrine; namely the article of the proceeding
of the holy Spirit from the person of the Son as well
as the Father, which the Latin Church always hath
asserted against the Greek. And it is certain that
those whom du Plessis alledges, who supported him
against the Thomists, owned that he erred in this
article; and as to most of the other points, he de-
nied that he had asserted some, and endeavoured to
explain others. But afterwards he publicly re-
canted in the church-yard at Mentz, in presence of
the Archbishop, and several eminent doctors of the
universities of Mentz, Cologne, and Heidelberg; and,
according to Trithemius, his books and writings
were committed to the flames, and he in perpetual
penance confined in an Augustinian monastery, where
he died soon after. Thus it appears what the Sau-
mur witnesses are. In the mean time the reader
will remember, that the Protestant author, from
whom we have cited the heads of his doctrine, hath
couched them as he thought fit, in order to make
them look less odious and more plausible. Trith-
emius adds, that he asserted that there was not, nor
ever had been any such thing as original sin, and that
children were not conceived in original sin. He also
recites the other articles quite differently from the
Protestant, who hath perverted the Abbot of Ur-
spers's chronicle, from whence those who furnished
du Plessis with them, made their extracts. Rivetus
replied in favour of du Plessis, that it is true that John
de Wesalia agreed with the Greek Church on the article
of the procession of the Holy Ghost (15); but that in his o-
ther propositions to the number of 23, he was taxed with
the same errors with which the Protestants are charged,
and this according to the enumeration, and relation not of
Part. ii, pag. 631.

(15) Rivet, Re-
marques sur la
Réponse au My-
stère d'Iniquité,
part. ii, pag. 631.

(16) That it is
by Orthonius
Gratius. See
what he saith of
John de Wes-
alia above, re-
mark [4].

In general, Rivetus is in the right, for John de We-
salia's propositions, cited by du Plessis, are in a book
of Orthonius Gratius, a very good Papist; but he was
in the wrong to charge Coëffeteau with pretending
here that Orthonius was a Protestant. Coëffeteau did
not cite the Fasciculus Rerum expetendarum, but only
the continuator of the Abbot of Ursperg. It is at
pag. 1188, and 1189, that he says that the author of
the Fasciculus Rerum expetendarum was a Protestant and
a Lutheran. Rivetus had a great deal of reason to cor-
rect him here (17).

(17) Rivet, ibi
supra, pag. 611.

Observe, by the way, that the author of the Pri-
guez légittimes contre le Papisme hath been censured for
alleging the Abbot of Ursperg's continuator in evi-
dence. He hath been told that it is very well known,
that the publisher of that work was Cratomelius of
Schlestad, one of Melancthon's disciples (18). I believe
the censorer meant Crato Mylius, for that is the name
of the Bookseller who published in the year 1537, the
Abbot of Ursperg's Chronicle, corrected and continued
by Gaspar Hedion, Minister of Strasbourg. See the
Epitome of Gesner's Bibliotheca (19), and the first
tome of the Observations scliæ, printed at Hall in
the year 1700 (20).

(18) Critique des
Prijuques, pag.
236.

(19) de libris
Gasp. Hedion.

(20) At pag.
307.

WESSELUS

WESSELUS (JOHN) one of the most learned men of the XVth century, was born at Groningen about the year 1419 [A]; and having lost his father (a) and mother in his infancy, was educated by the care of a good lady, who having but one son caused him to study with him. She sent them both to Zwol, where there was a college, which was more esteemed than that of Groningen. It was a society of regular Priests of St Jerom, where youth were instructed. All those that were educated there were thaven like Priests and wore the religious habit; but when they quitted the college they were free to wear what habit they pleased. So that though Wesselus wore the cowl whilst he studied at Zwol, yet there is no reason to infer from thence that he was a Monk, since it is certain that he never engaged in a Monastical life [B]. It is indeed true, that early in his youth he had some thoughts which tended that way, but he refrained them as soon as he perceived that sort of life charged with some shocking superstitions, and at last the inclination wore off. As his great natural parts were attended with an incredible application to study, he made a considerable progress in learning at Zwol, and even publicly instructed others there. He left that city in order to continue his studies at Cologne, where he improved to such a degree of learning, as not only rendered him highly admired, but suspected of Heterodoxy. He consulted the originals, and there found matter for difficulties and arguments which puzzled and surprized his masters. He was by no means satisfied with their answers, that Aristotle, St Thomas, and the Seraphic Doctor, &c. had said this or that (b); and because he applied himself much to the study of the Platonic Philosophy, he thereby fell into a contempt of that of Aristotle, which rendered him very disagreeable to the Scholastic Professors. He frequently crossed the Rhine, to go to the monastery of Duytz (c) in order to read the works of the Abbot Rupert, of whom he was a great admirer. He was advised to go to Heidelberg, to read Divinity lectures there, and followed that advice; but the directors of the university alledged that he was unqualified for the Divinity Professor's chair, because he was not yet promoted to the degree of Doctor [C]; and when he requested to be so, he was answered that the canons did not allow the admission of Laymen to that degree. So that being resolved against the taking of orders, he contented himself

(a) He was a Baker.

(b) See the remark [D], citation (12).

(c) Situated over against Cologne. Rupert, who is called Abbot Tuitensis, was Abbot of that monastery.

[A] He was born at Groningen about the year 1419.]

(1) *At Hardenbergius, Seckendorf, Altingius, &c. See Seckendorf's History of Lutheranism, lib. i, pag. 226.*

(2) *Vita Wesseli, in Libro cui Titulus Effigies & Vitæ Professorum Academiæ Groningæ: Omlandæ, pag. 12, 13, & 24.*

(3) *Ibid. pag. 24.*

(4) *Ibid.*

(5) *Ibid.*

(6) *Ibid.*

Others place his birth about the year 1400 (1): but it is probable that they are mistaken, since two authors of Friesland say that he died in 1489, at seventy years of age (2). If we believe Geldenhaur, he lived above ninety years, and his sight remained so good to the last, that he never made use of spectacles either to write or read: *Geldenbaurius nonagessimum eum annum superasse narrat, integro visu & auditu, ita ut nunquam specillis usus sit, minutissimasque literas & commode legeret, & pulchre ipse pingeret* (3). Hardenbergius doth not confirm this, but on the contrary saith, that Wesselus, having never had good eyes, they grew so weak in his old age, that the continual blunders occasioned by his bad sight, in reading the Scripture before the Monks, rendered him the jest of his auditors. *At quod ad visum, Hardenbergius luscitiosum eum fuisse, & senio quoque caligare oculos capisse tradit, ut cum semper die Cæne Dominice in Cætu Fratrum vesperi pro collatione, ut illi vocant, legeret sermonem Domini in Cænâ habitum à cap. Job. 13 usque ad 18. frequenter à textu aberrans à Monachis rideretur* (4). As for the age attributed to him by Geldenhaur, it is thus refuted: 'Quod verò ad ætatem, Suffridus Petri & Regnerus Prædinius, quibus ut Frisius & in Urbe hac versatis rectius constare potuit, unde septuaginta annos vixisse affirmant, natum 1419, mortuum 1489' (5). - - - *As for his age, Suffridus Petri and Regnerus Prædinius, who were natives of Friesland, and lived in this city, had an opportunity of knowing it much better. Now they affirm that he lived seventy years, being born in the year 1419, and dying in 1489.* The registers of the church where Wesselus was buried express the year of his death, but not that of his age: which if they had mentioned we should have been more certain of Geldenhaur's, or Suffridus's error. 'Sepultus Groningæ, in Monasterio, quod Spirituum Virginum dicitur, in ipso templi choro, non longè à summo altari. In libro memoriali templi illius hæc leguntur: Anno Domini 1489 obiit Venerabilis Magister Wesselus Hermanni, egregius Doctor Sacre Theologiæ, & in Latinâ, & Græcâ, & Hebræâ linguis multum eruditus, & in tota Philosophia quasi universalis' (6). - - - *He was buried at Groningen in the convent which is called the Convent of the Spiritual Virgins, in the choir of the church, not far from the great altar. In the registers of that church we find the following words: In the year of our Lord 1489, died the venerable Master Wesselus Hermanni; an excellent Divine, very well versed in the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew tongues, and in a manner*

'thoroughly acquainted with all the parts of Philosophy.'

[B] *It is certain that he never engaged in a monastical life.* This is affirmed, and frequently repeated in the tract from whence I have taken this article:

'Cucullum monasticum five Franciscanorum five alius ordinis nunquam induit. . . Rogatus quare non saltem primam tonsuram adsumeret? dixit se non metuere patibulum quanto quidem tempore mentis maneret compos' (7). - - - *It is certain that he never put*

'on the cowl of the Franciscan, nor of any other order.'

'... Being asked why he did not at least take the first tonsure, he replied that he did not fear the gallows so long as he kept in his right wits.' Nay, we are

there assured that he constantly resisted the importunities of the General of the Franciscans, who pressed him to assume the habit of that order: 'Is cum esset eruditus & eruditorum fautor, ad se attraxit Wesselum, cum ut in disputationibus, quarum avidissimus erat, & quotidiano exercitio ejus opera uteretur; tum verò ut sui ordinis monachum eum postea faceret; à quo tamen Wesselus abhorrebat. Sed usus

presenti fortunâ in familiam se ipsius dedit' (8). - - - *As he was a learned man himself, and a favourer of the learned, he took Wesselus into his house, that he might use his assistance in disputes, of which he was extremely fond, and in his daily studies; and likewise that he might afterwards make him a Monk of his order. Wesselus had an aversion to that: but, embracing the favourable opportunity, he was glad to be admitted into his family.* Notwithstanding this a learned man pretends, that Wesselus was a Franciscan, in the following words. *Wherefore Lewis XI commanded Job*

Boucart, Bishop of Avranches, to take care of this reform; he being assisted by a Franciscan, whose name was Wesselus Gransfortius of Groningen, who by his voyages in the Levant, had acquired a perfect acquaintance with Aristotle, and all the good Greek authors in each science, assembled all the principal heads and members of the university, and, with their concurrence and good advice, drew up and published an edit against the Nominalists, which we shall insert entire at the end of this chapter, as a monument not yet printed, very much to the honour of our Lewis XI (9).

[C] *Because he was not yet promoted to the degree of Doctor.* This objection furnishes us with an invincible argument to confute some writers, who have said, that our Wesselus acquired such a treasure of erudition in the university of Cologne, that he was made Doctor of Divinity, Law, and Phisic, there. *Geldenbaurius refert magno & assiduo & vix credibili labore hoc eum adsecutum*

(7) *Ibid. pag. 13, 14.*

(8) *Ibid. pag. 17.*

(9) *Naudé, in his additions to the History of Lewis XI, pag. 193.*

himself with reading Philosophical lectures : after which he returned to Cologn, from whence he went to Louvain, and having spent some time in hearing the lectures of the Theological Professors there, he went to Paris. The Philosophical controversies being then very hot betwixt the Realists, Formalists, and Nominalists; he endeavoured to convert the principal champions of the Formalists, by bringing them over to the sect of the Realists; and afterwards, he himself went over to the Formalists, and not finding that sect more in the right than the other, he embraced the opinions of the Nominalists. Some authors say, that he travelled to Greece and the Levant [D], the better to learn the Greek and Hebrew languages. However that be, the reputation which he acquired, procured him the particular esteem of Francis della Rovere, General of the Minor Fryers. He adhered to him, and if he was thereby obliged to see several blamable actions, amongst

tum esse, ut non solum Theologicæ Majestatis lauream mereretur, sed etiam Jureconsultis & Medicis Doctoribus annumeraretur: adeoque summus in omnibus Facultatibus titulus fuit ornatus; ut vulgo quidem perhibetur. Mihi tamen vix verisimile videtur. Si enim jam tum triplici laurea insignitus fuisset Wesselus, quæ ratio fuerit, quod postea admittitur non fuerit ab Heidelbergensibus, nullam aliam ob causam, quam quod titulo Doctoris destitueretur. Pro exaggeranda ergo Wesseli viri incomparabilis eruditione hanc de tribus titulis fabulam, & plura alia, jactatam jam olim fuisse credo (10).

(10) Vita Wesseli, pag. 14.

[D] That he travelled into Greece and the Levant.] We have seen above that Naudæus affirms it. Others pretend that the name of Basilus, given him by several authors, was bestowed upon him by Bessarion. They tell us that Bessarion having been acquainted with our Wesselus in Greece, at first by changing the U into B called him Basilus, and afterwards Basilus. The author already cited rejects these traditions, and doubts whether Wesselus ever was in Greece. His words are: 'Hardenbergius pro Wesselo Basilium dictum ait, quod elegantiorum hominum auribus Wesseli nomen nimis durum & veluti barbarum videretur: vel quod alterum quodammodo Basilium magnum judicarent; vel quod Bessarion Cardinalis Græcus, quo ibi amicissimo usus, suum B per nostrum B quam V exprimeret maluerit, atque pro Wesselo Basilium, ac mox Basilium coeperit vocare. Quamvis vix videatur verisimile aut in Græcia unquam fuisse Wesselum, aut in ea familiariter usum fuisse Bessarione: cum enim hic teste Jovio jam anno 1434 in Italia vixerit, atque anno 1439 ab Eugenio Papa creatus sit Cardinalis, debuerit Wesselus ante annum xv ætatis in Græciam ad Bessarionem abiisse: quod à vero abhorret (11). - - - Hardenbergius says, that he was called Basilus instead of Wesselus, because this latter name seemed too harsh, and in a manner barbarous to polite ears; or because they looked upon him to be in some sort another great Basilus; or because the Greek Cardinal Bessarion, who treated him with great friendship there, rather chose to express his country B by our B than V, and so instead of Wesselus, began to call him Basilus, and presently after Basilus. But after all, it neither seems probable that Wesselus was ever in Greece, nor that he contracted a friendship with Bessarion there; for since, according to Jovius, the latter lived in Italy as early as the year 1434, and was made a Cardinal by Pope Eugenius in 1439, it follows that Wesselus must have gone to Bessarion in Greece before he was fifteen years of age; which is utterly false.' A little farther he brings in Wesselus boasting of his travels in Greece. 'In disputationibus Theologicis magnos titulos Doctorum contemnebat, solis Divinis literis firmiter adherens. Quare siquis forte inter disputandum, ut fieri solet, ei objiceret, hoc dicit Doctor Sanctus; hoc Seraphicus &c. ipse respondere solebat; Thomas fuit Doctor, quid tum postea? Et ego Doctor sum. Thomas vix latine intellexit, & unilinguis fuit. Ego trium principalium linguarum mediocrem peritiam assecutus sum. Thomas vix umbram Aristotelicam vidit: Ego Aristotelem Græcum IN IPSA GRÆCIA DIDICI (12). - - - In Theological disputes he despised the great titles of Doctors, strictly adhering to the holy scriptures alone. Wherefore if any one in a disputation objected to him as it usually happens. This, saith the holy Doctor, this the Seraphical Doctor, &c. he generally made answer; Thomas was a Doctor, what then? I also am a Doctor. Thomas scarce understood Latin, and but one learned language; whereas I have acquired a tolerable knowledge in the three principal tongues.

(12) Ibid. pag. 14, 15.

'Thomas scarce saw the shadow of Aristotle; whereas I IN GREECE IT SELF HAVE STUDIED Aristotle in his original Greek.' But in the same page looks upon this voyage as a fiction: 'Postea in Græciam abiisse creditur; at si quis cogitet eo tempore non solum literas in Græcia jacuisse, sed totam quæ regionem bello arsisse, & hoc conficium fuisse cognoscet. Ita de Petro de Aliaco quoque relatum est, quod Græcè exactè sciret, per decennium in Græcia vixisse; quamvis certum sit nunquam Itali excessisse (13). - - - It is thought that he went into Greece afterwards; but if any one consider that not only learning was then at a low pass in Greece, but likewise that the whole country was engaged in a bloody war, he will know that this is also a fiction. In the same manner was it reported of Peter de Aliaco that he was a great master of the Greek tongue, and lived ten years in Greece; whereas it is certain that he never went out of Italy.' Let us also see what he observes on Wesselus's answer to a scholar, who put a question to him: Stay till I return from Egypt a second time, then your difficulty shall be solved. My author imagines that by Egypt he mystically meant Rome. 'In Ægyptum quoque profectus creditur Wesselus noster, persuasus omnes libros Solomonis, & totam illam gloriosam Bibliothecam Judæorum ibi adhuc servari: sed reverius solebat dicere; frustra perfectionem ab solvi. Judæi enim totam bibliothecam suam perdere maluerunt, quam legere quod confiteri videretur. Quamvis ego ratione habitâ belli, quo eo tempore totus Oriens flagrabat, existimarim Wesselum nunquam perfectionem in Ægyptum instituisse, sed intellexisse Ægyptum mysticam, five Romanam, juxta stylum Sp. Sancti, atque Cantero significare voluisse, se nunquam Romam reditum esse. Joannes Canterus, quem ipse instituerat, & præter alia artem Raimundi Lullii eum docuerat, aliquando curiosiorem questionem ei proposuit: ad quem Wesselus: Expecta donec secundo ex Ægypto rediero: tunc respondebo tibi; deridens curiositatem Canteri (14). - - - It is likewise believed that our Wesselus went into Egypt, being persuaded that all the books of Solomon, and the glorious library of the Jews there were still preserved entire. But he used to say after his return; that his journey had been undertaken to no purpose: for that the Jews had rather chosen to destroy their whole library, than read what they were unwilling to confess. Nevertheless, considering the war which at that time raged over the whole East, I am apt to think that Wesselus never undertook a journey to Egypt, but that he meant the Mystical or Roman Egypt, according to the stile of the Holy Ghost, and only intimated to Canterus that he never would return to Rome. John Canterus, his disciple, whom besides other things he had taught the art of Raymond Lullius, died, at a certain time, propose a question to him of somewhat too curious a nature; upon which Wesselus said: Stay till I return from Egypt a second time, and then I will answer you; thereby ridiculing the curiosity of Canterus.' All this shews that the life of Wesselus is little known, and that several falsities are reported concerning this illustrious man. A Modern author assures us that Wesselus went to the river Euphrates on purpose to see Ezekiel's tomb, and the antient library of the Jews; an evident sign of the contagious evil which perpetuates falsities. Let us hear this Modern (15): 'Though Rabbi Benjamin maintains, that the Prophet Ezekiel's tomb on the river Euphrates, and the library of the first and second temple were to be seen in his time; nevertheless, the Sieur Wesselus of Groningen, and many other great men, who went to that country on purpose to see that tomb, and that library,

(13) Ibid. pag. 15.

(14) Ibid. pag. 22, 23.

(15) Gallie Traité des plus belles Bibliothèques, pag. 14, 15, Paris Ed. 1700. See also Lamoignon, Bibliothèque, pag. 14, Ed. 1700.

amongst other motives he was induced to it by the hopes of going to Basil at the time of the Council [E], where he did not doubt but his master would be present. His hopes were not vain, for he saw that council, and made himself known to the learned men; he was also consulted, and admired in some public disputes. He returned to Paris with Francis della Rovere, his patron, and some authors say he was persecuted there and even banished [F]. His Mæcenas being elected Pope under the name of Sixtus IV, continued his favour to him, and offered him all sorts of preferments; but he only asked a copy of the Bible in Hebrew and Greek, which he obtained [G]. He left Rome and returned into

library, have unanimously reported, that it was a dream of the Rabbins, and that neither of them were to be found. I went thither in vain, says the Sieur Wessél (16), since the Jews have rather chosen to lose all their books, than to read what they will not confess.

(16) This word *Sieur*, shews that the author was very ill acquainted with our Wessélus.

[E] By the hopes of going to Basil at the time of the Council. The author whom I have abridged in the text of this article, ought to be censured here. He saith that Wessélus having intrigued for the Formalists in their disputes with the Realists and Nominalists, at last sided with the Nominalists. These things happened, continues he, at the time of the Council of Basil, when Wessélus was already become a domestic to Pope Nicolas V, by the recommendation of Francis della Rovere, General of the Franciscans, who was afterwards Sixtus IV, and who founded the Vatican Library. 'Erant hæc sub id tempus, quo Concilium Basiliense celebrabatur. Ipse autem jam pervenerat propter celeberrimam famam & incredibilem eruditionem in omni genere disciplinarum & artium in familiam Nicolai V, Pontificis Maximi, operâ Francisci à Ruvere, Generalis ministri Fratrum Minorum, qui postea Papa creatus Sixtus IV vocatus est, primusque fundamenta jecit celebratissimæ illius Bibliothecæ, quæ à loco vulgo Vaticana vocatur . . . (17)

(17) What is wanting here is to be found above in citation (8).

. . . in qua (familia Fr. à Ruvere) multa digna & indigna, quædam etiam pia, sed pleraque impia vidit & expertus est. Obduri tamen, ut per illum in notitiam omnium doctorum Virorum magis magnificæ perveniret, & liberis sine periculo disputare posset, simulque nancisci liberam occasionem admonendi hominis de vitandis idololatriæ superstitionibus & apertis obsecrationibus monasticis; maxime verò, ut via aperiretur, quâ pervenire posset in Synodum Basiliensem, in quam sciebat Franciscum, utpote totius Ordinis Supremum, vocatum iri, quod & contigit. Nam paulo post eo profectus est, & operâ Domini sui in Doctissimi cujusque notitiam pervenit, & ad multa consilia adhibitus est, & publicè aliquoties auditus disputare cum summa omnium admiratione (18). . . . These things happened at the time that the Council of Basil was held. Wessélus, on account of his great reputation and incredible learning in all the different arts and sciences, was already in Pope Nicolas V's family, by the recommendation of Francis della Rovere, General of the minor Friars, who was afterwards created Pope, under the name of Sixtus IV, and was the first who laid the foundation of that most famous library, which, from the place, is commonly called the Vatican . . . In which family (of Francis della Rovere) he was an eye-witness to many good and many bad actions, to some piety, but to a great deal of wickedness. Notwithstanding he continued there, that by his means he might become more and more acquainted with all the learned men, and be more at liberty to dispute without running any risque, and at the same time have opportunities of freely admonishing his patron to shun the idolatrous superstitions and public obsecrations of the Friars; but, above all, that he might find means to go to the Council of Basil, in which he knew that Francis, as General of the whole order, would assist.

(18) Vita Wessélus, pag. 17.

The thing fell out as he desired: for in a short time after he went thither, and by the recommendation of his master became acquainted with the most learned men, he was often consulted, and sometimes heard to dispute with universal applause. There are several mistakes in these words. I. The Council of Basil began in the year 1431, and ended, properly speaking, in 1443: and therefore since the author, whom I am censuring, supposes 1419 to be the year of Wessélus's birth, he cannot, with any colour of reason say, that this Doctor was very much admired at Basil during the session of that Council. Observe, that according to him, Wessélus's journey to Basil was posterior to his long residence at Cologne, to his journey to Heidelberg, to his return to Cologne, to his journey to Louvain, as well as

VOL. V. No. CXXXIV.

to Paris, to all his intrigues in favour of the Formalists against the Realists, and lastly to his adhering to the sect of the Nominalists. If you suppose that our Wessélus was not at Basil before the last year of the Council, it were still true that he had done what I have just now mentioned before the age of twenty-four years; which cannot be said without a great absurdity, and nothing can be more false. II. Nicolas V was not elected Pope before the year 1447, and consequently was not in the Pontifical chair, during the session of the Council of Basil. That Pope is said to be the founder of the Vatican Library (19). It is true, that others ascribe that glory to Sixtus IV. Both may be in the right in several respects, therefore I do not charge what our author says on that head as a fault. III. It is false that Francis della Rovere sat in the Council of Basil as General of the Franciscans. He was born in the year 1414. He run through his course of study by the age of twenty-two, and taught afterwards publicly for several years before he was made assistant to the General of his order, who was succeeded by three Generals before Francis della Rovere attained that dignity (20). Hence it plainly appears that it is impossible he should have been possessed of that post during the session of the Council of Basil, the conclusion of which happened in the year 1441, or, as others will have it, in 1443.

[F] Some say that he was persecuted at Paris, and even banished. This particular is very uncertain: Hardenbergius declares that he never heard it mentioned by any of those who had been acquainted with Wessélus. 'Cum Domino suo Francisco, Generali ministro, reversus est Lutetiam ubi multa expertus est, multa etiam passus, ita ut quidam scribant, illum Scholâ aut Urbe pulsam esse propter reprehensas superstitiones: quod tamen Hardenburgius à nemine unquam sibi auditum eorum ait, qui cum illo domesticè versati sunt. Et certum est, illum plus minus sedecim annos Parisiis versatum esse, & cum Domino suo, jam in Papam electo, unâ Romam profectum. Unde non videtur verisimile, Papam & eundem Monachum & quidem Minoritarum monachum, passurum eum fuisse, si à Schola Theologica Parisiensis proscriptus fuisset antea. Fieri potuit, quod postea illuc reversus pulsus sit (21). . . . He returned with his master Francis, General of the Friars minor, to Paris, where he suffered several hardships. Some even say that he was banished the school or city, for having censured certain superstitions. But Hardenburgius declares that he never heard it mentioned by any of those who most frequented his house. Certain it is that he lived sixteen years at Paris, and went to Rome with his master upon his being chosen Pope: whence it does not seem probable that a Pope, who had been not only a Friar, but a Friar minor, would have suffered him, if it had been true, that was banished from the Divinity-school at Paris before. Possibly such a thing may have happened to him after his return. Observe, that the edict of Lewis XI against the Nominalists is dated on the first of March 1473 (22). Wherefore if it was true that Wessélus had been assistant to John Bouchart, Bishop of Avranches in the preliminaries of that edict (23), he would have been a very considerable man in France, even during the Papacy of Sixtus IV.

[G] He only asked a copy of the Bible. . . which he obtained. The Pope thought this was a very silly request; Why do not you rather ask a miter, or something like it, said he? Because I have no need of any such thing, answered Wessélus. He chose the good part, but he exposed himself to the ralleries of the worldlings. Respondit Sixtus; Hæc nobis curæ erunt, tu pro te aliquid pete. Rogo ergo, inquit Wessélus, ut mihi detis ex Bibliotheca Vaticana Græcâ & Hebræa Biblia. Ea, inquit Sixtus, tibi dabuntur: Sed tu stulte, quare non petis Episcopatum aliquem aut simile quiddam? Respondit Wessélus, quia iii non indigeo. Hæc ipsa Hebræa Biblia

(19) See *Patris Jacob, Traité des Bibliothèques*, pag. 84. Lomier, de Bibliothecis, pag. 194, & seq.

(20) Taken from a manuscript Memoir imparted by a person, whom I caused to be consulted.

(21) Vita Wessélus, inter Vitas Profess. Oronings, pag. 17.

(22) See Naudé, ubi supra, pag. 223.

(23) See Naudé's words in the remark [B].

into his native country, where he got the affection and esteem of all men. He died at Groningen on the fourth of October 1489. He was perplexed with some doubts concerning the Christian religion during his last sickness, but at length they entirely vanished away (d) [H]. It is beyond question that his opinions were in several particulars contrary to those of Rome [I]; and he has been justly called Luther's fore-runner, I must not forget in this place that he is cited under different names [K]. Part of his

writings

(d) Taken from his Life among those of the Professors of Groningen, pag. 12, & seq.

(24) Vita Wesseli, ubi supra, pag. 18. This is mentioned as a thing which Wesseli had frequently related.

(25) Valer. Andria, Bibl. Belg. pag. 349.

Biblia diu beserunt Groningæ, apud virgines Spirituales, eorumque adhuc bodie quedam fragmina supersunt (24). Others say that it was Nicolas V, of whom he asked this present. 'Tantò eum promovendarum litterarum Hebraicarum studio flagrasse accepimus, ut, cùm Romam profectus Nicolao Pontifici gratissimus esset, et ique amplissima Wesselo munera offerret, his omnibus repudiatis unicum modò petierit & obtinuerit, Biblia Hebræa MSS. sibi ut liceret à Bibliotheca Vaticana in Belgium asportare (25). -- He had such a prodigious desire to promote the Hebrew tongue, as we have been informed, that when he went to Rome, and was in high favour with Pope Nicholas, who offered him very considerable presents, he refused every thing else, and only begged that he might be allowed to carry from the Vatican Library to Holland, a manuscript of the Hebrew Bible, which he obtained.'

(26) Vita Wesseli, ubi supra, pag. 24.

[E] He was perplexed with some doubts concerning the Christian religion . . . but at length they entirely vanished. Doubts of this kind more rarely occur in a death-bed than in the vigour of youth. Wherefore for the rarity of the thing I shall set down the whole narrative. Illapsum in morbum, qui etiam vitæ ipsi finem attulit, cum amicis quidam inviseret, utque valeret interrogaret: Respondit, se pro sua ætate & morbi molestia utcumque valere; sed unum admodum molestum sibi esse, quod variis cogitationibus & argumentationibus circumactis de veritate Christianæ religionis subdubitare inciperet. Obstupescerebat ille, ac hortari ægrum cepit, ut omnes cogitationes suas in Christum Servatorem unicum rejiceret. Sed cùm hujusmodi admonitionem ei molestiorem esse sensisset, tristis tunc abiit. Atque post unam vel alteram horam reversum ad se cùm Wesselus vidisset, alacri animo, & quantum valetudo linebat exultans dixit: Gratias ago Deo, omnes illæ vanæ disputationes abierunt: & nihil scio, nisi Jesum & hunc crucifixum. Et in hac confessione animam Deo reddidit (26). -- In his last sickness, when a friend, who came to see him, asked him how he did, he answered, That considering his age, and the nature of his illness, he was pretty well; but that one thing gave him great uneasiness; which was, that being perplexed with various reflexions and reasonings, he began to call in question the truth of the Christian religion. His friend was astonished at this, and exhorted him to turn all his thoughts towards the only Saviour JESUS CHRIST. But when he found that such an admonition displeased him, he went away with concern. About two hours after, when Wesselus saw that he was come back, he said, with a cheerful mind, and with as much joy as his weak condition would suffer him to express; I thank God that all my vain doubts are vanished: and now I know nothing but CHRIST, and him crucified; and, with this confession, he expired.

[I] His opinions were contrary to those of Rome. See the Catalogus Testium Veritatis, and consult also le Mystere d'Iniquité, where you will find these words: 'At the same time, tho' somewhat younger, lived Dr Wesselus of Groningen, called the light of their world, who in one of his letters discovers, that after the Inquisitors had condemned John de Wessalia, he expected they should fall upon him, and faith, that at Paris and Rome, he defended his opinions against several articles of the Church of Rome; and that some even of the court had approved of them: and it is plainly to be collected from his writings, that they were very little different from the confession of the Vaudois. Likewise in his book concerning Subjects and Superiors, he asserts that the Pope may err, and that when he doth so he ought to be resisted; that by his Simony and ill administration, he clearly enough discovers that he neither regards God, nor the salvation of his church; that his commands are no farther obligatory than they are consistent with the word of God; that his excommunications are less to be feared than those of any good and learned men: whence it was that the Council of Constance regarded John Gerson more than

John XXIII; and good men long before that regarded St Bernard more than Pope Eugenius. His works are severally printed at Leipzig, Antwerp, and Basil, (27). It is observed in his life that he had been overwhelmed by the tempest which bore down John de Wessalia, in the year 1479, if David of Burgundy, Bishop of Utrecht, his good patron, had not supported him. Quibus (fratribus prædicatorii ordinis hæreticæ pravitatis inquisitoribus) non minus quam cœvus & amicus Joannes Wessaliensis jam anno 1479, succubisset, nisi Episcopi Ultrajectini Davidis de Burgundia (cui non quidem Medicus erat Wesselus, ut multi perperam tradiderunt, sed dilectus Client) autoritas eum protexisset (28). To all these may be added the words of Luther, which I have cited in the article of SIXTUS IV (29), and Mr Sekendorf's extracts of Wesselus's works (30).

[K] He is cited under different names. In the collection of the Groningen Professors, his life begins thus: 'Wesselus Groningensis . . . diversis aliis & nominibus insignitus, & elogiis celebratus. In Chronici Urspergensis Paralipomenis Magister Joannes Wesselus Groningensis nominatur. In libro memoriali templi Groningani quo sepultus Wesselus Hermannii, Pelantino (qui ad annos plures fuit Archidiaconi Davidis Burgundi Episcopi Ultrajectini) Wesselus Gofvoert, Alberto Hardenbergio Gofvoert, Geldenhausio Gansfortius vocatur. Rodolphus Agricola in epistolis ad Reuchlinum, aliquæ, Basilium vel Basilium Phrisium eum indignant. Quorum appellationum diversitas, Friscorum nomen non ignoro, & facile agnoscitur, quo fonte promanarit. Nempè Joannis nomen ei proprium ex sacro Baptismate videtur, Hermannii à patris, Wesseli ab avi nominibus additum, quod postremum in Græcia, (ut vulgo creditur) aut potius supra seculum Græcorum lingua imbutus, ad ejus sonum vel ipse inflexit, vel detortum ab aliis admittit, ut Basilium diceretur (31). . . . Gofvoerti autem seu Gofvoerti, aut Gansfortii cognomen, dialecto illud Westphalicâ, hoc Germanicâ anserum vadum sonans (Westphalis enim Goos vel Goes est, quæ Germanis olim teste Plinio 10. 22. hodieque Gansfa) suspicari liceat inde ei obvenisse, quod majores fortè ex vicina Westphalia (ut multæ aliæ honestæ hujus Urbis familiæ) huc commigrassent, quum illud nomen villæ non procul Harena, hodieque maneat. Cæteræ appellationes Patriam testentur. . . . Wesselus of Groningen . . . had several names given him, and various encomiums. In the Paralipomena of the chronicle of Ursperg, he is called John Wesselus of Groningen. In the register of that church, where he lies buried, he is named Wesselus Hermannii. By Pelantinus (who was for several years Physician to David of Burgundy, Bishop of Utrecht) he is called Wesselus Gofvoert, Gofvoert, by Albertus Hardenbergius, and Gansfortius by Geldenbarius. Rodolphus Agricola, in his letter to Reuchlinus, and other authors, call him Basilium, or Basilium Phrisius. Such persons as are not unacquainted with the Frisland names will readily perceive whence these different appellations proceed. John was his christian name. He was called Hermannii after his father, and Wesselus after his grandfather. This last name was changed into that of Basilium when he was in Greece, (as it is commonly believed) or rather because he was an extraordinary master of that language, he was willing his name should have a Greek sound; for which reason he either made that alteration himself, or allowed of it when made by others. . . . As for the surname Gofvoert or Gofsefort, and the surname Gansfortius, the one is the Westphalian, and the other in the German dialect, signifying the ford of the Geese, (for the Westphalians call Goos or Goes what the Germans of old, according to Pliny 10. 2. and even to this day, call Gans) they were probably owing to this, that his forefathers came hither from the neighbouring Westphalia (as many other honest families of this city have done); and where there is a village near Harena, which still retains that name. His other appellations denote his country.'

[L] Part

writings are lost [L].

[L] *Part of the writings are lost.* He made a great many collections out of the works of the Abbot Rupert, and of several others, to which he added his own reflections. These rhapsodies swelled to such an unwieldy bulk under his pen, that he called them *Mars magnus*, -- *the great Sea*. Several of them were preserved in the monastery of mount Saint Agnes, but the sending of the manuscript to some learned men of Holland and Zealand, occasioned the entire loss of it (32). After the death of Wesselus the Monks and some other persons burnt all the manuscripts which they found in his closet (33). Whatever escaped the flames was printed at Groningen in the year 1614, and at Amsterdam in 1617 (34). Valerius Andreas quotes these two editions, but instead of telling us that the first was at Groningen, he saith it was at Arnheim

(35). But possibly he might find *Arnhemii* in the title of his copy without the book being ever printed there, by reason it is customary amongst Bookellers to allow a correspondent, who buys of them a certain number of copies, to insert his name in the title-page as well as he who printed them. It is probable that the Groningen Bookeller allowed that of Arnheim this liberty. This custom very frequently imposes on the Bibliographers, and occasions their unnecessary multiplication of editions.

I ought not to forget that several tracts of our Wesselus appeared in print before the complete edition of his works, in the year 1614. Some were published at Leipzig in 1522, with the title of *Farrago Rerum Theologicarum*, and a Preface by Martin Luther. It was reprinted at Basil in 1523, by Adam Petri, &c.

(35) Val. Andr. Bibl. Belg. pag. 849.

WESTPHALUS (JOHN) an imaginary person, who Moreri tells us was so named because born in Westphalia. He adds, that he was a Lutheran Heretic, 'who about the year 1533, began to preach abominable errors; particularly that the Scripture doth not say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son; that the Church hath erred, and several other impostures worthy of Hell, from whence they proceeded.' He cites Prateolus v. West. Gaultier in Chron. But we shall prove all this to be chimerical [A]. Not but that there was one JOHN DE WESTPHALIA; but he was a Printer, who settled at Louvain in the year 1475 [B].

[A] *We shall prove all this to be chimerical.* I cannot accuse Moreri of having cited Prateolus falsely; for that writer doth indeed affirm (1) that John Westphalus, *seu de Westphalia superiore*, a German, and a Doctor of Divinity, was very much infected with the Heresy of Martin Luther, and that his books were burnt at Mentz in the time of Charles VI and of Pope Clement VII, about the year 1533. He mentions seventeen erroneous tenets of the same man, and then concludes with these words: 'Hi ergo sunt articuli, qui (autore Bernardo de Luxemburgo sacrarum literarum professore, Ordinis Prædicatorii, in suo Catalogo hæreticorum) per fratrem Gerardum de Elthen inquisitorem fidei, & patrem Jacobum Sprenger, doctores itidem sacre pagine, ejusdem Ordinis Prædicatorii, conventus Colonienfis, ex Joannis de Westphalia libris excerpti sunt. -- These are therefore the articles which (according to Bernard of Luxemburg, professor of Divinity, and of the order of the Dominicans, in his catalogue of Heretics) were extracted from John Westphalus's books, by Friar Gerard of Elthen, Inquisitor of the Faith, and Father James Sprenger, likewise Doctors of Divinity, and of the same order of Dominicans in the convent of Cologne.' He directs us to the book whence he had this; which is the catalogue of Heretics, compiled by brother Bernard of Luxemburg, a Dominican Monk. Upon consulting this catalogue I found that Prateolus hath changed *Joannes de Westphalia*, into *Joannes de Westphalia*; for it is to *Joannes de Westphalia superiore* (2), that Bernard of Luxemburg ascribes the seventeen Heresies which Prateolus charges on *Joannes Westphalus, seu de Westphalia superiore*. I cannot apprehend what ground Prateolus, or those who have copied him, had for so many alterations as they have made in names and times. The Dominican Monk observes, that John de Westphalia's books were burnt at Mentz during the reign of the Emperor Frederic III (3), and mentions this fact six years at least before the year 1533 (4).

(1) In Catalogo Heret. voce Joannes Westphalus, p. m. 236.

(2) This shews that he was born at West, between Coblenz and Mentz, and not at West in the Duchy of Cleves.

(3) Joannes de Westphalia superiore, Doctor Theologie prædicatoris in diversis locis, Bohemis communis condemnatus fuit, & ejus libri combusti fuerunt Moguntie sub Frederico Imperatore tertio. Bernardus Luxemburgensis, in Catal. Hereticorum.

(4) I express myself thus, because I have only seen the third edition of his book, which is that of the year 1547. I believe he speaks of John de Westphalia in the foregoing editions; but I am not sure of it.

(5) In Tabula Chronographica, pag. m. 757.

that he found it no where. Prateolus groundlessly believed that Westphalia was divided into higher and lower. For the rest, we ought not to be surprized that Moreri fell into this snare, since Theophilus Raynaud, though a man of so much reading, also fell into it before him. He tells us on the authority of Prateolus, that John Westphalus, the Lutheran, was the only person that ever doubted that JESUS CHRIST was nailed to the Cross. *De hac (clavifigione) nemo dubitavit, præter unum quendam baud dubie cum ea effutiret, bilarierem, à Lutheri caula, Joannem Westphalum, ut ex eo refert Prateolus eo verbo artic. damnato* 17 (6). In which words are two faults: 1. John Westphalus is an imaginary person. 2. Suppose that he really had existed, and been a Lutheran, he would not have been either the only or the first man who raised this doubt; for it was one of the things objected against John de Westphalia, in his prosecution for Heresy in the year 1479. 'Item prædicavit publice in Ser. de passione Christi, crucifixum eum, & quis scit an funiculis ipsum alligaverunt, aut clavis crucifixum. -- He likewise started this doubt in a sermon which he preached publicly upon the passion of Christ, they crucified him, who knows whether they fastened him with cords, or nailed him to the cross?' They are Bernard of Luxemburg's words (7); and in the *Examen Magistrale Doctoris Joannis de Westphalia*, inserted in the *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum & fugiendarum* of Orthuinus Gratius, we find the following words: 'Vicesimo quinto (interrogatus) an prædicavit publice populo dubium esse an Christus fuisset funibus Cruci alligatus, aut clavis affixus. Fatetur se dixisse, quod non habetur in Evangelio passionis an clavis sit affixus, an funibus: Credit tamen quod clavis (8). -- In the twenty-fifth place, being asked if he had affirmed in a public sermon that it was doubtful whether Christ was fastened to the cross with cords or with nails; he confesses that he said there was no mention made in the Gospels whether he was fastened with nails or cords, but he believes it was with nails.'

(6) Theoph. Raynaud de Stigmat. §. i, cap. v, pag. m. 108.

(7) In Catalogo Hereticorum.

(8) Fascic. rerum expetendarum & fugiendarum. p. 330.

(9) Naudé, Adiciones to the History of Lewis XI, pag. 309.

(10) Revius, Histor. Daven- triens. pag. 144.

[B] *A Printer who settled at Louvain in the year 1475.* Let us examine these words of Gabriel Naudé: *the first that I know of, who printed in the Low-Countries was Joannes de Westphalia, who settled at Louvain in the year 1475, and began the exercise of this art on Aristotle's Ethics* (9). Revius's History of Deventer is not sufficient to confute this; for though we find there that Richard Pafroed, or Pafraed, a native of Cologne, and Printer at Deventer, published there the *Doctrinale alium, seu liber parabolarum Alani metricè descriptus* in the year 1449 (10), one cannot believe it, considering that this book is the twelfth in Revius's catalogue of the books printed by Pafroed. The two first are without any date: the third is dated

in the year 1477, the fourth, which is the Golden Legend, in 1479, and the following to the eleventh are dated from 1480 to 1494. How then is it probable that the twelfth should be of the year 1449? It is doubtless a typographical error.

WESTPHALUS (JOACHIM) a Lutheran Minister in the XVIth century, was born at Hamburgh [A] in the year 1510. He was master of the second class in St John's college of that city; after which he was minister of St Catherine's church there from the year 1541, to the year 1571 [B]. From that time to the sixteenth of January 1574, which was the day of his death, he was superintendent of the churches. There was a great discord between the Ministers of Hamburgh, some of them being moderate, and the others rigid Lutherans; Westphalus was the most zealous of the latter party (a). He was violent even to brutality [C]. The Lutherans themselves own that he shewed too great an animosity [D]. Calvin, when he wrote against Westphalus, pretty well adapted his style to that of his adversary (b); but it is said that he did not reproach him with the character of a drunkard [E]. Beza was surprized, and not without reason,

(a) Ex Mollero, *fig. ad Histor. Cheronef. Cimbr. p. 579. Zelotarum Hamburgenum Primicerius, says he, pag. 577.*

(b) See the remark [E].

(1) Additions to the *Elogies* extracted out of *Thuanus, Part i, pag. 454.*

(2) *He quotes Quenst. de Patr. illustr. Viror.*

(3) Moller, *fig. ad Histor. Cheronef. Cimbrice, Part. iii, pag. 579.*

(4) *Histor. Lutheran. lib. i, p. 245, litera i.*

(5) *Ubi supra, pag. 579.*

(6) *Id. ibid.*

(7) *Id. ibid. pag. 581. He quotes the livth and xxiij letters of Gabbema's Collection. Upon examination, I find his quotation to be right.*

(8) Mollerus, *ibid. pag. 580.*

* In Comm. *historico ad an. 1552, p. 604.*

† Lib. 26. *Comm. de statu relig. & resp. p. m. 780.*

‡ In *Anti-Pap. secundo, pag. 128, 129, 180.* & in *Anti-Pap. tertio, pag. 241, 242.*

§ In *Narrat. historica Controv. Sacramentarie, apud Schlusfeld. l. 2. Theol. Calv. p. m. 192, 193.*

** In *Hist. Sacram. pag. 119.*

†† In *Dedic. Concordiæ discordis.*

(9) Moller, *ibid. pag. 581.*

(10) *Ibid. pag. 579.*

‡‡ In *Prædicatione de orbe habitabili, pag. 263.*

[A] *He was born at Hamburgh.* Those who say that he was called Westphalus because a native of Westphalia, are mistaken. Mr Moreri is guilty of that error; which he copied from Mr Teissier, (1), who had it from a German Lutheran. I mean Quenstedt, as appears by his citation (2). Mr Mollerus when he censures Mr Teissier for this fault, spares Quenstedt (3). [B] *From the year 1541 to the year 1571.* Mr Sekendorf (4) tells us that Westphalus was invited from Wittenberg to Hamburgh in the year 1542, in order to succeed Kempius in the pastoral office of St Catherine's church, and that afterwards he succeeded Æpinus in the office of superintendent. In my opinion more credit is due to Mr Mollerus (5) who places the beginning of his ministry in 1541, and of his superintendency in 1571. How could he then succeed Æpinus, who died in 1553 (6)?

[C] *He was violent even to brutality.* The Divines of the Confession of Geneva bestowed that encomium upon him, one of them saith that he was fitter to keep beasts of burthen, than to administer the sacraments. 'H. Bullingerus hominem illum vocat vere Westphalum, id est, crassum. Theod. autem Bibliander, hominem ineptum & importunum, qui rectius in agris farragine jumentis colligeret ac misceret, quam sacrosancta mysteria unionis ac fidei Christianæ, & salutis humanæ sacramenta tractaret' (7). '----- Bullinger calls him a true Westphalian, that is, stupid. Theod. Bibliander gives him the character of a foolish and impertinent fellow, that was more fit to look out for provender in the fields and to mix it up for beasts of burthen, than to meddle with the sacraments of salvation and the holy mysteries of the Christian union and faith.' Bibliander alludes to a book which Westphalus published in 1552, intitled, *Farrago confusaneorum & inter se dissidentium de S. Cæna opinionum, ex Sacramentariis libris congesta*. It is thought that this book kindled again the Sacramentarian war, which seemed extinct after the death of Luther (8). 'Belli Eucharistici Lutheri obitu sopiti acris denuo instaurandi classis A. 1552. ipsum cecinisse, edita adversus Calvinum Farragine confusaneorum &c. è Pontificiis * Laur. Surius, ex Calvinianis † J. Sleidanus, ‡ J. Sturm, § Casp. Peucerus, ** Lud. Lavaterus, & †† Rud. Hospinianus uno ore clamitant. ----- Among the Papists Laur. Surius, and among the Calvinists J. Sleidan, J. Sturm, Casp. Peucerus, Lewis Lavaterus, and Rud. Hospinianus, cry out with one voice that this was the man who founded the charge, and kindled up afresh with greater violence the Sacramentarian war, (which had been extinct ever since the death of Luther) by publishing against Calvin his Farrago confusaneorum &c.' The author whom I quote (9), relates what Altingius and Hoornbeeck have said of Westphalus. 'Ab Henr. Altingio Lutheranus, accensur immoderatis, furiosis & blasphemis, ab Hoornbekio autem animi inflati & αὐτογνώμονος infimulatur. ----- By Henry Alting he is reckoned among the zealous, furious, and blasphemous Lutherans, by Hoornbeeck he is accused of being self-conceited and tenacious of his own opinions.'

[D] *The Lutherans themselves own that he shewed too great an animosity.* I shall again quote Mollerus (10). 'Theologus celebris quidem, sed famam †† Joach. Vægetio iudice, per magni nominis Adversarios, quos Scriptis provocabat, adeptus. Zelus illius, & summa, in impugnandis Calvinianis, Crypto-Calvinianis, Synergistis, Adiaphoristis, Majoristis, atque Mete-

rodoxis aliis, vehementia, Theologis etiam aliquot γυναικας Lutheranis, & in his Sim. Sulcero. Prof. Basileensi †, in excessu visa peccare, plurimis in Germania certaminibus sacris vel anam præbuit, vel fomitem suppeditavit. ----- He was a famous champion A. 1557, Divine, but he acquired his reputation, in the opinion of Joach. Vægetius, by the renowned adversaries whom he provoked by his writings. His zeal and great animosity in attacking the professed Calvinists, and such as were so in their hearts, the Synergists, Adiaphorists, Majorists, and other heterodox sects, may even some Divines that were sincere Lutherans, and among these Simon Sulcerus, professor at Basil, seemed to err in the excess, and either gave a handle to many religious contentions in Germany, or added fuel to them.'

[E] *That he did not reproach him with the character of a drunkard.* The proof which I am going to alledge of this, informs us, that Westphalus accused Calvin of gluttony. 'Ufus est aliquoties Calvinus, carnelem edendi modum oppugnans ab absurdo, vocabulis voracitatis & ingurgitationis. Quid tu ad hæc Westphale? Admodum, inquis religiose & reverenter loquitur Calvinus, ex crudo suo stomacho eructans voracitatem & ingurgitationem. Nempe Calvinum bene nosti, ut video: quem tota hæc civitas testari potest tam parvam sui rationem habere in cibo & potu, ut in eo interdum amicis non leviter peccare videretur. Quum te de temulentia reprehentum à Calvino ægre patereris, respondit Calvinus id quod res est, se de spiritus temulentia loquutum: & cur ad istam verborum asperitatem adactus esset copiose declaravit' (11). ----- Calvin, exposing the carnal way of eating, did sometimes make use of the words voracitatis, nesi and gluttony. What construction did you, Westphalus, put upon this? Calvin, said you, speaks in a most religious and reverend manner, while he belches up voracitiness and gluttony from his crude stomach. This indeed shews that you know Calvin well, of whom all this city can attest, that he is so negligent of himself, as to his eating and drinking, that sometimes his friends think him highly blamable in that respect. When you took it ill that Calvin should accuse you of drunkenness, Calvin made answer, as the thing really was, that he meant a drunkenness of spirit, and set forth at large what had obliged him to make use of these harsh words.'

But let us see what answer Calvin himself made, and at the same time let us give the History of this quarrel.

There was, for some time, a misunderstanding between the Church of Zurich and Calvin, about the Doctrine of the Eucharist; but it ceased in the year 1549, and both sides agreed on a treaty of peace, which contained twenty-six articles, and was called *Consensio mutua in Re Sacramentaria* (12). The rigid Lutherans were offended at this agreement, and published several libels against it: and it was on this occasion that Westphalus wrote the book, the title of which I have mentioned in the remark [C]. Calvin thought himself obliged to silence all these clamours, by publishing an exposition of his agreement. This he did in the year 1554, by a little tract in which he fell very severely upon Westphalus, without naming him. But he had not the same regard for him two years after, when he refused (13) that adversary's answer, nor in 1557, when he inscribed another treatise to him; he named him in both these books. Afterwards he gave him up to his obstinacy, and threatened to do so in the title of the last book (14). But now let us examine

† In *Epist. ad Joh. Math. scripta v. Joh. Facetti* (suppl. H. E. Sec. XVI. P. II. n. 63, pag. 82).

(11) Beza, de *Cæna Domini, contra Westphalum, Oper. Tom. i, pag. 457.*

(12) See the relation of Calvin's Tracts, pag. 73.

(13) *The Relation in which Calvin stood, Second Defence pag. 6. orthodoxy de Sacramentis lib. adversus Joach. Westphalum calumnias.*

(14) *Ultima Admonitio Joannis Calvini ad Joach. Westphalum, cui nisi obtemperet, non erit modo publicæ habendæ etc. quo pertinetur breviter haberi.*

reason, that Westphalus should publish that Calvin's mother had been a Priest's concubine [F]. He fully refuted this calumny. What is said by some that this Lutheran Doctor was the inventor of the Ubiquitarian opinion, is not true [G]. In order to judge of his character, it is sufficient to remember, that he ridiculed all the Protestant martyrs who did not believe Consubstantiation [H]. The arguments, which he once used against the

examine the grounds of the complaint concerning drunkenness. 'Indolenti & temulentis homines dum Sacramentarium bellum instaurant, primis librorum paginis audacter jactant pro tota Saxonia & vicinis regionibus se pugnare. . . . These unlearned and drunken men, while they revivify the Sacramentarian war, boldly pretend in the first pages of their books that they fight the cause of all Saxony and of the neighbouring countries.' This period (15) of Calvin

(15) It is at pag. 76b, of the volume of his Tractat.

induced Westphalus to complain, that he in particular, and the Germans in general, were charged with drunkenness: to which Calvin answered, that he did not in the least speak of a drunkenness occasioned by wine, but of another metaphorical drunkenness mentioned by the Prophet Isaiah. 'Quia forte veritus est, ne si solus ipse læsus foret, paucos inveniret privati doloris socios, totam gentem suam ad commune prælium incitat, ac si Germanis omnibus vulgatum temulentiae probrum à me objectum foret. Si ita esset, ne ipse quidem mihi vellem ignosci. Sed notanda est quam mox addit probatio. Crimine hoc, inquit, femel atque iterum me perfringit. Quasi vero si bibulus est, sine compotioribus inebriari nequeat. Quamquam ne hic de nihilo anxius sit, sciat non indictum fuisse prælium suis poculis, scias de alia temulentia me loquentum esse, quam Propheta

(16) Calvin. II Defens. de Sacramentis, pag. 768, Tractat. Theolog.

Isaias dicit non esse à vino (16). . . . Perhaps because he was afraid lest, if he were the only person hurt, he should find few people to sympathize with him, he stirs up his wretched nation to a common war, as if I forsooth, had upbraided all the Germans with the trite reproach of drunkenness. Were that the case I should not even desire to be forgiven. But what he subjoins as a proof of this is somewhat remarkable. He upbraids me, says he, with this vice several times. As if a man who is that way inclined could not get drunk without having his pot-companions. Nevertheless that he may not be disturbed about nothing here, I would have him to know once for all that I did not declare war against his cups: I meant another kind of drunkenness, which, as the Prophet Isaiah saith, does not proceed from wine. He renewed the same apology at the end of his last advertisement. 'Westphalum alicubi hominem temulentum vocare contigerat, non ut bibacitatem illi objicerem, sicuti interpretatus sum: sed qualiter Propheta ebrios esse dicit, & non à vino, qui stupore percussus, aut vertigine correptus, à sana mente exciderunt. Quod privatim de uno homine dictum est, ad totam Gentem trahi cæcæ profectio temulentiae est (17). . . . I happened somewhere to call Westphalus a drunken man, not that I wanted to upbraid him with a tippling disposition, as I explained myself before; but in the sense that the Prophet Isaiah calls drunk, though not with wine, such people who being struck with stupidity and dizziness have lost their right understanding. Now to apply to a wretched nation what is particularly said of one man is certainly the blind effect of drunkenness.' I am apt to think that this explanation did not satisfy Westphalus; and indeed it leaves room for great suspicions: besides, it is very visible that Calvin expresses himself in such words, as shew that he was not sorry it should be believed that he justly charged this vice on his adversary, though he protests that he meant another vice. He doth not deny the having treated him roughly, but he affirms that his vehemency is reasonable, and justifies himself by the example of God. Sicubi vehementius in eum invehebat, pro vestra prudentia & aequitate, quibus me stimuli adegerit expendi. . . . Quid mihi hic respondendum fuit, nisi ut malo modo aptare durum canem, ne sibi in sua vecordia nimis placeret? Equidem si homines istos mollires posse spes esset, non reculare demissus ac supplex Ecclesiae pacem redimere. Sed quo feratur ipsorum violentia, omnibus satis notum est. Itaque meam in ista duritie tractanda austeritatem, Dei quoque exemplum excusat, qui se pronuntiat non modo inclementius acturum cum praefraetis, sed contra eos praefraetum fore

(17) Idem, Ad monit. ultima, pag. 839, ejusd. Vol.

* Psal. xviii.

(18) Idem, II Defensio, circa init. pag. m. 765. See also the beginning of the ultima Admonitio, where he says, Quia cum duro & praefraeto capite negotium erat, an non liceret malum nodum duro cuneo retundere?

(18) That is, 'if in some places I have dealt too

roughly with him and expressed my self in too

sharp terms, be pleased according to your prudence and equitable discretion to consider what sharp weapons he hath pointed against me, to constrain me to it. . . . What could I do, in this case, but act according to the proverb, which prescribes a severe driver for a head-strong ass, that he might not grow too fond of his fury? Indeed if there were any hopes of mollifying these men, I would not refuse to make humble supplications to them, in order to redeem the peace of the Church. But it appears to all men what their extravagant impetuosity aims at. So that if I have been very severe in handling such a strange obstinate people, I am excused by the example of God himself, who declares not only that he will treat the froward without tenderness, but shew himself froward to them.

[F] He published that Calvin's mother had been a Priest's concubine. A little after the words of Theodorus Beza, which I have already cited, we find these.

'Quid amplius? Ingerit, inquis, Calvinus voces auribus & oculis, meretricibus convenientes: quas fortasse didicit à matre sua Pontificii sacrilegii concubina. Itane verò nugator? honestissimam matronam jam olim defunctam, & ejus viri matrem, cui quantum debeat Christiana Ecclesia tot suscepti labores testantur, & gratioribus futuris posteris (ut confido) testabuntur, tuis verè meretriciis probris afficere maluisti quam animo tuo morem non gerere? Sed continebo ipse me, & quid nos potius quam quid te deceat, spectabo. Calvinum & honesto loco & integerrimæ famæ parentibus natum, & in nobilissima familia à pueritia educatum si testibus probare oporteret, nos non unum aliquem testem, sed integram civitatem Noviodunensem citare possumus. Itaque de hoc refutando convitio minime laboramus. . . . What next? Calvin, say you, presents to our eyes and ears words that are fit for lewd women to make use of; possibly having learned them from his mother who was once a Popish Priest's concubine. Say you so, Mr Trister? Is it thus that, rather than not gratify your own humour, you throw your loose reproaches upon a most virtuous woman who is long ago deceased, and who was the mother of that man, to whom the Christian Church is under so great obligations, as his many works testify, and as they will testify to posterity, which, I hope, will be more grateful than the present age has been? But I will contain myself, and consider more what is becoming for me to say than for you to hear. If it were necessary to prove by witnesses that Calvin was born of creditable and blameless parents, and that he was brought up from his youth in a very noble family, not one witness alone, but the whole city of Noyon might be called upon to attest it. We shall therefore take no pains to refute this calumny.'

[G] What is said. . . . that he was the inventor of the Ubiquitarian opinion is not true. George Hornius affirms it, but Mr Mollerus refutes it by the testimony of Hospinian, who acknowledges that Westphalus and Heshuius, otherwise good Lutherans, opposed the new opinion concerning the Ubiquity which Brentius and Smidelin advanced (19). The Bishop of Meaux is therefore mistaken when in his *Histoire des Variations* (20) under the year 1558 he saith, that the great dispute at that time amongst the Lutherans was concerning the Ubiquity, which Westphalus, James Andrew Smidelin, David Chytræus, and others, established with all their might.

[H] He ridiculed all the Protestant martyrs who did not believe Consubstantiation. Beza lashes him on this account with the utmost severity. 'Ut tuam pietatem orbi testis, in martyres jocularis qui apud Gallos & alias gentes quotidie crudelissimam & ignominiosissimam mortem perpetuantur. Extant enim eorum aliquot confessiones, quæ tibi non satisfaciunt. Atque ut tibi non satisfaciunt, an ideo digni erant quibus etiam mortuis insultares? Nam certe pro Christi nomine ingressi sunt flammam, quas haud satis scio an tu vel uno digito velles attingere. Quod si negotium

(19) Georgius Hornius (Hof. Eccles. pag. m. 496.) in eum idem debacchatur more suo impetig, & primum Ubiquitatis auctorem fuisse nugarur ipse Hospinianus (in *De Concordiæ discordiis*) invito, qui novum Brentii & Smidolini de Ubiquitate doctrinam, à Westphalo atque Heshuiis, inter Lutheranos ipsos, ait, esse impugnatam. Mollerus, ubi supra, pag. 581.

(20) Livr. viii, num. 37.

* Corin.

the ministers of the confession of Geneva were very ridiculous [I].

I have not yet taken notice that he is reproached with having commended as a very Christian action the harsh refusal of a Toleration in Germany to the Protestants that were banished out of England [K].

* Cœnæ Domini nonnisi ex parte cognoverunt (demus enim id Westphalo, ac ne nobis quidem singula eorum dicta ac facta satisfaciunt) an idcirco non fuerunt victimæ Deo gratæ, quum ad extremum usque halitus omnes idolomanias sint execrati, & Christum ut verum Filium Dei & unicum nostrum per fidem μεσίτην sint amplexi (21). --- To give a proof of your piety to the world, you ridicule the martyrs, who, both in France and other countries, are daily suffering the most cruel and ignominious deaths. You are not pleased with some of their confessions. But what of them? Is that a reason why you should insult them even after they are dead? It was certainly for the sake of CHRIST that they gave their bodies up to the flames, which I doubt whether you would venture to touch with one finger. Let us suppose that they did not thoroughly understand the article of the LORD'S Supper (for we are willing to grant so much to Westphalus, since we ourselves do not approve of all that they say and do) should it therefore be said that they were not acceptable victims in the sight of GOD; since, to their last breath, they abominated all idolatrous extravagances, and embraced CHRIST as the true Son of GOD, and our only Mediator through faith? Compare the article HUTTERUS with this (22).

(21) Beza, ubi supra, pag. 215.

(22) In the remark [B].

(23) You will find in Hospinian. Hist. Sacram. Part. ii, fol. 224, & seq. the occasion and the consequences of it. Mr Samuel Andrews, Professor of Divinity at Marburg, speaks of it in his Epistola Gratulatoria & Apologética, printed in 1690, against the Dania Orthodoxa, fidelis, & pacifica of Mr Mafius, Professor of Divinity at Copenhagen.

(24) See the Acts of the Conference of Colindgen, published by John Utenhovijs, elder of the church of the Flemish Refugees. Vossius relates all this out of them in a letter to Grotius, which is his xliii letter.

(25) Taken from the same letter of Vossius, pag. 50.

[I] The arguments which he used. . . were very ridiculous. Lascus and Micronius, Ministers of the Flemish Church at London, being forced to leave that country, endeavoured to establish themselves and their flock in the territories of the King of Denmark (23), but the Lutherans opposed it, and even for some time refused an amicable conference with them, saying, that it was wholly unnecessary, since neither the King nor they had any scruples concerning the truth of the doctrine established in Denmark. But at last they condescended to a conference, and urged that the Calvinists rejected plain texts of Scripture; for, said they, what can be clearer than these words, *this is my body*? Besides this they told them, you follow neither Luther nor the Saxon Churches, and are condemned by the confession of Augsborg; in a word, you teach a doctrine which is not agreeable to the prevailing opinion in Denmark. They were answered, that the word of GOD, and not what Luther taught, or the kingdom of Denmark approved of, was the rule of faith. This, and several other such like answers, proved useless to the Flemish Refugees, and they were constrained to retire out of the kingdom in the midst of winter (24). Micronius some time after conferred, at Hamburg, with Joachim Westphalus, who immediately urged the consent of the Saxon Churches as an invincible argument. They, said he, have condemned Zwingle's opinion; it is therefore false, and ought to be rejected. Micronius replied, that if the truth of an opinion ought to be determined by the consent of the Churches, the Papal cause would be triumphant. Westphalus answered, that the Saxon Churches were the Church of GOD; and when the other urged that the true Church was not confined to any certain place, and that there was no Church but what might err, as was allowed by Luther, he affirmed that the import of Luther's words was not that the Church of JESUS CHRIST might be mistaken, but that the Popish Church might. Micronius always insisted upon this maxim, *That the Holy Scripture is the sole rule of Faith*; which did not prevent Westphalus's answering him: it would follow from your arguments, that his Danish Majesty, and the Senate of our city, who have decreed against you, are guilty of a great fault: consider that you are condemned by a Diet of Augsborg (25). *Si dubia adhuc esset nostra doctrina, graviter peccasset senatus noster, & serenissimus Danicæ Rex, qui adversum vos decreta tulerunt. . . . Contra vestram doctrinam Comitibus Augustanis pronuntiavit*

est (26). Micronius did not fail to reply, that by such arguments as these Popery would every where gain its cause (27). We have here a proof of the natural inclination of all parties, to make use of the compendious way of authority, and convert their adversaries errors into state-crimes. Dare you charge the magistracy of Hamburg, and the King of Denmark, who have condemned you, with injustice? If Westphalus had remembered that there are great numbers of Papists in the world, and had he but used his reason a little, would he have talked at this rate?

[K] He is reproached with having commended. . . the harsh refusal of a Toleration in Germany to the Calvinists that were banished out of England. I have already mentioned (28) the treatment which they met with; but I add, that the description which they gave of it may be seen not only in the books of Utenhovijs, Lasco, and Micronius, but likewise in the answers that were made to our Westphalus, in the year 1555, and afterwards (29). They likewise quote (30) the first letter of Theodore Beza, and page 40 Institutionis Sacramentariæ of Lavaterus: but the following passage will shew us that nothing was more disagreeable in this perfection than to see it publicly commended, and upon that we are referred to a book of Westphalus. Non meminerunt illi fratres, quid nam sit illud pastorale μελειωσασθαι καὶ συμπλασθαι de quo Apolt. ad Hebr. cap. 5. 2. Qui in tanta cœli inclementiâ, inter tot hostes, nostros palantes majores indignissimè suis finibus ejecerunt, & ne quidem illud Jacobi c. 2. v. 16. (quod vel in ipso reprobos cadit) illis apprecabantur Abite cum pace, calefite, & saturamini, vix ac ne vix quidem illis dantes τὰ ἐπιθήσεια τῷ σώματι & crudeliter iis invidentes τὰ ἐπιθήσεια τῆς ψυχῆς. Sed hoc imprimis nostris displicuit, istius ἀναισθησίας auctores & sibi hac in re fuisse gratulatos & repperisse modum qui illud factum tanquam præclarum, Deo gratum, Regibus & Magistratibus dignum, publicè ausi fuerunt defendere; & impetrarunt à Rege Danicæ & aliis, ut ne nostri, odiosè dicti Sacramentarii, in Dania, Hamburgi, & in aliis maritimis urbibus, vel hospitio exciperentur. Vidi lib. Westphali de Cœnâ Domini ex Augustino, ad an. 1555 (31). --- These brethren did not remember what is the duty of a Pastor, which requires him to be mild and compassionate, of which the Apostle speaks in his Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. v. ver. 2. I say they did not remember it, since they did in so unworthy and shameful a manner oblige our wandering fathers to leave their territories, notwithstanding the great inclemency of the weather, and their being encompassed with so many enemies. Nor did they so much as wish them what is mentioned by James, chap. ii. ver. 16. (which is said even of wicked men) Depart in peace, be ye warmed, and filled. Scarcely, or rather not at all, would they supply them with the necessaries of the body, and most cruelly denied them the necessaries of the soul. But the most disagreeable thing to our fathers was, that the authors of this inhumanity did not only congratulate themselves upon what they had done, but likewise found persons who durst publicly defend it as an action commendable in itself, acceptable to GOD, and worthy of Kings and Magistrates: and they obtained of the King of Denmark, and others, that it should be made unlawful for any one in Denmark, Hamburg, and other sea-coast towns, to give the least entertainment or shelter to those of our persuasion, whom by an odious name they called Sacramentarians. See Westphalus's book de Cœnâ Domini, &c. The person who speaks in this manner, was a Minister and Professor of Divinity at Breda, in the year 1651, when he caused the book, of which I have spoken elsewhere (32), to be reprinted with some notes of his own.

(26) Vossius, ibid. c. 2.

(27) Similiter argumentis facit omnes vicem Papa. ibid.

(28) In the remark [I], of this article.

(29) Et eorum qui doctæ & recte responderent minimum fuit se festibus indolgenti Joachimo Westphalo anno 1555 & deinceps. Lud. Gor. à Breda, ubi infra.

(30) Id. ibid.

(31) Ludov. Corradus à Breda, Not. in Apolog. Reform. in Belgio Encl. Epist. pag. 86.

(32) In the remark [E], of the article HENMINGUS.

WICELIUS

WICELIUS (GEORGE) a pretty good Divine of the XVIth century, was born at Fuld in the year 1501. He entered young into a monastery (a), but was not there long, before he not only renounced the monastical life, but the Roman Catholic Religion, and turned Lutheran. He had not the gift of perseverance, for he returned to the Romish communion. He was not able to digest the divisions which he saw springing up amongst the Reformers, and the particular persecutions raised against him: but what side soever he was of, he never believed that marriage ought to be forbidden to Priests (b). We may therefore easily imagine that he married whilst he was a Protestant; but it is false that he had successively several wives [A]. He contented himself with his first marriage, though he was persuaded that it was impossible to live or die well in celibacy (c); and it seems, that even when a Lutheran, he disliked Bigamy. He embraced the Protestant Religion at the age of thirty, or thirty-one years [B], and became Minister of a Church, from which he says that he was forced by a cruel persecution. Justus Jonas was one of his most violent antagonists, but Luther, on the contrary, wrote in his favour, and dissipated the storms raised against him by his being accused of some state crimes (d). It is said that his return into the pale of the Romish Church, procured him but very slowly the rank he deserved. He was exposed to several disgraces before he could be made even a parish Priest; but at last he became counsellor to the Emperors Ferdinand and Maximilian. His principal character was that of being earnestly desirous of a reunion among Christians; to accomplish which, he would willingly have abolished several things practised in the Church of Rome [C], though, after his return to that Church, he continued in her bosom till his death. Cassander, the reconciler, took his conciliating spirit from our Wicelius. Masius, Ferus the Franciscan, and Bishop Julius Pflug who had been for the Interim, were also his particular friends. By this we may judge of his inclinations; but much better by his writings, his *Via Regia*, his *Methodus Concordiæ*, &c. He wrote a prodigious number of Books, most of which were in the German language; and being afterwards translated into Latin, they were printed several times. He died at Mentz in the year 1573, and was buried in St Ignatius's church. He left one son, named (as well as himself) GEORGE, who published some books: therefore to avoid confusion, the father is distinguished by the addition *Major*, or *Senior*. This is what I thought my self obliged to extract out of the life of Wicelius (e), which is inserted in the appendix to the *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum* (f). From thence I have taken the body of this article and the citations, without any correction, referring criticisms to the remarks. The author of this life was a very learned man; but give me leave to say that he might and ought to have been much more exact in the writing of it.

(a) Cornelius Loos, in Catal. illustr. Germaniæ Scriptor.

(b) See his *Via Regia*, apud Wolfium, Lect. Memor. Tom. ii, pag. 376.

(c) Uxorem in primo statim ser-vore schismatis duxi, persuasus neminem posse neque pie vivere, neque bene mori, citra uxorem. Wicel. Conf. Respons. Jonica, pag. 63.

(d) Justus Jonas excitavit Principes adversus eum, seditionario facto conjectus est in lacum, neque longe fuit à laqueo præfatore: sed Lutherus pro eo scripsit.

(e) Thomas James is the author of it.

(f) Printed at London in 1690.

[A] It is false that he had successively several wives. His life inserted in the second tome of the *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum*, confutes Cornelius Loos, who said that Wicelius having lost his first wife, married a second, then a third, and after that others, as it is reported. *Adolescens Monasticum amplectitur, à quo vitæ instituto mox resiliit, uxorem duxit, qua defuncta, alteram, & hac, tertiam, & (ut ferunt) plures.* Serarius accuses him of having left the Lutherans on account of their divisions, and of having retained some of their opinions, but more especially those relating to marriage; that in order to remain a married Priest, he endeavoured to obtain orders from a Bishop of the Greek Church; that being willing to serve two masters, he was true to neither of them; that he was disobedient to the Canons of the Latin Church, by uniting marriage to the Priesthood, and to those of the Greek communion, by marrying more than once. *Georgium Wicelium lego primis adolescentiæ annis ad monasticum sese statum applicuisse: sed postea carnis Lutherique phibitis dementatam uxorem quesivisse; magnoque apud Lutheranos, propter aliquam eruditionis, linguarumque peritiæ opinionem, loco fuisse. At illis tamen cum nova, neque cum Ecclesiasticæ antiquitatis norma satis consentanea fingi ac refingi quotidie cerneret, variisque illos & acerbis inter se opinionibus diffidere, pedem retrahit; sed ita ut proprii nefcio quâ cerebri pertinacia ei quam par esset diutius glutinatiusque adhaerere, in uxoria præsertim re: cui servare simulque sacerdos esse cum vellet, dicitur Græcum nefcio ubi Episcopum, ut ab eo consecraretur, quesivisse. Sicque cum quadam veluti probro & risu Græcus audiebat. Sacerdos. At sellis federe duabus dum voluit, utraque decedit. Neque enim Latinus sacerdos bonus fuit, qui ad nuptias transit: neque sacerdos Græcus bonus, quid ad secundas & tertias, imò, ut quidam ferunt, etiam ad plures: Sed prole parum felici, ut Moguntia est notum (1).*

(1) Nic. Serarius, in Moguntia, lib. i, cap. xl, apud Miræum de Scriptor. Sæculi xvi, p. 23.

[B] He embraced the Protestant religion at the age of thirty or thirty-one years. Paul Freherus, in his *Theatrum*, contradicts Thomas James in this particular; for we find there, that Wicelius went to study at Wittenberg, about the year 1521, that afterwards he

became the leader of the rebels in Thuringia; that he was taken and condemned to die, but that he was pardoned by the intercession of Pontanus, Chancellor of Saxony; that Luther settled him as Minister in a village called Nimeck, near Wittenberg; that in the year 1531 he was imprisoned by order of the Elector John Frederic, and by the advice of Melancthon, on account of his attacking the Divinity of JESUS CHRIST; that not long after, he was banished the Elector's territories; that he retired to Leipzig, where Duke George protected him; that some time after he turned Papist (2), and in the year 1534, wrote against Luther's book *de bonis Operibus*; that after the death of that Duke, he was driven from Leipzig, spent the remainder of his life at Mentz and Cologne, turning a bitter enemy to the Lutherans, and that he died in 1563. As to the last particulars, Freherus's *Theatrum* wants correction; for the Appendix to the *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum*, affords incontestable proofs, that Wicelius would have yielded to the Lutherans several things for the sake of peace, and that he was still alive in the year 1564. What is yet more, one of his tracts inserted in this Appendix, pag. 750, is dated on the tenth of August 1575; and yet page 787, Cornelius Loos is allowed to be in the right, in placing the death of Wicelius in 1573. Molanus (3) and Serarius (4) place his death in the same year 1573.

[C] Several things practised in the Church of Rome. A specimen of it extracted out of his books, may be seen in the Appendix to the *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum* subjoined to his life.

See also the second volume of John Wolfius's *Latiniæ Memorable* (5). Wicelius's Letters, printed at Leipzig in 1537, contain as many invectives against the Canonists and Scholastic Divines, as against the Lutherans. There is just reason to wonder that the Inquisition did not fulminate against these works (6); this confirms what has been said of them, that their conduct is not uniform (7).

(2) Molanus, ubi infra, scribit, ibat se returned to the Romish Communion, in 1532.

(3) Molanus, in Bibliotheca Sacra, MS. apud Miræum de Scriptor. Sæculi xvi, pag. 23.

(4) Serarius, ubi supra, apud Miræum, ibid.

(5) From pag. 354, to 393.

(6) See Rivetus, pag. 976, of Tom. iii, of his Works.

(7) See the Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, Sep. 1685, p. 1053, & alibi passim.

WICKHAM (WILLIAM) Bishop of Winchester, was born at Wickham in the county of Southampton in the year 1324. He went through his classical learning at Winchester, and besides, he learned the elements of Geometry, Arithmetic, and Logic, as well as the French tongue: he was afterwards sent to Oxford, where he closely attended the lectures of Lewis Carleton, professor of Mathematics, and of William Dorach, professor of the Civil-Law. He staid near six years in that university, and behaved himself so well that he was very much esteemed by the most famous Doctors. He would have staid longer if his patron Nicolas Wedal (a), upon his being made Lord-Lieutenant of the county of Southampton by King Edward III, had not obliged him to come and live with him, in order to make him his Counsellor and Secretary. He could not have chosen a fitter person for that employment; for no man in those days either wrote or spoke more politely than our Wickham. From thence it came to pass that three years after Edington Bishop of Winchester, and Lord Treasurer of England, chose him for his Secretary. King Edward having seen him in that prelate's palace, could not help owning that he discovered a majestic air in him, upon which, receiving a great character of him from Nicolas Wedal, and Bishop Edington, he engaged him in his service. Encouraged by this, Wickham made his court to that great monarch with the utmost assiduity, and with equal address acquitted himself of the affairs entrusted to him: besides, he answered so pertinently to several political questions which the King put to him, that the idea of his merit which that Prince had conceived, daily increased. 'Quo ejus ingenium altius exploraret multas illi illustres quæstiones quæ statum ac summam rerum continerent, ut de bello suscipiendo vel deponendo, de conditionibus pacis ineundæ, de ærariis rationibus amplificandis, de industria proponere solebat, quibus Wicamus extempore ita ornate & prudenter tum verbis tum sententiis respondisse fertur, ut Rex præsentis ejus ingenio & peracutis responsis mirifice oblectaretur (b). - - - In order to make a further trial of his capacity, the King used to propose many remarkable questions to him concerning the state and management of affairs, the necessary measures for beginning or ending a war, the conditions upon which a peace was to be concluded, and the ways and means of increasing the revenues: to all which questions Wickham answered extempore (as it is reported) with so much elegance and discretion, both in words and sentiments, that his Majesty was wonderfully delighted with his ready wit and smart answers.' As he understood Geometry and Architecture, he was made surveyor of the King's buildings, to which post was joined that of Chief-Justice in Eyre. It was he who had the direction of the building of Windsor Castle, Edward was born in that place, and had at one time the King of France, and the King of Scotland prisoners there. Being therefore desirous to erect a magnificent monument of his victories, he preferred this to all other places: he caused all the ancient buildings to be demolished, and ordered a new and most magnificent structure to be erected. Wickham, who had the whole management of this, acquitted himself in a glorious manner, and took up but three years to finish the whole. His enemies gave so malicious a turn to an inscription which he put upon that palace [A], that they exposed him to the King's displeasure; but he soon dispelled that

(a) He was Lord of the village of Wickham.

(b) Hist. descript. Vitz. Wicami, pag. 22.

[A] So malicious a turn to an inscription which he put upon that palace.] The words were, *This made Wickham*, which admitting of the double interpretation of *Wickham made this*, or *this made Wickham*, his enemies interpreted it in the first sense, and possessed the King, that the surveyor of that edifice insolently arrogated the glory of it to himself. *Non deerant quidam invidi & malevoli qui Regi in aures insurrerent Wicamum tam magnificæ structuræ honorem sibi arroganter vendicasse, adeoque in nomen suum in interiori quodam pariete artis Windelorensis insculptum regalis ædificii titulum nominatim trajecisse* (1). The King being very much incensed, charged Wickham with that crime, but was soon appeased, and laughed at it when he heard his defence. Wickham answered, with a smiling air, that his accusers must either be very malicious, or very ignorant of Grammar, since the true sense of the inscription was this: *I am the creature of this palace, it is that which hath procured me the favour of my Prince, and raised me from a low to a high state.* It is proper to insert the Historian's own expressions here: *Cum autem Rex stomacharetur & iracunde Wicamo crimen objiceret, quod delatum erat, ille vultu non tristis aut consternatus, sed hilariter ac jucundo respondit, aut sultum hominem inscitia Grammaticæ, aut calumniatorem malitiosa casum inverfione illam criminationem instituisse. Neque enim Rex serenissime (inquit) ego hanc Arcem, sed hæc Arx me quantus quantus sum effecit, hoc est me in laudem ac gratiam apud tuam majestatem posuit, atque ab humili conditione ad tantas fortunas & dignitates evexit. Quod responsum tam factum ac Wicamo dignum (erat enim verum specimen humanitatis, venustatis, ac leporis) non solum omnem iracundiæ acerbiter Regi absterpsit, verum etiam lætitiâ in ejus animo tum commotionem suavem jucunditatis in corpore excitavit* (2). I would not swear

(1) Historica Descriptio (See the whole title at the end of the text of this article, in the margin, citation (f)), pag. 27, 28.

(2) Id. ibid. pag. 28.

that Wickham had no eye to the equivocal sense of this inscription. But that King Edward's anger, expressed on this occasion, may not pass for an uncommon weakness, I shall mention some particulars concerning the nicety and jealousy which sovereign Princes have discovered in parallel cases.

The magnificence of Pericles in the construction of public edifices at Athens is very well known. Now when the Orators, who sided with Thucydides, and were of his party, were at one time inveighing (as their custom was) against Pericles, as one who squandered away the public stock in idle expences, and made havock of the state-revenues, he starting up in the open assembly, put the question to the people, whether they thought that what he had laid out was too much: and they saying, *Too much of all conscience.* Well then, said he, *since it is so, let not the cost and charge go upon your account, but upon mine, provided the inscription upon the temples and other public buildings be only in my name.* When they heard him say this, whether it was out of a pride to see the greatness of his spirit, or because they would not yield to him the glory of having erected so magnificent and sumptuous buildings, they cried aloud, bidding him spend on, and take what he thought fit out of the public purse, and spare no cost, 'till all were finished (3).

When Pausanias, King of the Lacedæmonians, consecrated a golden tripod to the temple of Delphi, he caused to be inscribed on it, that under his conduct the Perians were beaten at the battle of Platæa. The Lacedæmonians not being able to suffer this vanity, caused the inscription to be erased, and the name of the towns which had furnished the victorious troops to be inserted instead of it, as we are informed by

(3) Pausanias in the Life of Pericles.

Cornelius

that storm, and made it contribute to the increase of his interest with that Prince. Having entered into Holy Orders, he was immediately presented to several rich benefices by the liberality of that monarch, who not thinking these donatives sufficient, made him Principal Secretary of State, and Keeper of the Privy-Seal. Whilst he continued in these posts, and with the greatest conduct discharged all his offices, he was promoted to the See of Winchester in the room of Bishop Edington, in the year 1367. Not long after he was made Lord High-Chancellor, and afterwards President of the Privy-Council. In a word, he had such a large share of the King's favour, that they applied to him what St John says of the Eternal Word [B]. In order to discharge the duties imposed on him both by his spiritual and temporal dignities and posts, he applied himself on one side to regulate his manners, according to the strictest discipline, and to establish in his diocese a Clergy which led an exemplary life, and were able to instruct their parishioners [C]; and on the other side he omitted nothing that might contribute to the exact and impartial administration of justice. In the year 1371, when he foresaw that the great seal would be taken from him, he prevented the dishonour, and surrendered it to the King. That Prince returning to England after a very successful war with France, found his treasury very much exhausted. The Duke of Lancaster, one of his sons, at the head of several of the nobility complained of the Ecclesiastics, who at that time had the greatest part of the civil offices in the kingdom; they represented to the King that it was not the clergy's business to intermeddle with temporal affairs, and that it was more proper those places should be filled by the laity, who would discharge them with

Cornelius Nepos. *Quā victoriā elatus plurima miscere cepit, & majora concupiscere. Sed primum in eo est reprehensus, quod ex præda tripodem aureum Delphis posuisset, epigrammate scripto, in quo erat hæc sententia: SÜO DUCTU BARBAROS, APUD PLATÆAS ESSE DELETOS, EYUSQUE VICTORIÆ ERGO APOLLINI DONUM DEDISSE. Hos versus Lacedæmonii excelsulerunt, neque aliud scripserunt, quām nomina earum civitatum, quarum auxilio Perse erant viði (4).* Alexander, proud as he was, and jealous lest any body else should share in his glory, made use of an inscription which admitted the Greeks to a part of the honour of the triumph. Κοινόμενος δὲ τὴν νίκην τοῖς Ἕλλησιν . . . κοινῇ τοῖς ἄλλοις λαούροις ἐκέλευσεν ἐπιγράψαι φιλοτιμοτάτην ἐπιγεγραψὴν, ἈΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ Ὁ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΙΟΤ ΚΑΙ Οἱ ἙΛΛΗΝΕΣ, ΠΑΝ Ἡ ΛΑΚΕΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΩΝ, ΑἰΠΟΤΩΝ ΒΑΡΒΑΡΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΤΗΝ ἈΣΙΑΝ ΚΑΤΟΙΚΟΝΤΩΝ. Participans autem Græcis victoriam . . . cæteris manibus in communi gloriosissimum titulum inscribi iussit, ALEXANDER PHILIPPI ET GRÆCIS, PRÆTER LACEDÆMONIOS, DE BARBARIS ASIATICIS (5). . . . That the Grecians might partake of the fruits of his victory . . . upon all the rest of the spoils be ordered this glorious inscription to be written, ALEXANDER, the son of PHILIP, AND ALL THE GRECIANS, EXCEPT THE LACEDÆMONIANS, WON THESE FROM THE BARBARIANS WHO INHABIT ASIA. This was after the battle of Granicus; when he had occasion for their further assistance, and consequently was afraid to irritate them by omitting their names in the monuments of his victories, and hoped to endear them to him by mentioning them (6). He desired to appropriate the whole inscription of the temple of Diana to himself, and offered to defray the expence of the whole edifice; but the inhabitants of Ephesus would not consent to it, and not daring directly to refuse him this honour, they had recourse to a flattering shift, which extricated them out of this affair. They told him that it was not proper for one god to raise monuments to another. Scriptus Ephesii, se omnes sumptus qui in id ædificium facti essent, restitutum; quique porro requirerentur, præbiturum de suo, ita tamen ut ipsius nomen insinuaturo operi inscriberetur. Idque deprecati sunt Ephesii. quo tempore, quia Alexandro petenti aliquid denegare arduum erat, legatus eorum ad adulationem confugit, quā maxime expugnabilem norat, dixitque dedecere culmen ipsius, si diis aliquid consecraret, quum ipse deus esset. nam eum honorem ad hominibus haberi potiori naturæ. Ea gloriæ contentio inter maximum regem, & unam civitatem fuit. obtinuerunt Ephesii; & maluerunt ingenti pecunia carere, quam insinuaturo templi titulo regi cedere (7). The Thebans, I believe, were not in such a perplexity, when a courtesan offered to rebuild their walls on the same condition. I am sure they absolutely rejected the offer, if what Athenæus says be true. Ἐπύλει δὲ σφῶδεξ ἡ Φρύνη καὶ ὑπισχυρίτα τεχνίται τὰς Θήβας, εὖν ἐπιγράψασι Θηβαῖοι, ἈΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΜΕΝ ΚΑΤΕΣ-

ΚΑΨΕΝ, ΑΝΕΣΤΗΣΕ ΔΕ ΦΡΥΝΗ Η ΕΤΑΙΡΑ, ὡς ἰσοπὶ Καλλίστῳ ἐν τῷ περὶ ἱταίρων. Phryne usque adeo dives erat, ut Thebarum mœnia extructuram se polliceretur, si adscriberetur, ALEXANDRUM DIRUISSE, PHRYNEN VERO SCORTUM REFECISSE, ut ait Callistratus libro de Scortis (8). . . . Phryne the courtesan was so rich, that she promised to build the walls of Thebes, upon condition that the Thebans would make the following inscription, ALEXANDER DEMOLISHED THESE WALLS, BUT PHRYNE THE COURTESAN REBUILT THEM. So says Callistratus in his book Of Courtesans. But before I conclude, I shall relate a stratagem full as good as that of Wickham. The architect who built Pharus, engraved his own name on a stone, and that of the King on the lime which covered it. The trick was not discovered during his life, nor was he consequently exposed to any manner of danger on that account, no person being able to accuse him to the King as a robber of his glory; but he expected after the expiration of several years that the name written in the lime would crumble away, and none would remain visible besides his own, which he had fixed in a much more durable substance than lime. The following citation acquaints us with the name of this Architect. Οἰκοδόμος ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ, ἐνδοξον μὲν κατὰ τὸν λίθον τὸ αὐτοῦ ὄνομα ἐπιγράψαι. ἐπιχρίσας δὲ τιτάνη, καὶ ἐπιχαλύψας, ἐπιγράψαι τὸνομα τῷ τότε βασιλευσσομένου, εἰδὼς ὅτι καὶ ἐγίνετο, πᾶν ὀλίγον χρόνον συνεκτασόμενα μὲν τῷ χρίσματι τὰ γράμματα, ἐφανερὸν δὲ, Σώσεσθαι Δεξιφάνους κνίδισθαι, θεοῖς σωθῆσθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν σωζομένων. Postquam igitur hoc opus exedificasset, intus in faxis suum nomen inscripsit: quo calce illita occultato, nomen ejus qui tum regnavit, superinscripsit, ratus, id quoque etiam evenit, fore ut brevi admodum, literæ illæ cum illita calce caderent: hoc verò appareret: Sosthratus Cnidius, Dexiphani filius, diis servatoribus pro salute navigationum (9). . . . When therefore he had finished the building, he engraved his own name, &c. . . . expecting, as it really happened, that after a short time these letters would crumble away with the lime, and that then the following inscription would appear: Sosthratus Cnidius, the son of Dexiphanes, erected this to the gods preservers, in behalf of seafaring men.

[B] They applied to him what St John says of the Eternal Word.] The author I here cite (10) quotes a passage of Froissard which runs thus; At that time reigned a certain Priest called William of Wickham, and this William of Wickham was so much in favour with the King of England, that all things were done by him, and without him nothing was done. Compare this with the words of St John (11), and you will find no great difference.

[C] A Clergy which led an exemplary life, and were able to instruct] It is not sufficient for them to be either learned or good men. Both these qualities ought to be united. But in the age we are speaking of, it was much easier to find Priests who were neither learned nor pious, than to find any that were either the one or the other; and though the ignorance of

(8) Athenæus, lib. xiii, pag. 591, D.

(4) Cornelius Nepos, in Paulinus, cap. ii.

(5) Plot. in Alexandro, pag. 673, C.

(6) See Freinæmius, Suppl. in Q. Curtium, lib. ii, cap. v.

(7) Freinæmius, Suppl. in Q. Curtium, lib. ii, cap. vi, num. 33. Et quotes Pausanias, lib. vii, and Strabo, lib. xiv. I have found no such thing in Pausanias, but only in Strabo, lib. xiv, pag. m. 441.

(9) Lucianus de conscribenda Historia, sub fin. pag. m. 706, Tom. i.

(10) The author of the Historica Descriptio, pag. 32.

(11) All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made. John i. 3.

VOL. V.

7 A

with more fidelity and decency. The King being persuaded that if he slighted these complaints, he should disoblige a potent faction, and that if he removed the Ecclesiastics from the civil offices, he should draw vast sums from those whom he should call to an account, resolved on the alteration. Wherefore our Wickham very seasonably resigned the seal, and desired leave to retire to his diocese, which he did not obtain before the year 1374. The laymen being promoted to the public offices, discharged them so ill that the court was forced to re-instate the Ecclesiastics. The Duke of Lancaster was removed from the helm, but returned to the administration, when the death of the Prince of Wales had thrown the King into a languishing and mortal disease. Being now in power, he vehemently declared against the Clergy, and left no means unattempted to ruin our Wickham. He caused him to be accused of disloyalty and extortion, and forced him to appear at the King's Bench, as being the court empowered by law to take cognizance of this affair. He provided judges to condemn him, without allowing him the necessary time to digest his papers in order to his defence. Not content with depriving him of his temporalities, he advised King Edward to banish him; but that Prince though enfeebled in body and mind, refused it. He remembered that Wickham was found innocent of all manner of extortion five years before, when all the Ecclesiastics were obliged to give an account of their administration of the treasury. Wherefore he suspected the justice of the sentence which condemned him, and gave encouraging hopes to those deputed by the Bishops to him in order to request the annulling of this sentence; and at the same time suspecting the Duke of Lancaster to be guilty of some sinister design [D], he declared Prince Richard his grand-son (c) his successor, and restored to Wickham whatever the Duke of Lancaster had deprived him of. He died not long after (d). King Richard who succeeded him was but eleven years old, which rendered it very easy for the Duke of Lancaster, President of the Council, to revive the accusations against our Bishop of Winchester. They were accordingly reduced to seven heads, and maintained with very great assurance before the Council by the accusers, but the accused so strenuously refuted them that he was declared innocent. From that time, his noble desire of applying the riches which providence had bestowed on him, to very good uses, increased more than ever; and not being able to think of a more useful appointment, than that which furnished youth with the means of learning the sciences, he founded two magnificent colleges, the one at Oxford, and the other at Winchester [E]. Whilst he was taking care of whatever could contribute to the completing these two noble establishments, he was recalled to court, and by a sort of force obliged to accept of the dignity of Lord High Chancellor in the year 1389. He discharged that office for three years so well, that he rendered the nation happy; and this

(c) He was the son of the Prince of Wales.

(d) In the year 1377.

of those times was prodigious. yet there were more who were able to instruct than those who led a good life: and therefore this care of our Wickham must have proved a business of no small fatigue, since he ordered, in an especial manner, that all Deacons and Priests should be obliged to be free from drunkenness and leudness. Ante omnia tam Diaconos quam qui supra eos collocati sunt presbyteros ac sacerdotes ab infamia illa ebrietas & libidinis macula omnino immunes esse voluit. Nam quum ipsi sal terræ, lux mundi, ac dispensatores mysteriorum Dei crebro in scripturis usurpentur, nimis indignum esse dicebat eos vinolentia deformari vel cubilibus & immunditie inquinari, à qua turpitudinis labe & ignominia omnes etiam ex populo (quos Laicos vocant) melioris notæ abhorrent (12). -- Above all he required that as well the Deacons as the Presbyters and Priests, that were in a rank above them, should keep themselves entirely free from the foul stains of drunkenness and uncleanness. For whereas in the Scripture they are frequently called the salt of the earth, the light of the world, and the dispensers of the mysteries of GOD, he said that it was a thing very unbecoming their characters to be guilty of drunkenness, or lust and uncleanness; especially since even the better sort of people among the Laity obtained from these filthy vices. This is not the least glorious part of his administration.

(13) Vehementissima regni appetendi suspitione & invidia laborabat. Ibid. pag. 53.

(14) Qui in fenili ætate credulus & suspitionibus paulo indulgentior esse cepit . . . post hujusmodi scrupulum injectum paulo alienior deinceps à filio Lancastrie pater nonnullis videbatur. Ibid. pag. 54.

he could not get any thing by its establishment; he stood in need of a law that should prefer the uncles to the nephews. It may be replied that not daring to endeavour directly at the exclusion of Richard his eldest brother's son, he began with the project of an innovation, wherein he could not be suspected to have an interested view: but if he could have gained his end, (viz.) the establishment of the Salique law, he would have found room for other innovations, and would have requested a law in preference of the rights of uncles to those of nephews. Mr Varillac imagines that he designed to abrogate the law for the succession of grand-children, and that on that account he was an encourager of Wickliff (15); but Mr de Larroque agreeably and solidly refutes this thought (16).

[E] He founded two magnificent colleges, the one at Oxford, and the other at Winchester. He had long given very signal proofs of a zealous inclination to relieve the necessitous. Hospitality, one of the virtues which, according to St Paul (17), ought to shine in the life of a Bishop, was remarkably exemplified in him. He lodged in his house twenty-four poor people, and maintained them there all his life. He received all strangers with great humanity; and seven years before the foundation of the abovementioned colleges, he began to settle an annual pension on fifty hopeful youths, whom he sent to study at Oxford (18). These were his preludes. After which, having obtained Letters-Patents to build a college in that city, he laid the first stone of it very early in the morning on the fifth of March, in 1379, and designed it for one hundred persons, besides servants, fifty scholars were to be entertained there, in order to be instructed in the sciences, and a grave and learned man to govern the college with the title of Warden. He added ten Chaplains, three Clerks, and sixteen Choristers. This edifice being finished in seven years, he himself placed those hundred persons (19) in it at three of the clock in the morning, on the fourteenth of April 1386. The first thing they did after their entrance was by a solemn public prayer to implore the blessing of God (20). The following year he founded another college

(15) Varillac, Histoire de Wickliff, pag. 11, & 12.

(16) Larroque, nouvelles Accusations contre Varillac, pag. 11, & 12.

(17) Tit. i. 8.

(18) Taken from Historia de scriptis, pag. 15.

(19) He chose them himself.

(20) Taken from the same book, pag. 101, 102.

(c) Omnes illos simul ac conjunctionem proditiōnis ac lēse majestatis reos fecit, perinde ac si illi Regem regio imperio ac omnium rerum dominatu depoliare festuissent. *Historia Descript. Vita Wickhami*, p. 109.

was the reason why, without the most pressing instances, he could not obtain the King's leave to retire, when he saw the fatal troubles that were ready to break out, which induced him to desire a retreat in order to shelter himself from the storm. Being then returned to his church, he finished the building of his college at Winchester, and there built that sumptuous cathedral, which equalled, or wanted but little of equalling, that of St Paul in London. Besides this he very liberally disbursed several sums to the great advantage of the public, and the poor; all which could not yet prevent his being exposed to imminent dangers in the year 1397, when he and some others were accused of high-treason in full parliament (e), but he was very honourably acquitted. From that time to his death he lived quietly in his diocese, and was wholly intent upon discharging all the duties of a good prelate. Nay he was there pretty secure from all those commotions which violently shook England. He died in the eighty-first year of his age in the year 1404. Several scandalous reports were spread against him; amongst other things it was said that he revealed a secret declared in confession concerning a supposititious son [F], and that he made presents and promises to King Edward's mistress, in order to obtain the restitution of his episcopal temporalities (f) [G]. We ought not to forget that

(f) Taken from a book, intituled, *Historia Descriptio complectens Vitam ac Re gestas beatissimi viri Guilelmi Wickam quondam Vintonienſis Episcopi*, &c. printed at Oxford in the year 1690, in 4to.

in the suburbs of Winchester, near the Episcopal palace. He laid the first stone of this on the twenty-sixth of March, in 1387. He designed it for one hundred and five persons besides servants. These persons were, a Head or Warden, ten Priests, seventy scholars, an upper and under School-master, three Chaplains, three Clerks, and sixteen Choristers (21). All these entered the first time at three in the morning, on the twenty-eighth of March 1393 (22). The statutes of these two colleges are so excellent, that they served as a model for all those, who for the space of two hundred years made the like foundations in Oxford and Cambridge (23). I must not omit that Wickham provided that this college at Winchester should be a nursery for that which he founded at Oxford; for he ordered that all the places vacant in the last should be supplied by a draught from the former: which is religiously observed to this very day. My author expresses this part of the statutes in very significant words: *Quod Collegio suo Oxoniensi quasi fons & seminario inferretur, ex cujus (ut ita dicam) utero junior alia scholis quotannis nasceretur, & in alterum Collegium decreſcentium loco veluti ad Patres literarum ac Senatores immigraret. Est enim hoc illius Collegii Oxoniensis proprium & peculiare, quique statutiſ sanctum ut cum Lettera Collegia Oxoniensia in demor-tuorum aut discendentium locum ex scholis quibuscunque aſcitiſ cooptare ſolent, ſolum hoc non niſi naturales ex ſeminario ſuo Vintonienſi velut ex ſua & propria ſtirpe ſuccreſcentes eligat, & electos ad ſe tanquam ad novam Coloniam ſuo tempore & loco deducat* (24). Observe that his last testament and codicil were very memorable proofs of his charity and liberality (25).

(24) Ibid. pag. 102.

(25) Ibid. pag. 112, 113.

(26) Ibid. pag. 116, & ſeq.

[F] It was said that he revealed a secret declared in confession, concerning a supposititious son.] This is the third of the five calumnies which my author undertakes to refute. The two first are that Wickham's learning was even below a moderate degree, and that he had been a servant. Our author refutes this by several remarks which it is not necessary to transcribe here; those who are curious to see them may consult the original, to which I refer them (26). But as for the third calumny I shall give the substance of the Apology: in order to which let us begin with the accusation. It is pretended that the Duke of Lancaster's hatred to Wickham was grounded on his divulging that that Duke was not the son of Edward III. They add, that Philippa, King Edward's Queen, revealed in confession to our Bishop of Winchester, that John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, was the son of a German, and that she had fraudulently imposed him on the King, her husband, instead of a female infant she had by him. They farther say, that she intreated this Prelate to reveal it to the nobility of the realm, in case the Duke, this supposed son of King Edward, should aspire to the crown, or prepare to succeed to the true Princes of the blood according to the laws. Hence some have taken occasion to charge this Bishop with a notorious sacrilege, I mean the non-observation of the Canon-Law, which forbids the divulging any secrets delivered in confession. His Apologist justifies him. I. By the shining virtue of the Queen. II. By the good understanding always preserved betwixt the King and Queen. III. By the impunity of Wickham. IV. By his reconciliation to the Duke of Lancaster. V. By the silence of Historians, and pub-

lic records on this head. It is impossible, faith our author, that such a virtuous Princess should have killed her own daughter (27), in order the better to cover an abominable fraud. A King of such a great spirit would not have left so villanous an action of his wife unpunished: nor could he be ignorant of it, since it is pretended that it was revealed to the nobility of the realm. And if he had not believed it, he would have treated Wickham as the most infamous detractor deserve; the whole royal family being dishonoured by a report so injurious to the Queen, the slanderer would have been duly punished. But the Duke of Lancaster, hereby disgraced more than all the rest, would have brought him to justice, and never have been reconciled to him; and yet it is certain that after King Richard had reconciled them, they continued very well together till the Duke's death (28), that is about twenty-one years. Observe also that this story is no where to be found except in the compilation of a Monk: 'Reſte Harpiſfieldus in hiſtoria illud de ſuppoſito Regine partu tanquam fictum & commentum rejicit, ac nullibi niſi in Monacho Albanenſi reperiſ ſcribit' (29). - - - Harpiſfield, in his *Hiſtory*, very juſtly rejects as a fiction what is ſaid of the Queen's ſuppoſitious ſon, and affirms that it is no where mentioned but by a Monk of St Albans.

(27) Si primo hujus calumnie auctori credimus, ea quem non peperit, aluit, quam peperit, occidit. - - - If we believe the author of this calumny, ſhe killed her own child, and brought up another's.

(28) Ibid. pag. 121.

(29) Ibid. pag. 124.

[G] . . . And that he made presents and promises to King Edward's mistress, in order to obtain the restitution of his Episcopal temporalities.] This is the fourth calumny: our author indeed refutes it, but by arguments very far short of the strength of those which he alleges against the third. The express terms of the accusation run thus: 'Regi jam ægroto, ipsaque senectute confecto semper aderat atque ministrabat quedam femina Alicia Pierce, quæ Regi languido & infirmo obsecuta majorem quam ipse dux (30) cum Rege inuit gratiam: hanc præſenti mercede & uberiori promiſſa ſpe Wickam adduxit ut à Rege reſtitui ſibi ablata Episcopatus jura tam quæ ante percepta & in ſiſco reſervata eſſent, quam omnia prædia procuraret, quod illa invito duce, continuo impetravit' (31). - - - The King being now ſick and worn out with age, a certain woman, whoſe name was Alice Pierce, always attended and ſerved him. She, by humouring him in his weak and languishing condition, got more into his favour than the Duke himſelf. Wickham prevailed upon her by a preſent he made her, and the promiſe of another much greater, to ſolicit the King to reſtore the temporalities of his biſhopric which had been taken from him, as well thoſe which he had enjoyed before, and which were ſequeſtered in the Exchequer, as all the lands belonging to it. This ſhe immediately obtained for him in ſpite of the Duke. He refutes this. I. By the hatred which this immodest woman bore to the Biſhops. II. By the very ſmall confidence which the corruption of her manners could allow any perſon to have in her. III. By her ſtriſt friendſhip with Wickham's enemies. IV. By the expreſs terms of the Letters-Patents granted to this Prelate for his re-eſtabliſhment, which contain the reaſons of it, and declare the conſent of the Duke of Lancaſter, of all the nobility, and all the King's council: they are ſubſcribed at the bottom in this manner, *per ipſam Regem & conſilium*, - - - by the King and his council. The Apologiſt's exclamation ought not to be forgotten. 'O indignæ calumniatores, & chartarum publicarum malicioſes

(30) That is, the Duke of Lancaſter.

(31) Ibid. pag. 125, ex Actwor-tho in Vita Sado-bured.

he was employed in the expulsion of Wickliff [H].

(32) Ibid. pag. 126.

liciosos interpretes, qui quod instrumenta Regalia per sanctum Senatum fieri afferunt, id per impurum scortum factitatum prædicant. Num scortum & confilium istis idem sonat (32)? - - - O notorious calumniators, and malicious interpreters of the public records, who pretend, That to be the action of a strumpet which the royal acts assert to have been done by the sacred council. Do the names, council and strumpet, signify the same thing with them? He thinks it very strange, that, notwithstanding this declaration of King Edward, the liberalitate Episcopi ex promissione in difficultatibus suis atque Regni adductum fuisse ut ea bona restitueret, - - - that he had engaged himself by a promise to restore these temporalities, being induced to it by the liberal assistance which the Bishop gave him in the straits that he and his kingdom were reduced to, any should presume to assign, as the cause of this restitution, the good offices of a courtesan, purchased with money. V. Lastly, he urges that King Richard, after the flight of Alice Pierce (33), confirmed this restitution by the advice of his council, in which were present the Duke of Lancaster, the Prelates, Earls, and Barons. I am inclined to believe, that this calumny, of which we have just now seen the refutation, is false; but I do not find that it is refuted by very strong reasons. Thousands of instances prove these two things: first, that those who are persecuted by a King's mistress, will apply to her to be re-established, and endeavour to gain her by dint of money and promises, without ever distrusting her on a supposition that a professed whore must be capable of all sorts of perfidy; secondly, that an act of Replevy, obtained by the interest of a mistress, runs in the same stile, with that obtained by lawful means. A King, who grants any thing at the solicitation of his mistress, may easily engage his council to approve it; and if he doth not do it, his mistress herself will be able to gain the chief Counsellors: and then the most favourable and glorious clauses are inserted in the Letters-Patents, and no part of the usual form is omitted. To this may be added, that there have been some persons unjustly oppressed, who have been restored by no other means but by buying the good offices of a mistress. Nor ought we to be surprized, that after the disgrace of such a woman a confirmation of the Patent was obtained: for that is not at all extraordinary. So that the arguments of our author do not seem to me to be very strong. But it would indeed have been enough to have laid it upon the authors of this calumny to prove it. What is very certain, is, that King Edward's mistress could do every thing with him at that time, and that her power ended only with the life of that Prince. This King was unexpectedly surprized by the loss of his speech all at once, so that he had only time to express some pious sentiments, (to which he was exhorted by a Priest) by his gesture

(33) Quom jam Alicia Peers le in fugam cum sua peste ac pernicio convertisset. Ibid.

and eyes. This did not happen by reason that he was not long and dangerously ill; but the famous Alice Peers, too really his mistress, had so possessed him, that no person could have access to speak to him before he himself was speechless. Then this dissolute party, having in haste torn off the diamond rings which he wore on his finger, withdrew, and left him in the hands of a Chaplain, who could only draw some signs of penitence from him; which indeed, tho' late, when sincere are good; but are rarely sincere when so late (34).

I shall by the by say, that the fifth calumny, refuted in the above-cited book (35), is, that Wickham was banished, and continued three years in exile, according to some, and seven entire years, according to others. But this is utterly false, for he never lay under any sentence of banishment. I add farther, that he was never deprived of his bishopric, so that the fee of Winchester was never vacant from 1367 to 1404. Whence it necessarily follows that Wickliff was refused this bishopric in 1367, if what is pretended by Varillas (36) were true, viz. that his not being able to obtain that bishopric disgusted him, that it inspired him with a design of setting up for a Heresiarch; but if he was not able to obtain it that year, one of the reasons by which Mr de Larroque (37) refutes Varillas concerning the consequences of this pretended refusal, will become yet more specious.

[H] He was employed in the expulsion of Wickliff.]

My author touches only accidentally on this particular, when he is proving that our Bishop of Winchester was more learned than his detractors imagined.

Quid animi fuisse putas Richardo Regi quum Wickham anno Regni sui septimo una cum Courteney Cantuariensi Archiepiscopo Oxonium contra virum acerrimum Johannem Wicklesum mitteret? An mediocri eruditionis & ingenii esse oportebat, qui (quod ille ibi præstitit) dissentientes in religione opiniones conciliaret, & tam celebrem & acutum virum suspectæ fidei redargueret & ex Academiæ sinibus exterminaret (38)? - - - What do you think was King Richard's motive for sending Wickham in the seventh year of his reign, together with Courteney Archbishop of Canterbury, to Oxford, against that subtle and acute man John Wickliff? Is it reasonable to suppose that he was only a man of inconsiderable parts and erudition, who reconciled the differences of opinion in religious matters, and convicted the great Wickliff of being a Heretic, and expelled him from the bounds of the university? Observe here a remarkable particular of which the Jesuit Maimbourg (39), Mr Varillas, nay, even Mr de Larroque, as well as several others, have made no manner of mention; viz. that the Archbishop of Canterbury was in person at Oxford with the Bishop of Winchester, in the year 1383, or 1384 (40), in order to expel Wickliff from that university.

(34) Father D'Oriens, Hist. des Révolutions d'Angleterre, liv. v. pag. 68, 69, Tom. ii.

(35) Hæzer, Description, pag. 127, 128.

(36) Varillas, Hist. Angl. p. 2.

(37) Larroque, Hist. Angl. pag. 13, 14.

(38) Historia Descriptio, pag. 117, The Records of London are quoted.

(39) Maimbourg, Hist. de grand Schisme d'Occident, Tom. i. pag. 177, & de D. D. Edm.

(40) The French year of Richard is partly in 1383 and partly in 1384.

WIDA (a) (HERMAN DE) son to William de Wida Count of the empire, was made Archbishop of Cologne in the year 1515 (b). Long after he was elected Bishop of Paderbon, and persecuted the Protestants of that place [A]. In the year 1536 he held a council,

(a) It is more commonly written so in Germany, than Wida, or Weida. See Seckendorf, Hist. Luther. lib. iii, pag. 435.
(b) Seckendorf, ibid. Theod. de Beza, in Iconibus, says it was in the year 1510.

• Chytræus, ad ann. 1532.

(1) Maimbourg, Hist. du Luthéranisme, liv. iii, pag. 264, Dutch Edit.

(2) Irritatus plebis Paderbornensis petulantia & à Caenonia simulata. Seckendorf, Hist. Luther. lib. iii, pag. 435.

[A] He persecuted the Protestants of Paderborn.] As a commentary upon this I shall cite Father Maimbourg's words. 'After' the death of Eric of Brunswick, Bishop of Paderborn, Wida being elected by the Canons of that church to succeed him, with a design that he should oppose the Lutherans who began to establish themselves there, he performed it so well, that being assisted by his friends, who, together with several good troops, accompanied him, he made himself master of that city, drove out all the preachers he found in it, utterly abolished Luthéranism there, and prohibited any persons professing it on pain of death (1). Mr Seckendorf observes, that our Herman was excited to this rigour by the Canons, and by his resentment against the influence of the populace (2), and that, notwithstanding this, he gave some proofs of moderation. For he did not molest two Ministers who had escaped out of pri-

son, and pardoned sixteen citizens who were condemned to death. To this mercy, the intercession of their relations, and the executioner's refusing to behead them, contributed very much. Civibus Paderbornensibus XVI ad mortem condemnatis gratiam fecit, precibus supplicum & adstantium, immo & carnificis facto singulari, motus: Hic enim gladium, quo productus in forum decollare justus erat, iudicibus publice tradidit, negans, se innocentium cruore manus polluturum esse (3). - - - He pardoned sixteen citizens of Paderborn who had been condemned to death, being moved by the prayers and intreaties of those who were standing by, and even by a very singular action of the executioner; for the sword with which the executioner was ordered to behead those who were brought forth into the market-place, he publicly delivered to the judges, and said, that he would not stain himself with the blood of the innocent.' [B] He

a council, the regulations of which were very much approved [B]; for being a very good man, whose life was exemplary, he passionately desired the establishment of good order in his diocese. He not only endeavoured to restore a good discipline there, but also intended a reformation of doctrine, and having consulted Melancthon, and had several secret conferences with Bucer, he caused the latter to preach at Bonn, and engaged the former to come thither some time after [C]. The majority of the canons of Cologne opposed this enterprize, and not being able to gain any advantage by the books which

they

[B] *He held a council, the regulations of which were very much approved.* Let us again cite Maimbourg.

• Concil. Col-
lon. 7. t. 14.
Concil. edit. Pa-
ris.

(4) Maimbourg,
ubi supra.

(5) It is in the
sixth book of
Sadole's letters,
pag. 559, Edit.
Lugd. 1554, in
8vo.

(6) Seckendorf,
ubi supra, pag.
138, 139.

• Being apprehensive that the Lutherans already spread in the neighbouring provinces, would insensibly introduce the venom of their Heresy into his electorate, he, in conjunction with his suffragans, held a council at Cologne, where he made the most excellent Canons that could be desired for the maintenance of religion in its purity, the re-establishment of Ecclesiastical discipline in its vigour, and the regulation of the duties and morals of all true Christians in every station (4). Cardinal Sadole very much commended this Council of Cologne, but thought it somewhat strange that purgatory was not mentioned in it. See his letter to Herman (5). For the rest, this Archbishop was not much afraid that the Lutherans should introduce the venom of their Heresy into the electorate of Cologne: Father Maimbourg was ignorant of his real sentiments: read Mr Seckendorf, and you will find that this Prelate was already at that juncture more than half a Lutheran. * *Hermannum jam tum meliora intendisse, ex epistola M. S. Joh. Lumpii, Doct. Colon. quæ inter Heckerianæ extat, & d. 6. Oct. hoc anno data est, apparet. Scribit enim: Archiepiscopus nondum audit, quæ sentit, prode, ob Monachorum & Theologorum superstitiosa supercilia, quibus adhuc, infidum est, quod ex eorum non prodit culina, speratur tamen finis. Addit: Minoritanum, qui Præsuli à confestim & sacra concione est, cucullum ferre adhuc, sed aliud sentire: in templo majore concionari aliquam puram Evangelii doctrinam, aduolantibus ex vicinis oppidulis, etiam ex Hassia ditte præcul diffusa, non nullibus ut eos vix capiat Templum (6).* --- It appears by a manuscript letter of John Lumpius, Doctor at Cologne, (which letter is to be found among the Heckerianæ, dated the sixth of October that year) that the Archbishop had even then better sentiments. The Archbishop, says Lumpius, dares not yet declare his sentiments, for fear of the superstitious frowns of the Monks and Divines, who still look upon every thing as infidum which does not come out of their own kitchen. Nevertheless an end of this is to be hoped for. He adds, that the minor Friar, who was Father Confessor and Preacher to the Archbishop, still wore the cowl, but that his opinion was changed; that in the great church there was one preached the pure doctrine of the Gospel; and that so many thousands of people crowded thither from the neighbouring villages, and even from the remote dominions of Hesse, that the church could hardly contain them.

[C] *Having consulted Melancthon, and had several secret conferences with Bucer, he caused the latter to preach . . . and engaged the other to come . . . some time after.* He deputed Peter Medman to Melancthon in the year 1539, and wished he would come to him immediately, but his journey was deferred to the year 1543. Bucer being sent for by this Archbishop, came to him towards the end of 1541, and after several conferences which were very well relished by that Prelate, he went back to Strasbourg, from whence he returned to Herman the following year, and preached publicly at Bonn. He also informed the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse, that this Prelate had very good designs; but that he wanted encouragement, by reason of his age which made him act timorously and slowly. Those Princes did not fail to write to him in order to confirm him in his Christian intentions. He thanked them, and informed them that he had no other aim than the glory of God, and the happiness of his neighbours. He had before entreated the Elector of Saxony to send Melancthon to him; who accordingly set forwards on his journey about the end of April 1543, and, in conjunction with Bucer, drew up a project of Reformation, which the Archbishop caused to be read to him, and he himself carefully examined it (7). Some particulars, which did not favour much

(7) Taken from
Seckendorf, ubi
supra, pag. 436.

V O L. V.

of Protestantism, were overlooked in this project to please him; which obliged Luther to complain of Melancthon's and Bucer's connivance. The Elector of Saxony was not better pleased with this conduct, tho' the Landgrave told him, it was not to be expected that the work could be perfected all at once (8). We ought to know that the Archbishop was desirous to retain all the ceremonies which were not impious, and that each order should preserve its privileges: he did not pretend to abolish Episcopacy. * *Propositum scilicet erat Hermannus ut ex Melancthonis literis colligeret, Chytræus etiam Lib. 16. fol. 460. aperius tradit, ceremonias veteres omnes, quotquot sine pietate servari possent, una cum collegiorum dignitate, libertate, prærogativis & juribus omnibus, retinere, ut moderatæ & pie ordinationis Ecclesiæ Cathedralis exemplum esse posset: sed eventus ostendit, in rebus tantopere corruptis modum difficillime inveniri; quapropter omnis ista cautio inutilis fuit, & retenta illa pompa, doctrinæ puritati incrementa omnia subtracta fuerunt (9).* --- Herman proposed, as may be gathered from Melancthon's letters, and as Chytræus more plainly asserts, to retain all the old ceremonies which were not impious, together with the dignity, freedom, and all the rights and privileges of the colleges; that there might be an example of a moderate and pious administration in his Episcopal church. But the event showed that, when things are so far corrupted, it is very difficult to find a medium; for which reason all this caution proved useless, and the retaining of that pomp put an entire end to the increase of the purity of doctrine. The project of Reformation which he published, did not at all mention either Luther, or the Pope (10), and he took care to express himself so cautiously concerning the LOR's Supper, that the Zuinglian's could agree to it (11). Luther was very well pleased that his name was not mentioned (12), because he was well assured it might have deterred people; but he condemned the other parts of this cautious conduct, and became so violently enraged against Melancthon, that, perhaps, he had never been reconciled to him, if the latter had not laid the fault on Bucer, and if the Elector of Saxony had not laboured to prevent an open rupture betwixt them. * *Non latuit Melancthonem indignatio Lutheri, immo tantopere eum afflixit, ut de deferenda Wittenbergæ cogitaret, si Luthero invisus esset, aut quod futurum esse dicebatur, publice ab illo refutaretur. Sed pia Electoris Saxonie providentia & industria Pontani placatus est Lutherus, & Melancthonis excusationem accepit, dicentis, se neque caput illud reformationis Colonienfis de sacra Cœna composuisse, neque Bucerum celasse, quæ in eo desideraret, hunc tamen admonitionis suæ nullam habuisse rationem. Sic ira Lutheri vehementius in Bucerum versa est (13).* --- Melancthon was not ignorant of Luther's indignation; nay, he was so much concerned at it, that he resolved to leave Wittenberg, if he should prove obnoxious to Luther, or in case (for such a thing was talked of) he should be publicly confuted by him. But by the pious care of the Elector of Saxony, and by Pontanus's means, Luther was appeased, and admitted the excuse of Melancthon, who said that it was not he who composed the article of Reformation at Cologne touching the LOR's Supper, and that he had freely told Bucer what he thought was wanting in it, but that he had shown no regard to his admonition. Thus the edge of Luther's indignation was turned against Bucer.

This project of Reformation was printed at Buchen, if we believe the Preface, and that is all we can know of it; the time of the impression not being mentioned. A second edition appeared at Bonn, in 1543, printed by Laurence Mylius, or von der Matlen. And a third was printed the following year. These three impressions were in the German language. But the Latin edition, printed at Bonn, in 1545, by the same Mylius, is intitled, *Nostra Hermann, ex gratia Dei*

(8) Non Geli placuit illa simulatione Electori monito licet a Landgravo quod non omnia sub initium exacte constitui possent. Id. ibid. pag. 437, num. 3.

(9) Id. ibid.

(10) Hermannus ea placuit lenitas qua etiam cavet ne in toto scripto aliquid contra Pontificem nominatum spargatur. Id. ibid. pag. 448, d.

(11) Id. ibid.

(12) Id. ibid.

(13) Id. ibid.

(c) See the remark [D].

(d) Chytræus, in Saxonia, ad ann. 1552, in fine.

they published, they had recourse to the Pope and the Emperor. The former excommunicated and deposed the Archbishop, and was so effectually seconded by Charles V, that our prelate was forced to renounce his dignity in the year 1547 [D]. He retired to his paternal estate (c), where he died on the thirteenth of August 1552, being eighty years old (d). His scheme of reformation was more like that of England, than that of Germany

Archiepiscopi Colonienfis & Principis Electoris, simplex ac pia Deliberatio, qua ratione christiana, & in verbo Dei fundata, Reformatio doctrinae, administrationis divinarum Sacramentorum, ceremoniarum, totiusque curae animarum, & aliorum ministeriorum Ecclesiasticorum, apud eos, qui nostrae pastoralis curae commendati sunt, tantisper instituta sit, donec Dominus dederit constitui meliorem, vel per liberam & christianam Synodum, sive generalem sive nationalem, vel per Ordines Imperii Nationis Germanicae in Spiritu sancto congregatos. The copies of the

(14) Taken from Seckendorf, *ibid.* pag. 443.

(15) The Latin edition I make use of is that of Louvain, printed for Servatius Zaltinus 1544, in 8vo.

(16) Seckendorf, *ibid.* supra, pag. 438. *Clari Colonienfis de doctrina & vocatione Martini Bucer*, which was ascribed to Everard Billicus, a Carmelite, and so stuffed with scurrilous boresoneries, that the Canons of Cologne would not license it; wherefore the first title, *Judicium Cleri & Academiæ*, was struck out, and the other made use of, as we find in one of Melancthon's letters. 'Colonie liber editus est, non tam contra Bucerum, quam contra universam doctrinam Ecclesiarum nostrarum, & contra nostros Principes. Poeta operis est Carmelita ille bene fagnatus, & Bacchi ac Veneris sacerdos. Titulum operi fecerant: *Judicium Cleri & Academiæ*. Cum autem faniore in Collegio quidam Comites vidissent, scriptum dignius esse scurrile, quam Clero, iusserunt mutari titulum, ac testati sunt, id opus non probari suo Collegio. Addita est ergo tituli correctio, pro *Clero* jubent legi *Clerum secundarium*, nothos videlicet Cleros intelligunt. Petulantissime convitiatur doctrinae & Luthero, & in loco de conjugio spurcitie & obsecratione verborum utitur, quam vix in lenone ferrent aures mediocrium hominum. Convitia ex Plauti fabulis lecta sunt, quibus fortasse Carmelita ille magis delectatur, quam Psalmis (17). - - - A book

(17) Melancthon. *Epist. ad Crucigerum*. It is the lexicon of the *ibid.* book. It was written at Bonn, in 1543.

(18) Seckendorf, *ibid.* supra.

(19) See Seckendorf, *ibid.* pag. 443.

was published at Cologne, not so much against Bucer, as against the whole doctrine of our Churches, and against our Princes. The author is that big-bellied Carmelite, who may very well be taken for the Priest of Bacchus and Venus. The book was originally called, *The Judgment of the Clergy and the University*. But when some of the more judicious Fellows of the college had observed that it was a piece more worthy of buffoons than Clergymen; they ordered the title to be changed, and publicly declared, that their college did by no means approve of the book. For this reason they corrected the title, and instead of the word Clergy, they ordered to be put in, Under Clergy. The author rails in a most saucy manner at Luther and his doctrine, and in that place where he speaks of marriage, he makes use of such filthy and obscene words as the ears of ordinary men could hardly bear from profligate fellows. Unseemly jests are picked out of Plautus's comedies, which, perhaps, that Carmelite liked better than the *Psalms*. Gaspar Gennep translated this tract into German (18) and Melancthon published a refutation of it. The appeal which the Chapter of Cologne brought in before the Pope, may pass for a controversial tract (19): the Archbishop caused it to be refused. The Chapter published a *Programma* in German, on the eighteenth of November 1544; and the

Archbishop answered it on the thirteenth of December, the same year (20). In all probability, the prodigious superstition of the city of Cologne, was one of the obstacles which stifled Herman's design. That city is vastly abounds with monasteries, reliques, and images, that it may be called the Teutonic Rome. *Magni autem restituta est, de qua Melancthon quassus fuit, populi superstitio, Coloniae potissimum Agrippinae, Clero, templis, sacellis, statuis, reliquiis, plus, quam ulla in Germania civitas, repleta, ita ut Romam Teutonicam esse dicant* (21).

[D] He was obliged to renounce his dignity in the year 1547. He was promised assistance, that he might oppose force against force, but he chose rather to submit, in order to save his faithful subjects from the demerits of war. Read what follows, and you will find there the character of a good man: 'Constantiam profitebatur Ordines, & res ad vim spectabat: sed bonus senex Comitibus Mandercheidis & Nuenariis, nobilitatis in Archiepiscopatu facile primis, ita suadentibus obtemperans, tum misericordia Populi suumotus, & ne bello vastaretur provincia, ultro cessit, fideique & iurandum omnibus remisit. Obiit post annos sex Idibus Augusti anno 1552, in patria sua, & ut Sleidanus loquitur, qualem expevit, finem habuit. Nam, aut Evangelii propagare doctrinam, & recte constituere suae diocesis Ecclesias, aut privato sibi vivere licere, non semel optaverat: Et ab amicis aliquando motus, quantum invidiae sibi constaret ex ista religionis mutatione, respondere solebat: nihil esse, quod inopinanti posset accidere, seque jam pridem in eam casum obfirmasse mentem (22). - - - His subjects professed their refusal to stand by him, and it looked as if violence would have ensued. But the good old man complying with the advice of the Count Mandercheid and Nuenarius, who were the chief noblemen in the Archiepiscopate, and moved with compassion for his people, whom he was willing to save from the devastations of war, submitted of his own accord, and absolved them all from their oath of fidelity. He died six years after, on the thirteenth of August 1552, in his own country; and, as Sleidan says, his end was suitable to his desire. For he had been often than once bearded to wish that he might rather leave it in his power to propagate the doctrine of the Gospel, and to settle the Church upon a right footing in his dominions, or else that he might live a private man: and sometimes when his friends advised him to consider how much hatred he would draw upon himself by this change of religion, he used to answer, that nothing which should happen to him could surprize him unawares, for that he had prepared himself against all events.' Erasmus would have admired this conduct, he being so charmed with a saying of Otho, that he thought it very well deserved the Roman empire without prolonging the war, chose rather to die than occasion it's continuation. Cum inter ethnicum etiam hoc animo repertus sit Otho, ut potius duxerit spontanea morte vitam abrumpere, quam imperium tot hominum vitam mercari, vir vel ob hoc ipsum dignus imperio, si fortuna virtuti faveret (23). This thought hath something in it so heroic, that it is pity such an effeminate person as Otho should discover so much greatness of mind. But, as we have shewn elsewhere (24), his body and his mind were not of the same temper (25). The former was drowned in effeminacy, but the latter retained a large vigour; I speak of that vigour which forms itself on the ideas of equity. He always abhorred civil wars, and never would have attempted to set up against Galba, if he had not believed that affair would terminate without any effusion of blood. Othonem etiam privatum usque adeo detestatum civilia arma, ut memorante quodam inter epulas de Calpurnio Brutique exitu coaruerit: nec concurrebat cum Galba fuisse, nisi consideret sine bello rem transigi posse (26). When he resolved to kill himself, he had a sufficient number of forces to have continued the war with just hopes of success; but because it would have cost the

(21) *Id.* *ibid.* pag. 448.

(22) *Id.* *ibid.* See also *ibid.* in Iconibus. Non modo, sed et conscientiam tuam liberasti, sed teipsum quoque memorabili sceleris omnibus exemplo spernit, quem ultro vi majorem, prorsus boni consilium, placide Christianique vivere, quam licet immenso etiam deperitatum novum iniquum tamen huius

(23) Erasmus. *Epist. Dedic.* Suetonii Dicitur Calpurnio, &c.

(24) In the remark [8], of the article SEXTONIUS: towards the end.

(25) Non erat Otho nisi mollis & corporis lenitas. Tacitus. *Hist. lib. 1, cap. 2.*

(26) Suetonius. *ibid.* cap. 2.

Germany (e). Though it cannot be denied, that this Archbishop was rather a good man than a learned man, it may yet be said, that he was not ignorant [E]. The error committed in the supplement to Moreri's Dictionary is one of the most enormous that can be seen any where [F]. In the Paris edition of Moreri of 1699 (f) our Herman's article runs in Maimbourg's words.

I shall add something to the remark (g) concerning the prodigious mistake in the supplement to Moreri's Dictionary [G].

lives of great numbers of men, he concluded that it would be buying the preservation of a crown at too dear a rate. This was what Erasmus thought so excellent. He had read it in Tacitus and Suetonius. *Hinc inquit, (Otto) animam, hanc virtutem vestram ultra periculis objicere, nimis grande vitæ meæ pretium puto . . . Civile bellum à Vitellio cepit; & ut de principatu certaremus armis, initium illic fuit: ne pluraquam semel certemus, penes me exemplum erit, hinc Othonem posteritas æstimet . . . An ego tantum Romanæ pubis, tot egregios exercitus, sterni rursus, & Recip. eripi patiar (27). . . I should think that I bought my life at too dear a rate, if I should expose this spirit and this invincible courage of yours to any farther dangers. . . . The civil war was begun by Vitellius; and to him it is owing that we have fought once for the sovereign power: but it shall be my part to prevent our fighting more than once. From this let posterity form their character of Otto. . . . Shall I suffer the Republic to be deprived of such a number of young citizens, and of so many brave armies, by offering them up to a second havoc?* Erasmus would not have failed to approve the pacific modesty of our Herman, had he lived to that time; but I do not think he would have said, that it was less surprising in a Bishop than in a Pagan.

[E] *The' he was rather a good than a learned man . . . he was not ignorant.* Here is another passage of Father Maimbourg: 'He was † very ignorant, and utterly unacquainted with what a Prelate ought to know, even to that degree, that he had not Latin enough to enable him to say mass and read his Breviary. In effect, when the Landgrave of Hesse, who † took him into his protection after he was perverted, one day told the Emperor, that the only crime of that Archbishop was his attempting to reform his church: *Alas*, answered that Prince, *what can that poor man reform, who hardly understands a little Latin?* He never could say above three masses in his life, two of which I have heard, and am witness that he could not read even the introit. All those excellent Canons of his Council, which are so well expressed, were not made by him who knew nothing of the matter, but by the celebrated Dr Gropperus, Archdeacon of the church of Cologne, who drew them up, and put them in the condition we now see them in (28). It is certain that Sleidan (29) recites this discourse betwixt the Emperor and the Landgrave; but he adds, that the Landgrave replied, that this Archbishop had very carefully read the German books, and understood religion very well. *Sed diligenter evoluit libros Germanicos, ait ille, Et quod certo novi religionem intelligit.* Melancthon informs us, that this Prelate discovered a great deal of knowledge, when the model of the Reformation was examined in his presence: *Legi sibi totum librum jussit, attentissime audivit, multa de plerisque locis graviter disseruit, quædam suo judicio recte mutavit, interdum nostras sententias, re disputata, suæ opinioni prætulit. Huic labori dies sex tribuit, ac quotidie matutinas horas quatuor continas. Miratus sum Senis assiduitatem & diligentiam, ac animadverti serio hanc rem tantam ab eo agi; quod, quantum referat, intelligis. Et hæc controversiæ, pene ut artifex, dijudicat (30). . . . He ordered the whole book to be read to him, heard it with great attention,*

and made many solid reflexions upon the most part of it. Some proper alterations he made according to his own judgment, and sometimes after the matter had been argued, he preferred our opinion to his own. He allotted six days to this work, four hours at a time every morning. I was amazed at the old man's assiduity and diligence, and observed that he was very earnest in this important affair. Of what consequence that is you know very well. He reasons upon these controversies, as if he was perfectly master of the subject.'

[F] The error committed in the supplement to Moreri's Dictionary is one of the most enormous that can be seen any where. It was by express order of Herman, that Cardinal John Gropper was strangled with his hatband for endeavouring to oppose this new religion, are the words of the supplement (31). It would be very difficult to form probable conjectures concerning this horrible fatality, if the author had not cited Beza; but when we consult the place he points at, we find what was the occasion of his mistake, and then our surprize continues, and, what is more, increases. Beza compares our Herman to JESUS CHRIST, and John Gropper to Judas. He pretends that Gropper betrayed his master, and obtained for a recompence, a string which strangled him, that is to say, a Cardinal's hat. *Tu vero haud scis quam olim à Juda Christus à tuo Joanne Groppero proditus quam esset, retulit quidem hic quoque proditor stipendium peccati mortem Cardinalitii Galeri vinculis strangulatus (32).* It would be infinitely more excusable to say with Father Maimbourg, that Beza childishly aiming at wit, made a wretched dull jest (33), than to find in those words an execrable crime of the Archbishop of Cologne.

[G] I shall add something . . . concerning the . . . mistake in the supplement to Moreri's Dictionary.] Florimond de Remond furnishes me with this addition. He says that Theodore Beza, not satisfied with employing this allusion to Judas in prose, has likewise thought fit to express it in rhyme:

Voy d'un autre côté ce malheureux Groper,
Qui son Seigneur trompant, son cœur laisse attraper,
Estranglé d'un cordon d'un chapeau détestable.
De la grace divine Herman est le témoin
A celui qui du Ciel plus que du monde a soing,
Groper monstre de Dieu la vengeance effroyable.

See wretched Gropper on the other hand,
Seduc'd and strangled with an impious band,
His master he betrays. While Herman shall
Remain an evidence of grace to all
Who bear'n before vain earthly things desire,
Lo! Gropper stands a monument of ire.

A silly fool,' adds he, 'taking Beza's words in their literal signification, wanted to persuade me, that Gropper had made a halter of his hat-band, and strangled himself with his own hands: whereas Beza only means that his strong inclination for a Cardinal's hat had taken away his speech from him, which he would otherwise have employed in the defence of Lutheranism (34). Who could have imagined that such a plain metaphor as this would occasion such groundless and ridiculous fancies.

WILHEM (DAVID LE-LIEU DE) Counsellor in the council of the Princes of Orange, and in that of Brabant, deserves to be placed amongst the illustrious men of the XVIIth century. He was descended from a very noble and ancient family [A], and born

[A] *He was descended from a very noble and ancient family.* It held an honourable place amongst the nobility of Artois, and Cambresis ever since the year 1096, being, besides other estates, then possessed of the

lordships and seats of Bantoux, Bantoufel, Wilhem, Chantemerle, Froidebize, and Avesnes lez Gobert, &c. as appears by a decision of the council of Brabant at Brussels, on the fifth of July 1678. GEORGE LE-

LIU

(e) See the remark [C].

(f) Under the word *Weiden*.

(g) It is the remark [F].

(27) Tacit. Hist. lib. ii, cap. xlviii. These are Suetonius's words, ubi supra, cap. ix. Moriendi imperium cepit: ut multi nec frustra opinantur, magis potest, ne tanto rerum hominumque periculo deminutionem sibi afferere perferrent, quam desperatione ulla, aut diffidentia copiarum.

† Rouer. Post. Suri Comm. Sleid. l. i.

↓ Sleid. l. 27.

(28) Maimbourg, ubi supra, pag. 265.

(29) Lib. xvii, pag. m. 438, veris.

(30) Melancthon, Epistola ecciv. lib. iv. It was written from Erford. to Camerarius, the 11th of Aug. 1543.

(31) At the word *Herman*, pag. 670. This article is not in Moreri's Dictionary of the Dutch edition. Note, that Moreri, calls this Archbishop, *Herman de Meurs*, which is wrong.

(32) Beza, in Iconibus.

(33) Maimb. ubi supra, pag. 268.

(34) Flor. & Remond. Hist. de l'Heret. liv. iii, ch. ix, num. 4, pag. 322.

born at Hamburgh on the fifteenth of May, 1588. His mother, who joined to nobility of blood [B] great piety, and great zeal for the Protestant religion, educated him with a particular care; she sent him to study at Stade, at ten years of age, under the direction of very good tutors: and after he had improved, at Hanaw, by the lectures of John George Crobius, and John Rodolphus Lavaterus, she carried him to the university of Franeker. He staid there three years, and in 1611 went from thence to Leyden, where he made great advances in Philosophy, the Civil-Law, and the Oriental languages, &c. After that, he went to France, and made some stay in the Academy of Saumur, and afterwards in 1613, he went to lodge at Thouars, in the house of the learned Andrew Rivetus, who shewed him all the marks of a very particular esteem [C], on account, amongst other excellencies, of the Theological learning he had acquired. He improved himself very much by his Levantine voyages to Grand Cairo, Jerusalem, Alexandria, &c. in the years, 1617, 1618, 1619. He was very intimate with Cyril Lucaris, and frequently conferred with him concerning the differences betwixt the Greek and Latin Churches. He received several letters from that famous Patriarch (a), which very well deserve printing; and his heirs promise accordingly to publish them to gratify the curiosity of the learned. After his return from this long voyage, he resided some years with his brother at Amsterdam [D]; but his earnest desire of a more perfect knowledge of the Oriental tongues, and an inclination for the Levant, engaged him to make a second voyage thither in the year 1625. It is certain, that he travelled like a man of parts, that is to say, he made excellent and curious observations, acquiring besides an accurate knowledge of the Arabic, Persic, and Chaldaic tongues (b). He was met in those countries by the learned Golius, who had been recommended to him [E], and they contracted a cordial and intimate friendship which lasted as long as their lives. Being returned to Holland about the year 1631, he insinuated himself so far into the esteem of Frederic-Henry, Prince

(a) See the remark [E].

(b) Besides the learned languages, which he understood to perfection, he could easily speak most languages that are now spoken in Europe, and Asia.

LEU DE WILHEM, the father of him who is the subject of this article, left Tournay at the beginning of the troubles concerning religion, being himself, together with his five brothers, out-lawed for having buried their mother without observing the ceremonies required by the Romish communion. It appears by an authentic act of the twenty-second of December 1565, that their estates were confiscated; but they endeavoured to release themselves from this act, after the year 1576, by virtue of the pacification of Ghent. JAMES LE-LEU DE WILHEM, one of the six brothers, took refuge in England, and first married Margaret de Zegre, and for his second wife Mary de Duyts. By his first wife, besides other Children, he had TIMOTHY LE-LEU DE WILHEM, born at London the twenty-sixth of November 1568, and Lord of Borgerie Finges lez-Courtrai. By the second, he had besides others, MICHAEL LE-LEU DE WILHEM, born the twenty-seventh of September 1587, who died Counsellor and Schepen of the Hague, and who had married at Delft on the twenty-fifth of May 1614, Anne de Rechtere Niece to the Secretary Adrian Duyck: his sister (1) was married to Sir Dudley Carlton (2), King James's Ambassador in Holland (3).

(1) I follow word by word the Memoir imparted to the Book-seller.

(2) Who had by her a daughter, that is still living (in 1666.) She is the widow of the Lord Ferrers, and mother of the Countess of Arran, widow of a son of the Duke of Hamilton, mother of an only daughter, who is a very rich heiress.

(3) Taken from a Memoir imparted to the Book-seller. Item dic de plerisque infra Memorandis.

(4) He married the heiress of the house of Aigremont, Lady de M. Jett, &c.

[B] His mother, who joined to nobility of blood,] Her name was Gilliette van Opalsens: she was the daughter of John van Opalsens Esq; and of Joan l'Empereur d'Oppyck, filster to John l'Empereur d'Oppyck, Lord of Malerit, &c. (4), who was deputed to the Ducheys of Parma, Governors of the Low-Countries, by the city of Tournay, in conjunction with the confederate nobility. His son Antony l'Empereur d'Oppyck was the father of CONSTANTIN L'EMPEREUR, born at Bremen in 1591, Professor of Divinity at Leyden, and Counsellor to Prince Maurice, a person very well versed in the Oriental tongues, as he hath shewn by several books. He was twice married, first to Levina de Witt, daughter of the Lord of Rosenburgh, Counsellor of Amsterdam. Secondly, to Catherine Thyfius of Ky-nogen. He died in the year 1648, leaving only one daughter Sarah l'Empereur d'Oppyck, who was married to Mark du Tour, gentleman to the Prince of Orange, Father to the King of England. He died Counsellor in the Court of Brabant. But after this digression justly due to the merit of Constantin l'Empereur, I return to the mother of our David Wilhem. She was at Paris on St Bartholomew's day, and was saved from the massacre as it were, by a miracle; her husband was then at Rouen, and was also saved. Her father, John Van Opalsens, had the same good fortune some years before. He was condemned to death for his religion, the sentence was pronounced; but he escaped out of the prison of Tournay by the connivance of the goaler, and fled into England.

[C] Andrew Rivetus who shewed him, all the marks of a particular esteem.] To know the mutual friendship, which they contracted, and the peculiar esteem Rivetus had for him, we need only call our eye on the Epistle Dedicatory to his commentary on the decalogue (5). It also gives a very great character of the virtue, learning, piety, and other excellent qualities of David Wilhem.

[D] With his brother.] That is, with PAUL LE-LEU DE WILHEM, the Father of DAVID LE-LEU DE WILHEM, still living (6), who is President of the Schepens, and receiver of the city of Amsterdam. His wife is Hillegonda Van Beuningen, sister to the late Mr Conrad Van Beuningen, so well known by his embassies.

[E] The learned Golius, who had been recommended to him.] I have seen the original of the letter which Rivetus wrote to Mr de Wilhem (7) on the twentieth of October 1625, and from thence I have extracted these words: 'Servo adhuc tibi literas itineris tui Hierosolymitani, & eas quas à Patriarcha Alexandrino acceptas mihi communicasti quas vel tibi, vel ei qui tuo nomine eas petet, restitum cum vobis. Commendatione mea apud te non opus habet. Clariss. Golius, vir in rara eruditione, rara pietate & modestia præditus, nostro defuncto Erpenio intimus, & mihi tam proprio nomine quam tali necessitudine charissimus, &c. I still keep for you, the letters, which you received in your journey to Jerusalem, together with those of the Patriarch of Alexandria, which you were so good as to communicate to me. I shall restore them, as soon as you will, either to yourself, or to any one that you shall commission to receive them. Mr Golius, a man of rare erudition, singular piety, and great modesty, does not stand in need of my recommendation to you. He was intimately acquainted with our deceased friend Erpenius, for whose sake, and no less for his own, he is exceedingly dear to me, &c.' This informs us that Rivetus was, at that time, the depository of the Patriarch Cyril's letters to Mr de Wilhem. He has acquainted the public with the correspondence which his friend kept up with Cyril: as appears by these words we find in the Epistle Dedicatory which I have already quoted. 'Ex iis (retracatory) etiam ex ipsa Aegypto, quæ tabernaculo Dei intervirent abstulisti non pauca, aliis liberaliter communicaturus, ad communem utilitatem. Inter quæ non minima sunt, quæ ex intimâ illâ admiffione cum Reverendiss. Cyrillo tum Patriarcha Alexandrino, haufisti; cujus communicationis fructus, & sedulitatis tuæ in eo de rebus nostris plenus informando utilitatem, ringentibus adversariis, etiamnum colligimus & percipimus, postquam evehus est ad summam inter Orientales Christianos dignitatem. Quæ

(5) Ad Amplissimum præfatum sanctissimum pietate & multiplici eruditione virum D. Davidem de Wilhem. Tride honorabile, pios et literat. David de Wilhem.

(6) I write this in the year 1666. (7) Who was then at Aleppo.

Prince of Orange, that he was made a Counsellor in his Highness's council at the Hague. He married a filter of the celebrated Mr de Zuylichem (c), a lady of great parts. He had some children by her [F], as we shall see below. The States-General having made very considerable conquests in the province of Brabant, by the victorious arms of Prince Frederic-Henry, augmented the council of that province in the year 1634, bestowed a counsellor's place on our Mr DE WILHEM, and made him Superintendent of that country in 1640. As he loved and understood the sciences and the liberal arts, the great business in which so many posts engaged him, never hindered his studying hard, and keeping up an extensive correspondence with the Learned [G]. He took pleasure in protecting and serving them on all occasions at the court and elsewhere. He had a very fine library, furnished with the most excellent books in all faculties, besides a large number of very curious manuscripts (d) in Arabic, Persian, Chaldaic, &c. The present of mummies, manuscripts, and such other rarities, which he made to the university of Leyden [H], is still preserved there as an ornament. He died of the Stone on the twenty-seventh of January 1658, having faithfully, and with great application, served three Princes of Orange, namely Frederic-Henry, William II, and William-Henry, at present King of England (e).

(d) This may be confirmed by a passage of Frederic Spanheim, Vindic. Exercit. de Grat. universali, Part. i, pag. 67, wherein he says that David de Wilhem è tenebris eruit tractatum de tribus questionibus, compositum à Lupo Servato Abbate Ordinis Benedicti, Rabani discipulo, qui vixit octavo seculo, & mihi communicavit.

(e) Taken from a Memoir im-

(8) Andreas Rivetus, Epist. Dedicat. Commentar. in Decalog. Oper. Tom. i, pag. 1223.

* Quæ argumento sunt, quantæ fuerit in te propagandæ veræ Religionis cura, etiam inter remotissimos à nobis (8). From these countries, as well as from Egypt itself, you brought away many things, that were to be of no small use to the Church of God, and you intend generously to communicate them to others, for the public advantage. Among these what you learnt from your intimate familiarity with the most Reverend Cyril, then Patriarch of Alexandria, is not the least considerable: and even now since he had been raised to the highest dignity among the eastern Christians, we reap the fruits, and, notwithstanding the malicious scuffs of our adversaries, feel the benefit of your correspondence with him, and of the pains you took to inform him more particularly concerning our affairs. All these are proofs of your great diligence in propagating the true religion even among those people who are the most remote from us.

[F] A lady of great parts. He had some children by her. Her name was Constantia Huygens, and she was very well read. Mr Des Cartes highly esteemed her, and readily, nay with great deference, desired to know her opinion on the new Philosophical ideas which he had invented. She survived her husband about ten years, and died on the first of December 1667, very much regretted by all the judicious people of the Hague. Mr de Wilhem left behind him three daughters and one son, MAURICE LE-LEU DE WILHEM, at present Dean of the Council and Feodal Court of Brabant, sitting at the Hague (9), who is a gentleman of great honour, enriched with a very great stock of learning and merit; and whose conversation is most entertaining. I speak by experience, he being one of the first acquaintance which I had the honour to make at my arrival in Holland. After he had completed his studies, he travelled in Italy, France, Germany, Hungary, Sweden, and several other places, where he gained the esteem of all eminent persons. He accompanied Mr de Zuylichem his uncle to Orange in the year 1665, when that principality was restored with all the necessary formalities to its lawful sovereign. He was then received a Doctor of Law with great applause (10). He hath been always very curious, not only in the antiquities of his own country, but the Roman also. His strong inclination for these made him interrupt his study of the practical part of the law in 1670, in order to travel a second time in a more advanced age; and having staid some months at Paris, he set forward for Italy with Don Francisco Brancaccio (11), nephew to the Cardinal of that name, and in company with Messieurs de Grancei, the sons of the Marshal. He stayed a whole year at Rome, in order to search into whatever was remarkable in that famous city. Being returned into Holland, he diligently applied himself to inquire into the law of nations, and the interests of the Princes and states of Europe. His genius led him to it, and his acquaintance with several languages furnished him with great helps for that study. In November 1671, he went into Sweden with his Excellency Mr de Haren, Ambassador from the United Provinces, and was chosen (12) by the States-General to take care of their

affairs at that court, when that Ambassador was upon the point of his return. A few days after, the same States bestowed on him the place of Counsellor in the Court of Brabant, in the room of Mr Fagel, promoted to be their Register. Having acquired a very considerable acquaintance at the Court of Sweden, and standing very well with the Chancellor de la Gardie, and the other Senators of that kingdom, the States of Holland resolved in June 1673, to send him to that court, with the character of Deputy-Extraordinary of the United Provinces. The following year he was twice nominated to the office of Counsellor at the Court of Holland, first on the part of the towns and afterwards on the part of the nobility. In 1683, he married the eldest daughter of Mr Timmers, Burgomaster of Rotterdam, who has been Director of the India company, and several times Deputy to the Admiralty of the Maes (13) (§ 2).

(§ 2) He has by her a fine family of children, viz. DAVID LE-LEU DE WILHEM, Lord of Barlicum, of Middelrode, &c. Counsellor in the Council and Feodal Court of Brabant, by the voluntary demission of his father Lord of Woelwyk, who had been a long time Dean and fifteen years President of that court: PAUL-SEBASTIAN, and CONSTANTIN, LE-LEU DE WILHEM, who have taken their degrees in law in the university of Leyden; and MARY-CONSTANCE LE-LEU DE WILHEM, married to Mr William Paedt's Counsellor of the city of Leyden.

[G] An extensive correspondence with the learned. And above all, with Salmasius, Heurnius, Rivetus, Des Cartes, Heinsius, Vossius, Junius, Manasseh-Ben Israel, who dedicated to him his treatise de Creatione (14). The letters which he received from them and several other illustrious men, lie in heaps amongst the papers of his son Mr de Wilhem, who, if he had but leisure to select them, would find great numbers of which he might make a considerable present to the Republic of Letters. He would likewise find there pieces in manuscript like that which has been seen above (15).

[H] The present . . . which he made to the university of Leyden. Here is a public testimony of it: Id mihi silentio non est prætereundum, quod erga hanc nostram Academiam, studiorum tuorum olim promotricem, matrem proinde tuam, liberalem admodum te præbueris: factum est enim id curâ tuâ & ære tuo, ut Theatrum in eâ Anatomicum, tot raris & pretiosis skeiniosis, exterorum omnium qui illud invisunt animos in admirationem rapiat; inter quæ eminent duo condita cadavera (Mumias vocant) antiquissima, quæ in Ægypto eruta, & à te redempta, integerrima, te mittente, ad nos pervenerunt (16). . . . I must not forget to mention your generosity to our university, which formerly gave you your education, and is consequently your mother: to your care and expence we owe it that the Anatomical theatre, by the many rare and curious things contained in it, excites the wonder of all foreigners who come to see it. Among the rest, there are two very antient mummies, which being found out in Egypt, and purchased by you, came very safe and entire from you to us.

(c) See his article.

(13) Taken (as far) from a Memoir imported to the Bookeller.

† Taken from a Memoir communicated to the Bookeller, in the year 1719.

(14) That Epistle Dedicatory deserves to be consulted: It may serve for a proof to this article.

(15) Remark [L], of the article BORE.

(16) Rivetus, ubi supra.

(9) He was made President of it in the month of September 1703.

(10) See Mr Chambrun's Relation, printed at Orange in 1666, pag. 161.

(11) He had been a Captain of Horse in the service of the King of Spain, in the Low-Countries.

(12) By a resolution taken on the 26th of August 1671.

VOL. V.

7 C

WIMPINA

(a) It is a small town of Odenwald, in the Diocese of Wurtzburg.

(b) In the year 1506.

(c) Taken from the book published by Joachim-John Mæderus at Helmstad 1660, and written by an anonymous author with the title of *Scriptorium insignium . . . Centuria*.

(d) Seckendorf,
Hist. Lutheran.
lib. i, pag. 25.
num. 1.

(1) At Helm-
stadt in the year
1660. in 4to.

WIMPINA (CONRAD), Divinity Professor at Francfort on the Oder in the XVIIth century, was born at Buchen (a). He acquired a great reputation by his public as well as private lectures at Leipsic, in Philosophy, Divinity, and Poetry, &c. He had great crowds of auditors, and at the same time raised the envy of several people. These not being able to obscure his glory, by the sophistical subtilties which they proposed to him, and to which he learnedly answered, had recourse to calumnies and libels. He was obliged to appear at the tribunal of the Archbishop of Magdeburg, Primate of Germany, where he triumphed over his enemies. He was in a splendid manner promoted to the degree of Doctor of Divinity : a Cardinal-Legate, to whom he made a speech in St Paul's church at Leipsic, and who admired his eloquence, caused that degree to be conferred on him. Wimpina was presented by the whole faculty of Divinity. The reputation of this doctor advanced so high, that the Marquisses of Brandenburg designing to found an university at Francfort on the Oder, made him offers of a very considerable salary to be Professor there. He accepted the proposal, and went thither to lay (b) the foundation of that new university, where he became rector of two colleges, and first Professor of Divinity. He published several books (c) [A]. He was one of Luther's antagonists [B], and passed for the real author of the Theses which appeared under the name of the Dominican John Tezelius against this reformer (d).

[A] He published several books.] The anonymous author of the catalogue of illustrious men, published by Joachim-John Maderus (1), mentions several books written by Wimpina before the year 1514; but he makes no distinction between those already printed, and those which were not. However the catalogue of them runs as follows: *Editio proprietatum logicarum in commentatione non vulgaris libri IV. De erroribus Philosophorum in fide Christiana. De nobilitate celestis corporis. De eo an animati cæli possint dici. De nobilitate animarum cæli. De fato opus infigne & præclarum. Palillogia de Theologico fastidio. Panegyrici de Christi mirabilitate ac sublimitate. Apologeticus in sacra Theologia defensionem. Apologia secundata contra obstrationem Theologia. Apologia tertia ad Mellerstinas offensiones & denigrationes S. Theologia. Apologia quarta contra Laconium Mellerst. pro defensione Theologia. Apologia quinta pro repressione errorum Mellerst. Cribratio in tergiversationes Martini Mellerst. De ortu, progressu, & fructu S. Theologia. Super sententias libri IV. Præcepta cogitandi & rhetorice orationes. Opus quoddamque disputationis mirum & varium. Orationes & Carmina.* I do not in the least doubt but this Martin Mellerst, against whom Wimpina so often drew his pen, was the same Martin Mellerst of whom our anonymous author speaks particularly under number thirty-one, and of whose works he inserts a catalogue, amongst which we find no mark of his controversy with Wimpina. This Martin Mellerst bore the name of his country which is situated, in Franconia, and taught the Philosophy of the Thomists at Leipzig, for the space of twenty

years, with great reputation ; after which, he applied himself to the study of Physic, and being admitted Doctor in that science, became so famous, that Frederic, Elector of Saxony, chose him for his Physician (2).

As for the rest, Wimpina's book of *Divinationes* is one of his principal works; but he is charged with stealing it from Picus Mirandula (3). Here therefore is another author to be added to Thomafius's catalogue of Plagiaries. This tract of *Divinationes* was printed with several others of Wimpina, at Cologne in the year 1531, in folio. And three tomes of the said author were published at Francfort on the Oder, in 1528, of *Setisii, Erroribus, ac Schismatibus*, together with the *tragicæ de Providentiâ et de Fortuna*, in folio.

[B] *He was one of Luther's antagonists.* [H]e was one of the four Divines of Brandenburg, who, in the year 1530, refuted the articles of faith which Luther had published, and which served for a foundation to the Augsburg Confession. He was one of those Divines whom the Catholic Princes brought to the Diet that year (4). They chose the most able disputants (5); and finding that the first conferences between the deputies on both sides, did not make way for an accommodation, and supposing that the multitude of disputants, on each side, kept them at a distance from the ways of peace, they reduced the whole number of Divines to three of each side only. Those of the Romish party were Eccius, Wimpina, and Cochleus (6): whereas we may conclude that Mr Konig is mistaken in placing Conrad Wimpina's death in the year 1529.

(2) Ex Centuria Scriptor. insignium, in lucem edita à Joush. Joh. Madero.

(3) Toto clam
pere ex Pico piori
ma. Mart. del
Rio, *Disq. Magic*
lib. i^o, cap. ii,
Quæst. vii, §. ii,
pag. m, 247.

(4) Seckendorf,
Hift. Lutherana.
lib. ii, pag. 152

(5) Addeſſi
erant à variis
principibus in
Comitia pugna-
tiffimi ex adver-
ſariis Lutheri.
Secundus. ibid.
pag. 171, mss.

ng (6) *Id. ib.* *sup.*
177, *sup.* 16.

(a) He was born in Alsace, as he says himself in the Epistle Dedicatory of the *Prognosticon*.

WINDECK (JOHN-PAUL) Doctor of Divinity, a German by nation (A), and Canon of the Collegiate Church of Marchdorff, published at Cologne in the year 1603 a book wherein he pretended to prove by forty-two demonstrative reasons, that the Protestant religion would soon be destroyed [A]. His motive for undertaking this work, was that a Lutheran not long before had published a book concerning the prefages of the approaching ruin of Popery [B]. The event has shewn that these two authors were both equally

[A] He published a book wherein he pretended to prove . . . that the Protestant religion would soon be destroyed. It is a book in 4to of 423 pages. The whole title of it runs thus: *Prognosticus futuræ status Ecclesiæ, opusculum insensu cuiusdam per Sæviciam Lutherologum libro: ab hinc bimestri edito, de signis ruinæ Papæ, aliisque sectariorum jactantibus mendaciis, in quo duabus & quadraginta rationibus Apostolicis demonstratur, Lutheranismum, Calvinianum, aliisque sectas, contra Romanæ-Catholicam Ecclesiam longè latèus ac diutè grassantes, brevè esse perituræ: illam vero stæbilis constantia permauramur. Eisdem totidem etiæm Causæ continentur, cur ad unicum Ovile redire debeant sectarii, & in eodem permanere Catholici. Item Christiana Deliberatio, de optimo Religiosis statu continuando, seu quibus remediis, à Catholicorum provinciis sectæ omnes arceri, aut ubi misceantur, funditus evelli queant.* The author dedicated this book to Maximilian of Austria, Grand Master of the Teutonic Order.

(1) De Signis
brevis interituri
Papatus. See
Windeck's Epistolae
Dedicatory.

[B] A Lutheran, not long before-hand, had published a book concerning the presages of the approaching ruin of Popery (1.) He was not the only one that had dispersed

the like prophecies. Windeck remembered several other prognosticators. *Demiratus sum effrontem Eusebio-Euangelicorum impudentiam : è quorum catervis nullius gijfmodi fanaticæ, prodigijsseque vanitatis vaticinia, in vulgus sparsisse memineram* (2). He takes notice that Luther often boasted of his being the man appointed to destroy the Church of Rome, and that, according to Peucer, this had actually come to pass. *Per doctrinam Lutheri Pontificatum Romanum corruisse* (3). He adds, that there hardly passes a year without some English prognostication, that such a Pope should die, and that no body shall succeed him. He does not forget the Calvinists of France, who, as he says, hand about the prediction of one Peter Clement, a Huguenot, who was burnt at Paris forty years before, whereupon they alledged an inscription found amidst a heap of rubbish.

Calviniste in Galliis . . . splendide nugarunt de vaticinio cuspide Petri Clementis Hugonote, ante XL annos Parisiis combusti. Aium enim in ultima obfidione Parisiensis, cam tormentis muri quaterentur, inter rudera lapidem inventum, cui artificiosè vaticinium hoc fuerit insculptum : Pontificem Romanum . . .

hat (2) Windeck.
ted Epist. Dedicat.
folio (i) 3 vers.

(3) *Id.* *ibid.* fol.
(:) 3: be greater
book v, Chron.
Carina.

equally mad [C]. Windeck added to his book a second part wherein he proposes to the Sectaries forty-two motives for their reuniting to the Church of Rome. He ends with a Christian consultation upon the means of extirpating the sects. He adopts the most rigid principles of the enemies to Toleration, and he reasons sometimes *ad hominem*, that is to say, he alleges the Penal Laws established against the Roman Catholics in several Protestant states, and the persecutions which some of the new sects suffered from the rest. He does not forget the hardships which the fugitives of England suffered from the Lutherans, as I have observed elsewhere (b). He published at Cologne in the year 1604 a book *de Theologia Jurisconsultorum*. His treatise on the Electors was printed in 1616 (c). The Protestants made use of his maxims as a handle to throw the blame of the wars in Germany upon the Court of Vienna; but it was said in answer to them, that this Author had done no more than followed his own private notions, and that he never had

(b) In the remark [1], of the article WESTPHALUS.

(c) Konig. B.S. pag. 870.

(4) *Id. ibid.*
exterminandum, & ejus Doctrinam radicitus eradicandum: vicissim verò Calvinismum ubique recipiendum, & regnatum esse (4). . . . The Calvinists in France . . . talk mightily about the prediction of one Peter Clement, a Huguenot, who was burnt at Paris forty years ago. For they say that in the last siege of Paris while the canons played upon the walls, a stone was found amidst the rubbish, with this prophecy artfully engraved on it: That the Pope of Rome was to be destroyed, and his doctrine utterly extirpated: on the other hand, that Calvinism was to be received, and to prevail in all places.' He concludes that all this proceeds from a peevish jealousy, which makes people greatly expect what they vainly wish for (5).

(5) Ita deploratissimi isti homines im-probo livore ta-bescunt quod vanissime optant, stulte sperant & augurantur. *Id. ibid. verso.*

(6) Windeck, Prognost. pag. 27, 28.

(7) See the remark [C], of the article MORLIN.

(8) Those of the Nestorians, Eutychians, &c.

merical fancy to think of extirpating them otherwise than by an open war. Now it is folly to depend upon the good success of a war (9). Fortune sports with prudence and valour, and shifts the victory from one side to the other, at a time when such a thing is least expected (10): it equally frustrates our hopes and fears, it supplies the weak side with unforeseen resources; and when these last see themselves in their turn capable to obtain the most compleat triumph, new misfortunes happen to them, which revive the courage of the enemy. This is what people felt, to their sad experience, in the war of Germany, from the year 1618, to the peace of Munster. In a word, if those who pretend to guess what the event will be of such or such a war, are generally deceived from month to month (11), what can we think of those who flatter themselves with the hopes that a war which is not yet begun will prove the ruin of several nations? Experience should have taught Windeck that he was a rash prognosticator. Did not he know that the Roman Catholic Princes had succoured the Protestants (12)? And was it possible for him to doubt but that, considering the situation of affairs in Europe, the same thing would happen upon all such occasions? He had, in a peculiar manner, foretold the total ruin of the Heretics in the United Provinces, and promised that great exploit to the House of Austria.

'Austria pro-pago, acerrima Catholica fidei propugnatrix, sese ceu murum opponit pro Domo Dei, ad profligandos immanes ejus hostes, Turcas & Hereticos; adeo ut spes certa nos foveat, faventi potenti Numine, Heroicis vestris facinoribus utroque tandem ac praesertim infelices sectarios in Belgio radicitus evulsus iri. Quod hoc Opusculo, proxima foetura apud me nato, evincere conor (13). . . . The House of Austria, the zealous defender of the Catholic faith, stands fast, like a bulwark, for the House of GOD against its fierce enemies the Turks and Heretics: which gives us sure ground to hope, that by your heroic exploits, and the powerful assistance of the Deity, both these, particularly the unhappy sectaries in Holland, shall be utterly extirpated; as I endeavour to prove in the second edition of this treatise.' Ignorant fool that he was, did he not know that France protected the Dutch. Had he seen into futurity, he must have known that this crown would continue to be the chief instrument of their rise, and a very powerful obstacle to the House of Austria; and that the House of Austria, in her turn, would become their strongest bulwark, and save them from the ruin which should threaten them from France. It is certain that the House of Austria was one of the principal causes of their preservation in the war of 1672 (14); for France did not abandon her conquests till such time as the Emperor and Spain declared war against her in favour of that Republic. Spain stood in the breach to cover the Dutch, and chose to become the seat of the war, in order to ease them of it; and besides, it was Spain that paid the cost. The United Provinces recovered all that had been taken from them; but Spain lost Franche-Comté, and several towns in the Low-Countries.

It would be easy to shew the invalidity of all the other reasons of this prognosticator. He could not have found so many as forty-two if he had not divided one and the same into several branches, and if, to multiply his numbers, he had not turned the same commonplace into several shapes, in order to present it in different views. It is proper to observe, that he has grounded several of them upon false facts, or upon facts which he proves very ill.

(9) See Berneggerus, in Tuba Pacis, pag. 6, & seq. & 19, & seq.

(10) Quidam etiam vicis resit in praecordia veritus, Viresque cadunt Danaï. . . . Not only Trojans fall but in their turn, The vanquish'd triumph and the victors mourn. DRYDEN, Virgil, Aeneid. lib. ii, ver. 367.

(11) See the Réponse aux Questions d'un Provincial, pag. 151, & seq.

(12) See the remark [R], of the article ELIZABETH; the remark [P], of the article FRANCIS I; and the remark [R], of the article HENRY II.

(13) Windeck, in Epist. Dedicat. fol. (:) (:) 2 verso.

(14) These are the words of a famous Protestant Professor at Hall in Saxony: Certe nisi imperator noster atque Hispanus tum (anno 1672) advenissent jam pridem sub Gallorum jugo gemeret pristinam frustra requirens libertatem, Belgium. . . . It is certain that unless the Emperor and the King of Spain had suddenly interposed, then (in the year 1672) Holland had been long ago subjected to the French yoke, and might have wished for her ancient liberty in vain. Jo. Francisc. Buddeus, Select. Juris Nat. & Gent. pag. 623.

[D] The

had any place in the Emperor's councils [D].

[D] *The Protestants made use of his maxims as a handle . . . but it was said in answer to them that, &c. . .* [The author of the *Cancellaria Bavarico-Anhaltina* (15) had maintained that the Protestant

(15) See, remark [C], of the article KELLER.

(16) Pleßius, in Respons. ad præcipua Capita Cancellariæ Bavarico-Anhaltinæ, imit.

league had not hitherto been able to alledge any particular whereby it could appear that the Roman Catholics had formed designs against the States which adhered to the confession of Augsburg. He was answered, that the project formed against all the Protestants in general, was sufficiently discovered by Paul Windeck's book. *Quis in Protestantibus omnes Generalis* In the printed book from *Cancellar. Anhalt. Appendix*, pag. 1. as far as (16) *Ut* exclud.

It was replied that Windeck and Scioppius were private men, whose opinions and writings were of no authority. *Duas nefcio cujus Martii Spiritus* in the printed book from pag. 2. as far as (17) *Quid* (17) *Appendix Cancellariæ*, pag. 2.

The Protestant author replied, that the Roman Catholics alledged the very fragments of letters to convict the Protestants, and that there was much more reason for reproaching them with the books of Windeck, (18) *See Respons. ad Pab. Hercynianum*, pag. 15, 13. who had an ecclesiastical post, and with those of Scioppius, who was Counsellor to his Imperial Majesty (18).

WITTICHIUS (CHRISTOPHER) Professor of Divinity at Leyden, made himself famous among other things by introducing the Cartesian Philosophy into the schools of Divinity. He was born in Silesia on the seventh of October 1625. His father, who had been originally a Lutheran, turned Calvinist at the Duke of Brieg's Court, and was Minister there in quality of Vice-Superintendent of the whole country of Brieg. His son, of whom we speak here, was sent to study the Civil-Law at Bremen in the year 1642; but he soon quitted that study and applied himself to Divinity in which he made great progress, as well at Bremen as at Groningen, and Leyden. The first post he enjoyed in the universities was given him in the year 1651. He was made Mathematical Professor in ordinary at Herborn in the county of Nassau, with leave to give private lectures to students of Divinity. He found that post so little to his liking, that he soon quitted it, and went to teach in the college of Duisburgh in the Duchy of Cleves, where he likewise discharged the office of Minister from the year 1653. As that college was erected into an university in the year 1655, Wittichius received there the degree of Doctor in Philosophy and Divinity, and went from thence to Nimeguen to be Professor of Divinity, in which post he continued sixteen years. The books which he had published, and which turned in a manner all upon subjects that were partly Theological and partly Philosophical in the Cartesian way, procured him a great number of opponents: but that only served to make him the better known; so that he was judged worthy to teach Divinity at Leyden, the principal university of the United Provinces in the Low-Countries. He entered upon that office in the month of November 1671, and continued in it to his death, having a very numerous auditory, to which not only the clearness of his ideas contributed, but likewise his attachment to the doctrine of Des Cartes and Cocceius, which is indeed the least in favour with the great and powerful in Holland, but is most to the relish of young people, and of those who set up for men of wit. Wittichius died the nineteenth of May 1687. His principal books are these, *Consensus veritatis in Scriptura divina & infallibili revelata cum veritate philosophica à Cartesio detecta. Theologia Pacifica. Exercitationes Theologicae. Causa Spiritus Sancti. Commentarius in Epistolam ad Romanos*. After his death, his brother, an advocate at Aix la Chapelle, published the *Anti-Spinoza*, and some notes upon the meditations of Mr Des Cartes (a).

(a) Gronovius, in Orat. funeb. Christi. Wittichii.

(a) See the remark [C].

WOUWER (JOHN DE) one of the learned men of the XVIth century, and author of some books [A], was of Hamburg, and the son of a Refugee in Germany on account of Religion (a). He was born on the tenth of March 1574, and having gone through his Classical studies in his native country, he was sent to Leyden in 1592, where he spent five years in an intimate familiarity with the most learned men, and even with the great Scaliger. From thence he went to France where he acquired the friendship of Claudius Puteanus, Francis Pithæus, and several other great men. He afterwards spent two years in Italy, and received a great many civilities there from some Prelates and some Cardinals. He had even access to the Pope, who shewed great affection to him, and offered him a very honourable pension. Being returned to Germany, he accepted the post of Counsellor to the Count of East-Friesland, and was his envoy at the Hague in the treaty for the Pacification of Embden, as he was afterwards at the court of John Adolphus, Duke of Holstein. That Duke was so pleased with him at the first conversation, that he obliged him to bind himself by an oath, to engage in his service. He was first honoured with the place of his counsellor, and then advanced to the government of Gottorp. But after he had continued three years in that office, he fell into a disease which wasted him by slow degrees, and of which he died on the thirtieth of March 1612, to the extreme regret of his master, who caused him to be pompously interred

[A] *Author of some books.* He published, with notes, the works of Sidonius Apollinaris, Petronius, Firmicus de errore profanarum Religionum, Minutius Felix, and Apuleius; besides several notes on Tertullian, a treatise de Polymathia, a dissertation de cognitione veterum novi orbis. *Diis æstiva seu de Umbra. A panegyric* on

(b) Taken from Henningus Witte, in Memoria Wouweriana, pag. 79. & seq. of the Memorial Philoforum.

interred in the great church at Sleswic (b). He held an epistolary correspondence with the most learned men of Holland, and of several other countries [B]. He neither wanted learning, nor other good qualifications; but we are told that his faults were not less than his virtues (c). Being born a Protestant he embraced the Romish religion in Italy [C]; or at least it was reported so. He is ranked amongst the Plagiaries [D]. He was too fond of flattery, as appears by his testamentary legacy to those who should write

(c) See the remark [E].

(1) Taken from Henningus Witte, Memor. Philoforum. pag. 81, 82.

on Christian IV, King of Denmark. We have also two centuries of his Latin letters, and a *Synagma de Græca & Latina Bibliorum Interpretatione* (1).

[B] He held an epistolary correspondence with the most learned men . . . of several . . . countries. This appears by the collection of his letters printed with his *Synagma de Græca & Latina Bibliorum Interpretatione*. See Mr Morhof's opinion of them. 'Varie hic institutæ sunt de multis rebus literariis consultationes & judicia: nam multa, quæ agitantur illo tempore inter viros literatos, his in epistolis recensentur. Scriptæ illæ sunt ad illustres ejus temporis viros, Scaligerum, Meursium, Heinsium, Gruterum, Scriverium & plures alios, cum quibus non nisi erudita tractari poterant. Epistolæ ejus multas ineditas servat illustris Gudius, latitant & aliquæ inter MStæ Bibliothecæ Hamburgensis (2). . . . Several literary consultations and decisions are found here; & for many of the disputes which then employed the learned, are mentioned in these letters. They are written to the famous men of that age, Scaliger, Meursius, Heinsius, Gruterus, Scriverius, and several others, with whom he could only correspond upon learned subjects. Many of his letters remain unpublished in the hands of the famous Gudius, and some of them lie concealed amongst the manuscripts of the Hamburg library.'

(2) Morhofius, Polyhist. lib. i, cap. xxvii, pag. 304. He says that edition was published at Hamburg, in 1608. But how can this be reconciled with what Mr Witte says, ubi supra, pag. 82, that Elmenhorst published that Synagma, in the year 1618.

(3) Illustri Baronum stirpe oriundus. Id. ibid. cap. i, pag. 7.

[C] Being born a Protestant he embraced the Romish religion in Italy. Nicholas Wouwer, his father, a person descended from an ancient and noble family (3), left his country on account of the persecution of the Protestants there, and settled at Hamburg: a manifest proof that the person who is the subject of this article was born a Protestant. Badius's letters inform us that he changed his religion. 'Illud pro certo habetur, cum Romæ publicitus religionem abjurasse, nullo metu qui in virum constantem cadere possit, sed contemptu & inficitia pietatis, vel quod his potentius est apud mentes præcipiti ambitione afflatus spe consequendæ alicujus opimæ largitionis. Sed, ut audio, eluca elapsa est, solum hamum retinuit (4). . . . It is believed, for certain, that he publicly abjured his religion at Rome, not from any motive of fear that could work upon a resolute man, but from a contempt and ignorance of piety, or (which has still a greater influence upon minds that are hurried away by ambition) from the hopes of obtaining some large reward. But, as far as I hear, the bait slipped off and he retained nothing but the book.' In the second tome of the *Fasciculus Reuerum expensarum & sugiendarum* (5), there is a letter from one Francis Broccard (6), in which our John Wouwer (7) is ranked amongst the learned men who having apostatized, favoured the designs of the Inquisition at Rome. But read the letter which he wrote to Badius, and you will there find him denying this abjuration of his religion; and only owning that he disliked several things in the Reformation of Luther and Calvin. 'Non ego profecto eos, qui religionem reformatam susceperunt, multa, quæ fortasse disuadenda erant, pio sed improvido zelo tota rescidisse, hoc me serio improbare aperte fateor: neque illa sententia heri aut hodie mihi nata, sed ex illo tempore quo aliquem veri gustum sensus communis mihi suggessit, hoc si omnes in me improbant, ne irascor quidem. Mihi vero ita sentire liberum erit, & ostendere suam cuique sponfam esse pulchram (8). . . . I do not, indeed, deny, that those who undertook the Reformation of religion, did, with a pious but unwary zeal, cut off at once many things which, perhaps, it would have been much better to have unript by degrees. This, I freely own, was a method which I seriously disapproved of: neither did I conceive this opinion to day or yesterday, but ever since common sense taught me to have the least relish for truth. If all the world should censure me for this, it will not offend me. But I shall still be at liberty to think so, and to show that every one reckons his own bride the handsomest.'

(4) Badius, Epist. lib. ix, centur. i, pag. m. 701. It is dated the 18th of February 1603.

(5) Page 875.

(6) See concerning this man, the History of the Edit of Nantes, Tom. i, pag. 374: & seq.

(7) He is there called wrong Johannes Amburgensis.

(8) Joh. Wouwer, Epistola ad Badius, pag. 110. It is the laud of the first century of Badius's letters.

[D] He is ranked amongst the Plagiaries. The learned Mauffac, after having told us that since Casaubon could

not finish his book of the studies of the Antients, he would one day treat of that subject himself if he had leisure, adds that Wouwer interfered with Casaubon, without publishing any thing but what he had taken from that Critic. It is supposed that Wouwer appropriated this rich treasure to himself when he was at Montpellier with Casaubon. *De Isaac Casaubono loquor, in cujus messum falcem iniecit Joannes Wouwer vir certe ingenii non vulgaris, sed qui opus imperitum reliquit, quamvis omne quod edidit à Casaubono habuerit, dum una cum eo agebat Montpelii* (9). The book out of which I cite these words was printed at Toulouse, in the year 1615; that of Wouwer which Mauffac means, is intitled, *de Polymathia Tractatio*, and was printed in 1603 (10). Several reports, to the disadvantage of Wouwer, had been spread about before Mauffac published this accusation. Wouwer protested his innocence, in a letter which he wrote in the year 1605 (11). And Badius, to whom it was addressed, wrote to him in answer, that those rumors were vanished, and that he ought not to ascribe their rise to Casaubon. *Refrixit jam sermo levisimorum hominum, qui Polymathiam tuam Plagii suspitione infamabant. Casaubonus vir melior & candidior est, quam ut hujus culpæ insimulandus esse videatur* (12). He sent him besides a fragment of a letter of Casaubon, by which it appears, that without ever complaining of any theft, that learned Critic very much commended Wouwer's book. See also what Badius wrote to the brothers Puteani the same year (13); but above all see Thomaeus's Preface to the new edition of the treatise of *Polymathia*, which strenuously refutes Mr Mauffac. Mr Morhof mentions this particular, and cites Schoockius, who says that this reproach of Mauffac proceeded from envy, and that Vossius was guilty of stealing from Wouwer. *Ex invidiâ profectum hoc Mauffaci judicium Martinus Schoockius Confutatione Fab. Hamel. p. 2. c. 4. eximat. Ex ipso autem Wouwerio multa cepisse, suppresso ejus nomine, Vossium etiam Schoockius loco laudato, & Joannes Jonsson, lib. 1. descript. Hist. Phil. c. 10. p. 49. testatur* (14). Scaliger affirmed the same thing in conversation which Mauffac did in print (15). He generally called Wouwer a great Plagiary, and retailer of trash. Notwithstanding this he highly compliments him in his letters (16).

Lindenbroch was enraged against him. He accuses him of a thousand plagiarisms, particularly in his little book *de Umbra* (17). He tells us, that Wouwer finding that tract among Guelielmii's papers, only altered the form of it, and interwove some Latin verses which were made by another hand. 'Lindenbrogium nescio quomodo is semper infensum habuit: super sunt enim Lindenbrogii tum in Bibliothecâ Hamburgensi, tum in Gudianâ, Epistolæ, quibus illi acerbè insultat. Vocat illum hominem cum latrante nomine (à baubando). Multa in illo plagia notat, ac in aliquâ epistolâ hæc de illo habet, ejus de Umbra Tractatum inter plagia recensens: *Quem novissimè edidit librum tenebrosissimum umbratilis ille, inter doctissimi optimique viri Jani Guelielmi schedas repertum ajunt: in quo id tamen præstitit, quod aliam illi vestem induit, & suo more turpavit. Nam & carmina, quæ passim intermixta, non adulteri hujus fuerunt, sed Schoole Schlefwicensis Rectoris, viri eruditissimi & probi, qui etiam nunc vivit, & id aperte fateatur. Epistola hæc scripta est Hamburgi an. 1613. Gravis hæc in illum virum injuria est, & nescio quid acerbatis sapit. In aliis epistolis passim in eum invehitur, ac plura ejus plagia notat* (18). . . . Lindenbroch was, I know not for what reason, always an enemy to Wouwer: for there are extant, both in the library of Hamburg, and that of Gudius, some letters written by Lindenbroch, in which he bitterly insults him. He calls him the man with the barking name (Wouwer). He takes notice of many of his plagiarisms, and in one of his letters writes thus of him, reckoning his book *de Umbra* among plagiarist pieces. It is reported that the book *de Tenebris*, which that cloudy author has lately published, was found among the papers of the learned

(9) Philippus Jacobus Mauffacus, Notis in Plutarchum de Fluvio, p. 149.

(10) The edition I make use of is of that year, ex Bibliopolo Frobeniano. Thomaeus de Plagio Literario, p. 261, mentions only that of Hamburg 1604.

(11) The with of the second century of Badius's Letters, in the Leyden edition, 1650.

(12) Badius, Epist. ix, Centur. ii, pag. 165.

(13) Monui vos jampridem diffipatum fuisse rumorem de Wouwerio nostro quasi plagio domestico sublegerit potissimum partem sum Polymathie. Badius, Epist. iii, Cent. ii, pag. 155.

(14) Morhofius, Polyh. lib. i, cap. i, pag. 7.

(15) See the Scaligeriana, at the word Wouwerius.

(16) See Scaliger's Letters, particularly that which I have mentioned above, citation (1), of the article ELMENHORST.

(17) It is intitled *Dies æstiva*, five de Umbra Paegnon. It was printed in 1610. My edition is that of Oxford 1636, in 12mo.

(18) Morhof. ubi supra, cap. xxix, p. 304.

write a panegyric on him, after his death [E]. The letters which Baudius wrote to him, are an instance of the little sincerity to be met with in the compliments usually made to authors [F]. Some writers confound our John Wouwer with another

ed and excellent Janus Gulielmus; and that the pretended author did no more than alter the form of it, and spoil it after his own fashion. The verses, which are interperfed in it every where, are not the compofure of this Plagiary, but of the rector of the fchool of Slefwic, a man of learning and probity, who is ftill living, and publickly owns them. This letter is dated at Hamburg, in the year 1613: It is highly injurious to him, and betrays very much rancour againft him. In the reft of his letters, he every where inveighs againft him, and points out many of his plagiarifms.

[E] He was too fond of flattery, as appears by his . . . legacy, &c. . . .] This testamentary promise took effect; for in hopes of the promised fun feveral Panegyriſts ſtarted up, who extolled Wouwer above the ſkies. But if we had his life written by Lindenbroch, we ſhould find a great many particulars different from their relations. Felicior & alius Eruditus, & ipſo Principe ſuo, Johan. Adolpho, nullos, uti ſupra

† P. I. c. 13.
§. 3. pag. 198,
199.

‡ Promiſſe tam
A. 1613. in
Epiſt. quadam
Mſta, cujus
Autographum
Gudius & μα-
κρίτως affer-
bat. Conf. Mor-
hofii, Polybiſt.
lib. i, cap. xxiv,
pag. 304.

(19) Joh. Mol-
lerus, ſagace ad
Hiſtoriam Cher-
ſoneſi Cimbrica,
Part. ii, pag.
209, 210.

(20) Satis alias
arrogans & πα-
ρις δόξης.
Id. ibid. Part. i,
pag. 188.

(21) Wouwer,
in a letter of a
later date writ-
ten to Baudius
affirms the truth
of it: Me Con-
ſiliarium Cæſaris
electum vera ſa-
ma fuit. See
Baudius's Let-
ters, num. lxxviii
Cep. i.

(22) Baudius,
Epiſt. lxxv, Cent.
i, pag. m. 100,
101, this letter is
dated on the 18th
of February 1603.

monuimus, Encomiaſtas Poſthumos naſto, fuit Job. Wouwerius, Miniſter Aulae Gottorp. Primarius. Biographias enim, & Sermones Panegyricos, memoriz illius ſacros, publicarunt Gev. Elmenhorſtius, Ad. Olearius, Nic. Johann. Cruſius, alique complures, ſpe potius Nummi doſi (Præmii ſc. LX. Joachimi-
corum, quod cuilibet, Laudationem ſibi poſthumam ſcripturo, in Tabulis ultimæ Voluntatis Wouwerius deſtinavit,) ipſis affugente invitati, quam ſincero in virum Virtutibus pariter atque Vitiis magnum ducti affectu. Alio haud dubie ſine, ut Animo ſc. ſuo, in Wouwerium ob ſtudiorum Emulationem iniquiori, morem gereret, Vitæ illius Hiſtoriam † ſcribere in Animo habuit Frid. Lindebrogius, Civis ipſius, quo rigidiorum Vitiis ejus Cenſorem hæctenus obſervavi neminem (19). Job Wouwer, prime Miniſter of the Court of Gottorp, was more fortunate than other learned men, and even than his own Prince Jobn Adolphus who, as we ſaid before, had no encomiums written upon him after his death. But to Wouwer's memory, deſcriptions of his life, and Panegyric diſcourſes were dedicated and publiſhed by Elmenhorſt, Olearius, Cruſius, and ſeveral others. Theſe authors were rather prevailed upon by the bewitching temptation of money, (for Wouwer in his laſt will, had ordered a reward of ſixty Joachims to any one that ſhould write an encomium upon him after his death) than moved with a ſincere regard to the man himſelf, who was equally remarkable for his virtues and vices. Lindenbroch, his countryman, and the moſt rigid cenſor of his vices that I have ſeen, intended to write his life. But certainly it was with a quite different view, viz. that he might gratify his own humour, for he was ſomewhat prejudiced againſt Wouwer on account of a mutual emulation in their ſtudies. The author from whom I have borrowed theſe words, obſerves elſewhere that Wouwer was a little vain, and frequently talked of himſelf (20). Baudius alſo obſerved a great pre-
ſumption in him. Read the following lines: 'De Wouwerio eadem ad nos fama pervenit, eum id ætatis hominem admiratione doctrinæ (vide & ride ludibria judiciorum) coopertum in collegium Sena-
torum ſacræ Cæſaræ Majeltatis, ſed certiffimo argumeto perſuadeor rem ita ſe non habere (21), quod cum à reditu ſuo bis terve ſcripſerit ad Scaligerum, ad Scrivarium, ad Francicum Douſam etiam, cum perhonorifica noſtri mentione, tamen ubique miſerabiliter inſectator fortunæ ſuæ malignitatem, nec homo ſui oſtentator magnificus, quidquam de ſuperbo illo titulo adjicit, quem proculdubio non fuit omiſſurus, niſi prout ab ingenio deſicere vellet. Detepuit jam mucro iracundiæ noſtræ adverſus eum, quod ex pluribus indicis apparet eum non tam nocendi animo, quam ſui extollendi vanitate ſolium detrudere famæ & meritis laudibus amicorum. Dempto certe hoc vicio, multa habet ingenii naturæque dona, quibus ſupra vulgus ſapit, & illuſtrium virorum amicitiam meretur (22). The ſame report concerning Wouwer reached me, viz. that on account of his being ſo much admired for his learning, (behold, and laugh at the ridiculous judgments of men) he was at ſuch an age, made one of his Im-

perial Majeſty's Counſellers. But I have a very certain proof for believing, that it was not ſo: for whereas after his return he wrote two or three letters to Scaliger, Scrivarius, and Francis Douſa, in which he makes very honourable mention of me, he does at the ſame time moſt piteouſly complain of his own ill fortune, and takes no notice at all of that proud title, which certainly a man of his vanity and oſtentation would never have omitted, unleſs you can ſuppoſe that he acted in a manner that was quite contrary to his natural diſpoſition. Nevertheleſs the edge of my reſentment is taken off, ſince I have found by ſeveral manifeſt proofs, that in detracting from the reputation of his friends and from their due praifes he is not ſo much influenced by the deſire of hurting them as by the vanity of extolling himſelf. Setting that vice aſide, we muſt own he has many qualities and endowments which ſet him above the vulgar, and give him a title to the friendſhip of great and learned men.'

[F] Of the little ſincerity to be met with in the compliments uſually made to authors.] Wouwer publiſhed a panegyric on Chriſtian IV King of Denmark in the year 1603. Baudius writing to the author loads him with praifes, but in a letter to another he ſpeaks of this work as of a performance full of faults. What follows will prove the truth of theſe two particulars: In Dominici Baudii ἀλλοπροσαλλῶς Epiſtola ad Wouwerium ‡ haud parum obſerves ἐλαττωσεως. Illic † enim non tantum Generoſi Wouwerii impetus, & ardua felicitis Ingenii tentamenta, laudem apud De-
os, Amorem apud Homines, admirationem apud peritos Rerum æſtimatores, cenſet mereri, ſed Ironice etiam eundem laudat, quod, videretur & Eræſtarum mentium exemplo, Eloquentiam ſuam in Panegyrico Præceptuſculis Maſteſtrum non circumſcribat, ſed, Artium repagula ſidenter per-
rumpens, libero curſu ſeratur. In Epiſtola contra ad Corn. Mylium * Scaligero ἐμύνησθαι, majori, quam ille, ἀεὶ ῥαία, quid in Oratione hac deſideret, ſignificat: Affectavit Wouwerius, in Panegyrico ſublime & ſtordidum ſimul genus dicendi. Laudandus ob generoſum conatum, eſt interdum languenti, & pellucet nimis Emulatio Antiquorum. Multa ſunt, quæ non Ignaro Leſtori placere poſſunt. Si curram interdum non bene moderatur, magnis tamen exitit auſis. Generoſiores Animi, dum vitant humum, ſepe nubes & inania captant. Etas & poſteræ cura, limabunt, & depaſcent luxuriam agnata melioribus Ingeniis (23). Dominic Baudius, in his letter to Wouwer, does not uſe the ſame freedom of ſpeech; for there he not only allows that Wouwer's noble flights, and the courageous attempts of his happy genius ſerves the praife of the learned, the eſteem of honeſt men, and the admiration of the judicious, but he likewiſe ironically commends him, for that after the example of lively and daring minds he ſcorns to circumscribe his eloquence in panegyrics by the narrow rules of little maſters, but boldly breaking through the barriers of art roams at large. On the contrary, in his letter to Cornelius Mylius, he is of the ſame opinion with Scaliger, and, with more freedom than he, declares what he thinks faulty in that oration. Wouwer, ſays he, in his panegyric, affected both the ſublime and the ſtordid ſtile. He is to be commended for his noble attempt, tho' ſometimes he flags, and diſcovers an affected imitation of the Antients. There are many things in it which may pleaſe an attentive reader. If ſometimes he does not govern his chariot well, it muſt nevertheleſs be owned that he fails in a bold undertaking. Generous minds, while they avoid being low and mean, are often loſt in the clouds, and run into bombast. But age and new application will poliſh and correct the luxuriance that is peculiar to the beſt genius's. Wouwer himſelf knew the defects of his performance, and made a great many excuſes on account of the hurry he wrote it in, and deſired that the world would not judge of his ability by this eſſay. Obſerve, that this panegyric was compoſed on occaſion of the homage which the city of Hamburg paid to his Daniſh Majeſty; but as ſomething had eſcaped the author's pen which might redound to the prejudice of the liberties

† Cent. iii. Ep.
‡ ib. pag. 490.

* Cent. i. a. 66.
† Cent. iii. Ep.
‡ ib. pag. 490.

(23) Joh. Mol-
lerus, ubi ſupra,
Part. i, pag.
187, 188. His
addition of Baudius's Letters,
does not agree with mine.

another of the same name, who studied under Lipsius, of whom I shall speak in one of the remarks [G].

of that city. The Senate prohibited the sale of it, till the first pages were corrected (24).
[G] Some writers confound our John Wouwer with another of the same name . . . of whom I shall speak in a remark.] This other JOHN WOUWER (25) was

(24) See Mollerus, ubi supra.
(25) Or rather Vanden Wouwere, according to Valerius Andreas, Bibl. Belg. pag. 587.

born in the year 1576, at Antwerp, where he began his studies under the Jesuits, and afterwards went to Louvain, and lived with Lipsius, who had such an affection and high esteem for him, that he appointed him one of the executors of his last will, and recommended the care of his manuscripts to him alone. This Wouwer having spent three years in travelling into France, Spain; and Italy, was no sooner returned but he was promoted to the dignity of a Counsellor in his own country, and afterwards became a member of the Council of Finances and the Council of War. The Infanta Isabella Clara Eugenia deputed him to Philip IV, King of Spain, who dignified him with the honour of knighthood. He published some books, and died on the twenty-third of September 1635. The world expected from him the publication of two hundred letters, written to Lipsius (26). Father Schottus confounds this Wouwer with that of Hamburg, as Mr Morhof observes.

(26) Taken from Valerius Andreas, ubi supra.

(27) Morhof, ubi supra, pag. 7. See also Colomies cap. II, Καταγὰ Λίαν.

(28) It is the wife, of the first century ad Belgæ.

'Duo monenda nobis sunt, scilicet (27), in quibus erratum à viris doctis est. Primum est, quod duo confundantur ejus nominis, Antwerpianus & Hamburgensis Polymathie Autor. Andreas Schottus hunc Belgam facit in notis ad Proverbia Græca p. 68. sed falso. Lipsius in Epistolâ 8 Kal. Novembr. 1599. ad Antwerpianum illum scriptâ (28), utrumque probè distinguit: Janus Wouwerinus, inquit, cogn-

'minis tuus, si non Gentilis, quam bona tecum fæderatio! Optimum par, nec vel Dii dederint magis ex usu aut voto. Modestiam & probitatem in eo adolescente semper amavi, & ut vidi primum (Hamburgi id fuit, ante annos novem) unâ laudatum illam indolem ivi. Vivat, crescat, & lampada à nobis in hoc cursu jam stipsis accipiat: me libenter & judicia tradente. . . . We are to observe two things here, concerning which learned men have been in a mistake. The first is, that two of the same name are confounded, viz. the Wouwer of Antwerp, and the Wouwer of Hamburg, who was the author of the Polymathia. Andrew Scotus calls the latter Dutchman, in his notes on the Greek proverbs, but he is wrong. Lipsius, in his letter to the Wouwer of Antwerp, dated the 25th of October 1599, distinguishes them very well. Your namesake, John Wouwer, says he, if he is not your countryman, yet how well may he be confederated with you! An excellent couple, than which it is impossible to wish for a better or more useful. For my own part, I was always in love with the modesty and virtue of that young man, and the first time that I saw him, (which was at Hamburg nine years ago) I could not help launching forth in praise of his genius. Let him live and prosper, and take our places, and relieve us who are already worn out in this career. As for me, I surrender very willingly.' König (29) is guilty of the same mistake, for when he is speaking of our Wouwer, he cites Swertius (30), who mentions only the other. Mr Mollerus hath collected several mistakes on this head (31).

(29) König, Bibl. vet. & novæ, pag. 875.

(30) Page, 487, and the book he means, is Athenæ Belgicæ.

(31) Johannes Mollerus de Scriptoris Homonymis, pag. 733, & seq.



XENOCRATES,

X.



XENOCRATES, one of the most illustrious Philosophers of Antient Greece, was born at Chalcedon (a), and very early placed himself under the direction of Plato, to whom he always gave great proofs of his respect and fidelity [A]. He studied under this great master, at the same time with Aristotle, but was not endowed with the same parts; he wanted a spur, and the other a bridle (b). This was Plato's judgment of them, who farther added, that in setting them together he matched a horse with an ass (c). But his slow capacity rendered him far inferior to Aristotle (d), he very much surpassed him in Practical Philosophy: the purity of his manners had in it something extraordinary; his gravity, severity, or rather austerity, were of such a nature, that a Divine who at present should resemble him would infallibly pass for a Jansenist or a Rigidist. He had acquired such an absolute command of his passions, that a most beautiful courtesan, who laid that she would subdue his virtue, lost her wager [B], though she had the liberty to lie by him, which afforded her an opportunity of using all her artifices to allure him to enjoy her. This is a triumph as remarkable as that of St Aldhelme (e), and some other canonized Saints who have escaped untainted from the like temptations, as we are told. Chastity was not the sole virtue of this Philosopher; all the other parts of temperance shone in his conduct [C]. He

(a) Diog. Laërt. lib. iv, num. vi.

(b) Compare with this, what is said above, in the remark [B], of the article THEOPOMPUS.

(c) Ex Diog. Laërt. ubi supra.

(d) Id. ibid.

(e) See, above, the remark [C], of the article FRANCIS of Assise.

[A] He always gave great proofs of his respect and fidelity to Plato. He accompanied him in his voyage to Sicily, and was with him at the court of Syracuse.

(1) Diog. Laërt. lib. iv, num. 6.

(2) Id. ibid. num. 11.

(3) See Kuhn's Notes, in Diog. Laërt. ad lib. iv, num. 11.

(4) In the remark [E], of the article ARISTOTLE.

(5) Ælian. Var. Histor. lib. xiv, cap. ix.

(6) See Plutarch, in Vita Marii, iust. pag. 407.

(7) Valer. Maximus, lib. iv, cap. i, num. 2, in Est. pag. m. 351.

(8) Id. ibid.

(9) In the remark [R], of the article LAÏC.

(1) Dionysius, the tyrant, one day in discourse with Plato, telling him, *some body will cut off your head*; no man shall do it, replied Xenocrates, before he hath cut off mine (2). Observe that the tyrant's expression imported the same thing, as if he had said, *I will cut off your head* (3): which gives a greater idea of the generosity of Xenocrates. We have seen above (4), what is reported of his zeal for Plato's honour, when he was injuriously treated by Aristotle. I add, that he very patiently bore Plato's reprimands; and when he was excited to defend himself, he made no other answer than this, *he treats me so for my advantage*. *Ξενοκράτης* (5) ὁ Χαλκηδόνι ἐπὶ τῷ Πλάτῳ. εἰς τὸ ἀχαι (6) σκαπτομένῳ, ἐδ' ἔπαυσε καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ Πλάτῳ, ὅτι καὶ πᾶσι ἐμφορῶν καὶ αἰσιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀνδρα, ἔφατο· ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐμοὶ συμφέρει. *Xenocrates Chalcedoni, quum à Platone propter mores inurbanos reprehenderetur, nunquam indignatione iracunde commotus est: sed & illi, qui ipsum ad respondendum Platoni instigaret, Hoc, inquit, mihi bonum atque commodum est: & prudentissime homini silentium imposuit.* But instead of this we are told the quite contrary by a Latin writer: where we find, 1. That Plato was told that Xenocrates had spoken ill of him. 2. That Plato would not believe it. 3. That the informer, with an audacious air, asked why he did not believe it? 4. That Plato answered, it is not to be believed that a person, whom I love so well, should not love me also. 5. That the informer offered to swear it. 6. That Plato would not suffer it to go so far, but ended the dispute by the following words; *Xenocrates would never have said that, had he not believed that it was for my advantage* (7). *Postremo cum ad iurandum inimicitias ferentis malignitas confugisset; ne de perjurio ejus disputaret, asseruit nunquam Xenocratem illa dicturum fuisse, nisi ea dici expedire sibi judicasset* (8). This story in Valerius Maximus seems to me to be but that which we find in Ælian, maimed and reversed, and it confirms the text of this remark.

[B] A most beautiful courtesan, who laid that she would subdue his virtue, lost her wager. I mention this elsewhere (9); but I add here what Valerius Maximus saith: 'Phryne nobile Athenis scortum juxta eum (Xenocratem) vino gravem in pervigilio accubuit, pignore cum quibusdam juvenibus posito, an temperantiam ejus corrumpere posset: Quam nec

taetu, nec sermone aspernatus, quoad voluerat in sinu suo morari, irritam propositi dimisit. Factum sapientia imbuti animi abstinentis; sed meretriculæ quoque dictum perquam facetum, Deridentibus enim se adolescentibus, quia tam formosa, tamque elegans poti senis animum illecebris pellicere non potuisset, pactumque victoriæ pretium flagitantibus: de homine se cum iis, non de statua pignus posuisse, respondit. Potestne hæc Xenocratis continentia à quoquam magis vere, magisque proprie demonstrari, quam ab ipsa meretricula expressa est? Phryne pulchritudine sua, nulla ex parte constantissimam ejus abstinentiam labefecit (10). - - Phryne, a famous courtesan at Athens, lay down by Xenocrates in a night. lib. iv, cap. 2, in Est. num. 3. 351. 376. laid a wager with some young men that she would de- bauch him. He declined not her caresses, and suffered her to embrace him as long as she pleased; but he disappointed her expectation. As this was a proof of his abstinence and wisdom, so what the courtesan said upon it was very witty; for when the young men laughed at her, because with all her beauty and charms she had not been able to raise the passion of an old man warmed with wine, and desired her to pay her bet, she answered, that she had laid a wager about a man, and not about a statue. Could any thing more truly and properly describe the continence of Xenocrates than this expression of the courtesan. Phryne, beautiful as she was, could not make the least impression upon his constant chastity. You see this author supposes several particulars which raise the glory of the victory: it was entire tho' all the circumstances favoured the enemy. He will have it that the courtesan took hold of an opportunity when Xenocrates had drank plentifully; and adds, that the Philosopher did not refuse the caresses of her hands and voice, and that Phryne had leave to stay with him as long as she pleased.

[C] All the other parts of temperance shone in his conduct. His having drank plentifully when Phryne tempted him may be objected against this. They may likewise object against it the story of Athenæus, who relates that Xenocrates won the crown of gold, which the Syracusan tyrant promised to the person that should first drink off a certain measure of wine (11). It will be said that a man, who gets the prize appointed for the greatest drinker in the court of a drunken Prince, is not sober. But Xenocrates carried off this prize; therefore he was not sober. Consider this expression of Diogenes Laërtius: *Χρυσὸν στεφάνη τιμήν· 347/α ἐπ' ἀθλοῦ πολυποσίας, Corona aurea donatum in PRÆMIUM LARGIORIS COMPUTATIONIS* (12). Remember

He loved neither pleasures, riches, nor praises (*f*). He never could be corrupted by presents [*D*], and he acquired such a great reputation with regard to sincerity and probity, that he was the sole person whom the magistrates of Athens exempted from confirming

(f) Diog. Laërt. ubi supra, num. 11.

Remember also that Ælian inserts Xenocrates in that chapter, where he gives us a catalogue of those who loved drinking, and could drink a great deal (13). The first in this list is the Syracusan tyrant, who promised a golden crown to him who could drink most, and Xenocrates won the prize. Πρέκειο δὲ ἄλλον τῶ πρῶτον πάλιν σέβαν χρυσῆς καὶ ἐνίκησε Ξενοκράτης ὁ Χαλκεδόνιος; *Premium ordinatum est ei, qui plus bibisset, aurea corona, quam meritis est Xenocrates Chalcedonius* (14). Thus you have the objection fortified with all necessary proofs. It would be in vain to answer that Xenocrates was admired on this occasion (15), for the Historian who saith so adds another particular, which is really laudable, I mean, that the victor did not keep this golden crown, but placed it on a statue of Mercury, as he was going home. He used, on other days, to crown that statue with flowers, but that evening he fixed on it a golden crown: This was a proof of a disinterested mind; this was shewing that for the honour of the gods he could as easily part with what was most precious as with a nosegay. If the objectors should be so opinionative as to affirm that Athenæus's meaning is, that Xenocrates was admired both on this account, and because he drank more than the rest, they would be but small gainers: for every thing that is admired is not a good moral quality: several things are admired by reason of their singularity, and upon this foot a Philosopher might be admired for carrying off the prize from all the drinkers of Syracuse. He should have been vanquished; he ought to have avoided such an engagement; and if he had been temperate he had never entered these lists. Let us then see whether we can think of any other way of justification.

It must be owned that some very sober people, may be of such a constitution as to drink a great deal without losing their reason. Socrates, whose sobriety and austerity of life are incontestable, did not love drinking, and yet when he was forced to it by company, no body could hold out against him; and what was admirable in him, was, that he never was indisposed on these occasions, and that there was no difference between Socrates fasting, and Socrates at his departure from a feast and merry-making (16). If such a man on some extraordinary occasion as that festival, which was celebrated at Syracuse, when Dionysius the tyrant promised the golden crown to the drinker, makes a trial of his strength, and wins the prize, it ought not to be concluded from thence that he is intemperate. He does not thereby lose the character of a sober man: this virtue ought to be considered in the same manner with other habitual qualities. They constitute a character which is not lost by any single act of the opposite quality. Mr Daillé made this remark when he was charged with calling Mr Cottibay an extravagant visionary. 'Sometimes the want of attention, replied he (17), and frequently an excess of passion, starts a foolish or extravagant notion in the mind of a wise man. But you do not therefore call him a fool. If you believe Horace, the excellent Homer nods sometimes. Will you from thence accuse Horace of railing at that incomparable author, whom he elsewhere so highly esteems and admires? Will you say that he calls him a *stupid, dull, and stupid Poet*? No. For these names, as well as those of *detractor*, and *visionary* are only bestowed on such as are habituated to these vices, and not on those from whom such actions barely escape, and that very seldom, either through human weakness, or by the force of some extraordinary cause: *One swallow does not make the spring*, as the Philosopher hath it on a like occasion.' This is sufficient to justify what I have affirmed concerning Xenocrates.

I shall say by the bye, that two very learned Critics (18) are of opinion, that he was not at Syracuse when he carried this prize, and even was at Athens when he won it. I own, indeed, that their opinion is probable, tho' to me it seems less so, than that which I have followed. It is undeniable that Xenocrates was at the court of Dionysius, and that he was then very young. Is it not therefore more likely that he should indulge himself to drink on that occasion, than in the

city where he stood upon the foot of a thorough austere Philosopher?

What more authentic proof can we have of his great sobriety than the proverb of the Antients, *Xenocrates's chesfe*, which they made use of to express that a thing lasted a long time? The author of this particular (19) adds, 1. That when he had pierced a cask, it was so long before it was empty that the wine quite lost its virtue. 2. That Xenocrates several times threw away his provisions by reason they grew rusty or musty; which would not have happened to a less frugal person.

[*D*] He never could be corrupted by presents.] The Macedonian court used these means to corrupt a great many persons in the neighbouring Republics, and such persons who refused their presents did thereby sufficiently declare that they never intended to take any measures prejudicial to the interest of their country. Xenocrates took this course. He refused King Philip's presents; whence that Prince despairing to gain him, treated him uncivilly, and did not admit him to the conferences which he held with the other Ambassadors of the Republic of Athens, whom he had softened by his generosity, by feasting and cajoling. But Xenocrates continued inflexible, and preserving his integrity inviolable, never appeared at the audience and feasts as his colleagues did. They complained that he did no service in his embassy, for which he was very near being fined: but he discovered the whole secret, and warned the Athenians to have a watchful eye upon the public good, since the other Ambassadors were corrupted by presents. This procured him double honour (20). He would not receive the money which Antipater sent him (21), and when he accepted a small part of the sum which Alexander's Ambassadors brought him, it was only that he might not shew any contempt for that great Monarch. Xenocrates quum

legati ab Alexandro quinquaginta ei talenta attulissent, quæ erat pecunia temporibus illis Athenis præsertim maxima, adduxit legatos ad cœnam in Academiâ. Is apposuit tantum quod satis esset, nullo apparatu. Quum postmodum rogarent eum, cui numerari juberet, quid vos hesternâ inquit cœnula non intellexistis me pecunia non egere? Quos quum tristiores vidisset, xxx minas accepit, ne aspernari regis liberalitatem videretur (22). -- Xenocrates, when Alexander's Ambassadors brought him fifty talents, Tusc. Quæst. lib. v, fol. m. which in those days was a very considerable sum, especially at Athens, carried them to sup with him in the Academy, where he set before them no more than was just sufficient, and that too in the plainest manner. The next day, when they asked him, into whose hands he would order the money to be paid: Could you not see, said he, by last night's supper, that I have no need of money? But upon observing them troubled at this, he accepted of thirty minæ, purely that he might not seem to despise the King's generosity. Observe, in this Latin passage, the consequence he draws from the mean supper with which he treated Alexander's Envoys. Doth not this, said he, give you to understand that I have no need of money? Another Historian tells us (23), that having accepted part of the present, he sent back the rest to Alexander. He hath more need of it than I, said he, for he subsists a greater number of men. This is excellent morality; it points out the true source of avarice, and of the contempt of riches.

Let us observe that Valerius Maximus, who could not be ignorant of what Cicero relates, hath left out a circumstance, which was not convenient for his purpose. He aimed at a jingle of antitheses and parallels: he resolved to connect the triumph over Phryne to that over Alexander's money. Having told us that Xenocrates, in Phryne's judgment, was a statue; he takes it to be very witty to say that this Philosopher was no less a statue, with regard to the charms of gold, than those of a courtesan (24); and to add, that a great Prince would have bought the friendship of a Philosopher, but the Philosopher would not sell it to that great Prince (25). All these witty turns would have been spoiled, if it had been said that Xenocrates took part of the present. Wherefore he suppressed this circumstance.

7 E

Such

(13) Φιλοπότης τινος καὶ πολυπότηται. De qui-busdam qui & libenter & multum bibebant. This is the title of the xlii chapter of the iud book of Ælian.

(14) Ælian. Var. Hist. lib. ii, cap. xii.

(15) Ἐν τῷ αἰναιμῶν. Quamobrem in admiratione summa fuit. Ælian. ubi supra.

(16) Charpentier, Vie de Socrate, pag. m. 100.

(17) Daillé, Replique à Adam, & à Cottibay, Part. iii, ch. iii, pag. m. 157.

* Arist. en ses Mor. à Nicom. lib. i, cap. vii, towards the end.

(18) Kuhnus in Diog. Laërt. lib. iv, num. 8. Perizonius, in Ælian. Var. Hist. lib. ii, cap. xli, but observe that Mr Perizonius is not so positive in this opinion as the author.

(19) Stobæus, de continen. & sobri. Serm. xv, fol. m. 69.

(20) Ex Diog. Laërt. ubi supra. num. 8, 9.

(21) Id. ibid. num. 8.

(22) Cicero, Tuscul. Quæst. lib. v, fol. m. 277, B.

(23) Diog. Laërt. ubi supra, num. 8.

(24) Quid rex Alexander? an divitiis cum quætere potuit? ab illo quoque statum & quietam æque frustra tentatam putes. Valer. Maxim. lib. iv, cap. iii, num. 3, in Ext.

(25) Ita rex philosophi amicitiam emere voluit: Philosophus regi suam vendere noluit. Id. ibid.

XENOCRATES.

570
u/rv -
mer +

(g) Id. ibid.
num. 6.

confirming his evidence with an oath [E]. A discourse, which he made about temperance, so moved the most dissolute debauchee of that time, that he took an immediate resolution to renounce voluptuousness, and apply himself to wisdom [F]. This conversion was steady; for the convert, afterwards, became a very grave Philosopher. This great alteration ought not to be attributed to the charms of eloquence, but rather to the austere gravity of Xenocrates. There was nothing charming, or graceful in his behaviour; but a solid gravity and severity were inseparable from his manners; whence it was that Plato frequently advised him to sacrifice to the Graces (g). This want of politeness set off the glory which he had acquired by his austerity (b). It is not to be wondered that with this dry genius, he should have been so strongly inclined to the Mathematics, that he would not admit any scholars who were ignorant of that science (i). We ought more to admire that with this great character of rigid severity, he

(i) Lez. ibid.
num. 10.

(b) Audivi . . . illum, (Scipionem Nasticam) qui T. Gracchi conatus perditos vindicavit, nullam comitatem habuisse sermonis: ne Xenocratem quidem, severissimum philosophorum, ob eamque rem ipsam & magnum & clarum fuisse. . . . I have heard the same thing of Xenocrates, the severity of all the Philosophers, and that for this very reason he was esteemed great and famous. Cicero, de Officiis, lib. 1, cap. xxx, pag. m. 120, 121.

Such is the exact fidelity of this, and several other writers; they enlarge or curtail facts as they find it convenient, in order to adjust them to their own conceits.

Father Abraham cites a passage of Themistius, where this action of Xenocrates is ascribed to Xenophanes (26). He should have corrected that mistake.
(26) See Abraham's Commentary, in Orat. Ciceron. pro Sextio, p. 181.

[E] He was the sole person whom the magistrates of Athens exempted from . . . an oath. He could not have a greater honour done him than this. Valerius Maximus is very judicious on this head: 'Quantum porro honoris Athenis Xenocrati sapientia pariter ac sanctitate claro tributum est? Qui cum testimonium dicere coactus ad aram accessisset, ut more civitatis juraret, omnia se vere retulisse; universi iudices confurrexerunt, proclamantque ne iurandum diceret: Quodque sibi metipsis postmodum dicendæ sententiæ loco remissuri non erant, sinceritati ejus concedendum existimant (27). . . . How great an honour was done at Athens to Xenocrates, a man equally famous for his wisdom and virtue? Who when he was obliged to give in his evidence, and came up to the altar, in order to confirm what he had said with an oath, as the custom of the city was, all the Judges rose up, and told him not to swear. Thus what they themselves did not desire to be excused from, when afterwards they gave judgment, they dispensed with in him, as thinking it was due to his sincerity.' Cicero mentions this in one of his epistles to Atticus (28).

(27) Valer. Max. lib. ii, cap. ult. in fine, pag. m. 234.

(28) The words, of the first book. See also the same author, in Orat. pro Balbo, pag. 657, where he mentions the thing without naming Xenocrates.

hagn
probr +
convert

[F] A discourse on temperance . . . made one take an immediate resolution to renounce voluptuousness, and apply himself to wisdom. If the sermon of a Capuchin should at this time cause such an alteration, the world would acknowledge it to be a particular operation of the Holy Ghost, and admire the influence of Grace, which, according to the Jansenists, would be self-efficacious to the highest degree; for the person who was prevailed upon by this discourse, to change his course of life, was not an ordinary voluptuous man, but a ring-leader in that kind, who gloried in his debaucheries: his wife also accused him before a court of justice for neglecting her, and brutally debauching with boys; the brought the indictment against him called, Male Tractationis. θυγάτηρ δὲ τὸν Πολέμωνα καὶ δίκην κακώσεως, ὑπὸ τῆς γυναίκος, ὡς μειστεῖος συνέβη. Et in judicium vocatum Polemonem ab uxore nequitie infamatum, quod adolescentibus congrederetur (29). He was not ashamed to shew his excessive drunkenness in the most public place of Athens, being accompanied with a singing-woman, and several players on instruments. He was drunk almost every time that he appeared in the streets (30), and his lewdness was not less than his drunkenness. He went always well provided with money, and even concealed it in several parts of the city, that he might be supplied at all times, and in all places, with sufficient sums for his expenses, in order to gratify his vicious appetite (31). In short, he was the most famous debauchee in Athens. One day when he had drank plentifully, and run, as usual, through the streets with his customary equipage, and leud companions (32), he entred the auditory of Xenocrates, with a design to ridicule him, and to play some insolent tricks. When all the audience took offence at his behaviour, Xenocrates was not in the least discomposed (33), but more vigorously pursued the discourse which he had begun concerning temperance. Some authors say, that he

(29) Diog. Laërt. Ibid. num. 16.

(30) Lucian, in his accusatio, pag. m. 327, 323, Tom. ii.

(31) Diog. Laërt. ubi supra, num. 16.

(32) Origen. ubi infra.

(33) Id. ibid.

was not treating that subject, but leaving that which he was upon, he turned the discourse to this virtue; on which head he spoke so excellently and gravely, that all of a sudden he created an affection for modesty and wisdom in the mind of this hardened sinner (34). Polemo, (for that was the name of this drunkard) from that very moment became a disciple of virtue, and an exact imitator of the gravity of Xenocrates (35), whom he succeeded in his professor's chair. He gave over his drinking wine, and drank nothing but water (36). The Latin description of his conversion, which I shall transcribe here, is pretty enough: 'Perditæ luxuriæ Athenis adolescens Polemo, neque illecebris tantummodo, sed etiam ipsa infamia gaudens; cum è convivio non post occasum solis, sed post ortum surrexisset, domumque repetens, Xenocratis Philosophi patentem Januam vidisset: vino gravis, unguentis delibutus, fertis capite redimito, pellucida veste amictus, resertam turba doctorum hominum scholam ejus intravit: Nec contentus tam deformi introitu, confedit etiam, ut clarissimum eloquium, & prudentissima præcepta temulentia læcivius eluderet. Ortâ deinde, ut par erat, omnium indignatione; Xenocrates vultum in eodem habitu continuit, omnisque de quibus diserebat, de modestia ac temperantia loqui cepit. Cujus gravitate sermonis resipiscere coactus Polemo, primum coronam capite detractam projecit, paulo post brachium intra palium reduxit, procedente tempore oris convivalis hilaritatem depouit; ad ultimum, totam luxuriam exiit, uniusque orationis saluberrima medicina sanatus, ex infami ganeone maximus philosophus evasit. Peregrinatus est hujus animus in nequitia, non habitavit (37). . . . Polemo, a young man at Athens, of a very debauched life, who not only loved pleasures, but also gloried in his wickedness, one day, as he was returning home from a feast, not at night, but in the morning, saw Xenocrates the Philosopher's door open: upon which, drunk as he was, perfumed, having a garland of flowers on his head, and covered with a very thin robe, he entered his school, which was crowded with learned men: and not contented with such an indecent intrusion, he sat down on purpose to ridicule his eloquence, and his most judicious precepts, with the wanton sighs of drunkenness. While all that were present expressed a proper indignation at this, Xenocrates alone did not alter his countenance, but, quitting the subject he was upon, he began to speak of modesty and temperance. The gravity of his discourse was such that it wrought a sudden repentance in Polemo; and first he stripped off the garland from his head, next he pulled back his arm under his gown, and afterwards he laid aside the cheerfulness of his looks; at last he renounced his luxury, and being cured by the wholesome medicine of one discourse, of an infamous rake that he was, he became a very great Philosopher. This man was a sojourner in the territories of vice, not an inhabitant. To this may be added the following lines of Horace.

vmt

(37) Valer. Maximus, lib. vi, cap. 12, num. 1, in Edit. pag. 581, 582.

Faciasne, quod olim Mutatus Polemon? ponas insignia morbi Fasciolas, cubital, focalia: potus ut ille Dicitur ex collo furtim carpsisse coronas, Postquam est impransu correptus voce magistri (38).

(38) Horat. Sat. 111, lib. ii, vers. 233.

. . . . For let me ask thee this,

Can?

compatible

(k) See *Ælian*,
in *lib. xiii.*
Var. *Hist.*
cb. xxxi, which
is intitled,
ὅτι Ξενοκράτης
Φιλοκτιρίζων
ἦν, quod *Xeno-*
crates fuerit mi-
sericors.

(1) *Elian, ibid.*

(m) Plut. de
vitioso pudore,
pag. 533.

(n) Diog. Laërt.
lib. iv, num. 11,
& seq.

(c) Id. *ibid.*
 14.

fee (p) Id. Laërt.
ibid.

CREECH.

to but from
strangers
pain —
publicans

(49) Plut. in
Vita Flamini,
pag. 375, 376.
He relates the
same thing in the
lives of the ten
Orators, p. 342.

2. (1)

(50) Above, in the article TYRANNION, remark [C].

(51) Plut. in
Vita Phocion.
ppp. 755.

(52) In the remark [I.], citation (67).

$$7 + 1 = 8$$

[C] This Philosopher's Theology was very contemptible.] He acknowledged no other gods than the seven planets, and the heaven of the fixed stars. This made eight Deities; each planet being a god, and all the stars together making but one. See how Cicero rejects this doctrine: 'Nec vero ejus (*Aristotelis*) condici- pulus Xenocrates in hoc genere praeuditor est, cojus in libris, qui sunt de natura Deorum, nulla species divina describitur. Deos enim oculo esse dicit: quinque eos, qui in sphaera vagis nominantur.

(139) Plut. de Xenocrates was sufficient to convert Polemo (39).
Discrim. Adul. [G] He thought much, and was seldom seen in the
& Amici, p. 71. streets; and when he appeared there, the debauched youth

(40) Diog. Laert. 10.116 (supra, num. 39). The Greek text reads: *ἔπειτα ἐκείνην ἀποστρέψας τὴν ὄψιν, ὡς ἴσμεν, ἀπέβη*. The French translator (41) hath rendered these Greek words thus: *Hennessy, se tournant vers l'arrière, comme nous le savons, descendit*.

(41) *Francis de*
Feugerolles,
Doctor of Phy-
sic.

(42) *His misfabe* is the same with that of *Oliverris*, in *Valer. Maximus*, ubi supra, where he says, si quando ad urbem profecturus esset turbas omnes tumultuosum ac impudicorum ipsi transfreturo de via decedere solitas, sunt qui tradant (43). That is, according to Mr Foucherols, he spent the greatest part of his life in the Academy, without scarce ever going out; but if by chance he went thence into the city, it is reported that some of the rabble followed him, and disturbed him with

(43) Diog. Laërt. ubi supra, num. 6. Greek author's thought, and robbing Xenocrates of one of the brightest parts of his glory. The debauchees

(44) See, above, citation (8), of the first article FLORA.

(45) See the end of the foregoing remark. I must not forget what Plutarch saith, that Xenocrates did not come out of the Academy but once in

(46) See, the remark [L], citation (6=) to be present at the new tragedies which were acted during the feast of Bacchus.

[1] they sold him . . . *Demetrius Phalereus* bought
 him . . . immediately set him at liberty, and paid the
 debt to the Athenians.] We find all these particulars in
 Diogenes Laërtius (48), and I am surprised that Plu-

(48) Diog. Laërt. tarch doth not mention them, since he speaks of an ad-
ubi supra, *πρωτ.* venture somewhat like this. ' But we are told that Ly-
14. curgus, the Orator, one day seeing the farmers and

+ Plato says it was r. to get drunk on
the festival of Father's Day.

see below. He lived to the age of eighty-four, if we believe Lucian (q). Others say he died in his eighty-second year, having, through inadvertency, hit his forehead against a kettle in the night-time (r). Some authors pretend that he lived one hundred and three years [K]. He had a share in the friendship and esteem of Alexander the Great (s), and

(q) Lucian. in Macrobius, pag. m. 640, Tom. ii, Oper.

(s) See, remark [D].

(r) Diog. Laërt. ubi supra, mem. 14, 15.

planetary
gods

(53) Cicero de
Natura Deorum,
lib. i, cap. xiii.

one
god

A CONFUTATION
of those,
who said that
each planet was a
god.

soul of
star

see
Julian

unum, qui ex omnibus sideribus, quæ infixæ celo sunt, ex dispersis quasi membris simplex sit putandus Deus: septimum solem adjungit, octavumque lunam, qui quo sensu beati esse possint, intelligi non potest (53). - Nor was Xenocrates, Aristotle's disciple, more judicious in this respect: In his books of the nature of the gods, there is no account of a divine species. For he says there are eight gods, five of whom inhabit the planets, and bear their names; and one is composed of all the fixed stars, and is to be reckoned a pure and simple god, tho' made up of so many dispersed members. He adds the sun as the seventh, and the moon as the eighth. In what sense these gods can be happy, it is impossible to understand. This opinion of Xenocrates will be found absurd, not only if examined by the light of Revelation, but, even compared with the light of Nature; for without the assistance of the Bible, we conceive distinctly, that the idea of God is neither that of a species, nor of a genus, and consequently cannot comprehend any thing under it but an individual Being. It is therefore acting against reason, to admit more than one Deity. It is another fault against reason, to acknowledge any gods composed of matter; this necessarily subjects them to imperfection, limits them with regard to place and power, and, in a word, distinguishes them from the most infirm creatures, barely by the difference of more or less. How great was the incoherence of our Philosopher? How unaccountably he argues? He would have the moon a distinct deity from all the rest; he said the same thing of every planet, but not of each of the fixed stars, to which he allowed no other advantage than that of being parts of a Deity. The objection urged against him in the Latin passage which I have cited, is just, tho' perhaps he might have eluded it, by asserting that a planet is a god, in the same manner as Socrates is a reasonable creature. He is not reasonable as composed of flesh and bone, &c. but as possessed of a soul which knows and reasons. The sun, for example, is not a deity, considered as composed of that luminous matter which imparts its rays and heat to the earth; but as the seat of an intelligent power, which moves that vast body. What hinders this power from the enjoyment of pleasure and felicity? This is what he might have answered to the objection; but it is a very ill resolution of the point: for this intelligent power not being numerically the same with that of the other planets, will be fixed and centred in the sun by a natural necessity; and consequently, will depend on the matter of the sun, and follow its state and alterations, like those slaves called *servi glebæ*, or *glebæ ascripti*; - - - slaves who were bought and sold with the land. We cannot conceive any real happiness in such a dependence. The doctrine of the soul of the world is not so repugnant to right reason as this is; it doth not divide the Deity into several individuals really separated from each other.

(54) Plot. de
Idée & Ofride,
pag. 360.

Here is, I think, a contradiction in Xenocrates's doctrine. He took the planets to be gods, he therefore supposed the matter of them to be an essential part of the gods; for it would be absurd to affirm, that Socrates is a man, and that the body of Socrates is not essential to that man. But, on the other side, Xenocrates admitted a distinction betwixt the gods and certain *genii*, which supposes that he did not believe matter to be a part of the substance of the gods. Was this arguing consistently? Let us cite Plutarch, who observes (54), that Pythagoras, Plato, Xenocrates, and Chrysippus, according to the opinions of the ancient Divines, acknowledged that there were some great demons, who were neither gods nor men, and who were stronger and more robust than men, and highly surmounted our nature in power; but had not the pure and unmixed Divinity, but were agents compounded of the corporeal and spiritual nature, capable of pleasure and pain, and of other passions and affections which accompany those mutations, discomposing some more, others less; for there is a diversity in

vice and virtue, amongst demons, as well as amongst men. . . . (55) Plato attributes to the olympic and celestial gods whatever is right and odd; and whatever is left and even, to the demons; and Xenocrates held, that the unfortunate days, and seasons, wherein fighting, striking of the stomach, fasting or any scandalous or base custom obtains, do not appertain to the good gods, or good demons; but that there are in the air some great and mighty beings, but malicious and ill-natured, who find such things done on their account pleasant to them, and when they have obtained them, they cease to do any more evil to the persons. A commentator on Cicero, hath made a note on this opinion of Xenocrates. He saith that the evil angels may be well pleased with the obscene discourses of men, and that if any thing was capable to appease them, it were those discourses; but that fasts, macerations, and flagellations, with which the penitents labour to expiate their faults, infinitely displease those unfortunate *genii*: Longe fallitur Xenocrates, cum miseris illis Geniis mortalium plantis, verberibus, jejuniis, aliisque id genus corporis afflictationibus delectari putat: nihil enim perinde averfantur, atque oderunt, ut voluntaria, et sancta ejusmodi supplicia, quibus debita flagitii exolvitur pena, ac Divina Nemesis placatur. At si quo modo leniri possent hostes crudelissimi, non dubium quin male omniſi obsequiis vocibus, quæ impurissimorum Geniorum pollulas ad aures jucundissimæ semper accidunt, suaverent se mulier (56). I do not know where the French translator of Diogenes Laërtius took the following words: 'Xenocrates . . . compared the nature of triangles with that of intelligences: for, said he, the Divine Nature is like an equilateral triangle, the nature of man like a triangle, whose sides are all unequal; and that of demons, like a triangle, with one side unequal, and the other two equal (57)'. I omit Xenocrates's assertion, that the soul is a self-moving number (58). Several illustrious persons approved of this definition (59); but I cannot tell whether we can any way understand it at this time: for, I believe, the Greeks annexed to the word *ἀριθμός*, an idea which we do not fix to the word *number*; and that from thence may arise the obscurity which we find in this definition of the soul.

Let us observe that the Dominican Doctor who wrote a letter to Father le Comte, concerning the Chinese ceremonies, was not well informed of the doctrine of Xenocrates; for after having spoken of the Philosophers who admitted no more than one GOD, whom they acknowledged to be the principle and author of all things, a spirit diffused throughout, who governed all things. . . . A pure spirit, the love and enjoyment of which rendered man happy; he adds, that 'Xenocrates, Heraclides, and Theophrastus, Aristotle's disciples, had the same sentiments of the Deity (60)'. And yet these are the three Philosophers whom Cicero ranks together (61), when he refutes the erroneous opinions concerning the nature of God. I would fain know why they are all three put together as orthodox in this Doctor's letter. Remember that the two former were not Aristotle's disciples.

[K] . . . pretend that he lived one hundred and three years.] Meursius maintained this opinion. His reasons are these: Xenocrates was born in the first year of XCIII Olympiad. He began to teach in the second year of the CXth Olympiad, and taught twenty-five years; he must therefore have died in the second year of the CXVth Olympiad, at the age of one hundred and two (62). This is Meursius's conclusion in the ninth chapter of the third book of the Athenian Archontes. But in the twelfth chapter of the fourth book, he computes his life at one hundred and three years, and founds his calculation on the same facts. He is in the right to conclude, that Xenocrates died in third year of the CXVth Olympiad, and reckons better than he did before; but betwixt that year and the first of the XCIII Olympiad, he ought to have

(56) Lelacop.
Plus, in Cicero.
de Nat. Deor.
lib. i, pag. 57.
col. 1.

(57) Fougères.
Additions to the
life of Xenocrates.
in Diogenes La-
ërtius, pag. 280.

Note that he
adds, 'he cal-
culated the
number of syl-
lables, which
the Greek let-
ters can make
by their com-
binations and
transpositions,
which amounts
to 100,000,000.

I do not know
where the trans-
lation had real
auth.

(58) Plot. de
procent. Asi-
me, p. 1019.

(59) Id. ibid.

(60) Lettre d'un
Docteur de l'Or-
dre de S. Domi-
nique, sur les Cé-
rimoniaes Chi-
noises, p. 17.
Cologne, 1700.

(61) Cicero, lib.
supra.

(62) Meursius,
de Arch. Athén.
lib. iii, cap. 11.
pag. 113, 114.

(1) Plat. adv. Colot. circa fin. pag. 1156.

at his request wrote a treatise of the art of reigning (1). He was sent Ambassador more than once [L]. It must not be forgotten, that, according to his opinion, the true Philosopher are the only persons who do cheerfully, and of their own accord, what others are moved to do by the fear of the Laws (u), and that casting an eye on one's neighbour's house, is as great a sin as setting foot into it (x). This last thought condemns the coveting of another's goods, and a prying humour. He had a good maxim for the education of children [M]. He is praised for not being discouraged in the course of his studies by the slowness of his capacity [N].

(u) Plat. de Virtute morali, pag. 446.

(x) Plat. de Curiosit. pag. 521. See also Elian. Var. Histor. lib. xiv. cap. xlii.

10th
L. 10th

(63) 'En vñs Παύρος ἡ-
γεμ. A primis
sermo annis Pla-
tonis auditor fuit.
Diogen. Laërt.
lib. vi. num. vi.

(64) See the following re-
mark.

(65) In remark
[D].

* Some verses of
Homer in the
xth book of the
Odyssey.

J. C.

(66) Diogen. Laërt.
ubi supra, num.
9, 10.

found no more than one hundred and two years. Let us come to the main point. I think we ought not to rely, as he hath done, on the authority of the anonymous author, who described the Olympiads, and placed the birth of Xenocrates in the first year of the XC1st Olympiad. I have two reasons for believing that he is mistaken. The first is, that Xenocrates was very young when he became Plato's disciple (63). But Plato being advanced in years when he began to teach, it could not be possible for Xenocrates to enter his school very young, if he was born in the first year of the XC1st Olympiad, for he would not have been above twelve years younger than Plato. In the second place, I observe that he was deputed to Antipater, in the second year of the CXIVth Olympiad (64): at that time he must have been ninety-three years of age, according to the computation of the anonymous author. But it is not easy to imagine, that the authors who mentioned this embassy, should have taken no notice of the extraordinary age of the Ambassador.

[L] He was sent Ambassador more than once. I have already said (65), that he was one of the Ambassadors whom the Republic of Athens sent to King Philip, the father of Alexander the Great. Being also sent on an embassy to Antipater, for the deliverance of the prisoners of war taken at the battle of Lamia, he was by that Prince invited to supper, to whom he answered in the following words:

O Circe *, thy allurements tempt in vain
The man whose virtue prudent thoughts sustain;
For who can come with pleasure to a feast,
Before he see his captive friends releas'd.

Intimating by these words, that he would never eat till he obtained his request, meaning the liberty of his captive citizens and friends. The King perceiving the address of the man, freely condescended to his suit, and immediately set the prisoners free (66). Antipater was not so just in the following juncture. He exacted from the Athenians that they should send him full power to act as he should think fit, and refer the conditions of the treaty of peace to his pleasure. They sent to him Phocion, with other Ambassadors, and amongst the rest Xenocrates the Philosopher, whose reputation for prudence and wisdom was so great and universal, that they said, no man could be so arrogant, so cruel, or passionate, but that the mien and aspect of Xenocrates would soften him, and even inspire him with reverence and respect. Notwithstanding this, such was the malignity of the nature of Antipater, who was an enemy to virtue, that the contrary happened: for at first when he embraced all the rest of his companions, he passed by Xenocrates, not vouchsafing to take any notice of him: upon this occasion Xenocrates said, Antipater may well be ashamed to see me a witness of the ill-usage

he would give the Athenians. Afterwards when he began to speak, Antipater had not patience to hear him, but thwarted and interrupted him on every subject, and at last enjoined him silence: but when Phocion had declared the purport of their embassy, he replied, that he would make a peace and alliance with the Athenians, provided they would deliver up to him Demosthenes and Hyperides, and govern their Republic, according to the antient form of government instituted by their ancestors; according to which, none but people of fortune were admitted in to public employments, &c. All the Ambassadors, except Xenocrates, were content with, and accepted, these conditions as mild and indulgent, but Xenocrates said, that if the Athenians were slaves, Antipater treated them mildly enough; but if a free people he treated them too harshly (67).

Some will think, perhaps, that Antipater used Xenocrates so roughly, in order to revenge the incivility with which this Philosopher had received him. We are told (68), that going to Athens he made a visit to Xenocrates, who would not vouchsafe to interrupt his lecture, and made him no answer before he had finished it. But as every body knew that this Philosopher affected not to appear a courtier, and that the esteem which the world had for him was founded on his Philosophical gravity, it is not at all probable that Antipater should have taken it amiss that he was received in such a manner.

[M] He had a good maxim for the education of children. He was of opinion, that children rather ought to have a defence fitted to their ears, than fencers, or prize-fighters; because the ears only of the latter suffered by the blows, but the morals of the former were hurt and corrupted by words. Not that he thereby recommended deafness, or forbade that they should be suffered to hear at all; but he advised them not to listen to wicked discourse, that debauchery might be kept out, till better principles (like so many guardians appointed by Philosophy) had taken charge of that part, which is so liable to be drawn aside and corrupted by discourse (69). Plutarch greatly approves of this advice (70).

[N] He is praised for not being discouraged in the course of his studies by the slowness of his capacity. Plutarch made use of this example to encourage those of slow parts. Let us bear with patience the jests of those who are, or who fancy they are, more lively and quick of apprehension than we. This course was taken by Cleanthes and Xenocrates, who being somewhat duller than their school-fellows, did not however give over learning nor despond; but prevented the jests of others, by comparing themselves to narrow-mouthed vessels and copper-plates; because, though they received learning with difficulty, yet they retained it surely (71). One of these two comparisons hath been employed in one of Moliere's Comedies (72).

(67) Plat. in Vita Phocion. pag. 753.

(68) Diogen. Laërt. ubi supra, num. 11.

(69) Plut. de auditione, init. pag. 38.

(70) Compare with this what is above in remark [G], of the article LY-CURGUS.

(71) Plut. de auditione, pag. 47.

(72) See, above, remark [E], of the article E-RASMUS.

Educator

XENOPHANES, a Greek Philosopher, born at Colophon, was a disciple of Archelaus, as some say (a). According to this account, he should have been contemporary with Socrates (b). Others will have it that he learned of himself all that he knew (c), and lived at the same time with Anaximander (d). According to this account, he must have flourished before Socrates, and about the LXth Olympiad, as Diogenes Laërtius affirms (e). He lived very long; for some verses are cited in which he declares, that his studies had been applauded in Greece sixty-seven years: 2. That he began to meet with applause at the age of twenty-five (f) [A]. He wrote several poems on Philosophical

(a) Diogen. Laërtius, lib. ix, num. 18.

(b) He was a disciple of Archelaus.

(c) Diogen. Laërtius, ubi supra.

(d) Id. ibid.

(e) Id. ibid. num. 20. See remark [A].

(f) Laërtius, ibid. num. 19.

[A] He lived very long; for some verses are cited, &c. It appears by those verses that he was ninety-two years old when he made them; and as we have no reason for believing that he died in a short time

after, we may hence the more certainly know the error of Lucian, who allows him to have lived no longer than ninety-one years (1). Censorinus bestows on him above one hundred years (2). Scaliger is inclined

(1) Lucianus, in Macrobiis, pag. m. 640, Tom. ii, Oper.

(2) See Scaliger, in Euseb. pag. m. 96.

7 F

Philosophical subjects: besides two thousand on the foundation of Colophon (g), and on that of the Colony of Elea (b). His opinion concerning the nature of God, is very little different from Spinozism [B]. He wrote some verses against Homer and Hesiod (i), on the idle stories which they sung of the gods. He held a maxim which entirely over-

turned

(g) Idem, *ibid.* num. 20. Note, that *Moreri* reduces all the verses of *Xenophanes* to that number. *Artemaus* often quotes verses of that Philosopher. (b) A town in Italy. (i) *Diog. Laërtius*, *ibid.* num. 18. See *Sext. Empiricus* adv. *Math.* pag. 57, 341.

- clined to believe that he lived at least one hundred and four years (3). From this long life we may reconcile those who make him flourish in the LVth Olympiad (4), or the LXth (5); and those who place him under the XLth Olympiad (6); for we may suppose that the latter do not point out the time when he flourished, but that of his birth. Observe, that even on this supposition, it is not possible to reconcile them with those, who tell us that he lived till the time when the Persians were driven out of Greece. We have still some verses where it is pretended that he mentions their flight. *Athenæus* quotes them (7). If you understand by this the time when they lost the battle of Marathon, it was in the LXXIth Olympiad. If you understand the battle of Salamis, or that of Plataea, it was the LXXVth Olympiad. Suppose in the next place, not with *Casaubon*, that he made these verses fifteen or twenty years after the defeat of the Persians (8), but the very year of that great event, and you will find it impossible for him to have been born in the XLth Olympiad, since in that case it must be said that he lived at least 126 years. What shall we then think of a passage of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, which informs us that he was born in the XLth Olympiad, and lived to the time of Darius? *Τῆς Ελεατικῆς ἀγωγῆς, Ξενοφάνης ὁ Κολοφώνιος κατάρχει, ὃν φησι Τίμαιος κατὰ Ἱέρωνα τὸν Σικελίας δυνάστην, καὶ ἐπὶ χαρμῶν τὸν ποιητὴν, γεγενῆσθαι. Ἀπολλοδωρὸς δὲ, κατὰ τὴν τεσσαρεσκῆντ' Ὀλυμπιάδα γενόμενον, παρτετακέναι ἀγχοὺ τῶν Δαρείων τε καὶ Κύρου χρόνων: Eleaticæ disciplinæ princeps fuit Xenophanes Colophonius, quem dicit Timæus fuisse tempore Hieronis, qui in Sicilia obtinuit dominatum, & Epicharmi Poetæ. Apollodorus autem cum natus esset quadragesima Olympiade, pervenisse usque ad tempora Darii & Cyri (9). - - - Xenophanes of Colophon was the head of the Eleatic Philosophy: *Timæus* affirms, that he lived in the time of Hiero, who reigned in Sicily, and of the Poet *Epicharmus*. But *Apollodorus* says that he was born in the XLth Olympiad, and lived down to the times of Darius and Cyrus. Must we believe that an error crept into the Greek text, and that instead of Δαρείων we ought to read Κεῖρας? My answer is, there is no necessity to suppose it. For a life of one hundred years, which is allowed to Xenophanes, is sufficient to fill up the space betwixt the XLth Olympiad and the LXVth, which was the beginning of Darius's reign. I do not deny that it is a little strange to see, that so good an author as *Apollodorus*, should say that Xenophanes lived to the time of Darius and Cyrus. It would have been much more regular to have said to the time of Cyrus and Darius, as Mr *Menage* observes (10). Besides, it is certain that in pointing out the times, the Antients usually joined *Cræsus* and *Cyrus* together, which serves to support the correction I have mentioned; but at the bottom there is neither any absurdity nor any falsity in *Apollodorus's* opinion, that Xenophanes lived from the XLth Olympiad till the time of Darius. Yet I should rather choose to place his birth much lower, since, according to *Timæus* (11), he flourished in the time of Hiero, who did not begin to reign before the LXXVth Olympiad. I shall observe by the way, that I take their opinion to be ill founded, who say that he was a Disciple of *Archelaus*. This is *Lucian's* opinion (12).*
- [B] His opinion concerning the nature of God, is very little different from Spinozism. If we had all his works, we should be much better able to give a precise and distinct account of his system: and if we knew his opinions only by some small and very obscure fragments cited by *Cicero*, it were impossible to avoid confusion: 'Xenophanes qui mente adjuncta omne præterea quod esset infinitum Deum voluit esse, de ipsa mente item reprehenditur ut cæteri: de infinitate autem vehementius, in qua nihil neque sentiens neque conjunctum esse potest (13). - - - Xenophanes, ὃς οὐκ ἦν ὁμοῖον, of opinion that God is all that is infinite united
- (3) *Scaliger*, *ibid.*
- (4) *Euseb.* in *Chron.* pag. m. 127.
- (5) *Id.* *ibid.* pag. 128. *Diogen. Laërt.* lib. ix, num. 20.
- (6) *Sext. Empir.* adv. *Math.* pag. 51.
- (7) *Athen.* lib. ii, cap. xiii, pag. 54.
- (8) *Casaub.* in *Athen.* pag. 110.
- (9) *Clem. Alex.* *Strom.* lib. i, p. 301, C.
- (10) *Menag.* in *Diog. Laërt.* lib. ix, num. 20.
- (11) See, above, citat. (9).
- (12) *Lucian.* ubi *supra*.
- (13) *Cicero*, de *Natura Deorum*, lib. i, cap. xi.

with a mind, is likewise refuted with the rest, as to that mind. But he is yet more absurd with regard to infinity, in which there can be nothing that has any sensation or conjunction. These words of *Cicero* shew that Xenophanes taught that the intellect is God, and that all that is infinite is God. As for the first part of this doctrine, *Cicero* forbears the repetition of what he had said before to refute those who held the Divinity of the intellect; he supposes that the same refutation falls also upon this first point of the opinion of Xenophanes. With regard to the second part, he advances what he thinks capable of refuting it; for he observes, that infinity, as it contains nothing that has any sensation or conjunction, cannot be God. I shall not examine the weak side of this argument, it being wholly unnecessary: Every body will clearly apprehend that since there is something cogitative, connected with finite extension, as in man, such things also are not incompatible with an infinite extent. I might easily believe that *Cicero* did not apprehend the opinion he mentions; he divides it into two parts, when perhaps it ought not to be divided. It is more probable that Xenophanes meant, that God was nothing but the infinity of nature, accompanied with an intellect. 'Xenophanem notum est omne infinitum cum mente, Deum tradere (14). - - - (14) These words of *Menæmus* affirm that God was all that is infinite, accompanied with a mind. It would be a very strange doctrine to assert, on one hand, that every infinite is God; and, on the other, that the human intellect is God: this would be multiplying the Deity in a discordant manner, and erring inconsistently. I very well know that the ancient Philosophers do not appear to us exact, in the fragments we have of their opinions concerning the principles of all things: but what particularly obliges me to believe that Xenophanes did not make that division ascribed to him, is, that even according to the testimony of *Cicero*, he taught that there was but one sole Being, and that this Being was immutable, eternal, and the true God: (15) *Xenophanes paulo etiam antiquior unum esse omnia, neque id esse mutabile & id esse verum Deum, neque natum usquam quicquam & sempiternum conglobata figura* (16). This is more distinct than what *Aristotle* relates of Xenophanes's opinion. *Ξενοφάνης δὲ πρῶτον τῶν ἐνίστας (ὃ γὰρ Παρμενίδης τὴν λέγεται μᾶθησι) ὑδὲν διεσαφηνίσεν, εἰς τῆς φύσεως τῶν ὑδὲτος εἴκει δῖον. ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν ὅλον ὑδὲν ἀποκρίσας, τὸν εἶναι φησι τὸν θεόν. Xenophanes autem, quantum prior illi, unum posuerat, (nam Parmenides ejus auditor fuisse dicitur) nihil tamen clarum dixit, & neutrius horum naturam attigisse videtur: sed ad totum cælum respiciens, ipsum unum ait esse Deum (17). These words of *Aristotle* inform us, that Xenophanes took up with confused notions, and that he did not examine in particular whether unity be, with respect to matter, and that he asserted in general, what is One is God. Others say he maintained, that nature had no beginning, and shall have no end, and that she is always like her self; but that he spoke of the gods in the plural number. *Οὗτος γὰρ εἶπεν, ὅτι θεοὶ ἀπολείπει· ἀλλ' εἶναι λέγει τὸ πᾶν ὡς ὁμοῖον. Nullum penitus vel ortum vel interitum relinquit, sui semper simile hoc universum esse ratus (18). It is true he rejected the common opinion, that the gods stood in need of, and gave commands to one another (19). Dependence seemed to him incompatible with the Divine Nature. He added, that the gods saw and heard in general, but not particularly this or that thing. Thus I would understand these words of *Eusebius*, ἀκούει δὲ καὶ ὁρᾷ καθόλου καὶ μὴ κατὰ μέρος, in universum audire ac cernere, non verò per partes (20). This favours of Spinozism; for Spinoza affirmed that God, as a substance, is barely endued with thought in general, and that the particular knowledge of every object does not unite in the sole mind, in order to represent all things to the substance of God. I own it may be pretended that Xenophanes**

(15) *Cicero*, *Academicæ Quaest.* lib. i, cap. xxxvii.

(16) *Confut. Seculæ* *Empiricus*, *Pyrrhon.* Hypothesis τῶν ὑδὲτος εἴκει δῖον. lib. i, cap. xxxvii.

(17) *Aristoteles*, *Metaphysic.* lib. i, cap. vi, pag. m. 648, E. lib. i, cap. viii, pag. m. 1048, A. lib. i, cap. xii, pag. m. 1072, A. lib. i, cap. xiii, pag. m. 1072, B. lib. i, cap. xiv, pag. m. 1072, C. lib. i, cap. xv, pag. m. 1072, D. lib. i, cap. xvi, pag. m. 1072, E. lib. i, cap. xvii, pag. m. 1072, F. lib. i, cap. xviii, pag. m. 1072, G. lib. i, cap. xix, pag. m. 1072, H. lib. i, cap. xx, pag. m. 1072, I. lib. i, cap. xxi, pag. m. 1072, K. lib. i, cap. xxii, pag. m. 1072, L. lib. i, cap. xxiii, pag. m. 1072, M. lib. i, cap. xxiv, pag. m. 1072, N. lib. i, cap. xxv, pag. m. 1072, O. lib. i, cap. xxvi, pag. m. 1072, P. lib. i, cap. xxvii, pag. m. 1072, Q. lib. i, cap. xxviii, pag. m. 1072, R. lib. i, cap. xxix, pag. m. 1072, S. lib. i, cap. xxx, pag. m. 1072, T. lib. i, cap. xxxi, pag. m. 1072, U. lib. i, cap. xxxii, pag. m. 1072, V. lib. i, cap. xxxiii, pag. m. 1072, W. lib. i, cap. xxxiv, pag. m. 1072, X. lib. i, cap. xxxv, pag. m. 1072, Y. lib. i, cap. xxxvi, pag. m. 1072, Z. lib. i, cap. xxxvii, pag. m. 1072, A. lib. i, cap. xxxviii, pag. m. 1072, B. lib. i, cap. xxxix, pag. m. 1072, C. lib. i, cap. xl, pag. m. 1072, D. lib. i, cap. xli, pag. m. 1072, E. lib. i, cap. xlii, pag. m. 1072, F. lib. i, cap. xliii, pag. m. 1072, G. lib. i, cap. xliiii, pag. m. 1072, H. lib. i, cap. xlv, pag. m. 1072, I. lib. i, cap. xlvi, pag. m. 1072, K. lib. i, cap. xlvii, pag. m. 1072, L. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, M. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, N. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, O. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, P. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Q. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, R. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, S. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, T. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, U. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, V. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, W. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, X. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Y. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Z. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, A. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, B. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, C. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, D. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, E. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, F. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, G. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, H. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, I. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, K. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, L. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, M. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, N. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, O. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, P. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Q. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, R. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, S. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, T. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, U. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, V. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, W. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, X. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Y. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Z. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, A. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, B. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, C. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, D. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, E. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, F. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, G. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, H. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, I. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, K. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, L. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, M. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, N. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, O. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, P. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Q. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, R. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, S. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, T. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, U. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, V. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, W. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, X. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Y. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Z. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, A. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, B. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, C. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, D. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, E. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, F. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, G. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, H. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, I. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, K. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, L. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, M. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, N. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, O. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, P. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Q. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, R. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, S. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, T. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, U. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, V. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, W. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, X. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Y. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Z. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, A. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, B. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, C. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, D. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, E. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, F. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, G. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, H. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, I. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, K. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, L. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, M. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, N. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, O. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, P. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Q. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, R. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, S. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, T. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, U. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, V. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, W. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, X. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Y. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Z. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, A. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, B. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, C. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, D. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, E. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, F. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, G. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, H. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, I. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, K. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, L. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, M. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, N. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, O. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, P. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Q. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, R. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, S. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, T. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, U. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, V. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, W. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, X. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Y. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Z. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, A. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, B. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, C. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, D. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, E. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, F. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, G. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, H. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, I. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, K. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, L. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, M. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, N. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, O. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, P. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Q. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, R. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, S. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, T. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, U. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, V. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, W. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, X. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Y. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Z. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, A. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, B. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, C. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, D. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, E. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, F. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, G. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, H. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, I. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, K. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, L. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, M. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, N. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, O. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, P. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Q. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, R. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, S. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, T. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, U. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, V. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, W. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, X. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Y. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Z. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, A. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, B. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, C. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, D. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, E. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, F. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, G. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, H. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, I. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, K. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, L. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, M. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, N. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, O. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, P. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Q. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, R. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, S. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, T. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, U. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, V. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, W. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, X. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Y. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Z. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, A. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, B. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, C. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, D. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, E. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, F. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, G. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, H. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, I. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, K. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, L. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, M. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, N. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, O. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, P. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Q. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, R. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, S. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, T. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, U. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, V. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, W. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, X. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Y. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Z. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, A. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, B. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, C. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, D. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, E. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, F. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, G. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, H. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, I. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, K. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, L. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, M. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, N. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, O. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, P. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Q. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, R. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, S. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, T. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, U. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, V. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, W. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, X. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Y. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Z. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, A. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, B. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, C. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, D. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, E. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, F. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, G. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, H. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, I. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, K. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, L. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, M. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, N. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, O. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, P. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Q. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, R. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, S. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, T. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, U. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, V. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, W. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, X. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Y. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Z. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, A. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, B. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, C. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, D. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, E. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, F. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, G. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, H. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, I. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, K. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, L. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, M. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, N. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, O. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, P. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Q. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, R. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, S. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, T. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, U. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, V. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, W. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, X. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Y. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Z. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, A. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, B. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, C. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, D. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, E. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, F. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, G. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, H. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, I. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, K. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, L. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, M. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, N. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, O. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, P. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Q. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, R. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, S. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, T. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, U. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, V. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, W. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, X. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Y. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Z. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, A. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, B. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, C. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, D. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, E. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, F. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, G. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, H. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, I. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, K. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, L. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, M. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, N. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, O. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, P. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Q. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, R. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, S. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, T. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, U. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, V. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, W. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, X. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Y. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, Z. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, A. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, B. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, C. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, D. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, E. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, F. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, G. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, H. lib. i, cap. xlviii, pag. m. 1072, I. lib. i, cap.

turned the Pagan religion; viz. that it is not less impious to assert that the gods were born than to affirm that they die, since in either case it would be equally true that their existence is not eternal (k). This maxim is very true and not at all contrary to the doctrine

(k) Οἷον Ξενοφάνης ἔλεγεν ὅτι ὁμοίως ἀσεβῆσαι οἱ γένεσθαι φασκαρτες τὰς θεὰς τοῖς ἀποθανεῖν λέγουσιν. ἀμφοτέρως γὰρ συμβαίνει μὴ εἶναι ποτε τὰς θεάς. Ut Xenophanes dicebat similiter esse impios qui nasci affirmant Deos, & qui mori dicunt. Utroque enim modo contingit, ut non sint aliquando Dii. *Aristot. Rhetor. lib. ii, cap. xxiii, pag. 446, B.*

Xenophanes meant, that by a single act of the mind God sees all things, and not every one of them by a particular idea. He might explain himself if he was to return into the world: he would not be a little puzzled to remove the difficulties proposed to him concerning his contradictions, and inconsistencies. He admitted an infinity of invariable worlds, and four elements of all things (21). But to what purpose is this infinity of worlds, since he taught that all things were but one being, and that this sole and only being was God? Was not this speaking of the world, like the people who call America the new world, and who give the name of world to mankind, and in France even to a great Lord's footmen, &c. (22). He asserted that God was of a round figure, and yet made him infinite (23). He said that God did not in any thing resemble man, and that he heard and saw all things without respiration (24). A fine exception indeed! Was it necessary to express it? If the Deity hath nothing common with men, is it not evident, that he has no lungs and doth not breathe? Why did he not also at the same time except the eyes, the ears, and the face, &c. as well as the act of respiration? Xenophanes spoke more properly in the verses which Clemens Alexandrinus cites (25), for he said no more there than that God is not like man either in body or soul; and that if brutes could paint, they would represent the Deity in the shape of their own species: He continually returned to his unity. *Ἐν παντὶ τὸ εἶναι, οὐ καὶ φρονέειν, καὶ αἰσθάνειν, simulque (Deum) esse OMNIA, mentem, prudentiam, eternitatem (26).*

That God is ALL, a mind, prudence, eternity. The whole Eleatic sect also believed the unity of all things (27), and the immobility of all things (28). And perhaps I should not be mistaken, if I should venture to say, that from thence arose the doctrine so much extolled by the Sceptics, I mean, that our senses deceive us, and that we ought not to rely on their evidence. For when it was objected against those Philosophers that new generations continually happen in the world; which supposes that there are two principles, one active and the other passive, or at least that the sole substance of nature is not immutable; they found no better expedient to solve this difficulty, than to deny that there was any generation. They were therefore obliged to assert, that nature continues always the same, and that the alterations which we believe the undergones are nothing but meer illusions of our senses, and meer appearances. Eusebius informs us that Parmenides taught, that the universe being eternal and immovable, and one sole being, remained always the same with regard to the reality of things, and that the generations were only founded on a false judgment of the senses (29): *Ἀίδιον μὲν γὰρ τὸ πᾶν, καὶ ἀκίνητον ἀποφαίνεται, καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῶν περὶ φύσιν ἀληθειᾶν εἶναι γὰρ αὐτὸ μόνον. μὴ γένεσθαι τε καὶ ἀτρέμεναι, ἢ δὲ ἀκίνητον. γένεσθαι δὲ τὸν καθ' ὑπόληψιν ψευδὴ δοκῶντα εἶναι. καὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις ἐκβάλλει ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας. Etenim sempiternum esse orbem hunc universum, omnisque motu carere; ipsiusque naturæ veritatem omnino constare defendit (30); singularem enim illum & unigenam, stabilem ac quietum, nec certo aliquo tempore generatum esse: Generationem porro ad ea rejicit, quæ falsa quadam opinione patentur esse, adeoque sensus omnes communiōne veritatis excludit.* Let us also consult the same Eusebius, if we would see those Philosophers driven from this subterfuge. Aristotle clearly evinced to these defenders of immutability, or ingenerability, that the refuge which they had chosen betrayed them; for since they durst not deny the mutation of appearances, that is, that we do feel the earth at one time cold, and hot at another, it follows that nature is not immovable; and that the must of necessity change in the subject which produces, or receives our sensations. Perception is passive, and therefore the alteration of it supposes an efficient cause and a passive principle: and thus your unity of all things is over-

turned. Besides, this alteration is incompatible with your pretended immobility, or incorruptibility. *Ὡς ἐπὶ πρῶτον εἴη ἂν τὸ λεγόμενον ἔτερον. . . . ἔπειτα δὲ ἐν τῷ ὄντι ἔχει καὶ μὴν ἔδδ' ἀκίνητον. ἢ γὰρ αἰσθήσεις ἐστὶ κινήσεις. Habemus ergo primum id esse, quod diversum vocatur. . . . deinde quicquid est, non esse, quid unum. Adde ne immobile quidem illud esse, cum ipsa sentiendi ratio motus quidam sit (31).* I shall return again to this subject in the remark [K].

I shall observe by the way that there is a great deal of probability that the author of the *Art of Thinking* censures Aristotle unjustly in favour of Parmenides. 'It were to be wished, saith he (32), that Aristotle, who took care to acquaint us of this sophism (33), had taken as great care to avoid it. For it is too evident that he hath attacked several ancient Philosophers, by citing their opinions not very fairly. He refuses Parmenides and Melissus, for having admitted but one principle of all things, as if they had meant the principle of which they are composed, whereas they meant, the sole and only principle from which all things derive their original, which is God. The author of the *Art of Thinking* does Parmenides and Melissus more honour than they deserve. He represents their opinions concerning the origin of created beings as orthodox; and yet they are as impious as those of Spinoza, or very nearly so: these Philosophers acknowledged no difference betwixt the principle of which all things are composed, and that which produced them. They admitted but one sole Being, and pretended that all things were eternal. This is what is imputed to them in Eusebius, as we have seen above. Aristotle doth not charge them with all this in every respect: he owns that Parmenides teaching on one side that in reality there is but one Being; and, on the other side, that according to appearance, there are several Beings, accommodated himself to appearance, and supposed two other principles, which are heat and cold, fire and earth: *Ἀναγκαζόμενοι δ' ἀκολουθεῖν τοῖς φαινομένοις, καὶ τὸ ἐν μὲν κατὰ λόγον, πλεῖον δὲ κατὰ τὴν αἰσθήσιν ὑπολαμβάναν εἶναι, δύο τὰς αἰτίας, καὶ δύο τὰς ἀρχάς τίθισσι πάλιν. Σεισμὸν καὶ ψυχρὸν, οἷον αὐτὸς καὶ γὰρ λέγων. Τέτων δὲ τὸ μὲν, &c. Coactus vero illa, quæ apparent, sequi, & unum ratione, plura vero secundum sensum putans esse, duas causas rursus, ac duo principia ponit, calidum, & frigidum, velut ignem, & terram dicens. Horum autem alterum, &c. (34).* It is hard to apprehend by what turn of thought, such a great number of the ancient Philosophers could believe that there is but one substance in the universe (35). But it is very easy to apprehend that this being granted, they were then obliged to assert that the universe perpetually continues in the same state: for a being which necessarily exists, and which alone is all things, must of necessity be perfectly immovable. No external cause can change it, nor can it alter itself. It hath, independently on its own will, both its existence and all the attributes of its nature. Whatever it hath once, it ought to possess continually; for what had no beginning is not liable to destruction. This also proves that it cannot acquire any thing new, since the production of one new quality would be the destruction of some other (36). Thus far the system of Xenophanes and Parmenides was well supported. But as experience convinced them that changes do happen in nature, such as must be internal and effectual with regard to our thoughts, even tho' such changes were supposed to be meer illusions of the senses, these Philosophers should have acknowledged that they had built upon a false supposition, and should have admitted two principles, one active and the other passive. This being granted, we may believe that the active principle remains always in the same state amidst the continual variations of nature (37). It's uniform and invariable action impressed on different subjects, must necessarily produce all the vicissitudes in the world. Do not we see that the motion of the air, without altering in itself, produces different effects,

(31) Euseb. de ubi supra, lib. xiv, cap. xviii, pag. 756, D. ex lib. viii, Aristotelis de Philosophia.

(32) Art. de pensée, Part. iii, ch. xviii, pag. m. 316.

(33) This is, the sophism called ignoratio elench, to prove a different thing from that in question.

(34) Aristotle, Metaphysica, lib. i, cap. v, pag. 648, F. See also cap. iii.

(35) I think they were led into such an opinion by this supposition, that since nothing can be produced out of nothing, whatever exists has a necessary existence, and is therefore eternal and infinite, and that infinite can be but one.

(36) From hence we may draw a strong proof that our souls and matter are not uncreated beings. See the remark [K].

(37) Stabilisque manens dat cuncta moveri. Boet. Consolat. Philof. lib. iii, Manu in.

(21) Diog. Laërt. lib. ix, num. 19.

(22) See Furetier's Dictionary at the word *Monde*.

(23) Diog. Laërt. ibid.

(24) Id. ibid. *brutes painte*

(25) Clem. Alexandr. Strom. lib. v, pag. 601, & ex eo Eusebius, ubi supra, lib. xiii, cap. xiii, pag. 679.

(26) Laërt. ubi supra. See also Eusebius, ibid. lib. xiv, cap. xiv, p. 725, B.

(27) Euseb. ibid.

(28) Idem, lib. xiv, cap. xvii.

(29) Eusebius, ubi supra, lib. i, cap. viii, pag. 21. C, ex Plutarcho.

(30) This passage seems to be ill translated: it had rather signified that nature is not really exist, but only according to appearance or the delusion of the senses.

(1) Cicero, de
Divinat. lib. i,
init.

doctrine of the Incarnation. He believed that the Moon is an inhabited country [C], and that it is impossible to predict future events (I); and if the conjecture of a learned Critic is well grounded, he asserted that there is in nature more good than evil [D]. He would

(38) Cicero,
Academ. Quest.
lib. ii, cap.
xxxix.

it is
Drwn
as
moon
late from

(39) Laftant.
lib. iii, cap. xxii,
pag. m. 307.

(40) He married
a sister of Crom-
well, by whom
he had a daugh-
ter, who was
married to Dr
Tillotfon, Arch-
bifhop of Canter-
bury.

Isaac
Newton
conjectured

(41) Plut. de
Placitis Philo-
foph. lib. ii, cap.
xxiv, pag. 901.

(42) Plurima
deteriora mente
effe. Diogen.
Laërt. ubi fupra,
num. 19.

(43) Meric. Ca-
faubon. in hac
verba Diogen.
Laërtii.

effects, according as it meets with a wind-mill, a ship, scattered straw, or a heap of leaves, &c.?

[C] He believed that the Moon is an inhabited coun-
try.] Cicero informs us of this; and he is not the only

author, who ascribes this opinion to him. 'Habitari
' ait Xenophanes in Luna, eamque effe terram multa-
' rum urbium & montium (38). --- Xenophanes fays

' that the moon is inhabited, and a country having feveral
' towns and mountains in it.' Laftantius greatly ridi-
cles this opinion, and represents Xenophanes as be-
lieving, not that the furface of the moon was inhabited,

but that it contained within it's bofom an earth,
peopled with a race of men. He juftly blames him
for having asserted that this planet is eighteen times

bigger than the earth: 'Xenophanes dicentibus ma-
' joribus orbem lune duodeviginti partibus majorem
' effe, quam terram, ftultiffime credidit: & quod huic

levitati fuit contentaneum, dixit, intra concavum
lune finum effe aliam terram, & ibi aliud genus ho-
minum fimili modo vivere, quo nos in hac terra vi-

vimus. Habent igitur illi lunatici homines alteram
lunam, quæ illis nocturnum lumen exhibeat, ficut
hæc exhibet nobis. Et fortaffe nofter hic orbis alte-

rius inferioris terræ luna fit (39). --- Xenophanes
' was foolifh enough to believe the Mathematicians, when
' they faid that the moon's orb is eighteen times greater

' than the earth: and, what was confiftent with this
' credulity, he faid that the moon contained in it's bofom
' another earth, inhabited by a race of men, who live in

' the fame manner, as we do here. So thefe men in the
' moon have another moon to enlighten them in the night,
' as theirs enlightens us, and, perhaps, this globe of ours

' is a moon to that other earth.' I would not engage that
he has rightly underftood this Philofopher's opinion;

but feveral very great men of thefe latter ages would
laugh at him for making a jeft of it. This opinion
of Xenophanes does him honour: it is the opinion

of feveral famous Mathematicians. See what Dr Wil-
kins, Bifhop of Chefter (40), faith on this head. His

treatife of the World in the Moon was translated into
French, by the Sieur de la Montagne, and printed at
Rouen, in the year 1656, in 8vo. See alfo Mr Huy-
gen's Cosmotheoros. Mr Bafnage de Bauval gave us

an extract of it in his Journal for the month of
May 1698. For the reft, the opinions of Xenophanes,

concerning the motion of the fun and moon, and con-
cerning the caufe of eclipfes, are very pitiful. He fays

that 'the fun is eclipsed, by being extinguished, and
' that it recovers it's light next morning when it riles:

' he gives an account of an eclipse of the fun, which
' continued for a whole month, and alfo of a total
' eclipse fo that the day feemed to be night. . . . that

' there are feveral funs and feveral moons, according to
' the various climates of the earth, and at a certain time
' the orb of the fun falls upon fome part of the

' world which is not inhabited; and thus moving as
' in a vacuum, it undergoes an eclipse. The fame
' perfon affirms, that the fun moves ftrait forward in

' infinitum, but appears to us to move orbicularly by
' reason of it's great diftance (41).'

[D] He asserted that there is in nature more good than
evil.] Diogenes Laërtius reckons among the chief opi-
nions of Xenophanes τὰ πολλὰ ἥ τ'ω νῦ εἶναι, that

moft things are worfe than, or inferior to, the mind
(42). It feems unworthy of a Philofopher to fpeak

thus; for the meanest peasant knows very well, and
no body needs be taught, that the mind of man is bet-
ter than metals, water, or air, &c. We therefore

ought to believe that Xenophanes meant something
greater. The following is the conjecture of Meric
Cafaubon. He pretends that this Philofopher taught

that the Divine mind, which made the world, endea-
voured to endow all creatures with a ftate of perfection;

but that having met with ftrong obftacles in matter,
he could not always compafs his defigns; and there-
fore, on fome occafions, he was forced to produce

evil things (43). This is faying, that in this confli-
ct he was fometimes vanquifhed, but oftener vanquifher;

that the greateft part of things were fubmitted to the
defires and power of the Divine mind, and confe-
quently ἥ τ'ω νῦ εἶναι, doth not mean worfe than the

mind, but fubjected to it, and the matter of it's

triumph. Cafaubon confirms his conjecture by a pa-
ffage in Plato, where it is faid, that neceffity and the

mind concurred in the production of the world, and
that neceffity was perfuaded to confent that things for

the moft part fhould be governed for the beft (44). (44) Plato, in
Timæo, pag. m.
1058, D.

Μεμιγμένη γὰρ ἐν ἡ τῷδε κόσμῳ τῷ γένεσιν, ἐξ
ἀναγκῆς τε καὶ νῦν συσδύσας ἐγενήθη· νῦν δὲ ἀναγ-
κῆς ἀρχόντῳ, τῷ παίδειν αὐτὴν τῶν γιγνομένων
τὰ ἀλίστα ἐπὶ τῷ βέλτιστον ἄγειν, ταῦτα κατὰ
ταῦτα δὲ ἀνάγκης (45) ἡτ'ωμίνης ὑπὸ παίδος (46) Meric. Ca-
faubon reads
τῆς ἀνάγκης.

ἐμθεν, ἥ τω κατ' ἀρχὰς ἐγενήσθ' οὐ τῷδε τῷ παῖ.
Mundi enim bujus generatio ex neceffitatibus mentisque
coitu mixta est. Nam cum mens neceffitati dominaretur,
coitu mixta est. Nam cum mens neceffitati dominaretur,
propterea quod perfuadendo eam ad optimas ut plurimum
rerum eventus induceret, ipsaque hac ratione ceden-
sienti perfuafioni pareretur, mundi bujus exordia confite-
runt. Cafaubon obferves (46) that Homer, on a par-
ticular occafion, having faid that evil exceeds good, it

was converted into a general maxim (47): as if, uni-
verfally fpeaking, the miferies of human life overba-
lanced the happinefs of it. The fame Critic obferves,

that thofe who fpoke of this fubject with the greateft
modesty, excufed Providence on account of the fatal
neceffity which constrained it to open a gate to feveral
evils. 'Qui parciffime loquebantur Deum excufabant

' qui Bonus non nifi bona in operibus fuis & omni ad-
' miniftratione fua propofuiffet, fed materię obfultan-
' tis vel deficientis neceffitate coactus, etiam malis non

' paucis invitatus locum reliquiffet. --- Thofe who fpoke
' of this fubject with the greateft modesty, excufed GOD,
' who, as a good Being, had propofed nothing but what

' was good, both in his works and providence; but that,
' being forced by the neceffity of the matter which refifted
' or was deficient, he had unwillingly left room for feveral

' evils.' He adds, that Euripides hath ftrenuoufly
refuted the common opinion, that evil furpaffes good,
and he cites the beginning of that confutation.

Ἐλεξε γὰρ τις ὡς τὰ χείρονα

Πλείω βροτοῖσιν ἐστὶ τῶν ἀμεινόνων.

Ἐγὼ δὲ τῷ τοῖς ἀντίαν γινώμην ἔχω

Πλείω τὰ χρεῖα τῶν κακῶν εἶναι βροτοῖς.

Some fay that there is in nature more evil than good:
but I hold a contrary opinion to others, viz. there is in
nature more good than evil.

The fubfequent words of Euripides feemed to Cafau-
bon to be written by an infpired pen (48). Pliny (48) Cereus
differs from this Poet's opinion; for tho' he doth not

say that it plainly appears nature behaves to us rather
like a cruel ftep-mother, than a tender indulgent pa-
rent, yet he intimates that he is of fuch an opinion: *parentis*

' Principium jure tribuetur homini cujus caufa videtur
' cuncta alia genuiffe natura; magna fæva mercede boni. *id.*

' contra tanta fua munera: non fit ut fatis æftimare
' parens melior homini, an trifitior noverca fuerit (49). (49) Plinius, lib.
' --- The chief place will be juftly allowed to man, for who, *aut. p. m. p.*

' whofe fake nature feems to have produced all other
' things. Great are the bounties of nature, but attended

' with many evils, and purchafed with many afflictions:
' fo that it is hard to judge, whether fhe act the part

' of a tender and indulgent parent, or that of a cruel ftep-
' mother to mankind.' She lets the prefents fhe makes us,

to faith he, at the price of a thoufand afflictions. To
this purpose he gives a long defcription of human infir-
mities, and oppofes them to the advantages of animals;

nor doth he forget the vices in which men exceed the
brutes: 'Uni animantium luctus eft datus, uni luxuria,
' & quidem innumerabilibus modis, ac per fingula

' membra: uni ambitio, uni avaritia, uni immenfa
' vivendi cupido, uni fuperftitio, uni feputuræ cura,

' atque etiam poft fe de futuro. Nulli vita fragilior,
' nulli rerum omnium libido major, nulli pavor con-
' fuftor, nulli rabies acrior. Dentque cetera animantia in

' fuo genere probe degunt: congregari videmus, & ftare
' contra diffimilia: Leonum feritas inter fe non dimi-
' cat: ferpentium morfus non petit ferpentes: ne us-

' ris quidem belluæ ac pifces, nifi in diverfa genera
' fæviunt. At hercules homini plurima ex homine

' funt

would not be singular in this opinion : but it is probable that he was of a very different sentiment ; and if the question was only about evil morally considered [E], I do not believe he would find one opponent. Every body owns that good and honest men are very rare, and

(50) *Id. ibid.*
pag. 5. Compare
with this the
passage of Arno-
bius, cited in the
article TUL-
LIA, cita-
tion (52).

* sunt mala (50). -- Of all animals man alone is subject to sorrow, to luxury, and that in numberless respects, and through all his senses: man alone is addicted to ambition, to avarice, and an immoderate and excessive desire of life: he alone is concerned for his burial, and even for what shall happen after his death. No animal is more frail, none more lustful, none more liable to consternation, none more furious. In fine, other animals live friendly with their respective species. We see them flock and herd together, and only oppose others of a different kind. A lion, however furious, does not attack a lion. A serpent does not sting a serpent. Nor do the sea-monsters and fishes destroy any but those of a different kind from themselves. But men bring numberless evils upon each other. He doth not forget the reflexion which several people have made, that it would be best for a man not to be born, or to die quickly

(51) *Multi ex-
istere qui non
nasci optimum
censerent aut
quam ocyssime
aboliri. Id. ibid.*
pag. 4. See
above, the article
TULLIA, cited.
(56). See this
justice in Seneca
Enchiridion. Pyr-
rhon. Hypotypo-
sis. lib. iii. cap.
xviii, pag. 157.

(52) *Plin. lib. ii,
cap. vii, pag. m.*
146.

(53) *Id. ibid.*

(51). He affirms, in another book, that the greatest blessing that God has bestowed upon men amongst so many pains and troubles of life, is the power of killing themselves: *Nec sibi potest (Deus) mortem consciscere, si velit, quod homini dedit optimum in tantis vitæ pænis* (52). He had enumerated several of the follies of Paganism, and concluded, that of all these things there is but one certain, which is, that all things are uncertain, and that man is the most miserable and vainest part of the whole creation: *Quæ singula improvidam mortalitatem involvunt, solum ut inter ista certum sit, nihil esse certi, NEC MISERIUS QUIDQUAM HOMINE, AUT SUPERBIUS. Ceteris quippe animantium sola victus cura est, in quo sponte naturæ benignitas sufficit: uno quidem vel præferendo cunctis bonis, quod de gloria, de pecunia, ambitione, superque de morte non cogitant* (53). -- All these things discover the weakness of our understanding; so that this alone is certain, that nothing is certain, and that MAN IS OF ALL ANIMALS THE MOST VAIN AND MISERABLE. For other living creatures take no care for their food, which is abundantly supplied to them by the voluntary produce of nature. But this advantage of theirs is greater than all the rest, that they have no thoughts of glory, riches, ambition, or even death.

Plautus hath so naturally expressed an opinion contrary to Euripides's maxim, that I think myself obliged to transcribe his words :

Satin' parva res est voluptatum in vitâ,
Atque in ætate agundâ,
Præquam quod molestum est ! ita cique comparatum
Est in ætate hominum.
Ita Dis est placitum, voluptatem ut moror comes
consequatur :
Quin incommodi plus malique ilico addit, boni si ob-
tigit quid (54).

(54) *Plaut. in
Amphitr. Act. ii,
Sc. ii, init. pag.
m. 25.*

How few are the pleasures in every age of life, when compared with the troubles of it : This is the fate of all men, and the will of the gods, that pain and sorrow should accompany our pleasures. But let me immediately have more pain, and more sorrow, if it is attended with any pleasure.

Diphilus, the Poet, thought that fortune obliges us to drink a liquor composed of three evils, and only one good,

Ὠσπερ κυδαζέουσ' ἐνίοθ' ἡμῖν ἡ τύχη,
Ἐν ἀγαθῶν ἐπιχέασα τρεῖ' ἐπ' ἀνελπίστοις κακῶν.

(55) *Diphilus,
apud Stobæum.*

Fortuna nobis, tanquam cyathos effecantibus,
Si unum bonum infundat, tria mala affundit (55).

[E] If the question was only about evil morally considered. Many things might be observed upon the question, Whether Euripides is rather to be believed than Pliny, and so many other great men, who have maintained that the evils of human life surpasses the good things of it. Let us consider this subject a little, and say in the first place that if the dispute is only about vicious evil, it will soon be decided in favour of Pliny. For where is the man who dares maintain that

V O L. V. No. CXXXV.

the virtuous actions, compared with the crimes of mankind, are in proportion as ten to ten thousand ! In the second place, if the dispute is about painful evil, Euripides will have several adherents. As to the second point, I shall refer it to the following remark, and offer something there on the first.

How detestable soever the opinion of two principles hath constantly appeared to all Christians (56), they have nevertheless acknowledged a subaltern principle of moral evil. Divines teach us that a great number of angels having sinned, made a party in the universe against God. For brevity sake this party is denoted by the name of Devil, and he is acknowledged as the cause of the fall of the first man, and as the perpetual tempter and seducer of mankind. The Devil having declared war against God from the moment of his fall, hath always continued in his rebellion, and there was never any peace or truce. He continually applies himself to usurp the rights of his Creator, and debauch his subjects, in order to make them rebels and engage them to serve under his banner against their common master. He succeeded in his first hostilities with regard to man : In the Garden of Eden he attacked the mother of all living, and vanquished her ; immediately after he attacked the first man, and defeated him. Thus he became master of mankind. God did not abandon this prey to him, but delivered them out of their bondage, and recovered them out of that state of reprobation by virtue of the satisfaction which the second Person of the Trinity undertook to pay to his justice. This second Person engaged to become man, and to act as a Mediator between God and mankind, and as a Redeemer of Adam and his posterity. He took upon him to combat the Devil's party ; so that he was the head of God's party, against the Devil, who was the head of the rebellious creatures. The design was not to conquer all the posterity of Adam ; for they were all, by birth, in the power of the Devil, but to preserve, or recover the country which had been conquered. The design of JESUS CHRIST, the Mediator, and Son of God, was to recover it ; that of the Devil was to hold it. The victory of the Mediator consisted in leading men into the paths of truth and virtue ; that of the devil in seducing them into the road of error and vice. So that in order to know whether moral good equals moral evil among men, we need only compare the victories of the Devil with those of JESUS CHRIST. Now in history we find but very few triumphs of JESUS CHRIST : *Apparent rari nantes in gurgite vasto* (57) ; and we every where meet with the triumphs of the Devil. The war between these two parties is a continual, or almost continual, train of successes on the Devil's side ; and if the rebellious party made annals of their exploits, there is not one day in the year, but what would be there marked with some ample subject for bonfires, songs of triumph, and such other signs of victory. The Annalist would have no occasion for hyperboles and flattery, to shew the superiority of that faction. Sacred history tells us of but one good in Adam's family (58), and reduces to one good man the family of that good man, and so on in the other generations to Noah, in whose family we find three sons whom God saved from the deluge with their father, mother, and wives. Thus at the end of sixteen hundred fifty-six years, all mankind, except one family of eight persons, were so deeply engaged in the interest of the Devil, that the enormity of their crimes rendered it necessary to extirpate them. The deluge, that terrible monument of the justice of God, is a lofty monument of the Devil's victories ; and so much the rather as that general punishment did not deprive him of his prey : the souls of those who perished in the deluge went to hell : This is the Devil's aim and intention, and therefore his triumph. Error and vice, soon after the deluge, lifted up their heads in Noah's family : his descendants plunged themselves into idolatry, and all manner of debaucheries ; that is to say, the Devil preserved his usurped power over them. There was no more than a handful of people, confined in Judæa, that escaped him with respect to Orthodoxy ; nay, it must be owned, that among that people the success of the good party was very variable,

(56) For the
Manichees, the
Manichees, &c.
do not deserve to
be called Chri-
stians.

See Campbell
on gospels

triumph
over

(57) *Virgil.
Æn. lib. i, ver.
118.*

(58) Compare
with this remark
[E], of the ar-
ticle OROSIUS

and that nothing is more common than men who depart from the rules of virtue. But, without doubt, Xenophanes intended to speak of Physical evil; and his sense was, that

ble, with respect to Orthodoxy, since that very nation suffered it self to be seduced to idolatry from time to time; inasmuch, that their conduct was a continued shifting between true and false worship. But as for vice it never suffered a real *interregnum* amongst the Jews, any more than in other countries: and consequently the Devil continually kept a footing in the small conquests which the good party recovered. There happened a happy revolution at the birth of Jesus Christ: his miracles, his gospel, and his Apostles, made glorious conquests. Then it was that the empire of the Devil received a very great check, and a considerable part of the earth was wrested out of his hands; but he was not so driven out that he did not preserve several correspondents, and a great many creatures there; he maintained himself there by the abominable Heresies which he sowed: vices were never entirely driven out of it, and soon after entered into it again, as it were, in triumph. Errors, schisms, disputes, and cabals, introduced themselves, together with the fatal train of infamous passions, which generally accompany them. The Heresies, superstitions, violences, frauds, extorsions, and impurities, which have appeared all over the Christian world for several ages, are things which I should only be able to describe imperfectly, though I was master of more eloquence than Cicero. What Virgil said is true in the most literal sense.

(59) Virgil.
Æneid. lib. vi,
ver. 625.

Non, mihi si linguæ centum sint, oraque centum,
Ferreæ vox, omnes scelerum comprehendere formas,
..... possum (59).

Had I a hundred mouths, a hundred tongues,
And throats of brass, inspired with iron lungs,
I could not half those horrid crimes repeat:

DRYDEN.

Thus whilst the Devil reigned uninterrupted without the limits of Christendom, he so successfully disputed the ground in Christendom, that the progress of his arms was beyond comparison greater than that of truth and virtue. A stop was put to this progress, and he was forced to give ground in the XVth century; but what he lost on one side he regained on the other; and what he does not effect by lies, he brings to pass by the corruption of manners. There is no asylum, no fortress where he does not make men feel the effects of his power in this respect. Leave the world, shut your self up in a monastery; he will follow you, he will bring into it intrigues, envy, factions, or, if he can do no worse, lewdness; this last resource is almost infallible; *Diaboli virtus in lumbis est*, --- *The power of the devil lies in the loins*, faith St Jerome (60). A modern author affirms, *That in those places where Popery is yet predominant, there is no true piety* . . . and that Italy and Spain are places where there is scarce any more true virtue than in Turkey (61). He

(60) Montagne,
Essais, liv. iii,
chap. vi, pag. m.
134.

(61) Jurieu,
Vrai Systeme de
l'Eglise, pag. m.
162.

(62) Esprit de
Mr Arnauld,
Tom. ii, pag.
392.

(63) See the Ab-
bot Richard, Cri-
tique des Preju-
gez de Mr Ju-
rieu, pag. 234.
He quotes the
Avis aux Pro-
testants de l'E-
urope. This A-
vis, is prefixed
to the Preju-
gez de l'Eglise
contre le Papisme.

(64) Id. ibid.
pag. 238, quoting
the same Avis
aux Protestants.

saith in another book (62), *That it is a notorious and acknowledged truth, that all the convents of Spain and Portugal are places of prostitution; and that when chance draws the curtain, to give us an opportunity of seeing what passes in the French monasteries, we discover that they take a little more care of external appearances, but at the bottom are as lewd as others*. He spares the Protestants a little more; but yet he says (63) that corruption runs very high amongst them, and is become so general, that it is not only amongst the Reformed in France, but also those of England, the northern kingdoms, and the provinces of Germany; that the Princes and Sovereigns of those places think of nothing but their political interests; that the people are void of piety, and the pastors remiss; that a prodigious indifference for religion reigns every where, generally speaking; that Princes take no care of the truth (64); that the women of England are debauched to the last degree, and that the Protestant countries in Germany, are plunged into such a debauchery, as debases them, and makes them brutish. You may say, if you please, that this author's descriptions are overstrained; but it will nevertheless be true, that there prevails among Christians a deplorable corruption of manners.

These two things require our reflexion. War reigns at least for as long a time as peace amongst the Christians: I confine my self to Christianity, because it is unnecessary for me to speak of the Infidel nations; they are continually in the service of the Devil, and subject to his empire; and the usurper reigns there unmolested. It is undeniable that war is the Devil's time, or, if I may so express my self, his turn of reigning; for without mentioning the violences and debaucheries committed in it, every soldier is obliged to profess that he will suffer no injuries; he must either quit the employment, or revenge an affront: but this is manifestly denying our allegiance to the empire of Jesus Christ, and deserting to the enemy. Times of peace do not seem so favourable to the empire of the Devil, and yet they are very much so; for as people grow rich, they grow more voluptuous, and plunge themselves deeper in luxury and voluptuousness.

Nunc patimur longæ pacis mala, sævior armis
Luxuria incubuit, victumque ulciscitur orbem (65).

(65) Juvenal,
Sat. VI, ver.
291.

We suffer all the inveterate ills of peace,
And wasteful riot; whose destructive charms
Revenge the vanquish'd world of our victorious arms.

DRYDEN.

My other remark is more decisive. The Papists and Protestants agree, that very few people escape damnation. They allow none to be saved but only the Orthodox who lead good lives, and repent of their sins at the point of death. They do not indeed deny but that habitual sinners may be saved upon a sincere death-bed repentance, but withal they maintain, that nothing is more rare than such a repentance. According to which it is plain, that for one man saved, there are perhaps a million damned. Now the war which the Devil wages with God, is about the conquest of souls; and therefore it is certain that the victory is on the Devil's side: he gains all the damned, and loses only the very few souls who were predestinated to be saved. He is therefore *victor prælio*, & *victor bello*. . . *victorious in the battle, and victorious in the war*. For having inspired men with an infinitely greater number of wicked actions, than Jesus Christ has inspired them with good ones, he has been superior in the battle; and as he makes almost all men die in impenitence, he keeps all he had conquered (66). Death puts an end to the war. Christ doth not combat in order to release the dead from the power of the Devil. We must therefore say that this war ends in the Devil's advantage, what he claimed is yielded and abandoned to him. I know he will suffer eternal punishment for his victories: But this, far from obscuring my position, that moral evil is greater than moral good, serves to make it more indisputable: For the Devils amidst the flames will eternally curse, and make all the damned eternally curse the name of God. There will therefore be more creatures who will hate, than who will love God. Besides, in this remark, the question is properly about the state of things in this life.

I have an Italian book intitled *Monarchia del nostro Signor Gesu Christo*, printed at Venice 1573, and written by Giovanni Antonio Panthera Parentino. The author of this book gives the history of the battles of Lucifer with Jesus Christ, from the beginning of the world down to the times of Mahometanism. He passes slightly over some of the attempts in which Lucifer succeeded; but gives a full account of every attempt in which he failed; such as the Design of destroying the posterity of Abraham in Egypt, his enterprises against David, against the Macabees, against Jesus Christ, &c. This is like a man who seeing people gaming, should only take an account of the losses (67): it would appear by such a computation that he who had won the most had lost all his money. This is an image of the conduct of several Historians. Their nation appears always victorious: for they relate only those events which were prof-
perous.

(66) That it is
say, all he con-
quered when he
made the first
man fall, when
by all his poster-
ity became
flames to the De-
vil.

(67) Mr En-
quest in the first
volume of the con-
sideration of the
Defence, who
this thought
which regard to
those, who only
computed what
he had expended,
but not what he
had received.

Observe,

that the sweets of life do not equal the bitter potions which it obliges us to swallow [F].
Several

Observe, that all I have been saying is every day preached, and that without any design of derogating from the almighty power of Jesus Christ. No more is meant by it than (what is also my opinion) that man is naturally so prone to evil, that except the small number of the elect, all other men live and die in the service of the evil spirit, and render the paternal love of God to remedy their wickedness, or bring them to repentance, of no effect.

[F] *His sense was that the sweets of life do not equal the bitter potions which it obliges us to swallow.* Those who hold the contrary opinion, chiefly insist upon a parallel betwixt diseases and health. There are very few persons, whatever age they be of, but can reckon up, incomparably more days of health than of sickness; and there are a great many, who, in the space of twenty years, have not been afflicted with diseases that will take up in all fifteen days. But this comparison is fallacious (68); for health considered alone is rather an indolence than a sense of pleasure; it is rather a bare exemption from evil, than a good, whilst sickness is worse than a privation of pleasure: it is a positive state which plunges the mind into a sense of suffering, and loads the patient with pain.

(68) See the article P E R I-
CLES, remark
[K].

(69) I think it
is Madam de
Scuderi.

(70) Rarum est
quod sub magna
dimensione pa-
cium continet ma-
teriam: densum
quod sub parva
dimensione mul-
tum continet
materiam.

happy
compro

inde

Somebody (69) judiciously says, that *when health is alone, it is a good which is not much perceived, and sometimes only serves to make us the more ardently desire all the other pleasures which we cannot have.* Let us make use of a comparison taken from the schoolmen: they say that *rare*, i. e. porous, bodies contain but very little matter under a great extent; and that *dense* bodies contain a great quantity of matter in a small compass (70). According to this principle we must say, that there is more matter in three feet of water than in two thousand five hundred feet of air; this is a lively image of sickness and health. Sickness resembles the *dense* bodies, and health the *rare*. Health lasts many years successively, and yet contains but a small portion of happiness. Sickness continues but a few days, and yet comprehends a vast load of misery.

If we had a scale adapted to weigh both a disease of fifteen days, and the health of fifteen years, we should observe the same difference that we find in the balance betwixt a bag of feathers and a piece of lead. In one scale we should see a body which takes up a great deal of room, and in the other, one which lies in a very small compass; and yet one of them is not heavier than the other. Let us then beware of the illusion which the extension of health may draw us into, when it is paralleled with sickness. But you will say that health is considerable, not only by reason it exempts us from a very great evil, but also by the liberty it affords us, to enjoy a thousand lively and very sensible pleasures. I grant all this, but it ought to be farther considered, that there being two sorts of evils to which we are subject, it only secures us from one, and leaves us wholly exposed to the other. We are subject to pain and sorrow, two such terrible afflictions, that it is not to be decided which is most dreadful. The most vigorous health doth not secure us from grief. For grief flows in upon us through a thousand channels, and is of the nature of *dense* bodies: it comprizes a great deal of matter in a very small compass; evil is heaped up, crowded and pressed close in it. One hour's grief contains more evil, than there is good in six or seven pleasant days. The other day I was told of a man who killed himself, after an anxious melancholy of three or four weeks. Every night he had laid his sword under his bolster, in hopes that he should have courage enough to end his life, when darkness should increase his grief: but his resolution failed for several nights successively. At last, not being able to resist his uneasiness, he cut the veins of his arm. I affirm, that all the pleasures which this man had enjoyed in thirty years, would not equal the evils which tormented him the last month of his life, if both were weighed in the balance. Look back to my parallel of *dense* and *rare* bodies, and remember this, that the good things of this life are a less good, than the evil things are an evil. Evils are generally more pure and unmixed than good things; the lively sense of pleasure doth not continue long, it immediately grows flat and dull, and is followed with a disgust.

Πάντων μὲν κύριος ἐστὶ καὶ ὕπνος, καὶ φιλότιμος
Μολπῆς τε γλυκερῆς, καὶ ἀμύμονος ὄρχησμός.

Omnium quidem satietas est, & somni & amoris
Cantusque dulcis & egregiae saltationis (71).

*The best of things beyond their measure cloy;
Sleep's balm, blessing, love's endearing joy;
The staff, the dance*

Mr POPE.

(71) Homer,
Iliad. lib. xiii,
ver. 636. See,
above, a like
thought of Pin-
dar, in citation
(4), of the last
article BER-
NICE.

What appeared to us a great good when we did not possess it, scarce affects us in the enjoyment: so that we acquire, with a thousand troubles, and a thousand uneasinesses, what we possess with no more than a moderate pleasure; and very often the fear of losing the good we enjoy, surpasses all the pleasures of the fruition of it.

There has been pointed out to me a very fine passage of Pliny, and a very proper one to confirm the thoughts which I have just now offered. 'Si verum facere judicium volumus, ac repudiata omni fortunæ ambitione decernere, mortalium nemo est felix (72). Abunde igitur, atque indulgenter fortuna decidit cum eo, qui jure dici non infelix potest. Quippe ut alia non sint, certe, ne lassescat fortuna, metus est: quo semel recepto, solida felicitas non est. Quid quod nemo mortalium omnibus horis sapit? utinamque saluum hoc, & non a vate dictum quam plurimi judicent! Vana mortalitas, & ad circumscribendum seipsam ingeniosa, computat more Thracie gentis, quæ calculos colore distinctos, pro experimento cujusque diei in urnam condit, ac supremo die separatos dinumerat, atque ita de quoque pronunciat. Quid quod iste calculi candore illo laudatus dies, originem mali habuit? Quam multos accepta afflixere imperia; quam multos bona perdere, & ultimis merere suppliciis? ista nimirum bona, si cui inter illa hora in gaudio fuit. Ita est profecto, alius de alio judicat dies, & tamen supremum de omnibus: ideoque nullis credendum est. Quid quod bona ma-

lis paria non sunt, etiam pari numero: nec lætitia ulla minimo merore pensanda? Heu vana & imprudens diligentia! numerus dierum comparatur: ubi queritur pondus (73). If we would make a true judgment of things, without being biased by the allurements of fortune, we must determine that no man is happy. Fortune is bounteous and indulgent to the man who may justly be said not to be unhappy. For as to those who are called happy, their condition is always attended with a fear lest fortune should change and forsake them: and where this fear takes place, there can be no solid happiness. What shall we say of this observation, that no man is wise at all times? I wish this was false, and that a great many people did not justly account it an oracle. Man is vain, and ingenious in circumscribing himself, and computes his happiness after the manner of the Thracians, who every day put into an urn either a black or a white pebble, to denote the good or bad fortune of that day: at last they separated these pebbles, and upon comparing the two numbers together, they formed their judgment of the whole of their lives. Shall that very day which is distinguished by the white pebble give rise to evil? How many have been afflicted by the power which they have accepted? How many undone and reduced to the greatest misery by good things, and the same good things which were the cause of their former rejoicing. Thus it actually happens, one day judges of another, and the last judges of all the rest; so that no particular day can be relied upon. What shall we say of this observation, that the good things of this life are not equal to the evil, not even in number? And that the least affliction is not to be compensated by any joy? Alas! how vain and imprudently diligent is man, who compares his fortunate with his unfortunate days by their number, when the question is concerning the weight and nature of them.' I have found another passage which gives a lively description of the ill side of felicity, I speak of those common to all men, I mean corporeal pleasures. 'Quid autem de corporis voluptatibus loquar, quarum appetentia quidem plena est anxietatis, satietas verò penitentia? Quantos illæ morbos, quàm intolerabiles dolores, quasi quendam fructum nequi-

none
(72) Euripides, in
Medea, ver.
1228, & 1230,
pag. 327, says
the same thing.
happy

(73) Plinius, lib.
viii, cap. xi, pag.
m. 62. Mr du
Roi has ac-
quainted me of
this passage.

Several people are persuaded of the truth of this, and do not want plausible reasons for it,

‘*tiae fruentium solent referre corporibus! . . . Tristeis
vero esse voluptatum exitus, quibus reminisci libi-
dinum suarum vult, intelliget . . .*

Habet omnis hoc voluptas,
Stimulis agit fruentis,
Apiumque par volantum,
Ubi grata mella fudit,
Fugit, & nimis tenaci
Ferit ista corda morfu (74).

(74) Boëtius, de
Consol. Philo-
soph. lib. iii,
Prosa vii, pag.
m. 61.

‘*What need I speak of bodily pleasures, the pursuit of
which is full of anxiety, and the enjoyment followed by
disgust and repentance. How great distress, how in-
tolerable pains do they bring upon the body, as the
fruits of wickedness! . . . But that the issue of pleasures
is disagreeable and painful, whoever reflects on his
own lusts, must easily understand . . .*

*If pleasures e'er invade the heart
They stimulate through every part:
But when th' enjoyers happy made,
And when their grateful bones' s'bed,
Their sweet allurements soon decay,
They leave a sting and flee away.*

Thus Boëtius introduces Philosophy speaking to him. It appears by this discourse, that if anxiety pre-
cedes the enjoyment of pleasures, disgust and repen-
tance follow close after it. A vast number of authors
observe this unhappy concomitance, or, to speak more
intelligibly, this connexion of pleasure and uneasiness.
The two following were cited in my first edition:

(75) Ovidius,
Metam. lib. vii,
ver. 453.

‘*usque adeo nulli est sincera voluptas,
Sollicitique aliquid latens intervenit (75).*

*But mortal bliss will never come sincere;
Pleasure may lead, but pain brings up the rear.*

*The young disease with musty voluptuaries
mixes with our grief, and with our joys
the young disease with musty voluptuaries
mixes with our grief, and with our joys*

(76) Lucet. lib. iv,
ver. 1127.

*Surgit amari aliquid, quod in ipsa floribus angat.
Surgit amari aliquid, quod in ipsa floribus angat.
His sancti mirth, and poisons all his joys.*

CREECH.

And now I add a third, who is Antiphanes.

‘*Εν τῷ αὐτῷ δὲ γὰ τέρψι, ἔνθα τὸ
ἡδὺ ἔστι, πᾶσιόν τε καὶ τὸ λυπηρὸν. αἱ γὰρ
ἡδοναὶ
οὐκ ἐπὶ σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐμπορεύονται, ἀλλ' ἀκαλε-
στῶ αὐταῖς
λύπαι καὶ πῶνοι.*

Id est,

At in eodem ipso, in quo
Jucunditas inest, prope sanè & molestia praesto est.
Voluptates enim
Non ipse solae ingrediuntur, sed earum comites sunt
Dolores ac labores.

*Wherever pleasures and delights are present, pain and
sorrow are at hand. For pleasures never come alone,
pain and toil are their constant attendants.*

(76) Munera ista
fortune putatis?
insidie sunt.
Quisquis nostrum
tutam agere vi-
tam vult, quan-
tum plurimum
potest ista viscata
beneficia devitet,
in quibus hoc
quoque miserimi
fallimur, habere
nos putamus,
habemur. Seneca,
Epist. viii.

Let us also observe this circumstance. We are not
only in fear of losing what we possess, but also vexed
to see other people equal or surpass us, and that others
will soon be able to come up to us, and afterwards
get before us. Observe, that in order to prove that
good is not so perfectly good, as evil is evil, I have
made no use of this argument, that it rarely happens
fallimur, habere
nos putamus,
habemur. Seneca,
Epist. viii.

say, I have omitted this reason, because I do not

here consider the causes and occasions of good and
evil, but good and evil in themselves. For the rest,
it would be departing from the state of the question to
say, that man afflicts himself without cause. For it
is not our business here to know whether his grief
is reasonable, or the effect of his weakness; but
the question is, to know whether he grieves. This
very thing, that a man vexes himself without reason,
and makes himself unhappy by his own fault, is an
evil.

We must own with Seneca, considering the multi-
tude of good things which nature has imparted to us,
and the inexhaustible industry with which the wit of
man diversifies pleasures, and discovers the sources of
them; that God, not contented to provide barely for
our necessities, hath besides furnished us wherewithal
to live deliciously. ‘*Unde hæc innumerabilia oculis,
aureis, animum mulcentia? unde illa luxuriam quo-
que instruens copia? Neque enim necessitatibus tan-
tummodo nostris provivum est: usque in deliciis a-
mamur. Tot arbuta, non uno modo frugifera, tot
herbæ salutare, tot varietates ciborum, per totum an-
num digestæ, ut inertique quoque fortuita terræ alimen-
ta præberent. Jam animalia omnis generis, alia in
sicco solidoque, alia in humido innascentia, alia per
sublime dimissa: ut omnis rerum naturæ pars tribu-
tum aliquod nobis conferre (77) . . . Unde ista pala-
tum tuum saporibus exquisitis ultra satietatem lacef-
sentia? unde hæc irritamenta jam lassæ voluptatis?
unde ista quies, in qua putrescis, ac marces? Nonne
si gratus es, dices,*

Deus nobis hæc otia fecit (78).

‘*Whence proceed these numberless delights for the enter-
tainment of our eyes, our ears, and mind? Whence
that abundance which supplies even our luxury? For
care is taken not only for our necessities, but also for
our pleasures, and the gratifying of all our senses and
appetites. So many pleasant trees, fruitful in various
manners, so many wholesome herbs, and such a variety
of meats, in every season of the year, that the casual
produce of the earth might supply a lazy man with
food for his maintenance. Whence all these animals,
bred on the earth, some in the waters, and others
descending from the heavens, that every part of nature
might be tributary to man? . . . Whence those things
which by their exquisite tastes, and delicious flavours,
provoke your appetite even after it is satiated? Whence
those things which awaken your pleasures when de-
cayed? Whence that quiet and ease in which you
rot and moulder away? Will you not say, if you are
thankful, that you owe all this to the bounty of Heaven?’
All that Seneca saith in this part of his book de Be-
neficiis is very true; but, on the other side, doth
not Pliny (79) assure us that nature makes us buy her
presents at the price of so many sufferings, that it is
dubious whether she deserves most, the name of a pa-
rent, or of a step-mother? To reconcile these two
authors, we ought to consider what the Scripture
teaches us concerning the oeconomy of God, as
a father, and as judge of mankind. Those two
relations require that man should feel good and evil:
but the question is, whether evil exceeds good? and
upon this head I am apt to think that we can go no
farther than opinions and conjectures. Several people
say, that most persons, when a little advanced in
years, grow like la Mothe le Vayer, who would have
refused to pass again through the same good and
evil which he had felt in his life (80). If it be so,
we must believe that, upon the whole, every one finds
the pleasures which he has enjoyed, has been unequal
to the uneasinesses and pains with which he has been
afflicted. I do not alledge that no body is content
with his condition, for this is no proof that every
man believes himself less happy than unhappy.
These verses of Horace contain a most certain fact:*

Qui sit, Mæcenas, ut nemo, quam sibi fortem
Seu ratio dederit, seu fors objecerit, illa
Contentus vivat? laudet diversa sequentes (81)?

*Whence comes, my Lord, this general discontent?
Why do all laud the state that chance hath sent,*

Paley

(77) Seneca, de
Beneficiis, lib.
iv, cap. v. Com-
pare what has
been said above
of Cicero, in
citation [90], of
the article PE-
RICLES.

(78) Seneca, ibid.
cap. vi.

(79) I have cit-
ed his words in
remark [D].
See the words of
Seneca, in re-
mark [C].

(80) See remark
[F], in the ar-
ticle VAYER,
and what has
been said of Ci-
cero, in the ar-
ticle TULLIA,
remark [2].

(81) Horat. lib.
i, satira 2a.

Or their own choice procur'd? but fondly blest
Their neighbour's lots, and praise what they possess?
CREECH.

(82) I have quoted his words in the article TULLIA, citat. (83).

(83) Felicitas cui
præcipua fuerit
homini non est
humani iudicii :
cum prosperita-
tem ipsam alius
alio modo & su-
opte ingenio quis-
que terminet.
*Plin. lib. vii,
cap. xl, pag. m.
62.*

(84) Tacitus,
Annal. lib. vi,
cap. xxii,

(85) See the article MANICHEES, remark [C].

(36) Pausanias,
lib. viii, pag.
296.

Phlopidium, fecit & Cræsum (87) Lydorum regem, vitam omni suæ ætatis tempore beatam egisse, id ego ut credam non facile adducor. Nam ut hominum quis levioribus multo, quam alius quicumque qui iidem vixerit temporibus, incommodis affectus, non difficilimè fortasse reperitur, uti navis adversis tempestatibus minus agitata : sic promodum neminem unquam crediderim perpetuò molestarum & calamitatum immunem fuisse : quando neque ulla navis memorari possit, quæ semper secundissimis ufa fuerit tempestatibus. Nam & Homerus *id sensitse videtur, quo loco duo, bonorum unum, alterum malorum, doliâ apud Jovem statuit.* id enim ille ex Delphico Apolline didicerrat ; qui ipsium & miserum simul, & beatum dixerat, utpote ad utramque vitæ sortem genitum. - - *What I have heard at Plophis, concerning Aglaus, a man of that city, who lived in the time of Cræsus, King of Lydia, that this Aglaus was happy through the whole course of his life, seemed to me incredible. One man indeed may meet with fewer afflictions than other men, as one ship may suffer less in a storm than another. But that any man should be continually free from troubles and distresses, is as incredible, and contrary to experience, as that ever there was a ship which always enjoyed favourable winds. Homer says that there lies by Jupiter an urn containing good things ; but he places by him another containing evil things. This he learned from Apollo of Delphos, who pronounced, that Homer himself was both an unhappy and a happy man, and was born both to a good and a bad fate. As this Aglaus was living in Cræsus's time, it is no wonder that Solon omitted him, when he named to that Monarch three men who to him seemed happy (88), for he believed that to deserve such a title, one ought to be sheltered from the inconstancy of fortune, and that, during this life no man is secure from this inconstancy. If Solon had affirmed that those three men, never felt either grief or pain, he had been mistaken (89), and had contradicted that profound good sense which made him look for instances of happiness, not at the court of Cræsus, but amongst men of an ordinary condition.*

(87) This is now well translated by Romulus Amæus. It should be, *tem-pore Cræsi*. This fault has not been mended in the Leipsic edition, 1696.

(88) Plutarch. in Solone, pag. 93.

(89) See, above, in citation (86), the words of Pausanias.

'It is certain that those who would find persons, who have felt more happiness than uneasiness, will rather meet with them among the peasants, or the meanest tradesmen, than amongst Kings and Princes' (90). Read these words of a great man: 'Do you believe then that afflictions and the most deadly pains do not hide themselves under the purple, or that a kingdom is an universal remedy against all evils, balm that assuages them, or a charm which enchants them? Whereas, by the course of Divine providence, which knows how to counterpoise the most exalted conditions, this grandeur which we at a distance admire, as something more than human, affects less those who are born in it, or confounds itself in its own plenty; and, on the contrary, in grandeur, afflictions are more deeply felt; their blow is so much the heavier on great men, as they are less prepared to bear it' (91). These are the two forces of the un-

PRINCES and great men are not so happy as other people.

(90) See HORACE, Epodon Ode II.

m s v

C
G r n

(91) James Be

heavier on great men, as they are less prepared to
 'bear it' (91). These are the two sources of the un-
 happiness of Princes: their being continually ac-
 cuffed to the advantages of their condition, renders
 them insensible as to good, and very sensible of evil.
 Let them receive one piece of bad news, and three of
 good, they scarce feel the happiness of the latter, but are
 touched to the quick with the misfortune of the former.
 Can they then want uneasiness? Are their prospe-
 rities not thwarted by some ill fortune? Read all that
 Gustavus Adolphus did in Germany, and you will
 there find a superiority of fortune, which has very
 few examples; yet you will observe so great a mixture
 of disadvantageous events, that you will easily believe
 him to have run through a great deal of uneasiness
 (92). Nay, suppose the victories gained in some pro-
 vinces, do not concur with the losses sustained in others,
 you will have reason to believe that the joy is not
 pure and unmixed. An hundred anxious reflexions
 disturb it. People will imagine that the attack was
 made too soon or too late; too many men were lost,
 and all advantage was not taken of the disorder of
 the vanquished, but they were permitted to recover
 from their fright; and they believe that by a different
 conduct the victory had been more complete. How
 many Generals are there who have very uneasy nights
 after entire victories? They are sensible that they are
 beholden for them to some lucky chance, to the

(91) James Be-
 nignus Bossuet,
Bishop of Meaux,
Oraison funebre
de Marie Terese
d'Autriche,
Reine de France,
pag. 78, 79.
Dutch edition.

(92) He was ob-
 liged to publish
 some Manifesto's
 against those
 who blamed him
 for not taking
 the present
 of Magdeburg.

7 H fault

(87) This is not well translated by Romulus A-maſæus. It ſhould be, *tempore Cræſſi*. This fault has not been mended in the Leipſic edition, 1696.

e (88) Plutarch. in
Solone, pag. 91.

(89) See, above, in citation (86), the words of Pausanias.

O PRINCES and
great men are
not so happy as
other people.

(90) See Horace,
Epodon Ode II.

(91) James Be-
nignus Bossuet,
Bishop of Meaux,
Oraison funebre
de Marie Tereſe
d' Auſtriche,
Reine de France,
pag. 78, 79.
Dutch edition.

(92) He was obliged to publish some Manifesto's against those who blamed him for not preventing the taking of Magdeburg.

kind with an infinite number of agreeable conveniences, and appointed all other things for

fault of the enemy, and sometimes even to their own faults. They are sensible they have not done all that might have been done. They are apprehensive of the comments of the experienced, and of the malicious reflexions of their enemies. In a word, they cannot bear a good testimony to themselves, nor internally applaud the eulogies bestowed upon them. This disturbs and racks them. Whilst their consciences are sometimes asleep, with regard to the law of God, they are touched to the very quick with respect to the transgression of some laws in the art of war, and the non-observance of some rules which an expert General would have followed. Observe, that the most fortunate Princes, either in gaining of battles, or conquering of towns, are those, whom the defeat of an army, or the raising of a siege, afflict the most sensibly. A long train of adversities hardens others; but these grow almost insensible as to good success, and extremely sensible of the least disgraces. Augustus is an example of this. On a thousand occasions he obtained the most important and glorious advantages over his enemies that he could have wished, and scarce experienced any of the effects of bad fortune: but the loss of three legions so prodigiously afflicted him, that the pain, we may say, he suffered on this account, was greater than the pleasure which he had felt by ten victories. Read what follows: 'Graves ignominias cladesque, *sait* Suetonius, after having made a long enumeration of the successes of this Emperor, duas omnino, nec alibi quam in Germania, accepit, Lollianam, & Varianam: Sed Lollianam majoris infamiae quam detrimenti: Varianam pene excusabilem, tribus legionibus, cum duce, legatibusque, & auxiliis omnibus cæsis. Hæc nuntiata, excubias per urbem indixit, ne quis tumultus existeret: & Præsidibus provinciarum propagavit imperium, ut & à peritis & assuetis sociis continerentur. Vovit & magnos ludos Jovi Opt. Max. si rempublicam in meliorem statum vertisset: quod factum Cimbrico Mariscoque bello erat. Adeo namque consternatum ferunt, ut per continuos menses barba capilloque summisso, caput interdum foribus illideret, vociferans: *Quintili Vare, legiones redde: diemque cladis quotannis mœstum habuerit ac lugubrem* (93).

(93) Suetonius, in Augustus, cap. 23.

Augustus met only with two disgraces, viz. the overthrow of Lollius and that of Varus, both in Germany. The former was attended with more infamy than loss. The latter was almost fatal, for in it were slain three legions, with their General, the Ambassadors, and all their auxiliaries. Upon the arrival of this news, Augustus set a guard in several parts of the city, to prevent tumults, and enlarged the authority of the governors of the provinces, that they might keep the allies from making commotions. He likewise made a vow of instituting solemn games to Jupiter, if he brought the Republic into a better condition: This was done in the war with the Cimbrians, and the Marfi. It is reported that Augustus was so much affected with this disgrace, that having, for several months, neglected his beard and hair, he would sometimes knock his head against the wall, and cry out, Varus, restore my legions; and he annually held the day of that overthrow as a day of sadness and mourning. I cannot better prove, than by the example of Augustus, that we ought not to look for happy people upon the throne; for, if any monarch was ever fortune's favourite, it was Augustus; and yet the list of his griefs (94) is so large, that no one will deny, that at least he felt as much evil as good. See what I observe concerning Charles V (95), Queen Elizabeth (96), Lewis XI (97), and Lewis XIII (98). Mr Silhon faith judiciously, that the whole lives of the Emperors, Ferdinand, Charles V, and Philip II, were nothing but a mixture of good and evil; that in them we see prosperities without number, and misfortunes without measure; wounds covered with laurels, and triumphs adorned with mourning. . . . Look upon Ferdinand, proud of the reduction of the kingdom of Granada, and of obtaining the title of Catholic: see him triumphing in the conquest of Naples, and over the fortune of France: behold, a caprice gives him Navarre, and chance guides him to the discovery of an unknown world, and new riches. . . . But let us consider the other side of his life, and turn the tables. We shall see a prince ill treated by fortune, and

(94) You will find it in Pliny, lib. vii, cap. xlv.

(95) In the remark [L], of his article.

(96) In the remark [S], of her article.

(97) In the remark [T], of his article.

(98) In the remark [B], of his article.

a diadem broken by her blows. We shall see a father burying his only son, and solemnizing the funeral of his eldest daughter. A husband losing a wife, who had been his glory, and more the companion of his fatigues than of his bed. A master forsaken by his servants and creatures: An old man driven from his house, and a father-in-law deplored and stripped by his own son-in-law (99). Add to this, that he could not bear the reputation of a great Captain. And this jealousy was not the least of his uneasinesses. See in the original what Mr Silhon faith of Charles V (100), and Philip II. And see what Plutarch relates of a great Prince who was esteemed happy (101).

The Abbot Regnier had great reason to say (102),

Qu'ont ils d'ordinaire,
Qu'ont ils au dessus
Du destin vulgaire
Ceux qu'un fort prospère
Elevé le plus?
Une montre vaine
De grandeur humaine,
Qui marche avec eux,
Des dehors pompeux,
Brillants agréables,
Des soins devorants,
Des biens apparents,
Des maux véritables.
Les grands en un mot
N'ont pas le bon Lot.

The man whom fortune raises high
In power, or wealth, or dignity,
Say what has he above the fate
Of other men in humble state?
What but a pageant outside show
Of human grandeur does he know?
Devouring cares, apparent bliss,
Not one degree of happiness:
Whilst anxious thoughts, and misery
Lie hid beneath the pageantry.
In short, the truly happy state
Is not the portion of the great.

The following words of the Count de Buffi struck me the first time that I read them: 'When you and I shall no longer have upon our hands the expense of the war for our children, we shall meet with other troubles in time of peace; for, in short, we must have some. Hear our friend Comines talking on this subject of the crosses of human life. No creature is exempt from trouble, all eat their bread in pain and sorrow; our Lord promised it when he made man, and hath faithfully performed it to all sorts of people (103).' If Philip de Comines had been asked, Do you believe that Kings have a larger share in the execution of this promise of our Lord than other men? I am thoroughly persuaded that he would have answered, Yes, I believe it (104).

What I have been saying of Kings, may, in proportion, be said of all those whom providence raises to eminent posts, and who share in any kind of grandeur. Their lot is a mixture, in which evil is for the most part predominant. Great knowledge and a sublime genius do not exempt men from this fatality. No, look rather amongst the most ignorant rabble, than among illustrious learned men for happiness: the glory that surrounds authors and celebrated orators, doth not secure them from a thousand troubles. It exposes them to envy two several ways, which are very inconvenient. They have rivals who persecute them, and are jealous, in their turn, of the praises which others deserve; a Typographical error gives them more disturbance, than four letters full of eulogies can afford them pleasure. The glory which they have acquired diminishes the pleasure they take in being praised, and increases their uneasiness for the want of praise, for censure, sharing of fame, &c. Besides, the more learning they have, the more they know that

(99) Silhon, Mémoires d'Etat, liv. ii, Discours iii, pag. 131, Dutch edition.

(100) He is in the wrong to call him Ferdinand's nephew. He was deposed by some Latin book, wherein he found that Charles V, was nephew, that is, grandson to Ferdinand.

(101) It is in Agnæmon, See Plutarch, de tranquillitate animi, pag. 466, 471. Read the whole Dissertation of la Motte le Vayer, upon Prosperity, in the eighth volume of his Works.

(102) In a piece of Poetry, prefixed to Mr Lett's Critique sur les Lettres.

(103) Buffi de Comines's sixth letter of the first Part, pag. 215, Dutch edition.

(104) See the last chapter, and the conclusion of his Memoirs.

for their use, consider man in another respect as an unhappy being [G]. That kind of necessity to which so many people are reduced, of seeking a remedy for their uneasiness among

that their works are imperfect. If they guard against the weakness of prejudices, and the irregularities of a hundred mean passions, and are willing to conform their language and conduct to this temper of mind, they become odious, and must renounce all external advantages. If they externally conform to the depraved taste of the world, they reproach themselves a hundred times a day with this ignominious hypocrisy, and thereby disturb their quiet. There are very few who, like Democritus, can know the extravagance of humours, and divert themselves with it: that Philosopher was master of this talent. Read Hippocrates's letter to Damagetes, and add to it the paraphrase upon it which an author of the XVIIth century (105) published. He elegantly and particularly unfolds what the Greek author had said in general. He diverted himself with this censure, one may perceive that he was vexed, and that if he had been asked,

Quelle humeur sombre
Fais tu voir à contretiens ?

What puts you so much out of humour ?

He might have said

C'est que je ne suis point du nombre
Des Auteurs qui font contents (106).

I am not a contented author.

Pausanias (107) mentions the oracle which was delivered to Homer, *You are happy and unhappy*. Apollo could not answer better.

It is time to put an end to these common-places. Give me leave then to conclude with four remarks. The first is, that if we consider mankind in general, it seems that Xenophanes might have said, that pain and grief prevail over pleasure. II. That there are some private persons, who we may presume, taste in this life much more good than evil. III. That there are others of whom we may believe, that they have a much larger share of evil than good. IV. That my second proposition is more especially probable, with respect to those who die before their declining age; and that the third appears chiefly certain in those who arrive to a decrepit old age. When Racan said,

Que pour eux seulement les Dieux ont fait la gloire,
Et pour nous les plaisirs (108).

For them alone the gods have glory made,
And for us pleasures.

Doubtless he considered only the flower of our age; it is then that pleasures are predominant; and that good turns the scale (109): it is then that the Pagan Nemesis makes advances, and gives credit: she is then willing that accounts should be settled without any deduction; but she reimburses her self in old age.

Multa senem circumveniunt incommoda, vel quod
Quærit, & inventis miser abstinet, ac timet uti:
Vel quod res omnes timide gelideque ministrat,
Dilator spe longus, iners, avidusque futuri:
Difficilis, querulus, laudator temporis æsti
Se puero, censor castigatorem minorum.
Multa ferunt anni venientes commoda secum,
Multa recedentes adimunt (110).

An old man's character is hit with ease
For he is peevish, and all one disease:
Still covetous, and still he gripes for more,
And yet he fears to use his present store:
Slow, long in hope, still eager to live on,
And fond of no man's judgment but his own:
On youth's gay frolics peevishly severe,
And oh! when he was young, what times they were!

The flow of life brings in a wealthy store,
The ebb draws back what e'er was brought before,
And leaves a barren sand and naked shore.

CREECH.

This Poet hath not said all, nor was it necessary for him to touch on the disadvantage of old age which Juvenal displays.

Ut vigeant sensus animi, ducenda tamen sunt
Funera natorum, rogus aspiciendus amatæ
Conjugis, & fratris, plenæque fororibus urnæ.
Hæc data poena diu viventibus, ut renovata
Semper clade domus, multis in luctibus, inque
Perpetuo mœrore, & nigra veste senescant (111).

(111) Juvenal.
Sat. X, ver.
240.

Well, yet suppose his senses were his own,
He lives to be chief mourner for his son:
Before his face his wife and brother burns,
He numbers all his kindred in their urns.
These are the fines he pays for living long,
And dragging tedious age in his own wrong:
Griefs always green, a household still in tears,
Sad pomps: a threshold throng'd with daily biers
And liveries of black for length of years.

DRYDEN.

Add to this that passage of Virgil:

Optima quæque dies miseris mortalibus ævi
Prima fugit: subeunt morbi, tristisque senectus;
Et labor, & duræ rapit inclementia mortis (112).

(112) Virgil.
Georgic. lib. iii,
ver. 66.

In youth alone unhappy mortals live;
But ah! the mighty bliss is fugitive.
Discolour'd sickness, anxious labour come,
And age and death's inexorable doom.

DRYDEN.

Observe, that Racan advanced a maxim which contradicts the greatest of the ancient Poets, for see what Homer saith:

Ὅς γὰρ ἐπ' ἀλάσartos θεοὶ δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι,
Σέθεν ἀχρυμένους αὐτοὶ δὲ τ' ἀνδρείας εἰσι.

Sic enim fato tribuant dii miseris mortalibus,
Ut vivant tristes: ipsi vero sine curis sunt (113).

(113) Homer.
Iliad. lib. xxiv,
ver. 525.

... man is born to bear,
Such is, alas! the gods severe decree
They, only they are blest, and only free.

MR POPE.

[G] Even those who believe that nature... appointed all other things for their use, consider man... as an unhappy being.] Have we not seen, above (114), that Pliny, after a prologue which allows the superiority to all other animals, with regard to disadvantages? Could Seneca, who so well represents the favours which God bestows on men (115), have denied Pliny's observation? Could Socrates, who so advantageously described the prerogatives of human nature, have denied them? 'Thou thinkest,' said he to a disciple who denied Providence, 'that the gods take no care of man, they who have allowed him alone the privilege of going erect, which is of great advantage to him in discovering things at a distance, in considering things above at his ease, and avoiding many inconveniences. In the next place, all animals which walk have indeed feet; but they serve them for no other use than barely to walk. Whereas the gods, besides this, have given hands to man, which render him the happiest animal in the world. All animals have tongues; but there is none besides that of man, that can form words, to explain his thoughts, and communicate them to others. And

(114) Remark
[D], at the beginning.

(115) See, above, citation (77), (78).

(105) Alardus Amstelredamus. This paraphrase upon the Epistle of Hippocrates was composed in the abbey of Egmond in Holland, in the year 1526. The edition I make use of was printed Salongiæ apud Joannem Soterem, 1539, in 8vo.

(106) These verses are in one of Quinault's Operas. I only change the word *Amans* into that of *Auteurs*.

(107) See his own words above, in citation (86).

(108) See his letter to Balzac, in the second tome of the *Recueil de Lettres nouvelles*, printed at Paris in 1634, pag. 300.

(109) This is not contrary to that passage of the Psalmist: *Even the flower of this life is such; that we are always in pain and sorrow: for Moses only represented the state of the Jews at that time.*

(110) Horat. de Arte Poetica, ver. 169.

among forbidden pleasures, is no small part of the severity of their fate [H]. However, we may here alledge the authority of Aristotle; for that great genius, who philosophized with so much application, and penetration, acknowledged that there was in nature more evil than good, and that therefore Empedocles disliked the hypothesis of the unity of a principle, and first supposed two principles, one of good, the other of evil [I]. The Holy Scripture so emphatically represents the miseries of this life (m), that it is sufficient to afford a demonstrative argument on this controversy. I wonder Rabbi Maimonides, a man of great learning and judgment, and a good Philosopher, could think that he had fully refuted the doctrine I mention [K]. It is not improbable that Xenophanes believed the

(m) See particularly the book of Job, and that of the Psalms in several places.

non
volges

to shew that the gods have provided even for our pleasures, they have not determined the season for the amours of men, who may continually enjoy, till their extreme old age, a pleasure which the brutes taste only at a certain season of the year. Lastly, not content to bestow so many advantages on the body of man, they have endowed him with a soul, transcendently excellent, and surpassing all others. For which, amongst the souls of other animals hath any knowledge of the essence of the gods, the works of whose creation are so stupendous? Is there any other species, besides that of man, that serves and adores them? What animal like him can defend it self from hunger, thirst, cold, and heat? Which of them like us can discover remedies against disease, or exercise his strength? Which of them is so capable of learning, or so perfectly retains the things which he hath seen, heard, or known? In a word, it is clear that man is a god in comparison with other living species, considering the advantages of body and mind, which he naturally hath over them (116). It is very likely that after this beautiful description, he would have owned the deplorable condition of man, if he had been desired to examine the matter thoroughly.

(116) Xenophon, de memorab. Socrat. lib. i.

[H] Of seeking a remedy for their uneasiness among forbidden pleasures. Is not this removing a Physical evil by a moral one? Is not such a remedy worse than the disease? And is not the man very miserable, who can have recourse to no other remedy than this? It is very certain that a great many people find no other. Domestic brawls, and the fight of an ill management at home force men out of doors to gaming, or to drinking at the tavern. Without that they cannot drive away their melancholy; and that is the sole diversion which they oppose against uneasiness. Some even get drunk on purpose to avoid uneasy thoughts at night, the time when they are most troublesome. They have found that such thoughts keep them from sleeping, and make them too cruelly attentive to their misery. Therefore by wine they procure themselves a perfect drouziness. This is so much gained from ill fortune; this is securing the most formidable part of the whole day. Generally speaking, women cannot make use of this antidote to anxiety, and therefore their condition is more deplorable than that of men. Whence Medea declares in Euripides, that a woman ill married is in such a miserable condition, that it is better for her to die than continue in it; she cannot, like the men, go abroad in quest of necessary consolations.

Κἄν μὲν τὰς ἡμῖν ἐκπορεύμεναισιν εὖ
Πόσις ξυνοικῇ, μὴ βία φέρων ζυγόν,
Ζηλωτὸς αἰὼν εἰ δὲ μὴ, θανεῖν χρεών.
Ἄνδρ' δ' ἔταν τοῖς ἔνδον ἀχθεται ξυνών,
Ἐξω μολὼν ἵπτασε καρδίας χόλον,
Ἦ πρὸς φίλων τιν', ἢ πρὸς ἡλικά τεταπείσ.
Ἡμῖν δ' ἀνάγκη πρὸς μίαν ψυχὴν βλέπειν.

1000
miserable

Et si nobis hæc quidem peragentibus bene
Cohabitaverit maritus, non violentum nobis impo-
nens jugum,
Beata est vita: sin minus, fatius est mori.
Vir vero cum dolet propter res domesticas,
Foras egressus fedat cordis bilem,
Conversus aut ad aliquem amicum, aut coetaneum,
Sed nos oportet spectare ad unam animam (117).

(117) Euripid. in Medea, ver. 841, pag. m. 876.

If, when
The careful comfort rules her household well,
Her husband governs with a gentle sway,
And courts her lov'd embrace; what home-felt joy,

What inward comforts seize her raptur'd breast!
But if, he, scornful, flights her converse sweet,
'Tis better for her far to die than live.
Man when oppress'd with black domestic cares,
Ranges abroad to seek relief, and meets
The healing comforts of a faithful friend,
Or fellowship of some companion dear.
But helpless, hapless, woman, when denied
Those tender joys which from her husband's love
She justly claims, must seek it no where else.

[I] Aristotle . . . acknowledged that there was in nature more evil than good, and that therefore Empedocles . . . first supposed two principles, one of good, the other of evil.] Before I cite his words, I must observe, that he takes the liberty of unravelling Empedocles's opinion, and explaining it according to the spirit, rather than the letter of it; but after all he takes for granted, that good is the cause of all good, and evil the cause of all evil. The two principles of Empedocles, were amity and discord: Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τὰν αὐτῶν τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἐνόντα ἐφαίνετο ἐν τῇ φύσει, καὶ ἡ μόνον τάξις, καὶ τὸ καλὸν, ἀλλ' ἀταξία, καὶ τὸ αἰσχρὸν, καὶ πλείον τὰ κακὰ τῶν ἀγαθῶν, καὶ τὰ φαῦλα τῶν καλῶν. ὅπως ἀλλόως τις φιλίαν εἰσένεγκε, καὶ τὸ νείκεον, ἐκείνου ἐκατέρωθεν αἰτίον τῶν. εἰ γὰρ τις ἀκαταξίαν, καὶ λαμβάνοι πρὸς τὴν διάνοιαν, καὶ μὴ πρὸς τὴν φιλίαν εἶναι τῶν ἀγαθῶν, τὸ εὐρύσει τὴν μὲν φιλίαν εἶναι τῶν ἀγαθῶν, τὸ δὲ νείκεον τῶν κακῶν. ὥς εἴ τις εἴποι τινὰ καὶ λέγον, καὶ πρῶτον λέγον τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἀρχὰς ἑμπεδοκλέα, τὰς αἰτίας λέγον καλῶς. εἰπερ τὸ τῶν ἀγαθῶν αἰτίον, αὐτὸ τὸ ἀγαθὸν εἴσι, καὶ τῶν κακῶν, τὸ κακόν. Cum autem contraria quoque bonis inesse naturæ apparent, nec solum ordo, & pulchrum, verum etiam inordinatio, & turpe, pluraque mala, quam bona, & turpia quam pulchra, idem alius quidam amicitiam introduxit, & contentionem, utrumque utriusque horum causam. Si quis enim sequatur, & secundum sententiam accipiat, non secundum ea, quæ balbutiens Empedocles dicit, inveniet amicitiam quidem bonorum causam esse, contentionem verò malorum. Quare si quis dicat quodam modo dicere, & primum Empedoclem dicere malum, & bonum esse principia, fortasse bene inquiet: siquidem bonorum omnium causa, ipsum bonum, ac malorum, ipsum malum est.

(118) Aristotle, in nature things; which are contrary and opposite to good ones, and we observe not only order and beauty, but also disorder and deformity, and more things evil than good, more things deformed than beautiful; so there must be two distinct principles, one the cause of amity, and the other of discord. For if you take the sense and spirit of this opinion, and not the inaccurate expressions of Empedocles, it will appear that amity is the cause of good, and discord of evil. Therefore, if any one should say that Empedocles affirmed, in some respect, and was the first who affirmed that there are two principles, one good, the other evil, perhaps he would be in the right: for the principle of all good things is a good principle, and that of all evil things, is an evil one. Observe that he elsewhere (119) censures this opinion of Empedocles, and that he did not believe that there was any eternal principle of evil; for he affirms (120), that there is nothing but good in the eternal Beings.

[K] I wonder Rabbi Maimonides . . . could think that he had fully refuted the doctrine I mention.] He confesses that the Heathens, and even some of the Rabbins, made declamations on the superiority of evil, and he treats them as ridiculous and senseless men. Scapissime, faith he (121), solent in cordibus hominum imperitorum istiusmodi cogitationes exsurgere, ac si longè plura essent in mundo Mala quam Bona: ita

man
thee

(118) Aristotle, in nature things; which are contrary and opposite to good ones, and we observe not only order and beauty, but also disorder and deformity, and more things evil than good, more things deformed than beautiful; so there must be two distinct principles, one the cause of amity, and the other of discord. For if you take the sense and spirit of this opinion, and not the inaccurate expressions of Empedocles, it will appear that amity is the cause of good, and discord of evil. Therefore, if any one should say that Empedocles affirmed, in some respect, and was the first who affirmed that there are two principles, one good, the other evil, perhaps he would be in the right: for the principle of all good things is a good principle, and that of all evil things, is an evil one. Observe that he elsewhere (119) censures this opinion of Empedocles, and that he did not believe that there was any eternal principle of evil; for he affirms (120), that there is nothing but good in the eternal Beings.

(119) Aristotle, in nature things; which are contrary and opposite to good ones, and we observe not only order and beauty, but also disorder and deformity, and more things evil than good, more things deformed than beautiful; so there must be two distinct principles, one the cause of amity, and the other of discord. For if you take the sense and spirit of this opinion, and not the inaccurate expressions of Empedocles, it will appear that amity is the cause of good, and discord of evil. Therefore, if any one should say that Empedocles affirmed, in some respect, and was the first who affirmed that there are two principles, one good, the other evil, perhaps he would be in the right: for the principle of all good things is a good principle, and that of all evil things, is an evil one. Observe that he elsewhere (119) censures this opinion of Empedocles, and that he did not believe that there was any eternal principle of evil; for he affirms (120), that there is nothing but good in the eternal Beings.

(120) Aristotle, in nature things; which are contrary and opposite to good ones, and we observe not only order and beauty, but also disorder and deformity, and more things evil than good, more things deformed than beautiful; so there must be two distinct principles, one the cause of amity, and the other of discord. For if you take the sense and spirit of this opinion, and not the inaccurate expressions of Empedocles, it will appear that amity is the cause of good, and discord of evil. Therefore, if any one should say that Empedocles affirmed, in some respect, and was the first who affirmed that there are two principles, one good, the other evil, perhaps he would be in the right: for the principle of all good things is a good principle, and that of all evil things, is an evil one. Observe that he elsewhere (119) censures this opinion of Empedocles, and that he did not believe that there was any eternal principle of evil; for he affirms (120), that there is nothing but good in the eternal Beings.

(121) Maimonides in More Necessaries, lib. i. c. 2, p. 717.

the incomprehensibility of all things [L]. He gave the Egyptians good advice, when he saw them lamenting in the celebration of their festivals: *if the objects of your worship, said he (n), are gods, do not weep: if they are men, offer no sacrifices to them.*

(n) Plutarchus de Superstit. 174 fms, pag. 171.

Others

ita ut in multis poematis & cantilenis Gentilium hæc & similia reperiantur; Miraculi instar esse, quando in Tempore boni aliquid invenitur: Mala autem esse multa & perpetua. Atque hic error non folum in Vulgo obtinuit, verum etiam apud eos, qui Sapientes haberi volunt, & apud ipsum Alraft in libro illo celebri, quem Sepher Elobuth h. e. Theophrastum nominavit, in quo multa ex deliriis & stoliditatibus suis congesta, è quibus & istud est, quod plura existant Mala quam Bona; eò quod, si comparationem instituas inter recreationes & voluptates Hominis, quas tempore tranquillitatis percipit, cum doloribus, cruciatibus, perturbationibus, defectibus, curis, sollicitudinibus, & afflictionibus, deprehendatur, vitam Hominis illorum bonorum respectu, esse Vindictam magnam & Malum magnum. --- There arise very frequently in the minds of ignorant men such thoughts as this, that there is far more evil than good in the world; and accordingly in the poems and songs of the Heathens, we very often meet with these and the like expressions; It is as it were a miracle, if good things continue for any time: but evil things are numerous and lasting. This error prevailed not only among the vulgar, but even among those who desired to be thought wise men, and was held by Alraft himself, as appears from that famous book of his called The wisdom of God, where he has collected together a great many of his own delirious and foolish conceits, and this among others, that there is in the world more evil than good, because if you compare the recreations and pleasures of any man, such as he enjoys in times of health and peace, with his pains, torments, disorders, wants, cares, anxieties, and afflictions, it will appear that his life, compared with these good things, is a great punishment, and a great evil. He says that the cause of their extravagant error is (22), that they fancy nature was made only for them, and do not mind that which has no reference to their persons, from whence they infer that if any thing goes ill with them, all is amiss in the universe. He adds, that if we would consider the smallness of man, with respect to the universe, we should be soon convinced that the superiority of evil has no place among the angels or the celestial bodies, nor among the elements and the mixt inanimate beings, nor among several sorts of animals. This observation of Maimonides doth not come home to the question; for those whom he refutes mean nothing else but that among men evil surpasses good. What doth it avail then in order to convince them of their error, to say that evil doth not surpass good in the rest of nature? All inanimate bodies are incapable of good and evil; they must not therefore be put into the account when this question is in dispute: and there is no body but may maintain, that all in which we place the order, beauty, and perfection of the celestial bodies, &c. being changed, it would be no evil with respect to the universe, though man, or some other particular creatures, should suffer damage by it. If the sun and the planets, had the same variation as the ships, which go and come between Marfeilles and Naples, sometimes in fewer and sometimes in more days, without any fixed rule, could not one pretend, that, with respect to the universe, it is not an evil, an imperfection and a disorder?

[L] Xenophanes believed the incomprehensibility of all things. Let us begin this remark with a passage of Diogenes Laërtius: Φησὶ δὲ Σωτρίων πρῶτον αὐτὸν εἰπεῖν ἀκατάληπτα εἶναι τὰ πάντα, πλανώμενον, that is, Sotion, who says that Xenophanes maintained that all things are incomprehensible, is mistaken (125). We cannot judge by these words whether Diogenes Laërtius denied that Xenophanes held the incomprehensibility of all things; for he might not deny it, and yet charge Sotion with an error. This accusation would be just, if before Xenocrates others taught that all the objects of our mind are beyond our comprehension. There are a thousand such places in Diogenes Laërtius; they do him but little honour: for an exact genius would avoid these ambiguities and obscurities. I conjecture he intended to say that Xenophanes did not teach the incomprehensibility of all things (126); but at the same time I think he is to blame to speak thus of this Philosopher. All appearances engage us to believe that Xenophanes taught, that we could not comprehend any thing in the nature of things. Plutarch charges him with saying, that our senses and reason are fallacious faculties. Αποφαίνονται δὲ καὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις ψευδεῖς, καὶ καὶ τὸν λόγον ἀσθενεῖν, καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν λόγον διαβάλλειν. Sensus fallaces esse contendit, unaque cum illis ipsam quoque rationem in omnibus criminatur (127). Others will have it that he denied the evidence of the senses in order to conclude that nothing ought to be relied upon but reason, and they tell us that he was the first author of this doctrine. Οἰοῦνται δὲ τὰς μὲν αἰσθήσεις καὶ τὰς φαντασίας καταβάλλειν, αὐτῷ δὲ μόνον τὸν λόγον πισύειν. Τοιαῦτα γὰρ τίνα πρότερον μὲν Ξενοφάνης, καὶ Παρμενίδης ἐλεγον. Sensus visque omnia funditus repudianda, rationi uni fidem habendam opinantur. Ac primum quidem Xenophanes, & Parmenides in ea sunt doctrina versati (128). I believe Plutarch represents the system of Xenophanes more faithfully than Aristocles. I believe Xenophanes relied no more upon reason than upon his senses. This is what induces me to think so. He was the first who taught that whatever has been made is corruptible. Πρῶτον ἀπερίναλον ὅτι πᾶν τὸ γινόμενον φθαρτὸν ἐστὶ. Primus definiit omne quod fiat corruptioni obnoxium esse (129). He also taught that all things were but one sole being, that there was neither generation nor corruption; and that this sole being continued always the same, and could not be subject to any change (130). Ὅθεν ἡξίουν ὅτοι γὰρ τὸ ὄν ἐν εἶναι, καὶ τὸ μὴ ὄν ἕτερον εἶναι, μὴδὲ γενέσθαι τι, μὴδὲ φθείρεσθαι, μὴδὲ κινεῖσθαι τὸ παρ᾽ ἑαυτῶν. Hi quicquid esset, unum duntaxat esse: quod ab eo diversum esset, id non esse: generari nihil: nihil corrumpi, moveri omnino nihil statuebant (131). But the following is a more exact account of the principles of Xenophanes, in their natural connexion. First of all he affirmed (132) that nothing is made out of nothing, that is, to remove all ambiguity, that a thing which has not always existed can never exist. From thence he concluded that whatever is, hath always existed: Zephone, & Gorgias, init. in the first tome of his works, pag. 939; Edit. of Geneva, 1805.

(123) The fra water, whole bitterness is intolerable, contains 40, or 42, times more sweet particles than salt ones.

(124) Saint Evremont in his discourse of vexations and displeasures. I quote him from the extract of an anonymous writer, who criticised that author, pag. 137; for my edition, (Tom. iv, pag. 45) which is the Dutch one, in 1693, contains but part of what that Critic mentions. [(5a) This piece was falsely ascribed to Mr de St Evremont. R. x. m. c. x. i.]

(125) See, below, in citation (142), the passage of Sextus Empiricus.

(126) Diog. Laërtius, lib. ix, num. 20.

(127) Plutarch. in Stromatis, apud Eusebium Præparat. Evangel. lib. i, cap. viii, pag. 23, B.

(128) Aristocles, de Philosophia, lib. viii, apud Eusebium, ubi supra, lib. xiv, cap. xviii, pag. 756, B.

(129) Diogenes Laërtius, ubi supra, num. 19.

(130) See Plato, in Sophista, pag. m. 170, C.

(131) Aristocles, apud Eusebium, ubi supra.

(132) See Aristocles's Treatise, de Xenophane, init. in the first tome of his works, pag. 939; Edit. of Geneva, 1805.

more evil

(122) Causa erroris fatui illius Homini & omnium ipsius fociorum est quod, &c. Id. ibid, pag. 355.

3 sorts of evils

little evil says much good

Hume - universal sense of evil

Others say (o) that he made use of this thought, when the Eleates desired to know of him whether they ought to sacrifice to Leucothea, and shed tears for her or not. I must

(o) Aristot. Rhetoric. lib. ii, cap. xxiii, pag. m. 447, C.

with st
cal

(133) Ubi supra.

(134) When a being is distinct from another, it is not a part of it; and therefore a being distinct from any other being is made out of nothing, and consequently created.

not be one, but several beings. Lastly, this sole, eternal and infinite being, ought to be immovable, and immutable; for if it could change its place, there would be something beyond it, it would not therefore be infinite: and if it could suffer any alteration without changing of place, something that did not always exist would begin to be produced, and something which had always existed would cease to be. But that is impossible; for every thing which not having eternally existed should begin to exist, must be produced out of nothing, and every thing which never had a beginning hath a necessary existence; and therefore cannot ever cease to be. These were his principles, if we believe Aristotle (133). I do not doubt but they appeared evident to him, and that he was persuaded they were a gradation of consequences necessarily drawn from an incontestable principle. The orthodox Divines would deny him, that nothing can have a beginning; but would grant him that the being which never had a beginning is one only, infinite, immovable, and immutable, and that no being, whose existence is necessary, can be destroyed. They teach, and with reason, that God is not subject to any alteration? for if any change should happen to him, he would acquire, and lose something. What he should acquire would be either distinct from his substance, or a mode identical with his substance. If it was a distinct being, God could not be a simple being; and, what is worse, would be composed of an increased nature, and, created one (134). If it was a mode identical with his substance, God could not produce it without producing himself: but as he exists independently of his own will, and did not give himself his existence at the beginning, it follows that he can never do it. Besides, nothing that necessarily exists can ever cease to be: from whence it must of necessity follow, that God never can lose what he once had. Now what is called a modification, or *an ens inherens in alio*, is of such a nature that it cannot be produced but by the ruin of another modality; just as a new figure is necessarily the destruction of the old one. Wherefore if God acquired something new, he must necessarily lose some other thing; for this new acquisition would not be a substance, but an accident, or an *ens inherens in alio*. Since therefore nothing which necessarily exists can cease to exist, it follows that God can never acquire any thing new. Thus the immutability of God is supported by evident notions. Xenophanes added to his maxims the following one, viz. that nothing is made out of nothing; now every accident produced a new, and distinct from the divine substance, would be produced out of nothing. He was therefore obliged to deny that the eternal being could acquire any new mode distinct from its own substance. But he found himself very much perplexed when the continual generations in nature were objected to him. They prove both that the universe is not one sole being, and that it contains something mutable, since it actually changes. In order to remove this objection, he excepted against the evidence of the senses; he urged that they deceive us, that it is not true that there happen any generations in nature, and that they are but false appearances. But he was doubtless answered, that the appearances of the senses would not change at all, if our mind continued always the same, and if the beings without us did not change; and therefore at least, what in us is the passive subject of perceptions, which you call the fallacies of the senses, must be mutable and variable: Therefore what you assert that there is no change in the universe, is not true. I cannot see that he could make any other reply than this; our reason is as fallacious as our senses, and every thing is incomprehensible to reason. For if when it is grounded even on evidence, which is her *ne plus ultra*, she doth not hit on truth, it is a sign that truth is a thing incomprehensible, and impentenable. Now relying upon evident notions, I had asserted that nothing is made out of nothing; whence it necessarily follows that nothing can begin, and that every thing that once exists, exists always, which evidently proves the immobility, and immutability of all things; I had, I say, clearly comprehended this, and yet the experience of my sensations and passions, convinces me that I am mu-

table: I had not therefore comprehended any thing with certainty, I have not therefore a faculty adequately proportioned to truth. Thus we may suppose he reasoned, and thence we might conclude that the sect of the Acataleptic (135), and that of the Sceptics, owed their birth solely to the principle of the immutable unity of all things maintained by Xenophanes. I do not affirm, that he was in the right in the consequences just mentioned. The only reason why I allege this, is to shew that I do not contradict the writer of this Philosopher's life without just reasons (136). First I have on my side the evidence of Sorion (137), Cicero (138), Plutarch (139), and some verses of Xenophanes (140) which were not unknown to Diogenes Laërtius (141). In the second place I may affirm that Xenophanes held some principles, which, as I have just now given several proofs of it, necessarily engaged him to assert the incomprehensibility of all things. Let us here cite the verses in which he declares his opinion.

(135) There, who taught the incomprehensibility.

(136) See what I have said of Diogenes Laërtius at the beginning of this remark.

(137) See, above citation (115).

(138) See, below.

Καὶ τὸ μὲν ἔν σαφὲς ἔστι ἀνὴρ ἰδεῖν, εἰς τις ἔσται
Εἰδὼς ἀμφὶ θῖον τε, καὶ ὅσα λίγῳ περι-
πάρτων.
Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα τύχοι τετελεισμένον εἰπὼν
Αὐτὸς ἡμῶς οὐκ οἶδε, δὲκ' ὁ δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τί-
τυκται.

*Nullus aperte vir scit, sed neque vir sciet unquam
De Diis & cunctis à me quæ dicta fuerunt.
Namque licet sit perfectum quod dixerit ille,
Ille tamen nescit, cunctis & opinio in bis est (142).*

We see plainly in these words, that Xenophanes (143) *Xenophanes, apud* declared it impossible for any person to arrive at the *Sextum Empiricum* clear and certain knowledge of the truth; and that *adverbi- Mathematis,* even if a man should meet with the truth, yet he can- *pag. 146, 157,* not know that he has met with it: he adds, that there *280. See also* is nothing but opinions within our reach. Sextus *Placitum, de* Empiricus (143) ranks him amongst those, who deny *not. Poet. pag.* a *criterium veritatis*, a rule or measure of truth. I own *17, E.* that he disagrees (144) with those, who place him among the Acateleptics; but wistful he ascribes to him (145) *Phil. pag.* the opinion, that we do not comprehend things to 146, that degree of certainty which amounts to science, and that our determinations never go beyond likeli- (144) *Ibid. &* hood and probability. Is not this at bottom to assert *pag. 156, 157.* Acatelepticism, or the incomprehensible nature of things? φαίνεται μὴ πᾶσαν κατάληψιν ἀναρῆναι ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐπισημονικὴν τε καὶ ἀδελτοτικὴν, ἢ ἀπολαύειν δὲ τὴν δόξαν. τίτῳ γὰρ ἐμαρῖν τὸ, δόξῃ δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τίθεται. ὥς κρηττόν γίνεσθαι κατὰ τὸν τὸν δόξαν λόγον τῆς τῶν τῆ εἰσότης, ἀλλὰ μὴ τὸν τῆ πᾶσις ὕμνον. Videtur non omnino tollere comprehensionem, sed eam quæ est ex scientia, & quæ non potest aberrare. Relinquit ergo opinabilem, quo enim indicat illud cunctis & opinio in his est: quo fit ut ex ejus sententia id quod judicatur sit ratio opinabilis, hoc est ratio ejus quod est probabile, non autem ea quæ sequitur id quod est firmum ac stabile (145). So that I do not think Mr Menage (145) *Ibid. Phil. pag. 157.* was much in the right to say, that Sextus Empiricus in this place favours Diogenes Laërtius against Sotion (146). And I am the more confirmed in this because (146) *Menage in Diogenes Laërt. lib. 12, num. 1.* that learned commentator says just before, that Cicero and Origen are favourable to Sotion (147): ‘Sotioni adimulatore Cicero in Lucullo: Parmenides, Xenophanes, minus bonis quamquam versibus, sed tamen illis, quibus, increpant eorum arrogantiam quasi iusti, qui, cum sciri nihil possit, audent se scire dicere. Item Origenes in Philoiphicis: Οὐτῶν ἐπὶ ἀσπῶν ἀκατάληπτα εἶναι πάντων, τίποσιν ὄντες, εἰ γὰρ κατὰ τὴν μέλειαν τυχόν τεταλεσμένοι εἴσιν. Αὐτὸς ὁμοίως ἐν οἷσδε, δόξας δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τίθεται. Cicero in his Lucullus favours the opinion of Sotion. Parmenides and Xenophanes in these verses, however indifferent, reprehend and seem to be angry with those men, who, though we can know nothing, are however so bold as to pretend to know the truth. And likewise Origen, in his Philoiphicis, favours the same’

(135) Those,
who taught the
incomprehensi-
bility.

(136) See what I have said of Diogenes Laërtius at the beginning of this remark.

(137) See, above
citation (125).

(138) See, below, *cit.* (147)

(139) See, citation (127).

(140) See, in citation (142), the passage of Sextus Empiricus.

(141) He cites the beginning of them in *Vita Pyrrhonis*, lib. ix, cap. 72.

(142) Xenophanes, *opud* Sextum Empiricum adversus Mathematicos pag. 146, 19280. See also Plutarch, &c. diend. Poët. 17. E.

him (143) *Ind. A*
to 146.

kel- (144) Ibid.
1:6. 1

of
πειν

[Handwritten signature]

7561
4401. *W*

inquit
s. &

pro-

iricus pag. 157.

because (146) Ma
in Diogen.
Cicero lib. ix, m

Xen- (147) *Ma-*
en illis *ibid.*

Item

ὁ γὰρ
εἰπὼν·

opinion
verles,

angry
nothing,
mouth

the same

(p) Diog. Laërt. ubi supra, num. 18. (q) The same town with *Missena*, now *Messina*.
(r) Cicero, Acad. Quæst. lib. iv. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. i, pag. 301.

(148) Plato, in
Sophista, pag.
270.

(149) Sextus
Empiricus, Pyr-
rhon. Hypoty-
pos. lib. i, cap.
xxxiii, pag. 46,
Edit. Genev.
1621.

(150) Aristoteles, Physicor.
lib. i, cap. iii.

(151) In the article STILPO, remark [H].

(152) Conimbricenses, in the paraphrase upon the third chapter of the first book of Aristotle's *Physics*.

(153) Aristot.
ubi supra.

(154) See the
Conimbricenses,
ubi supra.

(155) Lescalo-
pier, in Cicer.
de Nat. Deorum
lib. i, num. 28,
pag. 44.

attest

(156) Socrates, Zeno of Elea, Arcefilaus, Carneades, and such like impugnors of certainty, were some of the greatest genius's of antiquity.

(157) Qui plura
novit, eum ma-
jora sequuntur
dubia. --- *The*
more a man
knows, the more
matter he finds for
doubting. Nau-
dé, Addit. à la
Vie de Louis X

(158) Thucydides
lib. ii, pag. m.
136. A.

(159) Terence
says this upon
another occasion
in his prologue to
the *Andria*.

f (160) Pyrrhone,
lib. ix, num. 72

disciple, and that the complained of poverty [M]. The answer he gave a man with whom he refused to play at dice, is very worthy of a Philosopher. This person calling him a coward; yes, replied he, I am extremely so, with respect to shameful actions (S).

(1) ὁ μολογῶν καὶ πάντῃ δουλοῦναι πρὸς τὰ ἀσεβῆ καὶ ἄτοκα. Fallus est ad res inhonestas se timidi-
dissimum etiam esse. Plutarchus, de vitiojo Pudore, pag. 530.

'want, but hath reserved this for himself, and makes use of it: he is not at all happy in the possession of vast quantities of Gold, nor powerful by holding the thunder and lightning in his hand, but rather by his wisdom and knowledge; and this is one of the best and wisest things which Homer said, speaking of Jupiter and Neptune:'

Ἡ μὲν ἀφροσύνησιν ὁμῶν γίνετο ἡδ' ἰα πάτρην,
Ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς πρότερος γεγόνει καὶ πλείονα ἦδ' η.

Est ambobus idem fane genus & patria una,
Sed Jupiter natu prior erat, pluraque noverat (161).

(161) Homer.
Iliad. lib. xiii,
ver. 354.

Both of one line, both of one country boast;
But royal Jove's the eldest, and knows most.

He affirms that the preference and the precedence of Jupiter was more venerable and worthy, because he was more wise and intelligent. And as for me, I am of opinion, that the beatitude and felicity of eternal life, which Jupiter enjoys, consists in that he is ignorant of nothing, and that of all things which ever were, none escapes him: I believe that an immortality deprived of the knowledge of all things which exist and have existed, would not be a life, but a space of time only. So that we may say, that the desire of understanding truth is a desire of the Deity, especially the truth of the nature of the gods: the study and acquisition of which science, is, as it were, the entering, or being initiated into a religion, and a more holy work than a vow of chastity, or cloistering one's self within a temple (162). Add to this, that the Christians, with respect to whatever constitutes the character of speculative Christianity, make public profession of the incomprehensibility of things, and look upon those as owls and Turks, who refuse to believe what surpasses the extent of their understanding. Such is the mystery of the Trinity, which, as Mr Nicolle owns (163), confounds reason, and prompts it to revolt. If there be any visible difficulties, they are those which are contained in that mystery, that three persons really distinct have only one and the same essence, and this essence being the same thing in each person with the relations that distinguish them, may be communicated without the communication of the relations which distinguish the persons. If human reason consults herself, she will revolt against all those inconceivable truths. If she pretends to make use of her own light to penetrate into them, it will only furnish her with arms against them. Wherefore in order to believe them, she ought to blind herself, to stifle all her ratiocinations and perceptions, and to depress and sink herself un-

(162) Plutarch,
at the beginning
of his treatise
concerning Isis
and Osiris.

(163) Nicolle,
Perpetuité de la
Foi, pag. 118,
119, Edit.
1666.

XYLANDER (WILLIAM) was born at Augsburg on the twenty-sixth of December 1532. The inclination he had for the sciences would have been fruitless, by reason of his father's poverty, if he had not met with a patron (a), by whose means he was maintained at the public expence, till such time as he had made progress enough to enter into the colleges where the city (b) furnished a subsistence to a certain number of students. He afterwards studied in the university of Tubingen, and then in that of Basil [A]: and having given proofs of his learning, he was called to Heidelberg to succeed

(a) Wolfgangus
Reisingerus nobilis patricius Aug-
ustanus. Melch.
Adam, in Vita
Philosophorum,
pag. 289.

(b) That of Augsb. Moreti was in the wrong to say after Mr Teffier, *Addit. aux Eloges*, Tom. i, pag. 448, that the Magistrates of Strasbourg maintained him at the universities.

[A] And afterwards in that of Basil] Melchior Adam affirms, that he there solemnly received the degree of Master of Arts, in the year 1556 (1). I suspect this date; for how is it probable that a man who had studied with so great application, and so many fine talents, should have received this little degree only at the twenty-fourth year of his age? Add to this, that he made his Latin version of Dion Cassius in the year 1557. He was already so learned, that he only spent seven months in writing that work, for the truth of which he appeals to the person to whom it is

(1) Melchior
Adam, in Vita
Philosophorum,
pag. 289.

der the weight of Divine authority. The Soci-
ans themselves in some respects are Acataleptics;
they cannot say, with any sincerity, that it is an
incomprehensible thing, that a self-existent nature should
be mutable. Wherefore, in some respects, their rath-
ness surpasses that of Xenophanes. The latter, at
last, thought fit to say, that he did not comprehend
either that an eternal nature is mutable, or that it is
immutable: but as to the former, they decide that it
is mutable: whence it follows that a being which
necessarily, and from all eternity exists, is liable to
destruction (164); which is the most contrary opinion
in the world to our clear and distinct ideas.

I cannot conclude without observing two things:
one is, that the evidence of Xenophanes's principles,
with respect to the immutability of what is eternal,
is as conspicuous as the clearest ideas of our mind;
so that it being incontestable, on the other hand, by
what passes within us, that there are alterations and
changes, the best course that our reason can take, is to
assert, that all things had a beginning, *God alone*
excepted. This is the doctrine of the creation; for to
pretend to explain the generations of nature, by sup-
posing several eternal principles, the action and re-
action of which diversifies what would remain uni-
form, if nothing external intervened, is to avoid one
inconvenience, and fall into a much greater. My se-
cond observation is, that the evidence of Xenophanes's
principles furnishes us with an excellent demonstration
against Spinoza; for if whatever had no beginning is
immutable, Spinoza's God is incapable of any change:
he is not therefore the immanent cause of all the al-
terations in the universe (165). An immanent cause pro-
duces something in itself: that thing is either a
mode identified with the substance which it modifies,
or else an absolute quality, and really distinct from it's
subject of inhesion. If an identified mode, God
cannot produce it; for since the Divine substance ne-
cessarily exists, it cannot depend on any efficient cause.
If it is a distinct quality, God can therefore create
beings distinct from himself; and then there is no
longer room for Spinoza's hypothesis. Add to this,
that the production of one mode or accident (166), is
the destruction of another. Whence it follows, that
if God was the immanent cause of the changes of
nature, some eternal modalities would have perished:
for Spinoza cannot, without contradicting himself,
affirm that what he calls God, had not always modal-
ities. Examine his distinction betwixt *Natura natu-
rans* and *Natura naturata*, and you will find a heap of
contradictions in it.

[M] He complained of poverty. I am so poor, said
he once to (167) Hiero King of Syracuse, that I
am not able to maintain two servants. How, replied
Hiero, Homer, whom you commonly blame and censure,
tho' dead, maintains above ten thousand.

(164) They say
that God bestow-
ed upon matter
what form he
pleased, when he
made the world.
He therefore de-
stroyed the eter-
nal form of mat-
ter. Whether
this form was a
mode, or a distinct
accident, is of no
importance to
me: It was a
real being, which
could be, tho'
it had no begin-
ning, and no ef-
ficient cause.

(165) Now, that
if the Fathers
had believed what
the minister,
who wrote the
Pastoral Letters,
imputed to them
concomitancy;
the generation of
the Word, their
opinion concern-
ing the immut-
ability of God,
had been almost
as impious as
that of Spinoza.
See *Juana can-
ram refuta*,
pag. 128, &
129.

(166) I mean
such an accident
as is necessary
in all.
(167) Plat. in
Apollon. pag.
175.

succeed Mycillus (c) who died Professor of the Greek Tongue in the year 1558. Not long before that time Xylander had published at Basil his Latin version of Dion Cassius (d). He acquaints us in his epistle dedicatory that indigence had made him undergo several uneasinesses [B]. In the year 1559 he gave a Latin version of the book of Marcus Aurelius; and because a great many errors had crept into it (e), he caused it to be reprinted more correctly in the year 1568, with the Latin version of some Greek writers [C].

(c) Taken from Melchior Adam, ubi supra.

(d) See the remark [A].

(e) See the Epistle Dedicatory, to the Basil edition 1568.

* exhortations, and even by your good offices and favours, prevailed upon me to translate from the Greek into Latin, that excellent writer of the Roman History, Dion Cassius, &c. This Epistle Dedicatory is dated at Basil, November the first, 1557: the impression was finished by Oporinus in the month of March 1558. Xiphilin was joined with Dion Cassius, but Xylander did not translate that book, and contented himself with giving a translation of it which had been done by William le Blanc, a native of Albi (3), and with correcting some passages in it. His notes on Dion Cassius and Xiphilin are good enough to persuade us that in the year 1556 the university of Basil would have honoured him with a higher degree than that of Master of Arts.

(3) It was dedicated to Cardinal d'Armagnac, at Rome in the month of February 1550.

[B] He acquaints us that indigence had made him undergo several uneasinesses. This must surely be his meaning in these words: 'Ego cum ab ineunte ætate bonas literas flagranti amore essem persecutus, earumque causa adversissima & acerbissima quæque perpeffus, &c. (4). . . . As I have had the most passionate desire after learning ever since my earliest years, and for the sake of that, have suffered the greatest hardships and vexations.' He ranks himself amongst those whom poverty obliges to cultivate learning: 'Meæ conditionis hominum, quorum honestos conatus in hoc genere angustia vitæ sustentandæ & paupertas quasi instigat. . . . Men in my condition, whose commendable endeavours toward the improvement of learning are owing to their indigence, and as it were prompted by poverty.' See especially the elogy which he placed at the end of the Epistle Dedicatory of his Dion Cassius. There he owns that, when he was eighteen years of age, he studied for the sake of glory; but that at the age of twenty-five, the low state of his fortune obliged him to study for the sake of a subsistence.

(4) Xylander, ubi supra.

Te mala pauperies, pulcrisque gravissima ceptis,
Conatu indignor plus potuisse meo.

Ut cumque excidimus præclaris protinus ausis
Jam querant, quibus hoc fata dedere decus
Et mea cum fortuna solo me affixerit, atque
Abjectum cogat serpere præter humum.
Ergo, divinis quantumvis æger inhærens
Artibus, & studiis deditus ingenuis:
Et TOLERARE QUEAM VICTUM, & fustenter honeste
Non aspernandi fruge laboris alor.

Accurs'd wants, thou deadly foe
To brave attempts, my greatest woe,
Whilst eager after fame I press,
Why dost thou still oppose my bliss?
Thou' fortune far below the great
Has plac'd me, and in humble state,
Yet fir'd with love of ev'ry art
That lights the mind, or mends the heart,
I've in this bold attempt prevail'd,
Or, like Prometheus, nobly fail'd.
Thou' poor, yet arts are my delight,
Arts my employ both day and night:
Theirs are my labours: they relieve
My wants, and by their bounty I shall live.

[C] With the Latin version of some Greek writers.] That is, of Antony Liberalis, of Phlegon de mirabilibus & longævis, & de Olympiis, of Apollonius Historiæ memorabiles, and of Antigonius mirabilium Narrationum Congeries. All this, with Marcus Aurelius, makes a pretty large octavo: the Greek and Latin are in it, but each by itself. The few notes which Xylander added are neither considerable, nor contemptible.



Z.

(a) His epitaph imports that he died at the age of 78 years, in 1417.



(b) He made him Cardinal Deacon (and not Cardinal Priest, as Giesner asserts in his *Biblioth. fol. 261.*) by the title of St Cosmus and St Damianus.

(c) In the year 1413.

(d) It was Antony de Chaland. See *Spondanus, ad ann. 1413, num. 5.*

(1) See Thomassin, *Elog. Part. i, pag. 3.*

(2) Taken from Panzirolus, de claris Legum Interpretibus, lib. iii, cap. xxviii, pag. m. 443.

(3) Thomassin, *Elog. Part. i, pag. 10.*

(4) Quod divino impulsu factum esse videtur. Panzirolus, *ibid.* pag. 445.

(5) Maimbourg, *Hist. du grand Schisme d'Occident, liv. iv, pag. 106, Dutch edition. He quotes Saint Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, Part. iii, Tit. xxii.*

(6) That is the time and place of the council.

ZABARELLA, or DE ZABARELLIS (FRANCIS) Archbishop of Florence, and a Cardinal, was one of the most celebrated Canonists of his age. He was born at Padua, in the year 1339 (a). He studied the Canon-Law at Bologna, and taught it at Padua with great applause. That city was then subject to Francis Carrari: it was attacked by the Venetians in the year 1406, and deputed Zabarella to the King of France to desire his assistance, which he not obtaining, Padua was obliged to submit to the Republic of Venice. The act of their submission was very solemn: Zabarella, at the head of fourteen other deputies, delivered the banner of Padua to the Senate in the great place at Venice, and made an eloquent speech on that occasion [A]. Some time after he went to Florence to teach the Canon-Law, and was there so loved and esteemed, that the Archiepiscopal see becoming vacant, he was chosen to fill it: but this election proved ineffectual, for the Pope being more diligent, had already bestowed it on another. Zabarella being invited to Rome by Boniface IX, stayed there some time, and gave his opinion on an important question proposed to him, concerning the methods of putting a stop to the schism. He afterwards returned to Padua, and was honoured with several deputations. He wisely refused the bishopric of that city which was offered to him, because he would not expose himself to the indignation of the Senate, which had nominated another to that dignity. Pope John XXIII, resolving to strengthen his party with learned men, made him come to his court, and gave him the Archbishopric of Florence. He did not confine his liberality to that alone, but created him Cardinal (b) in the year 1411. He sent him on an embassy (c) with another Cardinal (d), and with Emanuel Chrysoloras, to the court of the Emperor Sigismund, who demanded a council, as well on account of the heresies in Bohemia, as of the Anti-Popes. This Pope ordered his Ambassadors to chuse such a town for the holding of the council as might be in his interest. It is said that he gave them in writing the names of those towns which he liked, but at the moment of their departure, tore the paper on which he had written them [B], and gave them full powers on that head. For this reason they left it to the choice of his Imperial Majesty. The city of Constance was pitched upon. Francis Zabarella distinguished himself at the council held there, and advised the deposing of Pope John XXIII, who was charged with forty notorious crimes. If the right of election had been left to the Cardinals, it is highly probable that Zabarella would have succeeded the deposed Pope; but they were obliged to divide this right between themselves and the other members of that council [C]. It was divided into five classes, each of which nominated six Persons, who,

[A] And made an eloquent speech. He was not only a learned Civilian, but also a good Orator (1). He pronounced an eloquent oration on the fourth of July 1397, on the nuptials of Nicolas d'Este with Giliola, the daughter of Francis Carrari, the second of that name, Lord of Padua. Seven years after he made a speech to the Lady Belfiora, who was married to the son of the same Carrari, when she made her entry into Padua, and was received under a canopy; I say, he made a speech to her, in the name of the university (2). He also made the funeral orations of Francis Carrari, and Arcuanus Buzacharinus (3). [B] At the moment of their departure he tore the paper on which he had written them. Panzirolus, whom I have faithfully followed in the text of this article, ascribes this alteration of the Pope to a sudden inspiration (4). But that we may see this affair in its full extent, which is too briefly related by him, I will cite a French author. (5). 'It never appeared more clearly than on this occasion, that the providence of God at once frequently overthrows all the designs of human prudence, in order to accomplish its own. This Pope, as Leonard Aretin, his secretary and confident, assures us, had, in appearance, given full power to his Legates to agree with the Emperor on these two points (6), as they should think proper; but because on the other hand he would not be at the Emperor's discretion in a city where that Prince was master, he had noted, in a private paper, certain cities of Italy, and expressly charged them not to agree to any other; and yet when he dismissed them, as he was exhorting them faithfully to acquit themselves of their duty, and was just going to deliver them this paper, which he held in his hand, all of a sudden he changed his mind; and after having expressed himself in their praise, with great transports of tenderness and affection, protesting that he had a full and entire confidence in their fidelity; he told them, that, contrary to his former resolution, he would not limit their power, he shewed them the writing, and immediately tore it before their eyes. But, he was not long without altering his mind a second time; for, understanding that his Legates had at last consented, in compliance with Sigismund's desire, that a general Council should be summoned to assemble on the first of November, the following year, at Constance, a city of Germany, subject to the Emperor; he was like to go distracted, and a thousand times cursed his fortune, or rather imprudence, in changing his resolution so easily, and delivering himself up, as it were, bound hand and foot to a Prince, who would always have it in his power to put in execution whatever it should please the Council to order against him. But he was obliged to dissemble his resentments, for fear of rendring himself suspected, &c.' [C] Zabarella would have succeeded the deposed Pope, but, &c.] Panzirolus's relation is not very exact; for it

who, in conjunction with the Cardinals, elected Otho Colonna Pope, who took the name of Martin V. This happened in the year 1417. Zabarella died at Constance (e) on the fifth of November, in the same year (f). His funeral was celebrated with great magnificence; the Emperor and all the council were present at it: the funeral oration was pronounced by Poggius; the corps was carried to Padua, and interred in the cathedral church on the left side of the altar of the Holy Virgin. Our Zabarella wrote a great many books [D], and deserved the esteem of the public, as much by his virtuous life [E], as by his learning. He appointed for his heir BARTHOLOMEW ZABARELLA his nephew (g), of whom I shall speak in a remark [F]. I must not forget that he had among other disciples Peter Paul Vergerio, who wrote an excellent and very exact letter, on the life and death of his professor (h).

(g) Taken from Panzirolus, de clara Legum Interpretibus, lib. iii, cap. xxviii, pag. m. 443, & seq. ibid. pag. 444. Mr. Telfer says nothing of it in the Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum.

(h) Panzirol.

(e) And not in his own country, as Fæstus affirms, Hist. Juris Civil. Rom. lib. iii, cap. xxxi, pag. m. 515.

(f) Therefore he did not flourish in the year 1418, as Gefner affirms in Bibl. fol. 261.

(7) See Maimonides, ubi supra, lib. vi, p. 264.
(8) Constantine extirpatus est anno dñi. mccc. xviii. viii. Idus Novembris. Tomasin. ubi supra, pag. 5. Freherus, in Theatro, pag. 17, has not rightly transferred this; for he says extirpatus est Idus, Nov.

(9) Tomasin. Eleg. Part. i, pag. 5.

(10) Doujat. Prænot. Canon. pag. 609.

(11) Ex Tomasin. ubi supra, pag. 9. See also Oldoini in Athenæo Romano, pag. 258.

(12) For instance at Basil, by John Oporinus, in 1565, in folio. I make use of that edition.

(13) Bellarm. de scriptor. Ecclesiast. pag. m. 384.

(14) Tomasin. ubi supra, pag. 5.

it tends to persuade us, that Zabarella was living when they entered into the conclave to elect a Pope. This is false. The electors entered on the eighth of November (7), and Zabarella, according to Panzirolus, died on the fifth, others say on the sixth of that month (8). So I find that Tomasinus conforms himself better to the circumstances of time: Zabarella, according to him, would have arrived at the Papal dignity, by the unanimous consent of the electors, if death had not transported him to heaven. He also tells us that this Cardinal supplied the Pope's place in the Council. Concilio convocato Pontificis vices gessit. Unde omnium consensus summus Pontifex dicitur, re quoque ipsa designatus, fuisse, ni Deus Opt. Max. ipsum in Cælum, ibi satius Ecclesiæ suæ profuturum exisset (9). Panzirolus misled Doujat, who assures us that Zabarella died after the election of Martin VI (10).

[D] He wrote a great many books. Six volumes of commentaries on the Decretals and Clementines. One volume of Counsels. A volume of Orations and Letters. A treatise de Horis canonicis. De Felicitate libri tres. Variæ Legum Repetitiones. Opuscula de Artibus liberalibus. De natura rerum diversarum. Commentarii in naturalem & moralem Philosophiam. Historia sui temporis. Acta in Concilio Pisano & Constantensi. In vetus & novum Testamentum. De Schismate (11). This last treatise does not please the court of Rome. The Protestants have published it several times (12) with other pieces of the same nature, in which the jurisdiction of Princes is maintained without subjecting it to the power of the Popes. Read the following words of Bellarmine: 'Occasione longissimi schismatis scripsit etiam librum de schismate, in quo sunt aliqua corrigenda: quare in indice librorum prohibitorum, liber ejus de schismate cum præfationibus, Argentinae impressus ab hæreticis, prohibitus est, donec corrigatur (13). - - - On occasion of the long schism, he also wrote a book on schism: There are some things in this book to be corrected: for this reason in the catalogue of prohibited books, Zabarella's treatise on schism with the prefaces to it, printed by the Heretics at Strasburgh, is prohibited till it is corrected.' Observe, that Zabarella is cited under the name of Cardinal without any addition (14).

[E] He deserved the esteem of the public . . . by his virtuous life. He not only slept but little, and was extremely careful not to lose any time, but was endowed with a particular probity and chastity: being an enemy to luxury, his domestic affairs were managed with the utmost frugality, in order to diffuse his wealth abroad amongst the poor. He never connived at his neighbour's faults, but always exhorted his friends and disciples to a virtuous life. 'Somni parcissimus, & ne quàm temporis iacturam faceret, valde sollicitus. Vir recti animi, suavissimæ consuetudinis, & integerrimæ, castissimæque vite fuit, familiares & discipulos ad bonos mores hortari solitus ab ipsis non fecus ac pater diligebatur. Domi par-

cus, foris fortunas inter pauperes dividebat (15). - - - He slept very little, and was extremely careful not to lose any time. He was an upright man, his behaviour was most engaging, and his whole life most chaste and unblamable: he used to exhort his friends and disciples to lead a virtuous life, and was loved by them like a father. In his domestic affairs he was exceedingly frugal, but diffused his wealth abroad among the poor. One of the things which made him thought worthy of the bishopric of Padua, was, I believe, his charity to the poor, when he was Arch-priest of the cathedral church (16). I have mentioned (17) the reason which induced him to refuse that Bishopric. That refusal acquired him the admiration of the Paduans, and obliged them to resign to him a very rich abbey which had belonged to some Monks. This he held but a very short time; he soon restored it to its ancient possessors; they accepted it with the utmost gratitude, which they perpetuated as much as possible; for to this day his sacerdotal vestments are preserved in their monastery: and his arms are set up there in several places (18). It was on account of his holy life, as well as learning, that he was chosen Archbishop of Florence, when he was only Professor of the Canon Law (19).

I have also given (20) the reason why this choice was ineffectual at that time.

[F] BARTHOLOMEW ZABARELLA, of whom I shall speak in a remark. He was the son of ANDREW ZABARELLA, brother to our Francis; and professed the Canon-Law at Padua with great applause. He was afterwards called to Rome, where he discovered a great deal of learning, as well in his disputations as consultations. He was first raised to the Archbishopric of Spalato, and then advanced to that of Florence, and at last to the dignity of Referendary of the Church by Pope Eugenius IV. It is thought he had risen yet higher, if he had not died before he arrived at old age, in the year 1445. His body was carried to Padua, and interred in his uncle's tomb (21). I am surprised that his name doth not appear in the epitaph of our Francis, and that instead of it we see Joannes Jacobi viri clarissimi Filius id monumenti ponendum curavit. - - - This monument was erected by John the son of James, who was an illustrious man. Panzirolus and Tomasin give the whole epitaph; the latter observes, that the author of the Patavina Felicitas, and Swertius (22), have given it with some faults. The same thing may also be charged on Panzirolus; for in his book we read Obiit Constantiæ mccccviii, which ought to have been mccccxvii. An infinite number of transcribers and Printers of inscriptions are guilty of the like negligence. But to return to our Bartholomew. He died at the age of forty-six years, on the twelfth of August 1445, being then on the embassy with which Eugenius IV honoured him to the Kings of Spain and France. It is affirmed that the Pope had declared his design to make him a Cardinal (23).

(15) Panzirolus, ubi supra, pag. 445.

(16) In Cathedrali Patavina Ecclesia Archiepiscopatibus honore insignitus pauperum incommodis mira subveniebat liberalitate. Tomasin. ubi supra, pag. 4.

(17) In the text of this article.

(18) Tomasin. ubi supra.

(19) Florentiam vocatus jus Canoniconum explicavit ibique obviatæ sanctimoniam ac doctrinæ præstantiam ab illius Reip. procuribus ad Archiepiscopatus dignitatem conclamatus est. Tomasin. ubi supra, pag. 3.

(20) In the text of this article.

(21) Panzir. ubi supra, pag. 446, 447.

(22) In Deliciis Orbis.

(23) Taken from Riccobonus, in Descriptione Gymnasii Patavini, apud Freherum, in Theatro, pag. 19.

ZABARELLA (JAMES) one of the greatest Philosophers of the XVIIth century, was born at Padua on the fifth of September 1533. Having learned Rhetoric and the Greek tongue under very learned professors (a), he applied himself to the study of Logic, and to that of the Mathematics, in both which he made great progress. He extremely delighted in Astrology, and amused himself in drawing a great many Horoscopes, and it is reported, that he many times made true predictions. He acquired a profound knowledge of Aristotle's Physics and Ethics; so it is no wonder that the university of Padua made him one of its professors, in the year 1564. He taught Logic there

(a) John Faesolus, and Francis Robertellus.

there for the space of fifteen years, and afterwards Philosophy to the time of his death. He published several commentaries on Aristotle, which shewed that his genius was capable of clearing the greatest difficulties, and comprehending the most obscure questions [A]. Having been frequently deputed to Venice on important affairs, he harangued the Senate with great success. He refused the offers of Sigismund King of Poland, who invited him into his kingdom. He died at Padua in October 1589, and was buried in St Antony's church, where his funeral oration was pronounced by Riccobonus. He had bore the title of Count Palatine [B]. He had by his marriage with Elizabeth Cavacia, six sons and three daughters [C], and calculated the nativities of each of them. I know not how he succeeded in these calculations, nor for instance, whether he fore-told that the Senate of Venice should give him a thousand crowns, for the marriage of his youngest daughter (b). Authors differ in certain particulars concerning him, which ought not to be matter of dispute. Some say he was a handsome man, others, that he was ugly [D]. Some assert, that he had a very lively, quick, and ready wit; others, that he could not solve the objections of his disciples without asking time to consider them [E]. He is accused of holding some impious opinions

(b) Taken from James Philip Tomafin, Part. i. Elogior. pag. 136, & seq.

[A] He published several commentaries on Aristotle, which shewed, &c.] He published some Logical treatises in the year 1578. In these he treated copiously of method; and it was believed, especially in Germany, that on Logic he was the best guide that could be had (1). The following encomium is bestowed on the commentary which he published in the year 1582. Anno 82. edidit illa admirabilia commentaria in post. Annal. Aristotelis quibus omnibus Grecis, Arabibus, Latinis palmam in hoc divino Aristotelici ingenii opere illustrando præripuit (2). --- In the year 1582, he published his admirable commentary on Aristotle's Analytics, in which he has illustrated that divine work, worthy of the genius of Aristotle, far beyond all the Grecian, Arabian, and Latin commentators. Francis Piccolomini, his colleague, and rival, attacked him on the doctrine of Method. Zabarella published his reply in the year 1584. Imperialis observes, that Zabarella was inferior to Francis Piccolomini, in the faculty of discoursing (3); but when he took pen in hand, exceeded him in the force of argument: when he had occasion to ruin his adversaries hypothesis, he brought a multitude of arguments which crushed them: when he was obliged to maintain his own opinions, he did it with great skill and success. He scarce had his equal, either for overthrowing the adverse side, or defending his own. Neminem facile quis dixerit æquare Zabarellæ Scriptorum venustatem atque elegantiam, quibus accedit incredibile argumentandi robur & opinionum firmitas, quo nomine vix alius in evertendis aliorum placitis uberior, in austruendis propriis foelicior unquam est habitus (4). --- It may well be said that no author ever wrote with more beauty and elegance than Zabarella. Add to this his incredible force of reasoning, and his great talent in supporting his opinions. In this respect scarce any writer has been esteemed more copious in confuting the opinions of his adversaries, or more successful in maintaining his own. His book De Rebus naturalibus Libri XXX, quibus Quæstiones, quæ ab Aristotelis Interpretibus bodie tractari solent, accurate discutuntur, was printed in the year 1589. He dedicated it to Pope Sixtus V: the Epistle Dedicatory is dated at Padua, on the first of October, the same year. He had before published a small specimen of it in 1586, and dedicated it to that Pope's nephew. His commentaries on the three books of Aristotle de Anima, did not appear till after his death. His son Francis Zabarella published them in the year 1604.

(1) Kockerman. Præcognit. Logicor. Tract. ii. cap. vi. pag. m. 184. See also Tomafin. Elog. Part. i. pag. 137.

(2) Id. Ibid.

(3) See the remark [E].

(4) Imperialis, in Museo Histor. pag. 115.

(5) Ex Tomafino, Elogior. Part. i. pag. 139.

(6) Moreri had this from Mr Teiffier's addition to the Elogies, Tom. ii, p. 124.

[D] Some say he was a handsome man, others, that he was ugly.] His effigies in Tomafin represents his air to be very agreeable, and admirably confirms these words *Vultu spectabilis* (7): --- of a graceful aspect. But in Imperialis, the print of him expresses a gloomy, furly, and mean look, and very effectually proves the truth of these words, 'Nec subhæsitantibus lingue notæ vel TETRICA forte ORIS SPECIES ullas unquam fuz gloriæ maculas aspergere potuerunt' (8). --- Nor (9) Job. Imper. could a flammering be had in his speech, nor something still, in Museo Histor. p. 117.

Is it possible, that in things exposed to every body's view, authors should differ as much as white and black, as well in the strokes of their pens, as in those of the Painter's pencil? If the question was about the inclinations of the mind, I should not be surprized at this diversity of relations, for it is easy to fall into contrary determinations, with respect to those invisible objects, which only discover themselves by equivocal indications; but the question relates to the face: ought it not to be out of dispute whether his face was handsome or ugly?

[E] Some assert that he had a very lively . . . wit . . . that he could not solve the objections, &c. . .] This is another subject on which Historians ought not to oppose one another. They ought to agree on the question, whether Zabarella's genius acted in a quick or slow manner. He was Professor about twenty-five years in one of the most famous universities of Europe. This gave him a thousand opportunities of publicly discovering whether, when a difficulty was proposed, he wanted time to consider of it, or could solve it immediately. Why then should Tomafin express himself in this manner: 'Nactus est Mercurium feliciter stantem, quam ob causam CELERES ingenii motus, & ad quævis excogitanda FACILES ET EXPEDITOS, habuit in omni vita' (9): --- He is happily gifted with a ready wit, and accordingly his genius has during all his life been QUICK, EASY, and PENETRATING: and Imperialis, on the contrary, tells us? 'Carpebant in te plurimi memorie labem, & quendam in agendis TORPorem, quibus ad privata vel publica negotia minus reddebaris idoneus: SEQUIOREM te pariter quam ferret ingenii claritas in quæstionibus inopinate solvendis prædicabant, cum te Scholarium Teffibus nonnisi per INTERPOSITAS HORAS respondere solitum dicerent' (10): --- Many people blamed you for your want of memory, and for a slow manner: certain SLUGGISHNESS in acting, both which defects disqualified you for public and private affairs. They likewise said, that in solving difficulties, you was slower than was consistent with a clear genius; and that you did not answer the theses of your students, till you had taken AN INTERVAL OF SOME HOURS to consider of them? Some pages after he observes, that Zabarella stuttered, and that his words and deportment were rough and unpolished. In eo præsertim Jacobo Zabarellæ Collegæ suo (Franciscus Piccolomini) quod ipse facilitate quadam dicendi præditus, juncta comitati morum ac eximie humanitati, alter sermone durior, blasus, incomptus, civilibus in studiis inops potius quam redundans (11). --- Francis (11) Piccolomini had the advantage of his colleague James Zabarella in this, that the former had a certain facility of expressing his thoughts, together with a mild, a humane, and winning behaviour; whereas the latter . . .

opinions [F], as not believing the immortality of the soul; but he is praised for having led an exemplary life (c). I shall speak of the treatise in which he maintained

(c) Quibus omnibus (filiis & filabus) . . . faciem prætulit incorrupte gloriæ, & virtutis vere, suo cunctis exemplo prælocens. *Tomas. ibid. pag. 138.*

* expressions of the latter were harsh, blunt, and unpolished, and he was rather deficient than officious in paying civilities and doing kindnesses.

[F] He is accused of holding some impious opinions.]

(14) These words of Moreri are taken from Mr Teissier, ubi supra.

(13) Imperial. ubi supra, pag. 212.

(14) Compare Tomasin's words at the end of the text of this article.

On this head Mr Moreri is faulty. He is accused by Imperialis, faith he (12), of having opposed the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and of having given several marks of impiety and Atheism in his writings. The last part of this accusation is not in Imperialis; and if the first is, it is not expressed as a thing affirmed by that author, but rather as a very uncertain rumour, which he in some sort refutes. His words run thus (13): 'Præterea impensius te aliquanto impugnasse immortalitatem animæ, deterrimam Alexandreorum sententiam palam professum: quos tamen de te rumores ut forte ab exulceratis animis excitos, ita vel elusit posteritas, vel admirabilis ac prope divina tuarum virtutum fama compensavit (14): præaltæ siquidem mentis lumen in scriptis diffusum tuis, nullam debet lumen temporis nullamque livoris noxam vereri. . . . Besides, they said that you too warmly attacked the immortality of the soul, and openly professed the abominable tenet of the Alexandrians: but these rumours concerning you, as they were, perhaps, raised by invidious persons, so they have either been neglected by posterity, or destroyed by the admirable and almost divine fame of your virtues: and that exalted understanding which shines through your writings ought to fear no injury, either from time or envy.' This calumny, if I am not mistaken, was only grounded upon this. There reigned in Italy, and chiefly at Padua, for above an age, a famous dispute about this question, whether it was possible to prove the immortality of the soul from Aristotle's principles. Some Professors who were looked upon as favourers of Alexander Aphrodisiensis defended the negative. Others maintained the affirmative. Pomponatius, our Zabarella, Cremoninus, &c. took the first side, whence a great number of such persons as are incapable of using distinctions when they are most necessary, peremptorily charged these Philosophers with teaching the mortality of the soul. This is the Sophism, à dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter: . . . From a particular case to draw a general inference. In a word, this is an injustice and wickedness which society ought not to tolerate: for there is a prodigious difference betwixt absolutely affirming that the soul is mortal, and maintaining that, according to the hypothesis of such a Philosopher, it is impossible to prove that it is not mortal. See the article of POMPONATIUS. The Inquisitors acted on a principle of equity towards Zabarella: for they contented themselves with his declaration, that by the power of the Divine grace, he was fully persuaded of the truth of the orthodox opinion, tho' natural reason, and Aristotle's principles seemed incapable of forming in him this excellent persuasion. He published a book, in which he maintained, that the existence of a first mover separate from the bodies which compose the universe, could be no otherwise proved than by supposing the eternity of motion. This was declaring, that a Christian Philosopher cannot produce any proofs of the existence of a first mover, whose nature is spiritual; for it is a doctrine of the Christian faith, that motion is not eternal. Zabarella asserted, that in order to believe this existence, which no natural reason can demonstrate, the grace of the Holy Ghost was necessary. The holy office found nothing unreasonable in this assertion, and gave their approbation to this Philosopher's book. This emboldened Berigardus to take the liberty of maintaining the same opinion. It is true he did not do so bluntly; for he introduced an Interlocutor opposing this thesis. Let us cite a pretty long passage out of his preface: 'Denique ut conflet ea que dicuntur in nostris Circulis permissa jam fuisse à S. Officio, libet pauca subjicere, maxime ne cui durum videatur quod introduco Aristoteli defendentem sententiam Jacobi Zabarellæ viri in hoc Lyceo celeberrimi. Hæc sententia libro de inventione æterni motoris approbato sæpius à S. Officio, decet unicum medium philosopho naturali ad demonstrandum dari primum motorem à materia

V O L. V.

abjunctum esse motus æternitatem, quæ quia non datur, ut fide divina certi sumus, sequitur primum motorem demonstrari non posse naturaliter, sed ad hoc opus esse Dei contactu peculiari. Neque propterea Zabarella putat eam quam vocat demonstrationem primi motoris ex motu æterno, esse veram demonstrationem, utpote cujus medium falsum est, sed loquitur ex falsis principiis Aristotelis, nempe si verus esset motus æternus, inde solum ostendi posse primum motorem. Hanc Zabarellæ opinionem jam permisissam si tuerer, id fortasse tutò facere possem; verum contrariam existimo magis esse consentaneam pietati, propterea illi oppono Charilaum qui Circ. II. & XVIII. contendit Deum verum cognosci posse naturaliter, & licet rationes ille seorsum acceptæ non videantur sufficere ad convincendos pertinaces Epicureos, ut concludit ultimis verbis, omnibus tamen simul instructis, ait intellectum rectè dispositum posse elevari ad hanc cognitionem naturaliter, sed abique merito gratiæ & gloriæ, ut sic inexcusabiles verè dicantur à Divo Paulo qui contemptis his rationibus ad falsas & irreligiosas opiniones delapsi sunt. Zabarella tamen sequi videtur Campanella cap. 9. n. 2. ubi ait religionem veram (ac proinde Deum) citra fidem cognosci non posse: quin etiam apud Philosophos plus valere fidem quam rationem (15). . . . To make it appear that what is advanced in the following work has already been permitted by the holy office; let us add a few things, especially lest it should seem strange to any person that I introduce Aristotle's defending the opinion of James Zabarella, a famous man of this university. You will find this opinion in his book on the Investigation of the first Mover, a book that hath been often approved by the holy office, in which it is asserted, that a Natural Philosopher can demonstrate the being of a first Mover separate from matter, upon no other supposition than that motion is eternal; and as we know, by revelation, that motion is not eternal, it follows, that the being of a first Mover cannot be demonstrated by natural reason, and that the supernatural assistance of GOD is necessary for that purpose. Nor does Zabarella therefore think that what he calls a demonstration of the being of a first Mover, is a real demonstration; as the supposition upon which it is built, is false; but he argues from the principles of Aristotle, that if motion was eternal, from thence only would it follow that there is a first Mover. As this opinion of Zabarella has already been permitted, I might possibly defend it with safety. But I think the contrary opinion is more agreeable to piety; wherefore to oppose it I bring in Charilaus, who maintains, that we may know the true GOD by the light of nature: and tho' natural reasons taken singly seem too weak to convince an obstinate Epicurean, as Charilaus concludes, yet when taken altogether, he says, a well disposed understanding may, by the light of nature, rise to the knowledge of the true GOD, tho' without meriting thereby the grace of GOD and eternal felicity; so that they may truly be said, by St Paul, to be inexcusable, who despising the light of nature, turn aside to false and ungodly opinions. However this opinion of Zabarella seems to be followed by Campanella, when he says that the true religion (and therefore GOD) cannot be known without the help of revelation; but that revelation is even to Philosophers more valuable than reason.

Till I can come at this book of Zabarella, which is very hard to be met with in this country (16), I shall make one reflexion. I am not satisfied with my conjectures on this Philosopher's way of reasoning. He asserted (17), that the consequence is right from the eternity of motion, to the existence of a first spiritual Mover, but that a motion which had a beginning is no manner of proof that there is a first Mover distinct from matter. In order to reason upon this matter, it is necessary to suppose it impossible that a material principle should act eternally (18), tho' it may be capable of acting for several ages. But I do not see on what this assertion can be grounded; for if Zabarella grants me that a material principle could produce motion, which, according to Moses's hypothesis, did not begin till six days before Adam, he must believe that this

(15) Claudius Berigardus, in problemo Circuli Philani, pag. 5, 6.

(16) The schoolmen are so much despised in this country, that one would be ashamed to buy their books, or even to enquire whether they are to be found in a library.

A REFLEXION upon the consequences from the eternity, or the beginning of motion, with respect to the existence of God.

(17) Thus Berigardus makes him reason.

(18) Berigardus, in Circulo, pag. 5, advances this proposition, Nulla virtus materialis æternum motum creare potest.

tained that the proof of a God drawn from the existence of a first mover, is defective, unless we suppose motion to be eternal [G]. I shall occasionally say that there

this principle having been at rest from all eternity, was at last moved by itself, and that it shall once return to rest, since its materiality will never suffer it to do any thing eternal. But who doth not see the absurdity of this hypothesis? Every one clearly apprehends. 1. That all bodies which have been at rest from all eternity, would for ever continue so, unless they were put in motion by some external power. 2. That all bodies which might begin to move, and had continued in motion as long as the world has lasted, according to the Scripture, might also persevere eternally in that state. 3. That all bodies which might begin to move one hundred ages ago, might have begun twenty thousand years, an hundred thousand years, &c. sooner; for there is no more reason to fix the beginning of motion to one hour rather than another, unless we have recourse to the good pleasure of a spiritual cause: but if a body might have begun to move before any term assigned, it would follow that it might have been always in motion, and consequently motion might have been eternal without being produced by a cause distinct from matter. What I have just been saying shews, that we may very reasonably conclude, the existence of a first spiritual Mover, from this, that the motion of matter had a beginning, and that we could not make this conclusion, if we should once grant, that a motion which began might proceed from a material cause. Consequently I do not find that Zabarella reasoned well on this head.

Besides, it seems to me much easier to prove, that there is a first Mover distinct from matter, if we suppose motion to have had a beginning, than if we suppose it eternal. Let us suppose it had a beginning, and it will necessarily follow, either that all bodies began to exist, or that having existed from all eternity, they continued during an eternity in a state of rest. If all bodies began to exist, they must necessarily have been produced by a spiritual cause; and this is the first Mover which we are in quest of; for the spiritual principle, author of the existence of all bodies, will also be the principle of their motion. If all bodies are eternal, and yet their motion is not eternal, it follows that they have not in themselves the motive virtue; for if they had, they would have moved eternally. That motive virtue therefore does not reside in matter, it is therefore in a spiritual subject; and this again is the first Mover which we are in quest of. If it be the efficient cause of bodies (19), so much the better, for with much more reason will it be the efficient cause of motion. If it is not their efficient cause, if matter exists by itself, yet it will be the cause of their motion, since it is visible that a nature which hath been at rest during an eternity, does not begin to move itself, but must be drawn out of this state of rest by an external principle. On the other side, if we suppose that motion is eternal, it will be more difficult to maintain that it proceeds from an immaterial cause; for it may be urged, that the same necessity whereby matter hath eternally existed without having been created (20), hath made it move eternally without the help of an external principle, or spiritual mover. I cannot therefore comprehend the manner of arguing which Zabarella took; for whatever I conjecture on this head, tends to make me believe, rather that he diverted himself by broaching a paradox, than that he suffered himself to be seduced by specious reasons. Was he afraid that it should be urged against him that a spiritual Mover would not have left matter in a state of inactivity through all eternity, and that therefore the beginning of motion is a proof that the first Mover is not a spiritual being? But this objection is stronger against those who should maintain the materiality of the first Mover. Is it not more difficult to comprehend that a corporeal cause should act with liberty, and begin its actions at pleasure, than to comprehend the same thing of a spiritual nature?

[G] I shall speak of the treatise in which he maintained, that the proof of a GOD, drawn from the existence of a first Mover, is defective, unless we suppose motion to be eternal. All the former part of this article, and what is contained in the remark [H], was written in the month of March 1697. I read it over again

in August 1701, in order to send it to the press; and whilst I was perusing it, I remembered that for two or three years past I had Zabarella's works by me. I therefore believed that I ought to examine what he said, and compare with that the conjectures which I had made when I had no other guide than a citation of Berigardus. This examination made it appear to me, that my conjectures do not come home to the point, and that the state of the question is different from what I imagined. Notwithstanding, I have published them without any alteration; they may afford matter of reflexion, and, at all events, they may serve as a proof of my ingenuity, and make it appear that I use no manner of artifice. There are a great many authors who, on the like occasions, would have corrected their manuscript, and yet would say, *This is what we conjectured before we saw the book, and after we have read it, we have found our conjectures exactly conform to it.* But I will act with more sincerity, I am willing that the reader should know the difference between what I thought of Zabarella's book before, and what I ought to say of it after I have read it. Accordingly I shall give a short analysis of that treatise.

It is intitled, *De Inventionem eterni Motoris*, and contains but eight pages and a half in my edition (21). The author's first thesis is, that it is impossible to discover any otherwise than by motion that there is an immaterial substance; but he protests that he confines himself to the knowledge which may be acquired by the light of nature, and that he excepts revelation. *Hæc præmissa protestatione, nos hac de re secundum principia philosophiæ Arist. esse loquuturos, & illam tantum substantiarum à materia adjunctarum notitiam, quam via naturali adipiscimur, consideraturos, omnia penitus earundem cognitione, quam revelatione divina & lumine supernaturali accipimus; verissimam illam quidem, sed Arist. cujus dicta interpretanda suscepimus, profus abscindam* (22). *I first declare that I am to speak on this subject only according to the principles of Aristotle, and to consider that knowledge of substances abstracted from matter, which we attain by reason and the light of nature, setting aside entirely that knowledge of them which we have received from Divine revelation, and by supernatural light, which knowledge is indeed most true, but was utterly bidden to Aristotle, whose principles I have undertaken to explain.* He embraces the opinion of Averroës, who rejected the other proofs which Avicenna pretended to find in Aristotle's books, these for instance: there is one being dependant on another, therefore there is a first being which doth not depend on any thing whatsoever; for otherwise we should be obliged to admit a progress *in infinitum*. But this first being is GOD, therefore, &c. there is one perfection and one goodness greater than another; there is therefore a supreme perfection and goodness. But the being which hath this perfection and this goodness is GOD, wherefore there is a GOD. Averroës answers, that all this proves only the existence of a nature independent of, and more perfect than, others, but not its immateriality. He adds, that the ancient Philosophers, who admitted nothing but matter, would say that this independent and most perfect nature, is nothing else but Heaven (23). Zabarella concludes, that in order to come naturally to the notion of an immaterial substance, we ought to argue thus: Heaven hath an incessant motion; every thing which moves is moved by another; whatever is corporeal is movable, and there is no progress *in infinitum* betwixt the movers and the things moved; wherefore there is a first mover distinct from matter.

He afterwards enquires whether motion, whatever it be, affords a proof of the existence of such a mover, and declares for the negative; for he concludes, that nothing but the eternity of motion can prove the existence of a Mover separate from matter. He examines the opinion of those who pretend that Aristotle maintained (24), that even motion, which had a beginning, is able to lead us to the knowledge of a first spiritual Mover. This Philosopher, say they, argued thus: Whatever moves, is moved by another, and there is no such thing, as a progress *in infinitum*; wherefore there

(19) Note, that several great Orthodox Philosophers maintain that a creature may be eternal.

(20) I suppose that Zabarella argued against some men, who did not believe the creation.

(21) It is thus of Frankfurt (supra) Liberum Laxum Zaccari, 1618, in 4to.

(22) Jacob Zabarella, de Rebus naturalibus, pag. m. 55j.

(23) Quæ illi philosophi, eorumque membra facit Plato in Symplicio, quæ præterea res corporeas de se habent, illi alia esse concedunt, eorumque membra & perfectionem, esse esse autem Cælum, nec ullum præter illud dari dicunt. Deum. li. vi. pag. 254.

(24) In lib. vi. Physic. Aristot.

there are more ambiguities than are imagined in the controversy concerning the eternity

there is a first Mover, which is immovable, and consequently incorporeal, for if he were a body, he must of necessity be movable. Zabarella answers, that this argument of Aristotle can only lead us to the existence of a Mover that is immovable in no other than a general sense, which may comprize the souls of beasts. Those souls, continues he, are immovable so far as they are not movable in themselves, but only by accident. But tho' they are accidentally movable, they are called the first movers, according to the order essential to moving things. *Si hunc Aristotelis discursum consideremus, manifestum est, per eum nos non duci ad alium motorem immobilem, quam late acceptum, qui animas quoque animalium mortalium complectatur; immobiles enim sunt, quatenus non sunt per se mobiles, quum incorporeæ sint, sed tamen sunt per accidentis mobiles: neque per id fit, quin dicantur motores primi juxta ordinem movendum essentialem* (25). He adds, that those whom he opposes being very sensible of the lameness of this argument, have supplied the defect of it, in this manner: Heaven moves; it is therefore moved by something else; therefore there is a first immovable Mover. But is this Mover eternal, or not? If it is, we have what we enquire for: the motion of Heaven, be it what it will, be it but of two days, leads us to the existence of a God. But if this Mover is not eternal, it will one day perish, wherefore there is something, which will destroy it; it is not therefore the first Mover, we must therefore deny it that quality, and transfer it to another being, who shall destroy that pretended first Mover. Yet we were come so far as the first Mover, and we argued on that hypothesis: what absurdity more ridiculous than to offer in answer what is contradictory to a supposition, of the truth of which the contending parties are agreed? But that thing, which shall occasion sooner or later the destruction of that, which we have considered as the first immovable Mover, must it not be the first Mover? And to be so, ought it not to be in such a station as nothing can be above it, which is able to produce any alteration in it? It is therefore eternal, it is therefore what we were to find by following the track of Aristotle's argument. Let us hear Zabarella's answer which turns solely on the solution of the following dilemma: The first Mover is or is not eternal; if it is, we have gained our point: if it is not, there is then another Mover which can destroy it, there is therefore a Mover superior to this first Mover. But this is absurd, and contrary to the supposition to which both parties agreed. He answers (26), that the first Mover which his adversaries have hit on is not eternal, but of the same nature with the soul of brutes, that it is the form of Heaven, and that Heaven being composed of four elements opposite to each other, had a beginning, and shall have an end, in like manner with other parts of the world; that from the destruction of Heaven will necessarily result the destruction of its moving soul (27); that it shall not perish by the act of a first Mover; and that therefore tho' it shall be destroyed it doth not follow from thence that there is a superior agent or efficient cause above it; it is sufficient that it be united to a body naturally corruptible, for the corruption of that body necessarily draws on the corruption of its form or of the soul, which in it performed the functions of a first Mover. *Quando igitur bi dicunt, si primus motor universi est corruptibilis, ergo non est primus, forma materialis, negandum est consequens: ad probationem autem, quum dicunt, corruptetur à motore priore, hoc quoque est negandum; non enim ex eo quod est corruptibilis, requiritur motor prior, à quo corruptatur, sed quum sit incorporeus, et forma corporis, satis causa est ad ipsum interimendum corruptibilitatem corporis, cuius est forma; corpus autem ipsum, quum sit elementare, à suo contrario laedi et interiri potest* (28). Wherefore, concludes he, motion in general proves no more, than the existence of a first Mover immovable in the same manner as the souls of brutes, are immovable and nothing but an eternal motion can prove an eternal Mover. *Ex motu igitur absolute accepto absque consideratione eternitatis nil aliud ostenditur, quam dari primum motorem universi immobilem eo modo, quo animæ animalium brutorum sunt immobiles, hoc est, non per se mobilem: quod autem nec per se, nec per accidentis mobilis sit, proinde à materia abjunctus: et impartibilis, et infatiga-*

bilis, et sempiternus, id ea ratione non ostenditur; quapropter nullum aliud philosopho naturali medium relinquatur ad demonstrandum primum motorem æternum, nisi motus æternus; quando enim sumimus motum universi unum et eundem numero æternum esse, statim inferimus, eum ab uno tantum motore totum produci; quare necesse est, motorem illum esse infatigabilem, et sempiternum (29).

It would not be easy for the Peripatetics to refute Zabarella's reasons: for he argues *ad hominem* against them; he makes his advantage of their doctrine of substantial forms, and the motive and primitive virtue of the souls of animals. Most of the ancient Philosophers believed that self-motion was the essential character of the soul (30). Πάν γὰρ σώμα, says Plato, ὃ μὲν ἐξωθεν τὸ κινεῖσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὃ δὲ ἐνδὲθεν αὐτὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἐμ-λύχον. *Omne enim corpus cui motus extrinsecus indicit inanimatum est. Cui vero intus ex seipso inest animatum* *. The Moderns, who have justly rejected these principles, might confute him without any difficulty, and find nothing intricate in his objections. Observe, by the by, how pernicious and dangerous the consequences may prove of the Aristotelian hypothesis about the internal activity of forms distinct from matter. It is a principle which admits of almost an infinite number of first Movers, from whence it is easy to proceed so far as to reject a first universal Mover, or to assert that he is subject to death. The soul of each man and each brute is, in its kind, a first mover. It moves itself, and imprints motion on the body, of which it is the form. We may, in proportion, find the same principle in inanimate bodies. The form of heavy bodies hath no need of any external Mover to press them towards the center, nor that of light bodies to drive them from it; but is itself their first Mover in this respect. Now if this Aristotelian hypothesis be once admitted, a universal Mover of the Heavens will be no longer necessary, every planet will be moved by its form, the heavens and fixed stars will be moved by theirs, and none of these movers will be accounted incorruptible, but will be liable to the common destiny of forms, which cannot subsist after the dissolution of the matter united to them (31). Zabarella very clearly apprehending this consequence, asserted that the soul of the Heavens would one day perish, since the matter of the Heavens was composed of principles which clash with each other. It is so evident that matter is changeable, that the ancient Philosophers who believed that the *genii* were not entirely separated from matter, believed them mortal, not excepting the greatest of them all. An evidence of this is Plutarch's story, *The great Pan is dead* (32).

If Zabarella has been able to penetrate into the consequences of the common doctrine of the schools, he was not less in the right, when he asserted that in order to find a first eternal Mover, it was necessary to stop at one only cause which produced all motion. It is an advantage which we meet with in the Cartesian Philosophy; it ascribes to God all the moving and immediate power of the universe, and doth not divide it betwixt the Creator and the creatures. The multitude of Movers may infensibly lead to the most dangerous atheism, and from hence doubtless proceeds the atheism of the Chinese Philosophers (33). They first of all believed a superior, immaterial and infinite Deity; but attributing great natural powers to bodies, and chiefly to the celestial, they, by little and little, forgot the immaterial Divinity, and stopped at material principles. The visible and material Heaven is at present their great God (34).

For the rest, we ought not to be surprized that the Italian Inquisition permitted Zabarella to follow Averroës, in rejecting some proofs of the existence of a God. This sort of liberty is very great every where; and provided a man owns that this existence may be proved by other means, they give him leave to censure this or that particular proof. The Cartesians are not more annoyed on any head, than on Mr Des Cartes's demonstration of the existence of God. He was obliged to answer a vast number of objections. And we every day see the most orthodox people renewing this dispute. Mr Werenfels, Professor at Basil, maintained, in a printed tract, that this argument of Des Cartes is a meer paralogism. Mr Swicer, Professor at Zurich, answered

(29) Id. ibid.

pag. 257.

(30) See Aristotle de Anima, lib. i, cap. ii.

* Plato, in Phædro, pag. m. 1221, D.

(31) See, above, the comparison made in remark [I], of the article XENOCRATES, between the gods of Xenocrates, and the slaves called *servi liberi*.

(32) Plut. de Oracul. defectu, pag. 419. See also the remark [I], in the article CHRYSIPUS.

(33) See the remark [X], in the article SPIRONOZA.

(34) See several proofs of this in the apology for the Dominicans, printed at Cologne in 1699, pag. 79, & seq. See also the article SPIRONOZA, remark [X].

FACTS which prove that the Orthodox are allowed to dispute on the arguments for the existence of a God.

(25) Id. ibid. pag. 255.

(26) Id. ibid. pag. 256.

(27) Dicam itaque, ex interitu Cæli necessario fieri ut anima quoque motrix intereat, quia licet hæc contrarium non habeat, tamen ex subiecti corporis interitu ex necessitate deficiet, quum sit primus motor universi est corruptibilis, ergo non est primus, forma materialis, negandum est consequens: ad probationem autem, quum dicunt, corruptetur à motore priore, hoc quoque est negandum; non enim ex eo quod est corruptibilis, requiritur motor prior, à quo corruptatur, sed quum sit incorporeus, et forma corporis, satis causa est ad ipsum interimendum corruptibilitatem corporis, cuius est forma; corpus autem ipsum, quum sit elementare, à suo contrario laedi et interiri potest (28).

(28) Id. ibid.

eternity of the world [H].

- answered him; as did also Mr Jaquelot, a Minister at the Hague, whose answer is inserted in the History of the Works of the Learned (35) Mr Brillon, a Doctor of the Sorbonne, saw this answer, but not being satisfied with it, he published (36) a memoir to prove that Des Cartes's argument was a sophism, and not a demonstration. Father Francis Lami, a Benedictine Monk, refuted this memoir (37). Mr Jaquelot replied for himself (38). Mr l'Herminier, a Doctor of the Sorbonne, has lately published a book, in which he not only rejects Des Cartes's demonstrations concerning the existence of GOD, but also most others. 'Of five offered by St Thomas, which are also commonly made use of by Philosophers and Divines, this Doctor rejects four, and allows only one of them to be valid against the Atheists, for he looks upon it as a paralogism to prove the Deity by any of the following reasons. That all that exists cannot be contingent, and that there must be some being which necessarily exists of itself. That we cannot admit an infinite number of causes mutually subordinate, and that it is absolutely necessary to acknowledge a first cause on which all others are dependent. That matter cannot move itself, but that a first incorporeal Mover must necessarily exist, from which it mediately or immediately received it's moving impulse. That in those beings which exist, there appearing several degrees of perfection, as goodness, beauty, power, &c. there must undoubtedly exist a Being infinitely perfect, with respect to which they may be said to be less or more perfect in proportion to their approaching more or less to it's perfection. After having ranked these four demonstrations among the sophisms, the fifth which Mr l'Herminier looks upon as a real demonstration of the existence of GOD, is that drawn from the structure of the universe and the manner of its subsisting in such an excellent order of all it's parts, and with such a constant regularity of their motions (39). This is what we find in the journal of Trevoux, in the extract of Mr l'Herminier's book (40). It is long since a very famous school-man (41) declared, that all the proofs which reason can afford of the existence of GOD are only probable. This Doctor of the Sorbonne does not go so far.
- [H] There are more ambiguities than are imagined in the controversy concerning the eternity of the world. All Christians (42) are agreed, that nothing besides GOD hath eternally existed; but several assert that he might have actually created the world as soon as he formed the decree in order to it's production; from whence they conclude, that the world might have existed from all eternity, since the decree for it's production is undoubtedly eternal. Several also affirm that it is impossible for a creature to be eternal. Each of these parties is stronger in objections than solutions. But this dispute which is rendered so tedious and difficult, would soon cease, if the disputants of each side would but explain themselves clearly, and remove the ambiguities about eternity. The question ought to be put thus: *Is it possible that GOD and his creatures may have always existed together.* And then one would not so boldly take the negative side; for this term, the eternity of the world, a term which startles so many people, would not here make such an impression on the mind. And the better to remove this stumbling-block, it should be said that a creature which had always co-existed with GOD would not be eternal, for which this reason ought immediately to be alleged, that the duration of creatures is successive, and that eternity is a simple duration which essentially excludes the time past, and the time to come. By this essential difference betwixt the duration of GOD, and that of the creatures, we should put an end to almost all the dispute, and each party would find their account in it. We should grant to those who deny that a creature can be eternal, that they are in the right, and should not deny that it is possible for GOD and the creature to have always existed together, since it is certain that a cause doth not comprehend in it's idea a priority of time with respect to it's effect, and that this is especially true with respect to an omnipotent cause which needs only will in order to produce actually whatever it pleases. Mr Poiret hath very clearly apprehended the ambiguities which perplex this controversy, and render it in a manner a dispute about words. He judiciously ob-

serves that it is not true that the creature would be eternal, if their existence had no beginning, and tells us that those who affirm it have a wrong notion of eternity. 'Asserentibus (Platoni ut ajunt & Aristoteli) mundum existentie initio carere, fuit obiectum, si id ita se haberet, mundum igitur æternum fore. Ecce, homines isti sibi imaginantur Æternitatem, quasi esset infinitorum momentorum ordo principio atque fine carens, quæ vera æternitatis ignorantia est. Falsum est, mundum statui æternum si dicatur vel semper existisse, vel non posse affirmari in eo esse ali- quod momentum quod ab alio non fuerit præcessum: quamvis enim hoc esset, nihilominus mundus temporarius esset & dependens; neque hoc quicquam Dei Æternitati aut Potentiæ detraheret (43). --- (43) Petrus P. It was objected to those (Plato and Aristotle, as it is ret, Cogitat. Rationales de Deo, Anima, & M. lo, lib. iii, cap. xvi, num. 12, pag. 438, Edit. 1685, that if it was so, the world would be eternal. They who made this objection must have imagined that eternity is an order of succession of infinite moments of time, without beginning or end: but this shows that they know not what eternity is. It is false that the world would be accounted eternal, if we say either that it always existed, or that there is not any moment of it's time which is not preceded by another: for even if this was so, the world would only be temporary and dependent, neither would this derogate from the eternity, or the power of GOD. Observe by the by that this author doth three things. We have just now seen the first, which is the false consequence that the world would be eternal if it never began. In the second place he owns that the arguments commonly alledged against those who say that the world had no beginning are weak. He excuses those who not having the light of revelation, did not believe the beginning of the universe. He tells us that when he was writing that chapter he was persuaded it was not possible to find any good reasons against those of that opinion, tho' he had long searched after better proofs than all those which he had read, and which appeared weak to him. Postquam aliorum quæ occurrerunt rationes infirmas deprehenderem, alias diu in mente mea quæseram, putavi seposita revelatione non posse ex lumine nature demonstrari Mundum sic esse, ut prius non fuerit (44). 3. At last (44) he brings a proof which offered itself to his mind while he was writing, he brings it, I say, against these people. But observe, that an objection was made to him (45), to which he gave an answer (46), which doth not take off the force of it.

Here are other quibbles which prevail in this dispute. Those who say that the creatures did not always co-exist with GOD, are obliged to own that GOD existed before them. There was therefore such a thing as before, when GOD existed alone; it is not therefore true that the duration of GOD is an indivisible point: Time therefore preceded the existence of the creatures. These consequences make those gentlemen fall into a contradiction. For if the duration of GOD is indivisible, and without either time past or time to come, it follows that time and the creatures began together, and if so, how can we say that GOD existed before the existence of the creatures? That phrase is improper and contradictory. And the following are no less so, *God might have created the world sooner or later than he did create it; he might have done it one hundred thousand years sooner, &c.*

They do not attend to this, that by making eternity one indivisible instant, the hypothesis of the beginning of the creatures is weakened. How do you prove that the world did not always exist? Is it not from the argument, that there was an infinite nature which existed while the world did not exist? But can the duration of that nature set bounds to that of the world? Can it hinder the duration of the world from extending its self beyond all the particular beginnings which you would assign for it? You say that the creatures want only a point of indivisible duration to be without a beginning; for, according to you, they were only preceded by the duration of GOD, which is an indivisible instant. You will be answered, that they did not therefore begin, for if a stick wanted only one point (I mean a Mathematical point) to be four feet long, it would certainly have the whole extent of four feet. This is an instance that may be founded on the common definition of the duration of GOD (47), a definition much

much more incomprehensible than the doctrine of Transubstantiation; for if it is impossible to conceive that all the members of a man should be contained distinct from each other within the compass of a Mathematical point; how shall we conceive that a duration without beginning or end, and which co-exists with the successive duration of all creatures, is comprized in an indivisible instant (48)?

(48) The Schoolmen take great pains to make this intelligible. See among others Caramuel, in his *Philosophia rationalis & realis*, lib. vii.

This hypothesis raises another difficulty in favour of those who assert that the creatures had no beginning. If the decree of the creation doth not comprehend a particular moment, it never existed without the creatures; for it ought to be understood under this phrase, *I will that the world exist*. It is visible that by virtue of such a decree the world must have existed at the same time with this act of the will of God. But since this act had no beginning, neither had the world any. Let us suppose then that the decree was conceived thus; *I will that the world exist in such a moment*. But how can we suppose that, if the duration of God is an indivisible point? Can this or that moment be chosen rather than any other in such a duration? It seems therefore, that if the duration of God is not successive, the world could not have a beginning.

(49) It is at pag. 675, 676, of his *Cogitat. rationales de Deo, &c.*

This objection was proposed to Mr Poirer in the year 1679 (49). He returned an answer (50) which no ways removes the difficulty, and even takes away all means of doing it; for he supposeth that it is not possible there should be any moments before the existence of the creatures: nay, he seems to suppose that the decree of the creation was only made at the very moment that the creatures existed. Let us cite his words: '*Nec poterat existere mundus, nec momenta ulla, sine alio decreto, nempe eo cum dixit Deus, Volo mundum existere; & tunc, (ut ait Scriptura,) dixit, & facta sunt, tunc existitit extemplo mundus: Et hoc fuit primum ejus momentum, & ante hoc nullum fuit de facto possibile momentum; estque contradicibus concipere ante mundum plura momenta ex quibus unum eligatur ad existentiā primam mundi, cæteris partim sine mundo præterlapſis: nam momentum est modus creaturæ quæ existit (51). . . . Neither could the world, or any moment of time exist, without another decree, namely that when God said, I will that the world exist, and then (as it is in the Scripture) he spoke and the things were made: then the world immediately came into being. This was the first moment of its existence; and before this, there was no possible moment. And it is*

(51) Poirer, *ibid.* pag. 680.

contradictory to conceive, that before the first existence of the world, there were several moments of time, and that one of them was singled out for the first moment of its existence, while the rest passed away without any world: for time is a mode of a creature, considered as existing. For my part, I make a quite different supposition, and believe it solves the difficulty.

I suppose that among the possible beings which God knew, before (52) he made the decrees of the creation, we ought to reckon a successive duration without beginning or end; and whole parts are as distinct from one another, as those of a possible extension, which God likewise knew before his decrees, as a Being infinite, according to the three dimensions. He left in the state of the things possible, part of this infinite duration, and made decrees for the existence of the other. He chose such a moment as he thought fit in this ideal duration for the first which should exist, and fixed to it the act, by which he decreed the creation of the world. This is the reason why the eternity of that act doth not prove the eternity of the world. Thus we see again, that the indivisibility of the real duration of God, doth not prove that the world did not begin. We have also in this ideal or possible duration, the true measure of time. Others look for it in vain, in the motion of the Heavens. Others yet more chimerically assert, that time is an *Ens rationis*, a manner of conceiving things, and that without motion, or the thought of man, there would be no such thing as time. A gross absurdity: for tho' all created spirits should perish, tho' all bodies should cease to move, there would still be a successive fixed and regular duration in the world, which would correspond to the moments of the possible duration known to God, and according to which he would preserve every thing more or less, for so many years. An extension which is at rest, requires no less to be created every moment of its duration, than an extension which moves. The conservation of creatures is always a continual creation, whether they move, or rest in the same situation. The true measure of the absolute quantity of things, either with respect to extension or time, is only to be found in the ideas of God. Man knows nothing of it; he is only acquainted with relative magnitude or littleness. The same space of time appears to him short or long, according as he passes it with pleasure or pain. The very hour which seems short to one, appears long to another.

(52) This word ought to be understood according to our way of apprehending things, and what is called in the schools, priority of nature, *figura rationis*.

Indivisible duration

relative time

ZAHURIS, is the common name bestowed on a certain sort of men in Spain, who, as it is pretended (a), are so sharp sighted, as to see veins of water, metals, treasures, and dead bodies under ground. Their eyes are very red. Martin Del Rio tells us that when he was at Madrid in the year 1575, he saw a little boy of this sort. It is remarkable that though this author is very ready to impute extraordinary effects to the devils, yet he doth not believe that the Zahuris discover subterraneous waters and metals by any magical contract, but believes that the vapours discover the water to them, and that they know the mines by the herbs which grow in those places. But as for treasures and dead bodies, he saith the Devil sheweth them to them; since they can mark out what treasures and corps they see, and are able to do it only on Tuesdays and Fridays. He doth not argue very consistently on what is related of these people (A); and all those who cite him do it not much to their honour (B): either they do not understand Latin, or they rely on falsified quotations. Gutierrez, a Spanish Physician, laughs at what is said of the Zahuris (C).

(a) Del Rio Disquisit. Magic. Tom. i, lib. i, cap. iii, 2^a q^a. 10.

[A] Del Rio doth not argue very consistently, on what is related of these people. For if it be once granted that the Zahuris see dead bodies and treasures, there is no reason to pretend that they do not see veins of water, and gold and silver mines. Why then doth del Rio grant the one, and deny the other? For he denies it, when he says that they know by the vapours and herbs, what lies hidden in a certain place of the earth. A knowledge which is acquired after this manner, is not what we call seeing. To argue consistently on this head, he ought to deny the facts, or explain them all by the same Hypothesis; for if the Devil is the cause of the two last, he may very well be so of the two former.

(1) See the *Mercure Galant*, for the month of February, 1693, pag. 235.

[B] All those who cite him, do it not much to their honour. One of those who wrote concerning the wand of Peter Aymar, alleges Martin del Rio, as an author who on the subject of the Zahuris, goes no further than natural causes (1). But this is visibly false, since of the four performances of these people, he at-

cribes two to the Devil. Here follows what that author makes him say: *Del Rio relates that there are certain men in Spain, called Zahuris, by reason of their sharp sight. He saith that he saw one of them at Madrid, in the year 1575, and that those Zahuris were reputed to see through the thick surface of the earth, springs of water, treasures, and metallic mines; and tho' these effects seemed very surprizing, he informs us that he explained them naturally, and that several Philosophers also referred them to natural causes.* I. He doth not say panie genus hominum quod vident (2). II. This author does not mention the seeing of buried bodies. III. Del Rio doth not say that he naturally explained those three effects; he saith, *Mart. del Rio*, that with respect to the two first, he perſists in the natural explanation which he had given elsewhere (3); but he attributes the other to the Devil.

[C] Gutierrez . . . laughs at what is said of the Zahuris. He calls them Zabories, and so much the more blames the popular credulity in this respect, because

(2) Norant Hist. panie genus hominum quod vident. Zahuris, nos Lynceus possumus nuncupare. Diff. Magic. lib. i, cap. iii, 2^a q^a. iv, pag. 35.

(3) Commentar. Medem Seneca, var. 231.

VOL. V.

7 M

cause they suppose these people to be born on Good-Friday, and that they enjoy this miraculous privilege by virtue of their birth-day. 'Eo magis isti damnan-
' di, quia ex supersticiosa hominum opinione admit-
' tantur putantes tali prerogativa hos impostores do-
' nari, quia nati fuerint die illa sacra, humano generi
' semper fausta ac felici, in qua celebratur apud Catho-
' licos memoria Passionis Domini Jesu-Christi, feria
' inquam sexta Judæorum perfidia crucifixi, & que-
' madmodum tunc terra commota atque monumentis
' apertis latitantia, ac sepulta corpora apparuerunt ho-
' minibus illa die, sic altera in qua recolitur felix illa
' memoria si natalis alicui hominum fuerit, illam vir-
' tutem videndi potentia tribuit, aut donat quæ ad
' interanea terrarum pertingere possit: Vide quam fu-
' tile ac irreligiosum commentum (4). - - - The Za-

(4) Joan. Laza-
rus Gutierrez
Sepulchralis, in
Academia Pinci-
nae Medicinæ
publicus Professor,
Opusculo de Fal-
cino, Dubio vi,
num. 16, pag.
143.

ZANCHIUS, or ZANCHUS (BASIL) one of the learned men of the XVIIth century, was of Bergamo. He took the habit of a regular Canon, and applied with an extreme ardour, not only to the study of Philosophy and Theology, but also to that of the *Belles Lettres*. The works we have of his are proofs of his erudition [A]. He acquired such an extensive knowledge, that he was thought worthy to be keeper of the Vatican library. He discharged that post with the greatest reputation, and to the satisfaction of the learned. He died very piously at Rome in the year 1560 (a). This I take from Ghilini's *Teatro*. I am sorry that I cannot find in it the circumstances of a particular which I have read elsewhere, I mean that Zanchius being persecuted and oppressed in a cruel manner, ended his days in misery [B]. He was cousin to Zanchius (b) who is the subject of the next article, and had two brothers who were regular Canons as well as himself (c).

(a) Taken from
Ghilini, *Tea-
tro*, Part. 1,
pag. 26, 27.

(b) Hieron.
Zanchius, *Epi-
stol. lib. ii*, pag.
445.

(c) Id. *ibid.*

[A] The works we have of his are proofs of his erudi-
tion. Ghilini represents him as a man who had thor-
oughly studied the Latin tongue, and had thereby ac-
quired as much glory, as the most excellent Professors
of that language. *S'affaticò molto nell' acquisto della
lingua Latina, dalla quale ne conseguì la maggior gloria,
che dar si possi al più squisito professore di così necessaria
favella* (1). He improved, adds he, the Dictionary of
Marius Galezinus. I believe he should have said that
of Marius Nizolius. 'Assaiissimo li devono tutti i stu-
diosi, e devono anco in gran parte riconoscere dal suo
infaticabile intelletto la perfezione del fruttuoso Di-
zionario de Mario Galefino, il quale fu aumentato,
' e ridotto al termine, che hoggidi si vede; che hà
' per titolo *Verborum latinorum ex variis auctoribus*,
' lib. i. Vanno anco attorno con molta commendat-
zione del suo nome queste altre opere. *Dictionary
Poeticum, & Epitheta veterum Poetarum: de hortis so-
phie libri duo carmine conscripti: Adnotationes in di-
vinos libros: Quaestiones in libros Regum, & Paralip-
omenon: Poematum libri octo* (2). - - - All men of
' letters are greatly indebted to him, and ought to own
' that the useful Dictionary of Marius Galezinus, which
' he enlarged and brought into the form in which it now
' appears, was perfected in a great measure by his inde-
' fatigable labour. It is intitled *Verborum latinorum
ex variis auctoribus*, lib. i. There are likewise in
' the hands of the learned, these other works of his,
' which are greatly to his reputation. *Dictionary Poet-
icum, &c.* Add to this these words of Giraldus (3).
' Est & Petrus Zanchus Bergamas, qui mutato vitæ
' instituto à Sodalibus Bazilius vocatus est: vivit
' adhuc, à prima ejus adolescentia mihi cognitus Ro-
' mæ in studiis bonarum literarum versatus, nec minus
' in sacris bene eruditus: plurima ad hanc diem tum
' soluta oratione, tum pedestri & carmine perscripsit,
' inter quæ Romæ publicata in manus peritorum va-
' gantur duo libri versu heroico elaborati ad Petr. Bem-
' bum Card. qui inscribuntur *Hortus Sophie*, & præ-
' terea alia simul impressa: extat & laboriosum opus,
' *Sylva vocabulorum ex optimis auctoribus linguae La-
tinæ*, item Nizolii ex Cicerone *Paralipomena*. - - -

(1) Ghilini,
Teatro, Tom. i,
pag. 26.

(2) Id. *ibid.*

(3) Lilius Gregor.
Gyrall. de Poetis
fleur. temporum,
Dial. ii, pag.
169, Tom. ii,
Opr. Edit. 1696.

(1) Teffier,
Addit. aux Elo-
ges, Tom. ii,
pag. 160.

ZANCHIUS (JEROM) one of the most celebrated Protestant Divines, was born at Alzano in Italy [A] on the second of February 1516. He entered into the congregation

[A] He was born at Alzano in Italy. The differ-
ence which Mr Teffier (1) has discovered betwixt
Melchior Adam and Thuanus, is really no difference.
The former, saith he, writes that Zanchius was a na-
tive of Alzano, but Thuanus and Verheiden say he
was born at Bergamo. I own these two last authors
give him the epithet of Bergomas; but since it is not

' buris are so much the more to be condemned and exploded,
' as they are admitted only by the opinion of superstitious
' men, who imagine that these impostors are gifted with
' such a virtue, because they were born on that sacred
' day, ever blessed and happy to mankind, on which the
' Catholics commemorate the passion of our Lord Jesus
' Christ; the sixth day of the week, I say, on which he
' was crucified by the perfidy of the Jews: for, as the
' earth was then shaken, and the graves of the dead
' opened, many bidden and buried bodies, did on that day
' appear to men, so they think that the day on which
' this is commemorated, if it chanceth to be the birth-day
' of any person, imparts to him that virtue of seeing
' things which are in the bowels of the earth. What
' a silly and chimerical fancy is this!

Peter Zanchius of Bergamo, having changed his way
of life, was by his companions called Basil: he is still
living, I was acquainted with him at Rome, when he
was very young; he has diligently studied the *Belles
Lettres*, and is also very learned in Divinity: he writes
even till this day, a great many good things, both in
prose and verse. There are in the hands of the curious,
' two books of his written in heroic verse, inscribed to
' Cardinal Peter Bembo, and intitled *Hortus Sapientie*,
' together with other pieces printed at Rome. He
' has also published a laborious work, intitled, *Sylva
vocabulorum*, a collection of words taken from the
' best Latin authors, and likewise Nizolius's *Paralip-
omena*, from Cicero.

[B] Zanchius . . . oppressed in a cruel manner, ended
his days in misery. Paul Manutius deplors his sad
fate in a letter to Gambara an intimate friend of the
deceased. 'Basilii Zanchii, saith he (4), poetæ sum-
' mi, hominisque non vulgariter eruditi, miserabilis &
' indignissimus interitus hilaritatem mihi prorsus om-
' nem eripuit. quem, enim donare fumis præmiis ob
' excellentem virtutem; decorare honoribus ob singu-
' larem integritatem, atque innocentiam æquum fuit;
' eum tam ignominiose vexatum, tam acerbè, tam
' crudeliter extinctum, quis non ferat iniquissimè? e-
' quidem, ut audivi, etiam dolore tuo vehementer do-
' lui. nam & vixisti unà semper conjunctissimè, aliter
' alteri egregie carus. - - - The miserable and unde-
' served death of Basil Zanchius, has been a great af-
' fliction to me. He was a great Poet, and a man of un-
' common learning. Who would not be deeply concerned,
' that a man who merited the greatest rewards for his
' extraordinary virtue, and the greatest honours for his
' singular integrity and innocence, should be persecuted and
' oppressed with so much cruelty and ignominy, and end
' his days in misery? Indeed, when I heard of it, I
' greatly mourned on account of the grief it would give
' you: for you and Zanchius have lived together in the
' firmest union, and with the greatest mutual friendship.
' What follows in this Epistle of Manutius, is to be
found above (5), look there for the elegies which he
bestows on our Basil's verses.

(4) Paulus Ma-
nutius, *Epist.
xxviii*, lib. iv,
pag. n. 116.

(5) In the re-
mark [B], of
the article
GAMBARA.

congregation of the regular Canons of Lateran, at the age of fifteen, and continued there about nineteen years. He at first applied to the study of Philosophy and of school Divinity; but after having heard Peter Martyr's Lectures at Lucca, on the Epistle of St Paul to the Romans, and the Psalms, he engaged himself in the more profitable study of the Scripture and Fathers. Every body knows that Peter Martyr, who was a Canon of the same congregation, communicated the Protestant doctrines to several of his brethren before he threw off the monkish habit. The impressions which he made on them were so strong, that in the space of one year, eighteen of the fraternity imitated him in abjuring Popery. Our Zanchius was one of them. He left Italy in the year 1550, and stayed some time amongst the Grisons, and afterwards at Geneva, whence he designed to go to London, being invited thither by Peter Martyr, who intended to procure him a place of Divinity Professor in England. But being intreated by the directors of the university of Strasburgh, to fill the vacant place of the deceased Gaspar Hedion, Divinity Professor there, he accepted that employment in the year 1553, and exercised it almost eleven years, reading now and then some lectures on Aristotle. The university required him to sign the Augsburg confession, but did not obtain it without some limitations which the directors agreed to. He was admitted one of the Canons of St Thomas in the year 1555. He was a lover of peace [B], and hated Theological civil wars; which nevertheless he could not avoid. He was accused of some errors, he defended himself, and this affair was carried on so warmly, that it was reduced to the terms either of his voluntarily retiring, or of the directors dismissing him. He did not find his account in this alternative; wherefore he stirred very much to maintain his post. A thousand expedients were fought after, and at last they fell upon that of obliging him to sign a formulary. He signed it with some restrictions [C]: but that did not hinder his adversaries from triumphing, nor from spreading the news of their victory every where. He designed to retrieve himself, and new proposals of accommodation were begun, when a favourable opportunity afforded him a handsome pretext to extricate himself out of this labyrinth. The church of Chiavenna, in the country of the Grisons invited him to be their minister, and he accepted that vocation. He surrendered his canonry,

them no otherwise, than in expressing the native place of this great Divine more particularly: He calls it *Alzanum* (2), and saith that it is situated in the valley of Seri (3). Now it is certain, that *Alzanum*, and this valley belong to the Bergamasco (4). Mr Teiffier is again mistaken when he says that Alzano is a little town four leagues distant from Venice. If instead of four leagues he had put forty, he needed not have feared saying too much. Melchior Adam deceived him: he had read somewhere that our Jerom's father having received the news of his father's death, quitted his studies of the Civil-Law, and married. The care which he was obliged to take of his sisters, made him sensible that he would do much better to apply to his domestic affairs, than to follow the bar; nay, he left the city, and removed to Alzano, which was four miles distant (5); This he did like a good economist (6), that is, as I think, to live at less expence. This is what Melchior Adam found in some book (7). Upon this he falls to conjecturing, but is not happy in it; he says (8) in a marginal note, that in his opinion the city which Zanchius's father left was Venice. If he had been a good Geographer, he would never have entertained that thought, but would have known that the distance betwixt Alzano and Venice, is above forty leagues. His conjecture is turned into a downright affirmation by Mr Teiffier, who besides, translates *quartum lapidem*, by four leagues, though in the Latin style, they contain only four thousand paces. I take Bergamo, to be the city, from whence Zanchius's father departed, for reasons of economy. Quenstedt hath committed two gross faults: he says page 276 (9), that Jerom Zanchius was born at Alzano, in the valley of Seri, four miles from Venice; but in page 302, he makes him a native of the city of Bergamo.

- [B] *Zanchius was a lover of peace.* He was according to Melchior Adam (10), 'litium fugitans, concordia amans. . . . Modestie singularis, pacis Ecclesiarum studiosissimus' (11). - - - He shunned contention, loved concord, was a man of extraordinary modesty; and studied to promote peace in the churches. Others say (12), that very few surpassed him in learning, piety, and modesty. See the remarks in which I examine the narrative of Thuanus and Moreri.
- [C] *Obliged him to sign a formulary. He signed it with some restrictions.* We must know that there soon happened some broils betwixt him and John Marbachius, Minister, and Divinity-Professor at Stras-

burgh. They differed on the doctrine of Predestination, and its dependencies; but the fire lay hid under the ashes till the year 1561, when Zanchius induced the magistrates to suppress a book of Tilemannus Heslusius, which had been reprinted at Strasburgh, but had the name of Magdeburg in the title as the place where it was printed. This book treated of the Real Presence in, cum, sub pane, - - - in, with, and under the bread, and had a preface which was injurious to Frederic III, Elector Palatine, to Melancthon, and several other excellent Divines. The author of this preface, accused of Heresy and Atheism, all those who did not approve his opinion concerning the Real Presence and Oral Manducation. Zanchius caused this book to be suppressed, not on account of its doctrine, which he left to the judgment of the Church, but for the calumnies of the preface. This displeased Marbachius, and the other zealous asserters of Lutheranism, and put them upon trying all ways to remove Zanchius. For this purpose they canvassed all his lectures, and the manuscripts he had dictated, and when they had extracted from them whatever they could, they accused him of Heterodoxy, with regard to Predestination and Perseverance, &c. The affair was vigorously debated; Zanchius consulted the Divines of several places of Germany, and offered a verbal conference with his adversaries. This proposal was rejected, and in the mean time they declaimed against him before the people, with great animosity (13). At last, the affair came to an arbitration; and the following persons were prevailed on to come to Strasburgh; from Tubingen, James Andreas; from Deux Ponts, Cuman Flinsbach; and from Basil, Simon Sulcerus, and Ulric Coccius; the arbitrators declared that there was no Heresy in Zanchius's opinions; but drew up articles which he signed in this manner, on the twenty-eighth of March 1563. *Hanc doctrinam formulam ut piam agnosco, ita etiam recipio* (14); that is, in as much as I acknowledge this formulary of doctrine to be pious, so I receive it; or, I acknowledge that this formulary of doctrine is pious, and so I receive it. The Latin words will bear both these senses, and I would not answer for Zanchius that he was not sensible of this ambiguity, and that he did not intend to take advantage of it some time or other. Be that as it will, his adversaries were yet more artful; they so dexterously slipped some ambiguities into the articles of the formulary, that they could explain every thing to their advantage: accordingly they did not fail to interpret every

(2) Melch. Adam. in Vite. Theol. Exter. pag. 148.

(3) In valle Seriana, Id. ibid.

(4) See Leander Albertus, Description. Ital. pag. 638.

(5) Ad quartum inde distans lapidem. Melchior Adam. ibid.

(6) Quod rebus suis consultus fore judicaret. Id. ibid.

(7) He might have found it in the second book of Zanchius's Letters, p. 444.

(8) Id. ibid.

(9) Of his book de Patriis illustrium Virorum.

(10) In Vita Theol. Exter. pag. 149.

(11) Idem, pag. 152.

(12) Sanderfon, de Obligat. conscient. Præf. ii, apud Pope Blount, Conf. Author. pag. 541.

(13) Clamoris ad populum concionibus traducebatur. Henricus Alting. Tool. Hiflor. pag. 293, 299.

(14) Taken from Henry Altingius, ibid. pag. 299.

(a) Fructuose
quidem sed non
abluce cruce.
Melch. Adam.
in *Vit. Theol.*
Exter. p. 151.

(b) Taken from
Melchior Adam,
ibid. pag. 148,
& seq.

canonry, desired leave to depart, and retired from Straßburg in November 1563. From that time to the year 1568, he was very serviceable to the church of Chiavenna; and met with some crosses there also (a). He was offered a Divinity Professor's chair at Heidelberg, which he accepted; and began the exercise of that function in February 1568. He was promoted to the degree of Doctor the same year, in the presence of Frederic III, Elector Palatine: at the solicitation of that Prince, he wrote a large book against the Antitrinitarians; and after the death of that Elector, refused the invitations of the university of Leyden, and of the church of Antwerp, chusing rather to stay at the college of Neustad, where John Casimir, Count Palatine, had got together the professors, whom the new Elector, a great favourer of Lutheranism, had obliged to leave Heidelberg. Upon the death of this Elector, the administration of the Palatinate fell into the hands of the same John Casimir, who re-instated the professors in their former posts; but Zanchius, by reason of his great age, was declared *emeritus*. He died at Heidelberg on the nineteenth of November 1590. He lost his sight some time before his death (b). It doth not appear by Melchior Adam's life of him, that he was ever married; but according to Thuanus, he left a numerous issue [D]. He composed several books, which doubtless are as good as those of more modern Divines, and yet no body reads them: they are sold almost for nothing in the auctions of libraries; and the Grocers more eagerly take advantage of the low price of them, than the students in Divinity, or the ministers. The fate of the works of other Divines, who made such a figure in the XVIth century, is very like this. We may justly censure Thuanus in some particulars [E],

and

(15) Quoniam in
articulis involuta
doctrina, adver-
sariis omnia pro-
se interpretanti-
bus denuo enu-
pit controversia:
que priusquam
compereretur
Zanchius discipuli
Clavennam ad
Ecclesie mini-
sterium evocatus.
Id. ibid. pag.
299.

(16) Persuasus
tamen concordi-
causa, cum sine
præjudicio doctri-
nae suae id fac-
tum in intelligen-
ret, his verbis,
ut sibi exeret
subscriptis: Hanc
doctrinae formulam,
ut piam ag-
nosco; ita etiam
recipio; & sub-
scripsit quidem a-
liorum calidita-
tem sua simplici-
tate mensus.
Melch. Adam,
ubi supra, pag.
150.

(17) See the fore-
going quotation.

(18) See the fore-
going quotation.

(19) Hospin.
Historie Sacra-
ment. Part. ii,
pag. 536.

(20) Id. ibid.

(21) Id. ibid.
pag. 543.

(22) Id. ibid.

every thing to his prejudice; thus revived the quarrel, but he left them and went to the Grisons (15). Thus Henry Altingius relates the affair. We may add to his narrative some particulars which he omits, and Melchior Adam furnishes us with. The accusations charged against Zanchius turned not only on the doctrines of Predestination, and of the perseverance of the saints; but also on the Eucharist, Ubiquity, Images, Antichrist, and the end of the world. The chapter of St Thomas, of which he was a Canon, tried several ways of accommodation; afterwards the dispute was laid before the Council of Thirteen. He went himself to consult the churches and universities of Germany, and published the decisions which he obtained from them. He deliberated some time about signing the formulary drawn up by the four arbiters, and excused himself out of fear of scandalizing the pious souls, and confirming erring men in their opinions. At last, being resolved to subscribe it for the sake of peace, and because he thought it would be of no prejudice to his opinion, he armed himself with a precaution in his manner of signing it, and measured the artifices of his enemies by his own candor (16). This we have from Melchior Adam; but for my part, I confess, I cannot discover this candor; for Zanchius's subscription is so ambiguous, and so liable to shifts and subterfuges, that it doth not appear he drew it up in that manner, without a further prospect. Is it not owned that he chose this phrase, rather than another, out of precaution (17)? If there was any artifice in this, it was of no service to its author, nor did it contribute to establish peace. 'Sed ne sic quidem bene coit gratia: cum statim post adventum de victoria jactitare, triumphare, & laureas in Saxoniam, atque alias regiones literas mittere (18). - - - But neither did this establish unity and peace: for immediately after his adversaries vainly boasted of their victory, and sent many triumphant letters concerning it into Saxony, and other parts.'

Thus far I had written without ever thinking of consulting Hospinian's Sacramental History. I have now consulted it, and have found in it a long relation of this dispute. I see there (19) that one of Zanchius's good friends broke with him, and took advantage of a letter which he had communicated to him. I see that (20) Marbachius and his adherents forbore speaking to him, and so much as saluting him after the disgrace of Heshulius's book. But what serves most to prove the certainty of my conjectures, is, that I there see that Zanchius, in his mind, put a very particular sense upon the expressions of his subscription. His mental reservation was this: 'Hanc doctrinæ formulam recipio quatenus illam piam esse judico (21). - - - I receive this formulary of doctrine, so far as I believe it to be pious.' His adversaries sent copies of what he had signed to all parts, without ever mentioning the terms of his subscription (22); they feared their triumph would not appear considera-

ble enough to those who were capable of examining the equivocal words of Zanchius.

If we may rely on a letter which he wrote to David Chaillet, on the first of November 1563 (23), (24) it is in the they made use of many frauds. This letter deserves second book of to be read; he there makes his apology, and la. Zanchius's Let- ters, pag. 11, bours to prove that he did nothing against his con- & seq.

[D] According to Thuanus, he left a numerous issue [D] His words are: 'Scriptis multa . . . quorum partem, dum vixit, in lucem dedit, partem filii, quos PLU- RES reliquit, post mortem ejus publicavit (24). (24) Thuan. 'He wrote several things . . . some of which he pub- lished during his life, and others his sons, of whom there were MANY, published after his death.' This is somewhat hyperbolic; for the Epistle Dedicatory to Zanchius's letters signed by his heirs, mentions the names of only two sons, and that of his son-in-law. Here follows what I find concerning his marriages. His first wife was a daughter of *Caecilius secundus Curis*, by whom he had a daughter who did not live long. He afterwards married the sister of a gentleman, named Laurence Lumagius: the two twins of whom she was delivered in the year of her nuptials died soon after. The daughter who was born in the following year died at three years old. This is what Jerom Zanchius wrote to Lælius Zanchius, on the second of April 1565 (25). He there tells him that he had then two daughters.

[E] We may justly censure Thuanus in some particu- lars.] I. Peter Martyr left Italy in the year 1542, and Zanchius in 1550, wherefore the following words of Thuanus are not exact: 'Hieronymus Zanchius . . . paulo post Petri Martyris . . . discessum ob eandem causam Argentinam concessit (26). - - - Je- rom Zanchius, a little after the departure of Peter Martyr, removed to Straßburg, on the same account.' II. They are faulty in another particular; for Zanchius did not go to Straßburg till after having resided about nine months in the country of the Grisons, and as long at Geneva (27). III. Vermilio in Angliam evocato Anno 54. in munere successit. This Latin may signify that Peter Martyr went into England in the year 1554. But this is false, he went thither in 1547. However, not to take the expression in the strictest sense, let us grant Thuanus that the year he mentions concerns only the installation of Zanchius; yet we may justly censure him, since it is certain that Zanchius was installed in 1553, not in Martyr's, but Hedion's place. 'Successit ei (Caspari Hedion) in professione Hieronymus Zanchius Italus (28). - - - Caspar Hedion was succeeded in his professorship by Hierom Zanchius, an Italian.' 'Cum anno quinquagesimo tertio, in demortui Casparis Hedionis locum Theologus, qui in schola sacras literas doceret, esset sufficiens: ab amplissimo illius Reipubl. magistratu & scholarchis decretum est, Italum quendam, Marti- tyri non abisimilem, vocandum. Itum ergo primum est

(23) That letter is in the second book of Zanchius's Letters, pag. 11, & seq.

(24) Thuanus, Hist. lib. xix, pag. 379, et seq.

(25) Melch. Adam, ubi supra, pag. 149.

(26) Melch. Adam, in Vit. Theol. Geneva, pag. 244.

(d) Donatus
Calvus is the au-
thor of it: It is
intituled *Scena
Letteraria de
Scrittori Berga-
maschi*.

(33) Amarior
eo Romanæ Ec-
clesiæ & Pontifi-
cii nominis op-
pugnator Jaco-
bus Andreanus.
Id. ibid.

Conclitiorum, saltem, scripturae thesaurus, quod
 cula interdu[m] volunt apertissimam herefese[m] suarum
 damnationem legunt, numquid non dissimulant, num-
 quid non tergiversantur, numquid non argutantur?
 Audi domesticum testem Hieronymum Zanchium
 omnium Sacramentarium futilissimum: *Legi librum*
(Pseudo-Evangelici nescio cuius) sed non fuit somnatio
perlegi; cum nimirum viderem qualissem fit scribendi
ratio, quā in Ecclesijs ex Evangelio reformatis (eo no-
mine Lutheri, Calvini, similiumque sectas appellat)
permuli, ne dicam plerique omnes, utuntur: qui tamen
Pastores, qui Doctores, qui Columnae Ecclesiae videri
 7 N. volunt.

(37) Melch.
Adam, ubi su-
pra, pag. 152.

[F] and Moreri alfo.] I. When he faith that Zanchius was an *Apostate Monk of London*, it is not his fault, but that of his Dictionary. The Printers have put *de Londres (of London)*, instead of *de l'Ordre (of the order)*, and I observe this to shew to what errors they expose the readers: for how many readers have believed from hence, that Zanchius stole out of a monastery at London, when he turned Prote-

VOL. V

others there was one JEROM ZANCHIUS, who publish some Law-books. He was second cousin to our Divine (e). It will not be an unacceptable thing to the reader, if I say here that our Jerom had a servant named Frederic Sylburgius, who became a very learned man. He kept him four years (f), and then recommended him to Lælius Zanchius, that he might procure him a place at Padua (g). His letter of recommendation is dated on the second of April 1565.

(e) Zanch. Epistol. lib. ii, pag. 444.

(f) Id. ibid.

(g) Id. ibid. pag. 448.

volunt. Statum causæ ne intelligant, de industria sepe numero tenebris involuimus: quæ sunt manifesta, impudenter negamus: quæ falsa, sine fronte asseruimus: quæ aperte impia, tamquam prima fidei principia obtrudimus: quæ orthodoxa, hæreses damnamus: Patres tuos ad nostra somnia pro libidine torquemus: Patres jactamus, cum nihil minus quam illorum doctrinam sequebamur: Sophisticari, calumniari, conviciari, qui velimus: nobis est familiare; modo causam nostram, sive bonam sive malam, quo jure, quaque injuria tuamur: reliqua omnia susque deque facimus. Hæc ille τὸ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἰδὼν αὐτῶν περὶ τῆς, ut de Epimenide Cretensi dixit Apostolus Paulus cap. 1. Epistolæ ad Titum, ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτῆς ἐστὶν ἀληθὴς (38). --- What shall I say of the other Ministers of the Lutheran and Calvinistical sects, who wobble they sometimes turn over the smaller works of the Councils, Fathers, and ancient writers, read the clearest condemnation of their own Heresies. What dissimulation, tergiversation, and shifting are they not guilty of. Hear the words of one of their own witnesses, Jerom Zanchius, the most subtle of all the sacramentarians. I have read the book (written by I know not what Heretic): but I could not peruse it without some indignation, when I ob-

(38) Philippus Labbe, Dissert. de Script. Ecclesiast. Tom. i, p. 807, 808. Note, that he quotes none of Zanchius's treatises, which shows that he did not go to the fountain head, but relied upon the quotation of another man.

served what manner of writing prevails in the Churches reformed according to the word of God, (thus he calls the sects of Calvin, Luther, and the like) and is used by a great many, not to say almost all the Protestants; used by men who would be thought pastors, and doctors, and pillars of the church. To confound and perplex the state of the question we frequently involve our selves in darkness. The most manifest truths we impudently deny. Things which are false we affirm with effrontery. The most obvious impieties we intrude upon the people as the fundamentals of faith. Orthodox doctrines we condemn as heretical. The Scriptures we wrest at pleasure, in order to accommodate them to our own dreams. We boast of the Fathers, whilst there is nothing we mind less than their doctrines. Sophistry, calumny, and abuse, are familiar to us. If we do but maintain our cause, be it good or bad, no matter by what means: all other things are set at naught to serve that purpose. These are the words of one of themselves, even a Prophet of their own, As the Apostle Paul (chapter first of his Epistle to Titus) said of Epimenides the Cretan. This witness is true.

(a) An Episcopal city, in one of the isles of the gulf of Venice, in Latin Clodia, whence comes the Latin surname Clodienus, given to Zarlino.

ZARLINO (JOSEPH) a native of Chioggia (a) President and Director of the chapel of the Seignury of Venice, was one of the most excellent Musicians of the XVth century. He composed some airs which were sung and applauded at Venice, at the time that rejoicings were made in that city, for the victory of Lepanto, in the year 1571. He published several books which maintained and spread his reputation (b) [A]. He died at Venice on the fourteenth of February. 1599, at the age of fifty-nine years (c).

(b) Taken from Maffius Riccio, Hist. del Mondo, ad an. 1571, pag. 44.
(c) Thom. 83, 123, in fine.

(1) Pag. 55, of the second part.

[A] He published several books which . . . spread his reputation.] The catalogue of Thuanus's library (1) mentions two books of Zarlino, in folio; one intitled, *Demonstrationi Harmoniche*, printed at Venice in the year 1571, and afterwards, with additions, in 1573; the other printed in the same city, in the year 1588, and intitled, *Supplementi Musicali*. The Oxford catalogue mentions *toute le Opere* of Zarlino, in four volumes, printed at Venice in the year 1589, in folio, and besides that, a Latin treatise, *De vera anni forma seu de rellia ejus emendatione*, printed at Venice in the year 1580, in 4to. John Albert Bannius has highly commended the writings of this Musician. Josephus Zarlinus Clodienus, says he (2), Theoria instructissimus . . . doctissimis institutionibus, demonstrationibus, ac supplementis, lingua Italica editis (apud Venetos, anno 1580.) Musicam præ cæteris feliciter tradidit, & ab solvit. Prolixior nonnihil est, sed eruditione compensat fastidium: ex quo verior Musicæ eruditio haurienda. Ejus Compendium in Tabulas redegit Joannes Maria Artusius Bononiensis, Italico etiam idiomate: quibus breviter, clare & perspicue rem studiosius proponit. Scripserunt & alii; qui an Zarlinum æquent, nescio: saltem non superant. . . . Unus ergo instar omnium erit, sine quo nec veterum sententia expedire poterunt, nec perfecta hujus disciplinæ notitia facile obtinebitur. Ad perfectionem tamen Musicæ modernæ non accedit (3). . . . Unum Zarlinum præ cæteris commendavi; non quod aliorum scripta nullius momenti sint; cum multa præclara eruditaque dogmata contineant: sed unum Zarlinum coryphæum dixi. Cum enim Musica ab Authoribus descripta, in plerisque defectum patitur, magno studio, industria, ac lectione varia supplementum; unum aliquem commendare nequeo, ex quo hauriant studiosi (pauci etiam totam Musicam Theoricam ac Practicam simul intellexerunt & excusserunt) præter Zarlinum. Is, inquam, præ cæteris doctus, felicissimæ, & propemodum solus, rem

(2) Joh. Alb. Bannius, Dissertation. de Musica, pag. m. 675. Collection. de Sudis instituentis, Edit. Amstærd. 1645.

(3) Id. ibid. pag. 676.

executus, meo judicio, videtur. Ordinariæ Praxi deservire præcipue potest Zarlini Compendium à Joannæ Maria Artusio Bononiensi, optima methodo doctissime confectum (4). . . . Joseph Zarlino of Chioggia was a great master of the theory of Music. . . . In his learned institutions, demonstrations, and supplements, published in Italian at Venice, 1580, he has explained and improved that science, with much greater success than any other author. He is somewhat prolix. But his learning makes amends for that prolixity. His writings contain the true knowledge of Music. Joannes Maria Artusius Bononiensis reduced his compendium into tables, which he wrote likewise in Italian. In these tables he sets forth the science of Music, in a short, clear, and perspicuous manner. There are others who have written on Music; whether they equal Zarlino or not, I do not know, at least they do not surpass him. . . . So that Zarlino alone will serve instead of all the rest: without him the opinions of the Antients cannot be understood, nor a perfect knowledge of this science be easily attained. But he does not come up to the perfection of the modern Music. I have commended Zarlino above all the rest, not because the writings of other men on this subject are of no value; for they contain many excellent and learned instructions, but I have called Zarlino the best writer on this subject. For most authors having given but an imperfect account of Music, and as this defect must be supplied by great study, industry, and various reading, I cannot recommend any one of them to those who study this art, except Zarlino. Besides few of them have at the same time thoroughly examined and understood both the theoretical and practical Music. Zarlino, in my opinion, has written on this subject with more learning and success than all the rest: and he is almost the only author who has succeeded in it. His Compendium, as it is drawn up by Joannes Maria Artusius Bononiensis in an excellent method, and with great learning, may be chiefly serviceable in the common practice of Music.

(4) Id. ibid. pag. 685, 686.

ZENOBIAS

ZENOBIA, one of the most illustrious women that ever swayed a scepter, pretended to be descended from the Ptolomies and Cleopatras (a). She was married to Odenatus, a Saracen Prince (b), and contributed very much to the great victories which he obtained over the Persians [A], and which preserved the east to the Romans, when after the taking of Valerian it was very probable that Sapor would have wrested all that country from them. Accordingly she was honoured with the title of Augusta (c), when Gallienus in grateful acknowledgment of the services of Odenatus made him Emperor in the year of Christ 264. After the death of her husband she held the supreme power, and reigned in a very courageous and glorious manner. Her sons, by reason of their youth, enjoyed only the imperial name and honours (d). She did not only preserve the countries subject to Odenatus; but also conquered Egypt, and was preparing for farther conquests when the Emperor Aurelian made war against her (e). She lost two battles (f), and was forced to shut her self up in the city of Palmyra, where Aurelian besieged her. She defended her self very bravely; but seeing that in all probability the Emperor would take the city, she secretly went out of it. Aurelian being informed of this caused her to be so diligently pursued, that she was overtaken just as she was in the ferry going to pass the Euphrates (g). This happened in the year 272. The Emperor saved her life, and after making her an ornament of his triumph [B], presented her with a country seat near Rome, where she quietly passed the remainder of her days [C]. It is reported that upon her evidence Aurelian put many persons to death (h). She was beautiful, chaste, learned, valiant, and temperate, though on some occasions out of policy she would drink great quantities of wine [D]. If to these excellent qualities she could have added that of a good mother-in-law, she might have been

(a) Trebellius Pollio, in triginta Tyrannis, pag. m. 328.

(b) Procopius, pag. 97. Trebellius Pollio, ibid. pag. 298, calls him Princeps Palmyrenorum.

(c) See Tillemont, Hist. des Empereurs, Tom. iii, pag. 976.

(d) Trebellius Pollio, ibid. pag. 325.

(e) Zosimus, lib. i.

(f) See Vopiscus, in Aureliano. Moreri quotes in Annal. that leads into a mistake; Vopiscus wrote no Annals.

(g) Palmyra, built by Solomon, was a day's journey distant from this river.

(h) Tillemont, ubi supra, pag. 1066. He quotes Suidas, in A'v'v' pag. 494.

[A] She contributed very much to the great victories which he obtained over the Persians.] This is testified by Aurelian in a letter which he wrote to the Senate. 'Audio P. C. mihi obici quod non virile munus impleverim, Zenobiam triumphando. Næ illi qui me reprehendunt satis laudarent, si scirent qualis illa est mulier, quam prudens in consiliis, quam constans in dispositionibus, quam erga milites gravis, quam larga quam necessitas posuisset, quam trilis quum severitas poscat. Possunt dicere illius esse quod Odenatus Persas vicit, ac fugato Sapore Ctesiphontem usque pervenit. Possunt asserere, tanto apud Orientales & Ægyptiorum populos timori mulierem fuisse, ut se non Arabes, non Saraceni, non Armeni commoverent (1). - - - Conscript Fathers, I bear it is objected to me, that I did not act a manly part in triumphing over Zenobia. Truly they who censure me would greatly commend me, did they know what kind of a woman Zenobia is, how prudent in her designs, how constant in her resolutions, with what dignity she behaved towards her army, how bountiful she is upon the necessary occasions, and how austere when severity requires it. I can ascribe it to her, that Odenatus overcame the Persians, and having put Sapor to flight, reached as far as Ctesiphon. I can affirm that she was so formidable to the Eastern people, and the Egyptians, that both the Arabians, the Saracens, and Armenians lay quiet.'

[B] Aurelian . . . made her an ornament of his triumph.] The letter which he wrote to the Emperor Aurelian, in answer to that which he had written to her, to summon her to surrender, shews that she designed to follow the example of Cleopatra, who chose rather to put an end to her life than to live without reigning (2); but she changed her resolution, and submitting to necessity, adorned Aurelian's triumph. There she appeared so overloaded with jewels, that tho' very strong, she was scarce able to support the weight of them. It is true, we must make a great allowance for the golden fetters which were fastened to her feet, and the golden chains which bound her hands. 'Ducta est igitur per triumphum ea specie ut nihil pompabilibus populo Rom. videretur. Jam primum ornata gemmis ingentibus, ita ut ornamentorum onere laboraret. Fertur enim mulier fortissima sepiissime restitisse quum diceret se gemmarum onera ferre non posse. Vincit enim præterea pedes auro, manus etiam catenis aureis: nec collo aureum vinculum deerat, quod scurra Persicus præferebat (3). - - - Zenobia was led in triumph with so much splendor that never any thing appeared more pompous to the people of Rome. She was adorned with exceeding large jewels, and laboured under the weight of her ornaments. For though she was a very strong woman, yet it is reported that she stopped very often, and declared that she could not bear the weight of the jewels. Besides there were golden fetters fastened to her feet, and her hands were bound with chains of the same metal. There was like-

'wife a golden collar for her neck, which a Persian buffoon carried before her.'

Father Pagi affirms that Zenobia was led in triumph in the year 274, two years after she fell into Aurelian's hands; and refutes some very learned Chronologists, who have misplaced the years of these two events. See his *Dissertatio Hypatica* towards the end.

[C] A country-seat, where she quietly passed the remainder of her days.] Let us continue to cite Trebellius Pollio. 'Huic ab Aureliano vivere concessum est. Ferturque vixisse cum liberis, matronæ jam more Romanæ, data sibi possessione in Tiburti, quæ hodieque Zenobia dicitur, non longe ab Adriani palatio, atque ab eo loco cui nomen est Conche. - - - Aurelian saved Zenobia's life. And it is reported that she lived with her children, like a Roman matron, having received a seat in the Tiburtine-country: That seat still bears the name of Zenobia, and is not far distant from Adrian's palace, and the palace called Conche.'

[D] She was beautiful, chaste, learned, valiant, and temperate, tho' on some occasions, out of policy, she would drink.] Pollio having spoken of the exercises of hunting, which ensured Odenatus to the greatest fatigues, adds, that Zenobia had acquired the same hardiness, and, according to the report of several people, was more vigorous than her husband. 'Non aliter etiam conjuge affueta, quæ multorum sententia fortior marito fuisse perhibetur: mulierum omnium nobilissima Orientalium feminarum, & (ut Cornelius Capitolinus asserit) speciosissima (4). - - - (4) Id. ibid. pag. 299. She was no less inured to fatigues than her husband; and, in the opinion of many people, was much stronger than he: she was the noblest of her sex, and, (as Cornelius Capitolinus affirms) the most beautiful of all the women of the East.' This last word would afford me a good proof, if it were certain that the author, who is cited, made use of it. But the manuscripts vary; some have it *expeditissima*, instead of *speciosissima*: wherefore we ought not to depend upon it: let us look for other evidences. The following description represents her of a deep brown complexion, but withal very charming, and as having the finest teeth in the world. 'Fuit vultu subaqualo, fusci coloris, oculis supra modum vigentibus, nigris, spiritus divini, venustatis incredibilis: tantus candor in dentibus, ut margaritas eam plerique putarent habere, non dentes (5). - - - She was of a dark brown complexion, had eyes exceeding sprightly, black, and divinely bright; 333. she was incredibly beautiful: her teeth were so white, that many people thought she had pearls set instead of teeth.' Her chastity was so extraordinary, that she made use of the liberty, which marriage allowed her, no farther than was necessary for the procreation of children. (6) Cujus ea castitas fuisse dicitur, ut virum suum quidem sciret, nisi tentatis conceptionibus. Nam quum semel concubuisse, expectatis mensibus continebat se, si prægnans esset; sin minus, iterum potestatem querendæ

(1) Trebellius Pollio, in triginta Tyrannis, p. 229, Vol. II. Hist. Augustæ Scriptores. Edit. Lugd. Bat. 1671.

(2) Deditionem meam petis, quasi nescias Cleopatram reginam perire maluisse, quam in qualibet vivere dignitate. Vopiscus, in Aureliano, p. 481.

(3) Trebellius Pollio, ubi supra, pag. 336.

(5) Id. ibid. pag. 333.

(6) Tillemont, Hist. des Emper. Tom. iii, pag. m. 1041.

been placed among the most accomplished persons; but she was so far from having such a quality, that she was suspected of having consented to the assassination of her husband in the year 267, from a resentment of the tenderness which he shewed to his son Herod [E], whom he had by another wife.

She engaged in disputes concerning religion, and protected Paulus Samosatensis [F], who had been condemned by the council of Antioch: and her protection prevented

(7) Treb. Pollio, ubi supra, pag. 330.

quarrendis liberis dabat (7). This is what some rigid Casuists would impose upon all married people. And those who write for polygamy apply this morality to their pernicious design; for they pretend that a man should abstain from his wife during her pregnancy, and that if he cannot, he ought to have another who is not with child. A learned commentator on Tully's Offices observes, that if the age he lived in produced such women as Zenobia, there would be less danger in marriage for studious men, or those of a weak constitution; a sort of men, adds he, who have reason to fear either dishonour, continual janglings, or an immature death, with the squandering of their estates. His maxims are somewhat severe, read what follows.

Cum . . . sacræ literæ omnes vagas libidines detestentur: in ipso etiam matrimonio hic finis ab ipsa natura destinatus, diligenter confideretur, & quantum vel naturæ imbecillitas, vel conjugii servitus (sinit) fervetur ne homo infra bestias sese abiciat: quarum pleræque non nisi certo anni tempore ad procreationem incitantur: & femellæ pleræque, conceptu foetu, marem non admittunt. Eadem etiam Zenobiæ Palmyrenorum reginæ continentia celebratur, quæ cum se gravidam sensit, Odenatum maritum in thalamum suum non admisit. Digna (ut quidam exclamat) quæ sine omni dolore pareret: cum in matrimonio non voluptatem, sed procreationem solum spectaret. Cujusmodi matronas si nostra ætas ferret, etiam studiosi homines, & non firmissima præditi valetudine, minore periculo uxores ducerent: quibus nunc aut infamia, aut rixæ perpetuæ aut immaturus obitus cum detrimentis rei familiaris sunt metuenda. Ridentur hæc scilicet à lascivis hominibus, & in lustris ac ganeis magis versatis, quam in Theologia & Philosophia: quibus nos hæc non præscribimus. Indulgeant illi genio: sed probus adolefcentis hominem se esse, non pecudem meminerit. Quod si verum est, quod ἀνδρῶν Ptolemæi scribit interpres, Ægyptios singulis mensibus semel tantum consuetudine uxorem usos; quod infantis concepti momentum deprehenderent: quid Christianis facere par est propter Deum, summam & continentiam & abstinentiam flagitantem (8). — — — As the holy Scriptures discover the greatest detestation for all manner of lust, so in matrimony the end of procreation, which nature itself hath appointed, ought to be carefully attended to, and as far as the frailty of the flesh, and the demands of a matrimonial life will permit, we ought to confine our selves to the answering of that end alone, lest man should become worse than the beasts: for most animals are not incited to procreation, but at a certain season of the year, and most of the females do not admit the male animal, after they have conceived. Zenobia, Queen of Palmyra, is celebrated for the like continence, for from the time that she knew she had conceived, she refused to admit her husband into her bed.

(8) Hieron. Wolhus, Commentar. in Ciceron. de Offic. lib. 1, pag. m. 72, 73.

Behold, a woman, (as some person says in admiration of her) who deserved to bear children without any pain, since, in matrimony, she had no regard to her pleasures, but only to the procreation of children. If the age we live in produced women of this kind, how many men of learning, and of weak constitutions, might venture upon marriage without any danger, who are now in fears, either of dishonour, or of perpetual wrangling, or an untimely death, with the dissipation of their fortunes? Wanton men will laugh at all this, men who are more intimate in brothels, than conversant with Divinity and Philosophy. But I do not write for such persons. Let them indulge their passions; but let the virtuous youth remember that he is a man, and not a brute. If what an anonymous interpreter of Ptolemy wrote, be true, viz. that the Egyptians cohabited with their wives only once every month, for the sake of knowing the moment when their children were conceived, what doth it become the Christians to do for the sake of God, who exacts the greatest continence, and the greatest abstinence? It would be to no purpose to urge against Zenobia, that she had but

very few maids in her service (9); for the rest of her domesticks were eunuchs, advanced in years: such servants were much fitter to attend a warlike Queen, than a number of chamber-maids. As for her learning it is sufficient to say that Longinus instructed her; that she spoke the Egyptian tongue in perfection, and understood the History of Egypt, and the eastern History so well, that she made an abridgement of it. She read the Roman History in Greek, and understood Latin, but durst not speak it. *Ipsa Latini sermonis non usque quaque ignara, sed ut loqueretur pudore cobibita: loquebatur & Ægyptiacæ ad perfectum modum. Historiæ Alexandrinæ atque Orientalis ita perita ut tam epitomasse dicatur: Latinam autem Græcè legerat* (10). I was willing to excuse her with respect to drinking; by urging that she drank glass for glass with her Generals and strangers, only to attack them, or bring them over to her side; but I own my supposition is very arbitrary, and the expression of the Historian (11) signifies that she overcame the Persians and Arminians in drinking. It is true he says she was otherwise sober.

[E] She was suspected of having consented to the assassination of her husband, from a resentment of the tenderness which he shewed to his son Herod. The Historian having represented the excessive complaisance of Odenatus to Herod, his son, by another marriage, adds, that Zenobia being animated with all the spirit of a step-mother against this young man, increased his father's love to him. This seems to hint that Odenatus had no great affection for Zenobia; for if he had loved her very tenderly, he would have favoured Herod less, than the children he had by her; and not have looked upon Zenobia's hatred as a great motive to redouble his tenderness for Herod. *Erat circa illum (Herodem) Zenobia novitrali animo: qua re commendabiliorem patri eum fecerat* (12). This author a little farther, speaking of Mæonius the murderer of Odenatus, says: 'Hic confobrinus Odenati fuit: nec ulla re alia ductus nisi damnabili invidia, imperatorem optimum interemit, quom ei nihil aliud obiceretur præter filii Herodis delicias. Dicitur autem primum cum Zenobia consensisse, quæ ferre non poterat ut privignus ejus Herodes priore loco quam filii, ejus Herennianus & Timolauus, principes dicerentur' (13). — — — This man, who was Odenatus's sister's son, prompted by nothing but an abominable envy, murdered that excellent Emperor, though he was charged with no other fault but the tenderness he bore to his son Herod. Mæonius was said to have beforehand agreed with Zenobia, who could not bear that her step-son Herod should take place of her two sons Herennianus and Timolauus. Judge from hence what persons of no virtue are capable of doing, since Zenobia, endowed with so many excellent qualities, sacrificed her husband to an ambitious tenderness for her children, and to the chagrin of a mother-in-law which continually preyed upon her.

[F] She protected Paulus Samosatensis. I can scarce believe that the reason why she favoured him was that which you are going to see in the words I extract from page 1040, of the third volume of Mr de Tillemont's History of the Emperors. * S. Athanasius faith that she was a Jew, [by religion without doubt] * which Abulpharagius after him tells us: † but * at least she followed many of the Jewish opinions; † and she is said to have been the cause why Paulus Samosatensis, Bishop of Antioch, † of whom the † was protectress, † fell into the Heresy of Artemon, † whole opinions concerning JESUS CHRIST, very nearly resembled those of the synagogue. To per- suade the world that she was of the Jewish religion, another sort of evidence ought to be produced. It is easy to conceive, that a Pagan Princess should take pleasure in stopping the course of a synodical decree, if it be ever so little intimated to her that the condemned person is worthy of her protection, and that the fomenting divisions amongst Christians tends

(9) In minibus Eunuchis gravibus ætate laborantibus, poëlis amicis raris. Treb. Pollio, ubi supra, pag. 335.

(10) Id. ibid. (11) Mith. super cum decibus, quom esset aliam solaria. Mith. e- tiam cum Persis ut con vinceret. Id. ibid.

(12) Id. ibid. (13) Id. ibid.

(13) Mith.

* Ath. 666. pag. 57. d.

* Abulph. pag. 81.

† Theod. her. l. 2. pag. 121. c.

† Ath. pag. 87. d.

† Theod. pag. 121. c.

prevented his being driven from his church. He was not driven from it till after this prince had been overcome by Aurelian. See Father Pagi's *Dissertatio Hypatica* towards the end.

to the advantage of Paganism. Some learned men believe that Paul Samosatensis was not condemned by the

council of Antioch till after the fall of Zenobia; but Father Pagi hath solidly refuted them (14).

(14) Pagi, *Dissert. Hypat. pag.* 357, & seq.

ZENO of Elea, one of the most eminent Philosophers of antiquity, flourished in the LXXXIXth Olympiad (a). He was the disciple of Parmenides, and even according to some authors, his adopted son (b). He was a very handsome man. And some writers pretend that he was loved by his tutor to an unlawful degree [A]. Moreri informs us that he was the inventor of Logic [B]. He should have acquainted us also that he attempted to restore the liberty of his country, when labouring under the oppression of a tyrant, and that when the enterprise was discovered he suffered the most cruel torments with an extraordinary resolution. This affair is related with a thousand

(a) Diogen. Laërt. lib. ix, num. 29, pag. 566, *Edit. Wetstein.* 1692.

(b) Id. *ibid.* num. 25.

[A] He was a very handsome man. Some writers pretend that he was loved by his tutor to an unlawful degree. I mention elsewhere (1) that Apuleius was reproached with being handsome, and with dressing too well for a Philosopher. To which, among other things, he answered, that beauty had not always been separated from persons of his profession, and proved his assertion by the instances of Pythagoras, and Zeno of Elea.

(1) In the article of APULEIUS, remark [H].

(2) Apuleius, *Apol. pag. m.* 275, 276.

(3) See Menage in Diogenem Laërt. lib. ix, num. 28, where he shews that Zeno is the same town of Italy with Elea.

(2) Præterea, licere etiam Philosophis esse vultu liberali. Pythagoram, qui primum sese Philosophum nuncupavit, eum sui sæculi excellentissimæ formæ fuisse: item Zenonem illum antiquum Velia (3) oriundum, qui primus omnium dictionem solertissimo artificio ambifariam dissolverit, eum quoque Zenonem longè decorosissimum fuisse, ut Plato autumat. --- *Besides, Philosophers may be allowed to be*

handsome as well as other men. Pythagoras, the first who took the name of a Philosopher, was the handsomest man of his age: and that ancient Zeno of Elea, the first who explained, with great art and subtilty, those expressions which bear a double meaning, that Zeno was also an exceeding handsome man, as Plato testifies.

Plato's citation is right, but there are certain particulars in this passage of his which every body doth not approve, and I take him to be justly censured for it. His words run thus: 'Εφη δὲ δὴ ὁ Ἀντίφων, λέγων τὸν Πυθαγόρην ὅτι ἀρίστον ποιεῖ εἰς Παναθηναίᾳ τὰ μεγάλα ζήνων τε καὶ Παρμενίδης: τὸν μὲν ἔν Παρμενίδην, εὖ μάλα ἡδὴ πρὸς αὐτὴν εἶναι, σφόδρα πολλὸν, καλὸν δὲ καὶ ἀγαθὸν τὴν ὄψιν, περὶ ἣν μάλιστα φάντε καὶ ἐξήκοντα. Ζήνων δὲ, ἔργος ἐτὼν τετρακκοῖα τότε εἶναι, εὐμήκη δὲ, καὶ χαρίεντα ἰδεῖν καὶ λυγροῦσαι αὐτὸν παιδικὰ τὰ Παρμενίδου γεγονότα. Dicebat ergo Antiphon, Pythodorum narrasse, Zenonem atque Parmenidem venisse quondam ad magnorum Panathenzorum celebritatem: & Parmenidem jam senem, atque canum, aspectu decorum fuisse, annos ferme quinque & sexaginta ætatis agentem; Zenonem verò annos penè quadraginta natum; procerò insuper & grato corporis habitu: dicebatur autem in deliciis Parmenidi fuisse (4). --- *Antiphon said, that Pythagoras related that Parmenides and Zeno once came to the grand festival of Minerva; that the former was already pretty far advanced in years, was grey-haired, and of a beautiful, comely, aspect, being then about sixty-five years old; but that the latter, being then about the fortieth year of his age, was tall and handsome; and it is said, that Zeno served Parmenides in his pleasures.*

(4) Plato, in Parmenide, pag. m. 1110, A.

Athenæus blames Plato for having unnecessarily blemished the manners of these two Philosophers. Those who desire to see his own words may be satisfied by the following citation. Παρμενίδην μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἐλθεῖν εἰς λόγους τῶ Πλάτωνος Σωκράτην, μάλιστα ἡλικία συγχωρεῖ ἔχ' ὡς καὶ τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς ἢ ἀκροῦσαι λόγους τὸ δὲ πάντων σχετιώτατον, καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν ἐφευκτάς κατεπευγύσης χρείας, ὅτι παιδικὰ γεγονότα τῶ Παρμενίδου ζήνων ὁ πολὺς αὐτῶ. Parmenidem certè cum Socrate Platonis confabulatum fuisse ætas vix permittat, nedum hos vel illos sermones edidisse, aut audivisse. Quod autem indignissimum est, nullà compulsus necessitate scribere is non erubuit Parmenidi Zenonem civem suum in amoribus & deliciis fuisse (5). --- *That the Socrates of Plato should have conversed with Parmenides, or that such conversation should have passed between them is what their respective*

(5) Athenæus, lib. xi, pag. 305, F.

V O L . V .

ages will hardly permit. But for Plato to affirm, without the least necessity, that Zeno served Parmenides in his pleasures, was highly unbecoming.

[B] He was the inventor of Logic. Aristotle allows him that honour, as Sextus Empiricus (6), and Diogenes Laërtius (7) observe. But Zeno's Logic seems designed to perplex every thing, and not to clear a subject: he used it only to dispute against all comers, and silence his adversaries, whether they were right or wrong. Plutarch gives us this idea of him. Διηκούσε δὲ Περικλῆς καὶ Ζήνων τὴν ἑλεάτην, περὶ μαθημάτων περὶ φύσιν ὡς Παρμενίδης ἐλεγκτικὴν δὲ τινα, καὶ δι' ἐναντιολογίας εἰς ἀπορίαν κατακλίνουσιν ἐξασκήσαντο ἔξιν ὥσπερ καὶ Τίμων ὁ Φλιάσιος εἰρηκε διὰ τούτων.

(6) Sextus Empiricus adversus Mathematic. pag. 139.

(7) Diog. Laërt. lib. ix, num. 25.

Ἀμφοτερογλώσσον τε μέγα σθένος ἐκ ἀπάτηλον ζήνωνος, πάντων ἐπιλήπτορος.

Auduit Pericles Zenonem quoque Eleatem, de natura, Parmenidis more, philosophantem: qui impugnans quemlibet, usum paraverat quendam refutandi, qui deduceret ad perplexitatem. Quod Philastus Timon affirmat quoque, bis verbis.

Omnia pefringens, Zeno disceptat, utraque Et parte invictus, sed non fallax (8).

(8) Plutarch. in Pericle, pag. 154. The translation of these words may be seen below in the remark [E], citation (44).

These verses of Timon appear less mutilated in Diogenes Laërtius; I copy them from the Amsterdam edition.

Ἀμφοτερογλώσσον τε μέγα σθένος ἐκ ἀπατῶν ζήνωνος πάντων ἐπιλήπτορος, ἡδὲ Μελίσσου, πολλῶν φαντασμάτων ἐπάνω, παύρων γὰρ μὲν εἶσιν (9).

(9) Diog. Laërt. ubi supra.

Expressive Plato vires utriusque periti Lingua Zenonis, jurgatorisque Melissi, Phantasias, qui alius paucas, multasque subegit (10).

These verses represent a man who criticized every thing, overthrew several opinions, and kept very few for himself. If he was not the Palamedes mentioned by Plato, he perfectly resembled him. This Palamedes argued so subtilly, that he rendered the pro and con probable to his auditors: he shewed them that the very same things were like and unlike, that they were but one thing and different things, and that they rested and moved at the same time. Τὸν ἔν ἑλεάτην Παλαμῆδην λέγοντα ἐκ ὅσων τέχνη, ὥς δοκεῖν φαίνεσθαι τοῖς ἀκούσι τὰ αὐτὰ ὅμοια καὶ ἀνόμοια, καὶ ἐν καὶ πολλὰ, μινοντά τε αὐ καὶ φερόμενα. Enimvero Eleatem Palamedem artificio suo efficere solitum accepimus, ut eadem audientibus similia & dissimilia, unum & multa, manentia & fluentia viderentur (11). Diogenes Laërtius (12) saith that Zeno was called the Palamedes of Elea, in Plato's Sophist: but Mr Menage charges him with two errors. He shews that this Palamedes is not mentioned in that work of Plato, but in the dialogue intituled *Phædrus*; after which he proves, by the evidence of Quintilian, that this Palamedes was Alcidas the Rhetorician. Que non de Zenone Eleate, verum de Alcidasante intelligenda sunt, si fides Quintiliano. Ita enim ille

(10) This translation was thus made from a copy, in which the Greek had, ζήνωνος τε Πλάτωνος ἐπιλήπτορος, instead of ζήνωνος πάντων ἐπιλήπτορος.

(11) Plato, in Phædro, pag. 123.

(12) Diog. Laërt. lib. ix, num. 15.

thousand variations [C], as I shall shew in the remarks. I have only two faults to charge

(13) Menagius, in Diog. Laert. lib. ix, num. 25, pag. 403, col. 2.
libro III. institut. Oratoriarum capite I. ubi de Scripturibus Artis Rhetoricæ: Et Hippias Eleus, & quem Palamedem Plato appellat, Alcidas Eleates (13). - - - These things are not to be understood of Zeno Eleates, but of Alcidas, if we rely on Quintilian. For these are the words of Quintilian in his Institutions, speaking of the writers on the art of Rhetoric: And Hippias Eleus, and Alcidas Eleates, whom Plato calls Palamedes.

(14) Diog. Laert. ubi supra, num. 26.
[C] This affair is related with a thousand variations.] The Elean tyrant, whom he designed to destroy, was Nearchus, according to some, and Diomedon, according to other writers (14). Plutarch calls him Demylus, as we shall see hereafter: Tertullian names him Dionysius, and doubtless by a mistake in Chronology (15) takes him for the Syracusan tyrant, who so frequently occurs to us in authors, under the name of Dionysius: 'Zeno Eleates, saith he, towards the end of his apology, consulted à Dionysio, quidnam Philosophia præstaret, cum respondisset, contemptum mortis, impassibilis flagellis Tyranni objectus, sententiam suam ad mortem usque signabat. - - - Zeno of Elea being asked by Dionysius what Philosophy was good for, answered, to make a man despise death: whereupon the cruel tyrant having ordered him to be scourged, Zeno confirmed the truth of his answer even to death.' Here is one testimony of the admirable constancy of this Philosopher. I believe Tertullian placed the scene of all this (16) not at Elea, as he ought to have done, but at Syracuse. Others lay the scene in the isle of Cyprus, and are besides mistaken, both in the person tortured, and in the tyrant. 'Ducebatur intrepidus (Eusebius) temporum iniquitati insultans, imitatus Zenonem illum veterem Stoicum qui ut mentiretur quædam laceratus diutius, avulsam sedibus linguam suam cum cruento sputamine in oculos interrogantis Cyprii Regis impiegit (17). - - - Eusebius was still undaunted as he went to the place of execution, and continued to lash the iniquities of the times, imitating the ancient Stoic Philosopher Zeno, who being interrogated by the King of Cyprus, and kept longer in torture that he might be forced to invent lies, plucked out his tongue, and threw it with the bloody spittle in the tyrant's face.' Valefius's note on this passage of Marcellinus, will discover the errors of this Historian, and if you consult Mr Menage (18), you will find a very happy conjecture concerning the occasion of these mistakes. Zeno's action itself is differently reported. Some say, that being required to declare his accomplices, he affirmed that all the tyrant's friends had a hand in the conspiracy. This he did, in order to represent him as a person abandoned by all the world. After this general declaration he named some particular persons, and told the tyrant that he wanted to speak with him in his ear. The tyrant approaching, Zeno fixed his teeth so deep in his ear, and kept his hold so fast, that nothing but stabbing him with pricks could force him to let go. Εἶτα περὶ τινῶν εἰπὼν ἔχων τινὰ εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸ ὅς' καὶ δακῶν, ἐκ ἀνέκοντος αὐτὸν ἀπεκέντησεν, ταῦτ' ἐν Ἀλεξογειτονίᾳ τῷ τυραννοκτόνῳ παθόν. Deinde cum de quibusdam dixisset, quiddam sibi ad aurem loqui velle, eam mordicus apprehensam non ante dimisit quam stimulus foderetur, idem agens quod Aristogiton tyrannicida (19). Others say that he did bite off the tyrant's nose (20). And some affirm, that having declared his accomplices (21), and called the usurper the plague of his country (22), he addressed himself to the flanders-by, telling them that he was astonished at their cowardice, if the fear of being treated like him could oblige them to continue in slavery: after which, biting off his own tongue, he threw it into the tyrant's face (23); and that this so animated the citizens that they immediately stoned the usurper of their liberty. This is what Diogenes Laertius tells us. Plutarch observes, that Zeno, in biting off his tongue, and throwing it in a tyrant's face, practised his master's maxim, that great men dread dishonour, but that none but children, women, and cowards dread pain. Ζήνων τοίνυν ὁ Παρμενίδης γινώσκων, ἐπιδήμιον Διμήλων τῷ τυραννῶν, καὶ δυσυχίας περὶ τὴν παρῆσιν, ἐν πυρὶ τὸν Παρμενίδην λυγόν, ὥσπερ χρυσὸν ἀλλοτρίον καὶ δόκιμον παρῶν, καὶ ἀποδιδόναι ἔργοις, ὅτι τὸ αἰσχρὸν ἀνδρὶ μισγὰρ φοβερόν ἐστιν. ἀλγίστῳ δὲ, παίδεσ, καὶ γυναῖκα,

(15) Antiquior Zeno Eleates Dionysio Tyranno centum quinquaginta annis circiter. Menag. ibid. pag. 404.

(16) I mean that he thought the whole matter happened at Syracuse.

(17) Ammian. Marcellin. lib. xiv, cap. ix, pag. 46.

(18) Menag. ubi supra, num. 26.

(19) Diog. Laert. ubi supra, num. 26, pag. 565; ex Heracleide in Satyri Epitome.

(20) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(21) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(22) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(23) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(24) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(25) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(26) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(27) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(28) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(29) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(30) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(31) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(32) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(33) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

καὶ γυναῖκα ἰσχυρὰς ἔχοντες ἀνδρες, δαδίας. τὴν γὰρ γλῶτταν αὐτὸς διατρώγων, τῷ τυραννῶν περὶ πύσσιν. Zeno Parmenidis discipulus, Demio tyranno infidatus, re infelicitate gesta, doctrinam Parmenidis, velut aurum in igne, illasam ac probam facto ostendit. Scilicet turpitudinem magno viro metuendam esse: dolorem a pueris & mulierculis, ac viris animum muliebrem gerentibus timeri. Linguam enim suam dentibus amputatam, in tyrannum expuit (24). Hermippus says (25) that Zeno was pounded in a mortar.

Valerius Maximus could not fail to mention the constancy of this Philosopher; but he is guilty of some faults: for instead of ascribing to Zeno of Elea what relates to the tyrant Nearchus, he ascribes it to another person; and besides supposes, that Zeno designing to deliver the Agrigentines from the tyranny of Phalaris, did, and suffered, what others relate with respect to the tyrant of Elea. 'Qui (Zeno Eleati) cum esset in dispicienda rerum natura maximæ prudentiæ, inque excitandis ad vigorem juvenum animis promptissimus, præceptorum fidem exemplo virtutis suæ publicavit. Patriam enim egressus, in qua frui securâ libertate poterat, Agrigentum miserabilis servitute obrutum petit, tanta fiducia ingenii ac morum suorum fretus, ut speraverit, & Tyranno & Phalaridi vesanæ mentis feritatem à se diripi posse. Postquam deinde apud illum plus consuetudinem dominationis, quam consilii salubritatem valere animadvertit: nobilissimos ejus civitatis adolescentes cupiditate liberandæ patriæ inflammavit. Cujus rei cum indicium ad tyrannum mansisset, convocato in forum populo, torquere eum vario cruciatu genere cœpit: subinde querens, quosnam consilii participes haberet: At ille nec eorum quempiam nominavit, sed proximum quemque, ac fidelissimum tyranno suspectum reddidit: increpitanque Agrigentinis ignaviā ac timiditatem, effecit ut subito mentis impulsu concitati, Phalaris lapidibus proflerentur. Senis ergo unius eculum impositi, non simplex vox, nec miserabilis ejulatus; sed fortis cohortatio totius urbis animum, fortunamque mutavit (26). - - - Zeno of Elea, as he had a great knowledge of the nature of things, and a very ready talent in animating and giving vigour to the minds of youth, so he openly confirmed the truth of his precepts by the example of his own virtue. For having left his native country, where he might have securely lived in liberty, he went to Agrigentum, which was then groaning under miserable servitude: relying with so much confidence on his own genius and virtuous life, that he hoped to subdue the stubbornness, and tame the outrageous cruelty of the tyrant Phalaris. When he afterwards found that the habit of tyrannizing was so prevailing with Phalaris, that the wholesome advice he bestowed on him had no influence, he inspired the noblest of the youth of Agrigentum with the desire of shaking off his yoke, and sitting their country at liberty. The tyrant having notice of this, summoned the people to the Forum, and began to put Zeno to torture in various manners, inquiring in the intervals who were his accomplices. Zeno named none of them, but rendered one of those suspected who were standing by Phalaris, and were the most faithful to him; and by often upbraiding the Agrigentines for their cowardice and fear, he animated them to that degree, that, being roused, as it were, by a sudden impulse of mind, they stoned the tyrant. Thus, it was not the supplications of an old man upon the rack, nor his lamentable wailings, but his vigorous exhortations, which changed the temper and fortune of a whole city.

After which he relates what follows. 'Ejusdem nominis philosophus, cum à Nearcho tyranno, de cuius nece consilium inierat, torqueretur, supplicii patriter atque indicandorum conficiorum gratia; doloris victor, sed ultionis cupidus, esse dixit quod eum secreto audire admodum expediret: laxatque eculum, postquam infidis opportunum tempus animadvertit, aurem ejus morfu corripuit, nec ante dimisit quam & ipse vita, & ille corporis parte privaretur (27). - - - A Philosopher of the same name, who had entered into a confederacy against the life of the tyrant Nearchus, was by his command put to the torture, both for his punishment, and in order to discover the rest of his confederates. Being victorious over the pain he endured, but desirous of revenge, he said that he had an affair to communicate to Nearchus, which it was of great

(24) Plot. ad verius Colotem, circa fin. pag. 1126. Vide etiam de Garrula, pag. 505.

(25) Apud Valerium Maximum, lib. ix, num. 25.

(26) Valer. Max. lib. ix, cap. 10, num. 25.

(27) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(28) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(29) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(30) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(31) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(32) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(33) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(34) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(35) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(36) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(37) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(38) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(39) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

(40) Id. ibid. ex Antisth. in Successionibus.

charge on Mr Moreri [D]. For the rest, the opinions of Zeno Eleates, were very near the same with those of Xenophanes and Parmenides concerning the Unity, Incomprehensibility, and immutability of all things. I cannot believe he asserted that there is nothing in the universe [E]; for how could he pretend that he, who maintained that principle, did not exist? How could he, who aimed at nothing but by his arguments

pro

(28) Oliverius
says so.(29) Diog. Laërt.
ubi supra, num.
29. Iohannes, de
Scriptor. Histor.
Philos. pag. 116,
rectum 15 Zeno's.(30) Ex uno
Zenone Eleate
duos pariter
facit. Henricus
Valerius, Notis
in Ann. Mar-
cellini, lib. xiv,
cap. ix, pag. 46.(31) Ut modo
duorum Fabio-
rum res gestas
uni eum adig-
nasse contra
Pighium proba-
vimus, ita con-
traria plane culpa
unius Philo-
sophi facta, in duos
ejusdem nominis
dividit, lib. iii,
cap. iii. Nam
quam retulisset,
quam retulisset
Eleates Zeno
praestitisset, &c.
Jacobus Perizonius,
Animadv.
Histor. pag. 85.(32) Mr Perizonius
cites Cicero,
de Nat. Deor.
lib. iii, et Dio-
genes Laërtius.(33) Car. Boyle,
apud Acta Eru-
ditor. Lipsien.
1696, pag. 102,
103. In the Ab-
stract of Phalaris's
Letters, printed at Oxford
in 1695.

(34) Citat. (4).

(35) Chron. Eu-
scii.(36) Iohannes, de
Script. Hist.
Phil. pag. 116,
places him in the
LXXXVIIIth
Olympiad.(37) In the edi-
tion of Diogenes
Laërtius, of
1692, he is placed
in the LXIXth
Olympiad.(38) I write this
in the year
1696.(39) Nay, he
supposes that he
was very old at
the time of the
plot.

'great importance that he alone should bear; and the torture being abated for that purpose, when he found a proper opportunity for executing his design, he fixed his teeth so deep in the tyrant's ear, that he did not let him go, till he had left his life, and the tyrant a part of his body.'

Oliverius, who commented on Valerius Maximus, finds but one fault in this: he doth not blame Valerius Maximus for any thing but saying that Zeno, the chief of the Stoics, was put to death for endeavouring to destroy a tyrant. This censure is unjust; and it will be in vain to say that the same Zeno voluntarily killed himself at the age of ninety years (28), that will not convict Valerius Maximus of any error, since he doth not say that one of his two Zeno's was the head of the Stoics. Doth not Diogenes Laërtius say that there were eight Zeno's (29). It is not therefore necessary that he, who is distinguished from Zeno of Elea, should be the founder of the Stoics. Henry Valerius blames Valerius Maximus for making two Zeno's of one Zeno of Elea (30). One of our best Critics made the same observation, and besides pointed out what might have misled this ancient author (31). He observes that John Vorstius, making the same critical remark exposed himself to censure, by making Nearchus tyrant of the Liparitans. Vorstius grounded this opinion on Zeno's being examined concerning the arms, which, by his means, were brought to the isle of Lipara. He imagined that this Philosopher, after having delivered the Agrigentines from the tyranny of Phalaris, retired to this isle, and endeavoured to free it from the tyranny of Nearchus. But Mr Perizonius clearly proves (32) that it was the city of Elea which Zeno attempted to free from the tyranny of Nearchus. But to go further than this; I shall take the liberty to observe that these learned men let the greatest fault of Valerius Maximus pass uncensured. It lies in making Zeno of Elea enter into a plot against Phalaris: Chronology will by no means allow this. Let us suppose that Eusebius is mistaken in placing the twenty-eight years of Phalaris's tyranny betwixt the second year of the XXXIXth Olympiad, and the second of the XXXVIIIth. And let us prefer his placing this tyrant at the end of the LIIId Olympiad after an usurpation for sixteen years. Let us even suppose with several learned men (33) that Phalaris seized the sovereign authority in Agrigentum about the LIId Olympiad, and that he held it sixteen years according to some, or twenty eight according to others; it will nevertheless appear that he was dead before our Zeno was of age to undertake what Valerius Maximus relates of him. We have seen above (34), that Parmenides was about sixty-five years old when Zeno was but forty. But Parmenides flourished in the LXXXth Olympiad (35): judge then whether Zeno could make any figure in the fifty-ninth. But to deal plainly, I find some perplexity in the time when Parmenides is said to have flourished: for since Pericles, who died in the LXXXVIIth Olympiad, was Zeno's disciple, the flourishing time of Zeno ought to be placed about the seventy-sixth (36), and that of Parmenides, his master, a little higher (37). This is sufficient for my purpose. I should have examined all this more exactly, if I had given the article of Phalaris. I was ready to begin it, when I was informed that a worthy nephew of the most illustrious Mr Boyle had published the life of that tyrant. I inquired for that piece every where, but could not find it, and therefore I laid aside that article; I referred it till such time as I might have the advantage of that author's observations, and I do not yet know any more of his book (38) but what is extracted out of it by the journalists. However, we may believe that Valerius Maximus did not mention two Zeno's, without some sort of reflexion. He must have known that Nearchus lived after Phalaris; so that being mistaken in making the Zeno of Elea (39) cotemporary with Phalaris, he could not persuade himself that the same Zeno who designed to expel Nearchus, was he who contrived a plot against the tyrant of Agrigentum.

Observe, that several Critics will have it, that Seneca meant our Zeno of Elea, when he said, 'Notus est ille tyrannicida, qui imperfecto opere comprehensus, & ab Hippia tortus, ut conficiis indicaret, circumstantes amicos tyranni nominavit, quibus quam maxime caram salutem ejus sciebat. Et cum ille singulos, ut nominati erant, occidi jussisset, interrogavit: Ecquis superesset? Tu, inquit, solus: neminem enim alium, cui carus esses, reliqui. Effecit ira, ut tyrannus tyrannicidae manus commodaret, & praefidia sua gladio suo caderet (40). ----- That tyrannicide is well known, who being apprehended, before he could execute his design, and being put to the torture by Hippia, in order to discover his accomplices, named the tyrant's friends who were standing by, and to whom he knew the life and safety of Hippia was the dearest. When the latter had caused each of them to be slain, in order as they were named, he asked if there were any remaining: you alone, replied the other, for I have left no other person to whom you are dear. Such was the tyrant's anger, that he lent his hands to the tyrannicide, and slew his protectors with his own sword.' But for all Muretus and Justus Lipsius, I am apt to think, that Seneca meant one of those whom Hippia the son of Pisistratus, caused to be tortured. And though Seneca relates what others ascribe to Zeno of Elea, yet I do not believe that he had him in his eye. It is his custom, and that of several other authors, to apply to some persons, what has been said of others.

[D] I have only two faults to charge on Mr Moreri.] The first is his quoting Diogenes in the ninth book de Hist. Graec. & de Scit. Philos. Now it is not true that Diogenes wrote books on the Greek History, or concerning the Greek Historians, nor that his book is intitled de Scitis Philosophorum. It is intitled de Vitis, Dogmatis, & Apophthegmatis clarorum Philosophorum, Libri X. His second fault is saying that Diogenes speaks of seven other Zeno's, whose lives he hath not given us. For one of them is Zeno of Cittium, the head of the Stoics, whose life Diogenes hath written at large.

[E] I cannot believe he asserted that there is nothing in the universe.] I therefore suspect Seneca, who ascribes to him this opinion. Justus Lipsius also distrusts the truth of it. 'Audi, quantum mali faciat nimia subtilitas, & quam infesta veritati sit. Protagoras ait, de omni re in utramque partem disputari posse, ex aequo, & de hac ipsa, an omnis res in utramque partem disputabilis sit. Nauphianes ait, ex his quae videntur esse, nihil magis esse, quam non esse. Parmenides ait, ex his quae videntur, nihil esse in universum. Zeno Eleates omnia negotia de negotio dejecit, ait nihil esse. Circa eadem fere Pyrrhonius versantur, & Megarici, & Eretrici, & Academici, qui novam induxerunt scientiam, nihil scire. Haec omnia in illum supervacuum studiorum liberalium gregem conjice. Illi mihi non profuturam scientiam tradunt, hi spem omnis scientiae eripiunt: fatius est supervacua scire, quam nihil. Illi non praferunt lumen, per quod acies dirigatur ad verum: hi oculos mihi effodiunt. Si Protagorae credo, nihil in rerum natura est, nisi dubium: si Nauphiani, hoc unum certum est, nihil esse certi: si Parmenidi, nihil est praeter unum: si Zenoni, ne unum quidem. Quid ergo nos sumus? quid ista quae nos circumstant, alunt, sustinent? Tota rerum natura umbra est, aut inanis, aut fallax. Non facile dixerim, utrum magis irascar illis, qui nos nihil scire voluerunt: an illis, qui ne hoc quidem nobis reliquerunt, nihil scire (41). ----- Hear how great evil proceeds from too much subtilty, and how obnoxious it is to truth. Epist. lxxxviii, Protagoras says, that a man may dispute upon any subject equal advantage; nay, that he may dispute upon this, whether any subject whatever is disputable on either side. Nauphianes affirms, that the things which appear to be, nothing is more apparent than that they are not. Parmenides, that of these things which are seen, nothing exists.

Maya -
Hindoo

(c) See Plutarch's words, towards the end of the remark [E].

pro and con to perplex all those with whom he disputed (c), and confound them so, that they should not know which way to turn themselves, be guilty of such a palpable inconsistency? Did not he see that it was easy to silence him, by asking whether nothingness could reason? He argued strenuously against the existence of motion. Some of his objections on that head are preserved in Aristotle's works [F], but it is probable that

'exists. Zeno of Elea throws down every thing, and maintains that there is nothing. Much the same opinions are held by the Pyrrhonians, the Megaricians, Eretricians, and Academics, who have introduced a new science, viz. that we know nothing. You must throw aside all these tenets into the class of superfluous learning. The former say that knowledge will be of no use to me; the latter take away all my hopes of attaining knowledge: it is better to have an useless knowledge than none at all. The former do not give me any light for the attaining of truth: the latter put out my eyes. If I believe Protagoras, every thing in nature is doubtful; if Nauphebanes, this alone is certain, that nothing is certain; if Parmenides, there is in nature but one Being; if Zeno, there is not even one Being. What are we then? What are those things which surround us, nourish and support us? All nature is a shadow, or nothing, or an illusion. I can hardly tell whether I am more angry with those who pretend that we know nothing, or those who will not even allow that we know nothing.' I have cited those words of Seneca somewhat at large, in order to display all the degrees of Scepticism, amongst which there is none so extravagant as our Zeno's notion. If he really maintained such a paradox as this, either he meant to divert himself, or he did not understand the word *nothing* in the same sense as others do, or he was raving. But we do not find the least symptom of madness in the rest of his opinions. Wherefore we ought rather to solve it by taking it for a witty conceit, or a particular notion of the word *nothing*. Let us pass the same judgment on Gorgias Leontinus's book, in which he maintained three assertions (42): first, that there is nothing; secondly, that if there is any Being, man cannot comprehend it; thirdly, that though man could comprehend it, he could not express it. Let us see Justus Lipsius's reflection on that passage of Seneca: 'Sententia est, Zeno Eleates molestia nos liberavit, & omni inquisitione: nam ait, Nihil esse. Sed hæc mira, & exitiæ fatua aut sapiens sententia, nec mihi nunc capienda. An ad contemptum rerum retulit, Nihil hæc (non tamen Nihil) esse? velim, & sic laudem, non solum tolerem. Si aliter, & de ipsa existentia; elletoro hæc egent. Ceterum Zeno Eleates nusquam tale, apud Laertium quidem, ubi Dogmata ejus diversa, sed nec alibi commemorari legisse. Viderit Seneca (43). . . . Zeno of Elea freed us from all trouble and all inquiry; for he said that there is nothing. But either this is a very surprising and foolish saying, or it is a very wise one, and such as I cannot comprehend. Did he use it in contempt of things, and mean that the things of this life were (not nothing, but) naught? I assent, and not only allow but commend it. If otherwise, and he spoke of the existence of things, he was surely mad. For the rest, Zeno of Elea says no such thing in Diogenes Laertius, who has related several of his opinions, nor do I remember to have read this anywhere else. Let Seneca answer for it.' What Plutarch relates of Zeno's character will doubtless be objected against me: Pericles, says he (44), was also a hearer and disciple of Zeno Eleates, who taught Natural Philosophy, like Parmenides. This Zeno opposed every thing, and had got a certain habit of objecting and refuting, by which he perplexed his adversaries, and reduced them to a nonplus: as Timon the Phliæan testifies in these verses.

Zeno with wondrous art could every thing dispute,
And every thing could critic and confute,
Would either side the question take, nor fail
Defending or opposing to prevail.

It will be objected against me, I say, that a Philosopher of this humour, was capable of quibbling to such a degree, as to maintain that every thing is nothing. I answer, that it is not probable that so subtle a disputant would have run into such extremities, out of which it seems impossible for him to have extricated himself.

But however incredible this may appear, let us say that the consequences of Pyrrhonism may have engaged people to assert a great many extravagant things, and let us moderate a little the asseverations we have read (45). Let us also say, that perhaps our Zeno maintained that there was nothing, only in arguing on those principles which he attacked. It may be that from an argument *ad hominem*, they concluded that he positively and absolutely taught that position, though he advanced it only as a doctrine which resulted from some hypothesis, the falsity of which he had undertaken to prove. We know that he argued thus: if there is one Being, it is indivisible, for unity cannot be divided; now that which is indivisible is nothing, for that cannot be accounted among Beings which is of such a nature, that being added to another, it will not increase it, and being taken from another, doth not diminish it: and therefore there is no Being. This argument is mentioned by Aristotle, who says it is ridiculous (46). Let us omit the Greek, and let

down rather Fonseca's paraphrase, from which we learn that Zeno thus attacked a doctrine of Plato: 'Posterior ratio, quam assertit (Aristoteles) pro opinione naturalium contra Platonem, erat Zenonis Eleates, Parmenidis discipuli, qui hunc in modum argumentabatur. Ipsum unum separatum si datur, est omnino indivisibile, ergo nihil est; unde sequitur; non tantum illud, non esse substantiam rerum, sed neque omnino quicquam, quod ad eas pertineat. Consequentiam vero ex eo firmam putabat Zeno, quia nihil esse credebatur, nisi quod aliquam magnitudinem haberet: quam ob causam, sæpe utebatur hoc quasi Principio, Quod nec additum facit majus, nec detractum reddit minus, nihil est. Quocirca dicebat nihil esse, quod omni ex parte esset ens, nisi Corpus, quando quidem solum Corpus additum secundum quancunque dimensionem facit majus. Siquidem linea addita non facit majus, nisi secundum longitudinem; nec Superficies, nisi secundum longitudinem & latitudinem. Unde sequebatur Unitatem abstractam, qualem ponebat Plato, itemque Punctum, nihil omnino esse, quia nequeant rem ullam majorem facere (47). . . . The last argument which Aristotle alleges in favour of the opinion of the Naturalists against Plato, was that of Zeno Eleates, the disciple of Parmenides: he argued thus: if there is one separate Being it is indivisible, therefore it is nothing, from whence it follows that it is not only not the substance of things but also nothing belonging to them. Zeno imagined this consequence was just, because he believed there was nothing but what had some magnitude. Accordingly he often used this as a principle. That which being added to another thing, does not increase it, or being taken from another thing, does not diminish it, is nothing. He therefore said that there was nothing which in every respect was a Being, except body; since body alone, if added to another, makes a greater, according to its dimension: for a line added to a line makes not a greater but in length; nor doth a surface added to a surface make a greater but in length and breadth. Hence it follows that an abstract unity, such as Plato supposed, and likewise that a point, are nothing, because they cannot make any thing greater.'

[F] Some of his objections against the existence of motion, are preserved in Aristotle's works, where you will find four objections made by Zeno examined.

The first is (49). If an arrow, which tends towards a certain place, should move, it would move and rest at the same time. But that is a contradiction; therefore it doth not move. The consequence of the major is proved thus. The arrow is every moment in a space equal to it self. It is then at rest; for a thing is not in a space when it leaves it: wherefore there is no moment in which it moves; and if it moved in some moments, it would be at once in motion and at rest. To understand this objection the better, we must take notice of two principles which cannot be denied: one is, that a body cannot be in two places

(45) See, below, the explanation on the Pyrrhonians, cited [E].

(46) Aristotle, *Metaphys. lib. iii, cap. iv.*

(47) Fonseca in *Archiepiscopi Med. phys. lib. pag. 473, 474.*

(48) In the sixth chapter of the sixth book.

(49) I notice it the first, because Aristotle proposes and answers it at the beginning of the chapter; but afterwards he places it in the third rank.

(42) See Sextus Empiricus adv. Mathemat. lib. vii, cap. ii.

(43) Lipsius, *Manuduct. ad Stoic. Philof. lib. ii, Diff. iv, sub fin. pag. m. 693, Tom. iv, Oper.*

(44) Plut. in *Vita Pericly, pag. 154.* The words of the original may be seen above, in citation (8).

that he alledged several others, which perhaps were the same with those I shall mention below

THAT time is not divisible in infinitum.

at once; the other, that two parts of time cannot exist together. The first of these two principles is so evident, even without making use of any attention, that I need not explain it: but as the other requires a little more reflexion, in order to be understood, and comprehends the whole force of the objection, I will render it more obvious by an instance. I say then that what suits Monday and Tuesday with respect to succession, suits every portion of time whatsoever. Since then it is impossible for Monday and Tuesday to exist together, and that of necessity Monday must cease to be before Tuesday begins to be, there is no part of time whatsoever, which can co-exist with another; each must exist alone; each must begin to be, when the precedent ceaseth to be; and each must cease to be before the following can begin to exist. From whence it follows, that time is not divisible in infinitum, and that the successive duration of things is composed of moments, properly so called, each of which is simple and indivisible, perfectly distinct from time past and future, and contains no more than the present time. Those who deny this consequence, must be given up to their stupidity, or their want of sincerity, or the insurmountable power of their prejudices. But if you once grant that the present time is indivisible, you will be unavoidably obliged to admit Zeno's objection. You cannot find an instant when the arrow leaves its place; for if you find one, it will be at the same time in that place, and yet not there. Aristotle contents himself with answering, that Zeno very falsely supposes the indivisibility of moments. *Τὸτο δὲ ἐστὶ ψεύδος· ἡ γὰρ συγκρίνεται ὁ χρόνος ἐκ τῶν νῦν ὄντων ἀδιαίρετων, ὥσπερ ὁ ἀλλο μέγεθος ἐδὲν. Hoc verò est falsum, cum tempus ex momentis indivisibilibus non constet, ut neque alia ulla magnitudo (50).*

(50) Aristotle, *Physic. lib. vi, cap. ix.*

Zeno's second objection was this. If there be motion, what moves must pass from one place to another; for all motion comprehends two extremities, terminus a quo, and terminus ad quem, the place from whence it departs, and that to which it comes. But these two extremities are separated by spaces which contain an infinity of parts, since matter is divisible in infinitum; it is therefore impossible for the body that is moved to proceed from one extremity to the other. The intermediate space is composed of an infinity of parts, through which it ought to run successively, one after the other, without ever being able to touch that which is behind: so that to run through one foot of matter, I mean, to reach from the beginning of the first inch to the end of the twelfth inch, an infinite time would be necessary; for the spaces, which it is successively obliged to run through, betwixt the two extremities, being infinite in number, it is plain that they cannot be run through in less than an infinity of moments; unless it were pretended that the body which moves is in several places at the same time, which is false and impossible. To this Aristotle makes a wretched answer: he saith that a foot of matter being no otherwise than virtually infinite or infinite in power, may very well be run through in a finite time. I set down his answer with the perspicuity which the Conimbricarian commentaries have given it. *Hic rationi satisfactum ab se jam ante Aristoteles ait, videlicet cum hoc libro docuit infinitum sectione, quod non actu, sed potestate infinitum est, tempore finito decurri posse. Enimvero cum tempus continuum sit, parique modo infinitum, eodem infinitatis jure, eisdemque partium divisionibus sibi mutuo respondebunt tempus & magnitudo. Nec contra naturam talis infiniti est hoc modo pertransiri (51): -- Aristotle says that he has already answered this objection, having shown in this book, that a body infinite in division, that is, not actually, but virtually so, may be run over in a finite time. For as time hath a continuity of parts, which are infinite in the same manner as the parts of body are infinite, time and body will answer to one another by the same laws of infinity, and in the same division of their parts. Nor is it against the nature of such infinite that body should be thus run over. You have here two particulars: I. That each part of time is divisible in infinitum; which is invincibly refuted above. II. That a body is only virtually infinite. Which signifies that the infinity of a foot of matter, consists in this, that it may be divided without*

(51) Conimbricenses, in *Aristot. Physic. lib. vi, cap. ix, pag. m. 147, 148.*

end into smaller parts, but not in its actually undergoing that division. To urge this, is to impose on the world; for if matter is divisible in infinitum, it actually contains an infinite number of parts, and is not therefore an infinite in power, but an infinite which really and actually exists. The continuity of parts doth not hinder their actual distinction; consequently their actual infinity doth not depend on the division; but it subsists equally in a close quantity, and in that which is called *discrete*. But if we should grant this infinity in power, which by the actual division of its parts, would become an actual infinite, we should not lose any ground, for motion hath the same virtue as division. It touches one part of the space without touching the other, and touches them all one after another; is not this actually to distinguish them? Is not this to do the very same thing which a Geometrician performs on a table, when he draws lines which mark out all the half inches? He doth not break the table into half inches, but makes a division which expresses the actual distinction of parts: and I do not believe that Aristotle would have denied, that if an infinity of lines was drawn on an inch of matter, it would introduce a division which should reduce that to an actual infinity, which, according to him, was only virtually so. But what would be done, with respect to the eyes, by drawing lines on an inch of matter, is certainly done with respect to the understanding by motion. This may be confirmed by what the Geometricians say concerning the production of lines and surfaces. *Mathematici ut nobis inculcent veram lineam intelligentiam, imaginantur punctum de loco in locum moveri: cum enim punctum sit prorsus individuum relinquatur ex isto motu imaginario vestigium quoddam longum expers latitudinis Mathematici ut nobis superficiem ob oculos ponant, monent ut intelligamus lineam aliquam in transversum moveri, vestigium enim relatum &c (52).* --- *The Mathematicians, in order to give us a clear idea of a line, imagine a point to move from one place to another, for as a point is indivisible, that imaginary motion would leave a certain long trace without any breadth. The Mathematicians in order to represent to us a surface, desire us to imagine any line moving across from one place to another, and the trace which that motion leaves, is a surface.* We conceive that a body which moves by successively touching the parts of space, doth determine them as effectually as the chalk in the hand. But besides, when it may be said that the division of an infinite is ended, is there not then an actual infinite? Do not Aristotle and his followers assert, that an hour contains an infinity of parts? Wherefore when it is past, it must be owned that an infinity of parts have actually existed one after another. Is this a virtual, and not an actual, infinity? Let us then say that this distinction is null, and that Zeno's objection remains in full force. An hour, a year, or an age, &c. are each a finite time: A foot of matter is an infinite space; and therefore there is no body in motion that can ever reach from the beginning of a foot to the end of it. We shall see in the following remark, whether this objection may be eluded, by supposing that the parts of a foot of matter are not infinite. Let us content our selves in this place with observing, that the subterfuge of the infinity of the parts of time is of no service; for if there were in an hour an infinity of parts, it could never either begin or end. All its parts must exist separately; any two of them never do, nor can exist together: they must then be comprized between a first and last unity, which is incompatible with an infinite number.

The third objection was the famous argument called Achilles (53). Zeno of Elea was the inventor of it, if (53) See, the we believe Diogenes Laërtius, who tells us nevertheless that Phavorinus ascribed it to Parmenides, and to several others. *Οὐτὸς καὶ τὸν Ἀχιλλεῖα πρῶτον λόγον ἠρώσεις θαλασπίνου, δὲ καὶ Παρμενίδου, καὶ ἄλλος συγγενές. Hic & Achilles primus oratione argumentatus est; quamvis Phavorinus Parmenidem & alios complures profert (54).* This objection hath the same foundation with the second, but it is more adapted to the declamatory stile. It tends to shew that the swiftest body in motion pursuing the slowest, can never reach it. *Γίγνεται δὲ παρὰ τὸ αὐτὸ τῇ διχοτομίᾳ*

(52) Clavius in *Euclid. lib. i, num. 2, & 5.*

(53) See, the article *ACHILLES*, remark [L].

(54) Diogenes *Laërt. lib. ix, num. 19.*

V O L. V. No. CXXXVI.

7 P

below [G], some of which are against the existence of extension, and seem much stronger than

χρῆσις. ἐν ἀπορίῃσι γὰρ συμβαίνει μὴ ἀρῶν-
νείσθαι πρὸς τὸ πᾶσι, διαμενέοντι πᾶσι τῷ με-
γέθυ. ἀλλὰ πρὸς κεῖται ἐν τῷ ὅτι ἡδὲ τὸ τὰ-
χῆρον τέλει γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἐν τῷ δῶκεν τὸ βεβδύττειν.
ὅς ἀνάγκη καὶ τὴν λύσιν εἶναι τὴν αὐτήν. Obidem
autem evenit atque in divisione in dimidia. Nam in
utroque accidit, ut ad finem non perveniat, quoquo
modo magnitudine divisa. Sed in hac additur ne illud
quidem, quod celeritimum est, (quod tragicè prolutum est)
id quod tardissimum est attingere persequendo. Quamobrem
solutio eadem sit necesse est (55). Suppose a tortoise to
be twenty paces before Achilles, and limit the swiftness
of the hero in proportion to that of the tortoise as one
to twenty. Whilst he advances twenty paces, the tor-
toise advances one: she will then be before him still.
Whilst he proceeds to the twenty-first pace, she will
gain the twentieth part of the twenty-second, and
while he gains this twentieth part, she will go through
the twentieth part of the twenty-first part, and so on.
Aristotle refers us to what he says in answer to the se-
cond objection: and we may refer him to our reply.
See also what shall be said in the following remark,
concerning the difficulty of explaining wherein consists
the swiftness of motion.

(55) Aristot.
ubi supra.

I proceed to the fourth objection, which shews the
contradictions of motion. Suppose a table of four
ells, and take also two bodies of the same measure,
one of wood, and the other of stone (56). Let the
table be immovably fixed, and bear the piece of wood
according to the length of two ells westward, and
suppose the piece of stone placed to the east, and only
to touch the edge of the table. Suppose it to move
on the table westward, and that in half an hour it
goes the length of two ells; it will become conti-
guous to the piece of wood. Suppose that they touch
one another only by their edges, and in such a manner,
that the motion of the one towards the west doth not
hinder the motion of the other to the east. At the mo-
ment of their contiguity, let the piece of wood begin
to tend towards the east; whilst the other continues
to tend towards the west; let them move with equal
velocity. In half an hour the piece of stone will finish
its course over all the table; and so it will move
through a space of four ells, the whole length of the
table, in an hour. But the piece of wood will run
through the same space of four ells in half an hour, by
reason that it touched the whole extent of the piece of
stone by the edges: therefore it is true that two bodies
moving with an equal swiftness go through the same
space, one in half an hour, and the other in an hour;
and therefore an hour and half an hour are equal times;
which is contradictory. Aristotle saith, that this is a
sophism, since one of those moving bodies is considered
in reference to a space which continues at rest, mean-
ing the table, and the other with respect to a space in
motion, meaning the piece of stone. I own he is in
the right to observe that difference, but this doth not
remove the difficulty; for a thing, which seems incom-
prehensible, remains still to be explained, that is, that
a piece of wood should at the same time move four ells
on it's south-side, and but two on it's inferior surface.
But I shall illustrate this with a clearer instance. Sup-
pose two books in folio of equal length, as two feet
each. Place them on a table one before the other;
move them at the same time one above the other, one
towards the east, and the other towards the west, till
the eastern edge of the one, and the western edge of
the other touch one another: and you will find that
the edges by which they did touch one another, are
now four feet distant from each other; and yet each of
the books hath moved but the space of two feet. You
may strengthen the objection by supposing whatso-
ever body you please in motion, in the midst of several
others, which are moving several ways, and in various
degrees of swiftness; you will find that the same body
will in the same time run through several sorts of space,
double, triple, &c. to one another: consider well of
it, and you will find that this is only explicable by
Arithmetical calculations, which are only the idea of
our mind; but that thing doth not seem practicable in
the bodies themselves (57). For we ought to remem-
ber these three essential properties of motion. 1. It is
impossible for a body in motion to touch the same part
of a space twice successively. 2. It never can touch
two of them at once. 3. It never can touch the third

(57) The same
difficulties may
be raised from
the small wheels
of a coach, run-
ning over as
much ground as
the great ones,
in the same num-
ber of rotations
about their cen-
ter. The same
thing may be
said of a very
small wheel and
a very large one
fixed to one and
the same axis.

before the second, nor the fourth before the third, &c.
He who can Physically reconcile these three particulars
with the distance of four feet betwixt two bodies,
which have run through no more than the space of two
feet (58), must be no ignorant person. Observe, that
these three properties are as necessarily requisite to a
body which goes over spaces, whose motion is contrary
to it's own, as to one which passes through spaces
where it meets with no resistance.

[G] The same I shall mention below.] I am apt to think
that those who would revive Zeno's opinion, ought to
argue thus.

1. There is no extension, therefore there is no mo-
tion. The consequence is good, for what hath no ex-
tension fills no space, and what fills no space cannot
possibly pass from one place to another, and conse-
quently move. This is incontestable: the difficulty is
then to prove that there is no extension. Zeno might
have argued thus: Extension cannot be composed
either of Mathematical points, or of atoms, or of
parts divisible in infinitum; therefore it's existence is
impossible. The consequence seems certain, by reason
it is impossible to conceive more than these three
modes of composition in extension; wherefore the an-
tecedent alone remains to be proved. A few words
shall suffice as to Mathematical points; for a man of
the meanest capacity may apprehend with the utmost
evidence, if he is but a little attentive, that several no-
thingnesses of extension joined together will never make
an extension (59). Consult the first body of scholasti-
cal Philosophy that comes to hand, and you will there
find the most convincing reasons, supported by many
Geometrical demonstrations, against the existence of
these points (60). Wherefore to say no more on that
head, let us take it to be impossible, or at least incon-
ceivable, that matter should be composed of them. Nor
is it less impossible or inconceivable that it should be
composed of the Epicurean atoms, that is, of ex-
tended and indivisible corpuscles; for every extension,
how small soever, hath a right and left side, an up-
per and lower side: therefore it is a conjunction of
distinct bodies; and I may deny of the right side what
I affirm of the left, for these two sides are not in the
same place: a body cannot be in two places at once;
and consequently every extension which fills several
parts of space contains several bodies. I know besides,
and the Atomists do not deny it, that because two
atoms are two beings, they are separable from one
another: whence I conclude, with the utmost cer-
tainty, that since the right side of an atom is not the
same being with the left side, it is separable from the
left; and therefore the indivisibility of an atom is
merely chimerical. Whence it follows that if there be
an extension, it's parts are divisible in infinitum. But
on the other side, if they cannot be divisible in infi-
nitum, we ought to conclude the existence of extension
impossible, or at least incomprehensible.

The divisibility in infinitum is an opinion em-
braced by Aristotle, and almost all the professors of
Philosophy, in all universities for several ages.
Not that they understand it, or can answer the
objections it is liable to; but because having clearly
apprehended the impossibility of either Mathema-
tical or Physical points, they found no other course
but this to take. Besides, this opinion affords great
conveniencies: for when their distinctions are ex-
hausted, without being able to render this doctrine com-
prehensible, they shelter themselves in the nature of
the subject, and alledge, that our understandings being
limited, none ought to be surprized that they cannot
resolve what relates to infinity, and that it is essential
to such a continuity to be liable to such difficulties as
are insurmountable by human reason. Observe that
those who espouse the hypothesis of atoms, do not do
it, because they comprehend that an extended body
may be simple, but because they believe the two other
hypotheses to be impossible. We may say the same
of those who admit of Mathematical points. In
general, all those who argue on extension, are deter-
mined in their choice of an hypothesis no otherwise
than by the following principle: If there are but three
ways of explaining a subject, the truth of the third neces-
sarily results from the falsity of the other two. Whence,
they do not believe themselves mistaken in the choice of

(58) For in-
stance, the two
folio books above
mentioned.

OBJECTIONS
against the ex-
istence of exten-
sion.

(59) See the
Art of Thinking,
Part. iv, ch. 1,
pag. m. 192,
and the remark
[D], of the fol-
lowing article to-
wards the end.

(60) See among
others, a book of
Libertus Fro-
mondus, Profes-
sor at Lovain,
intituled *La-
ty-
trias seu de
compositis con-
tinuis*. It is a
much stronger
book than the
answer which
James Chancel-
ler (in Latin *Cop-
ules*) Professor of
Philosophy at
Paris, made in
the year 1654,
to two questions
of Cardinal de
Richelieu, de
magnum in
possib., &c.

than all the reasons which the Cartesians can alledge. I mean some Cartesians, who publicly

of the third, when they are clearly convinced that the two others are impossible; and accordingly the impenetrable difficulties of the third do not stop them in the least: they comfort themselves with this consideration that they may be retorted, or with a persuasion that after all this hypothesis is true, because the other two are not so. The subtle Arriaga having proposed an unanswerable objection, declares that he will not therefore change his opinion; for, saith he, other sects cannot resolve it better. 'Video hæc adhuc urgeri argumento supra factò, quod à nemine vidi solutum, sed nec illud solvere præsumo: cum autem commune sit omnibus sententiis de continui compositione, non est cur propter illud aliquis à propria sententia discedat (61). . . . Quòd autem alia sententia Aristotelis difficilia valde sint, & quæ à nobis solvi non possint, non cogit nos hanc sententiam deferere: materis enim difficultas est talis, ut ubique aliqua nobis inexplicabilia occurrant. Malo autem aperte fateri me ignorare solutionem aliquorum argumentorum, quàm eam dare quæ forte à nemine intelligatur (62). . . . I see these objections are still urged in the foregoing argument: I have met with no person who could solve them; neither do I presume to do it. But as all opinions concerning the composition of continuity are liable to unanswerable objections, a man has no reason, upon that account, to depart from his own opinion. . . . 'Too' there are other great difficulties in this opinion of Aristotle, and such as we cannot solve, yet that doth not oblige us to renounce it: for so many difficulties occur on that subject, that some things are inexplicable to us every where. But I would rather own that I know not how to solve an objection, than to give such a solution of it, as, perhaps, no body could understand.'

(61) Arriaga, Disput. XVI, Phys. §. xi, num. 241, pag. m. 433.

(62) Id. ibid. §. xii, num. 256, pag. m. 435.

A Zenonist might tell those who chuse one of these three hypotheses; you do not argue right, you make use of this disjunctive syllogism.

Matter is composed either of Mathematical points, or of Physical points, or of parts divisible in infinitum.

But it is not composed of . . . nor of (63) . . .

Therefore it is composed of . . . The fault of your argumentation lies not in the form, but in the matter: you ought to lay aside your disjunctive syllogism, and make use of this hypothetical one.

If extension existed, it would be composed either of Mathematical points, or of Physical points, or of parts divisible in infinitum.

But it is not composed either of Mathematical points, or of Physical points, or of parts divisible in infinitum.

Therefore it doth not exist.

There is no fault in the form of this syllogism; the sophism à non sufficienti enumeratione partium is not in the major; the consequence is therefore necessary, provided the minor be true. To be clearly satisfied of the truth of the minor, we need only consider the arguments which those three sects alledge one against another, and compare them with their respective answers. When each of those three sects makes the attack, it overthrows, subdues, and triumphs; but when it is on the defensive, it is utterly overthrown and confounded in it's turn. To be convinced of their weakness, it is enough to remember that the strongest of them, that which best disputes the ground, is the hypothesis of the divisibility in infinitum. The school-men have armed it cap-à-pes with all the distinctions which their great leisure would allow them to invent: But all this only serves to afford their scholars matter for talk upon a public disputation, that their relations may not suffer the disgrace of seeing them mute. A father or a brother go away better satisfied, when the scholar distinguishes betwixt a categoric infinite, and a syncategorematic one, betwixt the parts communicantes, & non communicantes, proportional and aliquot, than if he had answered nothing. It was therefore necessary for the Professors to invent some jargon; but all the pains which they have taken, will never be able to obscure this notion which is as clear and evident as the sun: An infinite number of parts of extension, each of which is extended, and distinct from all others, as well with respect to it's entity, as with respect to the space it fills, cannot be contained in a space one hundred

thousand millions of times less than the hundred thousandth part of a barley corn.

Here is another difficulty. An extended substance, if it did exist, must necessarily admit of an immediate contact of it's parts. According to the hypothesis of a vacuum, several bodies would be separated from all others, but several others must immediately touch. Aristotle, who denied this hypothesis, is obliged to own that there is no part of extension which doth not immediately touch some other parts in all it's exterior points. This is incompatible with the divisibility in infinitum; for if there be no body but what contains an infinity of parts, it is evident that each particular part of extension is separated from all others by an infinity of parts, and that the immediate contact of two parts is impossible. But when a thing cannot have whatever is absolutely necessary to it's existence, it is certain that it's existence is impossible: wherefore the existence of extension necessarily requiring the immediate contact of it's parts, and that immediate contact being impossible in an extension divisible in infinitum, it is evident that the existence of such an extension is impossible, and that this extension barely exists in the mind. What the Mathematicians acknowledge with respect to lines and superficies, with which they demonstrate so many excellent things, must be owned to be true with respect to bodies. They honestly own (64) that length and breadth without depth, are things which cannot exist any where but in our imagination. Let us say the same thing of the three dimensions. They cannot subsist any where but in our minds; they cannot exist any other way than ideally. Our mind is a kind of ground, where a hundred thousand objects of different colours, figures, and situation unite: for from an eminence we may see at once a vast plain covered with houses, trees, and flocks, &c. Whilst it is so far from truth, that all these things can possibly be ranged in this plain, that there are not two which can find room there; each would require an infinite space, since it contains an infinity of extended bodies. There should be infinite intervals left round each one, by reason that there is an infinity of bodies betwixt each part, and every other part (65). Let it not be said that God can do every thing; for if the most religious Divines venture to say, that in a right line of twelve inches, he cannot render the first and third inches immediately contiguous, I may very well say that he cannot make two parts of extension immediately touch one another, when an infinity of other parts separate them from one another. Let us therefore say that the contact of the parts of matter is only ideal; and that the extremities of several bodies no where unite but in our mind.

I shall now make a quite contrary objection. The penetration of dimensions is impossible, and yet it would be inevitable, if extension should exist; therefore the existence of extension is impossible. Put a cannon bullet upon a table, a bullet, I say, covered over with some liquid colour, make it roll upon the table, and it will trace out a line by its motion: you will then have two strong proofs of the immediate contact of the bullet and table. The weight of the bullet will shew you that it immediately touches the table; for if it did not touch it in this manner, it would remain suspended in the air, and your eyes will, besides, convince you of this contact by the track which the bullet hath left. Now I maintain that this contact is a penetration of dimensions properly so called. That part of the bullet which touches the table is a determinate body, and really distinct from the other parts of the bullet which do not touch the table. I affirm the same thing of that part of the table touched by the bullet. These two parts touched are each of them infinitely divisible in length, breadth, and profundity; they must therefore mutually touch one another according to their profundity, and consequently they penetrate one another. This is every day objected to the Peripatetics in their public disputes: they defend themselves by a jargon of distinctions, proper for no other use than preventing the displeasure of a scholar's relations, if they should see him silenced; and as for the farther use of these distinctions they have never served to any other purpose than to make it appear that the objection is unanswerable. Here

DIVISIBILITY in infinitum would hinder all manner of contiguity.

(64) Compare with this what is said towards the end of the remark [D], in the following article.

(65) This ought to be understood with the clause distributive sumpta.

DIVISIBILITY in infinitum would occasion the penetration of dimensions.

publicly assert, even in countries where the Inquisition prevails, that it is impossible to know

is therefore a very singular thing: if extension existed, it would not be possible for its parts to touch one another, and it would be impossible that they should not penetrate one another. Are not these most evident contradictions in the existence of extension?

THE means of suspension made use of against the existence of extension.

Add to this, that all the *ways of suspension* which destroy the reality of corporeal qualities, overthrows the reality of extension. Since the same bodies are sweet to some men, and bitter to others, it may reasonably be inferred that they are neither sweet nor bitter in their own nature, and absolutely speaking. The modern Philosophers, though they are no Sceptics, have so well apprehended the foundation of the epoch with relation to sounds, odours, heat, and cold, hardness, and softness, ponderosity, and lightness, favours, and colours, &c. that they teach that all these qualities are perceptions of our mind, and do not exist in the objects of our senses. Why should we not say the same thing of extension? If a being, void of colour, yet appears to us under a colour determined as to its species, figure, and situation, why cannot a being, without any extension, be visible to us, under an appearance of determinate extension, shaped, and situate in a certain manner? Observe also, that the same body appears to us little or great, round or square, according to the place from whence we view it: and certainly, a body which seems to us very little, appears very great to a fly. It is not therefore by their proper, real, or absolute extension that objects present themselves to our mind: whence we may conclude, that in themselves they are not extended. Would you at this day argue thus: *Since certain bodies appear sweet to one man, sour to another, and bitter to another, &c. I must affirm, that in general they are savoury, though I do not know the savour proper to them, absolutely, and in themselves?* All the modern Philosophers would explode you. Why then would you venture to say, *Since certain bodies appear great to this animal, middle sized to that, and very little to a third, I must affirm, that in general they are extended, though I do not know their absolute extension?* Let us see what a celebrated Dogmatist acknowledges (66): 'It is clearly discernible

(66) Nicole, *Art de penser*, Part. iv, ch. i, pag. m. 387, 388. See also Rohault, *Traité de Physique*, Part. i, chap. xxvii, num. 6, pag. m. 293, where he mentions the various appearances of the same colours; he knew it by experience.

(67) Mallebranche, *Recherche de la Vérité*, liv. i, ch. vi, & seq.

(68) Lami, *Connaissance de soi-même*, Tom. ii, pag. 112, & seq.

GEOMETRICAL demonstrations alleged against the existence of extension.

My last difficulty shall be grounded on the geometrical demonstrations so subtly displayed, to prove that matter is divisible *in infinitum*. I maintain they serve for no other use than to make it appear, that extension doth not exist any where but in our minds. In the first place I observe, that some of these demonstrations are employed against those who affirm that matter is composed of Mathematical points. It is objected to them, that the sides of a square would be equal to the diagonal, and that amongst concentric

cal circles, the least would be equal to the largest. This consequence is proved by making it appear that the right lines which may be drawn from one of the sides of a square to another will fill the diagonal, and that all the right lines which may be drawn from the circumference of the largest circle, will find room in the smallest circumference. These objections are not stronger against bodies being composed of points, than against their being divisible *in infinitum*; for if the parts of a certain extension are not more numerous in the diagonal line, than in the sides, nor in the circumference of the largest circle, than in that of the smallest concentric circle, it is clear that the sides of the square equal the diagonal, and that the smallest concentric circle equals the greatest. But all the right lines which can be drawn from one side of a square to another, and from the circumference of the largest circle to the center, are equal to each other: they ought then to be considered as *aliquot* parts; that is, as parts of a certain magnitude, and of the same denomination. Now it is certain that two extensions, whereof the *aliquot* parts and of the same denomination, as *inch, foot, pace*, are in equal number, do not exceed one another: it is therefore certain that the sides of the square would be as large as the diagonal line, if the diagonal line cannot be intersected by more right lines than the sides. The same thing may be said of two concentric circles. In the second place I affirm, that it being very true that if circles did exist, as many right lines might be drawn from the circumference to the center, as there are parts in the circumference, it follows that the existence of a circle is impossible. I am persuaded it will be allowed me that every being which cannot exist, without containing properties which cannot exist, is impossible: but a round extension cannot exist, without having a center, in which there meet as many right lines as there are parts in the circumference; and it is certain that such a center cannot exist: it must then be owned that the existence of this round extension is impossible. But that such a center cannot exist, I shall clearly prove. Let us suppose a round extension, whose circumference is four feet; it then contains forty-eight inches, each of which contains twelve lines; the circumference will then contain five hundred and seventy-six lines; which is the number of the right lines that may be drawn from the circumference to the center. Let us trace a circle very near the center; it may be so small that it will not contain above fifty lines; it cannot then give passage to five hundred and seventy-six right lines; therefore it will be impossible for these five hundred and seventy-six right lines begun to be drawn from the circumference of this round extension to reach the center: and yet if this extension exists, these five hundred and seventy-six lines must of necessity reach the center. What remains then to be said, but only that this extension cannot exist, and that accordingly all the properties of circles and squares, &c. are founded on lines without breadth, which cannot exist otherwise than *ideally*? Observe, that our reason and our eyes are equally deceived in this case. Our reason clearly conceives; I. That the concentric circle nearest the center is less than the circle which encompasses it: II. That the diagonal of a square is larger than the side. Our eyes see this without compasses, and more clearly with compasses; and yet the Mathematicians teach us, that as many right lines may be drawn from the circumference to the center as there are points in the circumference, and that from one side of a square to the other as many right lines may be drawn as there are points in the side. And besides, our eyes shew us that there is not in the circumference of the small concentric circle any one point, which is not a part of a right line, drawn from the circumference of the great circle, and that the diagonal of the square contains no one point that is not a part of a right line drawn from one of the sides of the square to another. Whence then can it proceed that this diagonal is greater than the sides?

This is what relates to the first proof, which I suppose Zeno might have made use of to refute the existence of motion. It is founded on the impossibility of the existence of extension. We shall see, below (69), mark (1), another

know that there are bodies, any otherwise than by faith: our senses deceive us, say they, with respect to the qualities of matter, therefore we ought to distrust their evidence concerning the three dimensions. It is not necessary, add they, that any bodies should exist; for God can without that communicate to our mind whatever it feels, and whatever it

no. 625
see 1st

another reason for the same impossibility. I am willing to believe that what he might have said in the last place, by making use of Geometrical demonstrations, is easy to be refuted by the same means; but I am strongly convinced that the arguments taken from the Mathematics (70) to prove the divisibility in *infinitum*, prove too much: for either they prove nothing, or they prove an infinity of *aliquot* parts.

II. Zeno's second objection might have been this. Granting that there is an extension which is not merely ideal, but really exists (71), yet I say that it is immovable, motion is not essential to it, nor contained in the idea of it, and several bodies are sometimes in a state of rest. Motion is therefore an accident. But is it distinct from matter? If it be distinct, of what must it be produced? Doubtless of nothing; and when it ceases to be, it will be reduced to nothing. But do not you know that nothing is made out of nothing, and that nothing returns to nothing

(72): Besides, must not motion necessarily be diffused on, and through, the body that is moved? The former will therefore be as much extended as the latter, and of the same figure; there will therefore be two equal extensions in the same space, and consequently a penetration of dimensions. But when three or four causes move one body, must not each of them produce its motion? Must not these three or four motions be penetrated together, both with the body, and amongst themselves? How then can each produce its effect? A vessel moved by the winds, tide, and rowers, describes a line which partakes more or less of these three actions, according as one of them is stronger than the others. Will you venture to affirm that infensible entities penetrated amongst themselves, and with the whole vessel, will have such a regard for one another as not to thwart themselves? If you say that motion is a mode which is not distinct from matter, you must then allow that whatever produces it, creates matter; for without producing of matter, it is impossible to produce a being which is the same thing with matter. But would it not be absurd to assert, that the wind which moves the vessel, produces a vessel? It doth not appear that these objections can be any otherwise answered than by supposing with the Cartesians, that God is the sole and immediate cause of motion.

III. Here is another objection. It is impossible to affirm what motion is; for if you say that it is to pass from one place to another (73): you explain one obscurity by a greater, *obscurum per obscurius*. I immediately ask you what you mean by the word *place*? Do you mean a space distinct from bodies? If so, you will involve your self in a labyrinth from which you will never be able to get out (74). Do you mean by it the situation of a body, among some others which surround it? But in this case you will define motion in such a manner, that it will be a thousand and a thousand times suit with bodies that are at rest. It is certain that hitherto the true definition of motion hath not been found. That of Aristotle is absurd, and that of Des Cartes is wretched. Mr Rohault, after much pains in endeavouring to find one which might rectify that of Des Cartes, produces a description which may agree with bodies, of which we conceive very distinctly, that they do not move at all (75); wherefore Mr Regis thought himself obliged to reject it (76). But that which he hath given is not capable of distinguishing motion from rest (77). God, the only mover, according to the Cartesians, must do with respect to a house, the same thing as with respect to the air, which flies from it in a high wind: he must create the air every moment with new local relations, with respect to that house: and he must also every moment create that house with new local relations with respect to that air. And certainly according to the principles of these gentlemen, no body is at rest, if an inch of matter is in motion. All then that they can say centers in explaining apparent motion, that is, explaining those circumstances which make us judge that one body moves, and another doth not.

VOL. V.

But all this is useless labour; every one is capable of judging of appearances. The question is to explain the very nature of things which exist independently of our minds; and since in that respect motion is inexplicable, one had as good say that it doth not exist but in our minds.

IV. I shall now offer an objection very much stronger than the foregoing. If motion can never begin, it doth not exist; but it is impossible for it ever to begin; therefore, &c. I prove the minor thus. It is impossible for a body to be in two places at once: but it could never begin to move without being in an infinity of places at once; for though it advance ever so slowly, it would touch a part divisible in *infinitum*, and which consequently corresponds with infinite parts of space; therefore, &c. Besides, it is certain that an infinite number of parts doth not contain any which is first; and yet a body in motion can never touch the second before the first: for motion is a being essentially successive, of which two parts cannot exist together: wherefore motion can never begin, if matter is divisible in *infinitum*, as doubtless it is if it exists. The same reason demonstrates that a body in motion, rolling on a sloping table, could never fall off the said table; for before it falls, it must of necessity touch the last part of the table. And how will it touch that, since all those parts which you will pretend to be the last, contain an infinity of parts, and an infinite number hath no part which can be last? This objection obliged some scholastic Philosophers to suppose, that nature hath intermixed Mathematical points with the parts divisible in *infinitum*, to the end that they may serve to connect them, and compose the extremities of bodies. They thought by that means to answer also the objection of the penetrative contact of two surfaces: but this evasion is so absurd, that it doth not deserve to be refuted.

V. I shall not much insist on the impossibility of circular motion, though that would supply me with a strong objection. I say only in one word, that if there was a circular motion, there would be a whole diameter at rest (78), whilst all the remainder of the globe moved very swiftly. But conceive this if you can in matter. The Chevalier de Mére did not forget this objection in his letter to Mr Pascal (79).

VI. Lastly. I say that if motion existed, it would be equal in all bodies; there would be no Achilles nor tortoises; the hound would never reach the hare. Zeno objected this (80); but it seems he went only upon the divisibility of matter in *infinitum*; and perhaps, some will say, he would have set aside that objection, if he had dealt with adversaries who admitted either Mathematical points or atoms. I answer, that this objection equally strikes at all the three systems; for suppose a road composed of indivisible particles; place the tortoise in it one hundred points before Achilles, and if he goes on, he will never reach her: Achilles will go but one point every moment, since if he went two he would be in two places at the same time. The tortoise will advance one point each moment: which is the least she can do, nothing being less than a point (81). The true reason of the swiftness of motion is inexplicable: the most happy thought on this head is, that no motion is continued, and that all those bodies which seem to us to move, stop by intervals. That which moves ten times faster than another, rests ten times to the others hundred. But however well contrived this subterfuge appears, it is of no use; it is confuted by several solid reasons which you may see in all the bodies of Philosophy (82). I content my self with that which is drawn from the motion of a wheel. You may make a wheel of so large a diameter that the part of the spokes the farthest distant from the center will move one hundred times swifter than the part fixed in the nave. And yet the spokes remain always straight: an evident proof that the lower part doth not rest, whilst the upper moves. The divisibility in *infinitum* of the particles of time, rejected above (83) as visibly false and contradictory,

7 Q

(78) To wit the axis.

(79) I shall speak of this letter, in the remark [D], of the following article.

(80) See the third objection of the foregoing remark.

(81) As it is plain that the atoms of Epicurus are divisible in *infinitum*, since they have the three dimensions, and that no body can deny this as to the space they fill up, I have not applied this objection to them.

(82) See Arriaga, *Disp.* xvi, *Physic.* §. xi. He follows the hypothesis of the *morale*, or interruptions of motion: he answers the objections very ill, and owns that of the wheel to be unanswerable: Ovidio in his body of Philosophy, *Tom.* i, pag. 357, & seq. strives mightily to resolve it, and believes he has found out a new solution of it. Cordani *noti di nuova solutio*, says he.

(83) In the remark [F], first objection.

(70) There are very fine ones in the Art of Thinking, *Part.* iv, ch. i, pag. 394. See also Rohault's *Physic.* *Part.* i, chap. ix.

(71) Take this for a dato non concessio.

(72) Zeno might have said it boldly, for all the ancient Philosophers admitted this maxim of Lucretius, *Res . . . non posse creari De nihilo, neque item genitas ad nil revocari . . .* *Lucret.* lib. i, vv. 266.

(73) Migratio de loco in locum.

(74) See the remark [I].

(75) Motion, says he, *Physic.* *Part.* i, ch. x, mm. 3, pag. m. 62, consists in the successive application of all the external parts of a body to the several parts of the bodies that are immediately near it.

(76) See his *Physic.* book i, *Part.* i, ch. i, pag. 42, of *Tom.* ii, at Lyons, 1691, in 12mo.

(77) Motion, says he, *ibid.* pag. 43, is the successive active application of all the external parts of a body, to several parts of the bodies, which immediately touch it.

it knows; and consequently the proofs of the existence of matter which reason affords us, are not evident enough to form a good demonstration on this point [H]. As for the objections which may be grounded on the distinction of a Plenum and a Vacuum, and which

(84) Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrhon.* is of no force against this sixth argument. You will find some other very subtle objections in Sextus Empiricus (84).

Thus, or in a manner very like it, we may suppose our Zeno of Elea to have argued against motion. I will not affirm that his reasons persuaded him that nothing moved; he might be of another opinion, though he believed that none could refute them, nor elude their force. If I should judge of him by my self, I should affirm that he as well as other men believed the motion of matter; for though I find my self very incapable of solving all the difficulties which we have just now seen, and though the Philosophical answers which may be made to them do not seem to me very solid, yet that doth not hinder me from following the common opinion. Nay, I am persuaded that the proposing of these arguments may be of great use with respect to religion: and I say here with regard to the difficulties of motion, what Mr Nicolle said of those of the divisibility in infinitum. The advantage which may be drawn from these speculations is not merely to acquire this sort of knowledge, which in it self is very barren; but to learn to know the limits of our understanding, and to force it however unwilling to own that some things exist, though it is not capable of comprehending them: for which reason it is proper to fatigue the intellect with these subtilties, in order to subdue its presumption, and deprive it of the assurance of ever opposing its faint light to the truths which the church proposes, under pretext that it cannot comprehend them: for since all the force of human understanding cannot comprehend the smallest atom of matter, and is obliged to own that it clearly sees that such an atom is infinitely divisible, without being able to conceive how that can be: is it not plain that the man acts against reason, who refuses to believe the wonderful effects of God's omnipotence, which is of it self incomprehensible, because our minds cannot comprehend these effects (85).

[H] The proofs of the existence of matter which reason affords us, are not evident enough to form a good demonstration on this point. There are two Philosophical axioms which teach us, one that nature does nothing in vain (86); the other, that things are done in vain by more means which might have been as commodiously done by fewer (87). By these two axioms the Cartesians, whom I am speaking of, may maintain that no such thing as matter exists; for whether it doth or doth not exist, God could equally communicate to us all the thoughts which we have. To say that our senses assure us, with the utmost evidence, that matter exists, is not proving it. Our senses deceive us with respect to all the corporeal qualities, not excepting the magnitude, figure, and motion of bodies (88), and when we believe them, we are persuaded that out of our mind there exists a great number of colours, favours, and other beings, which we call hardness, fluidity, cold, heat, &c. yet it is not true that any such thing exists out of our mind. Why then should we rely on our senses with respect to extension? It may very well be reduced to appearance in like manner with colours. Father Mallebranche having given all these reasons to doubt of the existence of bodies, concludes thus: 'It is therefore absolutely necessary, in order to be positively assured of the extraneous existence of bodies, to know God, who makes us sensible of them, and to know that being infinitely perfect he cannot deceive us. For if the intelligence which gives us the ideas of all things, would, if I may so say, divert itself by representing bodies to us as actually existing, tho' there were none; it is evident that this would be no very difficult thing to it' (89). He adds, that Mr Des Cartes could find no other immovable foundation, than this reason, that God would deceive us, if there were no bodies; but he owns that this reason cannot pass for demonstration. To be fully convinced of the existence of bodies, faith he (90), it must be demonstrated to us not only that there is a God, and that God is no deceiver, but also that God hath assured us that he hath really created bodies: and this I do not find proved in Mr Des Cartes's works. God speaks to

the mind, and obliges it to believe only two ways, by evidence and by faith. I grant that faith obliges us to believe that there are bodies; but as for evidence, it is certain that it is not full, and that we are not invincibly induced to believe the existence of any thing else besides God and our own soul. Observe that when he affirms, that God doth not invincibly induce us by evidence to believe that bodies exist, his design is to teach us that the error in which we should be in this respect, ought not to be charged on God. This is rejecting Mr Des Cartes's proof, and saying that God would be no deceiver, even tho' not one body should exist in the nature of things.

Michael Angelo Fardella, a Sicilian, published a book of Logic at Venice in the year 1696, in which he asserts the same principles with Father Mallebranche; as appears by the following extract of his book. He (91) particularly labours to prove, that it is very possible that objects should not be conform to their ideas. He says, he very clearly conceives that the Author of nature might so dispose our senses that they might represent to us those objects as existent, which really do not exist. Yet (92) when he defines the sensations in the second part, pag. 96. he says, that they arise in the mind from the impression which outward bodies make on the extremity of the nerves. When it is objected to him, that if the evidence of the senses is not infallible, JESUS CHRIST imposed on the Apostles, when to convince them that he had a real body, he said, Palpate & videte, quia spiritus carnes & ossa non habet, - - Handle me, and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones; he answers, that the ways of arguing, which the Scripture most commonly makes use of, are rather drawn from a Logic accommodated to the capacity of the vulgar, than from a real Logic: whence he concludes, that JESUS CHRIST, in order to persuade the Apostles that he was no phantom, but a real man, made use of that sort of reasoning which was best adapted to vulgar intellects, and by which men use to satisfy themselves of the existence of things. He adds, that GOD is not obliged to teach us infallibly that bodies exist, and that if we have more than a moral certainty of it, we owe it only to faith. Father Mallebranche's reasonings are certainly very strong, but I may venture to say, that they are much weaker than those we have seen above (93). I should be glad to know how Mr Arnauld would have refuted this, no person being more capable than he to find out a solution. By his examination of Father Mallebranche's opinion, he hath discovered that he understood the art of attacking the foundation. He hath struck at the basis of his adversary's doctrine; for he hath shewn, that if there are no bodies, we are forced to admit some things in God which are utterly contrary to the Divine Nature, as that of being deceitful, or subject to other imperfections, which the light of reason evidently makes appear to us, cannot be in God (94). He makes use of eight arguments, which Father Mallebranche calls good proofs but very bad demonstrations (95). I believe, continues he, that matter exists, but I believe it as well proved and ill demonstrated. Nay, I believe it as demonstrated, but presupposing faith. He proposes an objection which he grounds on the wicked and impious thoughts of the mind (96), and answers, 'That it is certain that the body doth not immediately act upon the mind, and therefore that God alone immediately puts into the mind all the good and evil thoughts, as it is he alone who moves the arm of an assassin, or impious wretch, as well as the hand of the alms-giver, and that the only thing which God doth not do is the sin, that is, he does not cause the consent of the will. It is true, God doth not infill into the mind of man vain and ill thoughts any otherwise than consequentially to the laws of the union of the soul and body, and to sin which hath changed this union into a dependance. But how will Mr Arnauld demonstrate, I mean really demonstrate that he did not commit some sin ten or twenty thousand years ago; and that it is not for the punishment of that sin that he is afflicted with these uneasy thoughts, by which God chastises him, and designs to make him deserve his recompence, by opposing what he calls the motions of concupiscence? Will Mr Arnauld demonstrate, that God who could per-

(85) Nicolle, *Art de penser*, Part. iv, ch. i, pag. m. 394.

(86) Natura nihil frustra facit.

(87) Frustra fit per plura quod eque commode fieri potest per pauciora.

(88) Mallebranche, ubi infra, pag. 70. See above, citations (86), (87).

(89) Mallebranche, *Eclaircissements sur le I. Livre de la Recherche de la Vérité*, pag. 64, Paris 1678.

(90) Id. *ibid.* pag. 68, 69.

(91) Journal des Savans, le 20 de July 1696, pag. 559.

(92) *Id.* *ibid.* pag. 559.

(93) The author of the Journal is mistaken here. He is in the wrong to pretend that Mr Fardella contradicts himself: It is no contradiction to say that there are bodies, and that it were possible there should be none, and yet that we should have the same sensations we have now. The author of the Journal might have made a better objection, which is, that supposing Christ accommodated himself to the popular Logic, it cannot be proved by the Scripture that there are bodies. How then can we be sure by faith, that there are bodies.

(94) In the remark [G], where the last objection is proposed.

(95) Arnauld, *Traité des vrais & des fausses idées*, pag. 104.

(96) Mallebranche, *Réponse au Livre des vrais & des fausses idées*, pag. 104.

(97) *Id.* *ibid.* pag. 104.

(98) *Id.* *ibid.* pag. 104.

(99) *Id.* *ibid.* pag. 104.

(100) *Id.* *ibid.* pag. 104.

(101) *Id.* *ibid.* pag. 104.

(102) *Id.* *ibid.* pag. 104.

(103) *Id.* *ibid.* pag. 104.

which might prove very puzzling to the modern Philosophers, I think it is very likely that he did not forget them [I]. Not being cotemporary with Diogenes the Cynic it was not his lecture that was refuted by walking. Every body admires the method which that Diogenes made use of to confound the arguments of the Philosopher whom he heard

mit fin and all it's consequences, which, by the natural laws, he hath established, oblige him to put into the mind so many filthy thoughts and impious inclinations, could not permit that he himself should have sinned twenty thousand years ago? Will he demonstrate that God could not without the help of a body give him disturbing thoughts; and that in consequence of the laws of the union of the soul and body, which he forefaw, and which he can follow without having formed any one body? But let him argue as much as he will, I shall easily break the chain of his demonstrations, by telling him that God may have had designs which he hath not imparted to him (97). Mr Arnauld offers a great many things in his reply, and particularly this, that there are in Father Mallebranche's answer some extravagant propositions, which, strictly taken, tend to the establishment of a very dangerous Pyrrhonism (98). His proof may be seen in the following passage (99): 'I beg of him to tell me, what he meant, when he granted that this proposition might be taken for an evident principle: *God is no deceiver, and it is not possible that he should take pleasure in deceiving me.*'

Doth he pretend that the evidence of this principle is absolute, or doth he think it restrained by this condition, *if I should not have committed some sin ten or twelve thousand years ago*, for the punishment of which God might take pleasure in deceiving me? If he answers that it is absolute, what he saith of the sin I might have committed ten or twenty thousand years ago is foreign to the purpose. And if he saith that this principle is not absolute, but restrained by that condition, nothing can be easier than to shew him, that it cannot be asserted without overthrowing both the Divine faith, and all human sciences. For he affirms, that not only the Divine faith, but whatever we know by ratiocination, is grounded on this principle, *That God is no deceiver* . . . (100) But this principle, that God is not a deceiver, will be utterly useless, if he who makes use of it was obliged to prove that he hath not committed some sin ten or twenty thousand years ago. I will say no more: The consequences of this chicanery are so horrible and impious, that it is even dangerous to dwell too long upon them. . . . (101) Is it necessary that God should impart all his designs to us, that we may be assured he doth not intend to deceive us? If so, none can be certain of it: and thus there will be no Divine faith, no human sciences, according to the author himself, as I have just shewn.

It was requisite, for several reasons, that I should recite some passages of the dispute of these two illustrious authors, and that, in general, I should insert in this remark what I find in that dispute. For in the first place I was obliged to prove, that there are stronger objections than those of Father Mallebranche. In effect, if it was true that the actual existence of matter implies contradictions and impossibilities, as (102) has been set forth above (103), it would be absolutely necessary to recur to faith in order to be convinced of the existence of bodies. Mr Arnauld, who hath found other refuges, would be obliged to have recourse to that only. In the second place, the article of Zeno of Elea, required a large account of the difficulties which this Philosopher might have proposed against the hypothesis of motion. 3. It is of use to know that a Father of the Oratory, as illustrious for his piety, as for his Philosophical learning, has asserted, that nothing but faith can truly convince us of the existence of bodies. Neither the Sorbonne nor any other tribunal ever gave him any trouble on this occasion. The Inquisitors of Italy never disturbed Mr Fardella, who asserted the same thing in a printed book. This ought to teach my readers, that they must not be surprized when I sometimes shew them, that with respect to the most mysterious evangelical subjects reason puts us to a stand, and that then we ought to be fully satisfied with the light of faith. 4. Lastly, a great part of the things, which I have inserted in this remark, may serve as a

supplement to another place in this Dictionary (104).

(97) *Id. ibid.* pag. 590, 591.

(98) *Id. ibid.* pag. 592.

(99) *Id. ibid.* pag. 593.

(100) *Id. ibid.* pag. 594.

(101) *Id. ibid.* pag. 595.

(102) *Id. ibid.* pag. 596.

(103) *Id. ibid.* pag. 597.

(104) *Id. ibid.* pag. 598.

[I] I think it is very likely that he did not forget the objections which may be grounded on the distinction of a Plenum and a Vacuum. Melissus, who studied under the same master with him (105), denied motion, and made use of this proof: If motion exists, there must of necessity be a vacuum (106), but there is no vacuum, therefore, &c. This shews that in Zeno's time there was a great Philosopher, who did not believe motion and a plenum to be consistent together. Wherefore since Zeno denied a vacuum (107), I cannot persuade my self that he did not make use of the same proof with Melissus, against those who admitted motion. He made it his business to oppose them, and used several arguments for that purpose. Would he have forgot the argument which the asserters of a vacuum have so often employed? He might have turned it otherwise than they, but not less speciously. If there was no vacuum, said they, there would be no motion; but motion exists, therefore there is a vacuum. He would have argued on the contrary foot, agreeing with them in this principle, that motion cannot exist in a full space; for, from this position, common to them and himself, he might have drawn a consequence diametrically opposite to theirs. His syllogism ought to have run thus: if there was any motion, there would be a vacuum; but there is no vacuum, therefore there is no motion. Observe, that when I say his manner of arguing would not have been less specious than theirs; I mean this only with respect to Philosophers very capable of comprehending the reasons against a vacuum; for I know very well that to the vulgar it is almost as strange a paradox to deny a vacuum, as to deny motion. Anaxagoras found the vulgar so possessed with the existence of a vacuum, that he had recourse to some trivial experiments to destroy this false prejudice. Aristotle (108) in the chapter where he mentions this, alleges some of the arguments which were made use of to prove a vacuum. They are not of any force, and he refutes them pretty well in the following chapter. Gassendus hath given all possible force to the experiments and arguments which favour the hypothesis of Epicurus concerning a vacuum (109); but he hath said nothing really convincing, and the weakness of it is fully exposed in the *Art of Thinking* (110). However, I believe our Zeno rendered himself formidable on this topic: such a subtle and vehement Logician as he, could very dexterously perplex this subject, and it is not probable that he neglected it.

But if he had known what several excellent Mathematicians (111) say in this age, he might have made vast ravages, and given himself airs of triumph. They assert that a vacuum is absolutely necessary, and that without it the motion of the planets, and the consequences thereof are things inexplicable and impossible. I have heard a great Mathematician (who hath reaped great advantages from the works and conversation of Sir Isaac Newton) say, that it is no longer a problem whether motion be possible, supposing a plenum; that the falsity and impossibility of that proposition hath been not only proved, but Mathematically demonstrated, and that henceforth to deny a vacuum will be to deny a point supported by the utmost evidence. He maintained that vacuity takes up incomparably more room than matter in the most ponderous bodies; and so that in the air, for instance, there are not more corpuscles than there are great cities on the earth. Thus we are doubtless highly obliged to the Mathematics: they demonstrate the existence of what is contrary to the most evident notions of our intellect; for if there be any nature with whose essential properties we are clearly acquainted, it is extension: we have a clear and distinct idea of it, which informs us that the essence of extension consists in the three dimensions, and that its inseparable attributes and properties are divisibility, mobility, and impenetrability. If these ideas are false, deceitful, chimerical, and illusory, is there a notion in our mind which we ought not to take for a vain phantom, or matter of distrust? Can the demonstrations which prove a vacuum remove our distrust? Are they more evident than the idea which shews us that

(105) *That is, under Parmenides. See Diogenes Laertius, lib. ix, num. 24, 25.*

(106) *Aristotel. Phys. lib. iv, cap. vii, Textu xxi.*

(107) *Diogen. Laert. lib. ix, num. 29.*

(108) *Aristotel. ubi supra, Textu li.*

(109) *Gassend. Phys. §. i, lib. ii, cap. iii, Opera Tom. i, pag. 192, & seq.*

(110) *Art. de penser, Part. iii, ch. xviii, num. 2. pag. m. 329, & seq.*

(111) *Mr Huygens, Sir Isaac Newton, &c.*

ARGUMENTS against a Vacuum.

heard endeavouring to prove that there was no motion. He walked about in the auditory, thinking that was sufficient to shew the falsity of all the Professor had been saying :

a foot of extension may change its place, and cannot be in the same place with another foot of extension? Let us search as much as we please into all the recesses of our mind, we shall never find there any idea of an unmovable, indivisible, and penetrable extension. And yet if there is a vacuum, there must exist an extension, essentially endued with these three attributes. It is no small difficulty, to be forced to admit the existence of a nature of which we have no idea, and is besides repugnant to the clearest ideas of our mind. But there are a great many other inconveniencies which attend this. Is this vacuum, or immovable, indivisible, and penetrable extension, a substance, or a mode? It must be one of the two, for the adequate division of being, comprehends but these two members. If it be a mode, they must then define its substance: but that is what they can never do. If it be a substance, I ask whether it be created or uncreated? If created, it may perish, while the matter, from which it is really distinct, may not cease to be. But it is absurd, and contradictory, that a vacuum, or a space distinct from bodies, should be destroyed, and yet that bodies should be distant from each other, as they may be after the destruction of the vacuum. If this space distinct from bodies is an uncreated substance, it will follow either that it is God, or that God is not the only substance which necessarily exists. Which part soever you take of this alternative, you shall find your self confounded: the last is a formal, and the other at least a material impety; for all extension is composed of distinct parts, and consequently separable from each other; whence it results, that if God was extended, he would not be a simple, immutable, and properly infinite, Being, but a collection of beings, *ens per aggregationem*, each of which would be finite, though all of them together would be unlimited. He would also be like the material world, which, in the Cartesian hypothesis, is an infinite extension. And as to those who should pretend that God may be extended without being material or corporeal, and alledge, as an argument, his simplicity, you will find them solidly refuted in one of Mr Arnauld's books, I shall cite only these words from it: 'So far is the simplicity of God from allowing us room to think that he may be extended, that all Divines have acknowledged after St Thomas, that it is a necessary consequence of the simplicity of God not to be capable of being extended' (112). Will they say with the schoolmen, that space is, at most, no more than a privation of body; that it hath no reality, and that, properly speaking, a vacuum is nothing: but this is such an unreasonable assertion, that all the modern Philosophers who declare for a vacuum, have laid it aside, however convenient it was in other respects. Gassendus carefully avoided having recourse to such an absurd hypothesis (112); but chose rather to plunge himself into the most hideous abyss of conjecturing, that all beings are not either substances or accidents, and that all substances are not either spirits or bodies; and of placing the extension of space amongst the beings which are neither corporeal nor spiritual, neither substances nor accidents. Mr Locke, believing that he could not define what a vacuum is, hath yet given us clearly to understand that he took it for a positive being (114). He was too knowing not to discern that nothingness cannot be extended in length, breadth, and depth. Mr Hartsoeker hath very well apprehended this truth. *There is no vacuum in nature*, saith he (115), *this ought to be admitted without any difficulty, because it is utterly contradictory to conceive a meer nothingness, with all the properties which can only agree to a real Being*. But if it is contradictory that nothingness should be endued with extension, or any other quality (116), it is not less contradictory, that extension should be a simple being, since it contains some things, of which we may truly deny what we may truly affirm of some others which it includes. The space filled up by the sun is not the same space taken up by the moon; for if the sun and the moon filled the same space, those two luminaries would be in the same place, and penetrated with one another, since two things cannot be penetrated with a third, without being penetrated among themselves (117). It is most evident that the sun and

moon are not in the same place. It may then be truly said of the space of the sun, that it is penetrated with the sun, and it may as truly be denied of the space penetrated with the moon: here are then two portions of space really distinct from one another, since they receive two contradictory denominations, of being penetrated, and not being penetrated with the sun. This fully confutes those who venture to assert, that space is nothing but the immensity of God; and it is certain that the divine immensity could not be the place of bodies, without giving room to conclude that it is composed of as many parts really distinct, as there are bodies in the world. It will be in vain for you to alledge that infinity hath no parts, this must necessarily be false in all infinite numbers, since a number essentially includes several unities: nor will you have more reason to tell us, that incorporeal extension is wholly contained in its space, and also wholly contained in each part of its space (118); for not only we have no idea of it, and it thwarts all our ideas of extension, but besides it will prove that all bodies take up the same place, since each could not take up its own, if the Divine extension was entirely penetrated with each body, numerically the same with the sun, and with the earth. You will find in Mr Arnould a solid refutation of those who say that God is diffused throughout infinite spaces (119).

By this specimen of the difficulties which may be raised against a vacuum, my readers may easily apprehend, that our Zeno would, at this present time, be much more formidable than he was in his own age. It is no longer to be doubted, would he say, that if all is full, motion is impossible. This impossibility hath been Mathematically proved. He would be far from disputing against those demonstrations, but admitting them as incontestable; he would solely apply himself to prove the impossibility of a vacuum, and would reduce his adversaries to an absurdity. He would confute them on whatsoever sides they turned; he would plunge them into perplexities by his dilemmas; he would make them lose ground wherever they retired; and if he did not silence them, he would at least force them to confess, that they neither understood nor comprehend what they say. *If any one ask me (they are Mr Locke's words) (123), what this space I speak of, is? I will tell him when he tells me what his extension is. . . . They ask whether this space be body or spirit? To which I answer by another question, Will you tell me what there can be only bodies and minds. If it be body, I will tell him what body is. If it be spirit, as (usually it is) Whether this space, void of body, be substance or accident, I shall readily answer, I know not: nor shall I be ashamed to own my ignorance, till he has answered that question, shew me a clear, distinct idea of substance (121).* Since such a great Metaphysical vacuum, after having for well studied this subject, is not able to answer the questions of the Cartesian otherwise than by asking other questions which he thinks yet more obscure and perplexed than theirs, may judge that the objections which Zeno might propose, could not be answered; and we may certainly conjecture that he would speak thus to his adversaries: *You shelter your felves in the hypothesis of a vacuum when you are driven from that of motion in a plenum; but you cannot hold out in this hypothesis the impossibility of it is demonstrated. Learn for a better way to come off by; for by that which you better already chosen you avoid one precipice, and throw yourselves into another. Follow me, I will shew you a better way: do not conclude, from the impossibility of motion in a plenum, that there is a vacuum, but rather conclude from the impossibility of a vacuum, that there is no motion, I mean real motion, but only an appearance of motion, or an ideal and intellectual motion. The Antients were so perplexed in their disputes about a vacuum, that some maintained that a vacuum and place were the matter of bodies. οὗτοι τινες εἶναι τοῦ κενῶ τῶν σωμάτων οὐκ οἶπες καὶ τόποι τοῦ αὐτοῦ τῶτο λεγόμενος, qui vacuum esse corpus materia dicunt, qui quidem etiam hoc idem afferunt esse (122).*

From what has been said, let us deduce a few

I. The first is, That Zeno's dispute could not be wholly useless: for if he missed his main design, which

(118) Tota in
toto & tota in
singulis partibus.
This is what the
school-men say of
the presence of
the soul in the
human body, and
of the presence of
Angels in certain
places.

(119) Arnault, Letters viii, to, to Father Malbranche. See particularly pp. 171, & pp. 171 & pp. 110 & pp. 110 of a book of Petit, a Physician of Paris, entitled de extensione animæ & rerum inoporeum natus; and *Ifr de la Chambre's* *opinion* published at Paris in the year 1666 in 4to, with the title, *De l'extension de l'ame*. All the *respones* *allegées* in *extension* and *spirituality* of *may* *exist* *in* *as* *if* *trough*, *they* *only* *only* *fore* *flows* *the* *falling* *of* *his* *effort*

we (120) Locke,
ro- ubi supra, p.
nly 188.

f a (121) 14 3
and 22, 189.

els,
ome

row
you

but

ntel-

odies.

vidam
fr. lo-

W CO- Phys. Lib.
cap. viii.

not be
design,

saying; but it is certain that an answer of that nature is more sophistical than our Zeno's arguments [K]. I do not believe, what some affirm of him (d), that he taught that matter is composed of Mathematical points: I should rather think he asserted that it could not be composed of them (e). I must not forget that he was less firm and resolute in suffering detraction, than in suffering the tortures exercised on his body. He was

(d) See below, citation (135).

(e) See Aristotle, *Metaphys. lib. iii, cap. iv.*

very

which was to prove that there is no motion, he would, however, have the advantage of strengthening his hypothesis of the *acatalepsia*, or incomprehensibility of all things. The demonstrations of our modern Mathematicians, to prove a vacuum, have convinced them that motion in a *plenum* is not comprehensible. They have therefore admitted the supposition of a vacuum, not because they did not find it surrounded with several inconceivable and inexplicable difficulties; but being obliged to chuse one out of two incomprehensible systems, they preferred that which least shocked them. They chose rather to satisfy themselves on the Mechanical, than the Metaphysical part, and even slighted the Physical difficulties which annoyed them; this, for instance, it is not possible to give a reason for the resistance of air and water, if there be but such a small quantity of matter, and so much vacuity in those two parts of the world. Other Mathematicians (123) deny a vacuum still, not but that they are sensible of the difficulties which obliged others to admit it; but they are more sensibly touched with the dismal perplexities they find in that supposition; they do not think it reasonable, on account of those difficulties, to renounce the clearest ideas which we have of the nature of extension. Observe, that some Philosophers of the first rank (124), do not believe that we know either what extension or substance is; they cannot talk otherwise as long as they believe a vacuum. This affords no small occasion of triumph to Zeno and all other Acataleptics: for while it is disputed whether we know, or are ignorant of the nature of substance and matter, it is a sign that we comprehend nothing, and that we can never be sure that we hit the mark, or that the objects of our mind resemble the ideas we have of them.

(123) Mr Leibniz, and Mr de Volder, a famous Professor of Philosophy and Mathematics in the university of Leyden.

(124) See, above, in citat. (120), Mr Locke's words.

The system of Spinoza is incompatible with a vacuum.

II. I shall observe by the way, that the hypothesis of a vacuum is the most proper in the world to overthrow Spinoza's system. For if there are two different extensions, the one simple, indivisible, and penetrable, the other compounded, divisible, and impenetrable; there must be more than one substance in the universe. This is the more easy to be inferred, by reason that the impenetrable substance would not be a perfect continuity, but a collection of corpuscles entirely separated from each other, and surrounded by a large incorporeal space. The Spinozists would not deny that each of these corpuscles is a particular substance distinct from that of all others. And thus by their own axioms, they must renounce their system, if they own that there is a vacuum.

A new proof against the real existence of extension.

III. The last consequence which I would draw, is that the disputes concerning a vacuum, have afforded a plausible reason to deny the real existence of any other than an ideal extension. They have perceived, in arguing against the Cartesians, who deny the possibility of a vacuum, that extension is a being which cannot be limited. It must then follow that there is no such thing as body in nature, or that there is an infinity of bodies. One of them cannot be destroyed without annihilating all the rest, nor can the smallest be preserved without preserving them all. Yet we know, by evident ideas, that when two things are really distinct, one of them may be preserved or destroyed without the preservation or destruction of the other; for as whatever is really distinct from a thing is accidental to it, and as each thing is capable of being preserved without that which is accidental to it, it follows that the body *A*, really distinct from the body *B*, may continue in being, without the body *B* subsisting, and that the preservation of the body *A*, doth not at all infer the preservation of the body *B*. Συμπεσυχός ἐστιν ὃ γίνεσθαι καὶ ἀπογίνεσθαι χωρὶς τῆς τῷ ὑποκειμένου φύσεως. Ἀccident est quod adest atque abest sine subiecti interitu (125). If this be true of accidents, which are the modes of a substance, as Porphyrius understands it here, it is truer still of an accidental substance with respect to others, as it is distinct from their essential attributes. Take notice that the school-men raise a great difficulty

(125) Porphyry, *lib. cap. v.*

here on pretence that blackness cannot be separated from an Ethiopian. Wherefore they recur to the distinction between a mental and a real separation. This is a meer illusion; for the subject of the blackness of an Ethiopian is matter, which would not be destroyed, if the body of that man was calcined. This consequence which appears so clear and consistent with evident notions, cannot however agree with the subject of which we speak; and you cannot suppose, that all the bodies included in a chamber should perish, and the four walls be preserved; for in this case there will remain the same distance betwixt them as before; but this distance, say the Cartesians, is nothing but a body. Their doctrine then seems to infringe the sovereign liberty of the Creator, and his due unlimited power over all his works. He ought to enjoy a full right of creating few or many, according to his good pleasure, and of preserving or destroying this or that, as it seems good to him. The Cartesians may answer, that he may destroy each body in particular, provided he make another of the same magnitude; but is not this setting bounds to his liberty? Is not this imposing on him a sort of slavery, which necessarily obliges him to create a new body every time that he pleaseth to destroy another? These are difficulties which cannot be answered on the supposition that extension and body are the same thing; but they may all be retorted against those who propole them to Des Cartes, if at the same time they acknowledge a *spacial* extension really existent and distinct from matter. This extension cannot be finite, one part cannot be destroyed without the production of another, &c. But if the nature of penetrable or impenetrable extension draws along with it such a large train of inconveniencies, the shortest way is to assert that it hath no other existence than in our mind.

[K] An answer like that of Diogenes is more sophistical than our Zeno's arguments.] Πρὸς τὸν σιγῶντα ὅτι κινῆσις οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀνεύχως πειρατάται. Dicente sibi quodam non esse motum, exurgens ambulabat (126). (126) Diog.

--- When a certain person told him that there was no motion, he arose and walked. This is all we find on this head in Diogenes Laërtius. You see he relates the fact with great simplicity: but the Moderns have a little amplified it. 'Vulgo etiam fertur Diogenes, cum negari à Zenone motum localem audisset, illico surrexisset, & ita redituque aliquoties magnâ festinatione replicata inambulasset, & rogatus, quis cum subito enthusiasmus perculisset, respondisset: Zenonem refello (127). - It is also commonly reported that Diogenes, bearing Zeno deny local motion, immediately started up, and walked up and down several times with great speed; and being asked what sudden enthusiasm had seized him, he replied, I am refuting Zeno.' They have named the Philosopher who denied motion, they have embellished the circumstances of the practical answer, they have made it a subject of declamations for young Rhetoricians. I am surprized that Sextus Empiricus should not vouchsafe to name the person, who thus refuted the objections against the existence of motion. What he saith more particular is, that a Cynic made use of this way of refuting those objections: Ταῦτά τοι καὶ ἐρωτῆεις φιλόσοφε, τὸν κατὰ τῆς κινήσεως λόγον, σιωπῶν πειρατάτην. Ideoque cum proposita esset Philosopho oratio motum negans, tacitus ambulare cepit (128). --- This Philosopher bearing a discourse against motion, made no answer, but walked about. In another place he expresses himself thus: Διὸ καὶ τῶν Κυνικῶν τις ἐρωτῆεις κατὰ τῆς κινήσεως λόγον, ἵδεν ἀπεκρίνατο, ἀνίστη δὲ καὶ ἐβάδιον. ἔρχομαι καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐνεργείας παύσαι, ὅτι ὑπαρκτή ἐστιν ἡ κίνησις. Ideoque quidem ex Cynicis, cum ei proposita esset contra motum oratio, nihil respondit; sed surgens ambulare cepit, opere & actu ostendens existere motum (129). --- One of the Cynics, bearing a discourse against motion, made no answer; but arose, and began to walk; shewing, by experience, and in fact, that there is motion. It is better not to name the person, than to affirm that Diogenes, the

(126) Diog. Laërt. lib. vi, num. 39.

(127) Libertus Fromondus, de compositione continui, pag. 6.

(128) Sextus Empiricus Pyrrhon. Hypotypos. lib. ii, cap. xiii, pag. 104.

(129) Id. lib. lib. iii, cap. viii, pag. 124.

very angry with a man who abused him; and when the world was surprized at his indignation,

(130) Diogenes the Cynic lived a long time after Zeno of Elea.

(131) Cosimbri-
cones in Phil.
Aristot. lib. vi.
cap. ii, pag. m.
218.

(132) Ibid. in
cap. viii, pag.
245.

(133) Franciscus
de Ovidio, Phy-
sic. Controvers.
xviii, pag. 334,
col. 1.

(134) Arist. Me-
taph. lib. iii,
cap. iv.

(135) Arriga,
and many other
Spanish school-
men, call those
men Zenonists
who hold that
matter is com-
posed of indivi-
sible and unex-
tended parts. A
very different
opinion from that
of the Atomists.

(136) Derodon,
Disput. de At-
omis, pag. 4, 5.
He quotes Sextus
Empiricus, lib.
ix, adv. Ma-
them. § Arist.
Met. lib. i, de
Generat. Text.
vii.

(137) Sext. Em-
pir. Pyrrh. Hy-
pocy. lib. iii,
cap. viii, pag.
104.

the Cynic, and Zeno of Elea were the actors. This chronological error is inexcusable (130): the Jesuits of Coimbra have ascribed it to Simplicius without refuting it. And, in this particular, they fell in with the vulgar error. 'Certè, say they (131), hæc Zeno-
nis tam absurda opinio nullo melius quàm experien-
tie ipsius argumento refellitur. Quod Diogenes Cy-
nicus fecit, ut refert Simplicius hoc in libro commen-
to 53. & lib. 8. comment. 25. Nam cum Zenonis
rationes aliquando audisset, surrexit, nec aliter quàm
coram ambulando respondit. --- Certainly this absurd
opinion of Zeno could not be refuted by a better argument,
than that of experience itself. This was done by Diogenes
the Cynic, as Sulpitius relates. For having once heard
Zeno arguing against motion, he arose, and made him no
other answer, but by walking before him.' They have
avoided the other vulgar error; they do not believe
that Zeno, who denied motion, and whose arguments
Aristotle examined, was the founder of the Stoics; they
have expressly named him Zeno of Elea (132). The
passage which follows is full of faults: 'Continuum
ex partibus indivisibilibus constare contra
Aristotelem constanter defendebat Zeno Stoicorum
Principes, quem ducem sunt sequuti ex Philosophis De-
mocritus, & Leucippus. Ex Theologis Antiquis May-
in 2. diff. 2. quest. 5. Gerardus apud Tantaletum hoc
lib. quest. 1. & Aegidius discipulus D. Thom. lib. 1.
de generat. quest. 8. citatus à Veracruz 6. Physic.
speculat. 1. (133). -- Zeno, the chief of the Stoic Philo-
sophers, constantly maintained against Aristotle, that
matter was made up of indivisible parts. In this opi-
nion he was followed by the Philosophers Democritus
and Leucippus, and by the ancient Divines, Mayx,
& Gerardus, and Aegidius the disciple of St Thomas.
There is no room to doubt that the author in this pas-
sage designed to speak of the same Zeno, whom Ari-
stotle refuted in the ninth chapter of the sixth book of
his Physics. But it doth not appear that Zeno of
Elea taught that matter was composed of indivisible
parts. He contented himself with talking advantage of
the contrary doctrine, to shew the impossibility of
motion. Nay, he asserted, that an indivisible body did
not differ from nothingness (134); and I will make it
appear below, that he did not admit of a composition
in the universe. Notwithstanding, he is looked upon
as the author of the sect which maintained, that mat-
ter is composed of Mathematical points (135). It would
be more reasonable to ascribe this opinion to Pythagoras
and Plato, as Derodon hath done, relying, with
regard to Pythagoras, on the testimony of Sextus Empi-
ricus, and, with relation to Plato, on that of Ari-
stotle (136). But what a blunder is it to make the
founder of the Stoics to be the guide of Democritus
and Leucippus! Leucippus preceded Democritus,
and both of them preceded the head of the Stoics by
several Olympiads. Besides, their atoms formed a
system very different from that which is attributed to
the Zenonists about the composition of matter.

However it be, the answer of Diogenes the Cynic
to the Philosopher who denied motion, is the sophistry
which the Logicians call *ignotatio Elenchis*. Diogenes
swerved from the state of the question; for the Philo-
sopher did not deny apparent motion; he did not deny
that it appeared to men that there is such a thing
as motion; but he asserted that nothing did really
move, and proved it by very subtle and perplexing rea-
sons. See what Sextus Empiricus says of the Sceptics:
'Ὅσον μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῖς φαινομένοις δοκεῖν εἶναι
κίνησιν, ὅσον δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ φιλοσόφῳ λόγῳ μὴ ὑπάρ-
χειν. Quantum ad apparentia quidem videri esse mo-
tum, sed quatenus quis Philosophicam rationem sequa-
tur non esse (137). -- In appearance there is motion,
but, according to Philosophy, there is none. What does
it then make against this assertion, to walk, or cut
a caper? Is it proving any thing besides the appearance
of motion? and was that the subject in dispute? Did
the Philosopher deny that appearance? Not in the
least; he was not fool enough to deny ocular Phæno-
mena, but he asserted that the evidence of the senses
ought to be sacrificed to ratiocination. Consult Ari-
stotle; he will inform you that several ancient Philo-
sophers, who having found reasons for absolutely deny-
ing the plurality of parts, the divisibility, and mobili-
ty of the world, afterwards made no account of the

testimony of the senses. 'Εκ μὲν ἔν τῶν τῶν λό-
γων, ὑπερβαίνον τὴν αἰσθησιν καὶ παρὰ τὴν
αὐτὴν, ὡς τῷ λόγῳ δὲον ἀπολαύειν, εἶναι οἷον τὸ
παῦν ἐν, καὶ ἀκίνητον, καὶ ἀπερὶον ἐνιοι. Ob hoc
ce igitur rationes nonnulli sensum prætereuntes, despicen-
tesque quasi rationem sequi ducem oporteat, universum ip-
sum, unum & immobile & infinitum esse afferunt (138). (138) Aristotle.
de Generat. & Corruptione, lib. i,
cap. viii, pag. m. 255.

Parmenides and Melissus are the ancient Philosophers
of whom he speaks. It must be believed that Zeno of
Elea retained the substance of the doctrine of Parmeni-
des, his master. Plutarch having said, that Parmenides
admitted the eternity and immutability of all things,
adds, that Zeno of Elea did not particularize any thing,
but seemed to float in uncertainty. 'Ἰδὼν μὲν ἔδεν
ἐξέθετο, διηπόρησε δὲ περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ αἰσίοις.
Nihil hoc in genere singulare vulgavit, sed anticipi free
dubitationis æstu fluctuavit (139). But others declare
(140) that with Xenophanes, Parmenides, and Melis-
sus, he taught the unity and incorruptibility of all
things, and the imperfection of the evidence of the
senses. He was not humble enough to continue in
his master's principles without any alteration: we see
his innovations in a book (141) ascribed to Aristotle.
They do not hinder his believing that there was no
generation: so that by a necessary consequence of his
principles, he was obliged to deny the motion, di-
visibility, composition of matter, &c. We have al-
ready seen in the article XENOPHANES, that the author
of the Art of Thinking, hath censured Aristotle, in
favour of Parmenides and Melissus. And attempts
have long since been made to give their opinion a fa-
vourable sense, and a great air of conformity to the
principle of the orthodox, concerning the nature of
God. But, in all appearance, Aristotle doth not de-
serve censure here; for he very well apprehended, and
exactly related what they taught, and consequently we
must believe their system to be a sort of Spinozism.
There is no room for imagining (142) that they ex-
pressed themselves by riddles or emblems; for the par-
ticular doctrine of the unity and immutability of all
things was a consequence of several clear and evident
principles. See above the article XENOPHANES, towards
the beginning of remark [L]. So
NES, towards the beginning of remark [L]. So
that it was in good earnest, and as a systematical do-
ctrine, and not as a witty conceit, that they denied mo-
tion, and asserted that its existence was barely mental.
Here follow the names of some apologists for those
Philosophers (143): 'Si prædicti Philosophi suum
illud dogma ad hujus tam recondite veritatis intelli-
gentiam retulere (144), non modo reprehendendi
non sunt, sed magnopere etiam commendandi. Certe
Parmenidem defendit, atque interpretatur Simplicius,
hoc in libro ad textum 6. Bessarion, 2. Libro con-
tra Calumniatorem Platonis, capite 3. & Nicolaus
Cusa, in lib. de filiatione Dei. Lege etiam pro
eodem re Eugubinum, lib. 3. de perenni Philo-
sophia cap. 6. & 7. F. Mirandula lib. 6. de
examine vanitatis, cap. 1. -- If the above-mentioned
Philosophers, in that opinion of theirs, had regard to
this hidden truth, (viz. That all things are contained in
the Divine goodness in an unmeasurable degree, and solely
as every member is uniformly contained in the unity, and
as all lines joining together in one center from which
they proceeded, are contained in that point) they are not
only not to be censured, but they deserve highly to be
praised. Certainly Simplicius, in that book, defends and
explains the opinion of Parmenides; Bessarion, in his
second book against the calumniator of Plato, and Nicolaus
Cusa, in his book on the Filiation of GOD, do the same
thing. Read also on this subject Eugubinus's eternal
Philosophy, and Mirandula's examination of Vanity.'

The result of all this is, that Diogenes's answer was
sophistical, tho' it was proper to gain the applause of the
company; it was a scoffing answer, but I believe also
that the Philosopher whom it concerned did only despise
it. Perhaps he heartily laughed at it; being a thousand
times happier than the sophist Diodorus, who was not in
a laughing humour, when his lectures against the exi-
stence of motion, were attacked by a malicious irony.
Having put his shoulder out of joint, he applied to He-
rophilus, the Physician, to have it set: How, said the
doctor? Your shoulder dislocated! that cannot be; for
it is neither removed out of the place where it was, nor
where

indignation, he answered if I was insensible of calumny, I should be likewise insensible of praise (f). This answer is unworthy of a Philosopher.

(f) Diog. Laërt. lib. ix, num. 89, pag. 566.

where it was not. This was one of the sophist's reasons against motion. If a body moves, said he, it must move either in the place where it is, or in the place where it is not. But it doth not move either in the place where it is, (for if it is there, it doth not depart) or in

the place where it is not, for it can neither act nor suffer where it is not. Therefore, &c. Diodorus being then very little disposed to relish this Logic, intreated Herophilus not to remember his discourses, but to give him the necessary remedy (145).

(145) Sextus Empiricus, ubi supra, lib. ii, cap. xxii.

Z E N O, an Epicurean Philosopher, a native of Sidon, gloriously maintained the honour of his sect; for he acquired a great reputation (a). Amongst other disciples he had Cicero and Pomponius Atticus [A], whence we may judge of the time when he lived. Vossius is mistaken on that head [B]. Zeno is represented as a Philosopher who

(a) See the remark [A], citation (6).

[A] Among other disciples he had Cicero and Pomponius Atticus. Mr Menage's words are: 'Zenonem Sidonium & Cicero & Atticus Athenis audiverunt, ut indicat ipse Cicero libro II. & V. de finibus, & lib. III. Tuscul. Quest. & libro I. Academ. ---' Both Cicero and Atticus heard at Athens the lectures of Zeno the Sidonian, as Cicero himself intimates in his second and fifth book de Finibus, and in his third book of Tusculan Questions, and in his first book of Academical Questions. I found the passage in the third book of the Tusculan Questions, and as it contains one of our Zeno's opinions, I shall set it down. 'Solent isti negare nos intelligere quid dicat Epicurus. Hoc dicit, & hoc ille græculus me audiente Athenis fenex Zeno istorum acutissimus contendere, & magna voce dicere solebat, eum esse beatum, qui præsentibus voluptatibus frueretur, consideretque se fruturum aut in omni, aut in magna parte vite, dolore non interveniente: aut si interveniret, si summus foret, futurum brevem: si productior, plus habiturum jucundi quam mali. Hæc cogitantem fore beatum, præsertim si & ante præceptis bonis contentus esset, nec mortem, nec deos extimesceret. Habes formam Epicuri vite beatæ verbis Zenonis expressam, nihil ut possit negari (1). --- These people are wont to deny that we understand the meaning of Epicurus. This is what he means, and it is what the old man Zeno the Greek, the most acute of all the Epicurean Philosophers, used to maintain and solemnly affirm, when I heard his lectures at Athens, viz. That the man is happy who enjoys the present pleasures, and who is confident that he shall continue to enjoy them during all, or the greatest part of his life, without any intermission of pain; or if pain should intervene, and be acute, that it shall be but of short continuance, or otherwise that it shall have more good than evil in it; that the man who lives in these thoughts shall be happy, especially if he is furnished with good precepts, and is not afraid either of death, or of the gods. Here you have a description of Epicurus's happy life, expressed in the words of Zeno's so that no part of it can be denied. I have also found the passage in the first book of the Academical Questions: it is as follows: 'Carneades nullius philosophiæ partis ignarus, & ut cognovi ex iis qui illum audierant, maximeque ex Epicureo Zenone (2) qui quum ab eo plurimum dissentiret, unum tamen præter ceteros mirabatur, incredibili quadam fuit facilitate (3). --- Carneades was skilled in all the parts of Philosophy, and had an incredible facility in imparting his knowledge; as I have been informed by those who have heard his lectures, and especially by Zeno the Epicurean, who tho' he differed greatly from Carneades in his opinions, yet was a greater admirer of him than of any other Philosopher.' I have not found the passage in the second book de Finibus (4), but I have found this in the first book. 'Hic mihi Phædrum, inquam, mentitum, aut Zenonem putas, quorum utrumque audiui, quum mihi nihil sanè præter sedulitatem probarent. Omnes mihi Epicuri sententiæ satis notæ sunt, atque eos quos nominavi cum Attico nostro, frequenter audiui, quum miraretur ille quidem utrumque, Phædrum autem etiam amaret, quotidieque inter nos, ea quæ audiebamus, conferebamus: neque erat unquam controversia quid ego intelligerem, sed quid probarem (5). --- In this matter, either Phædrus, or Zeno, you think, have imposed upon me. I attended the lectures of both these Philosophers: but indeed they recommend nothing to me besides application and diligence. All the opinions of Epicurus are well known to me, and I, and our friend Atticus have frequently heard the lectures of these two

Philosophers. He was an admirer of them both, and had even a great affection for Phædrus. We used daily to confer together on what we heard, nor did ever any dispute arise concerning what I understood, but what I approved. Let us add to these three passages, that wherein the Pontif Cotta, Cicero's cotemporary, acknowledges himself to have been a disciple of this famous Epicurean: 'Zenonem, quem Philo noster coryphæum appellare Epicureorum solebat, quum Athenis essem, audiebam frequenter, & quidem ipso autore Philone, credo ut facilius judicarem, quàm illa bene refellerentur, quum à principe Epicureorum accepissem quemadmodum dicerentur. Non igitur ille ut plerique, sed isto modo ut tu, distincte, graviter, ornate. Sed quod in illo mihi usu sæpe venit, idem modo quum te audirem acciderat, ut molestè ferrem tantum ingenium (bona venia me audies) in tam leves, ne dicam in tam ineptas sententias incidisse (6). When I was at Athens, I frequently heard the lectures of Zeno, whom our friend Philo used to call the chief of the Epicureans. And, indeed, it was Philo who advised me to attend these lectures, in order, I believe, that I might be the better able to judge whether these opinions were well refuted, when I should have heard them in the words of the chief of the Epicureans. Zeno did not express himself like most of his sect. His expressions were, like your's, distinct, weighty, and eloquent. But what often happened to me with regard to him, the same thing occurred when I heard you, I was grieved that so great a genius should have fallen (permit me to say so) into such slight, if not foolish and idle opinions.'

(6) Idem, de Nat. Deorum, lib. i, cap. xxi.

(7) Gassendus, de Vita & Moribus Epicuri, lib. ii, cap. vi, pag. m. 187. He quotes Cicero, lib. i, de Nat. Deor. (but 'tis Cicero was an auditor of Zeno, for 'tis Cotta who speaks) & lib. v, Epist.

Mr Menage hath not, like Gassendus, referred us to one of Cicero's letters to Atticus, to find the great friendship which these two illustrious Romans had for our Zeno. 'Quando Cicero & ipsum audivit & de eodem ad Atticum scribens: Zenonem, inquit, tam dilige quam tu (7). --- Cicero, who was a disciple of Zeno, writes thus of him to Atticus, I love Zeno as much as you do.' Gassendus seems to me to be mistaken. This letter of Cicero was written in the year of Rome 702. What probability is there that Zeno was living at that time, since he was very old when Cicero was present at his lectures in the year of Rome 674 (8)? Is it probable, if he was then living, that we should not find some particular concerning his great age, in the Epistle of Cicero, cited by Gassendus, nor in the preceding letter, where he mentions the same man? Observe, that in the best editions, for instance, that of Mr Gravii, this Philosopher is not called Zeno but Xeno. Manutius's conjecture on this head is incomparably better than that of Corradus. According to Corradus the Epicurean Philosopher is meant there (9); but, according to Manutius, Cicero speaks of an agent of Pomponius Atticus (10). Observe, that it is believed by several authors, that Lucetius was a disciple of our Zeno (11), and see what I have remarked (12) against the memoir, wherein the Baron des Coëturs was censured for having advanced that Zeno was the honour of the Epicurean sect.

(8) Zenonem Athenis Cicero & Atticus A. U. DCLXXIV. Olymp. CLXXV, se nem audiverint. Jonius de Script. Hist. Philo. pag. 183.

(9) Corradus in Ciceronis Epist. xi, Libri v, ad Atticum, pag. 497, Edit. Græv.

(10) Manutius in x Epistolam Ciceronis ad Atticum, lib. v, pag. 151, Edit. Græv. See the same Cicero, Epist. xxxvii, lib. xiii, ad Atticum, & ibi Manutium, aliquo comment.

(11) See the remark [M], in the article LUCRETIVS.

(12) Ibid.

(13) Vossius, de Hist. Græci, lib. i, cap. xvi, pag. 105, & lib. iv, cap. x, pag. 466.

(14) Diog. Laërt. lib. x, num. 25.

(1) Cicero, Tuscul. Quest. lib. iii, cap. xviii.

(2) There is in my edition of Epicurus & Zenon, which is a fault.

(3) Idem. Acad. Quest. lib. i, in fine.

(4) Fabricius, in Vita Ciceronis, ad an. 674, quotes also the second book, de Finibus.

(5) Cicero, lib. i, de Finibus, cap. v.

who treated his adversaries with a great deal of contempt, and very harshly [C]. There is scarce any greater proof of his boldness than the book which he wrote against the Mathematics [D]; a work which is lost, as well as that written by Posidonius to confute

Epicurus died in the second year of the CXXXVIIth Olympiad, and Cicero heard Zeno in the 674th year of Rome, that is, the first year of the CLXXVth Olympiad, it is impossible that Zeno should have been instructed by an auditor of Epicurus. There are above one hundred and ninety years betwixt the death of Epicurus, and the year when Cicero heard Zeno's lectures. See Jonsius (15), who hath taken notice of this mistake of Vossius. Mr Menage has adopted it (16).

(15) Jonsius, ubi supra, pag. 184.

(16) Menage in Laert. lib. vii, num. 35, pag. 279.

(17) Cicero, de Nat. Deorum, lib. i, cap. xxiv, pag. 135, Edit. Lefcaloperii.

(18) See Laert. Divin. Instit. lib. iii, cap. xii, pag. m. 201.

(19) 'Από τοῦ ἐπὶ Ζηνῶν, quod est aliquod exenatrat.

(20) Proclus, pag. 55, apud Barrow, Lect. V Mathem. pag. 76.

(21) Menag. in Laert. lib. vii, num. 35, pag. 279, col. 1.

(22) Huetius, Demonstr. E. num. 3, pag. 6, Edit. Lips. 1694.

(23) See Huetius, ubi supra, Arithm. iv, pag. 28, 29.

[C] He treated his adversaries with a great deal of contempt, and very harshly. Cotta attempting to prove that the Epicureans were slanderous, alleges our Zeno. (17) Zeno quidem non eos solum qui tum erant Apollodorum, Syllum, ceterosque fagebat maledictis, sed Socratem ipsum parentem philosophiae latino verbo utens scurram Atticum fuisse dicebat (18). Chrysippum nunquam nisi Chrysippum (19) vocabat. Zeno not only railed against Apollodorus, Syllus, and the other Philosophers of that time, but he said that Socrates himself, the parent of Philosophy, was an Athenian buffoon, and he always called Chrysippus, Chrysippus [that is a bitten fellow].

[D] The book which he wrote against the Mathematicians. We are informed of this by Proclus (20), who adds that Posidonius refuted it. Mr Menage cites some of Proclus's words: *Eum (Zenonem) integro volumine refutavit Posidonius Apamensis; alias Rhodius; teste Proclo libro III. ad 1. Euclidis. Ζηνων, inquit, ὁ Σιδωνίῳ, τῆς Ἐπικύρου μετέχων αἰρέσεως, πρὸς ὃν καὶ ὁ Ποσειδώνιος ὅλον γέγραψε βιβλίον, δεικνύς σαφὲν αὐτὸ πᾶσαν τὴν ἐπινόειαν* (21). Huetius having told us that Epicurus rejected Geometry, and the other parts of the Mathematics, because he believed, that they, being founded on false principles, could not be true, adds, that Zeno attacked them another way. This was by alleging that in order to render them certain, some things should have been added to their principles which were not joined to them. *Alia via adversus Geometriam grassabatur Zeno Epicureus, imperfecta ejus esse docens initia, unde nihil effici posset, nisi alia quaedam adicerentur, quae in iis praetermissa sunt: quam ejus sententiam toto libro confutare conatus est Posidonius* (22). The Mathematics are the most evident and certain of all human sciences, and yet they have met with opposers. If our Zeno had been a great Metaphysician, and followed different principles from those of Epicurus, he might have composed a book not very easy to be refuted, and cut out more work for the Geometricians than they imagine. All sciences have their weak side; nor are the Mathematicians free from that defect. Indeed very few people are able to oppose them well, because to succeed in this engagement it is requisite not only to be a good Philosopher, but also a very profound Mathematician. But those endued with the latter quality are so ravished with the certainty and evidence of their inquiries, that they never think of examining whether there be any illusion in them, or whether the first foundation be well established. They rarely think of suspecting any deficiency in them. But what is very certain is that several disputes prevail amongst the most famous Mathematicians. They refute one another, and answers and replies multiply among them as well as among other learned men. We observe this among the Moderns, and it is certain that the Antients were not more unanimous (23). It is a proof that there are in this road several dark paths, and that a man may wander and lose the track of truth. This must of necessity be the lot of one side or the other, since one affirms what the other denies. It may be urged that this is the fault of the Artificer, but not of the art, and that all those disputes proceed from some Mathematicians mistaking that for a demonstration which is not so; but that very thing shews that there are some obscurities in this science. Besides, the same thing may be urged, with respect to the disputes of other learned men. It may be said, that if they closely followed the rules of Logic, they would avoid the wrong consequences, and false assertions which mislead them. Nevertheless we must confess, that there are many Philosophical subjects, concerning which

the best Logicians are incapable of coming to a certainty, by reason of the want of evidence in the object; but the object of the Mathematics is free from this inconvenience. Be it so; yet there is in this object a very great and irreparable defect; for it is a meer chimera which cannot possibly exist. Mathematical points, and consequently the lines and surfaces, globes and axes, of the Geometricians are fictions which never can have a being: they are therefore inferior to those of the Poets; for the latter commonly contain nothing that is impossible, but have at least probability and possibility. Gassendus made an ingenious observation. He says that the Mathematicians, and especially the Geometricians, have established their empire in the land of abstractions and ideas, where they walk at their ease; but that when they get into the country of realities, they soon meet with an invincible resistance. Mathematici, imprimisque Geometrae, quantitate abstrahentes à materia, quoddam quasi regnum sibi ex ea fecerunt quamlibetimum; quippe nullo factu à materie crassitie, pertinaciae impedimento, Quare & supposuere imprimis in ea sic abstracta ejusmodi dimensiones, ut punctum, quod foret proprius immune partibus fluendo lineam, longitudinemve latitudinis expertem crearet, &c. . . . Atque ita quidem suppositiones sunt, ex quibus Mathematici intra purae, abstractae Geometriae cancellos, & quasi regnum consistentes suas illas praclaras Demonstrationes texunt (24). . . . Uno igitur verbo Mathematici sunt, qui in suo illo abstractionis regno ea indivisibilia supponunt, quae sine partibus, sine longitudo, sine latitudine sint, ac eam multitudinem, divisionemque partium, quae ad finem nequam perveniat; non item verò Physici, quibus in regno materiae versantibus tale nihil licet (25). . . . The Mathematicians, and especially the Geometricians, by abstracting quantity from matter, have erected for themselves a sort of empire, where they enjoy the greatest liberty, as they never meet with any obstacle from the grossness and stubbornness of matter. Accordingly they have, in the first place, supposed that in quantity thus abstracted, there are such dimensions as a point, which hath no parts, and a line, or length without breadth, generated by the flowing of a point, &c. . . . Such are the suppositions, by virtue of which the Mathematicians retire within the limits of pure and abstract Geometry, and as it were into a separate kingdom, where they compose their famous demonstrations. . . . In a word, it is the Mathematicians, who in this their empire of abstractions, suppose those things to be indivisible, which are without parts, without length, or breadth, and that where there is a division of parts, it may be carried on in infinitum. It is not thus with the natural Philosophers, who having to do with the material world, and living, as it were, in the empire of matter, cannot take such liberty. He gives an instance of the vanity of their pretended demonstrations, in two subtle Mathematicians who attempted to prove that a finite and an infinite quantity are equal. Nuper Viri praecleari Cavalierius, & Torricellius ostendunt de acuto quodam solido infinito longo & cuipiam latitudine parallelepipedo, cylindroque finito equali (26). Others prove that there are infinite quantities bounded on each side (27). If they find evidence in demonstrations of that kind, ought it not to be suspected, since after that kind, all, it doth not over balance the evidence with which common sense informs us, that what is finite can never be equal with what is infinite, and that infinity as infinity cannot have any bounds? I add, that it is not true, that evidence can accompany those gentlemen quote an author who is very well acquainted with their subtilties. 'It were to be wished, saith he (28), that the analysis of infinitely small quantities, which is pretended to be so admirably fertile, should carry in its demonstrations that evidence which is, and of right ought to be expected in Geometry. But when they argue on the infinite, on the infinite of infinity, &c. they argue on the infinite of infinity, and so on, without ever finding terms to stop them, and when they apply to finite magnitudes, these infinites of infinites, those whom they would either instruct or convince, have not

confute it. There are some who more regret the loss of these two books, than that of twenty

(39) *Ibid.* pag. 430.

EXTRACTS
from a letter,
written by the
Chevalier de
Méru, to Mr
Pascal.

'not always the penetration requisite to see clearly in: to such profound abysses . . . (29) Those who are accustomed to the old ways of reasoning in Geometry, do not easily quit them to follow such abstract methods; they choose rather not to go so far than to engage in the new paths of the infinite of infinite of infinite, where one doth not always see very clearly about one, and where it is easy to go astray without perceiving it. For it is not sufficient, in Geometry, to conclude, we must evidently see that the conclusion is just.'

It is a pretty good prejudice against the Mathematics, that Mr Pascal despised them even before he gave himself up to devotion. He had been passionately fond of the Mathematics, and had made extraordinary progress in them. He was, besides, endued with a very solid judgment, and very few people were capable of knowing the value of things better than he. It was not by his conversion to the only thing necessary, that he became disgusted at these sciences which had so charmed him. It was the examination of the thing itself; and the reflexion he made on the discourse of a layman, which cured him of his prepossession. It would be foolish to imagine that the Chevalier de Méru attacked him with pious reflexions. He undoubtedly made use of no other than Philosophical considerations: Let us see the effect of them, and cite the beginning of a letter from him to Mr Pascal. 'Do you remember you told me once that you were no longer so fully persuaded of the excellency of the Mathematics. And now you write to me that I have wholly undeceived you, and discovered to you some things which you had never seen, if you had not known me. But yet, Sir, I do not know whether you are so much obliged to me as you think. For you still retain a habit, which you have got from that science, viz. of not determining on any thing whatsoever, otherwise than by your demonstrations, which most frequently are false. The tedious ratiocinations drawn from line to line perplex you in a more sublime knowledge which never deceives . . . but you will continually remain in those errors into which the false demonstrations of Geometry have plunged you, and I do not believe you entirely cured of the Mathematics, as long as you affirm that the little bodies, concerning which we disputed the other day, may be divided in infinitum (30).' The Chevalier de Méru makes him afterwards several objections on the divisibility of matter in infinitum. Some of them are pretty good, and others very bad, and look rather like pleasantry than ratiocination; it is truly surprising that the same letter should be mixed with so many unequal things. The author, nevertheless, boasts of a prodigious ability in the sciences of which we are speaking. You

(30) Lettres de Mr le Chevalier de Méru, num. 19, pag. 60, Dutch Edit.

(31) *Ibid.* pag. 63.

(32) It should be Fermat.

(33) Hoetius, ubi supra, Axiom. xv, num. 3, pag. 31.

(34) *Ibid.* num. 2, pag. 23, & seq. See also from page 14, to page 19.

Another passage of the Chevalier de Méru's letter runs thus: 'I put you in mind that besides this natural world, which falls under the cognizance of ourselves, there is another invisible, and that it is in the latter

V O L. V.

that you may attain to the most sublime knowledge.

'Those who only consider the material world, commonly judge very ill, and always grossly, like Des Cartes, whom you so highly esteem, who did not know the space of places otherwise than by the bodies which fill them But without undertaking to convince him of this error, know that it is in this invisible world, of an infinite extension, that we are enabled to discover the reasons, and principles of things, most hidden truths, the fitness, exactness, and proportion, and the true originals and perfect ideas of all that we search (35).' This is the conclusion of his letter to Mr Pascal: I beg leave to say that I do not apprehend what he drives at; for his expressions are so loose and indefinite, that one may draw conclusions from them, which would be quite contrary to what he must have thought and represented. His design was to cure Mr Pascal entirely of the fondness he had for the Mathematics: he therefore intended to point out to him another object than that of this science, to point it out to him, I say, as the source and seat of those truths after which we aspire; and yet he describes to him an object which very nearly resembles that of the Mathematics: For they do not consider this world which falls under the cognizance of our senses, but that invisible world, of an infinite extension, where we may discover the fitness, proportion, &c. I believe he intended to recommend the Philosophy of ideas, the most subtle Metaphysics, which only tend to the contemplation of spirits, and the intelligible world which is in the mind of God: but the characteristics, which distinguish that science from the Mathematics, have not been considered by him; nor did he remember that the Mathematics have this principal property of considering extension as separated from matter and every sensible quality. Extension, or intelligible matter, is their object as sensible matter is that of Physics (36). Their excellency, according to the Ancients, consists in disengaging us from perishable corporeal things, and raising us to those which are spiritual, immutable, and eternal. Thence it proceeded that Plato disliked the conduct of some Mathematicians who attempted to verify on matter their speculative propositions (37). I shall here transcribe a most excellent passage of Plutarch, which turns on a saying of Plato, that God is continually employed in Geometrical exercises (38). 'This saying . . . intimates . . . what he himself has often mentioned, when he praised Geometry as a science that takes men off from sensible objects, and fixes their thoughts on such as are intellectual and eternal, the contemplation of which is the end of all Philosophy, as the viewing of mysteries is the end of mystical religion: for of all the mischiefs

(35) Chevalier de Méru, ubi supra, pag. 68, 69.

which arise to us from that sympathy in pain and pleasure which fastens the soul to the body, this is the greatest, that it renders sensible things more evident to us than intellectual, and forces the understanding to judge, rather according to passion than reason: for man being accustomed by his feeling of pain or pleasure, to regard the mutable and uncertain nature of bodies as a thing actually subsisting, grows blind, and loses the knowledge of that which really subsists, and destroys that instrument and light of the soul, which is worth a thousand bodily eyes, and by which alone the Deity can be discerned. Now in all the other Mathematical sciences, as in plain and smooth mirrors, the images and marks of the truth of intellectual objects appear, but Geometry chiefly, as being the parent of all the rest, withdraws, and, as it were, purifies and sets loose the understanding from the thoughts of sensible objects: and therefore Plato himself reprehended Eudoxus, Archytas, and Menechmus, for endeavouring to reduce the doubling of the cube to Mechanical operations, as if it was impossible to find out two lines which could be demonstrated to be mean proportionals. For he objected to them that all that was good in Geometry would be lost and corrupted, if it was made to fall back again to sensible things, instead of rising higher and contemplating those immaterial and immortal images, to which God was always attentive, and of which he was also the cause (39). Several passages of Aristotle (40) inform us, that quantity, as disengaged

(36) Hec est illa quantitas, que dici solet materia intelligibilis ad differentiam materie sensibilis que ad Physicum spectat; illa enim ab hac per intellectum separatur, ac sola intellectu percipitur. Biancanus, de natura Mathematicarum, pag. 6.

(37) Plutarch, in Marcello, pag. 305.

(38) Τὸν θεὸν δὲ διὰ τὴν γεωμετρίαν Deum semper geometriam tractare. Plut. Sympos. lib. viii, cap. ii, pag. 718. Note, that the Moderns, who doubt of the existence of bodies, might make use of this maxim, and say, that the action of God upon our minds, whereby he communicates to us the ideas of extension, and those of numbers, and motion, and of the relations of swiftness to space and duration, &c. is only a Geometrical work.

(39) *Ibid.*

(40) Vossius, de Scient. Mathematicis, pag. 4, & lib. quinta them.

7 S

twenty or thirty dramatical pieces, or that of the best Historians of antiquity.

from whatever falls under the senses, is the object of the Mathematicians. And the greatest part of the Mathematicians own, that this object exists no where but in the mind. Dr Barrow disapproves the granting this (41). His censure falls expressly on the Jesuit Blancanus and on Vossius; but it is certain that Blancanus was in the right, and ought not to have been censured for any thing besides asserting the possibility of the existence of the globe and triangle &c. of the Geometricians: 'Ultimo dici potest: hæc entia esse possibilia, quis enim neget Angelum, aut Deum esse posse efficere (42)?' ----- In the last place it may be said that these are possible Beings; for what man will pretend that an Angel, or that GOD cannot produce them? There is no need of a long discourse to shew it impossible that this globe, or that triangle, &c. should really exist; we need only remember that such a globe placed on a plane, would only touch it in one indivisible point, and that rolling on the plane, it would touch it always in a single point. From whence it will result, that it must be wholly composed of unextended parts; but that is impossible, and manifestly includes this contradiction, that an extension would exist and not be extended. It would exist according to the supposition, and it would not be extended, since it would not be at all distinct from

a being not extended. All Philosophers agree that the material cause is not distinct from its effect; wherefore what would be composed of unextended parts, would not be distinct from them: but whatever is the same thing with an unextended being, is necessarily an unextended thing. Our Divines, when they teach that the world was produced out of nothing, do not mean that it is composed of nothing: the word *nothing* doth not signify the material cause of the world, *material ex qua*; but the state antecedent to the creation of the world, which they call *terminum à quo*, and they acknowledge that taking the word *nothing* in the first sense, it is absolutely impossible that the world should have been made of it. Now it is not more extravagant to assert, that the world was made of nothing as of its material cause, than to affirm that a foot of extension is composed of unextended parts (43). It is not therefore possible that either an Angel, or God himself, should ever produce the triangle, the plane, the circle, &c. of the Geometricians; and therefore Blancanus deserved on this head to be censured.

I leave my readers to determine whether my censure of the last passage of the Chevalier de Mézière is well grounded.

(41) Compare with this what has been said above, at the beginning of the remark (C), in the foregoing note.

ZEUXIS, a very famous Painter, flourished four hundred years before CHRIST, towards the XCVth Olympiad [A]. What we know of his country is a little confused

[A] He flourished towards the XCVth Olympiad.] Mr Moreri is guilty of a fault in saying only that Zeuxis lived in the LXXXVIIIth Olympiad

(1) for he ought to have known that Pliny, who exactly specified the time when this Painter lived (2), namely in the fourth year of the XCVth Olympiad (3), refutes those who have placed it in the LXXXIXth. I am surprized that Scaliger hath not observed this in his note on the place of Eusebius, which makes Zeuxis to flourish in the LXXXVIIIth Olympiad. Eusebius deserved to be censured; since it is undeniable, without contradicting almost all those who speak of Zeuxis, that he was very intimately known to Archelaus King of Macedon. But there were two of the name of Archelaus, and the first not having begun his reign, according to Eusebius's chronology, before the beginning of the LXXXVIIIth Olympiad, Zeuxis must be arrived at a very remarkable old age, if the time of his flourishing fell on the LXXXVIIIth Olympiad, and if nevertheless he painted at Archelaus's court. I own these things are not incompatible; but let that be as it will Eusebius was too forward; he ought to have referred Zeuxis to the reign of this Macedonian King. I shall observe by the way, that the manner in which the Ancients place the chronology of illustrious men, may tend to confusion. The year of their birth and that of their death ought to be specified, and not the time when they flourished; for that is indefinite and uncertain, it is early or late in a man's life, according to tempers and opportunities: some are at the highest pitch of their reputation at the age of thirty. Others do not reach it till sixty. This makes me recollect the proof which Pliny uses against those who place Zeuxis in the LXXXIXth Olympiad. He refutes them by this reason, that it is an Olympiad wherein we must necessarily place the Painter who taught Zeuxis. This reason may pass, considering the time when Zeuxis appears in Pliny: but if we change in the text the LXXXIXth Olympiad into the LXXIXth, as Father Hardouin hath done on the authority of the manuscripts, Pliny's reasoning will hardly appear just; he will refute those, who say that Painter flourished in the LXXIXth Olympiad, he will refute them, I say, by shewing that to be the time where the master of Zeuxis ought to be placed. But why must this time be assigned to him? Because Zeuxis did not signalize himself before the end of the XCVth Olympiad. This is a weak reason. Must not a Painter grow famous till sixty years after his apprenticeship? I would therefore prefer the common reading of Pliny to that of the manuscripts in the king's library. I do not impute to fo

learned a man as Father Hardouin, what I am going to say; his Printers must have left out some numbers. He pretends that Suidas agrees with Pliny on the time of Zeuxis, since Suidas, relying on Aristotle, places the birth of this Painter in the LXXXVth Olympiad, and makes him flourish in the time of Ilocrates. A little after he refutes the vulgar reading of Pliny, concerning the LXXXIXth Olympiad, by reason that it is evident even from what he had just before cited out of Suidas, that Zeuxis died in the LXXXIXth Olympiad. I am sure that if my eyes do not deceive me, Father Hardouin's Printers have confounded the numeral letters of the original.

As for the rest I would not depend too much on the time specified by Pliny; it seems to me to be wrong. 'Ab hoc (Apollodoro) artis fores apertas Zeuxis Heracleotes intravit, Olympiades nonagesima quinte anno quarto, audentemque jam aliquid penicillum (de hoc enim adhuc loquimur) ad magnam gloriam perduxit, à quibusdam falso in octogesima nona Olympiade positus, cum fuisse necesse est Demophilum Himeræum, & Neseam Thasium, quoniam utrius eorum discipulus fuerit, ambigitur (4). ----- (4) Plin. lib. 36, cap. 19. Apollodorus having discovered the first rudiments of this art, Zeuxis of Heraclea improved it in the fourth year of the XCVth Olympiad, and from that infancy of glory in which it then was, brought it to the highest perfection. Some authors falsely place him in the LXXXIXth Olympiad: whereas Demophilus Himeræus, and Neseas Thasius, must have flourished at that time, it being doubted of which of these two Painters he was the disciple.' There is no need of being very nice about the time of the reputation of a great man, and it were easy to prove, from this author's own words, that he had been more exact, if he had marked the chronology somewhat more generally. For what doth he mean by this fourth year of the XCVth Olympiad? Does he mean that before this year Zeuxis lived in obscurity, and did not begin to make himself known till then? But this is not a proper way of specifying the time when any person flourished; it ought to be specified with respect to a reputation of some continuance; and if Pliny had done otherwise with regard to Zeuxis, he would have been very much mistaken. In effect, he informs us that this Painter did not give his pieces for nothing, till after he was exceeding rich. But when he gave them away Archelaus was living; for the present of his Pan to Archelaus is one of the examples of his liberality related by Pliny. He had therefore acquired vast riches and a great reputation by painting before the death of the last Archelaus, of the XCIVth that is, before the end of the XCVth Olympiad (5); and

(41) Isaac Barrow, Lect. V, pag. 85.

(42) Blancanus, ubi supra, p. 7.

(1) Mr Hofman has committed the same fault.

(2) Mr Felibien, pag. 56, of his 1 Entretien sur les Vies & sur les Ouvrages des Peintres, places Zeuxis in the XCVth Olympiad; but the Printer has committed a fault in making this Olympiad answer to the year of the world, 583. It should be 3583. Vossius, de IV Art. popul. places him also in the XCVth Olympiad.

(3) I do not mean with the utmost exactness. See the following citation.

(5) Edition places the death of Archelaus, in the third year of the XCIVth Olympiad.

confused [B]. Painting was then in the first degree of its lustre : From that beginning of reputation to which Apollodorus had brought it, he raised it to a great perfection. Some authors tell us, that it was he who invented the manner of disposing lights and shadows (a) [C] ; and it is agreed on all hands that he excelled in the art of colouring. Aristotle (b) found fault with his pictures for not expressing the manners or passions ; yet Pliny observes the contrary, with regard to his picture of Penelope, in which, faith he, *Zeuxis seems to have painted her manners* (c). He acquired immense riches (d) ; and once made a shew of them during the celebration of the Olympic games, where he appeared in a cloak embroidered with gold letters expressing his name. After he became so rich, he would no longer sell his works ; but gave them away, and said very frankly, that he could not set a price on them equal to their value. Before this time he made people pay for the sight of them ; and none were admitted to see his Helen but for ready money ; whence in gallery the Wits called that picture, *Helen the Courtesan* (e). He made no scruple of placing under her portrait the three verses of the Iliad, where Homer relates that honest Priam, and the venerable old men of his council, agreed that the Greeks and Trojans were not to blame for exposing themselves during so long a time to so many evils for the sake of Helen, whose beauty equalled that of the goddesses (f). I cannot well determine whether this Helen of Zeuxis was the same which was at Rome in Pliny's time, or that which he drew for the inhabitants of Crotona, to be placed in Juno's temple (g). It will not be improper to relate here what Zeuxis required from the Crotonians with respect to that picture. They had by great sums of money prevailed on him to come to them, in order to get many of his paintings, with which they intended to adorn their temple ; and when he acquainted them that he intended to draw the picture of Helen [D], they were very well pleased, because they knew his principal excellence lay in painting of women. He then asked them what beautiful virgins they had in their city, and they conducted him to the place where young lads learned their

(a) Luminum umbrarumque invenisse rationem traditur. *Quint. lib. xii. cap. x.*

(b) De Poët. cap. vi.

(c) Plin. lib. xxxv. cap. ix. pag. m. 199.

(d) Id. ibid.

(e) *Ælian, lib. vi. cap. xii.*

(f) *Valerius Maximus, lib. iii. cap. vii.*

(g) The same author says, that Zeuxis's *Marlysa* bound up, was to be seen in the temple of Concord. *Zeuxidis manus vidi, says Petronius, nondum versutatis injuria victas.*

(6) In the Life of Pericles.

(7) *Lib. xxiv. cap. viii.*

(8) *Chiliad. VIII, Histor. cxcvi.*

(9) *Lib. ii. de Inventione.*

(10) *Plin. lib. xxxv. cap. ix.*

(11) *Var. Hist. lib. iv. cap. xii. & lib. xiv. cap. xvi. & xvii.*

(12) *Harduin. in Plin. Tom. v. pag. 199. Jacob. Proust in Cicero. lib. ii. in Invent. Note, that the Antients, who were contented to call him Heracles, have done worse than if we should now-a-days denote a man's native country, by saying that he was born at Clermont.*

(13) See Plutarch's passage concerning Apollodorus, in the remark [C].

(14) *La Mothe le Vayer, Lett. ix. in the tenth volume of the Edit. in 12mo. pag. 76.*

(15) *Pliny not quoted by La Mothe le Vayer, informs us of it, lib. xxxv. cap. ix. Deprehenditur tamen Zeuxis grandior in capitis articulo : This last word he should have translated joints and not members.*

(16) *La Mothe le Vayer quotes lib. xii. Inft. cap. xvi. but it should be cap. x.*

and consequently Pliny would have been strangely mistaken, if he had placed the beginning of his reputation in the fourth year of the XCVth Olympiad. For my part, I believe that a medium ought to be taken betwixt Eusebius and Pliny, the rather because we read in Plutarch (6), that this great Painter flourished when Pericles caused a great number of public edifices to be built, and made Phidias the surveyor of them. But without alledging that Pliny (7) places Phidias in the LXXXIVth Olympiad, it is certain that Pericles caused these edifices to be built several years before his death, which happened in the LXXXVIIth Olympiad. Wherefore it doth not appear that Pliny had a great deal of reason to refute those who placed Zeuxis in the LXXXIXth Olympiad, and to make him then but a young disciple.

[B] *What we know of his country is a little confused.* For though the testimony of Tzetzes (8), who makes him a native of Ephesus, should not make us doubt that he was born at Heraclea, since Cicero (9), Pliny (10), and *Ælian* (11) agree, in affirming it ; it is not a little perplexing to choose out of such a great number of cities which had the name of Heraclea, that where Zeuxis was born. Some conjecture that it was Heraclea, near Crotona in Italy (12).

[C] *Some authors tell us, that it was he who invented the manner of disposing lights and shadows* (13). The glory of invention being that on which men set the highest value, Moreri should have informed his reader of that passage in Quintilian. Whereas he assures us, that the art of shading, in the fine pieces of Zeuxis, was beyond any price. Thus on one side he forgets the principal part, and on the other he stretches the thing too far. He forgot to tell us, that Zeuxis was the inventor of the mixture of lights and shadows in pictures ; and, without any ground, he saith, that it was the art of shadowing which rendered Zeuxis's pieces inestimable. His mistake happened thus. He had read in an author (14) from whom he took several things, that it was observed of Zeuxis that though his pieces, wherein the art of shading appeared first of all, were beyond any price, yet he was guilty of the fault of giving them gratis ; yet he was guilty of the fault of representing the heads larger than they really were, as he did also most of the members (15) : In this Quintilian (16) observes that he did no more than imitate Homer, whose beautiful ladies are robust, and in good case : Moreri, I say, had read this, and did not know how to make use of it. He ought to have extracted out of it what was blamed in the works of Zeuxis ; but above all, he should have taken this observation that the art of shading was the invention of this Painter. At least, after having left it out, he should not have

connected the words that go before it with those that come after ; for by this means he hath falsified the passage of *la Mothe le Vayer*, which wanted to be mended instead of being falsified. What makes me say so, is, that this famous writer lays down for a certainty, that the true reason why Zeuxis discontinued the selling of his pieces, was because it was not possible for any person to pay the true value of them. This is taking that Painter's words too literally (17), he probably did not think as he spoke : and if he had really believed it, he had been the most extravagant braggadocio in the world ; and consequently his rodomontade should not be alledged as a just reason. It is very probable that the pieces which he presented after his being very rich, were not better than those which he formerly sold ; for it is not customary to finish what one has a mind to give gratis, more than what one designs to sell at a dear rate. To which purpose I remember it is commonly said, that an Abbot's sermons are better whilst he is aspiring after a bishopric than after he hath obtained it. And therefore if Zeuxis's reason had been true, he should have left off selling his works sooner than he did. I was surprized not to find Quintilian's observations amongst those which *Felicien* hath given us concerning Zeuxis. Mr Hofman hath translated Moreri's expression somewhat ambiguously ; for the words, *Donare opera sua, inter quæ Umbra eminebant, instituit*, as he has turned them, seem to signify, that there was one of Zeuxis's pieces in which he had painted the shadows, which picture was the most excellent of his works. Besides, the word *eminebant* doth not seem designed for *umbra* in the Painters stile ; for no places appear to have less relief in painting, than those expressed by shadows (18).

[D] *To draw the picture of Helen.* It is an inexcusable omission in Charles Stephens, in Lloyd, Moreri, and Hofman, to have said nothing of the picture of Helen, but that Zeuxis painted it, tho' the Antients have related so many remarkable particulars concerning it. Charles Stephens hath only cited Pliny, who spoke of it by the by ; he should have quoted Cicero and *Ælian*, who have touched on the circumstances. Lloyd and Hofman only cite, properly speaking, in the same manner as Charles Stephens : for tho' they refer us to Cicero, it is plain that it is with regard to Zeuxis in general, and not with respect to Helen's picture ; this, I say, is plain, because they refer us also to Plutarch, in the life of Pericles, where he doth not treat of this picture. By the Printer's errors we find Cicero cited in Mr Lloyd's Dictionary thus ; 2. *de Juventut.* and in that of Mr Hofman also, lib. 2. *de Juventut.* instead of lib. 2. *de Invent.* which is enough to make several

(17) *Postea donare opera sua instituit, quod ea nullo satis digno pretio permutari posse diceret. Plin. ubi supra.*

(18) See *Vossius de Graphice, pag. 69.*

(b) Quorum nomina multi poetæ memorie tradiderunt, quod ejus essent judicio probatæ qui verissimum pulchritudinis habere judicium debuisset. *Cicer. lib. ii. de Invent.*

(i) Tantus diligentia ut Agrigantini facturus tabulam quam in templo Junonis Lacinie publice dicarent, inspexerit virgines eorum nudas & quinque elegerit, ut quod in quaque laudatissimum esset pictura redderet. *Plin. lib. xxxv. cap. ix.*

(f) Id. *ibid. cap. x.*

(19) De Græphice, pag. 69, in libro de IV Artib. popular.

(20) Cælius Rhodiginus, *Antiq. Lect. lib. xix. cap. xxvii. pag. m. 1086.*

exercises. This gave him the most favourable opportunity possible of seeing if they were beautiful, and well shaped throughout; for they were stark naked; and he appearing very well pleased, they gave him to understand, that he might judge thereby whether they had beautiful virgins in their city, since they had the filters of those young lads whom he most admired. He then desired to see the most beautiful, and the council of the city having ordered all the virgins to come together to the same place, that Zeuxis the city having ordered all the virgins to come together to the same place, that Zeuxis might have his free choice, he selected five; and by taking from each of them what was most charming in her, he formed the picture of Helen. These five maids were highly extolled by the Poets on account of their beauty which had obtained the approbation of the man who was the best judge of it (b) [E], and accordingly their names did not fail of being consecrated to posterity: however I do not believe there is now any trace of these names. Cicero, who informs us of all these particulars, hath left his reader to guess, that the Painter desired to see those five young beauties stark naked: but Pliny expressly affirms it; nay he says that before Zeuxis chose these five, he had seen all the Crotonian virgins in that condition (i). It is true he affirms, that Zeuxis painted for the Agrigantines, and not for the Crotoniates, and doth not name the picture: excepting this, it is plain he relates the same story with Cicero. I must not forget that Zeuxis disputing the prize of Painting with Parrhasius lost it (k) [F], in the following manner. Zeuxis had painted some grapes so extremely well, that the birds flew down to peck at them. And Parrhasius painted a curtain so artfully, that Zeuxis taking it for a real one, drawn before his antagonist's work, asked with the utmost confidence, why they did not immediately draw that curtain in order to shew what Parrhasius had done. Having found

several readers believe that Cicero wrote *de Juventute* as well as *de Senectute*. Vossius (19) hath censured Bulengerus, for saying in his book of Painting, that it was Venus and not Helen whom Zeuxis painted, from the five living originals placed before him: but in correcting this fault, Vossius himself hath committed another; he says that Pliny mentions as expressly as Cicero, that Zeuxis painted Helen. But it is not true that Pliny mentions it; he speaks in general of a picture. Observe, that Cælius Rhodiginus, speaking of the picture of Helen, the courtesan, has committed a gross solecism (20). Zeuxis, saith he, *pictura nobilem, inter cetera ejus artificii, baud parum multa quæ circumferuntur, & hominum desideria vix expleat. Helenam quandoque ab eo expictam ferunt, cui tantum sanè attribuerit, ut non temere nec quemlibet, ac (ut Græci dicunt) ὡς ἑταίρα, spectatum admitteret, ni πῦρ ἀπὸ πυρρός, id est propositam pecuniæ quantitatem erogasset.* The like faults in language have escaped the best authors.

[E] These five maids were highly extolled. . . on account of their beauty, which had obtained the approbation of the man who was the best judge of it. One might very well doubt whether the five maids whom Zeuxis chose, were each of them handsomer than those whom he did not chuse. The reason of this scruple is, that he designed only to unite in one body, the particular beauties which he found separated in those five maids: to which purpose there was no necessity that they should be all very beautiful; it was sufficient that some of them had the beauties which the others wanted. But who can deny that there are some women of indifferent beauty, who if you only compare one single part with the same in another, will, in that, surpass the greatest beauties. Wherefore it doth not appear that Cicero, or the Poets of whom he speaks, were necessarily in the right to prefer those five Crotonian maids, chosen by the Painter of Helen, to those who were passed by. Perhaps the Painter rejected some, who wanted very little to render them perfect beauties; but who were not at all for his purpose, because he found the same beauties they were endued with, in a more eminent degree in one of the five: after which it was enough for another of the five, tho' but indifferently handsome, to have that very small thing which was wanting in those whom he refused. The question, as every body sees, is not important, it may be laid aside; and if any person should assert that Zeuxis chose the finest five of them all, not by reason of it's being necessary to his design, but to enjoy a more agreeable sight, I will not oppose him. One of the chief grounds of this story is what is commonly said, that nothing in the world is perfect. And this holds true especially in relation to beauty. I appeal to the criticisms which handsome women pass upon one another, and yet they do not see every thing, as Zeuxis did, being, without doubt, resolved not to follow the method of

which Horace speaks in his second satire of the first book.

Ne corporis optima lyncæis
Contemplerè oculis, Hypsæa cæcior, illa
Quæ mala sunt spectes. O crus! O braccia! verum
Dèpygis, nasuta, brevi latere ac pede longo est (21).

Be not too eagle-eyed to view a grace;
And blind, as Hypsæa is, to spy a fault;
For such as judge by faults are often caught.
How neat her arm! her leg! 'tis true, but stay,
Her waste is short, her feet are splay.

CREECH.

The truth is, this Painter had no need of any thing, besides his own imagination, to draw the picture of a compleat beauty; for it is certain that our ideas go beyond nature. 'Ego sic statuo, nihil esse in ullo ge- nere tam pulchrum quo non pulchrius id sit unde illud ut ex ore aliquo quasi imago exprimitur, quod neque oculis, neque auribus, neque ullo sensu percipi potest, cogitatione tantum & mente complectimur. . . . Nec verò ille artifex (Phidias) quum faceret Jovis formam aut Minervæ, contemplantur aliquem quo similitudinem duceret, sed ipsius in mente intuens, in eaque defixus, ad illius similitudinem fidebat species pulchritudinis eximia quædam, quam artem & manum dirigebat (22). . . . In my opinion, there is not any thing, of whatever kind, so beautiful as that idea from which it is expressed, and of which it is only, as it were, an image or representation; an idea which is not the object of the eye, or ear, or of any other of the senses, but of our thoughts alone, and can only be perceived in the mind. . . . Phidias, when he made the statue of Jupiter, or that of Minerva, did not set up for his pattern any particular person: but he had in his mind a certain noble and exalted idea of beauty, which he regarded steadfastly, and attentively followed as the model of his work.' It would not be more impossible to find men as accomplished as the heroes of romances, than it would be to find as beautiful women as the heroines of the same fabulous country. This is so true, that when authors would in few words represent any one perfectly beautiful, they content themselves with saying, that the person surpasses the ideas of Poets and of Painters (23).

[F] Zeuxis disputing the prize of Painting with Parrhasius, lost it. The fact relating to the birds which Zeuxis deceived by his painted grapes, is commonly related after a very confused manner. But if Pliny was well consulted, authors would not fall into that confusion; for they would there see that Zeuxis drew two several pictures which related to this fact, and that each had it's particular adventure. I do not take

(21) See *ibid.* Robert and Henry Chenevix Trenchard, *Remarks on the State of Virginia*, in *the North American Review*, 1789, p. 100. *Noting can be more beautiful.*

Tout ainsi ce qui est le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

Le corps d'un homme.

found his mistake, he confessed himself outdone, since he had only deceived birds, whereas Parrhasius had imposed on the very masters of the art. Another time he painted a boy loaded with grapes, and the birds flew also to this picture; this displeased him, and he ingenuously owned that his work was not sufficiently finished, since if the boy had been as naturally expressed as the grapes, the birds would have been afraid of him. We are told that he wiped out the grapes and only kept the figure, in which he had least succeeded (1). Archelaus King of Macedon employed Zeuxis to adorn his palace with paintings; on this occasion we have in Ælian a fine reflexion of Socrates (m). One of this Painter's best pieces was a Hercules strangling some dragons in his cradle in the sight of his affrighted mother: but he himself preferred his Athlet, or wrestler, before all the rest, and under it placed a verse which afterwards became famous (n) [G]. It is

(1) Senec. Contr. v. lib. v.

(m) Ælian. Var. Hist. lib. xiv. cap. xxvii.

(n) Adeo tibi in illo (Athleta) placuit ut verum subiceret celebrem ex eo, invisorum aliquem facilius quam imitatorum. Plin. ubi not supra.

notice of what several authors relate, that Zeuxis himself attempted to draw Parrhasius's curtain; for Pliny doth not tell the story so: but this is an alteration of circumstances too inconsiderable to say any thing more of it. There is much more reason to think it strange, that Moreri's Dictionary should say nothing of the challenge or wager of these two Painters, and that Lloyd and Hofman have given but a very small hint of it. As for what relates to the other piece, wherein the boy carried grapes, Mr Moreri hath mentioned it in a manner which is not much to his honour, since he hath omitted the principal circumstances, not having given the least hint of the judgment which Zeuxis himself made of this piece; Mr Hofman hath not forgot this, but he makes use of a phrase which he ought entirely to have suppressed; *eadem ingenuitate*, saith he, *proffit* (Zeuxis) *iratus operi ac dixit*. These words are Pliny's, and are extraordinary proper in the original, where they relate to the story of the wager, that is to say, to Pliny's narrative, with what ingenuity Zeuxis owned that he was outdone. But when, in an article where there is nothing of this ingenuity, they tell us that Zeuxis acknowledged with the same ingenuity, &c. they throw us into impenetrable obscurities, and we can only conjecture, that the author gives us an imperfect passage. Most abbreviators are subject to this fault (24). Mr Hofman is on this head much more excusable than Mr Lloyd; for the latter having retained the phrase, *eadem ingenuitate proffit*, which he found in Charles Stephens, might easily think that it concerned a particular to which the reader of Charles Stephens was referred. But Mr Lloyd hath suppressed this reference, and by this means hath increased the obscurity of his article. Not that I pretend wholly to excuse Charles Stephens, for his *ut in Parrhasia supra vidimus*, could not give him a right to make use of these words, *eadem ingenuitate proffit*, because he had not been speaking of the success of the wager. The article of Zeuxis is much better in Calepin (25), than in all the Dictionaries which I have just mentioned. But I have not found any author who hath worse expressed the dispute betwixt these two Painters, than he who makes the greatest figure in the commentary *variorum* on Valerius Maximus (26). He affirms that Parrhasius painted some birds on a cloth, so very naturally, that Zeuxis fearing the judgment of the birds, with a modest ingenuity gave up the cause. I am very much mistaken if his phrase, *Zeuxis altum judicium timens* is not a corruption of Pliny's words, *Zeuxis altum iudicio timentis*; and if so, what greater instance can there be of the alterations made in thoughts of authors?

(24) Some instances of it may be seen in Gronovius's book de perinde Jude. See the Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, 1684, for May, Art. vi.

(25) The quotation out of Pliny, ought to be mended. It should be lib. liii, instead of xxvii. Charles Stephens, and Father Cancelli, in his Valerius Maximus, in usum Delph. quote, lib. iv.

(26) His name is Oliverius. See Valerius Maximus Variorum, of Leyden, 1655, pag. 314.

(27) Secondo Lancelotti da Perugia Abbate O. lietoano, l'Hogidi Part. ii, Distingano, xv, pag. 308.

Let us remember that Lancelotti of Perugia, takes all that is said of these two pictures to be fabulous. He doth not believe that the birds pecked at Zeuxis's vine, nor that Zeuxis mistook for a real curtain that of Parrhasius. It is thus that he clears himself of the objection, which this affords to those who have a mean opinion of the Moderns; he denies the fact; a very convenient way of solving difficulties. 'Oh, Zeusi con l'uva dipinta, dite voi, trasse gli uccelli à beccarla, il che non habbiamo d'alcuno de' nostri mentovati di sopra. Già io hò dato dentro con un libro di Farfalloni contra gli antichi Historici, & hocci rotto, come suol dire il Volgo, un paio di scarpe, intendina come vogliono i presenti o' posteri bell' Ingegneri, e però non temo, che sono millanterie della Grecia, e Farfalloni di Plinio, e quello dell'uva, e quelli de gli animali, che dessero segno di riconoscimento altri della loro specie fatti di colore per naturali (27). - - - But Zeuxis, you will say, painted grapes so well that he incited the birds to fly down, and peck

VOL. V.

at them: and this is not related of any of the Moderns. 'I have already published a book, wherein I expose the idle stories of the ancient Historians. . . . Let the present, or succeeding, Virtuoso's understand this as they please, yet I doubt not but that the story of the grapes, and that of the animals, who mistook a picture for living creatures of their own species, are nothing but the vain boasts of Greece, and the idle stories of Pliny.' Mr Perrault, full as zealous for the Moderns as Lancelotti, hath hit upon a more solid answer; for he alleges the like performances of a fresh date, which also prove that the nicety of painting doth not consist in that. His words are (28): *It is said that Zeuxis represented some grapes so naturally, that the birds flew down to peck at them. But what is surprizing in this? A great many birds have killed themselves against the Heaven of Ruel's perspective, by attempting to pass beyond it, without any person being surprized at it, and even this has not been much insisted upon in praising of that perspective. . . . (29) Some time since, going by the English men, I was an eye-witness of an adventure full as honorable to the art of painting, as the story of Zeuxis's grapes, and much more diverting. A new painted picture was set to dry in Mr le Brun's yard, the door of which was open; in the fore-part of the piece a great thistle was perfectly well represented. An honest country-woman went by with her ass, which seeing the thistle, suddenly ran into the yard, threw down the woman, who in vain strove to hold him in by his halter, and if a couple of lusty young fellows had not each of them bestowed on him fifteen or twenty blows with a cudgel to force him to retire, he had eaten the thistle, I mean, that it being newly painted, he would have licked off all the painting with his tongue. . . . Pliny also relates, that Parrhasius so naturally counterfeited a curtain, that Zeuxis himself was deceived by it. The like deceptions happen every day, whilst the pieces which deceive are not at all esteemed. Cooks have a hundred times laid bold of partridges and capons naturally represented, in order to spit them; and what followed? The company laughed, and the picture remained in the kitchen.*

(28) Perrault, Parallèle des Anciens & des Modernes, Tom. i, pag. 136, Dutch Edit.

(29) Id. ibid. pag. 137.

[G] Under it be placed a verse, which afterwards became famous.] If we believe Plutarch (30), this verse was placed under the pieces of Apollodorus. He doth not say that Apollodorus himself put it there, as Vossius (31), and Father Hardouin (32) affirm; he saith, in general, that it was written on the works of Apollodorus, *ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις ἐπιγράφεται, μνησται τις μάλλον ἢ μιμήσεται*. Cujus operibus inscriptum fuit, Facilius hæc culpabit quis quam imitabitur. . . . It was inscribed on the works of Apollodorus, It is easier to blame this picture than to imitate it. This is not the only thing Plutarch ascribes to Apollodorus, instead of attributing it to Zeuxis, as others do; he will have it also that Apollodorus invented shadows in Painting, *ἀνδράπων πρῶτον ἐξερῶν ὁμοῦν καὶ ἀπὸ ῥασιῶν σκιάς*. Primus hominum invenit colorum temperationem diversorum & umbræ coloribus exprimenda rationem. The whole passage runs thus: *Apollodorus, the first inventor of the tempering of colours, and of the art of expressing shadows, was an Athenian, on whose works was written,*

(30) Plut. de Gloria Atheniens. pag. 346.

(31) De Graphicis, pag. 79.

(32) In Plin. Tom. v, pag. 200.

One may more easily blame, than imitate this picture.

A French Poet (33) shewing the like assurance, faith of his Franciade in the following verses,

(33) Ronfard: see his Life.

Un lit ce livre pour apprendre,
L'autre le lit comme envieux:
Il est bien aisé de reprendre,
Mais mal aisé de faire mieux.

7 T

Some

not improbable that he highly valued his Alcmena (o), since he presented it to the Agrigentines. He did not value himself on quickly finishing his works [H]. It is said that having painted an old woman, he fell into such an excessive fit of laughter at the sight of that picture, that he died of it. This is what Verrius Flaccus relates (p) [I]. There is in Lucian a description of a picture of Zeuxis which deserves to be read: that picture represented a female centaur. I had collected several particulars for this article, which I suppress, on account of the publication of Junius *de Pictura Veterum* (q) [K]. I shall here insert a remark which was in the additions to my project: it relates to a book of Carlo Dati [L]. I shall not forget the first remark which I made in the article Zeuxis of my project. It points out some general defects in Moreri's Dictionary [M].

*Some read my book to learn, some to condemn,
'Tis harder to write better than to blame.*

[H] *He did not value himself on quickly finishing his works.* Plutarch relates that Zeuxis being informed that Agatharchus boasted of painting with ease and great dispatch, said, that as for his own part, he valued himself upon his slow performance, because that was the way to make his works of a long duration (34). The same Plutarch, in another book (35), relates the story, as if Zeuxis owned to some people who blamed his slowness, *That it is true he was long in painting his pieces, but they were designed for a long time.* All writers make him answer, *that he painted for eternity*: and thus this thought has lately been applied to the Dictionary of the French Academy, in the preface to that of Furetiere. It is the business of those, who amplify the boasting of this Painter, to see what authority they have for it.

[I] *This is what Verrius Flaccus relates.* He adds two verses which allude to this adventure,

*Nam quid modi facturus risu denique,
Ni pictor fieri vult qui risu mortuus est?*

*He sets no bounds to his immoderate laughter,
Thinking who laughs to death must be a Painter.*

But if it be true that Zeuxis died in this manner, how is it possible that so few authors should mention it? Was there any thing so remarkable in all his life as this extraordinary death? However, among the many Antients who have mentioned Zeuxis, only Verrius Flaccus informs us of this uncommon particular. And that by chance, and so improperly, that he is reprimanded by his abbreviator Pompeius Festus, for inserting such a thing in a work wherein he designed to treat of the signification of words. I wish we had the passage of Verrius Flaccus entire: what remains of it, was in the most deplorable condition in the world, before Joseph Scaliger applied his divining criticisms to it. Had Moreri and Hofman known this, they would doubtless have mentioned it, as they should have done, and then they had given us the two Latin verses a little more intelligible. Honeft Ravilius Textor (36) hath not inserted our Painter in his catalogue of those who died of laughing: which is doubtless an involuntary omission.

Observe, that Simon Majolus, Bishop of Volturara, is very much mistaken in relation to this fact. Zeuxis Pictor, *saitb* be (37), deformissimam spectans quandam picturam solutus in risum expiravit. Verrius alter pictor quod Anum quandam deformissimam pinxisset eandem mortem in risum solutus obiit, Rhodigino teste lib. 4. cap. 18. - - *The Painter Zeuxis, at the sight of a very deformed picture, fell into such an excessive fit of laughter, that he died of it. Verrius, another Painter, having drawn a most deformed old woman, fell into the like fit of laughter, and also died of it, as Rhodiginus testifies.* There is a very considerable omission in what he saith of Zeuxis, and a very great mistake in the rest: for this pretended Painter Verrius, who died of laughter, is a chimerical person: besides, Rhodiginus is very ill cited. See the margin (38); you will admire the metamorphosis of the thoughts transcribed by some compilers, which is sometimes as surprising as those of Ovid.

[K] *On account of the publication of Junius de Pictura Veterum.* I had rather refer to the excellent and learned collections of Junius, than heap up things which are to be found there. I take this opportunity to observe, that this work of Junius, printed at Rot-

terdam by Reinier Leers, would, perhaps, have yet lain hid in some study, if the Abbot Nicaise (39) had not made a thousand efforts to procure the edition of it. They forgot to acquaint the public of this in the preface. This excellent work is dedicated to the Abbot Bignon, one of the most illustrious protectors which the sciences at present have, and who by his wit, eloquence, and extensive learning, worthily maintains the glory of the name which he bears. Read that Epistle Dedicatory (40).

[L] *It relates to a book of Carlo Dati.* Here is the last piece of the additions to my Project: 'Since the printing of this article I have met with a book, which would have saved me a great deal of labour, if I had had it sooner. It is the life of Zeuxis, written in Italian by Carlo Dati, and printed at Florence in 1667, together with those of Parrhasius, Apelles, and Protogenes. The author hath collected whatever he found relating to those four Painters in the works of the Antients, and hath very exactly connected the whole; besides, he hath added to each life, several remarks, full of very fine and curious erudition. Those which relate to the life of Zeuxis would afford me a great deal of matter, if I was not in the last page of my Project. I shall only observe that they have informed me of a particular of which Vossius was ignorant; that is, that Bullingerus was not the first who said that Zeuxis painted Venus and not Helen, from the living originals which he selected out of the beautiful maids of the city. Volaterranus, and John della Casa, before him, mistook the one for the other; and what is more, Lippius hath somewhere said (41), that it was Juno and not Helen that Zeuxis painted. I observe by the way, that Carlo Dati hath censured Pliny without good reasons. He believes, that because the temple of Juno Lacinia was near Crotona in Calabria, the Agrigentines did not employ Zeuxis to paint a piece in order to be consecrated in that temple. But were not the temple of Delphi, and that of Jupiter Olympius filled with the gifts of all sorts of people, as at present our Lady of Loretto is filled with *Ex Voto's* from all Catholic countries?'

When I published what you have just read, I did not know that Tassoni fell into the same error, with Justus Lippius. *Questi fu colui, saith* be (42), *speaking of Zeuxis, che chiamato da gli Agrigentini, o Tassoni, Poeti diversi, si come hanno altri voluto da i Protoniati (43), a fare il ritratto di Giunone, il copiò dalle fattezze più belle di cinque vergine da loro elette fra un numero infinito, che ne vide d'ignude. - - Zeuxis was the Painter, who, being desired by the Agrigentines, or, as tells an error of others will have it, by the Crotoniati, to draw the picture of Juno, copied it from the most beautiful features and shapes of five of their naked virgins, who had been singled out from an infinite number of others.* The Italian is not less liable to ambiguities than the dead languages: if a Frenchman should place his words as they are in Tassoni, one would think, with reason, that he said that Zeuxis saw naked an infinite number of virgins, and that out of this great number, the inhabitants of Agrigentum chose five to serve as an original for this Painter. But the circumstances of this picture should not be related after this manner.

[M] *Some general defects in Moreri's Dictionary.* I shall set down another piece of my Project, transcribed from pag. 387. 'I do not pretend to propose this article as a perfect model: the world will do me sufficient justice, if they find it exempt from some faults which prevail in Moreri. That author's manner of citing books, is certainly a great fault;'

(o) Mr Felibien, pag. 66, says *Ambalanta* instead of *Alcmena*.

(p) At the word *Pictor*.

(q) It was printed since my Project in the year 1694.

(34) Plut. in *Vita Pericli*, pag. 159.

(35) *Idem*, de *Multitudine A-micorum*, pag. 94.

(36) See his *Officina, or Theatrum Historicum*, lib. ii, cap. lxxxvii.

(37) Simon Majolus, *Dierum Canicularium*, *Colloq. iv*, pag. 165. Edit. Romanæ, 1597.

(38) Zeuxis pictorem risu e-mortuum prodidit Verrius, dum animum à se pictam ridet affluentius. - - Verrius relates that Zeuxis died of laughter, at the picture which he had drawn of an old woman. Cælius Rhodiginus, lib. iv, cap. xviii, pag. m, 207.

(39) Concerning his good offices to authors, and his zeal for the promoting of learning, see Mr Nicaise's preface against the Que-tists.

(40) It is very well written, and ascribed to Father de la Basse.

(41) Lipp. Moreri. *Politi. lib. i, cap. 11.*

(42) *Alessandro Tassoni, Poeta diversi, lib. x, cap. xxi, pag. 414.*

(43) It is likely that the poet Tassoni had the poet Tassoni in his eye.

'fault; he heaps up all his quotations at the end of each article, without letting us know that such a thing was said by this, and such a thing by that author; he therefore gives his reader a great deal of trouble, since he is sometimes obliged to knock at five or six doors before he can find the person with whom he would speak. This is a predominant fault in several other books, the consequences of which were well known to a very able and judicious writer, who hath lately given us the History of the

Roman Emperors (44). To this I add, that Mr Moreri advances a thousand things, which we either do not find at all in his citations, or which he confirms by no evidence, or which are curtailed by the omission of certain circumstances, which are the most material parts of a fact, and afford the greater pleasure. To conclude, I say, he doth not always represent persons by what is most remarkable in them. And I think those faults will not be discovered in my article of Zeuxis.'

(44) Mr de Tillemont. The first volume of his book was printed at Paris, in 1690. (See Mr de Beauval's Journal, for the month of June 1691.) His manner of citing in that work, is extremely exact.

Z I A, or Z E A, an island of the Archipelago, one of the Cyclades, was antiently called Ceos, or Cea. It is ten thousand paces from the promontory of Attica, formerly called Sunium (a), and at present *Capo delle Colonne*. It was antiently part of Eubœa, but the sea separated it, and afterwards washed away almost one fourth part of its length, which was five hundred stadia, or sixty two thousand five hundred paces (b) [A]. In Strabo's time, the four cities which had been in the isle of Cea, were reduced to two, one of which was called Julis, and the other Carthæa (c). One of the two ruined cities bore the name of Careffus, and the other that of Pæcessia. There was in the neighbourhood of these two last towns a temple dedicated to Apollo Smintheus; and betwixt the ruins of Pæcessia and this temple, was that of Minerva Nedusia, which Nestor consecrated after his return from Troy (d). I have elsewhere mentioned (e) the names of some illustrious personages born in the isle of Cea, and (f) whatever relates to it with respect to Aristæus the inventor of honey. I must add here, that a woman of this island invented the art of spinning the production of the silk-worms, and of weaving it into stuffs [B]; and that it was the custom of the inhabitants to poison themselves as soon as they were arrived at a certain age [C]. The port of Zia is one of the securest harbours in the Mediterranean, besides, the ships there take in fresh water, biscuit and wood (g). The island

(a) Plinius, lib. 10, cap. xii, pag. m. 453.

(b) Id. ibid.

(c) Strabo, lib. 10, pag. 335. See also Pliny, ibid.

(d) Strabo, ibid.

(e) In the article Julis.

(f) Above, in the first article of ARISTÆUS.

(g) Guillet, Athenes ancienne & nouvelle, pag. m. 85.

pays

[A] Its length was five hundred stadia, or sixty-two thousand five hundred paces. Pliny affirms it: Mr Baudrand is therefore mistaken in asserting, on the testimony of this author, that the circuit of the isle of Cea was formerly sixty thousand paces (1). There is a great difference betwixt the circuit and the length of an island; however, he ought to have followed the account of his author without any diminution. He adds, that at present the circuit of this island is scarce forty thousand paces, the sea having swallowed up a part of it.

(1) Baudrand. Geograph. Tem. i, pag. 251.

[B] A woman of this island invented the art of spinning the production of the silk-worms, and of weaving it into stuffs. Pliny and Solinus affirm it. 'Ex hac (insula) profectam delicatorem feminis vestem, auctor est Varro (2). . . . Varro relates that the fine garment worn by the women, came from this island.' 'Ceos que ut Varro testis est, subtilioris vestis amacula arte lanificæ scientiæ prima in ornamentum feminarum rite dedit (3). . . . Ceos, which as Varro testifies, first produced, by the art of manufacturing wool, the fine garments which the women wear for ornament.' What follows is more exact. 'Telas araneorum modo textunt (bombyces) ad vestem luxumque feminarum, quæ bombycina appellatur. Prima eas redordiri, rursumque texere invenit in Ceo Mulier Pamphila, Latoi filia, non fraudanda gloria excogitata rationis, ut denudet feminas vestis (4). . . . The silk-worms spin webs in like manner as spiders: these webs serve for the luxurious apparel of the women, which are called silken garments. The art of first spinning, and afterwards weaving, these webs was invented in the isle of Ceos, by a woman named Pamphila, the daughter of Latous: she must not be deprived of the glory of having invented this garment, which makes the women's shapes appear to greater advantage.' Aristotle (5) furnished Pliny with this particular. Salmasius pretends that Aristotle's words ought to be understood of the isle of Cos, and that Pliny is mistaken in understanding them of the isle of Ceos (6). His pretension is not utterly groundless, but it is not incontestable.

(2) Plinius, lib. 10, cap. xii, pag. m. 453.

(3) Solin. cap. vii, pag. m. 23.

(4) Plin. lib. 10, cap. xii, pag. 515.

(5) Aristot. Hist. Animal. lib. 9, cap. xix, pag. m. 649.

(6) Salmas. in Solin. pag. 144.

[C] It was the custom of the inhabitants to poison themselves as soon as they arrived at a certain age. It is pretended that they were obliged to this by a law. Strabo, on this subject, cites two verses of Menander, and believes that the persons who had passed the age of sixty, were obliged to conform to that law, that a sufficient store of provisions might be left for the rest of the inhabitants. Παρά τούτοις δὲ δοκεῖ τεθῆναι νότος νόμος, ὃ μὲν μάλιστα Μινέρδης:

Καλὸν τὸ Κάϊον νόμιμον εἶναι Φανία
Ὅ μὴ δύναμεν ὅτι καλῶς, ἢ ζῆ κακῶς

Προσέταττε γὰρ ὡς τοῖκεν ὁ νόμος τὰς ὑπὲρ ἑξήκοντα ἔτη γεγονότας κοινάζεσθαι, τὸ διαρκεῖν τοῖς ἄλλοις τὴν τροφήν. i. e. Apud hos lex posita aliquando videtur, cujus meminit etiam Menander:

Optimum Ciorum institutum est Phania
Qui non potest vivere bene, non vivat male.

Jubeat enim, ut videtur, lex, eos qui sexaginta annos excessissent, cicutam bibere, ut aliis victus sufficere (7). (7) Strabo, lib. 10, pag. 335. There seems to have been once a law among this people, which Menander mentions,

Brave edict of the Cean commonweal,
Let not the man live ill, who can't live well.

It therefore seems that this law enjoined that those who exceeded sixty years should drink hemlock juice, to the end that a sufficient quantity of provisions might be left for the rest of the inhabitants. He also says it was reported that the inhabitants of this isle being besieged by those of Athens made a decree, by which they condemned to death all the old men whereupon the Athenians retired. The Greek word κοινάζεσθαι in Strabo ought to be changed into κοινεάζεσθαι which signifies to drink the juice of hemlock. This is Casaubon's conjecture (8), which he confirms by two passages, one out of Heraclides, and the other out of Ælian. The first of these authors saith that the air of the isle of Cea is so good, that men, but more especially women, might live there to a great age; but that they do not make any advantage of this favour of nature, and before they suffer the infirmities of a frail old age, they dispatch themselves out of the world some by the use of poppy, and others by that of hemlock. Οὐσὲς δὲ ὑγιαίνουσιν τῆς νήσου, καὶ εὐχάρων τῶν ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστὰ δὲ τῶν γυναικῶν, ἢ περιμένονσι γῆραι τοῖς λαυτῶν, ἀλλὰ πρὶν ἀσθενῆσαι, ἢ ἀπρωθῆναι τι, οἱ μὲν μύκωνι, οἱ δὲ κωνεῖν ἑαυτοὺς ἐξάγουσι. Quam salubri celo fruatur hæc insula, ex- tremam senectam attingere ibi hominibus datur, præsertim feminiis, non expectant tamen provecere ætatis qui sunt, sed illud anteverunt priusquam vel imbecillitas accedat, vel parte aliqua manci fiant, ita ut hi celeriter seipsum quidem papaveri, illi vero cicutæ sibi ipsi vitam eripiant. (9). As for Ælian, he affirms that those who by the reason of a decrepit age found themselves incapable of law.

(8) Casaub. Comment. in hunc locum Strabonis, pag. m. 165.

(9) Heraclides, de Politia, pag. m. 20. Note that Berkelius, in Stephani Byzantinum, sæmimis, non expectant tamen provecere ætatis qui sunt, pag. 431, falsè fatum suum, sed illud anteverunt priusquam vel imbecillitas accedat, vel parte aliqua manci fiant, ita ut hi celeriter seipsum quidem papaveri, illi vero cicutæ sibi ipsi vitam eripiant. (9). As for Ælian, he affirms that those who by the reason of a decrepit age found themselves incapable of law.

doing

(b) Spon, Voiage,
Tom. i, pag.
149, Dutch
Edition.

pays to the Turk seventeen hundred piastres for the Caracab, and two thousand five hundred by way of tenth (b). The Bishop of Thermia passes half the year in this island (i): it hath at present a large city and a ruined castle. Consult Moreri's Dictionary at the word Zea. He should have referred the reader to this word, rather than to that of Cea, when he set down the word Zia.

doing service to the public, assembled together at a festival and drunk the juice of hemlock. Νόμος ἐστὶ Κεῖαν, οἱ πάντες παρ' αὐτοῖς γεγραμμένους, ὡς περ ἐπὶ ξενία παρακαλοῦντες αὐτοῦ, ἢ ἐπὶ τινα ἱερῶν καὶ θυσιῶν ἀνελθόντες, καὶ σεβασάμενοι, πίνουσι κύνειον, ὅταν αὐτοῖς συνέδωκον, ὅτι πρὸς τὰ ἔργα τὰ τῇ πατρίδι λυσιστελοῦντα ἀχρηστοὶ εἰσιν, ὑποληψάμενοι ὅτι αὐτοῖς καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς διὰ τὸν χρόνον. Consuetudo est apud Ceos, ut ii, qui senio plane confecti sunt, tanquam ad convivium se mutuo invitent, aut ad quoddam solenne sacrificium conveniant, & coronati cicutam bibant: quum sibi ipsi confecti sunt, se ad promovenda commoda patriæ inutiles amplius esse, animo jam ob ætatem delirare incipiente (10). Pinedo (11), Kuhnii (12), and Berkellius (13), approve of Casaubon's correction, and there is no room to doubt of it's being a good one. Scaliger (14) citing the passage of Strabo reads κνωιδέσθαι, and not κνωιδέσθαι. Here is another of Casaubon's conjectures: he believes that Stephanus Byzantinus (15), who relates the same particular with Strabo, but instead of telling us that the old men drank hemlock juice, faith that they fought duels together, ἀγωνίζεσθαι, in certamine dimicare, made use of a copy of Strabo where the reading was κνωιδέσθαι or κνωιδέσθαι in arenam descendere, and not κνωιδέσθαι. Berkellius rejects this conjecture on pretence that it is contrary to the practice of the old men of Ceos, and to the testimony of Historians (16); but he did not in the least apprehend Casaubon's thought; he fancied that Casaubon supposed that this word might be that of Strabo, whereas he should have known that Casaubon supposed the copy of Stephanus Byzantinus to be corrupted. Mr Kuhnii offers another conjecture, which is that the reading in Strabo was ἀκνωιδέσθαι to drink aconite or wolf-bane (17): the change of that word into ἀγωνίζεσθαι might very easily happen. Pighius had before him told us that the text of Stephanus ought to be corrected in that manner (18).

We must now examine whether this practice of the old men of Cea was founded on a decree of the state or barely on one of those customs, which being once linked with the notions of a greatness of soul, are almost as strictly observed as the legal decrees. We have seen that Strabo was of opinion that there was an edict, which obliged them to kill themselves after having passed the age of sixty years. But very probably he is mistaken, for since the air of this isle was very healthful, and the inhabitants lived very long (19), the common-wealth would have been deprived of several robust subjects, who were still capable of serving their country, had they been forced by the authority of the laws to poison themselves at the age of sixty one years. And observe that the expressions of Heraclides insinuate rather a voluntary custom than an obligatory law. Observe also that Ælian's words very clearly specify decrepit persons, and not those who had attained the age of sixty-one. All this tends to refute the opinion of Strabo. If it was true, we could at least prove that this edict was not in force in the isle of Cea in Tiberius's time. The proof which Valerius Maximus hath given us of it, will let us into the true state of the case. Wherefore it will be proper here to consider the circumstances of that writer's narrative: they will make it appear that the public authority did not interpose any farther than to permit those who were weary of living to poison themselves, but not to command those who had passed a certain age to do it. Valerius Maximus before he gives an account of what he saw in the isle of Cea, relates that at Marfeilles a poisoning liquor was kept by the public, and given to those who offered satisfactory reasons to the Senate why they desired to rid themselves of their lives. The Senate examined their reasons with a certain temperance, which neither indulged a passionate and rash inclination to die, nor opposed a reasonable desire of death, whether they wanted to deliver themselves from the persecutions of

ill fortune, or would not run the risk of being forsaken by prosperity. This was the rule of the Senate, they forced no body to poison himself, but granted a permission to do it when they judged it proper: none could kill himself in the due form, and canonically, without being authorized by the sovereign. Venenum cicuta temperatum in ea civitate publice custoditur, quod datur ei, qui causas Sextentis (id enim Senatus ejus nomen est) exhibuit, propter quas mors si illi expetenda: Cognitione virili benevolentia temperata, quæ nec egredi vitæ temere patitur, & sapienter excedere cupienti celerem fati viam præbet; ut vel adversa, vel prospera nimis usi fortuna (utraque enim finiendi spiritus, illa ne perferret, hæc ne destituit, rationem præbet) comprobato exitu terminetur (20). The author adds, that in his opinion this practice at Marfeilles was borrowed from Greece (21); for I have observed, faith he, that it is also in use in the isle of Cea. Upon this he relates that going into Asia with Sextus Pompeius, and passing through the city of Julius, he was present at the death of a lady aged above ninety years. She had declared to her superiors the reasons which induced her to depart this life, after that, she kept her self ready to drink the poison; and as she thought that Pompey's presence would add a great lustre to the ceremony, she caused him to be most humbly supplicated to be present. He granted the favour, and with the most pressing instances eloquently exhorted her to consent to live, but all in vain. She thanked him for his kindness, and prayed that he might be rewarded not so much by the gods whom she was going to, as by those whom she quitted (22). She declared that she had been always favoured by fortune, and would not expose her self to the reverse of it. Ceterum ipsa bilarum Fortunæ vultum semper experta, ne aviditate lucis tristem intueri cogar; reliquias spiritus mei prospero sine, duas filias & septem nepotum gregem superstitum reliqua, permuto (23). She left two daughters and seven grandchildren, and having exhorted them to a mutual agreement and concord, &c. with an undaunted courage she took the glass which contained the poison, and after recommending her self to Mercury to obtain a happy and successful passage, she greedily drank off the mortal liquor. Cobortata deinde ad concordiam suam, distributo eis patrimonio, & cultu suo sacrificiis domesticis majori filiae traditis; poculum, in quo venenum temperatum erat, constanti dextra arripuit. Tum defusus Mercurio delibamentis, & invocato numine ejus, ut se placido itinere in meliorem sedis inferna deduceret partem; cupido hausit mortiferam traxit potionem (24). I omit the rest of the relation; and would not have cited so much, had it not been very rare to find in the heathen writers, the manner of their recommending themselves to the gods at the point of death. I do not remember to have ever observed that they asked the pardon of their sins. Nor do we see that this lady of the isle of Cea put up such a petition.

Let us observe by the way that the heathens admired less those, who killed themselves in their misfortunes, than those who did so, when they were under prosperous circumstances, and only in order to escape the inconsistencies of fate. A man was no sooner possessed with the maxims of the Stoicks, but he looked upon those as cowards who were fond of life during bodily infirmities or disgraceful misfortunes. In such cases death was accounted the only remedy which one ought to have recourse to without murmuring or complaining, and it was pretended that none, but those who loved life, would accuse the gods and men. Orho when dying made use of this maxim. Plura de extremis loqui, pars ignaviae habet, quod de destinationis meae documentum habet, quod de nemine queror; nam inculcare deos vel homines, ejus est, qui vivere velit (25). To say much of this death is an indication of cowardice. I die with this resolution, to complain of no body: for to accuse the gods, or men, is the part of a man who desires to live.

(i) Boadicea,
Geogr. Tom. i,
pag. 251.

(10) Valer.
Maximus, lib. i,
cap. vi, num.
7, in Ext. pag.
m. 180.

(11) E. Grecia
transitum inde
exilium, quod
illam CEA in
insula Cea ferre
ri animadverti
lib. lib. num. 1.

(12) The
quidam, inquit, Sen.
Pompeii Dis
magis, quoniam
quæ, quoniam
peto, quoniam
ferat: quia nec
horatæ vice
meæ, nec mor-
tis spectare de
finitur. lib. 1.
pag. 181.

(13) lib. lib.

(14) lib. lib.

(10) Ælian.
Var. Hist.
lib. iii, cap.
xxxviii.

(11) In Steph.
Byzant. pag.
332.

(12) In Ælian.
ubi supra.

(13) In Steph.
Byzant. p. 421.

(14) Scaliger, in
Varronem de
Ling. Lat. lib.
vi, p. m. 118.

(15) Steph. By-
zant. voce 'Ιουλι-
αί.

(16) Hæc quan-
quam speciosa vi-
dentur, minime
approbanda judi-
co, cum anti-
quæ ritui & Hi-
storiarum plane sint
contraria. Berkell.
ubi supra, pag.
421.

(17) Kuhnii in
Ælian. ubi su-
pra, pag. 233.

(18) Pighius in
Valerium Maxi-
mum, lib. ii,
cap. vi.

(19) See the
quotation out of
Heraclides, a-
bove, num. (9).

ZIEGLER

ZIEGLER (JAMES) professor of Divinity, a Mathematician and Cosmographer, flourished in the XVIth century. He was born at Landshut in Bavaria [A]. He is said to have been a Mathematical professor in the university of Upsal (a). Paul Jovius thought him a Swede, probably because Ziegler wrote some books concerning that country [B]. But that proof will be scarce sufficient to those who should only say that he resided there some time; for he declares himself that he composed his book concerning Scandinavia from memoirs communicated to him while he was at Rome [C]. The Bishop of Passau (b), a very learned prelate, was his Mécenas, and erected a tomb to him in his episcopal city (c). Ziegler had retired to this prelate's court, when the terror of the Ottoman armies obliged him to leave Vienna where he had taught a long time (d). He died in August 1549, and not in 1559, as Moreri says. The reading of some of his books hath been prohibited by the Inquisition; and that of others permitted only on condition that some things be corrected in them, and that the note of condemned author be always placed by the word Ziegler (e). Some Protestant authors acknowledge him as their brother (f). In the year 1523, he was strongly inclined to turn Protestant, as appears by a book which he wrote at Rome in favour of Erasmus against James

(a) Caspar Brufchius, de Laureaca & Patavio Germanico, lib. ii, pag. 273, 274, & in Epitaphio Jacobi Ziegleri, ibid. pag. 322.

(d) Thuan. lib. vi, pag. m. 118.

(e) See the Index Librorum prohibitorum, pag. 546, Edition 1667.

(f) See Mollerus Hypomn. ad Sueciam Literatam, pag. 441.

(a) Schefferus, in Suecia Literata, pag. m. 273. He quotes Mel-senius in Sueo-pentap. cap. vi.

(b) His name was Wolfgang, and he was of the house of the Counts of Salm.

(1) Teiffier, Ad-dit aux Eloges, Tom. i, pag. 20, Edit. 1696.

(3) In the year 1699.

(3) Thuan. lib. vi, pag. 118, Edit. Francof. 1625.

(4) Gefner, in Biblioth. fol. 367.

(c) Page 34, of his Dissertation de Rebus Sueco-Gothicis, apud Mollerum Hypomn. ad Sueciam Literatam, pag. 441.

(6) Paulus Jovius, Elog. cap. cxxxviii, pag. m. 281.

(7) Scheffer, in Suecia Literata, pag. 273, Edit. 1699.

(8) Gefner, in Bibl. fol. 367, veris.

[A] He was born at Landshut in Bavaria. And not at Landau, as we are told in the French translation of Thuanus cited by Mr Teiffier (1). The same thing is asserted with an additional error in Moreri's Dictionary; for it is there specified that James Ziegler was born at Landau in the Lower Alsatia. The Dutch editions, and that of Paris (2), have corrupted this place instead of correcting it; for they have changed the Lower Alsatia into the Lower Germany. Thuanus called him Lindavus (3), which rather signifies that Ziegler was of Lindau than of Landau. However that be, we ought to believe that when Gefner (4), and several others call him Landorum Bavarum, they mean that he was born at Landshut. Paul Jovius is mistaken in making him a Swede. I shall give his own words in the following remark. His error was followed by some authors, as Mr Mollerus observes in his additions to John Scheffer's Suecia Literata page 441. The learned Mr Schurtzschleich (5), does not follow Jovius, but he affirms that our Ziegler was originally a Swede. I do not know any more than Mr Mollerus whether he is in the right.

[B] Paul Jovius thought him a Swede, probably because he wrote some books concerning that country. He quotes with great encomiums what Ziegler wrote concerning the cruelty of King Christian II. 'Quis eo Latinas literas, quo Romana arma penetrare nequierint, pervenisse non miretur? Hic enim in terra Gothica natus, ac educatus, adeo exacte, puriter & facundè, Christianni Danicæ, atque Norvegicæ Regis immanitatem, neque ipsi sanguinario Tyranno diu lætam, neque demum Diis ultoribus neglectam perscriptam, ut eruditus gentibus pudori esse possit; quod Latine facundie fruges, sub Cimmerico cælo penè felicibus ac uberius, quam sub hac benigniore, ac temperatioris plagæ proveniant (6). - - - - Is it not very surprising, that the Latin tongue should reach that country, whether the Roman arms could never penetrate. For James Ziegler, born and educated in a Gothic land, has with so much accuracy, purity, and elegance, described the cruelties of Christian King of Denmark and Norway, in which the blood thirsty tyrant did not long triumph, nor at last escape the avenging band of Heaven, that learned nations may well be ashamed that Roman eloquence, planted in a northern soil, should thrive and prosper better than in this more benign and temperate climate.' Schefferus observes that this book of Ziegler was printed at Strasburg by Wendelin Rhiel in the year 1536 (7). Gefner saith the same thing, but observes that it was printed with some other books of the same author, and with a description of the Holy Land written by Wolfgang of Weissenburg: 'Terræ sanctæ, quam Palæstinam nominant, Syriæ, Arabiæ, Ægypti, & Schondie doctissima descriptio, unâ cum singulis tabulis earundem regionum topographicis. Item, Holmiæ planè regie urbis calamitosissima clades ab eodem descripta: cujus libri & hic titulus est: Christianni secundi regis Danmarciæ crudelitas perpetrata in proceres Sueciæ & populum Holmensem. Volumen impressum Argentorati apud Wend. Rhielium, 1536 in folio cum alia descriptione Terræ sanctæ juxta ordinem alphabeti, ad scripturam proximè directâ, auctore Wolfgango Weissenburgio (8). - - - - A learned description of the Holy Land, called

'Palestine, of Syria, Arabia, Egypt, and Scandinavia, together with Topographical maps, of each of these countries. Likewise the calamitous overthrow of the royal city of Stockholm, described by the same author, in a book intitled; The cruelties perpetrated by Christian II King of Denmark, on the Nobles of Sweden, and the inhabitants of Stockholm. This volume is printed at Strasburg by Wend. Rhiel in the year 1536, in folio, together with another description of the Holy Land in alphabetical order, designed for the understanding of the Bible, by Wolfgang Weissenburg.' This History of the cruelties of Christian is inserted in the second tome of the Scriptores historiæ Germanicæ, printed at Basil by the care of Schardius in the year 1574. It was joined by Wolfius, with Ziegler's Scandinavia, to Albertus Krantz's Historia Regnorum Septentrionalium, of the Francfort edition in 1583. The index Librorum prohibitorum (9) informs us that the description of the Holy Land, &c. was printed at Strasburg apud Petrum Olipionem in the year 1532. Gefner knew not of this edition.

[C] He declares that he composed his book concerning Scandinavia, from memoirs communicated to him while he was at Rome. I shall set down a piece of his preface, extracted out of Gefner's Bibliothecæ in the 368th leaf. 'Ego qui de locis Septentrionalibus, veteri historiæ incognitis, commentarium æditurus sum, atque ita ut illa loca rebus his, unde regiones beatæ dicuntur, affluentia sim ostensurus, ut hac plena fide apud auditorem reponam, necessario quoque præfabor quibus auctoribus confectum susceperim opus. Romæ dum essem, fuerunt in urbe continuo tempore, duo archiepiscopi Nidrosiensis regni Norduegie, prior quidem gente Danus, &c. Post hujus mortem substitutus ei Olavus Romam venit, quem frequenter conveni, & didici reliqua Norduegie, quanta tradi ab uno potuerunt. Gothiam vero, Sueciamque, & Finlandiam, supraque has ad Boream Laponiam extensam, sed etiam Gronlandiæ Chersonesum & insulam Tylen accepi à reverendis episcopis, Joanne Magno Upsalieni, & Petro Aoroseni Gothi, tunc in urbe privatis amicis, & mecum conjunctissime conversatis. Et quidem Upsalienis in commentario Schondie scribendæ antea fuerat, permiseratque id censure nostræ, &c. - - - - As I am going to publish a book concerning the northern countries, which were unknown to ancient historians, and to make it appear that those parts abound in such things as denominate a country happy; in order to gain credit with my readers, I shall give a prefatory account of my vouchers. While I was at Rome, there lived in that city two Archbishops of Drontheim in the Kingdom of Norway, one a Dane &c. After his death his successor Alaus coming to Rome, I frequently visited him, and learned of him the other matters concerning Norway, as much as could be related by one single person. What concerns Gotthland, Sweden, and Finland, and Lapland lying to the north of these countries, and also of Greenland, and the island of Iceland, I had from two reverend Prelates both born at Goth land, who lived at Rome in private friendship and great intimacy with me. And indeed the Bishop of Upsal, one of them, had been formerly employed in writing a book concerning Schoonen, and had submitted it to my amendments &c.'

(9) Page 546, of the edition 1667.

[D] A

7 U

V O L . V .

(g) Remark
[C], of the
article AVENTI-
NUS.
(h) See the Epi-
tome of Gefner's
Bibliothèque,
pag. m. 355.

Stunica [D], and which was printed at Basil by John Froben in the same year. What he wrote on Astronomy is not amiss [E]. There are several other authors called ZIEGLER; some of whom are in Mr König, but not JEROM ZIEGLER professor of Poetry at Ingolstadt in the XVIth century. He published Aventinus's Annals, as I have said (g), and wrote several dramatic poems which are published (b).

[D] A book which he wrote at Rome in favour of Erasmus. The title of it is, 'Libellus Jacobi Ziegleri Landavi Bavari adversus Jacobi Stunica maledictum, pro Germania. The Printer Frobenius faith of it: Commodum à Roma missus est Libellus Jacobi Ziegleri Landavi Bavari, quo promittit perpetuam rerum gestarum seriem ex quatuor Evangelis contextam, & obiter Stunicam pro ipsius dignitate tractat. . . . Videtur hic Landavius homo multæ reconditæque lectionis, ingenio festivo, magno judicio, filo non neglecto, denique toto pectore Germaniam spirans indolem. . . . The book of James Ziegler of Landshut in Bavaria was sent from Rome, at a very seasonable time: in this book he promises to give a continued History from the four Evangelists; and he occasionally takes to task Stunica, in a manner suitable to his deserts. This Bavarian seems to be a man of extensive and curious learning, of a facetious humour, and of great judgment: he seems not to be wanting in stile, and to have all the accomplishments of a German.'

[E] What he wrote on Astronomy is not amiss. At Basil in the year 1536, was published in 4to his book, de constructione solidæ Sphære, cum Scholiis in Opusculum Procli de Sphæra, & de canonica per Sphæram operatione, & de hemicyclo Bersi memorato à Vitruvio (10). Adjunctis Arati phenomenonis Græci, cum Commen-

tariis Theonis. His Commentary on the second book of Pliny; quo diffcultates Pliniana, præsertim Astronomica, omnes tolluntur: item Organum quo catholica siderum, ut apud Plinium est, mira arte docetur, was printed at Basil in 1531. Of this James Milichius speaks honourably in the Preface to a book which he published on that subject in the year 1534, in 4to (11). 'Ex tant, faith he (12), in hunc librum (secundum Plinium) Cigleri hominis docti, Commentarii, erudite & subtiliter scripti, sed neque integrum librum interpretantur, & à scholarum consuetudine nonnulli recedunt. Quare spero eum boni consilium esse, quod Amicis morem gessi, qui mihi autores fuerunt, ut hæc ad utilitatem juventutis collecta ederem. Adeo enim nihil de ipsius exultatione detraho, ut libenter profitear, me ab ipso sæpe adjutum esse. . . . There are extant on this second book of Pliny the Commentaries of the learned Ziegler, which are written with great erudition and acuteness, but they do not explain the whole book, and depart a little from the usages of schools. I hope therefore he will take it in good part that I comply with my friends, who have advised me to publish this commentary for the use of youth. And so far am I from derogating from the merit of Ziegler, that I willingly own I have been frequently assisted by him.'

(11) Father Hensdun, Pref. in Plinium, mentions that edition. I have not seen it, see that of the year 1538, Hæle Swenson, in 4to, mentioned by Gefner; but I have seen that of 1543, in 4to, and that of Leipsic, typis Wargianis, 1573, in 4to. (12) Jacobus Milichius Præf. in Commentarii in II Librum Plinii, Ed. b. 1573.

(10) Lib. ix, cap. ix.

ZOROASTER, King of the Bactrians, was vanquished by Ninus, and passed for the inventor of Magic [A]. Eusebius places this victory of Ninus in the seventh year of Abraham, and several authors make Zoroaster much antienter. There are also some who

[A] He was vanquished by Ninus, and passed for the inventor of Magic. The following words of Justin inform us that this was the last victory of this conqueror, and that Zoroaster philosophized very judiciously on the principles of the universe, and the motion of the stars. Postremum illi (Nino) bellum cum Zoroastre rege Bactrianorum fuit, qui primus dicitur artes magicas invenisse, & mundi principia, siderumque motus diligentissime spectasse. Hoc occiso, & ipse decessit (1). Some (2) ascribe to Semiramis the glory of having vanquished Zoroaster. They doubtless mean somewhat more than what we read in Diodorus Siculus (3), viz. that being gone to her husband at the siege of Bactra, she advised and made an attack, which ended in the reduction of the city. After which Ninus married her. I believe they mean that one of the wars which the gloriously terminated after the death of that great monarch, was that in which Zoroaster lost his dominions. An Historian (4), cited by Syncellus, treats of the birth of Semiramis and of that Magician, after having related the actions of Ninus (5). It is therefore to Semiramis rather than Ninus, that he ascribes the victory of which we are speaking, and I cannot tell whether to confirm this, we might not take advantage of the following Latin Verbes.

Perfarum statuit Babylona Semiramis urbem,

Justit & imperio furgere Bactra caput (6).

Semiramis

Rais'd Babylon, the Persian town, . . .

and had

The Bactrian city rise her empire's head.

Mr Stanley (7) faith, that Zoroaster, according to Eusebius, was cotemporary with Semiramis; but it is certain, that, according to Eusebius, he was vanquished by King Ninus. If what Arnobius faith be true, that magical secrets were used on both sides in this war betwixt the Assyrians and Bactrians, it will be difficult to believe that Zoroaster was the inventor

of that art; for it must be supposed that these secrets quickly passed into Chaldaea, and that they grew to such a great perfection in a very short time, that Ninus's Magicians were able to contend with, and overcome, the inventor. I do not lay this down as an impossibility. But Arnobius's words runs thus: 'Ut inter Assyrios & Bactrianos Nino quondam Zoroastre ductoribus non tantum ferro dimicaretur & viribus, verum etiam magicis & Chaldeorum ex reconditis disciplinis, invidia nostra hæc fuit (8). . . . Antiently the Assyrians and Bactrians, the former under the conduct of Ninus, and the latter under that of Zoroaster, fought against each other, not only with armed men, but also by the help of Magical arts, and the strict discipline of the Chaldeans. Ammianus Marcellinus will have it, that Zoroaster was only the augumenter of the Magical secrets of the Chaldeans (9). Some authors inform us that Azonaces was Zoroaster's instructor, and consequently Azonaces must be considered as the inventor of Magic: 'Hermippus qui de tota ea arte diligentissime scripsit, & vicies centum millia versuum à Zoroastre condita, indicibus quoque voluminum ejus positis explanavit, præceptorum, à quo institutum diceret, tradidit Azonacem, ipsum vero quinque millibus annorum ante Trojanum bellum fuisse (10). . . . Hermippus, who hath written with great care on every thing relating to this art, and explained twenty thousand verses composed by Zoroaster, who was the person who initiated him in this art, and that he lived five thousand years before the Trojan war.' St Augustin (11) and Orosius (12) have followed the tradition mentioned by Justin. Apuleius, in his catalogue of the most famous Magicians of antiquity places Zoroaster in the first rank, and makes him the most antient of all. 'Si quamlibet medicum emolumentum probaveritis, ego ille sum Carinondas, vel Damigeron, vel Moyses, vel Jannes, vel Apollonius, vel ipse Dardanus, vel quicumque alius post Zoroastrem & Hostanem inter Magos celebratus est (13). . . . If you will prove that it is of any advantage, then let me pass for Carinondas, or Damigeron, or Moyses, or Apollonius, or Jannes, or Dardanus himself, or for any other celebrated Magician.' SINCE THE TIME OF Zoroaster and Hostanes.

Observe, that Diodorus Siculus (14), who very amply relates the war betwixt Ninus and the Bactrians, calls

(1) Justin. lib. i, cap. i.

(2) Theo, in Progm. cap. ix, pag. m. 112.

(3) Diodor. Sicul. lib. ii, cap. vi.

(4) Called Cephalon. He lived under Hadrian. See Marston, ubi infra.

(5) Syncellus, pag. 167, apud Marston. Chron. Can. ad Sæcul. ix, pag. m. 144.

(6) Propert. Eleg. X, lib. iii.

(7) Thomas Stanley, Hist. Philof. Orientalis, lib. i, cap. iii, pag. 10, ex verbatim Jo. Clerici.

(8) Arnob. lib. i, pag. m. 5.

(9) Orosius (10) Plinius, lib. xxi, cap. vii, pag. m. 374.

(11) Augustin. lib. xxi, cap. vii, pag. m. 75.

(12) Orosius, lib. i, cap. i.

(13) Arnob. lib. i, cap. vii.

(14) Diodor. lib. ii, cap. vi.

who make him of a much later date: all authors are full of variations on this part of the History of this famous person [B], and scarce agree better on the rest. My readers therefore ought not to expect here any thing besides a heap of uncertainties, and an odd medly

the king of the latter not Zoroastrea but Oxyartes, nor doth he mention any Magic. Yet he relates what he had read in Ctesias, an Historian sufficiently inclined to spread such stories (15). Vossius (16) and Henry Valesius pretend that Justin says that Zoroaster defended himself against Ninus, not only by force of arms, but also by that of Magic. But Justin hath no such thing. The same Vossius affirms, that Justin's relation was taken from the first book of Ctesias, as Arnobius asserts. But this is a new falsity. Arnobius's words are very confused (17), and this fact doth not appear there.

[B] All authors are full of variations concerning the time of Zoroaster. We have seen that he was made contemporary with King Ninus, who, according to Eusebius, died about eight hundred twenty-five years before the taking of Troy. We have also seen (18) that Zoroaster, according to the opinion of Hermippus, preceded the Trojan War five thousand years. Hermodorus, the Platonist, followed the same chronology with Hermippus (19), and Plutarch mentions it as being the most commonly believed (20): but, according to Suidas, the interval betwixt Zoroaster and the Trojan war was but five hundred years. Some very great authors have said that Zoroaster lived six thousand years before the death of Plato: 'Eudoxus, qui inter sapientie sectas clarissimam, utilissimamque eam (Magicam artem) intelligi voluit, Zoroastrem hunc sex millibus annorum ante Platonis mortem fuisse prodidit. Sic & Aristoteles (21). --- Eudoxus, who would have the art of Magic to be accounted the noblest and most useful of all the branches of knowledge, relates that this Zoroaster lived six thousand years before Plato's death. The same thing is affirmed by Aristotle.'

Others, as Xanthus, the Lydian (22), do not make him above six hundred years more ancient than Xerxes's expedition. Others say that he must be looked upon as the same with a Pamphylian, whose name was Er, and who was the son of Armenius, and being risen again twelve days after his death, related what he had seen in the other world (23). His narrations seem to prove that he had read Homer's Iliad, and are at least a demonstrative proof that he lived after the siege of Troy. You will find them in Plato in the tenth book of his Republic (24). It is Clemens Alexandrinus who supposes that this man was the same with Zoroaster, which he proves by this, that the latter declares himself the son of Armenius, and a Pamphylian by birth (25), and divinely instructed in several things in Hell (26). But since Arnobius observes that this Pamphylian, the son of Armenius, was the favourite of Cyrus, we have here a tradition according to which Zoroaster appeared in the world much later than it is believed. *Armenius Zoftriani nepos, & familiaris Pamphilus Cyri* (27), are the words of Arnobius. Valesius observes that *Armenius* is there taken for *filius Armenii* (28); the word *Cyri* seems to him suspicious, he rather inclined to have it *Nini*, because, faith he, the person spoken of is one Zoroaster mentioned in Ctesias's first book. But Ctesias did not begin to speak of the King of Persia till his seventh book; and his six preceding books were employed in relating the actions of the Assyrians and Medes. I answer, it is not at all certain that Arnobius pretends that Ctesias spoke of this son of Armenius. Observe, that several Critics pretend that *Ostani*, or *Hofani*, should be read instead of *Zoftriani*; but they are not aware that they impute a very gross anachronism to Arnobius, for Ostanes having followed Xerxes in the expedition to Greece (29), it is not possible that he should have been grand-father to a friend of Cyrus.

Agathias, who lived in the reign of Justinian, informs, that according to the Persians of that time, Zoroaster, and Hytaspes were contemporary. But they did not say whether this Hytaspes was the father of Darius, or any other. Sir John Marsham positively decides, that it ought to be understood of Darius's father (30), and grounds his opinion on this, that one of the elegies engraved on his tomb, make him the instructor of the Magi; and that the same Historian who affirms that Hytaspes excelled in Magic, styles him the father of Darius (31): 'Deinde (post Zoro-

astrem) Hytaspes Rex prudentissimus Darii pater. Qui cum superioris Indiae secreta fidentius penetraret, ad nemorosam quamdam venerat solitudinem, cujus tranquillis silentiis præcelsa Brachmanorum ingenia potiuntur: eorumque monitu rationes mundani motus & siderum, purisque sacrarum ritus quantum colligere potuit eruditus, ex his quæ didicit, aliqua sensibus Magorum infudit: quæ illi cum disciplinis præfertiendi futura, per suam quisque progeniem, posteris ætatis tradunt. Ex eo per sæcula multa ad præsens unâ eademque profapia multitudo creata, Deorum cultibus dedicatur (32). --- After the time of Zoroaster, reigned Hytaspes, a very prudent king, and the father of Darius. This prince having boldly penetrated into the most remote parts of the upper India, came at last to a solitary forest, where there dwelt a silent and awful tranquility which the Brachmans enjoy. In this solitude these sublime genius's instructed him in the knowledge of the motion of the earth, and that of the stars; and from them he learned as much as he could acquire concerning the purest rites of religion. Part of this knowledge he communicated to the Magi, which, together with the art of predicting future events, they delivered down to posterity, each in his own family. The great number of men who have sprung from these families, ever since that age down to the present, have all been set apart for cultivating the worship of the gods.' Ammianus Merceulinus was in the wrong to say, that this father of Darius was a king, and perhaps he committed this fault upon having read in general, that one King Hytaspes was a great Magician, and believed that there was no other Hytaspes than the father of Darius. But it is beyond dispute, that a certain Hytaspes elder than the foundation of Rome, and a great prophet, is mentioned by authors. 'Hytaspes quoque, qui fuit Medorum rex antiquissimus, à quo annis quoque nomen accipit qui nunc Hytaspes dicitur, admirabilis omnium, sub interpretatione vaticinantis pueri ad memoriam posteris tradidit, sublatum iri ex orbe imperium, nomenque Romanum; multo ante præfatus, quam illa Trojana gens conderetur (33). --- Hytaspes also, the most ancient King of the Medes, and from whom the river Hytaspes derives its name, is the most admirable of them all: for under the interpretation of the prophecy of a boy, he informed posterity that the Roman empire, and even the Roman name, should be utterly destroyed; and this he predicted a long time before the establishment of that colony of that Hytaspes, Trojans.' It ought to be read Hytaspes and not Hytaspes in this passage of Lactantius. Thus some good Critics have corrected two places, where Justin Martyr mentions this Pagan prophet; one of them informs us that he predicted the conflagration of all perishable things; and in the other, he observes, that the reading of his writings was prohibited on pain of death, because they discovered the truths which the Pagans persecuted (34). Κατ' ἐνέργειαν δὲ τῶν θαύλων δαιμόνων, δάνατον ὤρισθε κατὰ τὴν τὰς Τεσσάρων, ἢ Σιγγλλῆς, ἢ τῶν περὶ τὴν βίβλου ἀναγινωσκόντων, ὅπως διὰ τὸ εὖ ἀποστέλλωσιν ἐν ἰσχυρῶν τὰς ἀνθρώπων τὴν καλὴν γνώσιν λαβεῖν, αὐτοῖς δὲ δαλεῖν τὰς κατ' ἐκείνους. ὅπερ εἰς τέλος ἐκ ἰσχυρῶν πρᾶξαι. Opera autem & instinctu malorum dæmonum mortis supplicium adversus librorum Hytaspis aut Sibyllæ aut prophetarum lectores constitutum est: ut per timorem homines ab illis, quò minus scripta ea legentes rerum bonarum noticiam percipiant, sed in servitute eorum retineantur, absterreantur (35). --- For by the powerful influence of the evil spirits, it was decreed, that whoever should read the books of Hytaspis, of the Sibyl, or of the Prophets, should be put to death: This decree was made in order to deter men from reading those books which might lead them to the knowledge of the truth, and in order to keep them in subjection to those evil spirits. I shall observe, by the by, that these books (36), as well as (37) See in what manner Clemens Alexand. Strom. lib. vi, pag. 636, D, speaks of them.

(31) Porphyry, ἐπεὶ ἀποχρεῖ, lib. i, num. 15, apud Marsham, ibid. Valesius, ubi supra, pretends that his elegy was engraved upon Darius's tomb, and not on that of Hytaspes.

(15) Henr. Valesius in Amm. Marcell. lib. xiii, pag. m. 374.

(16) Vossius, de Orig. Idolol. lib. i, cap. v, pag. m. 33.

(17) Arnob. lib. i, pag. m. 31.

(18) In the foregoing remark, citat. (10).

(19) Apud Diogen. Laert. in Proem. num. 2.

(20) Plut. de Iside, pag. 369.

6000

(21) Plinius, ubi supra.

(22) Apud Diogen. Laert. ibid.

2

recta

(23) Plato, de Republ. lib. x, pag. 361.

(24) Pag. 361, & seq.

(25) Clem. Alexandr. Strom. lib. vi, pag. 599.

(26) Compare what has been said of PYTHAGORAS, remark [F], of his article.

(27) Arnob. lib. i, pag. 31.

(28) Henr. Valesius, ubi supra.

(29) Plin. ubi supra, pag. 726.

(30) Marsham. Chron. Can. ad Sæcul. ix, pag. m. 145.

(31) Porphyry, ἐπεὶ ἀποχρεῖ, lib. i, num. 15, apud Marsham, ibid. Valesius, ubi supra, pretends that his elegy was engraved upon Darius's tomb, and not on that of Hytaspes.

inaccurat

(33) Lactant. lib. vii, cap. x, pag. m. 492. In the xviiith chapter of the same book he quotes a passage of that Hytaspes.

(34) Justin. Apolog. II, p. 66.

(35) Id. ibid. pag. 82.

pious frauds

(a) Riffle eodem die, quo genitus esset, unum hominem accepimus Zoroastrem. Eidem cerebrum ita palpitasse, ut impostam repelleret manum, futuræ præfatio scientiæ. *Plin. lib. vii, cap. xvi, pag. m. 35.*

(b) *Id. lib. xi, cap. 42, pag. 592.*

(c) Dio Chrysostomus. *Orat. Boethienica.*

(d) Cedrenus, and Suidas.

(e) Clemens Recognitionum, lib. iv, apud Bochart. *Geog. Sacre, lib. iv, cap. i, pag. m. 231.*

(f) *Id. ib. apud Huetium, Demonstr. Evang. Prepos. iv, cap. v, pag. m. 156.*

(g) *Id. ibid. apud eund. ibid. pag. 152.*

(h) See, above, remark [B], of the article CHAM.

medly of stories. We are told (a) that Zoroaster laughed on the very day he was born, that he is the only person to whom this happened; and that the palpitation of his brain was so strong, that it repulsed any hand laid upon his head, which was a preface of his knowledge. It is added (b), that he passed twenty years in the deserts, and that he there eat nothing but a kind of cheese which never grew old (c); that the love of wisdom and justice obliged him to retire to a mountain to live there in solitude; that when he descended from thence there fell a celestial fire upon it which perpetually burned; that the King of Persia accompanied with the greatest lords of his court approached it in order to put up prayers to God; that Zoroaster came out of these flames without being damaged; that he comforted and encouraged the Persians, and offered sacrifices as if God had accompanied him to that place; that afterwards he did not live indifferently with all sorts of men, but only with those born for truth, and who were capable of the knowledge of God, which kind of people the Persians called Magi; (d) that he wished to be struck with thunder, and consumed by fire from Heaven, and that he ordered the Persians to collect his bones after he was burnt in this manner, and to keep and venerate them as a pledge of the preservation of their monarchy; that they really paid a great veneration to his relics, but that in process of time having neglected them, their monarchy fell to ruin. The chronicle of Alexandria adds, that after having held this discourse with them, he invoked Orion, and was consumed by a celestial fire. Some writers say (e); that Mizraim the son of Ham was instructed in Magic by his father, and (f) that he was burned alive by the Demon whom he too frequently importuned (g); that the Persians adored him as a favourite of God, and a saint whom a thunderbolt served as a vehicle to mount up to Heaven, and as a living star, whence it came, that after his death he was called Zoroaster. Gregorius Turonensis relates very near the same thing of Cuth, the eldest son of Ham [C]. Others will have it that Ham himself was the Zoroaster of the eastern nations, and the inventor of Magic (h). Mr Bochart very well refutes this falsity (i). Cedrenus observes that Zoroaster, who became so famous an Astronomer among the Persians, was descended from Belus. This imports that he was descended from Nimrod. Some authors have taken him for Nimrod himself (k); others for Assur or Japhet. *All the ancient Persians believe Zoroaster antecedent to Moses, nay some Magi affirm that he is the same with Abraham, and frequently call him Ibrahim Zerdashti, as much as to say, Abraham the friend of fire (l).* The eastern Christians say that Zoroaster began to flourish in the reign of Cambyfes, and that he was a native of the Province of Media; but others make him an Assyrian, and pretend that he was a disciple of the Prophet Elijah (m). Ben Sebnab faith, that he was a disciple of Ezra, and that

Hyftaspes, the father of Darius; wherefore it is true that Zoroaster and this Hyftaspes lived at the same time (37). Valefius the younger affirms (38), that according to the testimony of Agathias, some said that Hyftaspes, the doctor of the Magi, was much more ancient than Darius's father. It is certain that Agathias doth not say this, but on the contrary complains, that the Persians did not say whether their Hyftaspes was the father of Darius, or not. I mention this only to shew that the citations of the most judicious authors frequently deceive us, and consequently that prudence obliges us to examine quotations, by whomsoever alleged. I here repeat this observation, though I remember to have made it in other places.

I should never have done, if I should censure all the mistakes of our authors, and mention all their variations, with relation to the chronology of Zoroaster. But what farther confirms Sir John Marsham's opinion is this. It is affirmed that Pythagoras was Zoroaster's disciple, under the reign of Cambyfes, the son of Cyrus. I have elsewhere cited (39) the words of Apuleius, which inform us of the fact. Some understand them as if Pythagoras, having been made a slave in Egypt, was transported into Persia. Others will have him transported into Babylon, and there instructed by Zoroaster the Babylonian, whom they distinguish from the Persian. *Hicse (quingue Zoroastri) addi potest Sextus Zoroaster, sic enim ab Apuleio vocatur, qui Babylone vixit, quo tempore Pythagoras captivus à Cambyse eo deductus est. Idem scriptor eum vocat, omnis divini arcanum antistitem, eoque magistro præcipue usum esse Pythagoram dicit. Videtur idem esse ac Zabratu, à quo Diogenes affirmat Pythagoram purgatum esse omnibus prius vitæ fordibus, & edoctum, quarum rerum probos expertes esse oporteret, uti & Phycam. Idem quoque erit Nazaratas Assyrius, quem Alexander, in libro de Pythagoricis Symbolis, affirmat magistrum fuisse Pythagoræ. Hunc eundem Suidas vocat Zarem, Cyrillus Zaranem, Plutarchus Zaratan (40).*

† In Floridis.

‡ Porphyry. *Vit. Pythagoræ.*

(40) Thomas Stanley, *Hist. Philosophiæ Orientalis*, lib. i, cap. ii, p. 8, 9.

tioned by Apuleius. This Zoroaster lived in Babylon, at the time when Pythagoras was brought thither a captive by Cambyfes. The same writer calls him the chief interpreter of all divine mysteries, and says, that Pythagoras was instructed principally by him. He seems to be the same with Zabratu, by whom, as Diogenes affirms, Pythagoras was purged from all the filth of his former life, and instructed in what good men ought to know, and in Natural Philosophy. He is also the same with Nazaratas the Assyrian, whom Alexander, in his book concerning the Pythagorical symbols, affirms to have taught Pythagoras. The same person Suidas calls Zares, Cyrillus Zaranem, and Plutarch Zarates. These words are taken out of Mr Stanley's book: I do not know what he means when he observes that Apuleius makes use of the expression *Sextus Zoroaster*, which I do not find in the book he cites. Nor am I more certain on what he grounds his assertion, that Pythagoras was brought prisoner to Babylon by King Cambyfes. The words of Apuleius plainly import that he was sent into Egypt with the prisoners of that prince (41). In order to understand this perfectly well, Herodotus should be consulted (42), who relates, that Polycrates, tyrant of Samos, intending to put to death some persons which he suspected to be hatching a rebellion, entreated Cambyfes to ask some troops of him; in which Cambyfes accordingly desiring, Polycrates sent him into Egypt forty sail of ships, in which he embarked these persons, and prayed him not to let them return. Apuleius meant, no doubt, that some persons then delivered by Polycrates to Cambyfes. He doth not speak of the transportation of Pythagoras, either to Persia or to Babylon.

[C] Gregorius Turonensis relates very near the same thing of Cuth the eldest son of Ham. The eldest son of Ham, saith he (43), was named Cuth. The latter was the first inventor of the art of Magic by the suggestion of the devil, and whith the first beginner of idolatry. He was the first who, moved by a diabolical suggestion, made a small statue to be adored:

(i) Bochart. *ubi supra*, pag. m. 231, & seq.

(k) See Huetius, *ubi supra*, pag. 150.

(l) Hieronimus, *Bibl. Orientalis*, pag. 911.

(m) *Id. ibid. et Anabaptismi*.

(41) *Inter captivos Cambyse regis, Ægyptum cum Polycrate (Pythagoras) delatus.* *Flor. pag. m.*

(42) Herodotus, *lib. iii, cap. xlv.*

(43) Gregorius Turonensis, *ubi supra*, lib. i, cap. v.

that this Prophet laid his curse on him, on account of his maintaining some opinions very opposite to the Jewish law; that he became leprous by way of punishment for his impiety, and that being expelled Jerusalem on that account, he retired to Persia, where he set up a new religion (p). Some have taken him for the Prophet Ezekiel (o), and it cannot be denied that they ground their assertion on the agreement of numerous particulars which belong to the one, and are related of the other (p). George Hornius imagines that Zoroaster is the false Prophet Balaam (q). Huetius shews that he was the Moses of the Jews, and mentions an infinite number of particulars, in which the account we have of Moses agrees with the Pagan stories of Zoroaster (r). There are scarce any people who do not believe that there were several Zoroasters, as well as several Jupiters and Hercules's. See Dr Thomas Stanley's treatise which Mr le Clerc hath translated into Latin (s); and you will there find (t) a Chaldean, a Bactrian, a Persian, a Pamphilian, a Proconnesian, and a Babylonian Zoroaster (u). They are in the wrong who believe that Zoroaster taught a diabolical Magic; for his Magic was only the study of the Divine nature, and of religious worship, as Plato expressly declares [D]. But though it is easy to clear him from this accusation, it is difficult to excuse him with regard to the doctrine of two principles, so strong is the presumption that he actually taught that there are two co-eternal causes, one of good, and the other of evil things [E]. Dr Hyde in his excellent

(n) Ibid. pag. 932.

(o) Huetius, ubi supra, pag. 251.

(p) Id. ibid. pag. 458.

(q) Hornius, Histor. Philol. lib. II, cap. IV, pag. 79, 80.

(r) Huetius, ubi supra, pag. 149, & seq.

(s) Intituled, Historia Philosophiae Orientalis.

(t) In the second chapter, of the first book.

(u) See the remark [B], towards the end.

adored: he made men believe that he had power to bring down the stars and fire from heaven. He went to the Persians, who called him Zoroaster, that is, a living Star. Having also learned of him the custom of worshipping fire, they adored him as a god, after he had been divinely consumed by fire.

[D] His Magic was only the study . . . of religious worship, as Plato expressly declares. There are four chosen persons, faith he, appointed to educate the eldest son of the King of the Persians. They choose the wisest, the most just, the most temperate, and the bravest man that can be found. The wisest man instructs him in Zoroaster's Magic, that is, the worship of the gods; besides, he teacheth him the art of government. *Ἄνδρες μὲν μαγίαν τε διδάσκει τὴν Ζωροάστρου τῷ Ὀρμαζδῇ (ὅστις δὲ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ διακρίσις) διδάσκει δὲ καὶ τὰ βασιλικά. Quorum primus magiam Zoroastri Oromasti filii docet, est autem illa Deorum cultus; atque idem tradit instituta regia (44). Observe that Zoroaster is called the son of Oromastus, and that Oromastus is the name which he and his followers gave to the good God, or good principle. Whence to call him the son of Oromastus should seem to be the same, as calling him the Son of God. Dr Stanley conjectures, with great probability, that this last title was really bestowed on him. Hinc colligas verba Platonis esse intelligenda de Mago Persa, qui propter inusitatam eruditionem figuratè, aut fabulose dicebatur filius Dei, aut alicujus boni Genii, quo honore affecti sunt Pythagoras, Plato, alique praestantissimi viri (45). . . . From hence we may infer that Plato's words must be understood of that Persian Magus, who, on account of his uncommon learning, was in an allegorical or fabulous manner, styled the Son of God, or of some good genius: and this honour was also paid to Pythagoras, Plato, and other learned men. Those who desire to see a great many passages which testify, that the Magic of the Persians, instituted by Zoroaster, was the study of religion and morality, need only read Briffonius (46) and Bullingerus (47). Nor is any person ignorant that Gabriel Naudé hath learnedly and solidly justified our Zoroaster against the accusation of the black art (48). He mentions several authors who may be consulted.*

(44) Plato, in Alcibiade I, pag. 441, C.

(45) Stanley, ubi supra, pag. 21.

(46) Briffonius, de Regno Persarum, lib. II, pag. 178, & seq. Edit. Comel. 1595.

(47) Jul. Caesar Bullengerus, Eclog. ad Arnobium, pag. 346, & seq.

(48) Naudé, Apologie des grands Hommes, pag. 234, & seq.

(49) Plut. de Iside & Osiride, pag. 369.

(50) What is omitted here may be seen above, in the article MANICHEES, remark [C], at the first paragraph.

(51) That is, the Persians.

to the good God, and others to the evil demon; and likewise they think, that land animals, such as dogs, fowls, and hedge-hogs, belong to God, and water animals to the evil demon; for which reason they account him happy who kills the greatest number of them. However, these men relate a great many fabulous stories concerning these gods. They say, for instance, that Oromazes sprung from the purest light, and Arimanius from darkness; that they are at war one with another, and that Oromazes made six gods, the first of whom is the god of Benevolence, the second of Truth, the third of Justice, the fourth of Wisdom, the fifth of Wealth, and the sixth of Pleasure which accrues from good actions; and that Arimanius likewise made the like number of demons, all opposite and enemies to the former.

After this, Oromazes having first trebled his own magnitude, mounted up as far above the sun, as the sun is above the earth, and so bespangled the heavens with stars, among which he established one (called Sirius, or the Dog-Star) as a mistress or guide to all the rest. After having made twenty-four gods more, he placed them in an egg-shell. But those who were made by Arimanius (being also of the like number) grated and raised this egg-shell to such a degree, that they pierced it; and ever since that time bad things have been promiscuously mingled and confounded with good. But the fatal and predestinated time will come, when Arimanius, who brought plagues and famines upon the earth, shall be ruined and utterly destroyed by the good gods; at which time, the earth shall be plain, smooth, and level, and there shall only be one manner of life, and one form of government among men, who shall all speak the same language, and live happily. Theopompus also writes, that according to the Magi, one of these gods shall be victorious for the space of three thousand years, and shall be vanquished during as long a time, and that for three thousand years more, they shall contend and fight one against the other, and destroy each others works; till at last Pluto shall fail and utterly perish, then mankind shall be happy, and neither need food nor yield a shadow; and that the god, who has wrought all these things, doth, for some time, take his repose and rest; but that this time is not too long for a god, and would not seem considerable to a man asleep. These are the fables invented by the Magi.

It was not a needless thing to set down this whole passage, since it contains somewhat at large the opinions and precepts of Zoroaster; and we may observe from thence, that the asserters of two principles, involved themselves in several absurdities, when they descended to a particular explanation of their system. I have observed the same thing when speaking of the Manichees (52). But since, according to the most common tradition, Zoroaster must pass for the founder of the Magi, and it appears by a great number of authorities that they admitted a good god, whom they called Oromazes, or Oromafdes, and an evil god whom they named Arimanius; it is very probable that he really asserted this doctrine (53).

6 +

6

triple

long

24

24

3+3=6

sleep

300

(52) Above, remark [B], of the article MANICHEES.

(53) See Diog. Laërt. in Proemio, num. 8, and Agathias Histor. lib. II.

Let

7 X

V O L. V.

excellent treatise on the religion of the ancient Persians, cites some authors who clear him

(54) Ἡ μὲν
ἐν μαγίᾳ
μυθολογία
τοῦτον ἐ-
νεῖ τρέπον.
Hoc modo se
habent magorum
fabule. Plut. de
Isid. pag. 370,
B.

(55) See, above,
the article MA-
NICHEES, re-
mark (C); the
article PAULI-
CIANS, cita-
tion (85); and
the article PE-
RICLES, cita-
tion (71).

(56) Plut. ibid.
pag. 370, F.

(57) Plut. de
creat. animæ,
p. 1014, 1015.
Note, that of the
four summaries
at the margin of
this quotation,
the three last
were made by
Simon Goulart.

natur
stine

WHAT chaos is,
according to Pla-
to, as explained
by Plutarch.

Or the substance
of body, and the
soul of the
world, and what
they are.

Let us observe, that Plutarch having recited what we have seen above, adds, *these are the fables invented by the Magi* (54). If we should infer from thence that he rejected, in general, the whole hypothesis of two principles, the one good, and the other evil, we should mistake his sentiments. He might indeed very well condemn the particular explications of Zoroaster's followers, but doubtless he admitted the whole foundation of their system, that the god whom they called good, is not the cause of any evil. I have cited several passages of his works, wherein he declares himself very clearly on this head, and yet they do not discover the whole foundation of his doctrine (55). Wherefore I shall add here some passages which will more clearly explain it to us. I believe that it agreed very well with the opinion he ascribed to Plato. 'That Philosopher, *saith he* (56), admits two souls of the world, one good, and the other evil; and also acknowledges, betwixt these two, a third cause, which is not without either soul or reason, nor immovable of itself, as some think, but adjacent, and adherent to the other two, yet always desiring and pursuing what is best . . . because the generation, composition, and constitution, of this world, is intermixed with contrary powers, which are not however equal, for the best prevails and is strongest, but it is impossible that the worst should utterly perish; so firmly is it settled in the body and soul of the universe, where it is perpetually at war with the good principle.' In another place he more amply sets forth this doctrine of Plato, and informs us that the original of evil is not lodged in an insensible, inanimate, matter, utterly void of action and qualities, and which is capable of receiving all imaginable forms; but in a matter which moves and is united to a soul, the disorders of which cannot be wholly and entirely corrected. I shall hereafter declare why I cite such a long passage.

(57) The world, saith Heraclitus, was neither created by a God, nor by a man: as if he had been afraid, that, in case we denied that God is the Creator of the universe, we should be obliged to own that man was the architect of it. But, according to Plato's opinion, it is far better to own that the universe was created by God, and in our songs of praise to ascribe the glory of this structure to him, the frame itself being the noblest masterpiece, and God the most excellent architect, and the best of all causes; yet that the substance and matter of the universe were not created, but always subject to the ordering and disposal of the builder, so as to be made as like himself as possible. For the creation was not out of nothing, but out of matter wanting beauty and perfection, like the rude materials of a house, a garment, or a statue lying first in shapeless confusion. For before the creation of the world the universe was a chaos, that is, a confusion or disorder of things: yet this chaos was neither without a body, without motion, nor without a soul: but the corporeal part was without form or consistence, and the moving soul was rash and inconsiderate, without reason or conduct. God did not make a body of that which was incorporeal, nor a soul of that which was inanimate; as the Musician doth not make the voice, but only renders it sweet, tuneful, and melodious, or as the dancer doth not make motion, but only renders it graceful and well-timed: thus God did not make the tangible solidity of bodies, nor the imaginative or moving faculties of the soul; but having found these two principles, the one obscure and dark, the other turbulent and extravagant, both imperfect, disordered, and confused, he so ordered and disposed them both, that of these two principles he made the noblest and most excellent of all animals. Therefore the substance of body is no other than what Plato calls the nature susceptible of all things, and the seat and nurse of all created beings. As to the substance of the soul, in the book intitled *Philebus*, he calls it infinity, or the privation of all number, measure, and proportion, admitting neither of more nor less, greater nor smaller, like nor unlike. As to that substance which he says, in his *Timæus*, is mixed with the indivisible nature, and becomes divisible in bodies, we must not

understand it to be a multitude in unity, or length and breadth in points; for these are qualities more proper to bodies than to the soul; but it is that unlimited principle, moving both itself and other substances, that, which in several places of his writings he calls necessity, and in his treatise of laws he openly styles the disorderly, evil, and mischievous soul. For such was the soul of itself; but at length it was endowed with understanding, ratiocination, and harmony, that it might become the soul of the world. Thus that all-receiving and material principle had both magnitude, space, and distance, but was void of beauty, form, and proportion; however, all these it obtained, when it came to be formed into seas and land, the heavens, the stars, and that infinite variety of plants and living creatures. Now as for those who attribute to matter, *supposing* and not to the soul, that which Plato in his *Timæus* calls Necessity, in his *Philebus* Infinity, and the privation of measure and proportion, they cannot maintain it to be the cause of evil, because Plato always supposes that this matter is void of form or figure, or any other quality or virtue, and compares it with oils that have no scent; such as the Perfumers use in composing their perfumes. For Plato could not possibly suppose that to be the cause and principle of evil, which of itself is sluggish, without any active quality, motion, or inclination; and at the same time give this infinity the epithet of wicked and mischievous, and call it Necessity, which, in several cases, is repugnant to, and rebellious against, God. For this Necessity, which defeats heaven (as he says in his *Politics*) and overturns it, together with that concupiscence which is born with us, and that confusion of ancient nature, which was void of order, before it was formed into its present beautiful shape, whence came they to be conveyed into the various forms and beings, if the subject, which is the first matter was void of all quality whatever, and deprived of all efficient cause? The architect being in his own nature good, intended a frame the nearest approaching to his own perfections. For besides these two, there is no third principle, and if we admit that there is evil, without any precedent cause or principle that produced it, we must fall into the difficulties and perplexities of the Stoics: for of those principles that have a being, it is not possible that either the good one, or the other which is void of all quality, should produce evil. But Plato did not act like those who came after him, who not having perceived and understood the third principle and third cause which is between God and matter, fell into the most strange and absurd proposition imaginable, affirming that the nature of evils came forth casually, and by I know not what accident, or came forth of itself: yet they will not allow a single atom of Epicurus to shift ever so little in its place; for this, say they, would infer that there is motion without any prior cause. Nevertheless they affirm, that vice and wickedness, with a thousand other deformities and imperfections of bodies arise by consequence, and without any other efficient cause (58). But Plato does not say so, for denying that the first matter hath any quality, and removing from God, as far as is possible, the causes of evil, he has written thus concerning the world in his political discourses. The world, says he, received from its maker all things beautiful and good; but as to things evil, wicked, and unjust, in heaven, they proceeded from its exterior habit, and former disposition, and it conveys them to the several animals on the earth. A little lower, in the same treatise, he adds, In process of time, when oblivion encroaches upon the world, the distemper of its ancient confusions prevails more and more, and the hazard is, lest being dissolved, it should again be sunk and plunged into the immense abyss of its former confusion. . . . Plato does indeed give to matter the titles of mother and nurse; but the cause of evil he makes to be the moving force residing within it, and which in body is divisible, a motion not governed by order and reason, though not without a soul, which in his treatise of laws, he expressly calls the soul repugnant, and contrary to that

two principles of things, viz. the Artist and the first matter, he endeavours to explain the cause of evil: but he lets himself, being ignorant of what the holy Scripture says on this subject.

In order to illustrate what is said above, he supposes a third principle between God and matter, and afterwards sets forth Plato's opinion concerning the cause of evil.

(58) See, above, remark (7), of the article CHRYSIPPUS, the Philosopher; and remark (12), of the article PAULICIANS.

him on this head. I shall examine whether they deserve credit [F]. It is even affirmed that

* that other which is the cause of all good. For tho' the foul be the cause and principle of motion, yet it is the understanding which is the cause and principle of the order and harmony of motion: God therefore hath not rendered matter sluggish, but prevented it from being any longer troubled and disordered by an extravagant and inconsiderate cause: neither hath he infused into nature the principles of mutation and passion; but when it was under the pressure of all sorts of passions, and disorderly mutations, he removed all the disorders and irregularities, making use of symmetry, proportion, and number, as the most proper instruments for that purpose.*

This explication of Plato's doctrine concerning the creation of the world, and the original of evil, is one of the most beautiful passages in Plutarch; and though this doctrine is not true, it deserves to be read with attention, and contains several excellent ideas, and sublime conceptions, of a surprising fertility, with regard to those who know how to make good use of consequences. This is the reason which engaged me not to curtail this passage. How many people who shall read this, would not take the pains to recur to Plutarch, if I had only mentioned the pages of the author? Another reason prevented my being contented with this: I here find some particulars, which I shall make use of below (59).

[F] Dr Hyde . . . cites some authors who clear him . . . I shall examine whether they deserve credit.] Those who have read Mr Bernard's journal (60), need not be informed that the *Historia Religionis veterum Persarum*, published by Dr Hyde (61) at Oxford, in the year 1700, in 4to, is one of the most excellent pieces that can possibly be written on such a subject. The idea which the learned journalist hath given of this performance is sufficient to convince us, that it contains a very curious erudition, and profound discussions, which disclose several uncommon particulars, and discover a country which we scarce knew any thing of before. But to come to the matter. Dr Hyde affirms (62), that the ancient Persians acknowledged no more than one sole uncreated principle, which was the good principle, or, in one word, God: and that they looked upon the evil principle as a created being. One of the names which they gave to God was Hormizda, and they called the evil principle Ahri-man. And this is the original of the two Greek words *Ωρεμωδης* and *Αρεμωδης*: one of which was the name of the good, and the other that of the evil principle, as we have seen above (63), in a passage of Plutarch. The Persians pretended that Abraham was the first founder of their religion (64). Zoroaster afterwards made some alterations in it, but it is said that he made no manner of change, with relation to the doctrine of one sole uncreated principle; but that his innovation in this particular, was only the giving the name of light to the good principle, and that of darkness to the evil one (65). Of which here is an evidence (66). *Zerdust affirmavit Lucem & Tenebras esse . . . duo Principia sibi invicem contraria: & sic esse Yezdan & Abreman, qui fuerunt . . . initium eorum quæ inveniantur in Mundo: ex eorum mixtione [scu combinatione] extitisse Compositiones; & ex variis Compositionibus productas fuisse formas. Et quæ Deus qui creavit Lucem & Tenebras, utriusque Autor unicuique sit, sine Socio, sine Pari aut Simili; nec ei referenda sit . . . existentia Tenebrarum, sicut dicunt Zervanite: sed Bonum & Malum, Integritas ac Corruptio, & Puritas ac Spurcitas exiverunt ex mixtione [scu compositione] Lucis & Tenebrarum: & nisi hæc duo commissa fuissent, non extitisset Mundus. Et hæc duo contra se invicem inurgebant & de victoria contendebant, donec Lux vinceret Tenebras, & Bonum Malum. Tum postea saluum evasit Bonum ad mundum suum, & Malum devorabit ad Mundum suum: & sic fuit causa Liberationis. Cumque Deus excelsus hæc duo temperaverat & miscuerat pro arbitrio suo, eoque in Compositione viderat, tum instituit Lucem ut originale quiddam, & indixit existentiam ejus ut existeret. Sed Tenebræ secutæ sunt sicut umbra personam. Nam cum videret eas quodammodo existere, sed non realiter existere, tum planè produxit Lucem, & acquisitæ sunt Tenebræ per consequentiam: nam ex necessitate extitit contrarium, quippe cujus existentia fuit necessaria, sc. ut contingens in creatione, non autem ex primâ intentione, secundum exemplum quod adduxi-*

mus de Personâ & Umbra. These words clearly express, that, in Zoroaster's hypothesis, the two principles, one of good, and the other of evil, Oromazes, Arimanius, or light and darkness, were, properly speaking, no more than second causes, and did not strictly deserve the name of principles: they were the effects of another cause, and the productions of God. There arise several absurdities in the particular explication of the doctrine of this Magus; for he asserted, on the one side, that God alone had produced darkness; and on the other, that its existence ought not to be referred to God. He said, that God mixed the light with darkness, because without this mixture the world could not have been produced; that good and evil, purity and impurity, proceeded from this mixture; that there was a sharp engagement betwixt light and darkness till the latter was overcome; that after its defeat it retired into its own world, and light to its proper world also; that God having mixed these two contraries together, established an original light, and made it exist; that darkness resulted from it as a shadow from a body; for God seeing that darkness existed in some sort, though not really, gave a plenary existence to light, and so to darkness by an inevitable consequence, and not according to the primitive and direct intention of the Creator (67). This chaos of thoughts is incomprehensible to us western people. None but the eastern nations accustomed to a mystical and contradictory language can bear such excessive nonsense without disgust and horror. But be it how it will, may they reply to me, Zoroaster is thus cleared of the principal accusation, and it must no longer be pretended that he acknowledged two uncreated principles, or an Arimanius essentially evil and self-existent. This is what remains to be examined.

I. I answer, in the first place, that it is unquestionable, that the Greek authors, who have ascribed to Zoroaster the opinion of two principles, designed to attribute to him a doctrine contrary to the common Theology, as well as to the principles of the Aristotelians and Stoics: those two sects agreed with the people on this head, that the same God who pours down good upon the earth, pours down evil also; and that if he punishes on one side, he rewards on the other, &c. But if they had asserted that Zoroaster and the Magi were of a contrary opinion to that, they must have believed that these Magi taught that the principle which distributed good, is personally distinguished from the principle which does the contrary, and that these two principles are independent of each other, and the one co-eternal with the other (68).

II. This is confirmed by reason, that this hypothesis was resorted to on no other account, than in order to shun the perplexity (69) which they met with in the supposition, that the same Being, which is the cause of good, is also the cause of evil. But this difficulty had not been avoided, if Arimanius had been allowed to have been a production of the good God; for the question would have turned, how Arimanius, the evil principle, could have been produced by a cause infinitely good. It is obvious to all men, that to assert that God himself produced all evils, or that he produced Arimanius, who consequently is the necessary author of all evils (70), amounts to the same thing, quod est causa causæ est causa causati. . . . that which is the cause of a cause, is also the cause of its effect. So that Zoroaster could not escape the force of any one objection, if his doctrine had been what Shahrîstâni says it was (71). Therefore let us grant that the Greeks have not without ground charged him with admitting two eternal principles.

III. I am not ignorant that it may be urged that the Grecians were very imperfectly acquainted with the opinions of the Philosophers whom they called Barbarians, and that what they wrote of the Jewish nation, and the antiquities of Egypt is very inaccurate. But let this be repeated as often as you please, I shall answer, the Arabian writers are not more credible, when they speak of a Philosopher so remote from their own time as Zoroaster was.

IV. I conjecture that his followers for their own interest have done him the favour to ascribe to him the creation of the evil principle, and that they did it

(67) Compare what has been said in the article CHRYSIPUS, the Philosopher, remark [T]; and in the article PAULICIANS, remark [I], at the third paragraph.

(68) Dr Hyde owns that this doctrine was taught by those whom Plutarch mentions. See, below, citation (75).

(69) See Plutarch, in the passage which has been cited in the article MANICHEES, citation (28), and in the foregoing remark of this present article.

(70) Light and darkness, are causes acting necessarily and without any liberty.

(71) Above, citat. (66).

(59) In the following remark.

(60) *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, for February, 1701, Art. iii, and for March 1701, Art. i.*

(61) Professor of the Oriental languages, in the university of Oxford.

(62) Thomas Hyde, *Hist. Religionis veter. Persarum, cap. ix, pag. 161.*

(63) In the remark [E], citation (50).

(64) *Id. ibid. ap. xxi, pag. 175.*

(65) *Id. ibid. ap. xxii, pag. 190.*

(66) Shahrîstâni, *apud Hyde, ubi supra, pag. 299.* have left out the Arabic words which are in this and the following passages of Dr Hyde, and in the room of them have put blanks.

that he was no idolater, either with respect to the worship of fire, or that of

it since the time that they were subjected to the severe domination of the Mahometans who abhor them, and call them idolaters and worshippers of fire. Being unwilling to expose themselves still more to their hatred, and insults, under pretext that they acknowledged an uncreated nature sovereignly wicked, and independent of God, they thought fit to varnish over this part of their system with another interpretation: they could not absolutely deny that Zoroaster admitted of two principles, since it is too well known that he acknowledged them. The Tarikh Montekheb faith, that Zoroaster, author of the sect of the Megiouch, or Magi, was also the first who taught the doctrine of two principles of all things, and that the firm name of Megiouch, bestowed on them, is a word corrupted by the Arabians, from the Persian word, Meikhoufch, which signifies sharp-sweet, by reason of the two principles, good and evil, which he established (72). Here is an author who ascribes to Zoroaster the first establishment of this opinion;

(72) Herbelot, Bibl. Orientale, pag. 931, col. 1,

(73) This seems to signify that Zoroaster put an end to those things.

(74) Ibn Shahnâ, in libro de Principiis & Postremis apud Hyde, ubi supra, cap. ix, pag. 163.

but Dr Hyde alleges a passage which makes this system of a much older date, and besides seems to hint that Zoroaster only reformed it: 'Quod Persarum gentem . . . ei est Religio pervetusta: & in eâ Docti vocantur Keiomarfi. Isti statuunt aliquid Deum æternum quem vocant Yezdan, eo designantes τὸν Θεόν: & alium deum creatum ex Tenebris, quem nominant Ahreman, designantes Diabolum. Magnificiunt Lucem, eo usque dum colant Ignem: & cavent sibi à Tenebris. Nec destiterunt sic facere (73), donec prodit Zerdusht jactans prophetiam. Asserunt itaque Deum Creatorem, quod scilicet creavit Lucem & Tenebras; eumque esse Unicum, nec habere Socium. Et quod Bonum & Malum, & Probitas & Improbilas conquiritur sunt ex mixture Lucis & Tenebrarum: & quod si hæc duo non fuissent mixta, non extitisset Mundus: & quod hæc duo hoc modo mixta non definent, donec Bonum approprietur Mundo suo & Malum Mundo suo: [i. e. utrumque horum tandem concedet ad Mundum sibi proprium, scilicet in fine Mundi.] . . . Et hanc esse Religionem Magorum (74). . . . There was a very ancient religion among the Persians; and those who were learned in it, were called Keiomarfi. They held that there is an eternal Deity, whom they call Yezda, meaning GOD, and that out of darkness was created an other god, whom they name Ahreman, by which word they denote the Devil. They highly esteem light, inasmuch that they worship fire; and they have a great aversion to darkness. They continued in this practice, UNTIL Zerdusht appeared, who pretended to prophecy. Thus they affirm that GOD is the creator of the universe, because he created light and darkness, that there is but one GOD, who is without any equal: that good and evil, probity and wickedness, sprung from the mixture of light and darkness: that if these two had not been mixed together, the world would not have had a being: and that they will not cease to be thus mixed, till good and evil be appropriated each to its own world, [that is, till each of them retires to the world proper to it, namely, at the end of the world.] This is the religion of the Magi.

V. Lastly, I say that Dr Hyde owns that there are yet some sects, which by acknowledging God and the Devil to be two co-eternal natures, agree with the assertors of Zoroaster's Oromazes and Arimanus. His words are: 'Dualistæ Diaboli coeternitatem asserunt. Sunt enim ex Indo-Persis & Dualistis Manichæis alique Hæreticis (ut quidem sunt in omni Religione,) qui opinantur Diabolum à seipso processisse, ut loquantur, i. e. æternum fuisse, & malos Angelos sibi creasse: sed est Hæretica opinio, eaque ignorantium quorundam hominum qui peculiariter vocantur . . . Thanavîa, i. e. Dualistæ seu . . . Domini duorum, scilicet. Assertores seu Auctores duorum principiorum; qui (inquit Shahrîstânî,) Lucem & Tenebras seu Deum & Diabolum statuunt duo Principia coeterna, in contrarium Magorum qui Lucem æternam & Tenebras creatas putant. Isti tales fuerunt, qui Oromazen & Arimanum duos esse Deos asserbant ut Plut. lib. de Isid. & Osir. (75) . . . The Dualists assert the co-eternity of the Devil. For there are some Indian Persians, and Manichean Dualists, and other Heretics

(75) Id. ibid., pag. 164.

(as there are some in all religions) who imagine that the Devil proceeded from himself, as they term it, that is, that the Devil is eternal, and created the evil angels: but this is an heretical opinion, and held only by some ignorant men, who are distinguished by the name Thanavia or Dualists, or assertors or authors of the two principles, who affirm (says Shahrîstânî) that light and darkness, God and the Devil, are two co-eternal principles, in contradiction to the Magi, who believe that light is eternal, and that darkness was created. Such were they who asserted, as Plutarch informs us, that there are two gods, Oromazes and Arimanus. There are some particulars which are very singular and extravagant concerning the system of the Zoroastrian Magi in the book of a Mahometan. I shall cite from it what relates to the Dualists, who hold still the co-eternity of the Devil, and with great importunity ask whence evil could proceed, if the evil principle was not eternal?

Addit Shahrîstânî, Quod Magus peculiaris fit . . . Dualitas, adeo ut statuunt . . . Duos . . . seu Gubernatores duos æternos, qui dividuntur in Bonum & Malum, & Probitem ac Improbitem, Emolumentum ac Nocumtum. Horum unus nominatur Lux, & alter Tenebræ. Sc. Yezdan seu Deus, & Ahreman seu Diabolus. Eorumque Religionem esse sec. hanc divisionem seu distinctionem: & quod omnes Magorum Questiones vertantur super duobus Cardinibus, quorum unus est Explicatio Misionis Lucis & Tenebrarum, & alter est Explicatio Liberationis Lucis à Tenebris. Et quidem, quod Misionem statuunt . . . Initium seu statum à quo, & Liberationem . . . Rediitum seu statum ad quem. . . . The Magi alone, addit Shahrîstânî, believe a duality, and that there are two eternal chiefs, or governors, who are divided into good and evil, probity and wickedness, advantage and hurt. One of these is called light, and the other darkness, the former is Yezdan, or GOD, and the latter Ahreman, or the Devil: and their religion is founded on this division or distinction: all the questions of the Magi turn upon these two points, one of which is to explain the cause of the mixture of light and darkness; and the other to explain the deliverance of light from darkness. And they hold that this mixture was the beginning of things, or condition from whence they proceeded, and that this deliverance is the return of things, or condition into which they are to be brought. I shall further cite what follows: 'Supradictus Shahrîstânî pergit narrare, quod Magi statuunt . . . Principia duo, sicuti dixerat: sed quod . . . Magi originales non existimant expedire ut ambo sint . . . coeterna ab initio; sed quod Lux sit . . . æterna ab initio, & Tenebræ . . . productæ. Et quod tum, differant de modo seu causâ productionis ejus; cum à Lucē producitur tantum Lux, quæ non producit ullum Malum; & quomodo ergo productum Principium Mali aut alius cujusvis rei, cum nihil adjunctum (seu par fuerit) Luci quoad primam ejus productionem & æternitatem (76). . . . The same (76) Id. ibid. Shahrîstânî continues to relate, that the Magi lay down two principles; as he had said before; but the original Magi, says he, do not think that both must be co-eternal; they hold that light alone is eternal, and darkness created: then they differ concerning the manner and cause of the production of darkness; since from light nothing can proceed but light, which doth not produce any evil, how then was the principle of evil, or of any other thing produced, since nothing was joined with light, (or equal to it) as to its first production and eternity. Some of the Magi assert that Arimanus, or the evil principle, was created by an evil thought which arose in the Divine intellect. This thought was, what will happen, if I meet with no opposition? What can be said more detestable? Would it have been more blasphemous to allow this Arimanus to be eternal, than to ascribe such an original to him? Asserentes Yezdân fuisse . . . sine initio æternum, & Ahreman fuisse . . . productum & creatum. Yezdan cogitasse secum. Nisi fuerit mihi contraria, quomodo erit? Hancque cogitationem pravam naturæ Lucis minus analogam, produxisse Tenebras dictas Ahreman, qui naturâ dispositus ad malum & diffidium & improbitatem & noxam & omnia

Ym
hls

(76) Id. ibid. cap. xxi, pag. 165, seq. Shahrîstânî & Religio

of Mithra [G]. What appears least uncertain among so many things which are related of him, is that he was the introducer of a new religion into Persia, and that he did it about the reign of Darius the successor of Cambyfes. He is still in great veneration amongst those Persians, who are not of the Mahometan religion, but retain the ancient worship of their country. They call him Zardhuft, and several people believe that he came from China, and relate a great number of miraculous things on that head. You may see a specimen of them in Mr d'Herbelot's *Bibliothèque Orientale* (*), and in the History of the religion of the Banians, written in English by Mr Lord, and translated into French by Mr Briot (y). Consult also Huetius's Evangelical Demonstration (z), and Dr Hyde's book. Several authors believe that all the works which have gone under the

(*) At the word Zerdashti.

(y) That translation was printed at Paris in the year 1666, in 12mo.

(z) Pag. 152, & seq. and pag. 458, 459.

(77) Id. *ibid.*

documenta: & prodiens contra Lucem, eam opposuit tam naturā (seu factō) quā dictō (77). ----- They affirm that Yazdan is eternal without beginning, and that Abreman was produced and created: that Yazdan thought with himself, what will happen, if I meet with no opposition? And that this evil thought not being analogous to the nature of light, produced darkness, called Abreman, which, being naturally disposed to evil, discord, wickedness, and all manner of mischief, came forth against light, and opposed it both in word and deed. They add, that a war arose betwixt the army of light, and that of darkness, which at last ended in an accommodation, of which the Angels were the mediators, and the conditions were that the inferior world should be wholly left to Arimanius for the space of seven thousand years, after which it should be restored to light. Before the peace Arimanius had extirpated all the inhabitants of the world. Light had called men to its assistance whilst they were yet but spirits: which it did either to draw them out of Arimanius's territories, or in order to give them bodies to engage against this enemy. They accepted the bodies, and the fight, on condition that they should be assisted by the light, and should at last overcome Arimanius. The resurrection shall come when he shall be vanquished. This, they conclude (78), was the cause of the mixture, and shall be the cause of the deliverance. The Greeks were not ignorant that Zoroaster taught a future resurrection (79).

(78) Eiusmodi fuisse causam Mithonis, hanc verò causam liberationis. Id. *ibid.* pag. 296.

(79) See what Diogenes Laërtius, in Proemio, num. 8, relates concerning the doctrine of the Magi.

(80) Hyde, ubi supra, cap. i, pag. 5.

(81) Id. *ibid.* pag. 10.

[G] It is affirmed that he was no idolater either with respect to the worship of fire, or that of Mithra. Dr Hyde affirms (80) that the followers of the ancient religion of the Persians deny that they ever paid Divine adoration to the stars. They maintain that they do not adore the sun, but only turn towards it when they pray to God. He has found amongst Zoroaster's precepts that we ought to salute the sun, and bestow praises on him, but not that we ought to serve him with religious worship. He proves that their ceremonies might very justly pass for civil honours, and to this purpose he makes some exceeding curious observations. He applies to the fire what he says of the sun; the bowings and prostrations of the Persians before the holy fire were not a religious adoration, but only a civil one: 'Idem quoque dicendum est de eorum cultu Igne, quem (ut supra tetigimus) imitando Judæos in Pyreis servarunt. Nam quamvis ei exhiberent Reverentiam quandam, eamque per Prostrationes, hæc tamen non fuerunt Adoratio divina, sed tantum civilis, prout se habet mos Orientis erga quosvis Magnates, & olim fuit erga Angelos tanquam Dei Legatos ejus personam representantes; cujus rei exempla affatim suppetunt non tantum in Vet. Test. sed & in Novo, ubi femine ad veram Fidem conversæ (visis apud Christi sepulchrum Angelis,) adorarunt procidentes faciebatur in terram: idque quamvis probè scirent non esse Deum, sed Angelos, ut constat ex verbis earum prostrationem se vidisse visionem Angelorum (81). ----- The same thing must be said of their worshipping fire, which, as I have mentioned above, they kept in their Pyrea in imitation of the Jews. For though they paid a certain reverence to the fire, and that by prostration, yet this was not a religious, but only a civil, worship; as it is the custom of the eastern people to prostrate themselves before any great man, and as it was antiently the custom to fall down before Angels, as being the messengers, and representatives of GOD. There are many examples of this kind of worship not only in the Old Testament, but also in the New, where the women who had been converted to the true Faith, (upon seeing the Angels at the sepulchre of

Christ), fell with their faces to the ground, and worshipped. Yet they well knew that it was not GOD they saw, but his Angels, as appears from their own words, we have seen a vision of Angels. He concludes (82) with observing that they are wrongfully called idolaters, and worshippers of fire, and will have it that Zoroaster was an instrument to oblige them to persevere in the true faith (83). He was a man educated in the knowledge of the true God, whom he peculiarly worshipped in a natural cave, in which he placed several symbols representing the world. Mithra, representing the sun, filled the master's place. But it was not to Mithra, but to the true God, that he paid his adorations: 'Is cum esset insignis Philosophus, Religione austera, & totius Matheseos peritissimus, hac ratione Persas sui admiratione perculit, & sue Doctrinæ attentos reddidit. Præsertim coluit Deum in naturali quodam Antro, quod ille Mithriacum effecit & mirificè ac mathematicè comparavit, ubi scilicet Mithra præfidebat, hæc inferiora Regio modo regens, eaque imprægnans ferebat: adeo ut omnes postea non tantum in summis Montium jugis antiquissimo more Deum colebant, sed & subinde illius exemplo, Sacra sua Mithriaca in tali Antro præstare & peragere didicerunt. In eo erant Mithræ & hujus Mundi Symbolica philosophicè & mathematicè spectanda & contemplanda, non autem colenda; quæ itaque in re falluntur Autores: nam Persæ tunc talia Simulachra non colebant (84). ----- As he was an eminent Philosopher, strict and austere in his religion, and greatly skilled in all the parts of the Mathematics, he struck the Persians with an admiration of him, and rendered them attentive to his doctrine. He worshipped GOD chiefly in a certain natural cave, which he consecrated to Mithra, and adorned in a wonderful and regular manner, placing in it several symbols which represented the world. There Mithra presided, as the sovereign of all earthly things, which he governed and impregnated: so that afterwards they all worshipped GOD not only on the tops of the mountains, after the antient custom; but also from his example they learned to perform their mithriatic rites in the like caves, where they placed symbolical figures of Mithra and of the world; these figures were to be beheld and contemplated in a Philosophical and Mathematical manner, but were not to be worshipped: so that in this point authors are mistaken: for at that time the Persians did not worship these images.' Consult this learned man in the fourth chapter of his work, where besides other learned passages, you will find these words of Porphyry: 'Referente Eubulo, Zoroastres primus omnium in montibus Persidi vicinis Antrum nativum, floridum, fontibusque irriguum in honorem Creatoris, & omnium Patris Mithræ, consecravit: ita ut Antrum conditi à Mithrâ Mundi figuram ei representaret: ea verò quæ intra Antrum, erant certis invicem intervallis disposita, ut Elementorum Climatesque mundanorum symbola seu figuras gererent (85). ----- Eubulus relates that Zoroaster was the first who, in the mountains nigh Persia, consecrated a natural cave, adorned with flowers, to Mithra the creator and parent of all things. This cave represented to him the figure of the world, created by Mithra; and the things which were within it, were disposed at certain distances, in such a manner that they were the figures, or symbols, of the elements and climates of the earth.'

We may here observe that in this book of Dr Hyde there are some particulars which may be serviceable to the Jesuits, on account of the charge brought against them concerning the honours paid to Confucius, which they affirm to be purely civil. Father le Comte who hath been so much blamed for asserting that the true religion

(82) Id. *ibid.* pag. 14. See also pag. 22.

(83) Id. *ibid.* pag. 160.

(84) Id. *ibid.*

(85) Porphyry de Nympharum antro, apud Hyde, *ibid.* cap. 10, pag. 118.

the name of Zoroaster, some of which are yet in being, are supposititious. Dr Hyde is not of that opinion [H].

religion, or the knowledge of the true God, hath lasted in China for several ages (86), will find a very good assistant in this learned Oxford Professor.

[H] Several authors believe that all the works which have gone under the name of Zoroaster . . . are supposititious. Dr Hyde is not of that opinion.] Suidas affirms that there were extant four books of Zoroaster

περί φύσεως de natura - - concerning nature; a book περί λίθων τιμίων de gemmis - - concerning precious stones; and five books of judiciary Astrology, Αστρονομικά ἀποτελεσματά, prædictiones ex inspectione stellarum. It is very likely that what Pliny relates as quoted from Zoroaster (87) was taken from those books. Eusebius (88) cites a passage, which contains a magnificent description of God, and gives it as the very words of Zoroaster, ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ συναγωγῇ τῶν Περσικῶν, in sacro Persicarum rituum commentario - - in his sacred commentary on the Persian rites. I know no body who doth not believe that Clemens Alexandrinus says, that Prodicus's followers boasted of having Zoroaster's secret books (89). But perhaps his words are taken in another sense, and mean that they boasted of having the secret books of Pythagoras. They have been lately printed, with the verses of the Sibyls at Amsterdam in the year 1689, according to Oporopæus's edition, *Oracula magica Zoroastrii cum Scholiis Pletbonis & Pselli*. Those pretended magical oracles make but two pages. Here follows the opinion of Huetius concerning all the books in general which go under Zoroaster's name. He calls them all supposititious. * Ex cujus (Zoroastrii) fama & exiti-

* Nicol. Damasc. Hist. l. 7. in Exc. Conf. Porphyry.

† Euseb. Præp. Ev. l. 1.

† Clem. Alex. Strom. 1.

† Suidas, in Ζωροάστρου.

** Auct. Recog. l. 4, c. 27.

matione provenit eorum fallacia, qui sub ejus nomine Oracula quædam magica Græce scripta incautis obtruserunt. Edita illa sunt cum Pselli & Pletthonis scholiis: sed si naves admoveris, fraus subolebit. Vetusiora quidem illa sunt, nihilo tamen γνησιώτερα (superiora) Oracula, quæ Cræci temporibus extitisse narrat Nicolaus Damascenus. Infinceros quoque eos dixerim libros, quos Chaldaice scriptos, & Chaldaice commentariis illustratos, & effata ac sententias complexos Johannem Picum habuisse ferunt; infincorum & librum Zind, mihi de nomine solum cognitum, quo ritus magicos, & ignis colendi disciplinam ajunt contineri. . . . Infinceros & quos Hermippus, Plinio teste, ducentis versuum millibus sub Zoroastrii nomine conditos indicibus quoque positus explanavit. Ex iisdem fallariorum incudibus profectus est supra memoratus Persicarum Legum codex Zundavastaw, quem vetustissimum tamen tunc, & eundem fortasse, qui ab † Eusebio Collectio sacra Persicarum rerum appellatur. Indidem profectus & quem se in arcanis habere jactabant, qui Prodicus Philosophi doctrinam sectabantur, ut est apud † Clementem Alexandrinum; indidem & quos commemorat † Suidas; & qui de Magia, Zoroastrii nomine, scripti circumferebantur, ut habet ** Auctor Recognitionum; & quem tradit Auctor Astrologiæ

cujusdam Persicæ, Ebraice reddite, ab eo lucubratum, & Regnum Dei fuisse inscriptum, & manibus Persarum afficte gestari esse solitum (90). . . . (90) Hæc est The same and reputation of Zoroaster encouraged certain men fraudulently to impose upon the unwary some magical oracles written in Greek, as the genuine works of this Philosopher. They are published with the commentaries of Psellus and Pletton: but upon a slight examination, you perceive the fraud. These oracles which, as Nicolaus Damascenus says, were extant in the time of Cræsus, are indeed much antienter, but not more genuine than the former. I may likewise call supposititious those books written in the Chaldaic tongue, illustrated with Chaldaic commentaries, and containing the wise sayings and opinions of this Philosopher, which they say were in the possession of John Picus. I also take to be supposititious the book of Zind, which I know only by the title, and is said to contain the Magic rites, and the manner and form of worshipping the fire. . . . The same thing may be affirmed of those two hundred thousand verses, which went under the name of Zoroaster, and were, as Pliny testifies, explained by Hermippus. Zundavastaw, the above-mentioned book of the Persian laws, is of the same stamp: yet in my opinion it is very antient, and the same with what Eusebius calls the sacred Collection of the Persian Affairs. To these we may add the book which the followers of the Philosopher Prodicus boasted they had secretly in their possession, as we learn from Clemens Alexandrinus. The books mentioned by Suidas are likewise forged, as also those on Magic, which went about under the name of Zoroaster, as the author of the Recognitiones, says; and that which the author of a certain book on Persian Astrology, translated into Hebrew, mentions as the composition of Zoroaster, and which he says was intitled the Kingdom of God, and was continually in the hands of the Persians. Huetius adds (91), that Porphyry (92) reproached the Christians with the forgery of several books, and boasted of having proved that the apocalypse of Zoroaster was one of those supposititious pieces.

Dr Hyde acknowledges that the ancient Heretics falsely alledged, under the name of Zoroaster, some supposititious prophecies concerning JESUS CHRIST; but he saith that they had not presumed to do it, if they had not known that there were extant genuine works of Zoroaster in which were contained such prophecies (93). He believes (94) that God revealed to Zoroaster the coming of the Messiah, and that Zoroaster inferred this wonderful revelation in his works. He takes the Zundavastaw, which Huetius rejects, to be an authentic piece: he gives us the true title and analysis of it, and is persuaded (95), that this author's works were written in the ancient Persian language, and are preserved to this present time.

(91) Hist. lib. l. 1, c. 10, p. 160.
(92) Porphyry, in Vita Plotini.
(93) Hyde, vii. l. 1, c. 1, p. 10.
(94) Hyde, vii. l. 1, c. 1, p. 10.
(95) Hyde, vii. l. 1, c. 1, p. 10.

ZUERIUS BOXHORNII (MARK) Professor at Leyden, the son of James Zuerius Minister at Bergen-op-Zoom, and of Anne Boxhorn the daughter of a Minister at Breda, of whom I shall speak below [A], was born at Bergen-op-Zoom in September 1612 (a). He was but six years old when his father died. Some time after he followed his mother to Breda, and there was educated by Henry Boxhornius, his grand-father by his mother's side, till the Spaniards became masters of that city in the year 1625. Then he was carried to Leyden by Henry Boxhornius, who having no male issue desired him to take his name. This young scholar made to great and speedy a progress, that he published some very good Poems in the year 1629, on the taking of Boileduc,

[A] He was grandson to a Minister at Breda, of whom I shall speak below.] His name was HENRY BOXHORNII, or BOXHORN, and he was born in Brabant. He went through his studies at Louvain, and after having there obtained the decree of Licentiate in Divinity, he was promoted to the Deanry of Tillemont, and expressed such a warm zeal for the Romish religion that he was made Inquisitor. But he changed his opinion, and embraced the Reformed religion. He was first of all a Minister in the duchy of Cleves, afterwards at Woerden in Holland, and at last at Breda (1).

He left this last town, when the Spaniards took it in the year 1625, and retired to Leyden, where he took care of the education of his grandson (2), who is the subject of this article. Henry Boxhornius wrote some books of controversy. His antagonist was Henry Cuyckius, who accused him of falsely pretending to be of the family of the Boxhorns. This Cuyckius, Professor of Philosophy at Louvain, Grand-Vicar and Official to the Archbishop of Mechlen, and at last Bishop of Ruremonde, published in the year 1596, an *Epistola Parænetica*, in which he exhorted Henry Boxhorn

(1) Taken from the Anti of Mr. Baillet, Tom. i., pag. 158, 159.

(2) Jacobus Boxhornius, Episcopus Mechliniensis, in Vita Marci Zuerii Boxhornii.

Boileduc, and some other victories obtained by the Dutch. He was then only seventeen years of age. He was but twenty when he published several considerable works [B]. This acquired him so great a reputation, that, in the same year 1632, the curators of the university of Leyden conferred on him the Professorship of Eloquence. He made so great a figure in this post that Chancellor Oxenstiern, then Ambassador-Extraordinary from Sweden in Holland, offered him an honourable employment, by order of Queen Christina [C]: but Boxhornius preferred the post he enjoyed in his own country to all those honours [D]; and continuing as well by his lectures as books to give frequent proofs of his learning, and exact knowledge in Politics, and History, he was made Professor of those two sciences in the room of Daniel Heinfius who was declared *emeritus*. He discharged this office in a manner very advantageous to his auditors, and very glorious to himself. He was for some time at variance with Salmasius; but that quarrel which obliged him to take pen in hand against that formidable Critic, was at last composed [E]. He freely communicated his knowledge to other authors, as Valerius Andreas confesses in his *Bibliotheca Belgica*. He died after a tedious sickness at Leyden on the third of October 1653. Aged forty-one years. He wrote on various subjects [F], and particularly

(3) See Mr Baillet, *ibid.* pag. 158, & seq.

(4) Pag. 153.

(5) In four volumes in 12mo. Moreri is mistaken, when he says that this work, Pliny's Panegyric, Justin, and some satirical Poets were published by Boxhornius in the year 1631. Valerius Andreas has committed the same fault, as to the *Historia Augusta*.

(6) Omnium apud laus lectos fuisse non semel audivi. Jacob, Bailei, in eius Vita.

(7) Suetonius tanto omnium favore exceptus est, ut clarissimi huius Acad. Profess. ad linguæ Græcæ perfectionem quæ jam vacat adigere me voluerint. Boxhornius, in *Epist.* pag. m. 15, Edit. Francof. His letter is dated on the 29th of September 1631.

(8) As Valerius Andreas does. Hankius de Romanar. Rer. Script. pag. 295, has transcribed most of his faults.

(9) In Apologia pro Commentario ad Agricola Taciti adversus Dialogum.

(10) See the article THO-MÆUS, citat. (6).

(11) Ab Axelio Oxenstierna regni Cancellario Fœderis Germanici Directore, ad Fœderatos Belgas legato extraordinario Regine & eorundem Procerum nomine ad amplissimas dignitates in Sueciam evocatus fuit. Bailei, ubi supra.

Boxhorn to return into the pale of the Church. To which Boxhorn answered that he would have nothing to do with such a corrupt Church. Cuyckius returned to the charge: and Boxhorn replied by an Anti-Cuyckius, printed at Leyden, in the year 1598. Boxhorn was attacked on his nobility: for Cuyckius would not admit his pretension of being descended from the Boxhorns, a noble family in Brabant (3). See the history of the siege of Breda (4).

[B] He was but twenty years of age when he published several considerable works. As *Theatrum Urbium Hollandiæ*; *Scriptores Historiæ Augustæ cum Animadversionibus ac Notis* (5); *Poëtæ Satyrici minores cum Commentariis*; *Plinii Panegyricus*. He deserved a place among the illustrious youths, of whom Mr Baillet hath drawn up such a curious catalogue; for to say nothing of the verses which he published at the age of seventeen, and which were very much applauded (6), it is certain that in the year 1631, he published an edition of Suetonius with notes, which induced the Professors of the university to advise him to put in for the Greek Professorship, which was then vacant (7). He was therefore an author at the age of nineteen. How many considerable books did he publish in the following year? There was no occasion for an officious lie to make him an early author: the strictest truth was sufficient for it; I wish therefore Valerius Andreas had rigorously adhered to it, and had not said that Boxhornius published books at the age of sixteen, and that he was made professor of Eloquence, and of the *Belles Lettres*, before he was nineteen years of age. The first of his productions appeared in the year 1629, and he was not Professor before 1632. Add to this, that he was thirteen years old when he left Breda to go to Leyden: wherefore they are mistaken by one year who make him but twelve years old when he was matriculated at Leyden (8). It happened to Boxhornius as to several others; when age increased his learning he grew somewhat ashamed of his first productions, and accordingly discovered some desire to disown them. Nevertheless it appears that he had still a tenderness for them, since whilst he seemed to disown them, he took care to publish the praises which Salmasius gave them in his letters to him. 'Claudius Salmasius juveniles hocce conatus sibi adeo probari tum temporis literis ad Boxhornium datis significavit, ut maxima quæque ab ipso non tantum sperare, sed sibi & eruditorum orbi & quidem ex vero promittere adeoque præfagire fuerit ausus: quæ illius Herois verbis ipsis publice alibi (9) leguntur, eo nempe loco quo Boxhornius ipse postmodum hæc ipsa aliaque juvenilia damnavit, ac proinde inter scripta sua vix numeravit. . . . Claudius Salmasius, in his letter to Boxhorn, says, that he was then so well pleased with these juvenile essays, that he not only entertained the greatest hopes of him, but also ventured to promise to himself, and to the learned world, nay, to preface the greatest things of him. These are the expressions of Salmasius, which are published in that place where Boxhorn himself afterwards disapproved of these, and other, his juvenile performances, and accordingly would hardly reckon them among his writings.' This we find in Boxhorn's life. It puts me in mind of what Grotius wrote to Scribnerius (10).

[C] Chancellor Oxenstiern offered him an honourable employment by order of Queen Christina (11).]

The author of Boxhornius's life doth not mention in what year this Chancellor came into Holland; had he taken the pains to express it, he would have avoided an error in Chronology: he would not have said that some time after Boxhorn had refused to go to Sweden, he refused to go to Dort, whither he was invited by the magistrates to teach in the college which they re-established in the year 1634. 'Non diu posthæc cum Reip. Dordracenæ proceser illustre suum & vetustissimum à Reformatione in fœderato Belgio Gymnasium anno quidem unde octogesimo superioris seculi erectum sed collapsum restaurarent an. 1634, omnium calculis Boxhornius dignus judicatus & habitus est cui res literaria in eo promovenda committeretur. . . . Not long after, in the year 1634, when the magistrates of Dort were re-establishing their illustrious college, which was as ancient as the Reformation in the United Provinces, being erected in the year 1579, they unanimously chose Boxhorn, as a person worthy to be intrusted with the promoting of learning in that college.' The dates are confounded here; for it is certain that the Chancellor of Sweden did not come into Holland before the year 1635. The magistrates of Dort offered Boxhorn a better pension than he had at Leyden, yet he did not accept their offers; which procured him an augmentation of his salary at Leyden. This is the usual consequence of refusals of this kind, when men either are willing, or know how to make the best of them.

[D] Boxhorn preferred the post he enjoyed in his own country to all these honours. Before the author of his life published this fact, Valerius Andreas spoke of it: How then comes Moreri to say that Boxhornius went into Sweden, where his merit procured him considerable employments? Is it thus that these words ought to be translated? *Evocatus superioribus annis à Suecorum ad Ordines fœderatos Legato, Regine & Procerum nomine ad amplissimas dignitates in Sueciam illi septentrioni amorem prætulit patriæ* (12).

[E] That quarrel with Salmasius was at last composed. This must be understood with some distinction: The acts of hostility ceased, they did no longer openly profess themselves enemies to each other, but their hearts remained the same, and could not suppress their fallies and eruptions on all occasions. Boxhornius a year before his death, when already seized by his mortal distemper, disdainfully received the visits of strangers recommended by Salmasius. 'Eos qui à Salmasio venerant fastidiosè excipiebat, jam tum nimio tabaci usu correpta valetudine quæ altero post anno eum cum vitâ destituit. . . . He disdainfully received the visits of those who came from Salmasius: his health was already impaired by an immoderate use of tobacco: he died two years after.' These two facts I find in the funeral orations of John Caspar Lentzius (13). And what relates to tobacco puts me in mind of what I have heard, that Boxhorn had a hat with a hole in the brim to hold his pipe, so that he could smoke both whilst he was studying and writing.

[F] He wrote on various subjects. He must not only have been very laborious, but also have known a great many things, and have been endowed with a very great facility in writing; for without that a life so short as his would not have sufficed for all the works, which he published. I have already mentioned

(12) Valerius Andreas, *Bibl. Belg.* pag. 641. Bailei add, Quare eas recu- suos mediocri in conditione esse maluit, quam apud exteros alto in fastigio collo-

(13) In Theatre Pauli Freheri, pag. 1180.

particularly on the invention of Printing [G]. On that subject he advanced an opinion very different from that of Mallinkrot, and yet his dissertation procured him the friendship of that learned man. He very carefully studied the antiquities of Gaul [H], which led him to dive into the Scythian tongue, and the antiquities of that nation, on which he wrote very ingeniously both in Dutch and in Latin. He had also composed an Historical account of women, illustrious for their learning, and writings; but this book never appeared [I]. Some have pretended that the Dutch were not pleased with the publication of a small treatise which he had dictated to his scholars, and wherein he explained the constitution of the Republic of the United Provinces (b) [K]. His Sacred

(b) *Ex ejus Vita, conscripta à Jacobo Balemio, quæ extat in limine Epistolæ Boxhornii.*

tioned some of his commentaries on the ancient authors, but have said nothing of his notes on Justin, Tacitus, and Pliny's epistles, nor of his commentary on the life of Agricola published in the year 1642, and a little while after defended against the attacks of an anonymous writer. I have not mentioned his annals of Zeland and Holland, which he published in Dutch with large additions, and better digested; those of Zeland in the year 1644, and those of Holland in 1650. He endeavoured to obtain the title of Historiographer of Zeland (14), and afterwards that of Historiographer of all the United Provinces (15): but I believe he obtained neither; for if his requests had succeeded, the author of his life would have touched on this point: now I do not find that he said one word of it. The Index to his letters mentions that he obtained his request with regard to Zeland; but when one consults the page to which it refers, nothing like it appears. His history of the siege of Breda is written in good Latin. He wrote several treatises on political subjects, as an apology for the navigations of the Hollanders. *Dissertatio de Trapezitis vulgo Longobardis qui in fœderato Belgio fœnebres mensas exercent: Dissertatio de successione & jure primogenituræ adeundo principatu ad Carolum II, magnæ Britannię Regem: De majestate liber singularis adversus J. B. Cogitationes subitaneas in præcedentem dissertationem.* It appears by this last piece that what he published in favour of Charles II King of England, when fled from his kingdom, had displeased some republicans. There is a collection of his *Disquisitiones politice, id est, 60. casus politici ex omni historia selecti*, printed in the year 1651 in 12mo. He published a great number of Orations on several subjects, and after his death came out his *Idæ orationum ex selectiori materia moderni status politici desumptæ, his Institutiones politice, and his Latin Letters and Latin Poems.* This last printed in the year 1659, was reprinted in Germany in 1679, with a preface written by James Thomasius, Professor at Leipzig, which very well deserves to be read.

[G] And particularly on the invention of Printing.] He asserts that the glory of this invention is due to the city of Haerlem, and not to Mentz, as he formerly believed. *Cujus inventæ gloriam Harlemenses, non Moguntini, ut olim, nunc denuo assertum inus* (16). His dissertation on this subject was printed in the year 1641.

[H] He very carefully studied the antiquities of Gaul.] Of this the author of his life gives us the following account. 'Nunc hîc finem imponerem, nisi paucis dicendum esset de iis, quæ super Dea Nehalemia (17) 1647 primum in Walachriæ oris inventa est commentatus, & inde ad Scythicæ gentis linguam, antiquitatem, & mores indagandos multa ingeniosè fane scripsit & scripturavit non vernacule modo, prout inceptorat, sed & Latine: nominatim librum originum Gallicarum (18), in quo Gallos à Germanis ortos ex veteri ipsorum lingua asserere conatur, qui tamen non nisi à morte auctoris & alia ejusdem, prodijt in lucem, obfetricante Georgio Hornio in professione Historiarum non indigno successore.

(14) Boxhorn. in Epistol. pag. 219, 226.
(15) Ibid. pag. 308.
(16) Epistol. pag. 167.
(17) He wrote two tracts in Dutch upon that goddess: one of them was printed in the year 1647, and the other in 1648.
(18) That book is intitled Originum Gallicarum Liber in quo veteris & nobilissimæ Gallo- rum Gentis Origines, Antiquitates, Mores, & Lingue aliæque erant aut illustrantur. Cui accedit antiquæ Lingue Britannicæ Lexicon Britannico-Latinum, inserta explicatque passim Adagii Britannici. Prodiit Amst. apud J. Janff. 1654, in 4to.

----- I shall conclude, after I have said something concerning the observations he made on the goddess Nehalemia, who was first found on the coasts of Walchern, and concerning what he afterwards ingeniously wrote, and intended to write not only in Dutch, as he had begun to do, but also in Latin, in order to discover the language, antiquity, and manners of the ancient Scythians, especially concerning his book on the antiquities of Gaul; where he endeavours to maintain, that the ancient Gauls were descended from the Germans, and to prove it by their ancient language. Yet this, with some other of his books did not appear till after the author's death, being published by George

Hornius, his worthy successor, in the professorship of History.' It appears by Boxhornius's letters that his *Origines Gallicæ* were in the press in the year 1648

(19): and continued so in 1652 (20). He speaks of it only as of a small piece (21), but he had a good opinion of his system. He hoped to prove that the Greeks and Romans owed all to the ancient Frieslanders (22). His treatise *de Scythicis originibus* was finished in the year 1647 (23), but he had a hundred things to add to it; for in a letter written to Mr de Zuilychem in the year 1652. He speaks thus: 'De originibus nostris & sepultis hæcenus Scythicis Antiquitatibus (nam & de iis querere dignatus es) hoc est, ut ego accipio, Asia totius & Europæ, superbius forte & jactantius respondeo. Multa excussi diligenter, conquisivi multa, multa meditatus sum, multa etiam ignorata, feliciter, nisi fallor, tandem deprehendi; quæ aliquando publicis judiciis filtrare ac exponere tuo imprimis, quod scio esse & gravissimum pariter, & æquissimum, audebo (24). - - - - You are pleased to inquire of my book on the antiquities of the Gauls, and those of the Scythians, which are as yet unknown, being, as I take it, the antiquities of all Asia and Europe. I answer with confidence, and perhaps with some vanity, that I have very diligently examined, collected and reflected on a great many things, and have at length, if I mistake not, made several happy discoveries, which I may some time lay before the judgment of the public, and before your's in particular, which I know to be of great weight, and very impartial.' He published a Latin discourse in the year 1650, to shew the affinity betwixt the Greek, Latin, and German languages.

[I] He had composed an historical account of women, illustrious but his book never appeared.] Valerius Andreas is to blame for inferring in the Catalogue of Boxhorn's works, *Bibliothecam eruditionis ac scriptum illustrium seminarum*; and doubtless it was owing to him that several authors imagined, and even published, that Boxhorn put out this curious treatise. Voglerus affirms it as positively as if he had read the book (25), and is not censured for it by Meibomius (26). What is certain is, that Boxhorn had this project in his head: he had good collections on this subject, which he offered to Isaac Pontanus (27), who had some thoughts of an undertaking of this nature (28); but if you think no more of it, added he, and will be pleased to transfer to me this commission, I beg of you to send me your memoirs. Ernestus Brinchius communicated to him a list of learned women. *Velim scribere Vobiscum nobili viro Ernesto Brinchio gratias meo nomine agi, ob transmissum Syllabum eruditarum seminarum. In quarum gratiam Bibliothecam meam, & amicorum scriinia super excussi. Deprehendi autem non paritendum earum numerum, quæ vulgo ignorantur. Si tibi animus sit pergere exco- in eo, quod aliquando cepisse te intelligo, lubens qualem acunque mea transmittam, si vero tibi visum lampada mihi tradere, ut tua non deneges, unice rogo.* I shall here occasionally say that Father Jacob, a French Carmelite, had composed a book of the like nature; which many authors cite and refer to, and yet it never was printed, nor ever will, for the manuscript is lost.

[K] Some have pretended that the Dutch were not pleased, &c.] Sorbieri writes this to Patin: pag. 157. his words are: 'I have sent you a curious little book intitled *Commentariolus de Statu Provinciarum fœderati Belgii*, the publication of which has very much displeased in these provinces, because it gives a very clear and distinct idea of the government of this Republic, and this ought to remain inter Arcana Imperii. Boxhorn had made this commentary for his scholars in politics, and had dictated it to them in private; but the secret took wind, and there have been many copies of it handed about, that at last

(19) Epistol. Boxhorn. pag. 291.

(20) Ibid. pag. 315.

(21) Sub prelo jam est excussum Originum Gallicarum. Ibid. pag. 315.

(22) Ibid. pag. 319.

(23) Ibid.

(24) Ibid. pag. 314.

(25) Similiter place ad astrum latissimum

deducere opus est argumentum & grege tradere Marcus Zuili- Boxhornius 221.

17 Bibliotheca eruditionis: x

17 Bibliotheca eruditionis: x

17 Bibliotheca eruditionis: x

17 Bibliotheca eruditionis: x

17 Bibliotheca eruditionis: x

17 Bibliotheca eruditionis: x

17 Bibliotheca eruditionis: x

17 Bibliotheca eruditionis: x

17 Bibliotheca eruditionis: x

17 Bibliotheca eruditionis: x

17 Bibliotheca eruditionis: x

17 Bibliotheca eruditionis: x

17 Bibliotheca eruditionis: x

17 Bibliotheca eruditionis: x

17 Bibliotheca eruditionis: x

17 Bibliotheca eruditionis: x

17 Bibliotheca eruditionis: x

17 Bibliotheca eruditionis: x

and Profane History, which extends from the birth of JESUS CHRIST to the year 1650, is well esteemed: it is but one volume in 4to. The best part of it is that of the XVIIth century, and the beginning of the XVIIth. Boxhorn was somewhat ugly, and so swarthy, that he was one day taken for a Spaniard [L]. Upon that occasion he made an answer full of zeal for his country (c); but let the Casuists determine whether it be conformable to the Spirit of the Gospel [M]. Sorbieri seeing him somewhat angry with Grotius had the equity to excuse him; and besides, to suggest that this language was conformable to the laws of Policy [N].

Some learned Germans had no great opinion of his learning, and have observed several errors in his works. He had notice of this, and resolved to revenge himself by a satire [O]: I cannot tell whether he executed his design.

...

- (19) Sorbieri, Letter lxxii, pag. 438.
- (20) Bafelin, in ejus Vita.
- (21) With this title Nouvelle Héresie dans la Morale touchant la Haie du prochain, prêchée par Mr Jurieu, &c.
- (22) Note, that the mischief which soldiers do to the enemy by wounding or killing them, and the mischief which a private man should do them by giving them a drought, that occasions a Fever, &c. are different things. The first is not brought into question here, but is supposed without any difficulty.
- (23) See the Entretien sur la Cabale chimérique, pag. 87, & seq.
- (24) He reckons among the propositions complained of several consequences, which the accuser says might be drawn from the Heresies charged upon him; but he does not say that the minister preached those consequences. It is therefore a base trick to complain that he is accused of having preached those consequences.
- (25) Intitulé, Examen de la Théologie de Mr Jurieu, pag. 207, & seq.
- (26) Invisi Boxhornium juvenem annorum triginta... doctum sine, & multis, ne nimis dicam, libris notum. Sorbieri, pag. 44, Dutch Edit.
- (27) a Bookseller put it to the press without placing his name to it; and the impression was sold before the public had time to find fault with it (29). I do not certainly know whether Sorbieri was in the right to say this, but I know that this small treatise was printed at the Hague for John Verhoeve, in the years 1649, and 1650, and that the edition of 1650, was revised and enlarged. There were also other editions. I have seen the sixth, printed at the Hague by Adrian Vlacq, in the year 1659.
- (28) [L] He was so swarthy that he was one day taken for a Spaniard. This was in the year 1637, when the Spanish garrison left Breda according to the capitulation. Boxhorn being then in the Prince of Orange's camp, and seeing that garrison pass, heard a Dutch soldier take him for a Spaniard: You mistake, said he, do not judge of me by my hair and my aspect; if you knew the candour of my heart, you would not doubt of my being a true Hollander. And if I were able, I would immediately throw the King of Spain into a fever, fix him so close to his bed, and so terrify him, that he should never more unjustly attack our liberty. Those who had rather read the original Latin, shall soon be satisfied. Statura corporis ipsi fuit longa & erecta, & quam cum subfusca facie crines efficiebant qualescunque deformem: nigredinem eam candore animi sui albicantem reddere solebat. Unde cum Breda capta inter exeuntium Hispanorum spectatores & ipse esset, & a nostrate quodam milite ipso audiente pro Hispano ob dictam nigredinem habitus, illi homini faciem non minus quam verè respondebat, Tu me ex vultu & crinibus Hispanum judicas, sed male: nam si candorem animi Belgici mei nosset, qui tam magnus est ac nigri sunt mei crines, & in mea esset potestate, pro amore in communem patriam vel bodie Hispaniarum Regem febri affigerem ledoque alligerem, & metu sic terrem, ut imposterum abstineret ab injusta liberorum Belgarum oppressione & oppugnatione (30).
- (29) [M] Let the Casuists determine whether this answer was conformable to the Spirit of the Gospel. The accusation which appeared in a loose sheet in March 1694 (31), if just, would prove, that Boxhorn might easily obtain his absolution, and even a full approbation of the Casuists, who should be like the preacher who is accused; for we are told that he preached that the precept of loving and blessing the persecutors of the Church, doth not engage us to any more than to wish and promote their heavenly felicity. The temporal mischief (32) which Boxhorn would have done to the King of Spain, would not have prevented his wishing the conversion of that Prince. Besides, a disease is no assassination; but the said preacher hath told us in one of his books, that except assassination, all other means are allowable and fair against a declared enemy (33). He hath made so lame an answer to the accusation, and that with such perplexed and sophistical turns (34), that his answer, together with the industrious care he took to withdraw his sermons from the press, have convinced all reasonable men, that he was very justly accused. Consult Mr Saurin's book (35).
- (30) See, below, the remark [P].
- (31) [N] Sorbieri had the equity to suggest that this language was conformable to the laws of Policy. Boxhorn was thirty years of age when Sorbieri went to visit him, and was known then by a great many, and perhaps too many books (36). By degrees he grew warm against Grotius in this conversation, and blamed him not only for his method of re-uniting Christians, but also with respect to the political affairs of Holland. Is visus est tunc magis Grotio minus amicus; nam sensim procedente, ut fit, sermone ad quaestiones tunc V O L. V. No. CXXXVII.
- (32) temporis volitantes docta per ora virum & nupera scripta, non solum dissentire (quod faciunt multi boni & amici Grotio) se falsus est circa initium conciliationis modum & tributum nimium Rom. Pontifici auctoritatem, sed ipsum insimulatus est circa politica patriae negotia, una cum ceteris Remonstrantibus (37). - - - He seemed not to love Grotius; for the conversation, as it usually happens, gradually falling upon the questions at that time among the learned, and upon the new books, Zuërius not only confessed that he differed with Grotius (which many of his good friends own they do) as to his manner of reconciling Protestants and Papists, and the too great authority ascribed to the Pope; but also blamed him, and the rest of the Remonstrants, with regard to the political affairs of Holland. Sorbieri excused Boxhorn, because it would not have been prudent in a professor, who intends to be successful in his affairs, and use his endeavours for the advancement of his domestic prosperity, to expose himself to the displeasure of the ruling party. Quærens apud me rationem qua excusarem Boxhornium; aut quia junior res gestas audierat ab aliis non probata fidei testibus: aut quia professorum munus exercens conductum mercede se putabat à Calvinianis, quorum exciderat gratia, clavum Reipubl. tenentium, non est hominis bene rem familiarem gerere quaerentis. Perhaps there lurks a malignity in these excuses; but since Sorbieri doth not deny that Boxhorn might speak according to his persuasion, we ought not to suppose that he applied to him the saying, beneficium accipere libertatem vendere est: a well paid salary prevents speaking one's thoughts.
- (33) [O] Some learned Germans... have observed several errors in his works, he... resolved to revenge himself by a satire. This appears in a letter from Rupert to Reinefius. Videtur Boxhornius nimium tribuere ingenio suo, & ante tempus togâ brachium exerere. Quum olim vidissem Florum ejus, occurrerant multa valde putida; quæ privato studio notata, sed postea nescio quâ fraude in vulgus sparsa, in ipsius Boxhornii manus venisse dicuntur. Etiam Satyram, ut audio, minatus est in literis ad quemdam Dresdensem; quasi pro meis agnoscere debeam universa, quæ inimica manus transmissit: Vivimus enim hic in Viperina societate. Sed quicquid velit, agat, & typographica tubâ proprium dedecus infonet in eruditæ aures: ego nullus trepido, quamvis illud poetæ infusurrare quispiam possit.
- (34) Occursare Capro, cornu ferit ille, caveto (38).
- (35) Epist. xxi Reinefii ad Hoffmannum & Rupertum, pag. 64, 65.
- (36) Boxhornius seems to be full of himself, and to show his parts before they are ripe. Some time ago when I read his Florus, I met with several very bad things; these I noted for my own use; but afterwards, by I know not what fraud, these notes became public, and it is said, even fell into the hands of Boxhornius himself. I am informed, that in a letter to a certain person at Dresden, he threatens me with a satire; as if I ought to acknowledge all these to be my writings, which his enemies publish against him: for here we live together like vipers. But let him do as he pleases; let him proclaim to the world his own disgrace. I am not afraid; though somebody may whisper the saying of the Poet:
- (37) Avoid the goat, who pushes with his horn.
- (38) Reinefius, in a letter to Hoffman, hath these words: Tragocrotem Batarum qui nescio quid Ruperto nostro minatus fuerat, confidentissimum Criticum esse & in Antiquitate videre præ calore parum, offendam ex ejus

(39) Ibid. Epist. xxvi, pag. 99.

(40) Ibid. pag. 111.

AN important digression on the accusation of a new Heresy, relating to the hatred of our neighbour.

ejus Quæstionibus Romanis, ubi circa Inscriptiones nonnullas pueriliter hallucinatur (39). - - - *As for that formidable Dutchman, who has threatened I know not what against our Rupert, I shall shew that he is a most audacious Critic, and very shallow in the knowledge of antiquity, being hurried away with his passion. This I shall prove upon him from his Quæstiones Romanæ, where, explaining some inscriptions, he blunders like a child.* See also the 27th letter of the same Reinefius (40); where he treats Boxhorn with a great deal of contempt.

[P] Having here an occasion to speak of this accusation of a new Heresy, relating to the hatred of our neighbour, I shall make a digression, which I think very important. I am persuaded that a compiler of facts is wanting in his duty, if he neglects to engage the attention of his readers to those accidents which are somewhat singular. Now there is not any thing more capable to gain their attention, than the pains which an author takes to reflect on those accidents, and observe such circumstances of them as discover uncommon passions. All this furnishes the reader with an ample matter of reflexion, with the art of judging of men, and of avoiding being surprized into a rash credulity.

This is what engages me to make some remarks here on the consequences of the accusation; and as most of my readers may not know the contents of that loose sheet, and cannot now have a writing of that nature from the Bookellers, it is fit that the groundwork of my digression should be an abstract of that little piece.

The accuser first relates the doctrine which had been preached, and secondly he shews the pernicious consequences of it.

He affirms, that the doctrine of Mr Jurieu, the Minister accused, amounts to this: I. *That the sentiments of hatred, indignation, and wrath, are allowable, good, and commendable, against the enemies of GOD, that is, as he himself explained it, against the Socinians, and the other Heretics of Holland, against the superstitious, idolaters, &c.* II. *That we ought to shew this hatred and indignation, by breaking off all correspondence with those people, neither saluting them, nor eating with them, &c.* III. *That we must not only hate the Heretics and bad qualities of such people, but that we ought to hate and detest their persons. One of the objections which he started to himself, and rejected with the most disdainful air, is this, that we are bound to war against error and vice; and yet to have charity for the person of the sinner.* After these general propositions, to which the doctrine of the accused person is reduced, he is charged in particular with having objected to himself the history, or parable, of the Samaritan, the example of JESUS CHRIST, who conversed with people of a bad life, the command he gives us to love our enemies, to bless those who curse us, to pray for those who persecute us, and in general all that is usually represented to a Christian people, in order to make them renounce the spirit of revenge: The Minister, I say, is charged with having raised all these objections to his doctrine, and of having slighted and despised them. He pretended that these passages are not well understood; nay, he asserted, that the sermons of our Saviour on the mount, are a hard doctrine which must needs be softened, by taking it not in a literal, but in a figurative sense, and that by the persecutors for whom our Saviour commands us to pray, we are not to understand those who persecute the Church, but such private and personal enemies as a man may have in the place of his residence; that, for the rest, we may fulfil the command of blessing those who curse us, provided we wish them spiritual happiness, though we hate their persons, and wish them temporal evils. Whereupon, addressing himself to his audience, he declared to them, that they might and ought to hate the King of France, and wish him ill; not, added he, because he has taken your goods and estates from you; but because he persecutes your religion.

These are the tenets imputed to Mr Jurieu: I have given the very words of the person who accuses him in their full extent, because I was afraid least an abridgment of them should not be faithful. This is his first point; the second is as follows.

The accuser having set forth the Heresy which had been preached, strongly exhorts the pastors and confidantes to censure it; and, in order to animate them the more, he points out the fatal effects it may produce, if it should pass unpunished. He represents to them the ascendancy which Mr Jurieu has over the people, and how easily they are persuaded into what flatters their passions, and adds, that the strongest and most natural passion of the heart of man is that of revenge and hatred of our enemies; that nothing is so grating to our corrupt nature, as not to be allowed to bear an ill will to those who have tormented us on account of religion; that it would be a very great consolation for a man, whom a Priest or Captain of dragons has persecuted, in order to make him go to Mass, to be allowed, without any scruple of conscience, to wish that such a person had the plague, or the gravel, or was in the gallies, &c. and to load him with imprecations and abuse; and that nothing is more irksome than what we read in those treatises, which are commonly perused by way of preparation for the Sacrament, that he who presents himself at the table of the Lord, with a heart full of resentment or hatred against any person whatsoever, communicates to his own damnation. But Mr Jurieu, continues he, removes all those pious scruples. He allows us (41) to (41) Observe, communicate with hatred in our hearts, and imprecations that he especially in our mouths, against those who persecuted the Refugee. He desires us to hate them, and forbids us to wish them temporal felicity. The accuser affirms, that according to these doctrines it would not be allowable to procure temporal happiness to our persecutors, and would be an unjustifiable action to relieve them in sickness, or if their houses took fire, to assist in extinguishing it. He expressly exhorts the Synod of the Walloon Churches (42), to prevent the bad consequences of these false doctrines, he alledges several arguments to induce them to it, and tells them, among other things, that the Heresy which he attacks, is incompatible with the prosperity of the State; For, says he, what distractions would not ensue, if the Protestants should neither salute those of a different religion, nor eat with them, nor trade with them; what if it was a thing allowed and commendable in them to hate all the Papists, all the Arminians, Menonites, &c. what if the gospel obliged them only to wish the spiritual felicity of such people, but not to wish them any temporal good, nor to help them out of a ditch, if they saw them in one, nor to give them an alms, if they saw them in want? Could this country prosper upon the foot of such maxims? For the rest, he declares that he does not desire the Synod to give credit to his accusation, that his sole view is to induce them to inform themselves of the fact, and oblige Mr Jurieu to publish the two sermons such as they were preached. (42) It was to meet soon after in the city of Torgow.

We must remember that these two sermons were preached on the twenty-fourth of January, and the twenty-first of February 1694; and that this accusation appeared in the month of March of that same year, at a time when the audience had fresh ideas of these sermons. This circumstance is remarkable.

Let us now take a view of the accused Minister's conduct. As soon as he knew that several of his hearers were shocked at his doctrine, he sent these two sermons to be printed. They were already in the press, and would have appeared soon after: but as Jurieu put a stop to the printing of them, and took other measures. He published remarks on this loose sheet, he affirmed that it was full of falsehoods; for it is false, these are the terms of the author of the remarks,

1. That Mr J. said, that the sentiments of hatred are good and commendable against any person whatever, if hatred is taken for a human passion which has its principle in self-love.
2. It is false that he asserted absolutely that we ought to shew this hatred against Heretics, by not saluting them, nor eating with them. What he advanced on this point is what St Paul and St John have affirmed, with the restrictions which will appear in these sermons.
3. It is false that he asserted that we ought to break off all the commerce of civil society with Papists, Menonites, Arminians, &c. that is to say, that

* that we ought neither to give to the Jews, nor take from them bills of exchange. An impertinence which he neither advanced nor imagined.

* 4. It is false that he rejected this maxim, *Love the person of a sinner, but hate his vices*, as a dangerous or false one, he rejected it as being too subtle, as being not very intelligible, and, in short, as not being applicable in all cases. These sagacious gentlemen, no doubt, understand very well how it is possible to afflict the person of a parricide with the most horrible torments, with burning irons, melted lead, the rack, tearing him limb from limb, and at the same time love that person. But they ought to excuse those who cannot comprehend this.

* 5. It is false that Mr J. said, directly or indirectly, in part, or in whole, *that by the persecutors, for whom our Saviour commands us to pray, we must not understand those who persecute*.

* 6. It is false that he addressed himself to his audience to tell them that they might and ought to hate the King of France, and wish him ill. What was said on that head will appear in these sermons.

* 7. It is false that he allowed of any man communicating with hatred in his heart, and imprecations in his mouth.

* 8. It is false that Mr J. forbade to do good, or to wish temporal felicity to our persecutors, and said that we were not obliged to procure any temporal good to the Papists, Mennonites, &c.

Observe, that he promises twice to publish these sermons, as being the infallible way to detect and expose the falsehoods asserted by his accuser. But in the same page 3, where this promise is made, he gives notice, that, instead of publishing these sermons, he may, perhaps, put out a complete treatise on this part of Morality. A little lower he acquaints us that honest people shall, at a proper time, be instructed in this matter; but that at present these sermons will not be published, because he is informed, from several quarters, that his enemies have prepared their batteries, and were resolved to find Heresies in them at any rate.

(43) I shall wait a while, continues he, till their fire is spent. I pass by the rest, it is only a heap of praises and invectives, which Mr Jurieu bestows, the former on himself, commending his own great feats, and the latter on his enemies. I likewise pass by a writing which appeared against this Minister's remarks, not with regard to the accusation, but with regard to his quarrels with Mr de Beauval. That piece, and Mr Jurieu's Apology (44), and Mr de Beauval's Reply, are incidents entirely foreign to the accusation, and consequently to my digression; my sole design being to consider what happened in consequence of the accusation.

If the accusation made Mr Jurieu's two sermons the subject of great talk, his remarks on it, made them still more so, and as this happened on the day before the Synod met at Tergow, every body was impatient to know what resolution that assembly would take in relation to an affair which was so nice, and so scandalous. That appeared very soon. The Synod treated both the pamphlet of the accuser, and that of the person accused, as libels, and dropped the affair, as a thing which had never happened. This was very strange and surprising to those who had expected that the Synod would inform themselves of the fact; nor did it remove the great scandal which had been given to the public, either by the accuser, if he calumniated Mr Jurieu, or by the person accused, if he had preached the doctrine laid to his charge. Here is the question which I design to clear up. It is a shame for our age that people dare to impose, with so much boldness, upon the public; this is the way to deprive us of the most specious maxims we can offer against the incredulous in matters of fact. Since therefore the bulk of this work may probably withstand the injuries of time better than a little book, I think myself obliged to communicate to my readers, whilst the affair is fresh, an explanation of this charge of a new Heresy, to the end that no unfortunate Sceptic may object, that in the year 1694, there having arisen a dispute whether a Minister, who had more than 1200 hearers, had preached a certain doctrine, or had not, it was impossible to decide it three days

after the sermon was preached. Those who will duly consider my remarks will own, I am persuaded, that in this affair it is possible to discern the truth and the falsehood.

I. I begin with this consideration, that no regard is to be had to the following principle, *If it was false that a Minister preached before 1200 persons the Heresy of the hatred of our neighbour, no body would have been bold enough publicly to accuse him of it three days after*. The reason why this principle is here of no force, is because another proposition may be opposed to it, namely, *If it was true that a Minister preached that Heresy before 1200 persons, he would not have dared publicly to deny it three days after*. If you conclude from the former principle that such an Heresy must have been preached, since the Minister was immediately accused of it before the public, I may conclude from the other principle that it must not have been preached, since as soon as the accusation appeared, the person accused publicly denied it. The shortest way is to set aside this manner of arguing, and to balance the affirmative of the accuser with the negative of the person accused. Let us imitate the Synod of Tergow, which paid no regard to either, and treated the pamphlet of the accuser, and that of the person accused, as equally libellous. In general, let us lay down this as a maxim, that all the proof we can draw from one man's affirming any thing, is defeated by another man's denying it, and let us now determine, by the particular circumstances of this question, which is the safest side of it, the affirmative, or the negative. This is my design in the following observations.

II. The accuser was not obliged to declare his name, since his design was only to engage the Synod to examine whether the Heresy which he attacked, had been actually preached. So that nothing can be inferred in Mr Jurieu's favour from hence, that his accuser did not publish his name.

III. The accuser was not obliged to answer Mr Jurieu's pamphlet; for it became him to wait the determination of the Synod, in relation to a fact which he affirmed, and the other denied: and when he saw that they would not meddle in the question, it became him to give it over, since no private man has a right to put interrogatories, and that was the only way of deciding the question. Nothing therefore can be inferred in Mr Jurieu's favour from hence, that his accuser did not support his first writing by a second; for let him have written what he would, all was to no purpose, unless witnesses were judicially examined.

IV. It is a certain and unquestionable fact that the Walloon Synods favour Mr Jurieu. He has more than once boasted of the regard they paid him, and has as often gloried in the triumphs which they gave him over his enemies. To be convinced of this we need only see his answer to the accusation (45). His adversaries complain of the indulgence, shewn him by the Synods, and observe that he has abused their excessive lenity (46). See the history of this Synodal favour in a book of Mr Saurin, a Minister at Utrecht (47). From hence we may draw two consequences, one to justify the accuser's silence, and the other against Mr Jurieu. In effect, if, as that Minister himself owns, the Synod of Breda threw aside among the rubbish the accusations brought against him by the deputies of some churches, if the Synod took into consideration only four of them, from which they took care to justify Mr Jurieu; we may easily understand that the author of the accusations ought to have been silent; and if in truth he was in the right, it was however prudent in him not to prosecute his first design, as it would have been to no purpose. The other consequence I am to mention is this. A Synod, which manifestly favours a Minister, does not neglect to examine an affair, when it is certain that such an inquiry would fully justify that Minister, and confound his accusers. Since therefore the Synod, tho' strongly solicited by the author of the accusation to examine the fact, neglected to make any manner of inquiry, it is very probable that they feared lest the event of it might not be favourable to Mr Jurieu. Thus it must be presumed that this Minister preached the Heresies laid to his charge.

V. It

(43) See the reflexions which Mr de Beauval made upon this, in his Considerations on two sermons of Mr Jurieu, pag. 2.

(44) That Apology left Mr de Beauval's remarks in all their force; and this he made appear in his reply, in a manner which confounded Mr Jurieu so much, that not being able to disentangle himself, he imitated the Missionaries of France, who finding themselves too hard pressed by a book of Controversy, had recourse to the Civil Magistrate, and obtained the suppression of the book.

(45) These gentlemen are very incorrigible. The Synod of Leyden tore their libel; and after they had renewed their objections under a greater authority; the Synod of Breda had so little regard for all that heap of accusations, that they only considered four of them, from which they took care to justify Mr J. and left all the rest among the rubbish: Tho' his absence gave his adversaries a full liberty, which they knew well how to employ.

(46) Démonstration de la Nouvelle Héresie, near the end.

(47) See the Preface, of the book intitulé, Examen de la Théologie de Mr Jurieu.

V. It is certain Mr Jurieu was persuaded that the author of the accusation was a Divine (48), and that the whole party, with which he has had so sharp encounters, had a hand in that piece. Hence it is that in his remarks he generally uses the plural number, *these gentlemen*. It cannot therefore be alleged that if he did not take an effectual method of refuting the accusation, his reason was because he would have only exposed a single person, and one unknown; for it is certain that he would have exposed, as he imagined, all those Ministers with whom he is at variance. Why then did he neglect this advantage at so decisive a juncture? Why did he not desire the Synod to name commissioners who might be sent to the place where his sermon was preached, and interrogate the most intelligent hearers? Why has he not produced any deposition in his favour, having so many friends who would not have refused him any thing, which their consciences had allowed them to declare in his vindication? In a word, why did he not publish his two sermons? The accusation should have made him desirous to publish them; on the contrary, it occasioned his putting a stop to the printing of them. A man must be a very stanch Pyrrhonist, who does not decisively affirm that such a conduct fully justifies the accusation. All appearances incline us to believe, that Mr Jurieu resolved to publish these sermons, when he knew they had shocked his audience. Doubtless he wrapped up and disguised the harshest maxims he had preached, and hoped that such a remedy would remove the scandal which had been taken. But when he beheld with what an air of importance the matter was treated in the accusation, and what an odious and seditious turn his doctrine would bear, he perceived that he had not sufficiently softened matters, and that, in order to blind his censurers, it was fit to make several more considerable alterations in his copy. Whereupon the only course he could take was to stop the impression: for had he corrected the copy so far as to get beyond the reach of his enemies, he would have put forth the most horrible medley that ever appeared, his system would have been a contradiction, from beginning to end; besides, several people would have well remembered that the sermons, as they were printed, were not the same which they had heard. The general talk would have been the insincerity of this Minister, who preached one doctrine, and published another. An attestation of the Consistory, that the printed sermons were perfectly like those which had been preached, was not easy to be obtained, and would not have convinced his auditors that they had heard such a doctrine preached, which they well remembered they had not heard. He therefore had no option to make, he was obliged to resolve upon suppressing them, and thereby deprive himself of the most effectual and expeditious method of covering his enemies with eternal shame, in case he had been innocent, in case the accusation was false. This is a decisive argument against him.

(49) In the year 1694, that Consistory was extremely favourable to him.

VI. Whoever has but a slender knowledge of the situation of affairs in this country, certainly knows that the Walloon Consistory of Rotterdam grants every thing that Mr Jurieu can reasonably demand (49). Nay, there are people who believe that his interest is not confined within so narrow limits. However, I suppose, that he obtains from the Consistory nothing but what is reasonable. Now had he not preached the doctrines laid to his charge, nothing was more just than to grant him a certificate of this. He would therefore have obtained it, had he asked it of his Consistory. Why then did not the Minister accused, instead of denying the accusation, in an anonymous pamphlet, disavow, in the face of the world, that he had preached the errors imputed to him, and support his denial by an ample certificate from his colleagues, Elders, and Deacons? He passes for being very tender of his reputation, and does not cease to say that his honour is necessary to the Church; it cannot therefore be pretended that he neglected to obtain a certificate, because it was indifferent to him whether he was defamed, or commended, being contented with the testimony of his own conscience, and that of honest minds who love him. Such a manner of defending him would be to impose upon the world, and upon himself in the first place.

VII. He well foresaw that the suppression of his two sermons would be the triumph of his adversaries. Accordingly he did not say that he intended to suppress them; he only gave some reasons why the publication of them was suspended for some time; and in case he suppressed them; he promised a complete treatise on that subject. All this pleads in favour of the accuser, better than an able Advocate could: for here are the reasons of this delay. He was informed that these gentlemen intended to criticize the two sermons, and did not think it proper at present to give them the pleasure of the attack. That would divert them; but that would scandalize the public. It is fit to wait a little till their fire is spent (50). But it is obvious that these gentlemen would have only rendered themselves ridiculous by criticizing two orthodox sermons, since they had accused them as full of Heresies. Where could they find these Heresies, if the accusation was such as Mr Jurieu pretends? The public would not have been scandalized to see a famous Minister make out his innocence: on the contrary, the public would have been greatly edified to see a false accuser put to shame. A dispute on this subject in writing, could not appear too soon, since it would contribute so greatly to shew the innocence of the Minister, and the calumny of his censurer. The more his critics had acted according to their first heat and passion, the more would they have entangled themselves. A man of parts would have taken advantage of their fury. But let us grant to Mr Jurieu that his delay was reasonable, what will this avail him, since it now appears that he did not intend to publish these sermons. A year is now elapsed without the publication either of them, or of any book on the hatred of our neighbour. Is not the fire of his adversaries yet spent? But, if the reasons he has assigned for the suppression of these two sermons betray his insincerity, the remarks he has made on the occasion betray it likewise.

VIII. He has not distinguished those two points which the accuser has so clearly done. See, above, the two points of the accusation. The first relates to the doctrines asserted by Mr Jurieu: the second concerns the effects which these doctrines may produce. All those who know the laws of disputation, tell us, that the consequences resulting from any doctrine ought not to be imputed to the defender of that doctrine, when he is known to reject them; but let him reject, or admit them, it is still allowable to point them out to him, because this may be a means of converting him. How many people would abandon a principle, if they knew the bad consequences which may justly be deduced from it? Thus the accuser has done nothing but what was reasonable, when, in order to induce and prevail with the Synods to censure the Heresy which he accused, he pointed out the pernicious consequences of it. He would have been in the wrong to assert that Mr Jurieu expressly preached these consequences; neither has he asserted it: the most ignorant readers may discern, as easily as the most learned, which are the propositions his accuser imputed to him, and which are the propositions he infers from the former, without pretending that he preached them; can it therefore be thought that Mr Jurieu dealt sincerely when he confounded these two kinds of propositions? Is it not manifest, that, in order to delude honest minds, and credulous people, he complained that he was accused of having preached, that it is lawful for a man to communicate with *baired* in his heart, and imprecations in his mouth? All the hearers of whom it should be asked if they had heard him utter such a proposition, would answer, No, and yet would they say with wonder, this is what the base accuser imputes to him; after such a calumny what may not be expected from him? This whole pamphlet is nothing but an infamous libel. This artifice, gross as it is, may have deceived a great many people; and for that reason Mr Jurieu employed it in his answer. Let us affirm the same thing of this other proposition, namely, that he is accused of having preached, that we ought to break off all the commerce of civil society with Papists, Mennonites, Arminians, &c. that is, we ought neither to give bills of exchange to the Jews, nor take them from them. It is very false that he was accused of having preached these words, and of having descended into these particulars; one

(50) See how Mr. Jurieu has refused all the reasons, as his Examination de la Théologie de Mr. Jurieu, Tom. ii, p. 112.

one must take him for a madman to accuse him of such things. It was only represented to the Synod that if we were to live according to the doctrines which he taught, we must renounce all manner of commerce with the enemies of the truth. It is his part to shew, if he can, that his principles do not infer such monstrous consequences.

Observe, that some consequences have so close and obvious a connexion with their principle, that we can never be persuaded that a man of sense, who teaches the principle, rejects these consequences. If once you teach that it is lawful to hate, and to curse those who persecute, how can you deny that it is not lawful for a man to present himself at the communion-table with his heart full of hatred, and his mouth full of imprecations against those who persecute. Is it not evident that in order to prepare one's self for receiving the communion, it is enough to depart from things unlawful? But let that be as it will, what the accuser imputes upon this head is an obvious consequence, which he draws from the Heresy charged upon him, and is not one of the propositions imputed to him. This discovers more and more the dissingenuity of the preacher. And from henceforth we may believe him very capable of denying that he preached such a Heresy, though it is very true that he did preach it.

IX. The same dissingenuity will evidently appear, if we consider how he answers in relation to the doctrines imputed to him. Let us compare his answer with the terms of the accusation. He is accused of having preached, *that the sentiments of hatred are good and commendable against the enemies of God*: his answer is, *it is false that he affirmed that the sentiments of hatred are good and commendable against any person whatever, if hatred is taken for a human passion, which hath its principle in self-love*. This is a downright imposition upon his readers; for thus he supposes that he was accused of having said, that hatred, even when it is a human passion, which hath its principle in self-love, is good and commendable. But it is evident that this is not the question: he is accused only of having said that the sentiments of hatred are good and commendable against the enemies of God. A man who deals plainly, and is conscious of his own innocence, does not recur to such artifices; he does not justify himself against chimerical accusations, he faithfully represents the crime of which he is accused, and answers plainly and precisely to the sense of the words of the accusation. Has Mr Jurieu done this? Has he answered, as a man ought to have done, who could justly deny the charge? *I did not say that the sentiments of hatred are good and commendable against the enemies of God*. Not in the least; he chose rather to entangle himself in captious distinctions, *I did not say that the sentiments of a human hatred which has its principle in self-love, are good and commendable against any person whatever*. But was you accused of this, might it be answered? What avails a justification of this nature, which is foreign to the accusation? I go farther, and maintain that his own distinction undoes him; it proves that he preached that, provided the sentiments of hatred be not founded in self-love, they are good and commendable against the enemies of God, and ought not to be called a human passion; he therefore preached that his hearers might lawfully hate the Papists, provided their hatred was not grounded upon some injury received, but upon the war the Papists make against the truths which God hath revealed. Now this is what the accuser calls a new Heresy in Morality, relating to the hatred of our neighbour. He did not make this new Heresy consist in the following proposition; *It is good and commendable to hate our enemies*; but in this, *It is lawful and commendable to hate the enemies of God*: and consequently the person accused owns all that is charged, and, in spite of his wrangling, justifies the veracity of the accuser.

It does not concern me to examine whether the doctrine in question is justly styled Heretical; I only inquire after the truth of the fact, and do not think it necessary to acquaint any body that this doctrine is really a pernicious Heresy (51). None but such as have never understood the New Testament, can doubt of it; and if once it was commendable to hate the

person of our neighbour for the love of God, there is not one precept in Scripture which a man might not transgress for the love of God.

X. I expressly set down the words, *bate the person of our neighbour*, because this gives me a fresh occasion of shewing the sincerity of the accuser. Mr Jurieu owns that he rejected this maxim, *We ought to love the person of a sinner, and hate the vice*, not as a dangerous or false one, but as being too subtle, as being not very intelligible; and, in short, as not being applicable in all cases. For instance, says he, it is not applicable to those who put a criminal to death. It would not have been an easy matter to give a better proof than this of the accuser's sincerity. He said that one of the objections which Mr Jurieu rejected with the most disdainful airs is this, *that we ought to war against error and vice, and yet have charity for the person of the sinner*. Does Mr Jurieu own this charge, since he confesses that he rejected that objection as being too subtle, as not very intelligible, nor applicable to Judges who punish criminals? In the stile of disputation, those who reject a distinction as too subtle, and too obscure, and those who reject it as false and chimerical, differ only in their expressions. The former use polite terms, and a sort of compliment; the latter an uncivil language: but, in truth, both of them form the same thought, and it is certain that the greatest defect in the distinctions of the Irish, or Spanish, Logicians is, that they are not very intelligible, they are too abstract, and too susceptible of exceptions. Add to this, if the distinction between the crime, and the person of a criminal does not take place in the tribunals of Judges, it cannot take place any where else, since no man living lies under so great an obligation as a Judge does, to renounce all passion against the person of a criminal. I refer my reader to Mr Saurin (52), and shall only say, that Mr Jurieu's answer, concerning the two principal doctrines which had been imputed to him, raises a presumption against him, which is not less forcible than a good proof.

If we would multiply presumptions against him, we need only observe the passages in his remarks where he acts with dissingenuity.

XI. He acts with dissingenuity, and with a seditious and persecuting spirit, when he affirms that his accuser is a Socinian and Anabaptist, with regard to magistracy and war. His accuser only said *that the precepts of Jesus Christ, and the maxims of charity are believed and taught by those very Heretics who attack the Trinity, the Incarnation, and Predestination*. Does this mean that he approves what they teach concerning war and the magistrates?

XII. He acts with dissingenuity when he says, that he was obliged to preach these two sermons, in order to refute, among other maxims, this, *that charity does not permit us to trouble any person under the pretext of piety and religion, and that Heretics ought not to be disturbed, as enemies to God*. He preached these two sermons in order to refute what one of his colleagues had lately preached. Now it is certain that this colleague never said, nor ever believed, that Heretics ought not to be troubled, or disturbed. He is well persuaded that we ought to write against them, demonstrate their chicaneries, press them hard upon their sophisms, and shew their system in all its falsity and absurdity: and these things cannot fail to trouble and disturb the Heretics.

XIII. He acts with dissingenuity when he alleges what passed with relation to certain letters, which Mr Jurieu had written to the Duke of Montausier, as a proof of a correspondence with the court of France. Mr Jurieu's enemies have had transcripts of these letters, and of that Duke's answers, and have made use of them to vex, and, as they express themselves, to unmask him (53). They have published some extracts of them, which shew that he made most flattering compliments to the King of France, and such as were the very reverse of the language he held here in conversation, in the pulpit, and in his books. The accuser touched upon this point by the way. This de Mr Bayle, greatly angered Mr Jurieu: he affirmed that these gentlemen, by producing these extracts, had given an *unanswerable proof*, that they held an *unwarrantable correspondence with the enemies of the State* (54). He affirmed

(51) See Mr Saurin's *Dout*, intitulé, *Examen de la Théologie de Mr Jurieu*, Tom. ii, pag. 307, & seq. where he refuses Mr Jurieu's Remarks, on the Accusation, and shews him that his Moral Doctrine, concerning the hatred of one's neighbour, is one of the loosest maxims of the Jesuits.

(53) See the *Cabale Chimérique*, pag. 51, 52, of the new edition, and Lettre de Mr de Beauval sur les Différens de Mr Jurieu & de Mr Bayle, pag. 35, 36.

(54) *Réflexions sur la Dénonciation*, pag. 4.

This avails nothing; for when the magistrates prohibit a book, they do not warrant that it contains false facts. Mr Jurieu does not pretend that when the States of Holland prohibited the book intitled *l'Esprit de Mr Annauld*, they determined that the facts contained in that book were lies. In fine, a minister venerable on account of his age, his gravity, piety, and learning (65), such a minister, I say, who hath seen Mr Jurieu an hundred times in the Synods, affirms that *Mr Jurieu's presence usually ruins his affairs, because he has fits of raving which he cannot keep up, and he rashly advances things of the falshood of which he is presently convicted*. What man does not see that since either the accuser, or the person accused, must needs be an impostor, reason and good sense would have us suspect the latter, rather than the former (66).

(65) Mr Saurin, See his Preface to his Examen la Théologie de Mr Jurieu.

(66) Semel machos (and by so much the more reason Sæpe machus) semper presumitur in eodem genere mali, say the Christians.

(67) See la Chimère démontrée, pag. 515, and in the Preface, pag. 64.

(68) Réflexions sur la Dénonciation, pag. 5.

XX. Some body perhaps will say that in an affair of this nature, one might give more credit to a person unknown, if the question was not concerning a falshood to which so many persons living were witnesses. In answer to this objection, I shall make two remarks, one is, that Mr Jurieu was so bold as to publish in the year 1691, that the Burgo-masters of Rotterdam had shewn a particular regard to him, when they sent for him and the author of the *Cabale Chimérique*, to acquaint them with their resolution. Yet it is certain that these gentlemen had held an even balance between the two parties, and required nothing of one, but what they required of the other (67). There were five witnesses to this, the four Burgo-masters, and the Pensionary of the city. Nevertheless, Mr Jurieu immediately published that they had shewn him this pretended regard, without fearing that any of these worthy persons should detect him in that false assertion. He had his evasion at hand; viz. that he had not put his name to his factums or cases; and besides that, he well knew they would not go so far as to judicial proceedings. What he has done since that time is much bolder, he has said (68), that these gentlemen *will ever lament the zeal which the worthy magistrates of Rotterdam shewed against their friend the professor of Philosophy*. A few days after he perceived that this professor lost his post, only on account of religious opinions, and therefore that the accusations of state-crimes which Mr Jurieu laid against him, with so great a noise that it resounded throughout all Europe, were not regarded. This comes very near to make him known for a public calumniator, or a rash and heedless accuser, utterly void of discernment. What has he done to ward off this blow? Why he has changed his tone; he has affirmed, that the book on comets was not the true cause of the Professor's disgrace, and that it was chiefly on account of the *Advice to the Refugees* that his salary, and permission to teach, were taken from him, not without having been heard, but after the Magistrates had taken up a considerable time in examining all the pieces, answers, replies, &c. This is an assertion of the falshood of which the whole city of Rotterdam is convinced, for there is not one citizen who did not ask of some of the Counsellors how the affair passed, and consequently must have known that the very first time it was proposed in the council, whether they should revoke the permission granted to that Professor, in the year 1681, to teach both in public and private, with a salary of 500 florins, the majority were for the affirmative: thus the affair was proposed and concluded in the same meeting: I know not if it lasted a full hour. The *Advice to the Refugees* was not mentioned there, directly, nor indirectly. Some of those who gave their opinions only alledged the *Thoughts on the Comets*, and represented the danger of suffering youth to be instructed in such opinions as are contained in that book. How bold must the man be, who after two or three months, whilst all the members of the Council are living, publicly asserts, that these gentlemen grounded their resolution chiefly upon the *Advice to the Refugees*, and had thoroughly examined that affair long before? This boldness is the more surprising, as several of these gentlemen, when they came to the Council, knew not that such a proposal would be

made, I mean that of revoking the salary, and the permission to teach. Never had a word been said of this matter in their meetings, never were the members exhorted to examine the pieces, never were commissioners named to examine them, and make their report. It is well known that most of these gentlemen do not understand French, and consequently could not examine any factum (or case) on the accusation of the *Advice to the Refugees*, nor examine the book on comets. Mr Jurieu's temerity, indiscretion, and want of respect for the Council of Rotterdam, whose conduct he has unreasonably, and without the least occasion, taken upon him to justify, might be fully exposed, if one knew as little as he does how to render to Cæsar, the things which are Cæsar's. The Council of that city has no need to justify their conduct in that affair. They are absolute sovereigns, with regard to the permissions of teaching; and may order, as they think proper, that every Philosopher who would obtain a salary, and permission to teach, should follow this or that system; so that the author of the book on Comets might have been removed from his professorship merely because he was no Voëtian, after the same manner as in other countries all Ramists, Cartesian, &c. are excluded from professorships. Let us conclude, that a man, capable of asserting, that the Magistrates of Rotterdam, did a thing which they have not done; capable of asserting it, I say, whilst these Magistrates are still living, and have fresh ideas of the affair, is very capable of denying that he preached a doctrine, though it is certain that he did preach it.

XXI. I have one observation more to make, which appears to me considerable. It is easy to conceive, may our posterity say, that the anonymous author of a pamphlet may wrongfully accuse a famous Minister of having preached Heretical doctrines; whereas it is incredible that such a Minister would dare to deny that he preached what he did actually preach. Two thousand hearers, if you please, will detect the assurance of the false accuser; but what harm can they do him? They know not who he is, nor where to find him, he is sure never to meet with the shame which he deserves. The Minister cannot flatter himself with these hopes. Two thousand hearers, provoked at his boldness, or rather effrontery, would mortify him wherever he appeared. Common sense teaches us that this punishment is inevitable. It is not therefore probable, that a Minister would expose himself to it; since therefore Mr Jurieu, a few days after he had preached these sermons, published a pamphlet, in which he denied that he preached the Heresy imputed to him, he deserves more to be credited than the accuser.

This is a plausible objection, and may forthwith strike foreigners; but they and our posterity will easily avoid being surprized, if they consider the two things which I am going to observe.

First, this objection proves too much; for if it was a good one, Mr Jurieu had not publicly advanced what I have already mentioned; nor asserted in the Synods several falshoods of which he was presently convicted, as Mr Saurin, an eye-witness, has charged upon him in the face of the public (69). Fifty Ministers, and about as many elders, all present together in a Synod, are more to be feared than a multitude of people spread in a city; I say, they are more to be feared by a Minister who dares to deny a known truth.

(69) In the Preface to his Examen de la Théologie de Mr Jurieu, pag. xxx, 4. See above the end of number xix.

In the second place, the greatest number of hearers are not capable of certifying whether a Minister preached the propositions charged upon him, or those which he owns that he preached. They have not attention, or penetration, or memory enough, to be able to answer that there were, or were not, such and such restrictions and explanations in the doctrine preached. So that a Minister may be very easy as to the greatest part of his hearers; he may assure himself that he can safely deny that he preached what he has actually preached, and disguise it as he thinks fit, without fearing the consequences. As for intelligent hearers, they are to be feared; but Mr Jurieu is on such a footing that he has no occasion to fear them.

He

He foresaw what has happened to him; I mean that he should raise many enemies to himself: for this reason he had the address to fortify himself more carefully than they fortify frontier towns the most exposed. He shewed a zeal full of fury for the ruin of Popery, and that of France (70). He insulted and affronted all the sectaries in Holland, both as being Heretics, and Republicans, in order to make a merit of being odious to them. He made a great show of his interest: and having persuaded his emissaries that he had not this interest by the recommendation of others, but originally and directly by himself, they spread this news from house to house: so that those of Mr Jurieu's congregation are persuaded, that he can do a great deal of good to those who are devoted to him, and a great deal of mischief to those who oppose him (71); I am persuaded, that, by a subtle and artful galconade, he has increased the idea of his interest: but it is certain that he has powerful patrons, who, through maxims of state, will bring him off in the worst affairs, in which he can engage. Hence it is that there is hardly any body who does not carefully avoid incurring his indignation. He well knows this, and therefore was not concerned if two or three hundred private persons were convinced that he denied the truth, by denying the accusation. He was well assured that no body would stand as a witness against him: he knows that good Christians are persuaded that they ought to hide the faults of their pastors, as Shem and Japhet hid the nakedness of their father. He has so often affirmed and repeated that it is not possible to blame him, without injuring the Church, that he has persuaded a great many people into the belief of it: he has so often, and so pathetically, represented that he has worn out his strength and vigour in the service of the cause, and now only leads a wretched, lingering life, because he has sacrificed his watchings and labours to the good of the Church, that most of his brethren are persuaded that they should be guilty of a cruelty, if they should cast the least stain upon his honour; and they will not reproach themselves with having made his grey hairs descend with sorrow to the grave. This is one of the reasons of what his adversaries call *the excessive lenity of the Synods*. Now since the appearing of his *Important Advice to the Public*, and his marvellous accusation of the Cabal of Geneva, people are afraid of being incorporated in it, if they speak or act in the least like those of that pretended Cabal. One would think they imagine that he is an open dealer in wares of this sort. This puts me in mind of one thing, which, of all the expedients he has used to establish his authority, I ought first to mention. He set up for an informer of two great conspiracies, which he pretended to have discovered among the Refugees. One is a Cabal both of state and religion, the other of religion only. The former is spread from south to north, and has its center at Geneva, and its design is to render the King of France master of all Europe, in order that he may ruin the Protestants. The other is composed of a great many Ministers come from France, who are infected with the Pelagian and Socinian Heresies, and are resolved to sow them as much as possible, since they are no longer restrained by the fear, which, in France, obliged them to conceal their opinions. These two conspiracies proved to be equally chimerical; nevertheless, the informer reaped a great advantage by them. He thereby made himself considered as the rampart of Orthodoxy, and honest people were very near giving him the title of

MARSHAL OF THE FAITH: I mean Marshal, or Provost at least, of the long robe. Several of the brethren have attributed his greatest faults to an excess of zeal, and have only considered them as irregularities, which might, with a safe conscience, be protected, or excused, that the Church might not be deprived of so necessary a defender. Several others did not dare to declare against him, lest they should pass for members of one or other of these two imaginary Cabals. One is in fear for his pension, another of being never promoted. After all, if we are surprised that the Ministers, in a body, would not meddle in the affair of the accusation, we ought not to be surprised that no private person gave his attestation in that cause. The lawful authority did not require it of any person, besides the fact to be attested was scandalous, and the scandal seemed to be sufficiently removed by the public disavowal of the person accused. It is a great matter to see such a man not dare to maintain what he has preached. It is a tacit retracting of his doctrines, which they thought might be sufficient. And he well knew that they would be content with it.

Where is the man, who, after having reflected on all these things, thinks it strange that Mr Jurieu dared to deny the accusation.

These are the weapons with which I thought it became me to furnish posterity against future Sceptics. A Sceptic glad to render all facts uncertain, might have said thirty years hence, *It cannot be known for certain whether a famous Minister did or did not preach an Heresy on such a day: how then can we certainly know what passes in councils of state?* He may be answered by virtue of my explanation, that it is very easy to aver that the Minister did preach the doctrines with which he is charged by the accuser. If whilst things were fresh, any person had taken the pains to explain them, as I have done this, we should not be obliged on so many occasions to fall in with Scepticism in history. The negative argument would not in that case be of any force. I call a negative argument the silence of cotemporary authors, with regard to remarkable accidents, whether mentioned by no body, or mentioned without being contradicted. We are in this last case. Mr Jurieu denies, and every body suffers him to deny; even the accuser suffers it. For this reason, in future generations, the strength of the negative argument might be used in his behalf, if they did not know the contents of my digression.

There is no reason why what I have attempted to do in favour of our posterity, may not extend even to foreigners: for as to the persons who are now living in Holland, they do not want this information. They doubt not that Mr Jurieu preached the hatred of our neighbour in the sense of the accusation. The suppression of these sermons speaks very clearly on this head, and such of his hearers as can speak out without fearing the effects of it, very frankly tell the truth when occasion offers. This indeed is only the talk of conversation, and not a public certificate. It was said once in the presence of a Magistrate who had heard these sermons, that Mr Jurieu denied the whole accusation. *How, said the Magistrate, does he deny he preached that a man fulfils the command, provided he wishes spiritual felicity to persecutors?* Yes, it was answered, that is one of the points which he most boldly denies. The Magistrate shrugged up his shoulders, and protested that he distinctly remembered to have heard him speak this new doctrine. I was present at that conversation.

ZUYLICHEM (CONSTANTINE HUYGENS, LORD OF) Secretary and Counsellor to the Princes of Orange, one of the most ingenious men and best Poets [A] of the XVIIth Century, was born at the Hague, on the fourth of September 1596. He was the second son of Christian Huygens [B], Secretary to the Council of State of the Republic

[A] *And best Poets.* There are of his composition an infinite number of Dutch verses: he also published some Latin poems under the title of *Momenta delatoria*.

[B] *He was the second son of Christian Huygens.* This CHRISTIAN was the son of CORNELIUS HUYGENS, a gentleman of Brabant, and of Gertrude Back (1). He was the first of his family who settled in

Holland. He married (2) into a very considerable family of Antwerp, by taking for his wife Susanna Hoefnagle, the daughter of James Hoefnagle, and Elizabeth Veleler (3). This James Hoefnagle was so rich, that he gave three hundred thousand florins for his redemption from the Spanish garrison when it was continued in Antwerp in the year 1576. This large ransom secured him and his family from the fury of the soldiers,

(1) Being the son of a family of Antwerp, by taking for his wife Susanna Hoefnagle, the daughter of James Hoefnagle, and Elizabeth Veleler (3). This James Hoefnagle was so rich, that he gave three hundred thousand florins for his redemption from the Spanish garrison when it was continued in Antwerp in the year 1576. This large ransom secured him and his family from the fury of the soldiers,

(1) The daughter of Christian Back, and Lucy Back de Weelden, of the same family with those of Aften.

Republic of the United-Provinces, and was preferred to the post I have mentioned under Prince Frederic Henry. He continued in the exercise of it under his successors, until he resigned it to his eldest son (a). In the year 1661, he was sent to the Court of France, to solicit the restitution of Orange, of which Lewis XIV had taken possession. And in the year 1665, having at last obtained what he demanded, he took a journey to Orange, in order to cause that principality to be delivered to its lawful sovereign. This was performed with great solemnity (b). He lived to a great old age, with the happiness of retaining both the solidity of his judgment, and the vivacity of his wit, and also of seeing his family well settled, and the sixty-two years services he had done to the house of Orange well approved. He had kept a great epistolary correspondence with the most illustrious learned men [C], and as he loved and understood the Liberal Arts, he delighted in favouring those who made profession of them. He died in the year 1687, aged ninety years and six months. He was President of the Prince of Orange's Council. Mr Huygens, one of the greatest Mathematicians of Europe, was one of his three sons [D].

(a) See the remark [D].

(b) See the relation published by Mr Chambrun, Minister of Orange, in the year 1666.

(4) Called *Theodorus van Liefvelt*, Lord of Hamme, Ste. Anne, Opdorp, &c.

soldiers, as well as the fine house which he had built; but did not prevent their killing, even in his arms, one of his relations who fled to him for protection. The country-seat which he built, about a quarter of a league from Antwerp, is still known by the name of Lanternhorf. Balthazar Hoefnagle, his eldest son, married the daughter of the Chancellor of Brabant (4). As for CHRISTIAN HUYGENS, he served Prince William in quality of his Secretary, ever since the foundation of the Republic of the United-Provinces. The histories of Reydanus and Hooft relate a noble action of his, when he was Deputy to that Prince, after whose death he was Secretary of the Council of State. He died at the Hague, in the year 1624, leaving two sons and two daughters. MAURICE HUYGENS, his eldest son, and godson to Prince Maurice, was born at the Hague on the twelfth of May 1595, and was Secretary to the States after the death of his father, and left issue. CONSTANTINE HUYGENS, the second son of Christian, is the subject of this article. He had two sisters: GEERTRUDE HUYGENS, the eldest, was married to Philip Doublet, Lord of St Annelant, &c. Receiver-General of the United-Provinces. From this marriage proceeded Philip Doublet, Lord of St Annelant, &c. who married SUSANNA HUYGENS, his cousin-german, the daughter of our CONSTANTINE HUYGENS. The other sister of the said Constantine, named CONSTANTIA HUYGENS, was born on the second of August 1602, and married David le Leu de Wilhem, as I have said above (5).

(5) In the article of WILHEM, remark [F]. All this is extracted out of a Memoir imparted to the Book-keeper.

[C] He had kept a great epistolary correspondence with the most illustrious learned men. Chiefly with Daniel Heinisius, Nicolas Heinisius, the son of Daniel, Vof-

fus, Erius Puteanus, Balzac (6), Corneille, and still more with Father Merienne, and Mr Des Cartes (7). Observe also, that he is frequently mentioned in the printed letters of several learned men. See amongst others those of Mr de Wicquefort and Barlaeus, lately published in Latin and French (8).

[D] Mr Huygens, one of the greatest Mathematicians of Europe, was one of his three sons.] His name was

CHRISTIAN; he died on the eighth of July 1695, at the age of sixty-six years, without ever marrying. Hymen could not well agree with a person like him, wholly devoted to the enquiry after what was most profound in Mechanics, Astronomy, Geometry, &c. See his elogy in the History of the Works of the Learned (9). To make it compleat, Mr de Beauval had no occasion for any thing else besides a catalogue of the writings and inventions of this great man. You will also find his elogy, as well as that of Mr de Zuylichem, his father, in a letter written by Sorbier, on the thirteenth of July 1660 (10). Mr Huygens was then only thirty-one years of age (11). His eldest brother, named CONSTANTINE, was Secretary to the Prince of Orange, upon the resignation of his father, and continued in the possession of that post after the accession of that great Prince to the British throne. He died at the Hague in November 1697. Mr de Zuylichem left a third son, who died at Rotterdam in the beginning of July 1699. He had the office of Deputy of the Admiralty of the Maese for life. He left a very fine family. His eldest son possesses the lordship of Zeelhem, of which Mr Huygens, the Mathematician, bore the title during the last years of his life.

(6) Balzac inscribed to him his criticism upon Heinisius's *Herodes infanticida*. Several Letters which he wrote to him are printed.

(7) See Mr Baillet in his Life of Des Cartes, page 542, & seq.

(8) At Amster-dam 1696.

(9) For August, 1695, Art. ix, page 542, & seq.

(10) Sorbier, *Lettres & Relations*, p. 143, & seq. Paris edition, 1660, in 8vo.

(11) Sorbier says he was but 24. He is mistaken.





A N

Historical Discourse

On the LIFE of

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS,

KING OF SWEDEN.

CHAP. I.

Containing his actions till the truce concluded with Poland in the year 1629, some time before he entered Germany, to make war on the Emperor Ferdinand II.

SWEDEN had been governed for almost a century, by Princes different from those who reigned in Denmark, when GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS ascended the throne. The vicinity and warlike temper of these two nations, raised so great an antipathy between them, that the one has always attempted to subdue the other. They have some times succeeded in these attempts, and Sweden and Denmark have reigned over each other by turns. Near the close of the XVth century, it was the turn of Denmark to reign over Sweden: for CHRISTIERN, or CHRISTIAN I, King of Denmark, who died in the year 1482, was likewise King of Sweden, and left a son, named JOHN II, who for some time enjoyed both these kingdoms. He was expelled by the Swedes; and this made CHRISTIAN II, his son, more desirous to re-unite these two kingdoms in himself. He at first succeeded in his enterprise; for notwithstanding the valour and resistance of the Swedes, he laid siege to Stockholm, and obliged them to acknowledge him as their King. But he did not long enjoy either this new kingdom, or that which he possessed already. His cruelties rendered him so odious, that, upon his return from Sweden, the Danes took from him the crown of Denmark, and gave it to his uncle FREDERIC, Duke of Holstein, who having defeated CHRISTIAN, confined him in a castle, during the rest of his life.

This change gave the Swedes an opportunity of shaking off the Danish yoke. Fortune was so favourable to the courage of a Prince of the house of VASA, called GUSTAVUS ERIC-SON, (that is the son of ERIC) descended from the antient Kings of the Goths, and from CHARLES CANUTE, who had sixty years before been King of Sweden, that he drove the Danes out of all their garrison-towns, and was afterwards proclaimed King of Sweden, amidst the joyful acclamations of all the people. From him descended the famous GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS, who is the subject of this discourse.

This great revolution, by which in the same year Sweden and Denmark had each a new King, was not like to stifle the antient quarrels between these two kingdoms. One might have thought that FREDERIC, the better to justify the choice which had been

ANNO
1523.

1523.

1523.

made of him, would have laboured to recover to the Danes the superiority which they had lost; and that GUSTAVUS, for a like reason, would have used all his efforts to secure the advantage, which he had gained from the Danes: but the contrary happened: each of the new Kings only endeavoured to establish himself in the throne which he had obtained by the voice of his subjects, and believing that the friendship of each other was necessary for that purpose, they contracted together a very strict alliance, which doubtless greatly contributed to introduce the Lutheran religion into these two Northern kingdoms: for as Princes are usually disposed, they rarely embrace the same novelties, when they hate one another, and the attachment of their enemies to a new religion, is to them a strong argument of the falshood of it.

I should depart from my subject, was I to explain how ERIC, the eldest son of GUSTAVUS ERIC-SON, was deprived of his crown by JOHN, his brother, Duke of Finland, and husband to the Princess CATHARINE, sister of SIGISMUND AUGUSTUS King of Poland; and how afterwards CHARLES, Duke of Sudermania, another son of King GUSTAVUS ERIC-SON, was made King of Sweden, in prejudice to Prince SIGISMUND, the eldest son of King JOHN, his brother. I shall only observe that this exclusion of SIGISMUND, sowed great discord between the Poles and the Swedes, because SIGISMUND having been elected King of Poland during his father's life, and not having been able to prevent his uncle CHARLES, Duke of Sudermania, from being declared King of Sweden by the States of the kingdom, he employed the forces of Poland, to take satisfaction for the injury he believed the Swedes had done him, and transmitted to his posterity the care of making good his pretensions. But notwithstanding this, as the reign of SIGISMUND, and that of his son ULADISLAUS were very glorious in Poland; so CHARLES enjoyed Sweden with great reputation till his death, and left that kingdom to his son, under whom it became one of the most glorious and flourishing in Europe.

ANNO
1587.

In the year 1611, upon the death of CHARLES, was raised to the throne of Sweden this illustrious son, who has done so great honour to his nation, the famous GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS, the scourge of the House of Austria, the terror of the Court of Rome, and deliverer of the Protestant religion. He was born at Stockholm on the ninth of December 1594, and his birth gave a most sensible joy to his father, and to the Princess CHRISTINA his mother, CHARLES's second wife, and daughter to a Duke of Holstein. SIGISMUND King of Poland, had in the same year been crowned King of Sweden, and returning to Poland, had left the regency of Sweden to CHARLES his uncle. In the year 1600 this regency was changed into a true and full royalty, by the States of the Realm, and in an authentic manner, such as removes every just charge of usurpation from the memory of that Prince. Otherwise, we must say that SIGISMUND ought to have laid no claim to the crown of Sweden, since he was the son of a Prince, who only ascended the throne upon the exclusion given by the States to him who filled it. But tho' the royal name, and the royal authority had been conferred on CHARLES in the year 1600, he was crowned only in 1607, three years after the same States of the kingdom had settled on his family the succession to the crown of Sweden by way of election, without excluding the daughters, if the male issue should fail.

1596.

We may easily imagine that Poland did not lie quiet, and that CHARLES put himself in a condition to make head against the Poles. He immediately passed into Livonia, chusing rather to carry the war out of his kingdom, than to wait for the enemy in his own dominions. He knew besides that the places belonging to Sweden in that country, lay the most exposed to the attacks of the enemy. Thus Livonia became the theatre of the war which arose between Sweden and Poland.

1600.

The first campaign was very prosperous to the King of Sweden, the greatest part of Livonia having then been reduced. But the two following years, the Poles in their turn gained very considerable advantages over him, by the valour of JOHN ZAMOISKI, one of their most famous generals. Afterwards both sides had their share of success, and tasted a little of good, and of bad fortune.

It having been reported in the year 1609, that SIGISMUND had attacked Muscovy, in order to get himself declared Great Duke; CHARLES, thought himself obliged to traverse that design, the success of which could not but prove fatal to him. The affairs of Muscovy were then in a bad situation, by reason of the frequent seditions, which in a very short time had cut off three or four of their Emperors.

(1) He was crowned on the first of June, 1606.

BASIL ZUSKI (1) who reigned at that time, ascended the throne, by putting to death DEMETRIUS, who had got possession of it, by making the people falsely believe that he was the son of the Great Duke JOHN BASIL, the second of that name, who died in the year 1584. Under cover of this imposture, he had formed a great party; and by the powerful succours he received from the Poles, had caused the Great Duke FOEDOR-BORIS-LOWIZ to be strangled. This FOEDOR-BORIS-LOWIZ had succeeded his father BORIS-GUDENOW, who died two months before (2) of the uncauseness that was given him by the warlike preparations of the pretended DEMETRIUS. No man was better acquainted with the imposture of this DEMETRIUS than BORIS-GUDENOW; for he knew very well that he had rid himself of the true DEMETRIUS, the brother of the Great Duke THEODORE, as well as of THEODORE himself, whom he had

(2) Boris-Gudenow died on the third of April, 1605.

had poisoned in the year 1597. The good fortune which DEMETRIUS had to become Emperor, made a greater impression on some turbulent spirits, than the violent death which precipitated him from the throne: for BASIL ZUSKI, who upon his death was become Great Duke, in a short time found he had to contend with two false DEMETRIUS's, who raised great disorders in Muscovy. Such was the state of affairs in that country, when the King of Poland carried the war into it. There was a great probability that he would oblige the Muscovites to choose him their Emperor, and even that this new dignity would enable him to subdue the Swedes, whom he only considered as his rebellious subjects. All the maxims of policy determined CHARLES to give his assistance to the Great Duke, who strongly importuned him for it.

The affair having been proposed to the States-General of the kingdom, they resolved to make a treaty of alliance with the Great Duke; whereupon King CHARLES sent him some good troops under the conduct of Count JAMES LA GARDIE: these troops did the Czar great service, and signalized themselves on many occasions. But the restless, wild, and odd, humour of the Muscovites furnished the factious with too many means of supporting themselves; besides the Swedish troops having mutinied, because they did not receive the pay which the Czar owed them, that unfortunate Emperor, destitute of every resource, was dethroned, and confined in a monastery. Upon this SIGISMUND conceived greater hopes either for himself, or for his son ULADISLAUS. There was indeed much talk of choosing his son Emperor of Muscovy. Some people also cast their eye on Prince CHARLES PHILIP, the King of Sweden's second son, and this was much talked of, even after the death of that King: yet neither was elected. The Muscovites preferred a sovereign born in their own country, and elected MICHAEL FEDEROWITS, a relation (3) of JOHN BASILIDES.

ANNO
1613.

During these last disorders in Muscovy, CHARLES was involved in a new war. CHRISTIAN IV, King of Denmark, being unwilling to lose so favourable an opportunity, as the King of Sweden presented to him, by engaging in the war with Muscovy and Poland, resolved to break with him. He found out several pretences, and several subjects of complaint, he wrote letters, he insisted much on his patience, and proposed ways of accommodation, as they always do, who are fully determined to come to a rupture. In a word, he made use of all the formalities which are commonly employed either to hide from the public the injustice of the aggressor, or to retard the preparations of the enemy, and by which none but very simple people are ensnared. At last, after having used all those little formalities, he wrote to King CHARLES, that he declared war against him, and at the same time set out in order to besiege at once both Calmar and Elfsburg.

(3) Michael Federowits was the son of Theodore Kikiuits, Patriarch of Moscow, and of Mary daughter of John Basilides, and sister to the true Demetrius.

This was the first war in which GUSTAVUS served, being only sixteen or seventeen years of age. Something had been always observed in him, which promised that one day he would be a great man; and the King, his father, who had perceived this better than any other person, relying upon it, had taken an extreme care of his education, and neglected nothing that might render him an accomplished Prince, both in the qualities of his body and mind. Finding himself obliged to repel the Danes, who besieged two of his towns at the same time, he carried his son with him to the army, and sent him towards Christianopol, a place which belonged to the Danes, hoping to give their forces a diversion, by threatening one of their towns. The success was greater than had been expected; for though there was a strong garrison in Christianopol, yet the Swedes seized it at the first onset, after having blown up the gates by petards. The garrison not having had time to capitulate, was put to the sword, and the city was set on fire.

GUSTAVUS transported by the ardour of his courage, ran a great hazard in this expedition; for having exposed himself too far, he was forced to escape the danger he was in, by pushing his horse into a water half frozen, where he had perished, if PETER BANNIER, knight of the order, and Senator of the kingdom, had not come to his assistance.

The taking and sacking of Christianopol, and some other attempts which were made on the Danes, did not hinder them, after they had made themselves masters of the town of Calmar, from taking likewise the Citadel. It is true that this was not so much owing to their valour, or to any neglect in CHARLES to relieve the Citadel, as it was to the treachery of the officer who commanded in it. The surrender of that place was soon followed by the invasion of the island of Oeland, and by the taking of the castle of Borkholm.

These disgraces so much incensed the King of Sweden, that not having been able to take satisfaction of the enemy, in some battles which he hazarded, he proposed to the King of Denmark that they should terminate their quarrel by a Duel. CHRISTIAN ridiculed this proposal, and answered that such a combat was rather the affair of an adventurer, than of a Prince. Nay he rallied him on the infirmities of his old-age, as if there was but little glory to be won, by gaining an advantage over a man in his years, or as if it was an unfair dealing to place the lives of a young and of an old King in balance, when the course of nature alone would soon put an end to that of the latter. A little after, he attacked the King of Sweden in his camp, and killed more of King CHARLES's soldiers, than he lost of his own.

V.O.L. V.

8 C

We

We may easily imagine that all this grievously vexed the King of Sweden, who had never wanted vigour nor courage, and had acquired great glory on many occasions. He thought of the means of revenge, and met with some: but doubtless the most pleasing was that which GUSTAVUS procured him, by retaking the island of Oeland and the castle of Borkholm, shewing that his very first attempts were masterly strokes.

How unwelcome and afflicting must death be to the father of such a son, from whom he might daily expect so many grounds of comfort? yet he must resolve to die near the end of the same campaign: for on the thirtieth of October 1611, CHARLES IX, King of Sweden, died after a few days illness. Four days before his death he had been informed that Count LA GARDIE had retaken several places from the rebellious Muscovites, and that the inhabitants of Novogrod whom he had subdued, had given him their promise to elect CHARLES PHILIP to the crown of Muscovy: but he seemed to take little concern in all this. He shewed that from thenceforth his only care was to prepare for death, and that he left all the affairs of this world to his son GUSTAVUS. He died very piously in the sixty-first year of his age, much regretted by his subjects, who considered him as the preserver of the Protestant religion, which the artifices of the Jesuits, backed by the credit of SIGISMUND, had infallibly banished out of Sweden, if CHARLES had not prevented it.

The loss of so great a Prince would have occasioned a longer and more sensible grief to the whole kingdom, had it not been for the great qualities of the young GUSTAVUS, who succeeded. I have already said that his father had conceived the greatest hopes of a son who had such natural endowments, and so careful an education. He had often expressed to his court the good opinion he had of his dear GUSTAVUS; for speaking of various things which he had wished for the grandeur and glory of the nation, but such as he did not hope to accomplish, he used to say to those who were present, *this lad will do it*, laying his hand on the head of his son. And as this kind of discourse never fails to pass from the court to the city, and to run from mouth to mouth, throughout the whole kingdom, all Sweden knew the esteem which King CHARLES had for his successor, and had conceived very great hopes of him, as well as CHARLES. How great a burthen is this on a Prince! For, on one hand, nothing is more difficult for him than to answer the high ideas which a whole people have preconceived of him; and, on the other, nothing is more blasting to his reputation, than not to answer them. We shall see hereafter that GUSTAVUS surpassed all that had been expected of him.

As a long interregnum could not but be prejudicial to the Swedes, in the situation of the general affairs of the kingdom at that time, being at war with Poland, Denmark, and Muscovy; the States of Sweden, without loss of time, assembled at Nicoping, in the month of December which followed the death of the King, and, by the general voice of all the deputies, elected to the crown GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS, his son. This Prince being only seventeen years of age, made a speech which charmed the whole assembly, so full was it of greatness of mind, and of modesty together. He said, 'That considering his youth, and the difficulty of the affairs of the kingdom, he would rather have chosen not to take so heavy a burthen upon him; but that the States having thought it proper he should, he would undertake that charge in the name of the most holy Trinity, and apply all his care, and all his forces to maintain all the orders of the state in the true religion and in all their privileges.'

In the beginning of his reign, he applied himself wholly to the war against the Danes, because that was the most pressing evil, as it threatened the heart and center of the kingdom. He therefore took the field as soon as the season permitted, being resolved to recover Calmar, and drive the enemy from the frontiers: but before he set out, he disposed of the principal offices of the crown, and filled them with persons of a distinguished merit, especially the office of Great Chancellor of the kingdom, which he bestowed on the famous AXEL OXENSTIERN, one of the ablest men that ever appeared in Europe.

A King who had no other endowments but the courage of GUSTAVUS, would not have failed to open the campaign with the siege of Calmar; but as for him who notwithstanding his fire, and the impetuosity with which his youth inspired him, was not incapable of entering into himself, and deliberately consulting the maxims of prudence, he considered that the Danes had so strongly fortified that place, that it was more proper to think of recovering it by gaining equivalent advantages, than by attacking it with main force. Therefore he did not lay siege to Calmar, but was only intent on giving the enemy a diversion: and for this end the King himself entered Schonen as far as was possible, and having ravaged it, he returned to his camp, after having had a sharp encounter with the enemy in his retreat.

But whatever pains GUSTAVUS took either to vanquish the Danes, or at least to defeat their enterprises, he had but little success. CHRISTIAN IV King of Denmark, was a courageous Prince, skilled in the art of war, and had more troops than his enemy. He therefore took some towns from the Swedes, and put to sea a fleet which alarmed the city of Stockholm, and to say the truth, the advantage of that war was on his side. For though by the treaty of peace concluded in the beginning of the year 1613, he

restored

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS.

restored to the Swedes all the places he had taken from them, yet they were obliged to pay him great sums of money for his reimbursement, and to make him several concessions. From hence, to observe it by the way, we may learn that it is not always sure to judge of the reign of a Prince by the first years of it, for here is one of the most glorious reigns that ever was, the beginnings of which were attended with a kind of disgrace. Here you see the great GUSTAVUS, who being involved in a war in the beginning of his reign, only comes out of it by dearly purchasing peace, at the mediation of the King of England.

His honour did not suffer by it; for there are a great many occasions, when Princes have the disadvantage without deserving to be blamed. If we would justly blame an unsuccessful Prince, it is not enough for us to say that he was unsuccessful, we must add that he had but very small obstacles to encounter; and this could not be alleged against the King of Sweden. Moreover the maxims of policy determined him to make peace with the King of Denmark, for besides the disposition of the King of Poland; always to create troubles to the Swedes, he likewise saw the Muscovites at variance with Sweden. King CHARLES, earnestly solicited by the Great Duke to assist him against the enterprizes of SIGISMUND, and sufficiently induced to it by his own interest, had sent some good troops into Muscovy, as I have said already. These troops greatly conduced to keep affairs in balance; and if they did not obtain, as the Swedes had been made to hope, that GUSTAVUS's brother should be chosen Great Duke in the room of BASIL ZUSKI, who was confined in a monastery, the Poles on their side could neither obtain the election of SIGISMUND, nor that of ULADISLAUS. The Muscovites chose an Emperor from among their own Princes, and at least they ought to own that the assistance of Sweden had been useful to them, in procuring the liberty of that election. But no sooner was the new Czar installed, than he declared war against Sweden.

GUSTAVUS, to convince him that he had judged wrong, if he had founded his hopes on the youth of the King of Sweden, resolved to invade Muscovy in the year 1615. Accordingly he entered that country, immediately seized on some towns, beat the Muscovites who durst keep the field in his presence, and laid siege to Pleskow, a rich town, and one of the principal keys of Muscovy. He opened the trenches with great vigour, and his batteries had already made a considerable breach in the walls of the town, when at the pressing solicitations of the King of Great Britain, the greatest peace-maker of the world, he raised the siege. The rigour of the season, which was already far advanced, had not been able to make him take that resolution; but the intreaties of King JAMES joining with this consideration, GUSTAVUS raised the siege with a good grace, shewing, in opposition to the notions entertained by some people, that the greatest generals, and those who are appointed by Heaven to perform the greatest exploits, do not take all the towns which they attack.

It must be added in his vindication, that he entered Muscovy, not with the design of making conquests there, but only to oblige the Czar to make a peace. Had he aimed at conquest, he would not have cast his eye on that quarter; he would have been contented to have nothing to fear from it. Thus the Ambassador of Great Britain, having assured him that the Great Duke desired a peace, but that out of haughtiness he would not enter upon a negotiation, while he saw his towns besieged, GUSTAVUS abandoned the siege of Pleskow, and wrote a handsome letter to King JAMES, wherein he did not fail to make him sensible of the sacrifice which, in his consideration, he had made to the work of peace, by raising the siege of a very considerable town, the taking of which appeared to him infallible. He then returned to Sweden, and held the State of Finland and Nordland, which he had summoned to meet on the nineteenth of January 1616.

As he was not a Prince who only sought to be admired by his subjects for his valour he made in the assembly a very eloquent speech, and such as was very proper to persuade the people that he chiefly desired to be loved by them, as a Prince incapable of sacrificing their wealth and repose to his own glory. This was wisely considered by GUSTAVUS: for we need not question but there were ill designing persons in the kingdom, who tacitly accused him of too great ambition, and said that he had more regard for his own glory, than for the repose of his subjects, when he engaged in the war with Muscovy. This was not only said, but was also written in certain libels which SIGISMUND, King of Poland, spread about in the kingdom, to sow discord among the Swedes. In order to dissipate these suspicions, GUSTAVUS shewed in his speech what conduct the Muscovites had held with regard to Sweden, and from thence drew several reasons to shew that they ought indispensibly to undertake and pursue the war against them. He did not forget to warn his subjects against the artifices of SIGISMUND, and after having given a particular account of what had passed in Muscovy he concluded with a protestation that all his designs were only directed to obtain a good peace, and to secure the public tranquillity. This speech produced the most desirable effect for the King of Sweden, and procured him what he had thought the most difficult to obtain; for the States consented to raise the supplies which were necessary for carrying on the war. It would not be a hard matter to make subjects approve of conquest

and

and battles, provided they cost them no money. The difficulty lies in persuading them that it is often the part of policy and oeconomy to expend a great deal of money for that purpose, which indeed is very true.

It appeared that GUSTAVUS had spoken sincerely; for in the year 1617, a peace was actually concluded with the Emperor of Muscovy, by the mediation of England and Holland, and would have been concluded sooner, had it not been obstructed by the long preliminaries which were necessary in order to examine the full powers of the Ambassadors, and to agree on titles and dignities, which it is not an easy matter to regulate with the Ambassadors of the Great Duke; and generally the most important part of their embassy is over, when the affair of precedence and titles is terminated. By this peace the whole province of Ingria, which is very considerable, was yielded to Sweden.

After this peace, King GUSTAVUS made several establishments in domestic affairs, for the interior felicity of the kingdom: this is never more necessary than in the reign of a conquering Prince, because it generally happens that a kingdom which acquires great glory abroad, is exhausted and miserable at home. He made useful regulations for the holding of the States, established a council for maritime affairs, a Chancery, a court of Exchequer, and besides, a chamber of Commerce, with several good statutes concerning Merchants, whether Swedes, or foreigners.

But as it was not enough to provide for domestic affairs only, GUSTAVUS did not forget what kind of a man his cousin the King of Poland was. He did not forget that SIGISMUND was a Prince who left nothing unattempted to recover the crown of Sweden, and had his emissaries in that kingdom, who dispersed libels against the present government, and endeavoured to seduce as many people as they could from their allegiance to GUSTAVUS. To prevent the effect of these secret practices, in the year 1614, an edict of the King had been published in the general assembly of the States of the kingdom, prohibiting all his subjects from studying in the universities of Roman Catholics, and from travelling to the court of the King of Poland, or having any correspondence with his courtiers or officers. SIGISMUND was not contented to seduce the Swedes by libels, but went so far as to spread about manifestos in Sweden, wherein he exhorted them take up arms against their King.

GUSTAVUS found no better means of guarding against these indirect hostilities, than to attack Poland with open force. He had capacity enough to defend himself against his enemy by the weapons of the cabinet; but besides, that these are not much in use among the northern nations, he had too great a soul to submit to these artifices; and, to say the truth, the match had been too unequal in that respect, between a Lutheran Prince, and a Prince assisted by the counsels of the court of Rome, who had at his service as many Monks and Jesuits as he pleased. GUSTAVUS therefore very wisely resolved to repel SIGISMUND's intrigues by arms, and he had no difficulty to obtain the consent of the States to the war with Poland.

After such a resolution had been taken, the important affair was to prevent his enemy. For this purpose, the King of Sweden, without loss of time, sent troops into Livonia, with a fleet of eighteen men of war, and seized Dunamond, a place which checks the town of Riga, at the mouth of the river Dwina, and defends the harbour. To this conquest he soon after added that of Pernaw and Windaw; and he might easily have carried his conquests farther, because the King of Poland was at that time greatly pressed by the Turks and Tartars: but he sacrificed all these advantages to generosity, and granted a truce for two years, which his enemy demanded of him. An example of moderation which the Swedes would have set off with many pompous panegyrics, had they been acquainted with the modern Rhetoric.

The moderation of GUSTAVUS did not make him forget what he owed to the tranquillity of his dominions, and he would not gain any praise by this virtue, at the expence of his other qualities. When therefore he granted to SIGISMUND a truce, which gave him leisure to defend himself against the Infidels, GUSTAVUS thought himself obliged to join this condition with it, that during these two years they should endeavour to put an amicable end to all the differences subsisting between Sweden and Poland. This was reasonable, for it was not to be expected that GUSTAVUS should renounce the advantages he possessed, without taking precautions against future evil; besides, he granted as long a truce as could be desired for the discussion of the differences between him and SIGISMUND. Two years would not perhaps have sufficed for that discussion in the Diet of Ratisbon, but they ought to suffice to the Poles; so that GUSTAVUS, besides the moderation of taking no advantage of the incursions which the Turks and Tartars made on his enemy's frontiers, had likewise the generosity not to prescribe him too short a time for the pacification of their differences. But as he was well persuaded that SIGISMUND had only demanded the truce, that he might have leisure to gather new strength, and more forces, he took, with his Council and the States of the kingdom, all the necessary measures to prevent being surprized by that dangerous neighbour, and to begin the war as soon as the truce should be expired.

If

If GUSTAVUS had valued himself on craftiness, he would have concealed his design, and given several plausible reasons for all these warlike preparations; but his great courage would not suffer him to dissemble. On the contrary, he ordered Count JAMES LA GARDIE, Governor of Estonia, and Great Marshal of the kingdom, to write to the Governor of Livonia for the King of Poland, that he would not be kept eternally in suspense between peace and war, and was therefore resolved, as soon as the two years of the truce were expired, either to conclude with the King of Poland a perpetual and irrevocable peace, or at least a truce for many years, or to attack him with all his might. Certainly this is a sincerity which is no longer in practice; where are the Princes who give their enemies notice so long beforehand that they intend to declare war on them at a certain time? How many Princes do we see who attack their enemies while they are protesting that they have no design to break the peace? They who on one hand will applaud the great candour of GUSTAVUS, will not blame him on the other for any want of prudence, when they know what great preparations he made for the war with Poland, for which he was willing that SIGISMUND should also be prepared, since he gave him notice of his design. These preparations were such as manifested that GUSTAVUS was as great in prudence as courage. He gave full satisfaction to Christian IV, King of Denmark, upon some grievances which he complained of, and had a personal interview with him on the borders of the two kingdoms, in order to confirm the friendship and good understanding which subsisted between them, and that he might have nothing to fear from Denmark, while he should make war in Poland.

As GUSTAVUS well knew the importance of naval forces in a war, he took particular care to equip a good fleet, and with so great success, that he rendered it the principal hope and firmest support of the State. He caused a great number of cannons to be cast, and all sorts of small arms and warlike machines to be forged. He levied many troops, and ordered some officers, well skilled in military discipline, to make them perform their exercises regularly, to make them encamp, and in general to keep them enured to all the military functions. He was frequently present at all these exercises, and established good order every where, to which his presence contributed as much as his capacity.

Before he came to a rupture with Poland, he married the Princess ELEONORA, daughter of JOHN SIGISMUND, Elector of Brandenburg, and after the nuptials were over, he summoned the States of the kingdom, who took the necessary resolutions for the charges of the war. They likewise appointed public prayers and rejoicings in memory of the Reformation, which had been introduced into the kingdom an hundred years before; so that this became a secular solemnity.

ANNO
1620.

The truce being expired without the King of Poland's accepting the condition which had been proposed to him, or shewing any inclination to a decisive treaty of peace, GUSTAVUS began the war by making an irruption into Livonia. He sent no Herald of Arms to SIGISMUND to declare war against him in form, because he had plainly and publicly signified to him, that the very moment the truce should be expired, he would attack him, if no treaty was then concluded. The Poles complained of having been attacked without any previous declaration of war, but this complaint was entirely groundless, since they had been threatened with a war two years before.

1621.

The first attempt which GUSTAVUS made was the siege of Riga, the strongest and most important town in all that country. Such a conduct is not always attended with success, and there seems to be some temerity in attacking the chief places at first; because, if the attempt miscarries, the General suffers in his reputation, or discourages his soldiers, whilst he raises the courage of the enemy; whereas if he fixes on a less difficult siege, he may depend on succeeding, or gaining all the favourable opinions and prejudices that accompany happy beginnings. But, on the other hand, if he takes the capital, he makes all the rest of the province tremble of course, and it is usually by these decisive strokes that great things are brought about in a little time. GUSTAVUS having maturely weighed all the reasons on both sides, determined to open the campaign with the siege of Riga, the capital city of Livonia.

Riga is a large town, fortified with good bastions and fraized half-moons, and has a large trade by reason of its situation, being only two leagues distant from the sea, where the river Dwina, which runs through it, opens so commodious a harbour, that vessels of all kinds pass and repass within its enclosure. In the year 1181, it surrendered to STEPHEN BATTERY, King of Poland, having been formerly subject to the temporal jurisdiction of its own Archbishop. Livonia had already been almost wholly subdued by King SIGISMUND AUGUSTUS, the last of the JAGELLONS, who had overcome GOTHARD KETTLER, Great-Master of the Teutonic order in Livonia, and had obliged the Livonians to take an oath of allegiance to him, and acknowledge themselves subjects of the crown of Poland. This SIGISMUND AUGUSTUS likewise forced the Great-Master to consent to the suppression of his order, and to yield all his rights on Livonia to Poland. In consideration of this, in the year 1561, he was invested for himself and his descendants with the duchy of Courland and Semigalia. It was an easy matter to subdue Livonia; for the Great-Master, the knights of his order, and most of the ecclesiastics, having embraced the Lutheran religion, met with

V O L. V.

8 D

nothing

nothing but rebellion and disobedience among their subjects; which formed several parties in that province. WILLIAM OF BRANDENBURG, brother of ALBERT, Duke of Prussia, nephew of the King of Poland, and Archbishop of Riga, having died a Protestant much about the same time that the Great-Master KETTLER made his treaty with SIGISMUND, Riga was erected into a Republic, and SIGISMUND seized on the rest of the diocese: but it afterwards surrendered to Poland, in the reign of King STEPHEN BATTORY, that it might enjoy the same privileges with Dantzic, and secure to itself a powerful protection. This is a short account of the revolution which brought the town of Riga under the Poles, who possessed that place when GUSTAVUS laid siege to it in the year 1621.

His fleet met with such a violent storm near the mouth of the Dwina, that a timorous and superstitious man would have imagined that Heaven warned him not to continue in his enterprize. But GUSTAVUS, without being astonished at this unhappy beginning, in which some of his ships were lost, and others were dispersed, continued firm in his first resolution, so that having brought together his fleet, and landed his army, which consisted of about twenty or twenty-five thousand men, he encamped before the city of Riga. The principal officers who served under him were Prince CHARLES PHILIP, his brother; Count JAMES LA GARDIE, Great Marshal of the kingdom; HERMAN WRANGEL, Field-Marshal; GUSTAVUS HORN, JOHN BANNIER, MANSFELD, ROSENCRANTS, OXENSTIERN, illustrious names in the History of that age, and two brave Scottish Colonels, SEATON and RUTHWEN. The quarters having been marked out, and occupied by the troops that were to be posted there, they immediately began to throw up the lines of circumvallation; and in the mean time, the Admiral CHARLES GYLDENTRILHM, and CLAUDIUS FLEMING who commanded the fleet under him, had orders to keep at sea at the mouth of the river, to prevent any succours of men or warlike stores from entering the town.

The inhabitants made the greater preparations for a defence, as they judged by the manner in which GUSTAVUS went about the siege, that he was resolved not to leave the place till he should make himself master of it. The citadel was sufficiently provided with a garrison, arms, and provision. The town indeed had only three hundred soldiers to defend it; but the citizens, jealous of their liberty, and well disciplined, supplied that deficiency. We may judge of the resistance they made by the length of the siege, by the capacity and intrepid activity of GUSTAVUS; and we may form a pretty great idea of the difficulties he met with to reduce the besieged, if I only say that they did not surrender to GUSTAVUS, till after a siege of six weeks. I shall not enter into the particulars of all the assaults, and all the sallies; these details, which do well in a journal, and would not be disagreeable if I was speaking of the last siege of Vienna, would strangely tire the reader, when they concern a town which was attacked in the year 1621. I shall content myself with saying that the batteries of the Swedes overturned several steeples, and several public buildings, and made several breaches in the bastions, and in the walls, that the Swedes spared neither grenado's, nor bombs, nor mines, nor countermines, nor any of the things which the reader well enough imagines of himself, when he knows that a town has been well attacked, and well defended.

The intrepidity and activity of GUSTAVUS were conspicuous every where, nay, sometimes appeared a little too much; for it is said that he did not always remember he was a King, so much did he expose himself to danger, like the meanest soldier of fortune. He was far from the circumspection of those Princes, who always keep without the reach of cannon-shot; for at the first approaches, GUSTAVUS observing from an eminence what places were the most proper for the different quarters of the army, a cannon-bullet struck the very place from whence he had just removed. Another time some people were killed with a cannon-shot so near him, that his cloaths were stained with their blood; and a third time, a bullet pierced into his tent, and made a kind of circular motion, as if it was to seek the head of the King, as they say who find wonders in every thing. In short, GUSTAVUS was very near disproving the observation of Charles V, who said one day to one of his Generals, who exhorted him not to hazard himself so much, that there never was a King killed by a cannon-shot.

If upon this any one should imagine that GUSTAVUS had been sorry to take the town without resistance, he would certainly be mistaken: for by his letters he frequently exhorted the Senators and citizens to surrender voluntarily, and not to wait for the sad extremities which they might apprehend. He endeavoured to intimidate them. He promised to grant them an advantageous capitulation, and surely was not well pleased that they paid no regard to his summons. I am willing to believe that this conduct proceeded, in some measure, from his finding himself obliged to lay waste a fine city, by his cannons and bombs, and to destroy many people: yet we must not doubt but that he had a more prevailing motive to it; and that was the saving of his time and preparations, which he might have employed to better purpose, had he soon been master of the town and citadel of Riga. Generals are glad to persuade the towns they besiege, that their only motive in exhorting them to a timely surrender is their good-will

good-will towards the besieged: but for the most part clemency is not the motive to these exhortations, and the besieged likewise do not believe it.

Though the King of Poland was then still at war with the Ottoman Porte, yet he sent some troops to the relief of Riga, under the conduct of Prince CHRISTOPHER RADZWIL. They approached the lines, but finding from some slight skirmishes that nothing could be done, they quickly retired. The inhabitants were made to hope they should soon be relieved, and this rendered them more obstinate in rejecting any capitulation.

At last GUSTAVUS vexed to be so long in taking a town, resolved to spring the mines which were ready under the walls, at the same time to make a general assault, to expose the town to pillage, and afterwards raze it to the foundation. But the Prince, his brother, and the other great lords of the kingdom interceding for that town, obtained of the King that the inhabitants should have notice of the destruction which threatened them, and that six hours should be granted them to come to their final resolution. The magistrates and inhabitants having maturely considered the condition they were in, resolved at last to surrender; and thus they saved themselves from a terrible destruction which hung over their heads.

The King used them with a singular clemency, though their obstinacy had greatly provoked him, and promised not only to allow them the enjoyment of their liberty, but likewise to augment their privileges, provided they should prove as faithful to him, as they had been to the King of Poland. The Poles were not wanting to publish that GUSTAVUS had made himself master of the town by means of a treacherous correspondence, the faction in the city which favoured him having raised a sedition in his behalf. Thus men endeavour to comfort themselves in their disgraces, by lessening the glory of the enemy who has beat them: yet as it cannot be denied but that there is very frequently ground for attributing the taking of towns to the perfidy of their governors and inhabitants, it must likewise be owned that the vanquished on many occasions have recourse very wrongfully to that weak consolation, and would be more equitable, if they bestowed greater praise on the valour of their enemy. The taking of Riga is one of these occasions.

After this important conquest, the King secured Mittau, the residence of the Duke of Courland; soon after he re-established him in it on certain conditions, having concluded a truce for one year with the King of Poland. The city of Riga appeared by its deputies in the States-General of Sweden, summoned to meet at Stockholm the following year, and there took an oath of loyalty and allegiance to GUSTAVUS.

The truce seemed only to have been agreed upon, that both sides might have time to make great armaments. It appeared by the steps which SIGISMUND took, that he was resolved to make great efforts to invade Sweden. In effect, his preparations in Prussia were made with this view. To prevent this irruption, GUSTAVUS discussing some differences he had with the King of Denmark, concerning the duties on the importation and exportation of merchandizes, demanded of him not to suffer SIGISMUND to levy men in Denmark, nor his ships to pass the Streight. Not content with this, GUSTAVUS obtained an order in the States of the kingdom, that the war should be transported into Prussia, the better to secure to the Swedes their commerce in the Baltic; and because the duties laid in the year 1620, on cattle and sown lands were not a sufficient fund for the charges of the war, it was moved in the assembly of the said States that a new duty, till then unknown in Sweden, should be laid on all provisions consumed in the kingdom; and though this motion at first startled most of the members, yet they agreed to it. It appeared that this kind of impost would be less burthen-some to the inhabitants, and would produce a greater revenue, because no person of whatever quality or condition would be exempt from it; and the more easily to obtain the consent of all the orders, a promise was made that as soon as this new duty should be laid, the other extraordinary duties should either be taken off, or lessened. These promises are very often made, but very rarely kept.

Besides, the King by a solemn edict took under his protection all those who should be appointed to collect this duty, for it was easily foreseen that they would be exposed to the fury of the populace, or would at least bring upon themselves a volley of imprecations and abuse. In this edict it was declared that all who should use these persons ill, either in deed or in word, should be punished with death, as disturbers of the public peace, and violators of the royal edicts; and because it is very often useful to the Prince, (that he may be supplied with money all at once) to farm out his taxes, and it is to be feared that the Farmers and Underfarmers should stir up tumults among the people, the King made another edict in which he precisely determined what the Farmer could exact without fraud, and when, and in what manner he could exact it of every person.

I observe all these things the better to shew the capacity and prudence of GUSTAVUS; for it appears that he well knew what he had to fear from the people, and what was fit to be done in order to bring them into his measures, and to prevent the greatest inconveniences on both sides. It is in vain to murmur; a kingdom cannot possibly preserve its reputation abroad, and keep its neighbours in awe, if the sovereign has not the funds in readiness; but for this purpose must there not be duties and extractors of these

these duties, under the protection of the laws? It is true if we except the first beginnings, the public peace requires much more that laws should be made against the exactor, to restrain his avarice, than laws to guard him against any insult.

In the beginning of this year, King GUSTAVUS had the affliction to lose his only brother. This loss was the more affecting, as GUSTAVUS had no children, and thus the King of Poland seemed to have better pretensions, at least for a day to come. That King was a terrible pretender, and it would be hard to find a house which has in the same time produced two Kings so warlike as GUSTAVUS and SIGISMUND, one King of Sweden, and the other of Poland, both descended from the illustrious house of VASA, and first cousins. The misfortune was that they were on bad terms together, and this proceeded from reasons of interest which rendered their differences irreconcilable. Accordingly we see that they never found the least opportunity to treat of the foundation of their differences: all they could do, was to agree on a cessation of arms. But though they agreed on a cessation, in order the better to examine the bottom of the affair, and to commence a decisive treaty of peace, they never came to that point; for the truce being expired, the business was either to prolong it still for some time, or to renew the war.

The last of these two courses was taken in year 1623. GUSTAVUS not being willing to give his enemy the advantage of making war out of his own country, embarked in a fleet of sixty-six sail which he stationed near Dantzic, and by this quick and bold expedition he not only prevented SIGISMUND from executing his design of carrying the war into Sweden, but likewise obliged him to demand the prolongation of the truce till the first of June 1625, which was granted him.

ANNO
1624.

Among the pacific actions of GUSTAVUS during this cessation of arms, Historians make a particular mention of his liberalities to the university of Upsal, to which he granted several considerable funds for perpetuity, even from his own patrimonial estate; which enabled that university to maintain a great many professors and necessitous students.

Eight years after, he founded the university of Derpt in Livonia; and this could not be forgot by Historians, who commonly, being men of letters, think it very incumbent on them to immortalize the honour which Princes do to learning by granting it their protection; and it may be said that the more a Prince performs praise-worthy actions, the more he ought to procure the favour of the learned, because it is only by the testimony of their books that posterity is acquainted with the greatest heroes. AUGUSTUS owes the greatest part of his glory to the interest he had made among the learned men of his court. Nothing therefore was more politic in GUSTAVUS than to gain by his bounties the love of a famous university.

It had been agreed upon between the Kings of Sweden and Poland, that if during the truce which was to continue till the first of June 1625, a peace was not concluded, one party could not attack the other without having declared war on him two months before that first of June. GUSTAVUS desiring to observe this condition, dispatched a courier to the King of Poland to acquaint him that he would attack him at the end of the truce. He dispatched him I say, in the time agreed upon; but the rigour of the season so much retarded his journey, that he did not finish it in two months before the truce was expired. The Poles loudly complained of this want of sincerity; the Swedes excused themselves by the badness of the roads, and complained in their turn of several things, and especially of the little inclination which the King of Poland shewed towards a peace. The Polish Ambassadors were of opinion that all manner of hostilities ought to cease, whilst the accommodation of the two crowns was negotiating; but Chancellor OXENSTIERN who was at the head of the Swedish embassy, shewed that there was some artifice in requiring such a cessation, while Sweden appeared to be in so good a condition to make great progress in the war, and represented the loss his his master would suffer, if he neglected so favourable an opportunity, and waited peaceably till his enemy's troops were reinforced. In short he required that several articles should be granted to him, before he would promise a cessation of hostilities.

The Poles giving no positive answer, but inveighing against the conduct of Sweden both in their speeches and writings, GUSTAVUS resolved to answer them with sword in hand, and as his valour and good-fortune had acquired him a great authority in his kingdom, he obtained of the states all the assistance he desired. They augmented the tax on cattle, and laid a new duty on all milled grains, a duty which the more easily passed as the common people saw that it would lie heavier on the rich than the poor. Besides all this, the States-General of the kingdom made an act for keeping a settled number of troops, and promised the King a sum of money for the maintenance of land and sea forces.

With so many good helps, GUSTAVUS, finding himself in a condition to make a powerful irruption into his enemy's dominions, set sail for Livonia, with a fleet of seventy-six ships, and in a short time drove the Poles from all the places which they still held in that province, from the important fort of Kokenhusen, from Felburg, Duneburg, Nidorp, and Derpt. He discovered the intelligence which the Poles had in the city of Riga, and totally defeated the young SAPIEHA, who with more courage
than

than prudence, had dared to face GUSTAVUS. He passed the Dwina, entered Livõnia, and seized on Põswol, whither the Cossacks had retired, after having made some incursions on the Swedes, and he took the strong town of Birfen, where he found more than sixty pieces of cannon. He returned through Courland and the province of Semigalia, seized on Mittaw, Bouschia, and several other places, and did not forget in so great a train of success, to press SIGISMUND to an accommodation.

This is not surprizing. GUSTAVUS, having a very solid judgment, well knew that the proper time for a Prince to make peace is the time of his enemy's ill fortune; for if he cannot entirely ruin him, he does better to secure his conquests by a good treaty, while his enemy is weak and unfortunate, than hazard them by continuing the war, the event of which repeated experience shews to be very uncertain. Thus we see that worsted Princes generally defer an accommodation with the victor as long as they can; which succeeds sometimes well, sometimes ill, there being no fixed and certain rule of human actions.

GUSTAVUS therefore judging that he had now a favourable time of making peace, sent safe-guards to the Ambassadors of the King of Poland, by Messieurs HARWITS and HORN, and by SALVIUS, Great Sub-delegate of Chancellor OXENSTIERN in the conferences of peace. But for the very same reason that GUSTAVUS desired the renewal of the conferences, SIGISMUND desired nothing less, so that they were obliged to turn their thoughts to the war, and GUSTAVUS, no doubt, brave as he was, soon resolved upon it.

The event convinced the King of Poland that his hopes that fortune would quit GUSTAVUS, were vain. The Lithuanian troops commanded by General SAPIEHA, and reinforced with several regiments of Cossacks, Hussars, Heyducks, and Germans, thought themselves sure of the victory, if they could engage the enemy in the open field. But the Swedes defeated them in a plain of the province of Semigalia, near Wagonia, and taught them to know GUSTAVUS better. Upon this occasion GUSTAVUS shewed them that he was none of those warriors whose talent is confined to one only manner of fighting, and who being fit for taking towns, are not capable of winning a field battle, or who being able to succeed in places full of defiles and mountains, know not how to fight in a plain and open country.

On that day he performed all the duties of an able and courageous General, and gained so memorable a victory, that we may justly wonder why Historians have not more exactly preserved the memory of it. But perhaps the last campaigns of GUSTAVUS have appeared to them so glorious, that they have saved all their abilities to speak worthily of them, without much minding the rest. Count TURN who commanded the right wing, and GUSTAVUS HORN, who commanded the left, acquired great praise in that battle.

This new victory made no change either in the disposition of GUSTAVUS towards a peace, or the repugnancy of SIGISMUND to treat with a victorious enemy; so that the King of Sweden resolved to try whether by distressing him more, he could not at last oblige Poland to terminate the differences between the two kingdoms. It is not surprizing that GUSTAVUS so earnestly desired to put an end to that quarrel; for besides the reason which I have already mentioned, he loved his subjects, and was tenderly loved by them, and as he knew that SIGISMUND and his descendants would on all occasions protest against the exclusion which the States of Sweden had given them, and thus that Poland would never want a plausible pretence for making war against the Swedes, he would have been glad to extirpate the seeds of those troubles, and to give his country peace on that quarter, as well for the present, as for the time to come. For this end he desired to settle the pretensions of SIGISMUND, and to fix them in such a manner by a decisive treaty, that the succession to the crown of Sweden might certainly be known, without being continually exposed to the vicissitudes of fortune, and to the chance of a war between the two rivals.

In order to reduce the King of Poland to the necessity of entering once for all into a treaty on his pretensions, the King of Sweden thought fit to carry the war into Prussia. This is the name of a very considerable province, situated between Pomerania, the Baltic sea, Poland, Lithuania, Livonia, and Courland. It was possessed for a long time by the knights of the Teutonic order, whose valour and power appear in History with lustre. But that power fell at last by the two most general causes of the overthrow of human grandeur, namely by vanity and corruption of manners. The pride of that order having carried them so far as to aim at aggrandizing themselves at the expence of their neighbours, created them enemies, which ruined them; and the debauchery of the knights rendered them so odious both to God and man, that the Prussians were glad to get rid of such masters. Accordingly when JAGELLON, Great Duke of Lithuania, and afterwards King of Poland, whom they had dared to provoke, had chastised them in a terrible manner, though they did not amend for all that, the Prussians shook off their yoke, and submitted to CASIMIR III, King of Poland.

Yet the order was not abolished; for the Great Master LEWIS OF ERTICHAUSEN having gained a victory over CASIMIR, made an agreement with him in the year 1466, by which he yielded the western Prussia to the crown of Poland, and held the eastern

VOL. V.

8 E

Prussia

* Frederic William, Elector of Brandenburg, and first sovereign Duke of Prussia, died on the twentieth of April 1688. Therefore, as that Prince was living when Mr Bayle composed his *Historical Dictionary on the Life of Gustavus Adolphus*, he must have written it before the year 1688.

Prussia in loyalty and homage to the said crown. After this manner the eastern Prussia became a fief of the crown of Poland, but because the Great Master ALBERT OF BRANDENBURG refused to pay the homage which he owed to King SIGISMUND, his uncle, the order was suppressed and converted into an hereditary duchy, dependent on the crown of Poland, with which Albert of Brandenburg was invested in the year 1525. This is now called Ducal Prussia, to distinguish it from Royal Prussia which belongs to Poland since the year 1466. The former belongs to the Electors of Brandenburg since the year 1611. But the Elector FREDERIC WILLIAM *, full of life and of glory even to this day, has enjoyed the sovereignty of it ever since the year 1657. I thought this little Historical digression would not be disagreeable to the reader.

From what I have just said it appears, that when the King of Sweden went into Prussia, it belonged partly to Poland, and partly to the Elector of Brandenburg. GUSTAVUS offered the latter a neutrality, and was glad that he accepted it; but for the greater precaution he demanded of him the port of Pillaw, as a pledge of his promise, and it was granted him. This port was very serviceable to GUSTAVUS for exacting great contributions from the Dantzickers. Soon after he made himself master of Frawemberg and Braunsberg, from whence he expelled the Jesuits, and sent their library to the university of Upsal; but it was not a compensation to the Protestants for the library of the Elector Palatine, which had been sent to Rome some years before; for there was no comparison between these two libraries.

I know not whether the Jesuits whom GUSTAVUS had expelled from Riga in the year 1621, were sorry to be treated in that manner by a Protestant Prince. As they are neither said to be very humble, nor very disinterested, it is probable they were not much grieved to be used with that distinction, and to have so fine a pretence of glorying that it is to them chiefly the Heretics bear an ill will. It is certain they turn every thing to their own advantage, and so magnify their losses, representing themselves to the world as the sole victims sacrificed to the fury of sectaries, that they get more wealth than they have lost. But it is equally certain that GUSTAVUS did not expel them through a spirit of persecution; he expelled them, because he had been informed that they meddled in too many affairs, and in a conquered town were obnoxious to a Prince whom they deemed an Heretic. They are therefore in the wrong to glory so much that the Protestants hate them more than the rest of their communion. The most intelligent persons of their church have been sensible that the true cause of the aversion which the Protestants bear them, is not a matter which they have reason to boast of. But let us return to GUSTAVUS.

He was already one of those warriors whose name alone strikes the enemy with terror, and prevents strong towns from preparing for a defence. Accordingly the report of his arrival having been spread throughout all Polish Prussia, in a very short time Varmia, Ravensburg, Elbing, Marienburg, Stum, Christburg, Brodnitz, Wormitz, and the two isles lying above Dantzic, between the branches of the Vistula and the Nagpht, all fell into his hands. I am willing to believe that the absence of SIGISMUND, and a secret jealousy between his Generals, contributed to the success of the King of Sweden. Notwithstanding, it is certain that the principal glory of his success is due to his diligence, his vigour, and the reputation he had acquired by his great exploits; his reputation going before him, astonished his enemies, and prepared them to submit: Besides he had very good troops, and officers of consummate experience, whom the example and glory of so great a King inspired with a courage and ardour, capable of surmounting the greatest difficulties.

The taking of Dantzic would have greatly augmented the glory of the King of Sweden. Nevertheless he did not attack that flourishing city, perceiving that he had neither troops, nor strength enough to subdue it. He was contented not to have that town against him, and to threaten it from time to time, in order to draw the greatest advantage from it, which he could, and to render it useless to the King of Poland. But the inhabitants proud of their riches, and full of themselves, did not grant to GUSTAVUS all he demanded. This obliged him to draw near them with his army, after he had passed the Vistula and seized on Dirschaw, which he put in a state of defence. He signified to the Dantzickers that he expected that all their ships should pay him a tribute; that they should keep a perfect neutrality, furnish him with provisions for money, and send out of their harbour all Polish ships. They agreed to all these articles except the last; and not to irritate GUSTAVUS by too blunt a refusal of it, they sent deputies to him several times, to lay before him their reasons. By this means they carried their principal end, which was to amuse GUSTAVUS, and gain time, till the arrival of the King of Poland; for whom they designed to declare openly, as soon as they could do it, without putting themselves too much in danger.

In effect, SIGISMUND arrived some time after in Prussia, with a considerable army. The loss of so many towns and castles, and the impetuous course of GUSTAVUS's victories had given him a cruel vexation, and raised in him an immoderate desire of revenging himself. Having therefore brought together about twenty-thousand men, he encamped at Graudentz; whereupon the Dantzickers espoused his party so warmly, that they

they laid siege to Pautske where GUSTAVUS had a garrison, and made themselves masters of it; upon this likewise the Swedes treated them as enemies, and did them great mischief.

After some attempts on Marienburg, and the castle of Munden, which were very unfortunate to the Poles, SIGISMUND knowing that he should lose all his reputation, if he stayed longer in Prussia without doing any thing, decamped from Graudentz, and having passed the Vistula, laid siege to Mew, in the small province of Pomereillia. He knew GUSTAVUS too well to doubt of his coming to the relief of the besieged. He therefore fortified himself upon an eminence, by which the Swedes must necessarily pass in their way to Mew.

GUSTAVUS having drawn near that post, to attempt the relief of the place, was very much annoyed by the enemies cannon; but this only increased his desire to force their intrenchments. Having therefore secured himself against the insults of the Poles, he ordered the ground to be viewed, and understood that there was a small by-path which led to the summit of the eminence. They were forced rather to climb than to walk, in order to reach it. Nevertheless, in a short exhortation he made the soldiers, to shew them that there is nothing which courage and fidelity cannot compass, he so animated them, that they earnestly desired to march. Count TURN and General MUSTEN had the charge of this affair. They conducted it so wisely that they gained the eminence, the soldiers having helped themselves up by some branches of trees. They immediately killed the centinels and all they met, and were intrenching themselves on the eminence, when they were warmly attacked by the Polish troops. The fight was maintained for two hours with great vigour, and the advantage was on the side of General MUSTEN, for he put the enemy to flight; notwithstanding, when they returned to the charge, Count TURN retired, not to fly, but to gain a more favourable place. He was pursued, the fight began afresh, and the Swedes boast of having slain a great number of the enemy. Was it otherwise, they cannot be denied the glory of having relieved the place, since SIGISMUND raised the siege of Mew.

Soon after he seemed to be disposed towards an accommodation. They agreed on a place where the deputies of the two crowns should confer on that important affair; but their conference came to nothing. The deputies having come out of their tents, observed one another for a long time; without opening their lips, or so much as saluting one another. Each of them was afraid lest he should not support the honour of his master with a becoming gravity. Thus they were to take great care not to advance faster than the deputies of the other party, and not begin to pay civilities. At last after several grave steps, several majestic looks, and a long silence, SCHEMUKI, one of the Polish Ambassadors, being probably tired of a countenance so forced, and so useless to the design which had brought them thither, opened the conference, and demanded for his master conditions which were absolutely rejected. They prepared therefore for war. KONIECKSPOLSKI, a famous Polish General, formed an enterprize on Dirschaw, but GUSTAVUS having thrown men and provisions into that place, obliged him to retire with loss. The other attempts which the King of Poland made on Mew and Marienburg were not more successful. Thus the campaign was very favourable to the Swedes.

To compleat his happiness, GUSTAVUS became a father near the end of this same year 1626; it was indeed only of a daughter: but as the States of Sweden had already declared the daughters of the posterity of CHARLES IX capable of succeeding to the crown, and as they renewed the same decree at this time, GUSTAVUS had no longer the grief not to see an heir to his kingdom. In effect, this daughter of whom the Queen of Sweden was delivered on the eighth of December 1626 succeeded him, and has at least been as much known as GUSTAVUS, under the famous name of CHRISTINA.

What obliged the States to declare CHRISTINA heiress of the kingdom soon after her birth, was that they observed SIGISMUND to be more proud and more inflexible, under pretence that there was no Prince in Sweden who could succeed GUSTAVUS. Therefore, in order to humble that pride, they thought fit to shew him that they had a successor at hand, in the person of an infant newly born.

This was not the only resolution which the States took at that time, in order to humble the pride of SIGISMUND; they came to several others which ought to mortify him still more: for GUSTAVUS having laid before them the conditions of peace, which he had proposed to the King of Poland, they resolved that no better conditions ought to be offered to him, and that if he did not accept these, the war ought to be continued with greater vigour than ever. And the better to succeed in it, they promised the King not only the necessary supplies of money, but also their personal services and their lives. In this we must admire the conduct and good fortune of GUSTAVUS: for whereas in several kingdoms, the assemblies of the States are only theatres of disputes, where nothing is ever concluded but after a thousand complaints, and a thousand reproaches, the States of Sweden, meeting almost annually in the reign of GUSTAVUS, perfectly agreed to furnish him with whatever he desired, and even prevented his desires. This is very remarkable; but it will appear more so, when we consider that it was necessary to obtain the consent of the deputies to the continuation, and even very often to the augmentation of the state of the war, and that their business was almost always to provide for

for new levies of soldiers, and new equipments of fleets. This good fortune must be attributed, 1. To the address of GUSTAVUS, who persuaded his subjects that he desired nothing so much as an end of the war, and that all the pains he took, and all the dangers to which he exposed himself, were only directed to that end, but that he had to do with an enemy who aimed at nothing less than invading the whole kingdom, and extirpating the Protestant religion out of it: 2. To the glory he had acquired; for tho' the conquests of a King are generally very useless to his subjects, and though it is indifferent to them whether their sovereign contents himself with the dominions of his ancestors, or extends them, yet they are taken with I know not what admiration mixed with love of their Prince, when he renders himself famous over the whole world. The *Te Deums* which they frequently hear, and the bonfires they make for the taking of towns, or gaining of battles, dispose them more cheerfully to contribute to the charges of the war. And as it has been very well observed, that though valour is not the virtue of women, yet they prefer soldiers to all other men, so it may be said, that though the conquests of a monarch are not the affair of his people, yet they ruin themselves with more satisfaction for the sake of a warlike Prince, than for the sake of any other.

GUSTAVUS, before he took the field, did two things which shew his humanity, and the care he took of his subjects. He published an edict in favour of those who were forced to leave their country on account of their religion. He offered them a sure retreat in his own dominions, and promised them a general exemption from all public duties. As these unhappy people were very numerous, by reason of the furious and tyrannical zeal with which the Emperor was wretchedly possessed, several of them took the benefit of GUSTAVUS's generosity; and this rendered his kingdom still more flourishing.

Besides, he desired the States carefully to examine the proposal which had been laid before him, for establishing a company to trade to the West-Indies. That company was established; but the success did not answer the hopes which had been conceived of it. In this, however, we must praise the virtue of that great Prince, who was moved to make this new establishment, only by the facility which he hoped from it of instructing the Infidels, and promoting the benefit of the whole kingdom.

In the spring of the following year GUSTAVUS returned to Prussia, being resolved to conquer the haughtiness of the Dantzickers. For this purpose he passed into one of the isles of the Vistula, where they had several forts, and attacked the principal one. He would certainly have taken it, had not a musket-shot which he received in his belly, forced him to abandon that enterprise. This disgrace was largely recompensed by the advantage which the Swedes gained at Kefmarck, a fort where the Poles had a garrison. They were dislodged from it, and immediately after a detachment of the Polish army, which came to relieve the garrison, was defeated.

Some time after there was a sharp engagement between the two armies at Dirschaw, where the Swedes were encamped. The Polish infantry having attacked them, were so warmly received by GUSTAVUS's cavalry, that they would have been cut to pieces, had not the cavalry of the King of Poland come to their assistance. The Poles being superior in number could not be repulsed but with difficulty; yet they were repulsed, and had not GUSTAVUS been dangerously wounded with a fauconet-shot, while he was viewing from an eminence the King of Poland's camp, it is very probable that the Swedes would either have cut the Poles to pieces, or put them to flight.

On this occasion the principal officers of the army, having Chancellor OXENSTIERN at their head, made a most humble remonstrance to the King, intreating his majesty to have more care of his person than he had hitherto had. They represented to him that his life was absolutely necessary for the good of the whole kingdom, and therefore that he ought to preserve it with the same care as he did the welfare of his subjects, for whom he had so great a tenderness. GUSTAVUS answered that he was sensible of this mark of their affection; but told them at the same time that he did not believe himself to be so necessary to his kingdom as they represented, and was persuaded that after his death, the providence of God would display itself for Sweden in the same manner as it had hitherto done, 'God hath committed this charge to me, continued he, neither fear nor sloth must make me neglect it; and what can happen more glorious to me than to lose my life in fighting for the glory of God, and the good of my subjects?' The event has but too well shewn that the remonstrance made less impression than the answer.

His courage supported him during the greatest pain in such a manner, that he then preserved all his presence of mind, and even his gaiety; for his Physician not contented to consider the wound, but having likewise exhorted him to take more care of himself for the future, GUSTAVUS smiling exhorted him in his turn not to meddle in another man's profession, which he expressed in the Latin proverb *ne sutor ultra crepidam*. Another time his Surgeon not being able to take the musket-balls out of a wound which they had made, *let them continue there*, said he, *as an illustrious monument of a life which has not been spent in sloth and idleness*, alluding, no doubt, to a saying of ALEXANDER the Great.

As GUSTAVUS was the soul of his army, we are not to imagine that it did any thing considerable, while he could not act by reason of his wounds. The Swedes were content to observe the Poles, who likewise did nothing remarkable during the rest of that campaign, though the Emperor had sent them some auxiliary troops commanded by the Duke of Holstein. A peace was proposed, and there was room to hope that it would be accepted by both parties, when the Spanish Ambassador came to break all their measures. He had his own ends; the house of Austria began to fear GUSTAVUS, and it was their interest to neglect nothing to keep him at variance with Poland. The Spanish Ambassador, guided by this principle, flattered SIGISMUND with a thousand vain hopes. He promised him a fleet of twenty-four men of war, ten thousand soldiers, and two hundred thousand crowns in money, which, in his opinion, would render him master of Sweden. SIGISMUND was credulous enough to give into the snare, and reckoned that the following campaign would make him King of Sweden. He therefore would not hearken to any peace, and by this means GUSTAVUS had another expedition to make into Prussia in the year 1628.

It was always his maxim to make war in the enemy's country. He therefore made haste this year to return into Prussia, knowing that the Poles designed to carry the war into his own dominions. His thoughts were chiefly bent upon humbling the proud city of Dantzic, from whence SIGISMUND drew his best supplies for the war which had for some time continued in royal Prussia. With this view, before he embarked, he published an edict, wherein he declared that he would confiscate all ships belonging to Dantzic, which carried contraband goods, and that, with regard to merchandises of another sort, he would not suffer any to be brought into that city, without paying a certain duty to the ships which he should keep at the entry of the Vistula; this shews that he did not prepare to take the city, but only to humble it. GUSTAVUS's first approaches were successful; for his fleet meeting with seven Dantzic ships between the town and the mouth of the river, took three or four of them, and sunk one. What followed did not answer this happy beginning, for a very small number of Polish ships beat forty Swedish. The assaults made on some forts of Dantzic were so vigorously repulsed, that the Swedes lost a great many men, whereas the Poles recovered Pofke and Mew, without any loss. These disgraces were somewhat lessened by the surprising of one of the isles of the Vistula, where the Swedes got twenty brass guns.

The Poles perceiving their advantages were not yet decisive, endeavoured to bring on a pitched battle. For this purpose they encamped pretty near the Swedes, and had several skirmishes with them. GUSTAVUS, who could not bear to be insulted by the enemy, especially when he was able to make head against them, finding he had twenty-four thousand foot, two thousand horse, and three thousand archers, drew up his army in battalia, to shew the Poles that he was as willing as they to come to a general engagement. They engaged and fought vigorously; but while GUSTAVUS was bearing the efforts of the Polish army, and amusing them with a part of his troops, he sent the best of his horse and foot, by a side-way, to attack the enemy in the rear; and by this march, well concerted and well executed, he put the Poles in disorder, slew three thousand of them, wounded KONIECKPOLSKI, the best of their Generals, took four of their field-pieces, fourteen colours, and returned victorious to his camp, with so much the more glory, as the loss of several of his men shewed that the advantage had been obstinately disputed.

The city of Dantzic now began to be apprehensive, because after the battle it was more straitened both from sea and land. In effect, GUSTAVUS was chiefly intent upon Dantzic, after he had gained that advantage over the Polish army. He ordered eight great men of war continually to cruize upon the coast, that nothing might enter into the town while he drew as near it as possible with his army. The inhabitants who desired above all things to have the sea open, and who were besides very good seamen, were chiefly bent upon attacking these eight ships. They attacked them with ten of theirs, and after an engagement of three hours, put four of them to flight, made themselves masters of the admiral-ship, and would have also taken the vice-admiral, had not he who commanded it, blown it up, to deprive the enemy of the pleasure and advantage of that capture. The Swedes lost four hundred men, and the commander of their fleet. It is easy to imagine with what vexation and resentment GUSTAVUS was transported, when he saw that Merchants (for thus monarchs treat those Republics which apply to commerce) triumphed over his ships, and led his Admiral into their harbour, to the view of all the citizens, and as a monument of their victory. But how could all this be helped? The best course that could be taken was unquestionably to send other ships in their room, instead of repining to no purpose; and this is what GUSTAVUS did.

He sent twelve ships to the mouth of the Vistula to block up the town again on that side; by this means commerce began to be established at KONIGSBERG, a town in Ducal Prussia, and to diminish in proportion at Dantzic. These twelve ships not content to cruize, attacked the enemy's fleet upon the Vistula, and after an engagement which lasted a whole day, they made themselves masters of one of the largest ships of

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS.

Dantzic, called *the Dutch house*. Yet they did not carry her off, because a lighted match falling by chance into the powder-magazine, blew up the ship; but thereby they gained more than they lost, for the consternation which seized the enemy at the dismal sight of it, obliged them to fly, and their admiral-ship foundered on a sand-bank, where she was entirely destroyed by the Swedish cannon.

In the mean time the King had occupied several posts around the city, had, with great labour, passed a morass about three German leagues long, and built three bridges of boats to bring over his army into a forest, from whence he pressed the city more closely; and then at last the inhabitants were no longer so proud. The magistrates were afraid of a sedition among the populace, because the stop put to commerce, and the blockade of the town, had made them want success that plenty and affluence to which the Dantzickers were accustomed, and for this reason they pressed the King of Poland to make peace with Sweden. SIGISMUND had all the motives in the world to a peace, but what might chiefly induce him to it was, that the promises of the Spanish Ambassador proved vain and fruitless; for so far were twenty-four men of war from coming to his assistance, that on the contrary he was obliged to send nine of those which vined near the Baltic. This was doubly prejudicial to Dantzic, 1. As it weakened the naval forces of that city: 2. As it irritated against them the King of Denmark; for WALSTEIN employed these nine ships to maintain the unjust dominion which he had usurped in the Baltic, and to disturb the two northern kingdoms.

CHRISTIAN IV revenged himself by permitting his subjects to seize all ships belonging to Dantzic, and all ships trading to that place. Notwithstanding all this, the famous city of Dantzic was preserved.

The rains came to its relief; the Vistula overflowed with so great force, that it broke all the bridges; whereby the several quarters of the Swedish army were deprived of communication and provisions. The waters having subsided, the Swedes were obliged to leave that place, and comfort themselves in their retreat as well as they could, by taking, with an immense booty, Newemburg on the Vistula, and Straßberg on the frontiers of the kingdom.

Newemburg was re-taken some time after, and the covetousness of the soldiers was the occasion of it. As they found a great deal of booty in those parts, they dispersed and did not keep a good guard, so that the Poles falling upon them in a village, slew many of them. They who escaped retired into the city, and promised to surrender it, if the Poles would save their lives. The Poles promised they would, and afterwards put them to the sword. Then GUSTAVUS, so much the more irritated against the Poles, as they had broken the law of nations, made incursions even to the gates of Warsaw, and overthrew whatever opposed him. Among the prisoners who had been made in these incursions, there were several women and maids. GUSTAVUS strictly ordered that they should be treated with all manner of civilities, and his orders had so great an effect that no injury was done to their honour; this rarely happens to female prisoners of war.

GUSTAVUS had also twice the advantage of the enemy before he returned to Stockholm; for General WRANGEL, Governor of Elbing, being informed that the Poles were marching towards Brodnitz, in order to besiege it, passed the Dwina, at a ford which was ill defended, and suddenly falling upon them, defeated them, and seized their cannon and baggage. Besides, WRANGEL having been ordered to scour the country with eight thousand men, in order to bring provisions to the Swedish camp, which was greatly in want of them, met, near Straßberg, a considerable body of Hussars and Cossacks, whom he was obliged to fight. He would not, perhaps, have succeeded, if they had agreed among themselves; but perceiving some misintelligence among them, he so dextrously improved the opportunity, not giving them time to put themselves in order, that he took and killed a great number of them; and what was still more necessary, he carried off a convoy of two thousand chariots laden with provisions. By this means plenty was restored to the Swedish camp which had suffered very much for want of provisions during the greatest part of the campaign.

At this time the town of Straßund, threatened by WALSTEIN, implored the assistance of the King of Sweden, who sent it powder and a succour of five hundred men. This action greatly provoked the Imperialists, and made them hold a conduct which put them at variance with GUSTAVUS. This proved a great and irreparable prejudice to the court of Vienna, as we shall see in its place.

It looks as if the house of Austria had some foresight of what they were to suffer by GUSTAVUS, so much did they labour to keep him engaged in the war with Poland. We have already seen how the Spanish Ambassador made magnificent promises, in order to put off the conclusion of a peace between the Kings of Sweden and Poland. Spain had no intention to furnish the King of Poland either with twenty-four men of war, or ten thousand soldiers, or two hundred thousand crowns in money, in order to dispossess GUSTAVUS of his dominions. Nevertheless, Spain gave hopes of all this, because it was of great importance to that kingdom that Poland and Sweden should continue at war, and because the Spaniards knew that they could more easily find excuses for

for their want of sincerity, than repair the mischiefs they apprehended from Sweden. Therefore they did not scruple to make their Ambassador act according to the definition which has been given of persons of his character, 'that they are men sent abroad to lye for the good of the State.'

Spain had played its part in the year 1627: the court of Vienna played theirs in the following years, by sending troops to SIGISMUND, in order to make him obstinate in refusing any accommodation. General ARNHEIM commanded these auxiliary troops, in the year 1629; they consisted of five thousand foot and two thousand horse; and he had the misfortune to pass for the cause of all the ill success of SIGISMUND; whether he really did not act as he ought to have done for the advantage of SIGISMUND, or whether the latter seeking on whom to discharge his vexation (for there must always be somebody who may bear the blame) found no person more proper than the General of the Imperial troops. However, the campaign of this year 1629 was not so unsuccessful to SIGISMUND, but that GUSTAVUS shared with him in the caprices of fortune. For if on one side HERMAN WRANGEL, Field-Marshal, defeated STANISLAUS POŁOSKI, Castellan of Caminieck; the Swedes on the other side were forced to raise the siege of Thorn, and some time after there happened an engagement wherein GUSTAVUS was made prisoner, but without being known, and in that manner he came back to his army. I am going to tell, in a few words, how the Polish authors relate this adventure.

They say that the great General KONIECKPOLSKI having attacked the Swedish army, commanded by GUSTAVUS in person, put them to flight, that GUSTAVUS having rallied, returned to the charge, and fell into the hands of a trooper who seized him by the belt; that he escaped from this trooper by leaving with him his belt and hat, and that immediately after he was taken by another, who was going to kill him, when a German, who knew him, cried out that he was a servant of the Rheingrave, that upon this the trooper left him, and the German having given him a horse, GUSTAVUS rode all that night to Marienburg.

The Swedes say, that the army of the King of Poland, being re-inforced with Imperial troops, marched up to GUSTAVUS, who prepared to receive them with his usual intrepidity, and ordered the Rheingrave, who was nearer the enemy with a detachment of the army, not to engage; that notwithstanding, the Rheingrave imagining he had a fair opportunity, attacked the Imperialists, but was forced to retire in disorder, and with loss; that GUSTAVUS joined him, and obliged the Imperialists to retire; that after this the latter made as if they designed to march to the great isle of the Vistula, near Dantzic, that there was a sharp engagement to hinder them, and that GUSTAVUS, having mixed with them, was taken prisoner by a Polander, who knowing him in general to belong to the contrary party, commanded him to follow him; that GUSTAVUS making a difficulty to obey, was upon the point of being killed, when a captain of the horse, called HENRY SOOP, came up and brought the King off from this danger by killing the Polander, and that this captain was afterwards created Knight of the Order in the assembly of the States. What may be gathered as certain from these two different accounts, is, that the King of Sweden, transported by the heat of his courage, mixed among the enemy too far, and too ill accompanied. He was a great General, and weighed things with the greatest sedateness, but he sometimes forgot himself in the action, and was not always master of his temper, heated with the passion of overcoming an enemy, who vigorously contended with him for victory.

The Swedish Historians add, that from that day till the truce, there were several engagements, wherein SIGISMUND's army was always worsted, and in some places with an irreparable loss. But the Polish Historians say, on the contrary, that SIGISMUND being informed of the great advantage gained by General KONIECKPOLSKI over the Swedish army, on the day when GUSTAVUS so fortunately escaped, came immediately to his army, to improve that advantage, but that General ARNHEIM, who would not consent to the siege of Marienburg, was the occasion that all the fruit of so important a victory was lost; that the King complained to WALSTEIN of the perfidy of this General, and that WALSTEIN recalled him, and substituted in his place, ADOLPHUS, Duke of Holstein, who did little service, because he was but little respected by the Germans who had served under General ARNHEIM. Finally, that the last warlike exploit was performed by the Cossacks in the isle of Marienburg, where they defeated and killed the young WRANGEL. According to this account, the Poles in that campaign suffered only by not improving their victory.

It would be a very difficult labour, and of a very doubtful success, to enquire whether the Poles or the Swedes are most to be credited in their narratives. Let us be content to know that it is at least unquestionable that SIGISMUND consented to a truce for six years, tho' the Emperor and the King of Spain dissuaded him from it, as much as they could, and offered him great succours, if he continued the war. It is equally unquestionable that SIGISMUND was a warlike Prince, and so passionately desired to recover the kingdom of Sweden, of which he pretended that GUSTAVUS was not the lawful possessor, that he consented to the truce with the greatest reluctance. In fine, it is unquestionable that the truce was concluded on conditions glorious for Sweden; for it was agreed

agreed that the port of Memel in Prussia, Elbing, Brunsberg, Pillaw, and all the places which the King of Sweden held in Livonia, should remain in his possession, that Marienburg should be deposited in the hands of the Elector of Brandenburg, and that if a peace was not concluded, Marienburg and Dirfau, which were restored to Poland, should return to Sweden.

The Polish Historians, after this, may falsify and obscure, as much as they please, the detail of this war; they will never be able to obscure this truth, that the glory and advantage of it remained to GUSTAVUS, and that he was at least *viſtor bello*, --- *viſtorious in the war*, if he was not most frequently *viſtor pugna*, --- *viſtorious in the battle*. The truce could hardly fail to be concluded at that time; for both parties were greatly solicited to it by the Ambassadors of France, England, and Brandenburg.

The Elector of Brandenburg had been very much embarrassed during the course of this war: at first he secretly favoured GUSTAVUS, afterwards finding GUSTAVUS had conquered the best part of Prussia, he knew not which of his neighbours ought to have his good wishes, nor whether it was more his interest that the Swedes should possess that province, or be driven out of it by SIGISMUND, and then his thoughts were so confused that even GUSTAVUS doubted whether he ought to trust him or not, and therefore told him that he gave him six months to resolve upon taking one side, or the other. He treated secretly with GUSTAVUS; but because SIGISMUND, whose vassal he was with respect to Ducal Prussia, which was at that time a fief depending on the crown of Poland, threatened to divest him of it, if he did not openly embrace his party, he broke with Sweden, and sent succours to the King of Poland. To extricate himself from such troublesome circumstances, it was his interest more than that of any other Potentate, that these two Princes should come to an accommodation.

In the next place, the Republic of Poland was so weary of a war, undertaken by SIGISMUND only to revenge his private quarrels, and to recover a kingdom which he had lost by too blindly following the maxims and counsels of the Jesuits, this Republic, I say, was so weary of a war which did not concern it, and had only straitened the antient boundaries of Poland, without any appearance of repairing that loss, far from conquering a new kingdom, that their discontentment in this affair was now generally known. The Dantzickers in particular were so weary of a war which weakened their commerce, and by consequence deprived them of their greatest advantage, that they extremely pressed the King of Poland to accommodate with Sweden.

In fine, we must not doubt but that GUSTAVUS, however insatiable of war he may be thought, desired to make an accommodation with Poland, either by a peace, or a cessation of arms. For by that accommodation he did not lose the hopes of gratifying his warlike inclinations. The disorders in Germany, his own particular interest to lessen the power of the Emperor, who had made himself formidable in the Baltic, the solicitations of several States, which wished that the house of Austria were confined within its just bounds, and the designs of that house towards an universal monarchy, all this opened to GUSTAVUS the largest field for military valour, and he only wanted to be free on the side of Poland, to engage in the boldest and most glorious design that has appeared these many years. The house of Austria was not ignorant of it, and for this reason had greatly laboured to foment the war between him and SIGISMUND. But the efforts of that house were in vain. GUSTAVUS concluded a treaty with the King of Poland, in the year 1629, for a longer time than either of them was to live. Let us now see how he employed the years which followed that truce; and because the better to comprehend the reasons of his conduct, it is fit to know the state of Germany at that time, let us here give a short and faithful account of the enterprizes of the house of Austria on the liberty of Europe in general, and that of the Protestant religion in particular.



A N



A N

Historical Discourse

On the LIFE of

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS, KING OF SWEDEN.

CHAP. II.

Of the situation of affairs in Germany, when GUSTAVUS entered it.



THE house of Austria owes the beginning of its glory and power to **RUDOLPH**, Count of Hapsburg, elected Emperor in the year 1273. The merit of **RUDOLPH** was so generally acknowledged, that the Electors of the empire, by giving him their suffrages, put a stop to all the factions and cabals which had for a long time created divisions in Germany, and they united all parties in the approbation of their choice. He worthily maintained the dignity they had conferred on him, and strenuously laboured to support the honour of the empire, but without forgetting the particular interests of his own house. In effect, if he would not suffer **OTTOCARUS**, King of Bohemia, to seize on Austria, in prejudice of the rights of the empire, his only view in this was to bestow that country on his own son.

Austria had been erected into a Markgraviate by the Emperor **Otho I**, in favour of **LEOPOLD**, his brother-in-law, who had worthily discharged the commission he had received from the Emperor **HENRY I**, to guard that frontier against the incursions of the Hungarians. It was afterwards erected into a duchy by **FREDERIC BARBAROSSA**, in favour of one of **LEOPOLD**'s descendants; and, in fine, the last male of that family, named **FREDERIC**, having perished in the unfortunate expedition of **CONRADINE** against **CHARLES OF ANJOU**, in the tragical manner which every one knows, **OTTOCARUS** seized it by virtue of his wife's pretensions, she being the heiress of **FREDERIC**. **RUDOLPH** being arrived at the Imperial dignity, declared that **OTTOCARUS** had seized on a country, which did not belong to him, since it was a fief appropriated to the male heirs. But his reasons not being persuasive enough, he enforced them with good troops, cut off **OTTOCARUS** in a battle he gained over him near Vienna, in the year 1278, and invested his son **ALBERT** with the duchies of Austria and Stiria, and the lordships of Carniola and Windismarc. Since that time the name of Hapsburg appears no longer. **RUDOLPH**'s posterity only took the name of Austria, and have rendered it very famous. They erected that fief into an archduchy, and endowed it with several ample privileges.

V O L. V.

8 G

This

ANNO
1260.

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS.

ANNO
1298.

This house has furnished Germany with fourteen Emperors, all in an uninterrupted succession, excepting the three first; and Spain with six Kings, if we reckon in that number PHILIP, the father of the Emperor CHARLES V. Though RUDOLPH left sons capable of succeeding him, yet the Electors did not choose an Emperor out of his family, but out of the illustrious house of Nassaw, which to this day is one of the most glorious and flourishing in Europe. We may easily imagine that ALBERT OF AUSTRIA, the son of the Emperor RUDOLPH, was displeased at this election, and improved every conjuncture which might ruin his rival. He had powerful friends. He raised a formidable faction, laboured to get him deposed, and himself elected in his room; in a word, he overcame the Emperor ADOLPHUS OF NASSAW in the battle of Hafensuet near Spire. Having perceived him at the head of a squadron in the hottest part of the engagement, he singled him out, and killed him, and by this means secured to himself the Imperial crown. ALBERT was killed ten years after by his own nephew, leaving several children by his marriage with ELIZABETH OF CARINTHIA. This marriage united Carinthia and Tirol to the patrimony of the house of Austria, and was, as it were, the prelude to the aggrandisement of that house.

1314.

FREDERIC, ALBERT'S eldest son, was undoubtedly very much affected with the barbarous action of his cousin; but perhaps was still more displeased that HENRY VII, of the house of Luxemburg was then raised to the Imperial throne. He comforted himself as well as he could, with the hopes of a favourable opportunity, which he thought he had found after the death of HENRY. For some of the electors chose him Emperor. It was indeed the least part of them, and consequently his election was not regular. But he found too great an advantage in believing it valid, not to maintain that it was so; he knew besides, that, provided a Prince overcomes his rival, he will not want the means to rectify the irregularity of his election: accordingly FREDERIC used all his endeavours to ruin LEWIS OF BAVARIA, who had been elected by the greatest number of suffrages, and whose election was consequently more regular. As these two competitors were very brave, and supported by many friends, their dispute kindled a war in Germany, which lasted eight years. Whatever makes a war considerable, happened in this, several encounters, several towns either besieged or taken, two battles, in the last of which fortune openly declared against FREDERIC, by making him fall into the hands of his competitor, who did not set him at liberty till after three years imprisonment, and after he had made him swear to content himself with the empty title of King of the Romans, without ever pretending to the empire. He kept his promise; though, by reason of the great disputes between LEWIS OF BAVARIA, and the Pope, he was tempted to believe, that a man is not held by the promise which he makes in prison; and though the Pope himself strongly solicited him to come either to Avignon, or to Rome, and assume the Imperial dignity. After his death, which happened in the year 1330, there passed a century before the posterity of RUDOLPH of Hapsburg came again to the Imperial crown: but in the year 1438, this house, which has been so greatly beholden to marriages, again recovered that crown by virtue of a marriage, and got so sure a hold of it, that they have wore it ever since.

1346.

The house of Luxemburg which had lost the empire by the death of HENRY VII, recovered it thirty three years after, by the election of CHARLES IV, grandson of HENRY, which was made even during the life of the Emperor LEWIS OF BAVARIA, and at the instigation of the Pope, his mortal enemy; but CHARLES was hardly acknowledged till after the death of LEWIS; most of the Princes, and all the cities of the empire having judged that the thunderbolts of the court of Rome did not hinder LEWIS OF BAVARIA from being their lawful sovereign.

WENCESLAUS and SIGISMUND, both sons of CHARLES IV, swayed the Imperial scepter after him, the former immediately after his father, who died in the year 1378; and the latter after the death of RUPERT Count Palatine, who having succeeded WENCESLAUS deposed by the electors of the Empire in the year 1400, died in 1411. SIGISMUND left an only daughter; who was married to ALBERT Duke of Austria, and brought him the Imperial crown, with the kingdoms of Bohemia and Hungary in the year 1438; for in all elective kingdoms he who marries the heiress of the late King, is usually preferred to all others. The reign of ALBERT was very short; but in recompence FREDERIC OF AUSTRIA, his cousin, who succeeded him, filled the Imperial throne fifty-three years. He had the good fortune and address to marry his son MAXIMILIAN with the richest heiress in Europe, MARY OF BURGUNDY, only daughter of CHARLES THE BOLD, whose ambition and warlike temper are so well known. This marriage so considerably increased the power of the house of Austria, that perhaps it might have been wished for the tranquillity of Christendom that their power had not become greater. It might have been enough for one house to have annexed to it's antient patrimony, and to the Imperial dignity, the provinces of the Low-Countries, so rich, so flourishing, and conveniently situated: nevertheless, the providence of God has been pleased to suffer the great power of some, and the jealousy and diffidence of others to be a continual source of war; from whence we may conclude that the benefit of mankind requires that no Prince should become too powerful.

However

However that may be, MAXIMILIAN having been elected Emperor in the year 1493, after the death of his father, married his son with JOAN OF ARRAGON, daughter of FERDINAND OF ARRAGON, and ISABELLA OF CASTILE, and by this means added to his house the great and vast estates which FERDINAND possessed, both in the new and the old world. The marriage of FERDINAND with ISABELLA OF CASTILE brought him great advantages, both because she was heiress of several great kingdoms, and because she was capable to second her husband in his great designs. To the kingdom of his fathers, and to those of his wife, he added Granada, and Navarre, Naples, and Sicily, and all the countries discovered in the new world.

One could hardly have imagined that this great succession concerned the house of Austria; for besides that FERDINAND had a son, whom he took great care to marry sometimes with the daughter of MAXIMILIAN, he had only bestowed on PHILIP, son of the same MAXIMILIAN, the second of his four daughters: yet notwithstanding all this, she became the heiress of FERDINAND. The Prince, her brother, dying without issue, the Infanta ISABELLA, her eldest sister, the wife of DOM EMANUEL, King of Portugal, left only one son, who died in his infancy. Thus the Princess JOAN inherited all this great succession, and transferred it to her eldest son, who under the name of CHARLES V has been so famous in Europe.

CHARLES, born at Ghent on St MATTHIAS's day, which fell that year on the twenty-fifth of February, had lost his father, when the death of his grandfather by the mother's side opened to him the succession of all his kingdoms. His mother indeed was still living, but the distraction of her mind not allowing her to reign, she was obliged to resign her authority; and thus CHARLES reigned alone some time after the death of King FERDINAND. Besides the possession of so many kingdoms, he had soon a new accession of power. The Emperor MAXIMILIAN, his grandfather, dying on the twenty-second of January 1519, he came to the Imperial crown six months after. For this he was partly beholden to his German extraction, and the seeming mediocrity of his genius. Otherwise, it is not to be doubted but that FRANCIS I, King of France, would have been preferred to him; but the Germans were afraid of the temper, capacity, and courage of the latter, which had appeared on several occasions. I need not say that CHARLES now became the most powerful Prince in Europe; that is obvious; but after what I have hinted of the seeming mediocrity of his genius, I must add either that the Germans knew him very ill, when they believed that he was not a great man, or that his genius opened by degrees, and was formed by experience in affairs. This Prince was certainly endowed with great qualities, and to his great courage was joined much judgment, and much of that capacity which is necessary for the sovereign of a vast empire.

As miracles rarely happen, and it must have been a miracle if CHARLES V, endowed with such qualities, and possessed of such great power, had not aspired after new kingdoms, several people believed that he introduced into the house of Austria the design of an universal monarchy, a design which that house is not now accused of, (the accusation would be very unjust) but which was formerly imputed to them. Such a project necessarily required that his hereditary dominions should border upon the dominions of Spain, or at least that it should not be difficult to bring troops from Spain to Germany, and from Germany to Spain. For this end CHARLES, not content to have added, to the patrimony of the house of Burgundy, what he wanted in the seventeen provinces of the Low-Countries, fortified himself in Italy as well as he could. Knowing also how necessary it is to be assured of England, in order to subvert Europe, he did not pass by the opportunity which was presented, of marrying his eldest son with Queen MARY, the daughter of HENRY VIII. I enter not into more particular considerations, because they would carry me too far from my subject.

Several circumstances made CHARLES V fail in the design of an universal monarchy, supposing he entertained it; but nothing traversed that design more than the disadvantage he had to live in an age so ill-timed for his purpose, as it produced a number of great men. For whereas there have often passed compleat centuries, in which we cannot observe any Prince of a distinguished merit; in the age when CHARLES lived, appeared HENRY VIII, King of England, a Prince courageous and bold, who never suffered the balance to incline too much to one side; FRANCIS I, King of France, who thwarted the house of Austria in every thing, and every where, who had the heart of a lion, and the most active and stirring genius; SOLIMAN, Emperor of the Turks, a great conqueror, and one of the most formidable neighbours that ever ravaged Hungary.

I say nothing of several brave and prudent German Princes, who opposed CHARLES V with great resolution and glory.

He was too great a man to suffer himself to be possessed with a sanguinary and superstitious spirit, which incites Princes to persecute religions different from their own; so that it is probable whatever he did, with regard to the Protestants, proceeded either from a design of engaging the Pope to be always on his side, or from a fear lest the establishment of Lutheranism should continue to be prejudicial to him, by reason of the too passionate zeal of the Papists. But as soon as he was sensible that it was not

his interest to persecute the Lutherans, like a man of great sense and courage, he threw off all the complaisance he had formerly shewn to the Pope, and rejected the counsels of Ecclesiastics, enemies to the public peace. From hence proceeded the treaty of Passaw, which gave full liberty of conscience to all the States of the empire. Had he done this twenty years sooner, he would have probably removed several obstacles to the execution of his great design; but he was somewhat too late in pacifying the differences in point of religion.

Fortune had already forsaken him, and favoured HENRY II, imitating coquets (as he himself mournfully said) with whom it is a strong reason for preferring one man to another, that he is fifteen or twenty years younger. The displeasure he had to outlive his good-fortune made him take the resolution of leaving the world; but in such a manner, as he might claim great merit by it; for he confined himself in the solitude of a monastery, knowing that Ecclesiastics would give a fine turn to this action, and that of all the actions of his life this would be by them the most extolled.

CHARLES had committed one fault which he in vain endeavoured to repair; he had caused his brother FERDINAND to be elected King of the Romans. He considered, but too late, that in order to preserve and increase the power of his house, it was highly important than all its dominions should be united in one person. He would therefore have been glad to revoke the election of FERDINAND, and substitute PHILIP his son in his room. But as FERDINAND rejected this proposal, CHARLES bestowing the Spanish monarchy on his son, was obliged to leave the Imperial crown to his brother; and in effect FERDINAND, who was already King of Hungary and Bohemia, obtained that crown, upon the retreat of CHARLES V.

FERDINAND refusing to yield the empire to his nephew, raised a kind of misunderstanding which lasted for some time between the two branches of the house of Austria, the elder of which reigned in Spain, and the younger in Germany, as they do to this day. FERDINAND entirely embraced the principles of Toleration, which had been so wisely followed by his predecessor in the treaty of Passaw. He had confirmed that treaty in the name of the Emperor his brother, in a Diet held at Augsburg in the year 1555, and three years after, he confirmed it anew, no longer as the bare deputy of his brother, but as fully invested with the Imperial authority.

ANNO
1564.

His son MAXIMILIAN II, who succeeded him, followed this noble example of moderation, and extended it even farther than his father had done, for he tolerated the exercise of Lutheranism in his own dominions, he highly detested the massacre of Paris, executed by the order of CHARLES IX, his son in law, and told HENRY III, as the latter passed through Vienna, that a Prince who tyrannizes over the consciences of men, invades God's right, and often loses the things of this world, by meddling too much with those of the other.

He died in the year 1576, greatly regretted by the Protestants, and made room for his son RUDOLPH II, whose conduct did not degenerate from that of his late predecessors, while he was guided by his own judgment; for he applied himself to maintain the public tranquillity which Germany enjoyed since the treaty of Passaw, and imitating the moderation of his father and grand-father, he disturbed no man in the possession of his privileges, judging, with great truth, that it is the principal virtue of a sovereign to content himself with the power he lawfully possesses. Far from treading in the steps of those Princes, whose ambition disturbs the public peace, it may be said that he loved peace too much, and had not even the ambition of being master in his own family. This was very hurtful to Germany, because disaffected persons abusing the facility of RUDOLPH, found means to insinuate themselves into the Imperial council, and to extort from this Prince some attempts on the liberties of Germany, as appeared chiefly in the affair of Juliers.

1608.

This honest Emperor suffered for his too great facility. His brother MATTHIAS so greatly abused it, that he forced RUDOLPH to yield to him the kingdom of Hungary, and Austria, and to consent to his being crowned King of Bohemia. These unnatural and violent proceedings of MATTHIAS, and the weakness of RUDOLPH in giving credit to the predictions of TYCHO-BRAHE, who studied Astrology as well as Astronomy, ruined this unhappy Emperor. For TYCHO-BRAHE having told him that he was threatened with some imminent danger from his own relations, and that he ought to be on his guard, threw him into so great fears that he no longer ventured to go abroad, or see any company; and as the conduct of MATTHIAS confirmed the astrological warning, the Emperor sunk at last under his uneasiness and grief, and died on the eighteenth of January 1612, in the fifty-ninth year of his age.

Though the Protestants of Germany had, generally speaking, some reason to complain of RUDOLPH, who had some times been surprized into bad measures by the emissaries of the court of Rome, the Protestants of Bohemia, in particular, thought themselves very happy under the clemency of this Emperor. In effect, he had granted a liberty of conscience in Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia; and it is indisputable that before the war in Bohemia, the Protestants of that kingdom were equal with the Papists in every respect but this, that they had not a King of their religion. This equality was not an usurped power; but arose from the great privileges which RUDOLPH and

and his successor Matthias had granted to the Bohemians of the communion *sub utraque*; this was the distinction between the Protestants and those of the Romish communion.

The Emperor MATTHIAS felt the same jealousy of his authority, which he had raised against that of RUDOLPH, his predecessor. He had no children; his two brothers, the Archduke MAXIMILIAN, Grand-Master of the Teutonic order, and the Archduke ALBERT, Governor of the Low-Countries, had likewise none. Thus the succession lay open to the children of the Archduke CHARLES, son of the Emperor FERDINAND.

This juncture was favourable to the Spaniards. They had the glory of the house of Austria extremely at heart, and believed it was the interest of that house that both the branches of it should be governed by the same maxims; and as they had a better opinion of their own politics than of those of the Germans, they were persuaded that it would be more conducive to the common glory of the house of Austria, that the court of Vienna, instead of governing that of Spain, should on the contrary be governed by it. Accordingly they resolved no longer to defer making themselves necessary to the Imperial court. Having observed that an opportunity of doing this seasonably offered at the approaching election of an Emperor, they intimated to FERDINAND, the eldest son of the Archduke CHARLES that he had great need of their good offices, in order to succeed the Emperor MATTHIAS. This he believed, and attached himself to them as much as they desired; so that they no longer doubted but if the empire was once in their hands, they should dispose of it as they would.

With this view they warmly undertook the affair, and proposed FERDINAND to MATTHIAS as a person whom he ought immediately to adopt. They prevailed without much difficulty on the brothers of MATTHIAS to yield all their pretensions to FERDINAND. In short, they made it so much their business to invest him soon with the whole authority, that this gave the Emperor great uneasiness. So natural it is for Princes who have no children, and sometimes even for those who have, to be uneasy when they observe the attachment of the people to their apparent successor. But notwithstanding this jealousy, MATTHIAS acquiesced in the reasons of the Spaniards, with regard to the crown of Bohemia, which they wished he would dispose of during his life, in favour of him whom they protected. They gave him to understand, that the affair was not to be left to the chance of an election made during the interregnum, lest his heir should be excluded; that after his death, the States of Bohemia, pretending that the kingdom was elective, might bestow the crown on some Heretic Prince, and that in such a case the empire would unquestionably pass to another house. MATTHIAS, affected with a fear so dextrously inspired, caused FERDINAND to be declared his successor to the kingdom of Bohemia, in the year 1617.

Besides the Spaniards made a secret treaty with FERDINAND, by which King PHILIP III renounced in his favour, all his rights to the hereditary countries of the house of Austria, situated in Germany; in consideration of which FERDINAND engaged to deliver Alsacia to the Spaniards.

I thought it proper to make all these observations on the conduct of the four immediate successors of CHARLES V, in order to undeceive the generality of readers, who taking only a superficial and general view of things, falsely imagine that all the complaints which have been made against the house of Austria, fall as well on the German branch, as on the Spanish. Nothing is more untrue: for the whole conduct of the house of Austria in Germany, while they were not directed by the Spaniards, was thought commendable, or at least tolerable; and it is certain that the Princes of the empire would never have resorted to the remedies they used, had they not been persuaded that the Imperial court blindly followed the orders which came from that of Madrid, and that the Jesuits inspired both these courts with the design of exterminating all the sects, by setting up an Inquisition. Here we have an instance of the weakness of our reasonings. For what was seemingly more rational than to say, that, for the greater glory of the house of Austria, it was necessary that the court of Vienna should act in concert with Spain, where there were so many wise men instructed in the politics of PHILIP II? And yet this concert has been the most hurtful both to the Emperor and the Spaniards, because people were prejudiced with a frightful idea of the Spanish politics, on account of all that had passed in the Low-Countries, of the share the Spaniards had taken in the civil-wars of France, of the invasion of Portugal, of the extraordinary efforts they had made to dethrone Queen ELIZABETH, when they equipped their invincible Armada, and on several other accounts. Whether this prejudice was just or unjust, certain it is, that people had frightful thoughts of the government of Spain, and for this reason the German Princes stirred so much, as soon as they believed the Emperor was abandoned to the conduct of that strange nation. Now from these great emotions arose the violent storm which fell both upon the Emperor and Spain.

For the rest, though I have said, or may sometimes say in the sequel of this discourse, that Spain was accused of aspiring after universal monarchy, yet this must not be taken as if I asserted that the accusation was just. In this I act merely as an Historian, who relates common reports, without warranting the truth of them. I have therefore no reason to be apprehensive of provoking the Spaniards; and was I

even to declaim against their former ambition, I do not think they would take it amiss. In effect, they are at this day the first to blame those Princes who hold a conduct like that which was imputed to them about fifty or threescore years ago, they are the first to exclaim against ambitious Princes who aggrandise themselves at the expence of their neighbours, and they wish that all the powers in Europe would rise in arms against them. They are in the right to wish this; it is enough for ambitious nations to indulge themselves in the pleasing imagination, that it is the part of a great soul to aspire after the conquest of a great empire. It is not fit that they should also have the pleasure of conquering it. That would be too much. Let them freely enjoy pleasing imaginations, but let them meet with a vigorous opposition, and such as justice requires, when they would change their imaginations into realities.

Let us return to the Archduke FERDINAND. As soon as the Emperor MATTHIAS had caused him to be declared King of Bohemia, it was no longer doubted but that he would have him elected King of the Romans, especially since, having some time after gone to Hungary, he caused him to be declared King of Hungary at Presburg, on the first of June 1618.

The thoughts that FERDINAND would become Emperor extremely alarmed several German Princes, both because they saw that the empire would by this means be inevitably perpetuated in the same family, notwithstanding the golden bull, and because FERDINAND would re-unite in himself all the hereditary countries of the German branch. They could not conceive how they should preserve their liberty under an Emperor so powerful, and governed by the Spaniards. The Protestant Princes feared him more than all the rest, because they looked upon him as a Prince educated by the Jesuits, and who had already improved so much by the lessons they had given him at Ingolstadt, where he had studied, that as soon as he had succeeded his father, he had tolerated no sect in his dominions. Yet he had found them full of people who followed the new opinions; but by menaces and ill-usage he had forced a part of these people to change their religion, and had banished all the rest, whom neither the fear of exile, nor the confiscation of their estates and goods, could force to go over to the Romish communion. This rendered him both odious and terrible to all the Protestants; but on the other hand, it greatly recommended him to the three ecclesiastical Electors; and as he wanted no more than one vote, and was sure of giving that of the King of Bohemia to himself, he had great reason to depend upon succeeding the Emperor MATTHIAS.

The more this was likely to happen, the more did some Princes of Germany endeavour to prevent it. But none of them took this affair so much to heart as FREDERIC, Elector Palatine, the same who was King of Bohemia some time after. He was a Prince of great merit, and of exalted courage; and surely they who speak otherwise of him, must be ranked among those people of a vulgar understanding, who, judging of things only by the success of them, imagine because he was not successful in his enterprise, that he was not a great man. This Prince therefore took great pains to represent to his colleagues how necessary it was not to proceed to the election of a King of the Romans during the life of MATTHIAS. He told them that they would be more at liberty, in the interregnum, to transfer the Imperial crown to another house, and that it was necessary to do so, because if they did not interrupt the succession of the Princes of the house of Austria at that juncture, when the direct line failed, they could never entertain any hopes of interrupting it, especially if FERDINAND was elected, who being supported by a foreign power, and a numerous family, would establish himself and his posterity for ever in the Imperial throne.

But as these representations were insignificant speeches, unless there was found a Catholic Prince fit to be Emperor, (for the Protestants had only three votes, and four at least were necessary) FREDERIC cast his eye on MAXIMILIAN, Duke of Bavaria, a Prince of distinguished merit, and went to visit him at Munich, on purpose to persuade him to accept of the Imperial crown; promising him the votes of the three Protestant Electors, which, with that of the Archbishop of Cologne, whom he might depend upon, as being the Duke of Bavaria's own brother, would render the election infallible. The temptation was great: nevertheless, MAXIMILIAN resisted it, either because he knew himself too well to oppose so strong a party, or because the Ministers of the Pope and the King of Spain promised him other advantages, in the room of an empire which he could not preserve against the enemies he would raise by accepting it; so that he preferred a fortune less exalted, but solid, to one more pompous but tottering. And who knows but that he was threatened in the name of God with some horrible chastisement in this world, and with hell-torments in the other, if he accepted a crown, which, in the judgment of the court of Rome, could not be taken from the house of Austria, without manifest danger to religion?

I have already mentioned the journey of the Emperor MATTHIAS to Hungary. I add here, that during this journey the troubles of Bohemia broke forth; the Archbishop of Prague, and the Abbot Bruneau, gave the first occasion to them; the former by demolishing a church which the Protestants had built at Clostergrab; and the latter by shutting up another. The Emperor RUDOLPH had permitted the Protestants, by his Letters-

Letters-Patent, dated the ninth of July 1609, to build churches, hospitals, and schools, on their own ground in whatever jurisdiction they were situated, even without the permission of the lord of the fief or high-judiciary. They had peaceably enjoyed this privilege in the reign of MATTHIAS, and on a sudden saw two private men, without the Emperor's order, and merely by their own authority, demolish and shut up their churches. This provoked them to the highest degree, not so much on account of these two churches, as because they looked upon this as an omen of FERDINAND's conduct, from which they could only preface melancholy consequences; for since, without waiting for the approaching death of the good Emperor MATTHIAS, he signalized the beginnings of his reign by violences exceeding severe, they might be sure that he would not long delay to proscribe them, and to follow all the suggestions of the Jesuits who led him.

These fears increased some time after, by the approbation which was given in the Emperor's council to the violences of the Archbishop of Prague, and the Abbot Bruneau. The Protestants then saw that the old-age of MATTHIAS had delivered him a prey to his successor; so that having no hopes but from the resolution which they should discover, they thought themselves obliged to make FERDINAND, and the Spaniards, whose suggestions he followed, sensible that they should engage in a very difficult and dangerous affair, if they undertook to annul their privileges. They thought that the more submissive they should be, the more should they be trampled upon, and that they ought to render themselves formidable by some bold step, in order to stifle in their birth, the pernicious counsels which had been suggested to FERDINAND.

Accordingly they took resolutions not only too bold, but inexcusable on account of their violence. For not content to summon the States of the kingdom, in order to deliberate on the proper means of preserving the privileges of the country, they opened these States on the twenty-first of May 1618, without any regard to the Emperor's prohibition; and two days after sent several lords and deputies of towns to the council, in order to make their remonstrances. These discharged their commission with an air not like that of supplicants. Accordingly their petition was not received in the manner which they thought the equity of their cause required, which provoked them so highly, that they threw out of the windows, as traitors to their country, Count MARTINITZ, Count NAUATA, and PHILIP FABRICIO, Secretary of State.

After such a proceeding, the Bohemians found themselves engaged a new, to break with FERDINAND, because they could hope for nothing but by rendering themselves the strongest. Accordingly Count LA TOUR having made them sensible of the necessity they were under to repel force by force, they immediately sent commissions for levying troops throughout the whole kingdom. This Count had been very ill treated by FERDINAND from a hatred to his religion; for he had banished him out of Austria, and deprived him of his estate; and the Count expected no better usage when FERDINAND should come to the crown of Bohemia. This personal interest greatly prevailed on him to raise a general insurrection in the kingdom, and furnished him with a lively and animated eloquence in the speech he made to an assembly which he had summoned to meet. He represented to them the charms of liberty to which he invited them. Then he laid open to their view the loss of their privileges, and ruin of their religion, which they must unavoidably suffer under a Prince governed by Spanish counsels, and by Monks, both equally enemies to their liberty and religion; under a Prince inspired from his infancy with a violent hatred of Protestants, and who sufficiently discovered what measures he would take hereafter, by those which he had already taken in his own dominions, where the banishment of his subjects, the ruin and desolation of families, and the confiscation of lands and goods were the only monuments he had raised to his glory. He concluded with these memorable words. *Remember that now there is room neither for repentance, nor for pardon. We must no longer reason, nor deliberate. We only want concord and steadiness. The lot is cast. If we prove victorious, we shall be a just, free, and sovereign people; if we are conquered, we shall be traitors, perjured persons, and rebels.* He animated them to that degree, that they all resolved on an insurrection. They who disapproved it, durst not discover their sentiments, for fear of being ill-used by the rest: thus it commonly happens that men of a peaceable disposition are carried down with the torrent of a faction.

Upon the news of this great revolution, the opinions of the court of Vienna were divided. FERDINAND's cabal were for severely punishing the rebels. MATTHIAS, on the contrary, thought it proper to reclaim them by moderation, and by offering them new privileges. This was also the opinion of Cardinal GIESEL, his first Minister. The true cause of this opinion was not so much the clemency either of the Emperor, or of the Cardinal, though they were both moderate enough, as their jealousy of the Spaniards. MATTHIAS could not send forces to Bohemia, without giving the command of them to FERDINAND, and that was giving it to the Spaniards, whose conduct displeased him, as he had shewn by declaring for the new Republic of Holland. Therefore the Emperor and his first Minister would have greatly wished to avoid the war: but they could not prevent it, nor refuse the command of the army to FERDINAND.

All

All they could do was to limit his authority, by giving him a council made up of the creatures of MATTHIAS. This displeased him so much that at the instigation of the Spanish Ambassador, without whom he did nothing, he resolved to ruin Cardinal GLESEL, whom he believed to be the cause of the restrictions put upon his authority. In effect, after some complaints against the Cardinal's conduct, which tended to discredit him as a man too favourable to the Heretics, and too little concerned for the aggrandisement of the house of Austria, he was seized in the antichamber of the Archduke MAXIMILIAN, and immediately carried to Innspruch.

Very submissive excuses were made to MATTHIAS for this proceeding: but as he loved the Cardinal, and besides as the seizing of the Cardinal was a notorious contempt of his authority, all these submissions did not pacify him. Whether awake or asleep, he was heard loudly crying that his GLESEL must be restored to him. Nay it is said, that, in order to revenge that affront, he was upon the point of going over to the malecontents of Bohemia. Cardinal DIETRICHSTEIN appeased him a little, by bringing the King of Bohemia, and the Archduke MAXIMILIAN, into his chamber, to ask his pardon, and to protest that from thenceforth they would make no incroachment upon the Imperial authority. Nevertheless, the short time he lived, he passed it in continual apprehensions, feeling the judgment of God upon him, who permitted his cousin FERDINAND to deprive him of that authority, of which he himself had deprived his brother, the Emperor RUDOLPH. MATTHIAS died on the twentieth of March 1619.

The better to understand how the disorders of Bohemia agitated the whole empire, it is fit to know that ever since the year 1608, the Protestants, oppressed in several places, and fearing lest their patience should bring upon them new hardships, had laid the foundation of a particular alliance among several of them for their mutual preservation. This was done in the assembly of Ahaufen, on the fourth of May 1618; but the alliance was only concluded in the assembly of Hall in Suabia. The following year this alliance took the name of *the Union*, and the Princes who entered into it, that of *Correspondents*. The Elector Palatine was chosen the chief of the Union.

The Papists having met at Munich, made at the same time another alliance among themselves, and gave it the pompous title of *the Catholic League*; they chose for the chief of it the Duke of Bavaria, a very artful Prince, who well knew how to improve the public calamities to the advantage of his own house. These two great parties, or if you will, these two great Leagues, observed each other, without proceeding to extremities; but at last the troubles of Bohemia having taken birth from an affair of religion, and the whole empire being possessed either with the fears, or the hopes that the successor of MATTHIAS would persecute the Protestants, both the Union and the League prepared for a war which appeared inevitable.

But there was this difference between the chiefs of the Union, and those of the League, the latter acted with greater prudence and concord than the former, and signally triumphed over them. The Princes of the Union were not diligent enough in preparing for a war: they suffered themselves to be amused with proposals of accommodation, they gave the League time to bring together great forces, and after that, they could no longer brave it. They committed the fault which is very common in civil wars, *viz.* that people endeavour to save appearances. If a party would save appearances, they must lie quiet, but if they will not lie quiet, they must push things to an extremity, without keeping any measures. It rarely happens but that otherwise they are at once both criminal and unfortunate. Let this be said without any prejudice to the rights of the German Princes, who assert, that it was as lawful for them, with regard both to their civil and religious interests, to favour the cause of the Elector Palatine against FERDINAND, as it was for the King of France to favour the United Provinces against the Spaniards, and for the King of Spain to favour sometimes the League against the lawful heir of the crown, and sometimes the Duke of Rohan against LEWIS XIII. But if they had a right to succour the Protestants of Bohemia, who took arms against FERDINAND, they must at least own that they did them very little service. He who gave the most reputation to the arms of the Bohemians was ERNEST Count Mansfeld; who being informed of their insurrection, when he was in Piedmont, in the service of the Duke of Savoy, eagerly embraced that opportunity of signalizing himself, and offered them his service with two thousand men, whom the Duke allowed him to choose out of his troops, and maintained till the Count arrived in Bohemia. He was a brave man, who sought such opportunities in order to raise himself, and to subsist with splendor. He was natural son to PETER ERNEST, Count Mansfeld, Governor of the Low-Countries for the King of Spain, and had abandoned Popery, after having made several campaigns in the Emperor's service. He was cordially received by the malecontents of Hungary, who honoured him with the post of General of the artillery, and he became, with Count LA TOUR, one of the principal supports of the party.

The Imperial troops, which had been sent into Bohemia under the command of Count BUQUOY, there exercised unheard-of cruelties and violences; this still more exasperated the Bohemians, and determined Silesia and Lusatia to join them. The two parties fought, they besieged, lost, and took towns; but it is certain, that in the beginning

beginning, the Imperialists had the disadvantage, and that almost all the towns of the kingdom fell into the hands of the male-contents.

As for the Princes of the Union, they contented themselves with assembling at Rottemburg on the Tauber, from whence they sent deputies to his Imperial majesty, humbly desiring him to consider that all the Protestants of Germany had a great interest in the affair of Bohemia, and beseeching him to recal his troops. The affair was brought to a negotiation. The Archbishop of Mentz, the Elector Palatine, the Elector of Saxony, and the Duke of Bavaria were nominated to make that accommodation; but the tedious proceedings so common in Germany in affairs of this nature, and the death of the Emperor MATTHIAS prevented all redress.

As the house of Austria pretended that the kingdom of Bohemia was hereditary, whereas the States of the kingdom maintained that it was elective, MATTHIAS would not submit his cousin FERDINAND to the election of the Bohemians, when he made him their King; for that had been to acknowledge the justice of their pretensions. Thus FERDINAND had not obtained the crown of Bohemia by election, and consequently, according to the Bohemians, he had no right to it. For this reason, being informed that FERDINAND had been invited to the election of an Emperor as King of Bohemia, they represented to the Electoral College that he could not assist at the Diet in that capacity. But these remonstrances were not regarded. He was not only present at the election, but was also chosen Emperor on the twenty-eighth of August 1619.

The Pope, the King of Spain, and the whole Popish party, were so impatient to see FERDINAND upon the Imperial throne, because they hoped he would destroy the Protestant religion throughout the whole empire, that there was no possibility of deferring the Diet which was to elect a successor to MATTHIAS. They in vain represented that it was necessary to wait till these disorders were somewhat appeased. The Popish party took all this for an artifice, and imagined that the Protestant Princes required time only the better to concert on the ways of excluding the King of Bohemia. Whereupon SUICOSD Archbishop of Mentz, one of the principal supports of the Catholic League, summoned the Electoral Diet to meet at Francfort on the twentieth of July 1619. This function belonged to him, both as great Chancellor of the German empire, in the capacity of Archbishop of Mentz; and as Dean of the Electoral College. FERDINAND was elected Emperor, as I have said, on the twentieth of August following, and was crowned a few days after, to wit, on the ninth of September.

Never perhaps did he find himself in more perplexing circumstances than the first year after the death of the Emperor MATTHIAS. The death of that Emperor revived the animosity of the Bohemians, and their diffidence increased, as they knew that MATTHIAS, who was more inclined to soften than to irritate affairs, could no longer check the restless humour of FERDINAND. In vain he made them advantageous, promises, they were not disposed to hearken to them, nor to believe that they were any thing more than Jesuitical artifices; besides by accepting the amnesty which he offered them, they would have acknowledged him as their lawful sovereign; which was very inconsistent with their pretensions. Most of the neighbouring provinces followed their example. Silesia and Lusatia had already done it; and Moravia did it some time after.

The States of upper Austria resolved to keep the government in their own hands, till it should be decided to whom the succession lawfully belonged, whether to FERDINAND, or to ALBERT the brother of MATTHIAS; the Lower Austria was so full of male-contents, that it would have followed this example, had not the presence of FERDINAND hindered it from revolting. But neither could his presence nor authority stop the progress of Count LA TOUR, who drew near the Danube, passed that river, seized on the suburbs of Vienna, and besieged the city with great hopes of taking it by the correspondence he held with some persons in it. Happily for FERDINAND Count DAMPIER defeated MANSFELD, which obliged LA TOUR to retire. Though this good fortune was followed by another more considerable, I mean the election of FERDINAND, yet he found himself plunged in new distresses, for on one side the Bohemians created FREDERIC Elector Palatine, their King, and on the other BETHLEN GABOR, Prince of Transylvania, entered like a torrent into Hungary, made himself master of Cassovia, Altenburg, Presburg, and several other places; while the Bohemian troops commanded by Count LA TOUR marching along the borders of Austria, threatened the capital city, and entered Hungary, to join the Prince of Transylvania.

All this was more than sufficient to disturb a Prince of the greatest resolution, and it must be owned that FERDINAND had more merit, and possessed more great qualities, than many Historians ascribe to him, since he was proof against so many attacks, and not only acted like a man who was not astonished, but likewise dissipated all these factions, and rendered all the enterprizes of his enemies vain and fruitless.

If I did not remember that I mention these things only by way of digression, I should with pleasure set forth all the events which heighten the fortune of this Prince; but as I must soon return to GUSTAVUS, I shall speak of what followed only so far as it is necessary to give my readers a distinct idea of the State of Germany, when

VOL. V.

8 I

when the King of Sweden entered it. Yet I shall do it in such a manner, that the brevity of my narrative may not render it too dry, and obscure the series of the events.

To have a full view of the bad posture of the Emperor's affairs, we must consider that Bohemia, Silesia, Moravia, Lusatia, and Austria, had taken arms against him, while the Transylvanian BETHLEN GABOR, a Prince of great credit at the Ottoman Porte, valiant, courageous, and already master of the greatest part of Hungary, hastens with extreme eagerness to make new conquests, and is on his march to join the malecontents. Besides, we must look upon the insurrection of these provinces, not as one of those popular commotions which have no considerable chief, no discipline, nor counsel. They were great provinces, which, after having shaken off his yoke, were directed by wise and experienced men, who corresponded with the neighbouring States. Provinces which gave the command of their troops to famous Generals, or rather provinces very considerable for their number and forces, which chose for their King one of the first Princes of the empire, young, valiant, son-in-law to the King of England, and nephew to Prince MAURICE, who was esteemed a great General, and had great power in a flourishing Republic, at enmity with the Spaniards. Besides, we must consider that the house of Austria appeared too powerful to several Princes of Europe; that France, its antient enemy, was not the only state which desired to prescribe limits to its great power; and that the Elector Palatine had accepted the crown of Bohemia with the consent of the Protestant Princes of Germany; which supposes that they would assist him, with all their forces, against an enemy whom they all feared, being induced to it both by the interests of their religion, and of their States.

By shewing all the distresses and apprehensions of FERDINAND in the beginning of his reign, methinks I have solidly refuted those who have censured the Elector Palatine. Some have called him inconsiderate, as having accepted the crown of Bohemia against all the rules of prudence; others have said that he was simple enough to yield to the importunities of his wife, a daughter of the King of England, and for that reason highly displeased that she did not bear the glorious title of MAJESTY. All these censurers, I say, are people of a vulgar understanding, who think nothing commendable, but what is successful, and blame all unfortunate enterprizes. Had they any penetration, they would find that human prudence is, properly speaking, the sport of the providence of GOD, who to humble us, and to convince us that he is the supreme governor of all things, very frequently permits that the best concerted enterprizes should be defeated, and that the most rash and inconsiderate should succeed.

I will not give an instance of the former kind in the enterprize of the Elector Palatine, for I own it must be ranked among those of a doubtful issue. But I believe when all things are carefully examined it will be granted me, that there was not more to be feared than to be hoped from that enterprize; and therefore that this Prince did nothing but what a man of courage might have done, without being guilty of imprudence. So that even if it was granted that the ambition and pride of his wife contributed to determine his accepting the crown of Bohemia, his conduct would nevertheless be commendable, since it is certain, that if a Prince may, without rashness, engage in an enterprize, when the probability of succeeding in it, is equal to that of failing, and when a crown is the prize of the former, much more may he do it at the solicitation of his wife, who begs of him to give her a rank equal to her birth. But in spite of all that can be said, the world will never be persuaded that a Prince who has lost all his dominions for having accepted a crown, acted prudently in accepting it. He who regulates his conduct according to the appearances of future events, is not, in the opinion of the world, a wise man, unless besides he foresees among future events, those which happen contrary to all appearances. The world ridiculously imagines that successful men foresee all those caprices of fortune to which they owed their success, and consequently that the unsuccessful are much to be blamed for not having foreseen those caprices which defeated their enterprizes.

It was by several events which happened contrary to all appearances, that the Elector Palatine unhappily failed in his enterprize. It was easy to foresee, say they, that King JAMES would assist his son-in-law no otherwise than by some offers of mediation, by letters and Ambassadors. This is the only service he ever did to his allies: but this is exaggerated; for it was not improbable that a father, notwithstanding his pacific temper would make some efforts in favour of his children; and even if we grant that the Elector ought to have looked upon England as a country lost to the rest of Europe, and whose fortune it seems to be not to concern itself for the oppression of the weakest, were there not Princes enough besides, from whom, according to all appearances, he might expect assistance?

Who could have believed that the Protestants of Germany would have abandoned the Elector Palatine, they, who under the name of Correspondents had engaged from the year 1609 to maintain liberty, and the Protestant religion in the empire? They who believed that the Emperor was an enemy to both? They, in short, who having been consulted by FREDERIC, their chief, in the assembly held at Rottemburg on the twelfth of September 1619, answered that he ought to accept the crown of Bohemia, not

not only as being a new dignity, but also as what was necessary for the public good of Germany, and that of their allies, and advised him to set out immediately for Bohemia? Who could have believed that France, which, in those times, exclaimed so loudly against Princes that are too powerful, and solicited all Europe to make leagues against the house of Austria, would neglect so favourable an opportunity of weakening it? Who could have believed that France would side with FERDINAND, against those who aimed at depriving him of a part of his power? Who could have believed that BETHLEN GABOR, after such fortunate beginnings, after all the reputation he had acquired, and all the interest he had with the Turk, would be of no service to the Palatine. Let us therefore say, that FREDERIC was deceived by a train of events so singular, that the most refined prudence could never have suspected it. Let us not believe those who pretend that the vanity of the Duke of BOVILLON, his uncle, joined with that of the Electress, threw him into an imprudent undertaking. They say, that the Duke wrote to his friends at Paris, that while the King of France was making knights at Fountainbleau, he was making Kings in Germany. He might have said so; but as he was one of the ablest men of his age, it is not probable that he would have advised his nephew to accept a crown, if he ought in prudence to have refused it.

Observe that I only speak of human and political prudence: I enter not into the question whether FERDINAND was the true King of Bohemia, and whether, according to the spirit of the Christian religion, the Palatine could accept that crown to which he was elected by the States of the kingdom. That is not the matter in question. The question at present is, whether according to the maxims of an ambition, veiled over with the notion of political prudence, FREDERIC did well to accept the crown of Bohemia; and after all I see no great difference between a Prince who accepts a crown which has been taken from a King deposed, and a Prince who makes war on his neighbour in order to deprive him of his dominions. But though the Palatine had many reasons to hope for success in his enterprize, it was nevertheless unfortunate; so true it is that the divine prudence is pleased to confound the wisdom of man.

As soon as FREDERIC was informed that the States of Bohemia, Silesia, Lusatia, and Moravia, had unanimously chosen him their King, on the twenty-seventh of August 1619, (the very day before FERDINAND was elected Emperor at Frankfort) he assembled the Princes or Correspondents at Rottemburg, who, as we have already seen, advised him to go to Bohemia as soon as possible, and take possession of that crown. Neither he, nor the Electress his wife, had any aversion to it. Accordingly the ceremony of his coronation was only deferred till the fourth of November, and that of the Princess till the seventh. On the twenty-eighth of next April, the States of the kingdom chose his eldest son, being six years of age, for his successor. The Imperialists were not able to keep more than two places in Bohemia. Let us now see by what means FERDINAND surmounted all these distresses.

Religion was his principal machine for that purpose. He had approved his zeal for Popery by the two methods the most pleasing to the people and the clergy; namely, by a great devotion for the Virgin Mary, the saints, relics, and images, and by persecuting the Protestants. The first thing he did when he succeeded his father was to visit the church of Our Lady of Loretto, and there to make a solemn vow, that even if it should cost him his life, he would exterminate all the sects out of Stiria, Carinthia, and Carniola. He engaged in the like vow after he was crowned King of Bohemia and Hungary; for he made a short pilgrimage to an image of the Virgin Mary, which is in great reputation on the frontiers of Stiria, and there he solemnly promised to God to purge Bohemia, and the adjacent provinces, from the venom of Heresy. Several years before his death he made a third vow which concerned Hungary, and wherein he promised to employ all imaginable means to reduce all that kingdom under the obedience of the Virgin, whom he used to call *Generalissima* in his letters, and in the orders he sent to his Generals.

This signal devotion, as the Papists called it, or superstition, according to the Protestants, was both of great service and of great prejudice to FERDINAND. He reaped many advantages from it for a long time, but at last it proved very prejudicial to the whole house of Austria, and has rather weakened than strengthened the Popish party in Germany. If after this we should wonder how his successors came to follow his example, not only with regard to the excessive worship paid to the creatures, and the spirit of persecution, but likewise with regard to the blind complaisance he paid to the Monks, we ought to consider, (and then our wonder will be over) that the Monks had the cunning to make them believe that all the blessings which God bestows on the most august house of Austria, are the rewards of its zeal for the extirpation of the Protestants, and that all the afflictions which God sends on that house, proceed from its not being rigorous enough against the enemies of the Church. But this is a manifest contradiction: for if the severity of the house of Austria was great enough to be rewarded by God, the indulgence of it could not deserve to be chastised. But Kings and Emperors do not much regard this.

Be that as it will, it is great pity that FERDINAND was inspired with a zeal so superstitious and inhuman; for it cannot be denied that he had great merit, and that he ought

ought to be ranked among the illustrious men of that age. If we are not to believe that he deserved all the encomiums bestowed on him by the Jesuit LE MORMAN, his confessor, we must not on the other hand give credit to all that has been said in his prejudice by the Historians of the contrary party. It is reported that BETHLEN GABOR said, it was dangerous to make war upon FERDINAND, because he was neither daunted by adversity, nor dazzled with prosperity. After the coronation of the Palatine, FERDINAND made it appear that he was able to do something more than make vows to the Virgin Mary, for he used a very dextrous policy.

As his greatest apprehension was lest France should send forces to the new King of Bohemia, he sent Count FURSTENBERG Ambassador to the French court, and ordered him to represent that the design of the Protestants in Germany was only to ruin the Catholic religion, and that it was hoped his most Christian Majesty would powerfully assist the Emperor, who was engaged in so holy a cause. But he was far from representing matters in this light to the correspondent Princes. They held a famous assembly at Nuremberg, a little after the coronation of FREDERIC, who did not fail to be present there. Count HOHENZOLLERN was sent thither by his Imperial Majesty, and protested in his name, that he never had any thing so much at heart as the public tranquillity, the peace of religion, and of the State, and the preservation of the laws. He spoke afterwards of the affairs of Bohemia, and maintained that religion was only the pretext of the revolt, and that the Emperor had no difference with the Bohemians, on that account, nor would have any. At last he exhorted the assembly to find ways of accommodation, which might restore peace to the empire, in such a manner as might consist with the honour of his Imperial Majesty.

This was very artful; for it was imagined that FERDINAND, prompted by the Jesuits, aimed only at the ruin of the Protestant religion; and yet he intimates to the Protestant Princes that he has no such design, that religion is no way concerned in the troubles of Germany, and that he does not design to make the least attempt upon the liberty of conscience. By these fine protestations he lulled them asleep, so that they abandoned the unfortunate King of Bohemia.

It is true they did not come at once to such a strange resolution, for the answer they gave to Count HOHENZOLLERN made him fully sensible that they were aware of his artifice, and designed to assist the Palatine; but they did not long continue in that resolution.

The Princes of the Catholic League meeting at Wirtzburg, at the same time that those of the Evangelical Union met at Nuremberg, they resolved to raise an army which should be commanded by the Duke of Bavaria. This assembly at Wirtzburg was very numerous. There were present Ambassadors from the Emperor, Agents from the Spanish King, and Deputies from the Duke of Lorraine. FERDINAND's Ambassadors were far from saying that religion was not concerned in the quarrel, they strongly insisted on the contrary. So that one of the chief affairs which were laid before this assembly, was the preservation of the Catholic religion, threatened on all sides with utter ruin. This was as artful a conduct at least as that of declaring to the Protestants that religion was not concerned in the quarrel, and that the Emperor had no design to meddle in so tender a point: for most of the members of the Catholic League being either Prelates or Abbots, when FERDINAND persuaded them that the Protestants intended to destroy the Romish Church, he affected them in the most sensible manner; thus FERDINAND interested them in his cause by all that was dearest to them, namely, by the fear of losing a temporal and spiritual empire, which brought them great revenues, and made them lead a most delicious life.

The correspondent Princes, alarmed at the great levies made by the Catholic League, sent a deputation to the Duke of Bavaria, to acquaint him of their inclination to a peace, and presented to him a long deduction of their sentiments and demands. The Duke answered; they replied; and he also replied in his turn. There passed on both sides complaints, reproaches, justifications, protestations, and, in general, whatever is employed in the quarrels of the pen which precede, or accompany, the first acts of hostility. The result was that the Catholic League made prodigious armaments, and artfully amused the Princes of the Evangelical Union, who were content to be on their guard.

We shall soon see the effect of FERDINAND's embassy to the court of France. As to the Ambassadors whom he sent to CHRISTIAN IV King of Denmark, and to the Duke of Brunfwic, they obtained all that their master could reasonably expect, since these Princes promised to keep a perfect neutrality. The Ambassadors whom he sent to Italy obtained of the Pope considerable supplies of money, besides the troops sent by some Italian Princes, and two levies made in Sicily and the kingdom of Naples. FERDINAND had so well persuaded the world that his cause was the cause of the Church, that we may wonder the Pope did not publish a crusade against the Correspondents.

I know not whether it was owing to the address of this Prince, or to the stupidity of the court of France, that the French loudly declared for him. But at least it is certain that there never was a conduct more impolitic than this. France and the house of Austria had long been upon such terms, that they took all advantages of each other, and

and it was then only ten years since the death of HENRY IV, when he was ready to begin a war, the design of which was to reduce both the Emperor and the King of Spain to a very low condition. That war had long been designed, and all the necessary preparations had been made for it. France had also for a long time openly supported the United Provinces of the Low-Countries, which had shaken off the Spanish yoke. The Spaniards had not been wanting on their side, and had like to have ruined the French monarchy, in the time of the League. In short, no nation in Europe had more reason than France to weaken the house of Austria; and yet the French neglected the finest opportunity of doing it, and not content to do that house no prejudice, they rendered a signal service to it, since they were the principal cause of the treaty of Ulm, which disarmed the Correspondent Princes, and ruined the affairs of the Palatine. The French boast of that oversight, which was a notorious and unpardonable blunder in politics. They have said that France assisted the Emperor for the love of religion. People must say something to justify their faults, and cover them, if possible, with the cloak of religion. But on whom would they impose? If Popery was the cause why the French would not assist the King of Bohemia, why did they favour the Dutch, why did they make a League with the King of Sweden?

What is most probable is, that the Emperor's Ambassador arrived at Paris in the reign of a favourite who had meditated the ruin of Calvinism. It is not certainly known whether the address of the Spaniards, who at that time had many creatures at the court of France, whom they retained in good pay, inspired the Constable DE LUYNES with the design of attacking the Huguenots; or whether he derived that design from the hopes he conceived that by signalizing his ministry by an enterprise extremely agreeable to the Monks and the rabble, he should blot out the remembrance of the low and mean arts by which he had risen to favour. But however that may be, he it was who kindled the civil wars which raged in France under the reign of LEWIS XIII. He had already broached this design, when FERDINAND sent to demand assistance from the King of France. He had observed that the Emperor represented the quarrel between him and the new King of Bohemia, as an affair in which religion was concerned, and that the Duke of BOUILLON had not defeated this artifice, when he wrote to LEWIS XIII that the Catholics enjoyed all manner of liberty in the dominions of the male-contents, and therefore that the Emperor deceived him, when he affirmed that they designed to ruin his religion. Upon this the Constable had either honesty, or simplicity enough to believe that it was not fit to assist Heretics abroad, while he persecuted them at home.

Some have said that he engaged in the design of ruining the affairs of the Palatine, because the Spanish Ambassador had promised that his brother should be married to the heiress of CHAULNES, who was then at the court of the Infanta. Whatever might have been the cause of this conduct, it is certain that by his means it was resolved that France should favour the cause of FERDINAND. This was adding a second fault to the former, for he had done very wrong to undertake the ruin of the Huguenots. By the treaty of Ulm he shewed that he was entirely ignorant of the principles which had guided the French politics for many years.

This treaty of Ulm was concluded on the third of July 1620, by the Duke of ANGOULESME, Count BETHUNE and Mr de CHATEAUNEUF Ambassadors extraordinary from France. By this treaty it was agreed that the Catholic League might act and undertake against Bohemia and the provinces incorporated with that kingdom, whatever they thought proper, and that the Evangelical Union should not be allowed to make any opposition in favour of the Bohemians and their confederates. The Princes who composed that Union must have been struck with stupidity, for they signed this treaty, which was certainly one of the greatest blows to ruin the Elector Palatine and raise the fortune of the Emperor.

To this may be added two others; the first of which was the truce concluded with BETHLEN GABOR, and the second the formidable armies levied by the Emperor, and commanded by the most experienced Generals in Europe. As for the truce, we must know that the Archduke CHARLES, brother to the Emperor FERDINAND, having been driven out of his Bishopric of Breslaw, when Silesia shook off the yoke, retired to the court of the King of Poland, his brother-in-law, and obtained his permission to levy ten thousand men, who did the Emperor great service, for HOMONAI, an Hungarian Baron, headed them, entered into Upper Hungary, defeated RAGOTSKI, General of BETHLEN GABOR's army, and very much contributed to the concluding of a truce for ten months between the Emperor, and the Prince of Transylvania. During this truce, FERDINAND's troops, freed from a great trouble, applied wholly to reduce the provinces which had withdrawn their obedience from the Emperor. And as these troops were very numerous, and had that affair only to execute, it is not surprising that they succeeded, nor must we praise so much the devotion of FERDINAND, as if in this affair it had wrought miracles, for sure any other man, without being acquainted with the Holy Virgin, or St Ignatius, might have done the like exploits, had he been in the same circumstances with FERDINAND.

On the 27th
of February
1620.

Besides the army of the Catholic League, which was in Suabia, consisting of thirty thousand men, at the same time that the Emperor published the sentence of proscription against **FREDERIC**; I say, besides this army the command of which the Duke of Bavaria gave to **TILLY**, a General of great reputation, the King of Spain sent the Emperor five thousand horse, and twenty thousand foot, without reckoning the Levies which he ordered Count Ognate, his Ambassador at Vienna, to make for the Emperor in the States of Italy, and in Austria. The King of Poland sent the Emperor five thousand Cossacks, and several Italian Princes furnished him either with money or soldiers. The troops commanded by Count **BUQUOI** in Hungary, drew near the revolted provinces, as soon as the truce was concluded with **BETHLEN GABOR**, greatly pressed the Bohemians on the side of Lower Austria, and defeated them in several engagements. At the same time, **HOMONAI** entered Moravia and Silesia, and ravaged these countries, and Count **DAMPIERRE** pursued the troops of Count **LA TOUR** as far as Bohemia.

This being the State of affairs when the Princes of the Evangelical Union promised by the treaty of Ulm to suffer those of the Catholic League to do whatever they thought proper in favour of **FERDINAND**, and against the Elector Palatine, it was humanly impossible but that the Emperor must entirely ruin that unfortunate Prince who was King of Bohemia. We must not forget that the King of Spain sent the Marquis **SPINOLA** with an army of twenty-five, or thirty thousand men into the Palatinate, where notwithstanding the resistance of the Correspondent Princes, he made himself master of a great many places. Nor must we forget that the Elector of Saxony, though a Protestant, took upon him to execute the Imperial Ban against Bohemia, and attacked Lusatia, at the same time that the Duke of Bavaria was marching against **FREDERIC**.

ANNO
1620.

In such a situation of affairs, this Duke could not doubt of the ruin of **FREDERIC**. Nevertheless being very politic, he judged that he must use great diligence, lest he should lose this opportunity by some unexpected change. Therefore as soon as the treaty of Ulm was signed, his army advanced to Austria, and, laid waste the whole country in such a manner, putting the peasants to the sword and setting the houses on fire, that the cities were terrified, and despairing of their safety, returned to their obedience, and submitted to the discretion of the conqueror. Afterwards the Duke of Bavaria having joined **BUQUOI**, they resolved to carry the war into the heart of Bohemia, and march directly to Prague, since **FREDERIC**, trusting to the promises of the Transilvanian, whose truce with the Emperor would soon expire, refused to resign his crown. They actually entered it



CRITICAL

C R I T I C A L
R E M A R K S
UPON THE
N E W E D I T I O N
O F
M O R E R I ' S
H I S T O R I C A L
D I C T I O N A R Y ,

Published in the year 1704.

W I T H

A Preface and several Observations written by
Mr BAYLE, for the use of the new editors of that
Dictionary.

Translated into English from the third edition of the Original French.

*To which are added, NEW OBSERVATIONS upon
those Critical Remarks, and on the edition of Moreri printed in
the year 1725.*

M^R B A Y L E'S

P R E F A C E

CONCERNING

The second edition of these CRITICAL REMARKS.



HERE are few books of such general use as an Historical Dictionary. The public is so convinced of this, that though it was well known that Moreri's Dictionary, even after it had been several times corrected, was full of faults, yet a great many editions of it have been sold off. It is therefore doing a good service to the Republic of Letters, to contribute to the correction of this Dictionary. For this reason it has been thought proper to reprint here (at Rotterdam) the Critical Remarks which an anonymous author published at Paris upon the last edition of Moreri. They may be useful both to those who have already purchased that edition, and still more so to those who propose to make further amendments in that Dictionary.

That last edition of Moreri, as well as the edition of Paris 1699, were revised by Mr Vaultier, and are undoubtedly much better than the preceding ones; for besides that Mr Vaultier is a man of parts, his great vivacity does not hinder him from being extremely laborious and capable of a very long and deep application. This last quality is absolutely necessary for those who correct such an extensive and defective work as is the Dictionary of Moreri; but let a man be ever so much endowed with it, that he alone should be able to perfect this work, does not seem possible; for there are certain little pains which a great genius cannot take, they are beneath him, he does not willingly undergo the trouble of correcting any thing else but the faults which are the most diffused through the body of the work, and while he bestows his chief attention upon that, is it to be thought that he will take notice of a false date, of a proper name ill spelt, and of several other minute particulars, the correcting of which must be left to a man who is fit for examining punctilio's, and has more patience than vivacity of genius? Those who shall attend to this will read the remarks of the anonymous author upon the edition in 1704, without lessening the praises which Mr Vaultier has so justly merited.

In the present edition of these remarks, care has been taken to correct several errors of the press, besides those which are pointed out in the Errata of the Paris edition. The notes that are put in the margin serve to rectify, or to explain the text, or to give hints to the correctors of Moreri. It was thought proper to follow this method, in order to hinder the readers from being sometimes mistaken in believing that the remarks of the anonymous writer are always just. He is no doubt a man of better sense than to take it ill, that we have preferred the interest of the public to that of him in particular: and as he seems disposed to continue his remarks, which is a very commendable design, and may contribute much to the public advantage, it was thought that he would execute his design, and improve his talent with greater vigilance, and in a more beneficial way to the editors of the Historical Dictionary, if his Critical notes were sometimes criticized upon. I say sometimes, because in his work there are certain things upon which we have made no observations though we might have animadverted upon them in a remark. For example,

He finds fault (a) that in enumerating the works of James Almain there is no notice taken of that which concerns the Laity. The very circumstances of the time, adds he, should have engaged the Editor to speak of it with some exactness. This censure may be justly blamed; for the greatest part of his readers will not understand it. A book which concerns the Laity, is something so indeterminate that one may form a hundred different ideas of it. The circumstances of the time are not indeed such a general object, but they nevertheless include several things, and thus a reader who does not precisely know the character of that book of Almain, will never be able to guess the relation it bears to the present times. Now as an Historical Dictionary ought to serve instead of a library to the ignorant, it should be so contrived that the reader may find perspicuity enough in the work itself to under-

MAIN.

VOL. V.

8 L

stand

stand whatever is told in it without any other assistance. The same perspicuity should have appeared in the remarks of the anonymous writer, since they are a kind of supplement to Moreri, and a model for correcting him. It is therefore a fault to point out a book of Almain in a manner that is so obscure to a vast number of readers. We may add that to consult the conveniency of Moreri's Editors one should save them as much trouble as it is possible, and give them proper directions. This is what has not been done with respect to the omission that we find fault with concerning Almain, and it is what would have been done, if particular notice had been taken of the nature of the book, the place and time of the impression, &c. I would willingly supply this defect if I had the necessary helps, but the only conjecture I can frame of our author's meaning is, that Almain wrote a book wherein he treated of the authority of the people, and of the authority of the church, and maintained that as the power of the people represented by the assembly of the States of the kingdom, is superior to that of the head of the nation, that is to say to the power of the King, so the power of a council representing the whole body of the Church is superior to that of the Pope, notwithstanding his primacy, and quality of head of the Church. It is certain that James Almain having learned from John Major, a Scotchman by nation, this doctrine concerning the authority of the people, defended it vigorously and made use of it as a proof of the superiority of councils over the Pope. The catalogue of his books given by Dr de Launoi, (b) contains the following words: 'Expositio circa decisiones questionum Magistri Guillelmi Occam de potestate summi Pontificis, liberque inscribitur de suprema potestate Ecclesiastica & laica, ubi certa quaedam est propositio quæ tunc ut apparuit, tolerabatur, sed nunc tolerari desit. - - - - - An exposition concerning the decisions of the questions of Master William Occam touching the authority of the Pope, and the book is intitled; Of the supreme power, Ecclesiastical and Civil, where there is a certain proposition, which, as it appeared then, was tolerated, but has now ceased to be so.' There have always been Divines in France who maintained the superiority of the Pope over the council, and dextrously objected that those who lay so great a stress upon the writings of Almain and Major for the contrary sentiment, authorize a republican tenet altogether injurious to the majesty of kings. This is what contributed to the ruin of the famous Dr Richer in the reign of Lewis XIII, for it was not purely out of complaisance to the court of Rome that he was persecuted, they prepossessed the court of France against him, by shewing that he warmly maintained the inferiority of the Pope for no other reason but because he was strongly possessed with the tenet, That the States of the kingdom are superior to the King, and may dethrone, expel, shut up in a monastery, and punish their King in what other manner they please. They produced a thesis which he had defended in the year 1591, that the States were indisputably above the King, and that Henry III, had been justly proceeded against as a tyrant.

Had our author thought fit to explain what he expresses obscurely, and thereby to enable the editors of Moreri, to make the article of Almain curious, methinks he would have said at least in general what I have just observed; but in order to render himself thoroughly intelligible, it would have been necessary for him to particularize the relation which he finds between that Doctor's book, and the circumstances of the time, for in France there is no debate carried on concerning the question, whether the authority of the people be superior to that of the King; and as to what concerns the question whether councils be superior to the Pope, it was seasonable at Paris during the pontificate of Innocent XI, but from that time it is fallen into oblivion, and whoever should attempt to revive it, would render himself odious. It is not therefore easy to know that the circumstances of the time should have engaged Mr Vaultier to speak of Almain's book with some exactness.

We could shew, by other examples, that we had reason to say, we might have made more marginal notes than we have made. Notwithstanding we do affirm, that the critical remarks of which we here give a second edition, deserve to be read: they are short and lively, and will not tire any man's patience. If we had a mind to prepossess the readers in favour of them, we would not fail to take advantage of what is set forth in the Kings royal licence, that they have been approved by Mr Pouchard. This is the name of a formidable Critic who has vexed several authors in the Journal des Savans. The society that writes this journal had a great loss by his death: he embellished this work by the wit which he diffused through the articles that fell to his share, and which good judges readily distinguished; and he did not possess in a less degree than his brethren the talent of giving a sufficient idea of a large book in few words. This is a rare talent among the Journalists, some of whom cruelly fatigue the reader by bringing him back three or four times to the same book, which sometimes happens to be a very indifferent one, and would be treated with complaisance enough if it were but once mentioned. I think Mr Pouchard sufficiently ridiculed them, and with more reason than he ridiculed some other books, for it must be confessed that his criticism was a little too severe. People loudly complained of it, as will appear by the following instance. 'If the productions of wit had been formerly censured in the same manner as they are now, the empire of learning would be a desert, and several of those whose first performances succeeded ill would have ceased to write, and would not have become the ornament of France and the admiration of all Europe, where their writings are spread. At this day there are still to be seen, some, who began to make their appearance in the world by nothing higher than plain elegies, and who are grown to be lights of the Church. In fine the church, the bar, and several societies

(b) Page 613, of the Latin History of the College of Navarre.

'societies of the kingdom are full of learned men whose first performances made no great figure (c).'

What a prejudice would it not be in favour of the remarks upon the new edition of Moreri, that Mr Poucbard had allowed them to be solid! But as we have no mind to impose upon the reader, we honestly declare here that the approbation which is spoken of in the privilege, consists only in this, that Mr Poucbard declares he has read them by order of the Lord Chancellor, and that he has found nothing in them which can hinder their being printed. The meaning of this is no more than that they contain nothing against religion, morality, or the government.

If it be objected to our author that he should have communicated his remarks to the Paris editor, and not have published them, he may answer that he was willing that the Dutch editors, and the translators of Moreri into English, and German should reap the advantage of them: and after all, none but such morose Critics as can suffer nothing to escape their censure, will find fault with him for having published his discoveries, and for resolving to make himself further useful to the editors of the Historical Dictionary; for, as I said before, it is a matter of great consequence that a work of such a nature should be purged of all its defects. It is surprising that after having passed so many times under the eyes of the revisers and correctors of the press, it should be so full of gross faults, that, for example, we still find there that Postellus born about the year 1477, died in the year 1581, aged near a hundred years (1). No book should have been made sooner correct than this, for it has been read by more people than most other books, and the most ignorant readers are capable of discovering some faults in it. The first thing they do is to look out for their native country, and the towns where they have made some stay. The mistakes of Moreri in such articles cannot escape them. They should therefore inform the Booksellers of these mistakes, which would be a very easy thing, and as every reader may observe the falsities of this Dictionary in matters that come within his reach, it would not be difficult for him to communicate a list of them which might serve for the correction of new editions. It must be confessed that the indolence of readers has been very extraordinary, for they have almost all neglected to give notice of the mistakes which they had observed. How is it possible that among so many people who had been at Brisac, and who knew that according to Moreri that town had a stone bridge upon the Rhine, there has not been one who has had the charity to tell, or cause the Printers or editors to be told, that it was necessary to correct that passage (2). I should be glad that this reproach might serve to cure the almost lethargic indifference of the greatest part of readers.

But it would not be enough that every one should furnish a list of the faults he had observed; the labour of those who take upon them ex professo to correct Moreri, would still be very great. There will never be a thorough correction made, unless they take the pains to visit all the sources from whence Mr Moreri has drawn his materials. It is a troublesome piece of work, but not so terrible as it appears to those who consider the multitude of authors whom he quotes at the end of several articles, for we must not believe that he has consulted all these authors. I am certain that with regard to the Greek, and Latin Historians, he has generally consulted only Vossius, and that with respect to Ecclesiastical affairs and Ecclesiastical writers he has hardly consulted any but Baronius, Spondanus, Godeau, and Father Labbe. To what end therefore has he quoted so many others? I know not, but it seems to me that such an affectation which cost him little, since he did no more than name the authors whom Vossius &c. had cited, tends much less to the profit of the readers, than to persuade them falsely that he turned over an infinite number of books. He might have contented himself with referring to Vossius &c. Those who had Vossius would have known at the same time all the other writers mentioned at the end of Moreri's articles. I would not however advise the striking out these quotations which have stood so long, but it would be necessary to make them all intelligible; there are some of them which are not so, because they have too much abridged the names of the authors or the titles of the books. They have done worse sometimes, for they have disfigured both the titles of the books and the names of the authors. A book de Venatione which Moreri had cited, has in the Dutch editions been metamorphosed into a book de Veneratione. He has expressed himself so ill at the end of the article CALENTIO, that designing only to quote one author he quotes two, and disfigures the name of the latter. Cornelius Tollius, says he, in Append. Pierre Valere, de infelicit. Litterat. This should be rectified in the following manner, Cornelius Tollius in the appendix to the treatise of Pierius Valerianus de infelicit. Litterat (3).

(1) Mr Bayle takes notice hereafter of a like blunder, with regard to Mr de Sallo. See his remarks on our author's conclusion.

In the last edition of Moreri, printed at Paris 1725, it is said that Postel died on the sixth of September 1581 aged seventy-six years, three months, and nine days. This date is taken from the *Memoires de Litterature* of Mr de Sallengre, Tom. I. pag. 24. who had it from the History of the Priory of St Martin in the fields, by Martin Marrier, a Monk and Prior Claustral of that monastery, where Postel was buried: *Regalis Monasterii Sancti Martini de Campis, Parisiensis,*

Ordinis Cluniacensis Historia; Parisiis 1637 in 4to. NEW OBSERVATION.

(2) See hereafter the preface of the author of the *Critical Remarks*. NEW OBSERVATION.

(3) In the edition of Moreri published at Paris in the year 1712, they changed Pierre Valere into Petr. Valerius: in that of 1725, they have corrected this fault, and put Pierius Valerianus; but they have left the rest as it was, so that they continue to cite two authors, though they design to quote no more than one. NEW OBSERVATION.

(c) *Mercure Galant* for the month of January 1706 pag. 226 in the place where it speaks of the death of Mr Poucbard

who condemned almost all the productions of wit.

By

By consulting the authors whom Moreri has made use of, it will be found that he has often mistaken their meaning, that he has not chosen the most material circumstances, that he has maimed a great many things; and thus by comparing the copy with the original the work might be greatly improved and perfected.

In some things this comparison would not be sufficient. Moreri with respect to the Low-Countries had almost no other guide but Lewis Guicciardin, who made a very good description of them; but as great changes have happened in the towns of that country since the year 1587, when Lewis Guicciardin published the last edition of that work, there are several things which he affirmed with truth, but which cannot be affirmed now without a gross falsehood, and nevertheless Moreri affirms them just as he had read them in Lewis Guicciardin.

For example, Guicciardin says that near Mechlin, or Malines, a little beyond the gate St Catherine, on the road to Antwerp, there is a very large monastery built almost like a fortress, in which is a house consecrated to St Alexis, where above 1500 and sometimes even 1600 nuns continually reside, having the liberty to take care of their affairs, to go abroad, and even to marry if they please. Moreri has not failed to copy this. There is to be seen, says he, in the suburbs of Malines (or Mechlin) the monastery of St Alexis, where there are fifteen or sixteen hundred nuns who have the liberty to go out to take the air, to make and receive visits, and to marry when they think fit. This passage of Moreri always appeared suspicious to me, for as in our time several armies have encamped in the neighbourhood of Mechlin, and as many officers have passed and repassed by the same city, it seemed to me incredible that no body should mention this convent of fifteen or sixteen hundred canonesses, and that nevertheless it should be one of the rarities of Mechlin. My suspicions were strengthened by the reflexion I made, that when armies encamp near Remiremont, or Mauberge &c. the public almost constantly hears of the assiduity of the principal officers in visiting the canonesses of those places. But I have discovered at last that it is a long time since this monastery of St Alexis is no more in being, it was razed to the ground during the civil wars near the end of the XVIIth century. Thus we see that in order to rectify the Historical Dictionary, as to what concerns the Low-Countries, it is not sufficient to compare it with Guicciardin, the original which Mr Moreri followed, we must likewise consult more modern writers (4).

(d) I speak thus because I have not that of 1704. Since an occasion has offered to take notice of a gross error in the article of Malines, which passed from edition to edition till the (d) first revival of Mr Vaultier 1699, at least inclusively; I shall add, that part of the other errors are corrected in the Dutch editions, but that these are still left, viz. the inhabitants of Malines are free from all taxes on account of the good services which they did to Charles the Bold, Earl of Flanders, at the siege of Nans upon the Rhine. He should have said Nuis, and not Nans, and Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, and not Earl of Flanders, for though he was Earl of Flanders, he never bore that title. The first of these two faults has been corrected in the edition of Paris 1699, but not the second (5). Neither have they corrected the name of the river which runs by Malines: it is called Dile, and not Dele (6). They have not observed that the Seignory of Malines is one of the seventeen provinces of the Low-Countries, and that the great royal council instituted in the year 1473, was not then fixed at Malines. It was ambulatory (I mean that it followed the court of the Prince) till such time as Philip of Austria, upon his going to Spain in the year 1503, settled it at Malines (7).

The more we should descend to particulars, the more would the readers be convinced that a thorough correction of Moreri cannot be the work of a single man. Mr Vaultier alone might very well be the director-general, and the last reviser of the whole, but he would stand in need of coadjutors, I mean people who should work under him according to the different parts he should assign them. He would especially want one of those severe, and, if you please, humour-some and fantastical critics, in whom the least shadow of irregularity breeds strong suspicions that the author is mistaken. Such a critic would not have had the patience to read twice the first lines of the article Madruce (Madrizzo) in Moreri, without suspecting that they served as a kind of den to some wild beast. It would have shocked him at the first glance. These lines are as follows:

MADRUCE or LIBER (Christopher) called the Cardinal of Trent, was son to John Gaudence Liber, Baron of Madruce. It is not impossible but that one and the same family

(4) This mistake had passed into the edition of 1707; and the reviser of that of 1712, only added that these nuns were called Beguines. In the edition of 1725 (article MALINES) it is corrected thus: In the suburbs was to be seen the monastery of St Alexis, where there were 1500 or 1600 nuns called Beguines who had the liberty to go out, to take the air, to make and receive visits, and to marry when they thought proper: but this monastery was entirely demolished during the civil wars near the end of the XVIIth century. NEW OBSERVAT.

(5) This second fault was still in the editions of 1707 and 1712. In that of 1725, it is said that the inhabitants of Malines are free from all taxes on account of the good services which they did to Charles the

Bold, Duke of Burgundy, and Earl of Flanders, at the siege of Nuis upon the Rhine. NEW OBSERVAT.

(6) The edition of 1707 had still Dele: that of 1712 says Deule: and in that of 1725 there is Dile. NEW OBSERVAT.

(7) In the edition of 1725 they take notice that the great royal council, instituted ambulatory by Charles Duke of Burgundy, in the year 1473, was fixed at Malines in the year 1503. They have not observed that lines in the year 1503. They have not observed that the Seignory of Malines is one of the seventeen provinces of the Low-Countries, they only say that this Seignory is enclosed within one of the seventeen provinces, in Brabant. Nevertheless at the word Low-Countries, it is reckoned among the seventeen provinces. NEW OBSERVAT.

may have the names of Madruce and Liber, and that thus some should call it Madruce and others Liber, and consequently that the author of a Dictionary following the safest course might make use of the disjunctive or without committing a fault; but there is nevertheless in all this, I cannot tell what strange want of probability that detains and strikes a suspicious and attentive reader. He considers before he proceeds further, and he may possibly conjecture that Moreri deceived by some French author, or not understanding the Latin writers who have mentioned this Cardinal of Trent, has improperly divided Liber Baro, and taken the first of these two words for the name of the family, instead of taking it for the character of the quality of Baron. It is well known that the Emperors of Germany create barons who hold immediately of the empire, and who are thereby distinguished from the barons that are vassals to some other member of the empire. A baron that holds immediately of the empire, is called a free baron, Liber Baro. It is very (e) probable that the first of the family of Madruce, or Madruzzo, who was created baron, was one of those free barons, and that from thence it comes that the Latin authors who have mentioned the Cardinal of Trent and his father, have given them the title of Liber Baro. If this be the case, what a blunder has Moreri fallen into? And how could it so long escape the editors (8)?

(e) I express myself thus because I have not the Latin authors quoted by Moreri.

I shall occasionally inform them that they ought to correct a mistake concerning Cardinal Lewis Madruce (or Madruzzo). He was not made Bishop of Trent after his promotion to the Cardinalship, as Moreri affirms, he was Bishop of Trent before by the resignation of his uncle Cardinal Christopher Madruzzo, when Pius IV presented him with the hat in the year 1561, and sent it to him even while he was at Trent, by a particular favour (9). They ought besides to correct the alternative of the time of Cardinal Christopher Madruzzo's promotion. They should fix the date thereof to the year 1542, and not leave it undetermined as Moreri does between the year 1542 or the year 1544 (10). It is shameful not to know the true time of the creation of a Cardinal of the XVIth century, and when a person corrects the work of a man who was ignorant of that, and who was lazy enough not to clear up the fact, that person should think himself obliged not to be guilty of the same laziness. We may likewise acquaint the editors that they will do well to make up some omissions. The State of Madruzzo erected into a barony, and situated in the country of Trent, requires a small Geographical article which is wanting in Moreri (11). The family of Madruzzo wants a Genealogical article which should bring it down from the time that it began to enjoy a title of honour, or to make a figure, to the present time. Cardinal Madruzzo the creature of Clement VIII, and who came to be so considerable that he was looked upon as a man qualified for being elected Pope in the conclave where Urban VIII was chosen in the year 1623, likewise requires an article (12).

There are a great number of passages in Moreri which abound as much in omissions and blunders as the article of Madruzzo.

I am not ignorant that some people will pretend that it is of no manner of importance to the public to know whether the family Madruzzo was called Liber, or whether Christopher Madruzzo came to the Cardinalship in the year 1542, and not in the year 1544, or whether Lewis Madruzzo was already Bishop of Trent when he obtained the Cardinal's hat. The Journalists of *Trevoux* may possibly make this objection, for after having treated as trifling (f) the remark made by our author that Giles Boileau died in the year 1669, and not as Moreri affirms, in 1671 (13), they add, the world forsooth will think itself much concerned in this error of the Dictionary! But the editors of Moreri, if they are wise, will not regulate themselves upon this false taste of the Journalists of *Trevoux*. They will be of opinion that it is the duty of every corrector of a book to take from it all the false facts, and to substitute true facts in their room, and that if under pretence that an error in fact hurts neither the fortune nor morals of any body, it must be left in a book; there would be very few lies in the Historical Dictionary which ought not to be spared and carefully preserved. A judicious man is pleased with knowing the truth even in things that neither concern his virtue nor the welfare of his family, and one ought to look upon it as an undoubted truth that if Father Paul, who has made so much mention of the Cardinals Christopher Madruzzo and Lewis Madruzzo, had fallen into the mistakes which I have taken notice of, his antagonist Pallavicini would have censured him for it, and the Journalists of *Trevoux* would not condemn that censure. They themselves would be very sorry to be convicted of an error like that which concerns Giles Boileau, and if any one accused them falsely of such a mistake they would justify themselves with a great deal of vivacity. They would not content themselves with answering that the world does not concern itself much in errors of this nature.

(f) In the *Memoirs* for June 1706. pag. 948.

VOL V.

8 M

One

(8) This fault had passed in the editions of 1707 and 1712. In that of 1725 we find: 'MADRUCE (Christopher) called the Cardinal of Trent, son of John Gaudence, free Baron of Madruce, &c.'

They observe that Pope Paul III gave him a Cardinal's hat in the year 1542. NEW OBSERVAT.

(9) This is corrected in the edition of 1725. NEW OBSERVAT.

(10) See, above, note (8). NEW OBSERVAT.

(11) This Geographical article is to be found in the edition of 1725, at the word MADRUZZO or MADRUCE. It is taken from the Dictionary of Maty. NEW OBSERVAT.

(12) In the edition of 1725, there are three or four lines added concerning CHARLES MADRUZZO, created Cardinal by Pope Clement VIII. NEW OBSERVAT.

(13) See hereafter at the word BOILEAU. NEW OBSERVAT.

MR BAYLE'S PREFACE.

One of the things wherein the editors of the *Historical Dictionary* have succeeded best, is that they have reduced to more reasonable bounds the excessive praises which Moreri had prodigally bestowed upon a great many persons, and the great slanders that he had thrown upon many others. He was guided by the spirit of a declaimer who frequently mounts the pulpit, and did not remember that he assumed the character of an Historian. But even in this point his work has not yet been brought to perfection. There remain still in it several flatteries and injurious reflexions which ought to be left out, and it is certain that by striking out some encomiums a person will do a good office to those on whom they were bestowed, and will act not only from a principle, of love for truth, but likewise from a motive of brotherly charity. I am going to give an example of this.

It is affirmed in Moreri that a Marshal of France whose name I do not mention, commanded armies with a great deal of prudence, success, and glory. Let a reader be never so unattentive, and eager in pursuing his journey, he will stop short at meeting with such an encomium, and reflect upon so surprizing an object. For above the space of fifteen years, will he say to himself, have I traced step by step the *Gazettes*, and other news-writers, and I do not remember any kind of event on which to ground this prudence, this success, and this glory that I find here. I can point out the time and place where the enterprizes of this warrior were extremely unfortunate, but not the time and place of their good success. His most glorious campaigns are those where he formed no project, and where no project was formed against him. Either my knowledge is very imperfect or these encomiums are very unjust, for they cannot be just but in consequence of some actions which had such a fortunate and glorious issue, that they have been sufficient to eclipse the frequent and remarkable disgraces of which all Europe is informed, and which have been the burden of a thousand satirical songs spread over the whole world. Whence can it come that I should be ignorant of these actions which are so glorious? I must go directly and enquire.

It is plain that such a reader will desire all those he shall meet with to inform him, and that he will find no body who knows more of the matter than himself, so that he will be the cause why an infinite number of people who thought no more of this Marshal, will recapitulate all his disgraces. It will therefore be doing him a piece of very good service to leave this passage out of the *Dictionary*. By this means will they remove a stumbling block, a troublesome Memento. The readers not finding it in their way will proceed without stopping, and thus many reflexions will be suppressed, which would be to the disadvantage of this Marshal of France. This encomium is nothing less than an officious lie, and bears a much greater resemblance to the praises which the most inveterate hatred and malice bestows, *Pessimum inimicorum genus laudantes*. However I own it was not made with that view.

(g) E. longinquo reverentia major.

The editor could not but know the opinion of all France, and that if the wishes of the nation had been regarded, the warrior of whom we speak had very soon been removed from the command of armies; but it looks as if the Prince had been willing to shew in this that he thought himself as much superior to his subjects by the clearness of his discernment, as by the dignity of his character. The editor could not excuse himself upon a certain humour which the French are observed to have, and which a modern author pretty well describes: The French, says he, often times are very incomprehensible. They love their King and their country, they love the honour of their nation, they entertain the highest opinion of it that it is possible for them to have: and yet their nation itself does nothing to please them: they always imagine that some thing better might be done. The wisest answers, the most successful enterprizes, and the best concerted measures seldom escape their censure. They commend foreigners, praise their works and their troops, admire their counsels, and extol their good successes. Distance heightens respect (g). They despise and find fault with every thing that France produces. Let the number of those whom this character suits be as great as it will all over the kingdom, an author is not however obliged to be ruled by them in his praises or censures; but as they were not the only persons that exclaimed against the general in question, and since, on the contrary, they did no more than join their voice to that of the public, the editor could not clear himself without alledging some other reason than this. If he should try to excuse himself by saying that the person whom he commends has rather gained than lost ground in his master's favour, it would be a very weak defence. This indeed proves that fortune which never followed him to the field, has been a faithful companion to him at court, but we can draw no consequence from that against the public evidence, and if a Prince has a mind to distinguish himself by acting a part so singular, as that of magnificently rewarding ill success, an author has no right upon that account to bestow praises which all the world knows to be false. If instead of these words, prudence, success, and glory, Moreri had made use of the terms, affection, zeal, good intention, he would not have scandalized the public, nor have done such an ill office to the warrior whom he commends. But, once more, the best way will be to leave out the encomium and to put nothing in the room of it.

To speak once more of the pains which a good correction of Moreri requires. I shall observe that the first editions of that *Dictionary*, though they be more faulty than the Dutch ones, may nevertheless be of great use in correcting them. The editors therefore should always have these first editions before their eyes, and compare them line by line with the following. Among the several examples of the corruptions that have crept into the latter, I shall only take notice of one. Mr Moreri had said in the article of GILLIS LE MAÎTRE, that the Duke of Mayenne, and the other chiefs of the League, named John le Maître President of the Parliament of Paris

Paris in the room of Barnaby Briffon, and that in this quality they were deputed to the pretended States of the kingdom held at Paris in the year 1593. That the Legate proposed there the publication of the Council of Trent, without any restriction or modification, that it was a nice affair in itself; that le Maître and du Vair, then a Counsellor, had orders to examine it, &c. *There is a fault here which is corrected in the Dutch editions, where they have put he was deputed, instead of they were deputed, but they have committed an error in another place, for instead of le Maître and du Vair, then a Counsellor, they have put le Maître and du Vair, then Counsellors. This error is in the edition of Paris 1699, and shows that the attention of the editors is sometimes very remiss, for in reading the word Counsellors they did not remember that two or three lines before they had read that le Maître was deputed in quality of President (14).*

The last thing I shall observe is, that new errors will continually creep into the editions of Moreri notwithstanding all the attention and ability of the revisers, if they themselves do not take the trouble exactly to correct all the proofs, or if they do not get them to be corrected by men who are both very knowing and very attentive. It is owing to the negligence of the corrector of the press that we find in the edition of Paris 1699, at the article Lodrin, a very gross fault which had been corrected in the Dutch editions. I shall quote this article according to the edition of Lyons 1688.

LODRIN, a city and gulf of Albania in Greece. It must not be mistaken for LODRON, a lordship of the country of Trent in Italy; near Bressan.

All this is in the edition of Paris 1699. But in the Dutch edition which I make use of, and which is that of the year 1698, they have put, as it should be, Bressan, instead of Bressan, and they have retained the line immediately following which is,

LODRON. See Lodrin.

It has been left out in the Paris edition, but it would have been better to let it stand as it was, because there are a great many readers who do not find that which they look for in a Dictionary, unless it appears there at the beginning of a new line. The best way of correcting it would be to leave out these words it must not be mistaken for, and to put what follows in a line by itself. They are words which without any further caution sufficiently shew the readers that they ought not to mistake Lodron for Lodrin (15). We may likewise hint to the editors that they will do well to lengthen the article Lodron both as Geographers and as Genealogists. They ought to know that the curiosity of the readers increases very much with respect even to places that are pretty obscure, when the Gazetteers happen to mention them often. Such persons who never had the least desire to know where the Oglio is, and the Adda; nor what kind of places are Sala, Dezenzano, Gavardo, Montebello &c. have complained a thousand times for these four or five years past, that they did not find in Moreri very particular articles upon the source, and the course of these rivers, and upon the situation, and the qualities of these towns. People have at present the very same curiosity with respect to Lodron. Besides it is not a bare lordship, but an ancient county, and it is a great while since the Counts of Lodron have made themselves famous. The series of their Genealogy would make a curious article in Moreri (16). The learned will think themselves concerned in it because Joseph Scaliger pretended that his grand-mother Berénice, or Veronica, of Lodron, was daughter to the Count of Lodron. Scioppius in his Scaliger Hypobolimus says this is false; and alledges several facts which may serve for materials to the editors.

I make no excuse for the length of this preface, or advertisement, which I have joined to the second edition of the Critical Remarks first published at Paris. Every one will see that this may serve as a supplement.

(14) In the edition of 1707 & Aq. we find a separate article of JOHN LE MAÎTRE, where instead of *they* were deputed, they have put *he was deputed*; and the words *then a Counsellor* are left out. NEW OBSERVAT.

(15) In the last editions this article runs as follows: LODRIN, a city and gulf of Albania in Greece, ought not to be mistaken for LODRON, an ancient county of the

country of Trent in Italy, near the Bressan.

Thus they still make but one article of Lodrin and Lodron, instead of making two according to Mr Bayle's remark. NEW OBSERVAT.

(16) They have not yet given us in Moreri's Dictionary the Geographical description of Lodron, nor the Genealogy of it's Counts. NEW OBSERVAT.

T H E

P R E F A C E

T O T H E

P A R I S E D I T I O N.

WHAT I now publish is not a criticism upon Moreri's Dictionary; I am not rash enough to make such an attempt. Mr Bayle, after great efforts, has not fully executed it (1). Mr le Clerc, who came after him, and had the advantage of his observations, has only committed new faults, added to the old ones which he has not taken the trouble to correct: and indeed the edition which he published in the year 1699, to speak properly, is not exact in any thing besides the articles that have some conformity with those which we find in the Critical Dictionary of Rotterdam (2). The two editions which were published one upon the other at Paris, are not near so faulty as the former ones; and those who had the care of them, have purged them of several errors which we still find in the edition of 1699. The last especially seems to have been carried to a degree of perfection which a work of that nature may attain to: the chronology has been corrected; instead of varying as it did in several places, it is fixed to a certain order. The articles are put in a form more convenient to the reader, and purged of a great many false facts, which only serve to stifle the true ones, and to make people question the most fundamental points of history, when authors have had the indiscretion to confound both together: in short, every thing there is placed in an order that is agreeable to an eager reader, and useful to a learned one: and it must be said to the praise of Mr Vaultier, who has sustained alone the immense burthen of this labour, that it wanted a man of his patience and assiduity not to sink under the weight of so great an enterprize; especially when it is known that he was assisted by none, and that if you except one Friar, whose knowledge is limited to one certain kind of erudition, he was abandoned by every body else. It is true it might be objected to him, that he has received some memoirs, and that if he had shewed that he made any account of them, people would have furnished him with more, during the impression, and in proportion to the good reception they should have seen him give to the first. But this is not the question here, and as to what concerns me I have no complaint to make against him before the tribunal of the public.

After

(1) Our author pretends, that Mr Bayle undertook in his Dictionary to censure all Moreri's faults; but that *after great efforts, he has not fully executed that undertaking.* Mr Bayle never had such a design. He does not criticize Moreri but when he gives an article that is likewise to be met with in the Dictionary of that author. *I have put by themselves in a remark, says he in his preface, the errors I have imputed to Moreri. I have not touched upon those that are found in the articles given by him, and not by me, though they are not less considerable, nor less frequent in these articles than in those I have given.* A little after he subjoins: *For the sake of youth, who want to have their judgment formed, and to be made sensible of the most scrupulous exactness, I have taken notice of the least faults of Moreri in the subjects we both handle: as for the mistakes that are in other places, I do not meddle with them as I said before.* Here is a very plain proof of the little exactness of our Critic. His Remarks are almost every one taken from Mr Bayle's Dictionary, as will be shewn here-

after; and yet he has not at all attended to what Mr Bayle so expressly declares in his preface. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) This author does not do justice here to Mr le Clerc, who has corrected an infinite number of faults in the Dutch editions of Moreri's Dictionary, and has made very considerable additions to it. He has not seen these editions: what he says of them is borrowed from the reviser of Paris, who, the better to recommend his labour, had undervalued that of Mr le Clerc, at the same time that he made use of it. Mr le Clerc shewed the injustice of his proceeding in a memoir inserted in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for February 1700, Art. VII, pag. 207, & seq. He even observed, that the Paris reviser had left some faults that were corrected in the last Dutch editions; for example, at the article *C A B*, there was *Cumberlund*, instead of *Cumberland*. This error still continues in the edition of 1725. NEW OBSERVAT.

After such a particular account, it will be easy to judge of the nature of this little work: it contains only some remarks that have escaped Mr Vaultier; they are even, if you will, some faults which any other author, over-charged with such a prodigious labour, would infallibly have committed; and he might have esteemed himself happy if he had not been guilty of still greater ones. Among these faults there are some which particularly relate to certain nations, to certain countries, and even to certain districts, and which consequently do not much interest a reader, who has not seen these countries any where but in a map; but as I hope these Remarks may be of service to the first edition that shall be published of Moreri's Dictionary, I would not omit taking notice of these slight errors, being persuaded that it will be much easier for an editor to make a proper use of them when he finds them collected together in a small volume. There are other faults among those which I have censured, that will require a more serious consideration, and the correcting of which, as any reader may observe, was essential to the perfecting of the Historical Dictionary.

For example, it would never perhaps have come into the thoughts of the new editors, that there is no stone bridge upon the Rhine, and perhaps also if it were not for the remark I make on this subject, an editor who might have been present at the last siege of Brisach (a), would notwithstanding continue to write after Mr Moreri, that they cross the Rhine there *upon a fine stone bridge*. The remark, I own, is trivial; it nevertheless serves to correct an error which has run thro' twelve editions, and into which that skilful Geographer Mr le Clerc, who pretends to criticise Quintus Curtius, has fallen as well as the rest: I grant it is an error proceeding from want of attention, it cannot even be of any other kind (b); but is it the less an error upon that account? How many of those little authors who have no other stock for composing books, but the great Historical Dictionary, will believe hereafter that they cross the Rhine at Brisach *upon a fine stone bridge*? These little books, which are copied one from another, having once given a run to that false tradition, would be sufficient, in a few centuries, to make a probable opinion of what is said now, *that there is a stone bridge at Brisach*: and from thence would arise controversies among the Geographers; of the same nature with that which we see in our days, between Mr le Clerc, and Mr Perizonius, upon some passages of the celebrated Historian of Alexander the Great.

Will not what is said in the new edition of Moreri, concerning the year in which King James II died, be likewise one day the subject of a dispute among the Chronologers? Grounded upon incontestable records, some will place his death in the year 1701; others upon the authority of the edition of 1704, will maintain, that this Prince died (c) not 'till the year 1702. There will be a multitude of writings, and perhaps of slanders and abuse, and all this through the negligence of an Historian.

By

(a) There is too much hyperbole here: it is not in the least probable that an editor who should have seen with his own eyes, that the bridge of Brisach is not of stone, should nevertheless have neglected to correct this error of Moreri. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(b) Our author will give me leave to say, that the error he takes notice of may not only be of another kind than errors proceeding from want of attention, but that it actually is so, for though we attend ever so much to Moreri's words, we cannot judge that he is mistaken in saying that the bridge of Brisach is a stone bridge. None but such as know by some other way that the thing is false can perceive he is mistaken. But here follows the example of an error that proceeds from want of attention. Moreri, speaking of a river called LE MORIN, said that it is in Brie, that it takes its source near Sedan, that it runs through la Ferté Gaucher, through Colmier, &c. He did not copy this last word right, for Coulon, his original, says, Colomier (he should have said Colomiers); but as for the word Sedan he copied it faithfully. They who have corrected Moreri, have changed Sedan into Sedan, although, without doubt, they knew enough of Geography, not to be ignorant that Sedan is at a great distance from Brie. It is therefore owing to want of attention that they have put in their editions of Moreri, that the Morin, a river of France in Brie, takes its source near Sedan. They should have said near Sezanne. As to what concerns Colmier, they might believe that there was a place of that name in Brie, but with a little more application they would have found that it should be Colomiers, and not Colmier (3). Perhaps Mr Moreri followed, more than he ought to have done, the custom of several Frenchmen, which is to pronounce, with two syllables, the names that are written with

V O L. V.

three. It is thus that some authors who have written against Mr de Vallemont, call him *Valmont*, and that others call Malment an author who writes his name *Mallement*: from hence it will proceed one day or other that the Bibliographers will give us an author whose name is Vallemont, and another whose name is Valmont, &c; but Mr Moreri would not be excusable from the custom that he might have taken of pronouncing *Colgne* and not *Cologne*, *Colnie* and not *Colomie*. He should have written proper names not according to his own pronunciation; but according to their Orthography. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(3) In the edition of 1725, it is said that this river takes its source near Sezanne, and that it runs through Coulmier. NEW OBSERVAT.

(c) I believe this false date is an error of the press; nevertheless, the Critic was not obliged to enquire whether it came from the editor or Printers. It is the fate of authors that they must bear the blame of the negligence of the correctors of the press. I do not pretend to affirm in general, that an author may not sometimes be mistaken as to epochs, that are both very remarkable, and very late. The author of the Supplement to Moreri fancied, that Marshal Turenne made the whole campaign of the year 1675. He did not remember one thing which all the world knew, viz. that Marshal Turenne was killed by a cannonball on the twenty-seventh of July 1675. Here follow the words of the author of this Supplement in the article MONTSCUCULI: *But in the year 1675, Montecuculi could do nothing in Alfatia, because Marshal Turenne broke all his measures*. Nothing can be more false than this, for Montecuculi did not go into Alfatia till after Marshal Turenne's death (4). I shall say, by the by, that they should not only have corrected

8 N

By these two instances, singled out from several others, one may judge of the usefulness of these Remarks, which only relate to the matters themselves; for if we had been willing to take the errors of the press into consideration, there would have been matter enough to make a large volume.

refted this blunder in the Dutch editions, but likewise have made that article more complete. It was not to be expected that the author of the Supplement should have enlarged much upon the glory of Count Montecuculi. That General was not loved in France; they considered him as the principal cause of their losing all the conquests of the year 1672; but for that very reason the Dutch editions should have given us a long article of this General of the Imperial armies, and adorned it with the finest encomiums which he deserved. Such an omission is more blameworthy than to partake in the error which has not been corrected, concerning the age of Montecuculi. The Supplement says, that this General died in the year 1680, *aged more than eighty years*. It is nevertheless true that he lived but seventy-two years and eight months. He was born in the year 1608, as we find in his life

printed before his memoirs, at Geneva in the year 1704, and thereby we correct the fault of the Printers of that life, who fix his death on the sixteenth of October 1681, instead of 1680 (5). MR. BAYLE'S REMARK.

(4) This remained in the editions of 1707 and 1712. It was struck out in that of 1725. NEW OBSERVAT.

(5) This likewise remained in the editions of 1707 and 1712. In that of 1725 it is said, that Count Montecuculi died on the sixteenth of October 1680, *aged seventy-two years and eight months*; and at the end of his article they take notice that *he had presented to the Emperor, in the year 1665, his Memoirs, composed during his campaigns in Hungary, published in the year 1704 by Mr. Hayfen, a German gentleman, Governor to the Prince of Muscovy*. NEW OBSERVAT.



CRITICAL

C R I T I C A L
R E M A R K S
UPON THE
N E W E D I T I O N
O F
M O R E R I ' S
H I S T O R I C A L
D I C T I O N A R Y ,

Published in the year 1704.

A.

A C T O R .



MR BAYLE had already censured Mr Moreri for changing this word into that of *Altorius*. This error indeed has been corrected in the new edition ; as well as that where it is said that Ovid speaks of one *Altorius* : for these words, *quæ fuit Altoride cum magno semper Achille*, ought not to be understood of a man named *Altorius*, but of Patroclus, whom the Poets generally distinguish by the Patronymic name of *Altorides*, which signifies nothing else but *descended from Altor*. The explication which Mr Bayle has given of the Poet's thought is very full ; and it is their fault who published the editions of 1699 and 1704, that they did not reap the benefit of it, since they needed only to have consulted the Critical Dictionary. I confess it is troublesome to consult upon every article all the Critics, and all the interpreters ; but in that very respect will these Remarks be of great use to those who shall hereafter undertake to publish a new edition, since I collect into a very small volume part of the faults which were left in the old editions, so that one may run them over in a short time.

But if the new editor, on whose edition I make Remarks, has corrected this article in some places, he has changed it for the worse in several others ; the proof of which follows.

In the article of ACTOR *the Locrian*, the editor should have observed, that Peleus, the said Actor's son-in-law, was grandson to his (a) wife Ægina ; and that therefore Polymele, the daughter of Actor and Ægina, was at the same time Peleus's aunt and wife ; she was his aunt, as being sister to his father Æacus (1) : besides, Jupiter was (b) grandfather

(a) That is to say, Actor's wife. The word *his* is very ambiguous here. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the edition of 1725 it is said, that ACTOR, born in Locris, or according to others in Theffaly, was son to Myrmidon, and grandson to Jupiter, that he married the nymph Ægina ; and that he gave his kingdom with his daughter Polymele (it should have been Poly-

mele) to Peleus, the son of Æacus, and father of Achilles. NEW OBSERVAT.

(b) This wanted proof, for we do not see that Jupiter was father either to Actor or Ægina. He had a son by Ægina ; but Polymele, daughter to the said Ægina, was daughter to Actor, which made no consanguinity between Jupiter and Polymele. MR BAYLE'S REM.

(c) Aspledon

ACTOR. ADAM. ADAMITES. ADRICHOMITES. ADRIAN VI.

grandfather to Polymele, and likewise to Peleus. In the article of ACTOR, the son of Axcas, and father of Astioche, the editor is mistaken when he says that Astioche had two sons by Neptune; it was by Mars that she had these two sons, who commanded the troops of Aspledon (c) and Orchomene at the siege of Troy (2). The editor might have taken this *Astor*, for the *Astor* of whom Pausanias speaks in his fifth book, and who was son to Neptune and Agamede, the daughter of Augeus (3). On this head you may consult the tenth book of the Iliad. We see from thence that the editor has confounded these two articles, and that of two Actors he has made but one, whom he makes the father-in-law of Neptune; whereas that god was father to the second of the two whom I have just now mentioned.

(c) Aspledon and Orchomene are names of towns: the reader might possibly take them for names of men. MR. BAYLE'S REMARK.

(2) In the same edition we find that ACTOR, the son of Axcas, or Azeus, was father to Astioche, and that this nymph had by Neptune two sons, &c. Yet Mr Bayle had observed, that it was by the god Mars she had these two sons. NEW OBSERVAT.

(3) In this edition they have not given us the arti-

cle of ACTOR, son to Neptune and Agamede, the daughter of Augeus, though they might have taken it from Mr Bayle.

Our author has copied almost every thing that he says here from Mr Bayle. But he is mistaken in citing the fifth book of Pausanias. That quotation in Mr Bayle relates to another ACTOR, son to Phorbas. NEW OBSERVAT.

A D A M.

Moreri says that Josephus relates, that Adam engraved upon two different tables the observations which he had made upon the course of the stars. These are not the words of that antient Historian; he only says in the second chapter of the first book of his antiquities, that the offspring of Seth, the son of Adam, were the inventors of Astrology, and that they caused the principles which they had discovered, to be engraved upon two pillars, the one of brick and the other of stone, in order to secure them from the general destruction, which, as Adam had foretold, was to happen once by fire, and another time by water (1). Moreri likewise says, that the first man gave names to the plants, whereas the Scripture only ascribes to him the invention of the names of beasts. The editor has adopted the first of these errors (2), but has corrected the second.

(1) This Remark is taken from Mr Bayle. NEW OBSERVAT. (2) This is corrected in the edition of 1725. NEW OBSERVAT.

A D A M I T E S.

Moreri makes St Epiphanius say, that the churches of the Adamites were infamous places, on account of the abominable crimes which they committed in these caverns of horror and prostitution. That holy Father does not speak so in the summary of his second book; he only says, 'that the Adamites meet together as naked as they were born, and in that condition go thro' their lectures, prayers, and other religious exercises.' Besides, Moreri has too rashly affirmed, that there was a sect of these Heretics in England. This is absolutely false, and the editor has corrected that place, but he has not had the same precaution with respect to the text of St Epiphanius (1).

(1) All this is taken from Mr Bayle. What concerns St Epiphanius has been corrected in the edition of 1725; and Mr Bayle is quoted at the end of the article. NEW OBSERVAT.

AD RICHOMITES (a).

Moreri is mistaken in this article, when he takes *Trajectum* for Utrecht, instead of taking it for Maastricht. He says afterwards that Adrichomites himself published his Theatre of the Holy Land; whereas it is certain that this book was not published till after his death; besides, this same Bibliographer divides that work into two, by observing that the *Theatre of the Holy Land*, is different from the *Description of the Holy Land*, whereas it is but one and the same work. The editor has corrected the first fault, and adopted the second (1).

(a) He should have said *Adrichomius*, for so do we find that word written in the Dictionary of Moreri. MR. BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) This Remark is likewise taken from Mr Bayle, at the article AD RICHOMITES. All these faults are corrected in the edition of 1725. NEW OBSERVAT.

ADRIAN VI.

In an article where mention is made of this Pope, he is said to be of the house of Fieschi. I see very well that the author meant Adrian V, who was really of that family. But, after all, it is still a fault which it is necessary to correct in the editions that may be published hereafter; for nothing can be more different than Ottoboni di Fieschi, who was Pope under the name of Adrian V, and Adrian Florentius, who was so under that of Adrian VI. The former lived in the XIIIth century, and the latter in the XVIth (1).

(1) They have put *Adrian V* in the edition of 1707, and the following ones. NEW OBSERVAT.

A I N S.

A I N S.

This article was right in the preceding editions, and they have spoiled it in this. The river Ains *, which comes from the county of Burgundy, and divides Bresse from Bugey, is in the last edition improperly called the river of Dain. Guichenon, who has written the history of these two little provinces, is the proper judge of this question. We need only consult him, and we shall see how he criticizes *Cognatus* (a) and Maffo upon the subject of this river (1).

* *Ens, Indis, Indus, Danus, & Idanus*, in Latin.

(a) That is to say, Gilbert Coufin (*Gilbertus Cognatus*, who had been Erasmus's servant), and Papyrius Maffo. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the edition of 1725, at the article AIN (1') it is said that the river Ains runs between Bresse and Bugey. NEW OBSERVAT.

A L C I A T U S.

In the article of Andrew Alciatus, a Civilian of Milan, the editor has forgot to mention the following book, among those which he ascribes to him: *Rerum patriæ seu Historiæ Mediolanensis, lib. iv. ex M. S. Bibliothecæ Ambrosianæ*. One would think he could not forget, in the article of a celebrated author, the work which he dedicated to the glory of his native country (1).

(1) There is no mention made of this work in the last edition: but at the end of this article they have added: *those who would know the catalogue of Alciatus's works need only consult the Eluges des Hommes Savans de Mr de Thou, by Teissier, Tom. I.* They should have

referred to the edition of these *Eluges*, published in 1715, where they have collected the judgments of some learned men upon that history of the Milanese. NEW OBSERVAT.

A L E A N D E R.

Moreri, speaking of this Cardinal's death, had not determined what book he was about to publish when he died; but the editor tells us, that Moreri's words are to be understood as relating to his great work against the Professors (*Opera contra i Professores: Lorenz. Craffo*); nevertheless, it is not sure that it was the same which the Cardinal was writing when he died, and Mr Bayle is not certain of it (a). Therefore when a Critic of that penetration wavers upon any subject, another should not rashly form his opinion (1). The editor, in reckoning up the works of that great Cardinal, has forgot to mention his *Tables of the Greek Grammar* (2).

(a) This ought not to be understood as if Mr Bayle expressed some doubt upon that head: he neither affirms nor denies any thing: he only quotes the words of Paul Jovius, and those of Lorenzo Craffo. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) Our author should have assigned his reasons for doubting that the *Work against the Professors* was that which Alexander was writing when he died; and have shewn that Paul Jovius and Lorenzo Craffo are mi-

staken. Otherwise we have a right to consider his doubt as a pure imagination: and indeed it is only grounded upon a false supposition that Mr Bayle had raised doubts concerning it. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) There is no mention made in the new edition of Moreri of Alexander's *Tables of the Greek Grammar*, though Mr Bayle speaks of them, and it is from him that our author has taken this particular. NEW OBSERVAT.

A L E X A N D E R.

I should have believed that the editor would have corrected in this article a bad phrase which his author makes use of; at least I call it bad, because it is susceptible of a double meaning: it is this; *Darius n'avoit point voulu faire le dégât dans l'Asie, selon l'avis de Memnon* (i. e. *Darius had refused to lay Asia waste according to Memnon's advice*). To judge of this expression according to its obvious sense, we are as much inclined to believe that Memnon had not advised such waste to be made, as that he had advised it; so true it is, that the meaning often depends upon the order in which the words are placed, and upon the turn of a phrase. If the editor had carefully perused all the Remarks that have been made upon the different editions of Moreri, this fault would not have escaped him (1).

(1) This ambiguous expression has passed into the edition of 1725, where it is said that *Darius n'avoit point voulu faire de dégât dans l'Asie selon l'avis de Memnon*. Mr Bayle had already taken notice of it in

the article *Memnon*, remark [D]; but in a more distinct and precise manner than our author, who still copies him here. NEW OBSERVAT.

A L M A I N.

When Moreri speaks of that famous doctor of the university of Paris, and is enumerating his works, he should not have forgot that which concerns the Laity. The very circumstances of the time should have engaged the editor to speak of it with some exactness (1).

(1) Our Critic commits here several faults which Mr Bayle has particularized above in his *Preface*. NEW OBSERVAT.

ARLENIUS.

I should have expected that this author, who lived in the reign of Charles V, and who called himself in the world (*a*) by the name of Peraxylus, would have found a place in the new edition of the Dictionary. The fine Greek edition of Josephus, which he published from the excellent manuscript of Dom Diego de Mendoza, the Emperor's Ambaffador at Venice, in whose retinue he was, should have entitled him to that place: besides, Arlenius was an excellent Poet. Moreri, and those who since him have been employed in reviving his Dictionary, are not the only persons who were ignorant of the merit of this great man (1).

(a) That is to say, in the learned world. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(1) Our author (as I said before) has taken almost all his Remarks from Mr Bayle's Dictionary; but he has concealed or disguised these little thefts as much as he could. Here, for example, he produces, under the word *Arlenius*, what Mr Bayle had said in the ar-

ticle *Peraxylus*. What is singular in the case is, that he complains that *Moreri*, and those who since him have been employed in reviving his Dictionary, make no mention of *Arlenius*; and indeed they say nothing of him under that word; but they have given him a very good article, taken from Mr Bayle, at the word *Peraxylus*. NEW OBSERVAT.

B.

BASIN.

Armand Basin de Befons is not Archbishop of Aix, as the editor affirms, but of Bourdeaux, and he succeeded in that dignity to the late Mr de Bourlemont (1).

(1) This mistake is corrected in the edition of 1725, at the article *BAZIN* (*Claude*). NEW OBSERVAT.

BAVARIA.

This article is not exact, and the editor varies in his chronology. The Emperor Frederic III was not father-in-law to Albert IV, Duke of Bavaria, who is supposed to have married Cunegonda, that Emperor's daughter; on the contrary, Frederic III married for his second wife Cunegonda, daughter to Lewis of Bavaria, his greatest enemy; and he had by that second marriage Elizabeth, wife to Walter, Count of Schwartzberg (1). Now Lewis of Bavaria, who was afterwards Emperor, and the third of that name, was great grandfather's grandfather of Albert IV, Duke of Bavaria. How then was it possible for him to be son-in-law to the Emperor Lewis III (*a*), and consequently his cotemporary (2)?

The editor perhaps meant that Albert IV, Duke of Bavaria, married Cunegonda, daughter to the Emperor Frederic IV. But if he calls this Frederic III, he must then not reckon in the number of Emperors Frederic, called *the fair*, the third of that name, son to the Emperor Albert I, and grandson to the Emperor Rudolph I (3).

It

(1) Our author pretends that the Emperor Frederic III, (called *the fair*) married Cunegonda, daughter to Lewis of Bavaria, his greatest enemy. He has probably taken this from the work he criticizes: for in Moreri, at the word *Austria*, pag. 877, we find that the Emperor Frederic, called *the fair*, married for his second wife Cunegonda of Bavaria, daughter to the Emperor Lewis, by whom he had Elizabeth, wife to Guntier Count of Schwartzemberg. But, 1. Ritterhusius does not take notice that Frederic *the fair* had two wives: he only mentions Isabella of Arragon. 2. Heiff. in his *History of the Empire*, only says that Duke Frederic of Austria, and Duke Lewis of Bavaria, who disputed the empire with one another, were *cousin-germans*. 3. In Moreri, at the word *Bavaria*, and the article of the Emperor Lewis, pag. 135, we find no Cunegonda among the children whom he had by his two wives, and who are nine in number. Our author confounds here, after Moreri, Frederic *the fair*, who died in the year 1330, and had been competitor to Lewis of Bavaria, with Frederic *the Pacific*, who died in 1493. This last had by Eleanor of Portugal, a daughter named Cunegonda, who was married, in the year 1487, to Albert IV, Duke of

Bavaria, as may be seen in Ritterhusius, fol. 57, and 66, of the edition of Tubingen 1664; and as it has been observed in Moreri, at the article *Bavaria*, pag. 136, (where the Printers have by mistake put *Albert V*, instead of *Albert IV*) and at the word *Austria*, pag. 878. NEW OBSERVAT.

(a) He should have said Frederic III. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(2) Mr Bayle imagined that they had put here Lewis III, instead of Frederic III. In effect, the connection of the ideas and of the reasoning required that our author should have ended by proving that *Albert IV* could not have been son-in-law to Frederic III: but we must not expect that he should be so exact. After laying it down as a certain fact that Cunegonda was daughter to the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria, he concludes from thence that *Albert IV* could not have been her husband, since Lewis of Bavaria was *Albert the fourth's great grandfather's grandfather*, and consequently was not even so much as his cotemporary. NEW OBSERVAT.

(3) Ritterhusius and Heiff. give the title of Frederic III to Frederic *the Pacific*. Other writers call him with our author, *Frederic IV*. This matter is pretty

It is true that the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria disputed the Empire with him; but Pope John XXII, and a great part of the Princes of Europe, acknowledged him. Be that as it will, the editor should be consistent in the principles of his Chronology, and he is so far from being so, that he calls that Prince *Frederic III*, when he makes him father-in-law to Albert IV, Duke of Bavaria, and *Frederic IV*, when he observes that Lewis of Bavaria called *the Rich*, tore by way of contempt the letters which that Emperor wrote to him in the year 1457 (4).

As for the rest, it was the death of the Emperor Henry VII, of the house of Luxembourg, which gave occasion to the double election of *Frederic of Austria*, and of *Lewis of Bavaria*: it is this same Henry who was said to have been poisoned by a host or consecrated wafer.

pretty well cleared up in Moreri. At the article of *Frederic* called *the Fair*, pag. 192, that Emperor is named *Frederic III*, and they add that *some authors do not reckon him among the Emperors*: and at the article of *Frederic* called *the Pacific*, pag. *ibid.* they put *Frederic IV*, Emperor, or *III*, according to others. They likewise call him *Frederic IV*, at the word *Austria*, pag. 878. The case is the same with respect to the Emperor *Lewis*, of whom mention has been just made. Our author says *Lewis* of Bavaria *III* of that name: Moreri at the word *Bavaria*, pag. 135, calls him *IV* of that name: and at the article *Lewis*, pag. 219, *IV*, or *V*, of that name: and Heiff. says *V*, of that name. NEW OBSERVAT.

(4) In the last edition, at the word *Bavaria*, pag. 136, there is *Frederic III*. NEW OBSERVAT.

BEAUPOIL.

Lewis de Beaupoil of St Aulaire is improperly called the Marquis *Danmarie*: they should have said (a) *Lanmarie*. It is a fault which is peculiar to this edition, and the editor where he speaks of the late Mr Perrault has committed it (1).

(a) The *Mercurie Galant* for the month of April 1702, says *Lanmarie*, and speaks of the Marquis de *Lanmarie* Captain-Lieutenant of a company of the Gendarmery, married to the daughter of President Perrault, a lady of above two hundred thousand crowns fortune. But as proper names are ill spelt in the *Mercurie Galant*, it would not be reasonable to prefer *Lanmarie* to *Lanmarie*. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the edition of 1707, and the following, at the article *BEAUPOIL*, they have always put *Lanmarie*. They likewise write *Sainte Aulaire*, and not *Saint Aulaire* as our author does, who is likewise mistaken in saying *Perrault*, for *Perrault*. I have not been able to find the place where he pretends that this fault lies. NEW OBSERVAT.

BELLAY.

In all the editions of the Historical Dictionary, and in this last as well in the first, when they speak of the dignities of the Church of Bellay, they omit that of Archdeacon, and substitute in the room of it that of Chanter. The latter is not a dignity in the said Church, and that of Archdeacon is the second (1): besides the last letter but one of *Bellay* is not an *a* but an *e*. This Church has produced great men.

(1) In the edition of 1725, at the word *BELEY*, *Dignitaries*, which are the *Dean*, the *Arch-priest*, the *Archdeacon*, and the *Primicier*. NEW OBSERVAT.

BOILEAU.

Gilles Boileau, Steward of the King's privy-purse, brother to the celebrated Mr Despreaux, and to the Abbot Boileau, Doctor of the Sorbonne, was dead before the year 1671, which all the editions of Moreri assign for the year of his death; since Mr de Montigny who succeeded him in the French Academy, was admitted there in 1669. This fault has gone through all the editions, in this as well as in the former (1).

(1) This fault is corrected in the edition of 1707. *Questions d'un Provincial*, Tom. I. chap. XVIII. Mr Bayle had taken notice of it in his *Réponse aux* pag. 134. NEW OBSERVAT.

BRANCAS.

The Abbot Brancas, who is still living, is not the son of *Magdalen Clara* of Lenoncourt, first wife to the late Duke of Villars, but of *Magdalen Girard* his second wife (1).

(1) Since these Remarks were designed for the correcting of Moreri, our author should have pointed out the place where this fault lies. NEW OBSERVAT.

BRISACH.

There is a fault here which has escaped Mr Vaultier, as well as Mr le Clerc, and the other editors (a) of Moreri's Dictionary. Is it allowable for one to be ignorant that there is no stone bridge upon the Rhine? and that the rapidity of this river has always hindered any such from being built? Nevertheless they all affirm very positively in the article *Brisach*, that this town is situated upon the Rhine, which has there a stone bridge over it: this river has no bridges but such as are of wood (1), and even these are only

(a) We may add that Mr Baudrand is in the same case, since he says in his Geographical Dictionary, speaking of *Brisach* *cum ponte lapideo ad Rhenum fluvium*: --- with a stone bridge over the Rhine. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the edition of 1707 and the following ones, at the word *BRISACH* or *BRISSAC*, they say that there was formerly at that place a bridge of wood over the Rhine, which was demolished after the peace of Ryswick. In the edition of 1725, they always write *Brisach*. NEW OBSERVAT.

(b) We

BRISACH. CAMUS. CANADA. CHRISTINA OF BADEN.

only bridges (*b*) of boats. The first bridge that we find in going up towards the source of this river, is the bridge (*c*) of Constance; and the last is that of Straßbourg. It is true that formerly Cæsar built a wooden bridge below Mentz, in order to transport his army, but there is no such thing now (*d*).

(*b*) We can hardly conceive that the bridge of Brisach was a bridge of boats, when we remember that the reason alleged by France why she did not forthwith evacuate that fortress, which by the treaty of Riswick she was obliged to restore to the Emperor, was that they wanted a great deal of time for pulling up the piles which supported the bridge. It had been stipulated by that treaty of peace, that the bridge of Brisach should be demolished. Those who read the account of the battle that was fought in the year 1678, between the French and the Germans at the bridge of Rhinfeld will still be at a greater loss to conceive that this bridge is only a bridge of boats. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(*c*) The Sieur Coulon in his book of the rivers of France Tom. 2. pag. 504. Says that there are twelve bridges upon the Rhine, the first of which is at Stein, and the last at Straßbourg: now he says pag. 508, that Stein is near the place where the Rhine comes out of the lake of Constance. Our author had expressed himself more accurately if he had said, *the last bridge that we find in going up towards the source of this river is the bridge of Constance*, (or of Stein according to the Sieur Coulon; but he is mistaken for there is a bridge upon the Rhine at Constance) *and the first is that of Straßbourg*. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(*d*) As the end of these marginal notes is the same with that of the remarks of the text, viz. to make the future editions of Morel's Dictionary more perfect, we shall say here occasionally that there is something

in the article *Brigaw* which should be struck out. We read there that *Brisach was formerly its capital, but afterwards Friburg got the start of it, and is become memorable by its riches and other advantages. It is likewise so on account of the famous battle which the Duke d'Anguien won in the year 1644, where General Mercy was killed*. It will be proper in a new edition to stop at *Friburg got the start of it*. The rest is misplaced and should come in under the word *Friburg* (2). Besides it is not true that General Mercy was killed at the battle of Friburg in 1644. He was killed at the battle of Nortlingen in the year 1645. He had a brother named Gaspar who was killed at the battle of Friburg in 1644. This is what deceived Morel. In the article of General Mercy, Morel observes that he was wounded at Nortlingen on the third of August 1645. It should have been said that he died of his wounds. This capital omission ought to be supplied in the first edition that shall be published (3). MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(2) This is corrected in the edition of 1725, after the following manner: *Brisach was formerly the capital city, but afterwards Friburg, more famous on account of its riches, deprived it of that rank*. The rest is wholly left out. At the article *Friburg* mention is made of the victory obtained by the Duke d'Anguien. NEW OBSERVAT.

(3) All these faults are corrected in the last edition. NEW OBSERVAT.

C.

CAMUS.

THE editor calls the famous Bishop of Belley, *John-Peter le Camus*, instead *John-Peter Camus*. It is a fault which he has not taken from the old editions, but which he himself has made without doubt, by confounding the families of *le Camus* and *Camus*, which are nevertheless very different (1). The first is an ancient family of the Robe at Paris; Cardinal le Camus is of that family. The second is a family of military gentlemen though some branches of it at this day wear the Robe. Since I am speaking of John-Peter Camus, Bishop of Belley. I ought to remark that the author of the Paris Gazette, when he mentioned last year, or the year before, the death of Mr Camus, Abbot and General of the Order of St Ruf, is in the wrong to say that this Abbot was nephew to that Bishop; they were of the same family, but certainly the Bishop was not the Abbot's uncle.

(1) This fault is not in the edition of 1725. NEW OBSERVAT.

CANADA.

This article is curious enough, but it must be confessed that the author, speaking of the first Apostles who planted the faith in these newly discovered countries, should not have forgot to give the Jesuits their due (1). There are few religious societies to which the world is so much obliged as it is to this, and few that have acted with so much courage and zeal in declaring the truths of Christianity to these savage nations.

(1) Nothing has been added thereupon in the last editions. NEW OBSERVAT.

CHRISTINA OF BADEN.

The editor has confounded himself when he speaks of this Princess, who was third wife to Albert Marquis of Anspach; it is in the article of Brandenburg Anspach. He observes first of all that Albert was only twice married (1), and afterwards forgetting

(1) This error is corrected in the edition of 1725, at the word *Brandenburg*, pag. 455. NEW OBSERVAT.

CLAIRVAUX. CLEMENT XI. CLUSA. COMO. CREMONA.

701

no doubt the first proposition which he had advanced, he names the three Princesses who were wives to this Marquis. I do not know our author's real opinion touching this historical point; but whatever it be, it is most certain that Christina of Baden Dourlach was third wife to Albert of Brandenburg, Marquis of Anspach, and this Prince is grandfather to the new Princess of Hanover (2).

(2) *Wilhelmina-Carolina*, the late Queen-consort of England. NEW OBSERVAT.

CLAIRVAUX.

This abbey is not the chief of the order, it is only one of the four principal daughters of Cîteaux. Now if this abbey were chief of the order, the Abbot would not be subject to the jurisdiction of the Abbot of Cîteaux; it is nevertheless a certain fact, and easy to be proved that he is so (1).

(1) In the edition of 1725 it is said, that the abbey of *Clairvaux* is the third daughter of *Cîteaux*, *eleiive* and regular. NEW OBSERVAT.

CLEMENT XI.

There is a fault here which is owing to nothing but want of attention, for besides that it is not common to all the articles where mention is made of this Pope, it is impossible to believe the editor so ignorant as not to know that Clement XI, who now fills St Peter's chair, is not the immediate successor to Alexander VIII, since Innocent XII, whose government will one day be so famous in history, on account of the great events which happened in his time, reigned between these two Popes; it is nevertheless affirmed in the new edition, that Clement XI succeeded Alexander VIII (1).

(1) Our author should have pointed out the place where this error lies. NEW OBSERVAT.

CLUSA.

They seem to doubt, in the article of James Clusa, a Cistercian Friar, who became afterwards a Carthusian, whether this author be a different person from him who is known under the name of James de Paradiso; it even looks as if the author of the new edition was unwilling to distinguish these two authors. This article should not have been treated so superficially, and the authority of those who distinguish James de Clusa, and James de Paradiso, is not of such small weight that this question deserved to be treated so carelessly (1).

(1) In the last edition they have put CLUSE (James PARADES, they refer to DE CLUSE (James). NEW de), who, according to most authors, is the same with OBSERVAT. JAMES DE PARADES: and at the word JAMES DE

COMO.

Among the authors who have spoken of Como, or of the lake of Como, the editor does not mention an history or a description of that city, which does not indeed contain above two pages, and which was composed by Mr Duker, who took it from several authors. There has been added to it the plan of that city. Mr Duker was poisoned in Sicily in the year 1635. Camillus Ghilini, a writer of the XVIth century, and one of the best Latin authors of that time, has also given a description of the lake of Como. The piece does not exceed three pages, and has had no better fate than Duker's, that is to say, it has been forgot, as well as the description of the lake of Como in eight pages, written by Paul Jovius. It is strange that in one single article three authors of such distinction should be forgotten (1).

(1) These authors are still forgotten in the edition Mr Grævius's *Theſaurus Antiquitatum Italiae*. NEW of 1725. Their descriptions of the city and of the OBSERVAT. lake of Como are inserted in the third volume of

CREMONA.

The editor, in reckoning up the authors who mention this city, has forgot Lewis Cavitelli, who wrote the annals of it from its foundation to the year 1583 (1). They are very extensive, because the author does not so much confine himself to his subject, but that he often takes in facts which have a relation to the general history of Italy, and even to divers other parts of Europe. This work, tho' written in an age when learning begun to revive, is not the more correct on that account. The editor, as negligent as Moreri was, does not so much as give a particular article of Cavitelli.

(1) This author is quoted in the last edition; but third volume of the *Theſaurus Antiquitatum Italiae*. instead of *Cavitelli*, the Printers have put *Camelli*. NEW OBSERVAT. This work of Cavitelli's is likewise to be found in the

VOL. V.

8 P

CREQUI.

CREQUI. DENIS. DEODATUS.

CREQUI.

There is an error in the last edition, touching the Marquis de Crèqui, who was killed at the battle of Luzzara. It is observed there that the said Lord left some daughters by the lady N . . . d'Aumont, his wife, which is absolutely false: this Marquis left no posterity, and by his death the Count de Canaples, his uncle, at present Duke de Lefdi-guières, who was second son to Charles II, Sieur de Crequi, who was killed at the siege of Chambery, in the year 1630, has got possession of the entailed estate: it is easy to judge that the entail would not have taken place in his favour, if the Marquis de Crequi had left daughters (1).

(1) All this is corrected in the last edition. NEW OBSERVAT.

D.

DENIS (*Dionysius Ryckelius*).

THE encomium upon this Carthusian Friar is excessive; it is just (a), I confess, but then the author should have shown upon what he grounded it; and should have said something of the admirable works of this Anchorite; of these works, I say, which obliged Pope Eugenius IV to cry out in reading them, *Lætetur Mater Ecclesia que talem habet filium*. - - - *Let mother church rejoice in having such a son*. The book then which has done the greatest honour to Denis, the Carthusian, is his treatise concerning the authority of the Pope, and of the Council; and I do not doubt but it was the reading of that work which drew the exclamation from the sovereign Pontif. Denis Rikel was certainly one of the greatest lights of his order, and even of the Church (b).

(a) It is difficult to conceive how an encomium that is *excessivæ* can be just; or if it be just, how it can be *excessivæ*. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(b) Our author might have given several other hints touching this article; Moreri has forgot to mark the place where this Carthusian died; it was the Charter-house of Ruremonde in Guelderland (1). He was in the wrong to say that they surnamed him *Extatic*, on account of his attachment to contemplation, he should have added, that it was chiefly because it was thought he had divine inspirations during his extasies (2). There are several singularities in his life which would much adorn his article in the new editions of Moreri. The most common opinion is that he died at the age of sixty-nine years: nevertheless, Valerius Andreas, pag. 190, of his *Bibliotheca Belgica*, says,

that Denys the Carthusian affirms, that he composed his book of Meditations (which was his last production) at the age of seventy-nine years (3). MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the edition of 1725 it is observed, that he entered into the Carthusian monastery at Ruremonde in 1423, and lived there forty-eight years. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) We still find in the last edition that his continual attachment to contemplation got him the name of Extatic Doctor. NEW OBSERVAT.

(3) In the last edition it is said that he died on the twelfth of March 1471, aged sixty-nine years. They do not quote Valerius Andreas at the end of that article. NEW OBSERVAT.

DEODATUS (in Moreri) DIEU-DONNE'.

It is surprising that this article has not been corrected in any edition of Moreri's Dictionary; here they commit a capital error, for they confound two Popes into one. Certain it is that there have been two Popes of the name *Deodatus*, or *Deus-dedit*; the first succeeded Boniface IV, in the beginning of the VIIth century, that is to say, in the year 614: but besides the Deodatus of whom Moreri speaks, there was another, who succeeded Vitalianus about the year 669, the year in which the latter died. Moreri has taken this error from Platina and Onuphrius, who confound these two Popes. But what surprises me is, that we find the two *Deodatus*'s in the chronological table of the Popes, at the article of *Rome*. This shews the little exactness and attention of the editors; besides the second *à Deo datus* reigned seven years, two months, and seventeen days; therefore the time of his administration is long enough to deserve to be mentioned (1). His pontificate was even remarkable for some things, which might have served as an epoch to the historians. It was this Pope who allowed the Venetians to choose a chief for themselves, and to create a Duke.

(1) In the edition of 1725, these two Popes are very well distinguished: but the article of the second is brought in at the word *ADEODAT*. The chronology of our author is not followed there, for it is affirmed that Adeodatus succeeded Vitalianus in the year 671, and that he died on the eighteenth of May 676, after having held the see five years, two months, and seventeen days. NEW OBSERVAT.

DIEPPE.

DIEPPE.

Dieppe is twelve leagues from Rouën, even according to the most exact calculation; consequently it is at least a fault in point of exactness, to say that these two cities are only ten leagues distant from one another. I will confess, if you please, that the fault is of no great consequence, but it may nevertheless appear worthy of a Geographer's attention; and in an Universal Dictionary care should be taken to satisfy every body (1).

(1) In the last edition it is said that Dieppe is twelve leagues from Rouën. NEW OBSERVAT.

E.

EGHMONT (a).

IT is not an exact way of speaking, to say that the only person who remains of the illustrious (b) family of Eghmont is the Count d'Eghmont, who married Madam de Cosnac; however this is what our editor says, as if he had visited all the provinces of Flanders, on purpose to see whether that great family was reduced to the single person of the Count d'Eghmont now in France (c).

(a) Our author should have warned the editors to correct this Orthography: it should be writ *Egmont*: and if custom did not authorize *Egmont*, it would be still better to write *Egmond*: the Latin authors say *Egmonda*, *Egmondanus* &c. Strada should not have made use of the word *Egmontius* (1). MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(b) Moreri says that it is the principal family in Holland. He should have said *one of the principal*, &c. (2). MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(c) The editors should have been told that Moreri is mistaken, when he says that the Count d'Egmont who was beheaded at Brussels on the fifth of June 1568, left three sons and eleven daughters; he should have said *three sons and eight daughters* (3). He should not have forgot the date of the erection of Egmont into a county, he should have said that it was done in favour of John d'Egmont by the Emperor Maximilian I, in the year 1488 (4). The Count who was beheaded at Brussels deserved a longer article: they may enlarge it, if they please, in a new edition, and they will do well to consult the last History of the Duke of Alva (5). Mr Moreri has only followed the writers that were enemies to King Philip II. This was not discharging the duty of an Historian, he should have consulted the authors of both sides, and perhaps it would appear from thence that the said

Count was not clear from the crime of high-treason. It is not unlikely that he artfully endeavoured to manage matters so that Philip II, should not be King of the Low-Countries upon any other condition, than sending such orders there as were suitable to the advice given by the Nobility of the land. Those who aspired at this kind of sovereignty, connived at the mutinies of the populace and the pillaging of the churches. Count d'Egmont was accused of this perhaps with a good deal of reason. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the last edition at the word EGHMONT, family, they refer us to EGMOND, where, in effect, we find the article of that family. This last article is preceded by that of *Egmont*, village, so spelt, though in the following article they write *Egmond*. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) In the edition of 1712, and those that follow, it is said that the village of *Egmond* has given its name to one of the principal families in Holland, &c. NEW OBSERVAT.

(3) In some editions they say, that Count had three sons and ten daughters. NEW OBSERVAT.

(4) Nothing has been added upon this head in the edition of 1725. NEW OBSERVAT.

(5) They have not enlarged this article in the last edition. NEW OBSERVAT.

ENCYCLOPEDIA.

This word puts me in mind that they have forgot to mention the book which Andrew-Matthew Aquaviva, Duke of Atri in the kingdom of Naples, composed under that title (1). The family Aquaviva has produced learned men.

(1) In the last edition at the word AQUAVIVA, and in the article of *Andrew-Matthew d'Aquaviva III* of the name (it is thus that our author should have named him) they take notice that this Duke, after he he had been present at two battles that were lost &c;

having a particular inclination for learned men and letters, consecrated the remainder of his life to study, and even became an author. But they make no mention of his *Encyclopedia*. NEW OBSERVAT.

ESPERNAY.

The author of the new edition does not do justice to the antient city of Espernay, when he makes it to be no more than a borough. One had reason to expect that he would have corrected the first editions in this article. Those who are desirous to be informed of the antiquity of that town, which is in Champaign, need only consult a letter directed to Father de Villers, and inserted in the *Memoires de Trevoux* for the month of May of this present year: but the writer of that letter wrongs the author of the new edition of the Dictionary, when he reproaches him with having said, that

Espernay

ESPINAY DU RETAL. ESTE. FELIBIEN. FRANCIS II.

Espenay is only a village; the editor is nearer the truth, since he gives that place the title of borough (1).

(1) In the edition of 1725, they have put, *ESPERNAT, a city of France in Champaign, &c.* and they quote the *Memoires de Trevoix, 1725*. NEW OBSERVAT.

ESPINAY DU RETAL.

This Genealogical article is not exact; it is said therein that Richard d'Espenay was High-steward and Great-Chamberlain of Bretagne; which is a mistake, since it was Robert, father to Richard, that was possessed of these dignities (1). They commit another fault in the same article, when they affirm that Guy II d'Espenay married Jane d'Estouteville: it was not Guy II, who married that lady, it was Henry d'Espenay (2). In fine, they do not tell us that Claudius d'Espenay, who was son to Margaret d'Espreaux, and who married Jane de la Rochefoucauld, left besides Frances, Charles d'Espenay, who married Margaret de Rohan, by whom he had no children, and consequently his estate returned to his sister (3). It will concern those who shall have the care of the next edition of Moreri, to improve this article, pursuant to these Remarks.

(1) In the same edition we find that ROBERT d'Espenay, the first of the name, was High-steward of Bretagne, and first Chamberlain to Duke John VI; that ROBERT, the second of the name, grandson (and not son) to Robert I, was High-steward of Bretagne; and that RICHARD, son to Robert II, was Chamberlain to Duke Francis II. NEW OBSERVAT.

Catharine d'Estouteville. NEW OBSERVAT.

(3) This is corrected in the last edition: but where as our author says *Margaret d'Espreaux*, they have put *Margaret de Scepaux*; they have written *Durestal*, instead of *Du Retal*; and in the room of *Jane de la Rochefoucauld*, there is *Frances de la Rochefoucauld*. They observe there that CHARLES dying without issue, his estate went to Charles de Schomberg, his sister's son. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) We likewise find there that GUY II married Frances de Villefranche; and that HENRY married

ESTE.

The editor has varied speaking of Mary Eleanor d'Este, now Queen of England: in some places she is omitted, and in others not put in her right place. This Princess is daughter to Alphonso IV, Duke of Modena and Reggio, and to Laura Martinozzy, the late Cardinal Mazarin's niece; the late Duke of Modena, Francis II, was her brother, and the present Duke of Modena, formerly Cardinal d'Este, is her uncle. This Prince, who succeeded his nephew, who died without issue, is brother to the late Duke Alphonso IV. Such are the amendments to be made in this article in the subsequent editions (1).

(1) This article is corrected in the last edition. NEW OBSERVAT.

F.

FELIBIEN.

IN the article of Messieurs Felibien, they have forgot the Abbot Felibien, Archdeacon of Chartres, and, if I am not mistaken, brother to him who has given us that fine history of Painters. The Abbot Felibien is sufficiently known in the learned world to deserve being mentioned upon this occasion. The *Pentateuchus Historicus*, &c. which he published some months ago, should, methinks, have secured him a place in a Dictionary where his family holds a considerable one already (1).

(1) In the edition of 1725, we find the article of brother to *Andrew Felibien des Avoaux*. NEW OBSERVAT. JAMES FELIBIEN, who is the man in question here, SERVAT.

FRANCIS II.

In the article of this Prince, they place his birth in the year 1543 (on the twentieth of January); they meant (a), without doubt, 1544. The mistake is of no more than one year; but one year is considerable when we talk of a Prince that lived only sixteen years, and some odd months. This Prince died on the fifth of December 1560. Now from the twentieth of January 1543, to the fifth of December 1560, they would certainly find it to be more than seventeen years (1).

(a) This error proceeded from their making the year to begin only at Easter, and consequently the month of January 1543, according to our way of reckoning, belongs to the year 1544. The editors of Moreri should be very exact, either in giving notice of the difference which arises from the time of beginning the year, or in reducing the dates to the present calculation. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the edition of 1707, it is said that FRANCIS II was born on the twentieth of January 1543, according to the old way of reckoning. In that of 1712, the date of the day is corrected, and they put the nineteenth of January. But these words, according to the old way of reckoning, are left out in the last edition, and it is expressly said that this Prince was born on the nineteenth of January 1544. NEW OBSERVAT.

FURAN.

FURAN.

Is a small river of Bugey, which goes winding at a league's distance from Belley, and falls into the Rhône near Pierre-chatel. The editor calls it improperly *le Foran* (1).

(1) As Moreri gives no particular article of this river under the name of *Foran*, or *Furan*; our Critic should have pointed out the place where this fault is to be found. In the article *Bugey*, of the last edition, it is called *le Furan*. NEW OBSERVAT.

G.

GENOA.

IN speaking of this city and of *James Bracelli*, who was of Sarzana, in the Republic of Genoa, Moreri and his Continuator make use of an unpardonable exaggeration. *James Bracelli*, say they, *left also a book concerning the illustrious men of Genoa, which he inscribed to Lewis of Pisa a Jacobin, &c.* Do these words suit a small piece of three or four pages, which is tacked to another of the same size, intituled, *A Description of the coast of Genoa*, that is to say, of the country which extends from the Var to the Macra (1)? What Foglietta, Justiniani, Leander Alberti, Fascio, and *de Voragine*, have written upon the same subject, is more particular. Philip Beroaldus compares Bracelli's stile to that of Cæsar.

(1) In the edition of 1725 the following alteration is made here: *James Bracelli also left a short description of the coast of Genoa; to which is added a small treatise on the illustrious men of Genoa, inscribed to Lewis of Pisa, a Dominican.* These two pieces of Bracelli are inserted in the first volume of the *Tesaurus Antiquitatum Italiae*. NEW OBSERVAT.

GASPARD BARTHIUS.

The famous Gaspard Barthius was aged only seventy-one years and three months wanting five days when he died; the editor does nevertheless suppose him *to have lived somewhat above seventy-two years*; which I thus prove to be a mistake. Barthius was born on the twenty-second of June 1587, and died on the seventeenth of September 1658: we need only reckon the difference between these two years (1). This author, so famous among the learned, was very ill treated by Vossius, and he treated Scioppius very ill in his turn, being one of his severest adversaries. Barthius was a copious writer; and if we may justly blame any thing in the books which he published, it is the easiness with which he composed them.

(1) In the last edition they have put that Barthius died on the seventeenth of September 1658; which is taken from Mr Bayle, whom they quote. For the rest, our author should have spoken of Barthius under the letter B, and not under the letter G: but this preposterous order is pretty common with him. NEW OBSERVAT.

J.

JAMES II.

IN all the articles where mention is made of the late King of England, James II, they place his death in the year 1702. It is amazing that at three or four years distance from a matter of fact people should be already mistaken in a year. What would the case be then, if that Prince had died thirty or forty years ago? It is an inexcusable fault, since to avoid it, the editor needed only to have taken up the first almanack that came in his way, he would have learned there that the said Prince died in the year 1701, and he would have fixed his Chronology by that (1).

(1) They have corrected this fault in the last editions. NEW OBSERVAT.

S. JUSTIN.

In the article of this Father, the editor should not have forgot to say, that he was one of Aristotle's greatest adversaries. If he had consulted the seventh book of Eusebius, and St Jerom's catalogue of Ecclesiastical Authors, he might have seen with what warmth (a) this Father of the Church inveighed against the Prince of Philosophers. He published a treatise, in which he confuted several tenets of Aristotle's Philosophy, and wherein he shewed the dangerous consequences that might be drawn from them (1). If we search into past ages, we shall find few which have not produced adversaries to the Peripatetic Philosophy; it is true, all those who have attacked it have not been alike successful in decrying it; and it seems that it was reserved for (b) Mr Des Cartes to give it the deepest wounds.

(a) All this wants to be corrected; for, 1. He should have told us what work of Eusebius he means, when he says the seventh book is to be consulted, whether it be his Ecclesiastical History, or his Evangelical Preparation, or his Evangelical Demonstration. 2. In the catalogue which Eusebius has left us of St Justin's works in the eighteenth chapter of the fourth book of his Ecclesiastical History, we find no mention made of any treatise against Aristotle. 3. St Jerom's catalogue of Ecclesiastical Authors makes no mention of such a treatise written by St Justin. The treatise against Aristotle, which appears among St Justin's works, is accounted supposititious. See the *Bibliobesque* of Mr du Pin in the article of that Father of the Church. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the edition of 1712, and those that follow, we find only that *Photius mentions some treatise of Justin, against Marcion and against Aristotle*. NEW OBSERVAT.

(b) Mr Des Cartes did not make any particular refutation of the Peripatetic system: the mischief he has done it proceeds from his having laid down other principles, which have given people a distaste for the school Philosophy. It was Gassendus, who, by attacks in form, shewed the falsity of the Peripatetic doctrines. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

L.

LE FERON.

IN this article it is said that the late Duchefs of Chaulnes had neither brother nor sisters, in a word, that she was an only daughter. The Marquis de la Frete, who is now living, would not readily agree to this assertion (1).

(1) In the last edition, at the word *Feron*, it is said that *Elizabeth la Feron*, who married the Duke of Chaulnes, for her second husband, was the *only daughter of Dreux le Feron*. They add, that her mother, *Barbara Servien*, was married in second wedlock to *Peter de Gruel*, Lord of *la Frete* . . . and left children by him. NEW OBSERVAT.

LE JAY.

This article is faulty, for they have ill spelt the name of Catherine de la Boutiere, who lately died, and who was married to the late Nicholas le Jay, Baron de Tilly, & de la *Maison rouge*, and Counsellor in the parliament of Paris, who died in 1700: they write it *N . . . de la Boutire* (1). Besides, in the same article they place the death of the late Mr le Jay, Bishop of Cahors, in the year 1679; as to this last point there is only a mistake of about twelve years, since the late Mr le Jay, who succeeded Mr de Noailles, at present Cardinal and Archbishop of Paris, in the bishopric of Cahors, has been dead not above that space of time (2).

(1) In the edition of 1725, we find at length, *Catherine de la Boutiere*. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) In the same edition it is observed, that *Henry-William le Jay*, named *Bishop of Cahors* in the year 1679, died in 1693: and in the article of the Cardinal de Noailles it is said, that he was, in the year 1679, made *Bishop of Cahors*, and transferred to *Châlons-sur-Marne* in 1680. NEW OBSERVAT.

LODI.

In the article of Lodi, a town in Italy, no notice is taken of the History which Otho Morena wrote upon that subject, and which his son Acerbus Morena continued (1). This work is, properly speaking, the history of what Frederic Barbarossa did in Lombardy, from the year 1154 to the year 1168, chiefly with respect to the town of Lodi. The two Morena's died before that Prince, consequently they could not bring their history further down. They were both in the interest of Frederic; from whence we

(1) In the last edition no mention is made of the *History of Morena*; but only of that of *Defendente Lodi*. It is intitled, *Discorsi istorici intorno la Città di Lodi*, and was printed in the year 1629, at Lodi in 4to. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) In

LODI. LE MERCIER. LEYME. LORRAINE. LUCIAN.

707

we may justly conclude that their writings were not quite impartial. It was this no doubt that obliged Baronius to use them ill in his Ecclesiastical Annals: he speaks of them in very disobliging terms; but that Cardinal was still more partial to the Pope, than the Morena's were to the Emperor, notwithstanding that they writ, if we may say so, under his very eyes. What may be said in favour of these two authors, is that they writ nothing but what they had seen. Their Latin stile is such as prevailed in the XIIth century, that is to say, very bad. Felix Ofio, Professor of Rhetoric at Padua, has made upon that History long notes which deserve to be read.

The editor gives us an article of Morena, but he says in a very confused manner, that Otho Morena composed the History of Frederic Barbarossa, and that his son finished it; which is absolutely false, since that Emperor out-lived them: besides that book is rather the History of the wars of Lodi, than that of the said Emperor. By the History of a man is commonly meant, a particular account of his actions, from the beginning of his life to his death. Now the Morena's could not possibly have writ a particular account of Frederic Barbarossa's actions, since both of them died before that Emperor (2).

(2) In the last edition, at the article MORENA, it is said that OTHO MORENA began the History of what the Emperor Frederic Barbarossa did in Lombardy, from the year 1154 to the year 1168, chiefly with respect to the town of Lodi; and that his son ACRRUS MORENA, finished what his father had not been able to do. That History is inserted in the third volume of the *Theſaurus Antiquitatum Italianæ*. NEW OBSERVAT.

LE MERCIER.

The editor speaking of John le Mercier, Royal Professor of the Hebrew tongue at Paris, does not express himself so exactly as he ought to do, when he says that this learned man translated from Greek into Latin Harmenopolus. From these words, any body would be apt to believe that le Mercier has translated all the works of that Greek author; it is nevertheless certain that he has only translated his *Prochiron*, or *promptuarium juris civilis*. Those who only know Harmenopolus's works by the idea which Moreri, or his Continuators, give of them, will not hesitate a moment in believing, by what they say, that le Mercier had translated them all, because they have been all collected in one body (1).

(1) Our author has taken this remark from Mr Bayle's *Réponse aux Questions d'un Provincial*, Tom. I. Cap. LIII, pag. 482, & seq. In the edition of 1725 at Avignon, translated from Greek into Latin, the *Prochiron* or *promptuarium juris civilis* of Harmenopolus. NEW OBSERVAT.

LEYME.

This word was right in the first editions, and they have made it wrong in the present by putting *Leyne*, instead of *Leyme*: it is an abbey of nuns in the diocese of Cahors, of which mention is made in the article *Noailles*, upon the subject of Frances de Noailles, great aunt to the Marshal and to the Cardinal de Noailles, who was abbeſs there, and died not long ago (1).

(1) In the last edition at the word NOAILLES, and the article of HENRY Lord of Noailles, Count of Ayen &c. they have put *Leime*. NEW OBSERVAT.

LORRAINE.

In the article of Lorraine the editor has committed a very gross fault: he says that Catherine de Bourbon, sister to Henry IV, and wife to Henry Duke of Bar, was mother to the Princesses Nichola and Claudia de Lorraine; the first of whom was married to Charles, afterwards Duke of Lorraine, and the second to Francis de Vaudemont, grand-father to the present Duke of Lorraine. These two Princes, who were brothers, were first cousins to those two Princesses who were daughters to Henry Duke of Bar, and afterwards of Lorraine, by his second wife; for Catherine de Bourbon his first wife, lived only six months with him, being of different religions they fell out and parted; Catherine died in the year 1604 (1).

In this same article the editor is mistaken in the list of the Dukes of Lorraine. Gerard, who died in the year 1048, was never *Marchis* of Lorraine, as it is said in the new edition; it was his second son Gerard who was so by his marriage with Hedwige, heiress of the county of Namur, which her mother Hermengarde had left her (2).

(1) This is corrected in the edition of 1725, pag. 209, col. 1. who died in 1048, is called Count and Marchis of Alsatia; and Gerard, his son, Duke and Marchis of Lorraine. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) In the same edition pag. 207. col. 2. Gerard, Lorraine. NEW OBSERVAT.

LUCIAN.

It plainly appears that the editor had a mind to correct what Moreri says concerning the *Metamorphosis*, or golden *Asis* of Apuleius, nevertheless what he himself says on this occasion is not so exact as it ought to be; for to say that the golden *Asis* is a paraphrase on the same subject which Lucian had taken from Lucius of Patras, author of a book of *Metamorphosis*, or transformations, which Plotius mentions, is not an exact expression; he ought

LUCIAN. LUCIUS BRUTUS. LYCURGUS.

ought to have said that Lucius of Patras had been abridged by Lucian, and paraphrased by Apuleius: and thus that article should have been corrected (1). In the same manner, when they speak of Apuleius of Madaura (2), should they have forgot in reckoning up his works, *the Letters to Corellia*, which, to say the truth, are (a) written in a very free style, and his other treatises *de Republica*, *de Numeris*, *de Musica*, and his *Ludicra*, of which he speaks himself in his apology (3)? It is (b) a pretty ingenious Poem (4).

(1) Our author has taken this remark from Mr Bayle's article of *Apuleius*, remark (M). They have made no alteration here in the last edition of Moreri, except that instead of *Lucius of Patras* they have put *Lucius Patras*; but *Lucius of Patras* was right. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) By the manner of our author's expressing himself one might believe that *Apuleius of Madaura* is different from the *Apuleius* he was speaking of: he is however the same. NEW OBSERVAT.

(a) He should have said *verses*, for it is a long time since these letters have been lost. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(3) Nothing has been added upon this in the last edition. NEW OBSERVAT.

(b) It is very probable that the *Ludicra* of Apuleius was a collection of divers pieces some of which were in verse, and others in prose. He says that a letter contained in that collection had been objected to him; which letter was written in verse, and treated of the care to be taken in keeping one's teeth clean, *de dentifricio*. This does not prove that the *Ludicra* was a Poem. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(4) Our Critic having found in Mr Bayle the following words of Apuleius: *legerunt à Ludicris meis epistolium de dentifricio, versibus scriptum*, imagined that the *Ludicra* of Apuleius was a Poem; and though this work be not now extant, he speaks of it as if he had read it, and assures us that it is a pretty ingenious Poem. NEW OBSERVAT.

LUCIUS BRUTUS.

Moreri has followed the authority of Dionysius Halicarnassensis preferably to that of Livy, in speaking of this generous Roman. Dionysius Halicarnassensis makes him son to a daughter of Tarquinius Priscus King of Rome, who was sister (a) to Tarquin, whereas Livy makes him the son of Tarquinia sister to the last Tarquin. Mr Bayle demonstrates with an irresistible evidence, that the sentiment of Dionysius Halicarnassensis, upon this occasion is not to be defended, and that we must necessarily follow the opinion of Livy. I refer the reader to him (1).

(a) This is very obscure, for to which Tarquin must we suppose that the daughter of Tarquinius Priscus was sister? Was it to the last Tarquin? But in that case the opinion of Dionysius Halicarnassensis, which our author rejects, would not be different from that of Livy, which he would have us follow; and we should say that Tarquinius Priscus was father to the last Tarquin, which is entirely wrong, as Dionysius Halicarnassensis has plainly proved. The Tarquin who is said here to have been the brother of Brutus's

mother, whom they make daughter to Tarquinius Priscus, would necessarily be the son of Tarquinius Priscus, but History says nothing of such a son except that he died before his father, and left two sons behind him. See Dionysius Halicarnassensis at the beginning of the fourth book. MR BAYLE'S REM.

(1) In the edition of 1712, and those that follow, it is said Lucius Junius Brutus was son to a sister of Tarquin King of Rome, and nephew to Tarquinius Superbus. NEW OBSERVAT.

LYCURGUS.

They have made some alteration in this article, I confess, and it is not so faulty as it was in the supplement of the Dictionary, but after all it is not yet exact: for they seem to me not to distinguish the two Lycurgus's, one an Athenian Orator, son to Lycophron, and grand-son to another Lycurgus whom the thirty tyrants put to death; the other the Lacedemonian Legislator. These two persons were entirely different, and it was a gross fault to confound them, as the author of the Supplement (a) did; but in short as we find only one Lycurgus mentioned in the new edition (b), it still shews a disposition in the editor to confound them (1).

The author of the Supplement had committed a great many blunders in this article; one of the chief of them was, that by mistaking Plutarch's words, he makes him say that Lycurgus drove out all idle and vagabond persons, whereas the Greek word rendered by that of *maleficus* only implies that he drove out all bad people. He afterwards makes him conqueror in the games that were celebrated in the presence of the people, though Plutarch, does not say a single word of it. He committed several other gross faults which convince me that this author was no great Grecian. Mr Faydit, when he speaks of Lycurgus in his new book *, doubts (c) whether there had been two Lycurgus's, and he seems to confound the King of Thrace with that

* Remarques sur Virgile, &c.

(a) This censure is wrong, Moreri had given us the article of Lycurgus the Lacedemonian Legislator. Since therefore the author of the Supplement gave us the article of some other Lycurgus's, and particularly that of Lycurgus an Athenian Orator (by which epithet he distinguished him from the very first line) he did not confound the Lacedemonian Legislator with the Orator of Athens. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(b) As I have not this new edition, I content myself with saying that there are several Lycurgus's in the Paris edition of 1699, and that the Lacedemonian Legislator is there plainly distinguished from the Athenian Orator. He has been placed among the other Lycurgus's. But in the Amsterdam edition of 1698 there are above fifty pages between these and Lycurgus the Legislator. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) The edition of 1707 distinguishes all the Lycu-

gus's very well; and there is reason to believe that the edition of 1704 does the same. NEW OBSERV.

(c) I have looked in this book of Mr Faydit for the necessary page, and without being at all assisted by the index I found that it is page 540. I did not find there the fault which is taken notice of here, that is to say, the doubt whether there had been two Lycurgus's. Mr Faydit does not condemn the authors who distinguish the Lycurgus King of Thrace, from the other of Lacedemon, he only says that they all agree that these two Lycurgus's lived more than three hundred years after the destruction of Troy; it is upon this that he refers us to Moreri, and afterwards he concludes that it was absurd in Virgil to make Æneas say, when speaking to Dido, that he had passed through the kingdom of the Thracians, where the severe Lycurgus had formerly reigned in old times. Thracians are not acri

of Lacedemon. In short after shewing that he was very uncertain on this head, he refers his reader to Moreri. This authority should not be of any great weight for such an high-spirited author as Mr Faydit appears to be in his works.

'acri quondam regnata Lycurgo.' But, 1. We do not find in Moreri that Lycurgus, King of Thrace, lived after the war of Troy. We find nothing precisely determined there as to the time of that King. We only find enough to make us conclude that he lived in the fabulous times. 2. It is certain that the Antients who have mentioned that Prince make him live before the war of Troy. Homer, in the sixth book of the Iliad, introduces Diomedes (one of the Grecian Captains at the siege of Troy) relating, as an old story, the punishment of that Lycurgus for having driven out Bacchus. Apollodorus, in the third book of his *Bibliotheca*, pag. m. 175, describes the adventures of Bacchus, with respect to Lycurgus, King

of Thrace, in such a manner, that, by a plain consequence, this Lycurgus must have lived several generations before the war of Troy. This justifies Virgil, and demands a reparation of the injury done him. I should be very curious to know the name of the authors who have owned that Lycurgus, King of Thrace, lived more than three hundred years after the destruction of Troy. I do not know one that says so. As for the rest, the article of that King of Thrace is still very faulty in Moreri. There are several things wanting that ought to be there, and they have only quoted Plutarch and Propertius, who hardly say any thing of what is there related. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

M.

MARTIN AKAKIA.

MORERI and his Continuators have committed a great error concerning the native country of this Physician; they have translated the word *Catalaunensis* by *Catalan* or of *Catalonia*, instead of *Cbalonais* or of *Cbalons*. If they had carefully read Quenstet, in his book *de patriis viror.* to which they refer us, they would not have been guilty of such a blunder (1). I hope these remarks will prevent all mistakes in the following editions, concerning the native country of the chief of a family that is very considerable in the faculty of Physicians at Paris.

(1) This remark is taken from Mr Bayle. In the edition of 1725, we find that *Akakia* was born at *Cbalons on the Marne*. NEW OBSERVAT.

MATTHEW BOSSULUS.

He is different from another John Bossulus likewise a Frenchman, who lived above a century before him, but who, as well as he, has been very much forgotten in his own country. Mr Bayle had complained much that Matthew was so little known in the Republic of Letters, notwithstanding he had acted such a considerable part in the world. He was preceptor to Don Carlos son to Philip II, King of Spain: he had before that taught Rhetoric in the University of Valencia. These marks of honour have not however been able to rescue him from oblivion; and notwithstanding the tender anxiety of Mr Bayle he still continues in oblivion. Who could have believed that Mr Vaultier, who is so much concerned for the glory of his country, would have neglected to inform posterity, that France had given to the court of Spain a man of that consequence? It has been thought that the cause of this oblivion was his not having writ any books. If immortality can only be had at the price of being an author, it must be confessed that it would often be a greater advantage to remain buried in the dust with the generality of mankind, and to be of the number of those whose name does not go beyond the first generation (1).

(1) In the last edition of Moreri we find a good more than the transcriber in this place. NEW OBSERVAT. article of *Bossulus*; they have made great use there of MR BAYLE'S Dictionnaire, of which our author is no

MAZZOLIN.

The editor has adopted the error which prevailed in all the other editions concerning Sylvester Mazzolin, called *Prierio* or *Prierias*. That General of the Dominicans (a) did not die at Rennes in Bretagne on the twentieth of October 1520. Since he dedicated his book *de Strigi-Magarum Demonumque mirandis*, to Cardinal Auguftin Trivulfo, on the first of March 1521. I do not wonder that the editors have copied that error one from another, since not one of them mentions this book, which would have served to rectify their Chronology. I believe they have taken Francis Sylvester,

V O L. V. 8 R who

(a) There is reason to believe that Sylvester Prierias never was General of the Dominicans. MR BAYLE'S REM. (1) All

who was likewise General of the Dominicans for this Mazzolin. *Francis*, it is true, died in the course of his visitation at Rennes in Bretagne; but if we should even allow these two Generals, who are very different, to be no more than one and the same person, the error would not be the less gross upon that account, since Francis Sylvester died, not in the year 1520, but in 1528: so that granting the editor's supposition to be true, there would still be an anachronism of eight years (1).

(1) All this is taken from Mr Bayle, *Réponse aux Questions d'un Provincial*. Tom. I. Chap. LXVI, pag. 618, & seq. In Moreri's edition of 1725, they have given us the article of *Sylvester de Priere*, at the word *Mozolino*, upon what Father Quetif and Father Echard say of him in their *Bibliothèque* of the Dominican writers. *Mozolino* died at Rome in the year 1523, being then Master of the sacred palace. He never was General of the Dominicans. We find in Father Quetif and Father Echard the article of *Francis Sylvester*, General of the Dominicans, who

died at Rennes on the nineteenth of September 1528, aged fifty-four years. This article is not in the last edition of Moreri, where they will do well to correct the following reference: 'SYLVESTER called de Pri-
'erio, General of the Dominicans, see *Mozolino*.' These words, General of the Dominicans, should be struck out. There is likewise another fault to be corrected in the article *Mozolino*: the Printers have put *Edward Brown*, instead of *Edward Brown*. NEW OBSERVAT.

MEDICIS.

In reckoning up the authors who have wrote the life, or who have made mention, of the famous Marquis of Marignano, John-James de Medicis, brother to Pope Pius IV, it is surprising that the editor should not speak of the *Historia Cisalpina* of *Erycius Puteanus*, or rather of the History of the actions of John-James de Medicis on the borders of the lake of Como. *Erycius Puteanus* is so well known in the learned world, that one has reason to be surprized at Moreri and his Continuators for not naming him among the Historians of the Marquis of Marignano. The History of John-James de Medicis, which he composed, ends with the unfortunate battle of Pavia, where Francis I. was taken prisoner by the Spaniards, and carried to Madrid. In a word, *Erycius Puteanus* was the chief author that should have been consulted in order to give us sure and faithful memoirs concerning the life of the famous Marquis of Marignano, since he was best acquainted with it, and knew the most secret circumstances of it (1).

Besides, in the article of *Erycius Puteanus*, the editor, when he speaks of his works, says nothing at all of that above-mentioned (2). Galeazzo Capella has composed a short History not exceeding five pages, which may serve by way of supplement to that of the Marquis of Marignano, written by *Erycius Puteanus*: and indeed they have been printed together: the latter is an account of the war of Muzzo, a small town on the west side of the lake of Como. The Marquis of Marignano was, properly speaking, the author of that little war; he got by it the town of Marignano, a large sum of money, and the title of Marquis. This supplement has been forgotten as well as the work to which it is subjoined (3).

(1) In the last edition, at the word *MEDICIS*, *MEDICI*, or *MEDIQUIN*, (*John-James*) Marquis of Marignano, they quote, *Erycius Puteanus*, *Hist. Cisalpina*. This History is in the third volume of the *Theſaurus Antiquitatum Italiae*. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) In this edition at the article *PUY* (*Henry du*), or *ERYCIUS PUTEANUS*, they do not give the catalogue of this author's works: they only take notice in general, that he left a very great number of treatises

concerning History, Rhetoric, Mathematics, Philosophy, and Philology, an account of which may be seen in *Valerius Andreas's* *Bibliotheca Belgica*. NEW OBSERV.

(3) They have not yet inserted this particular in the article of the Marquis of Marignano; nor mentioned the book of Galeazzo Capella *de Bello Massim*, which Grævius has inserted in the third volume of his *Theſaurus Antiquitatum Italiae*. NEW OBSERVAT.

MILLET.

That name has been ill spelt in this edition, where they have put *Milet* instead of *Millet*, and that fault is peculiar to this edition, since it is not in the others. It is very necessary to take notice of it, that it may be avoided in the following editions. When I say very necessary, it is with respect to one of the greatest Mathematicians of the past age, who bore that name. I mean Claudius Francis Millet de Chales, a Jesuit, who besides, was of one of the most considerable families in Savoy; a family of which there have been Archbishops in the Tarentaise, first Presidents to the Chamber of Accounts of Chambery, and several other dignified persons (1).

(1) In the edition of 1725 we find, 'MILET DE' and under the word *Chales*, there is *CHALES* (*Claudius Francis*), a Jesuit, see *CHALES*: 'dius-Francis Millet de' a Jesuit, &c. NEW OBSERV.

MILTON.

This article is not very correct. The editor would have given us a just idea of that author, if he had told us what were his true sentiments concerning religion. Milton, who wrote so much in vindication of the wicked and successful attempts which his countrymen made upon the life of the unfortunate King Charles I, their sovereign, was a man of no religion; he indeed professed several religions, but he did no more than flutter upon the surface of every one; for he was first of the church of England; afterwards finding the sect of the Puritans, who are rigid Calvinists, that sprung up in England

England in the year 1565 more to his liking, he embraced it. The same fickleness which had made him quit the church of England, made him likewise desert the sect of the Puritans, in order to join the Anabaptists; people believed then that Milton was entirely fixed, but they were mistaken; the declaration which he made at his death that he was attached to no religion, shewed, at last, what he was, that is, a downright Infidel (a).

Milton was a very bad Poet, and still a worse Orator: his poems are wretched; there is hardly any line in them where the laws of quantity are truly observed; one perceives in reading them, that it is a school-boy's performance; consequently he had no occasion to tell us so, it appears plainly enough upon a slight perusal. Some authors pretend that he did not write the apology for the people of England, and that he only lent his name to the work of a French schoolmaster, who at that time taught children at London (1).

The

(a) Our author should not have contented himself with informing the editor of Moreri that these things are wanting in the article of Milton: he should likewise have pointed out to him the sources where the proofs were to be had, for one of the most essential laws which the author of an Historical Dictionary should observe, is not to advance any thing without citing authorities. MR. BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) Although our author had before him Mr Bayle's Dictionary, where there is a very good article of Milton, he has nevertheless ascribed to Milton sentiments which he was far from entertaining. Instead of relating them such as they were in themselves, he has judged of them according to his own prejudices, and has afterwards denominated them according to the judgment he made of them. This is not acting the part of an Historian, but that of a disputant, or of a declaimer. He even adds, of his own head, some circumstances that are absolutely false. Let us come to the fact. Mr Bayle, speaking of Milton's religion, says after his Historian, that *the sect which pleased him most in his youth was that of the Puritans; but, adds he, in his riper years he liked best the Independents and Anabaptists, because they allowed more liberty to every private person, and in his opinion seemed to come nearest to the primitive Christians: but in the latter part of his life, he separated himself from all communions, and did not frequent any Christian assembly, nor in his house did he make use of the form of worship of any sect. As for the rest, he expressed the profoundest reverence to God, as well by his actions as by his conversation.* These particulars have changed their nature and shape in passing through our author's hands. Milton, says he, *was a man of no religion; he indeed professed several, but he did no more than flatter upon the surface of every one; he was first of the church of England; afterwards finding the sect of the Puritans . . . more to his liking, he embraced it. The same fickleness which had made him quit the church of England, made him likewise desert the sect of the Puritans in order to join the Anabaptists; people believed then that Milton was entirely fixed, but they were mistaken; the declaration which he made at his death, that he was attached to no religion, shewed at last what he was, that is to say, a downright Infidel.* Nothing can be more false than the idea which this author gives of Milton, as being a man of no religion, and a downright Infidel. The works which he published evidently shew that this is a false and slanderous aspersions. The declaration which he is said to have made at his death, that he was attached to no religion, is another notorious falsehood. How could our author have the assurance to advance a thing which all England knows to be a lie.

He adds, that *Milton was a very bad Poet, and still a worse Orator; that his poems are wretched, and that some authors pretend he did not write the apology for the people of England, and that he had only lent his name to the work of a French schoolmaster.* He found all this in Mr Bayle, who took it from Salmasius's answer to Milton, but Mr Bayle has observed that they were idle stories with which some flatterers amused Salmasius. *All these are fables, says he, which I am glad to rectify, that authors may learn to give no credit to calumnies wherewith people fill their heads against their antagonists. They think they make their court by this means to those authors, and occasion their publishing an hundred impertinencies.* This remark has made no impression upon our Critic, it has not hindered him from making a grave and serious narrative of all those impertinencies.

2

In the last editions of Moreri, they have corrected the article of *Milton* from the Dictionary of Mr Bayle: but it is not yet entirely free from faults. I shall observe some of them here. 1. They call Milton's first wife *Mary Powell*, it should be *Mary Powell*. 2. They give the book ascribed to Charles I, the title of *Icon regia*, they should have said *Icon Basilike*. 3. Mr Bayle observes that *Milton absconded at the restoration of King Charles II, and did not appear in public till the amnesty was proclaimed.* He obtained a pardon, adds Mr Bayle, *and lay under no other penalty, but that of being excluded from all public offices.* In Moreri, it is said that he obtained from Charles II a pardon, *without being subjected to any other penalty, than that of being excluded from public offices.* But this was the Parliament's business, not the King's. It is true the author of *Milton's Life* says that in the act of Indemnity, the Parliament contented themselves with excluding him from public offices. But Milton is not named in that act; and this was sufficient to shelter him, without his having occasion for a pardon: for in the act itself it was declared that all those who were not by name excluded from the Indemnity, should be looked upon as comprised therein, and exempted from all penalties, in the same manner as if they were expressly named. John Goodwin, a famous Divine, who had published a book to justify the execution of Charles I, was excluded from public offices. 4. The new editors say, that Milton in his book of *the true religion*, &c, excludes none but Roman Catholics from salvation. They should have said, as Mr Bayle has done, that he excludes none but Roman Catholics from the benefit of a Toleration; and should have added the reason which moved him to exclude them from it. Milton, says Mr Bayle, *shews that Popery ought to be wholly deprived of the benefit of a Toleration, not as it is a religion, but as it is a tyrannical faction which oppresses all others.* 5. The editors have spun out this article by the recital of what passed at Oxford, in the year 1683. *The university of Oxford, say they, being met in a body, on the 2d of July (they should have said the 21st of July) 1683, declared XXVII propositions, extracted out of Milton's works, to be heretical and scandalous, and contrary to the allegiance which subjects owe to their King, &c.* But these XXVII propositions were not all extracted from Milton: several of them were taken from Knox, Buchanan, Baxter, and some other English and Scotch writers. They add, that *the English very much changed their way of thinking afterwards; as well as Bayle himself, who had commended them at that time, [in his *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, for the month of April 1684, Art. III. p. m. 141.]* They should not have said that Mr Bayle changed his way of thinking afterwards, without giving proofs of it. As for the English, it would be easy to shew that they have not changed their way of thinking. By the English, we are not to understand the Court, nor the university of Oxford; but the English nation in general: and if we consult the History of those times, we shall find that the English nation was entirely averse to the arbitrary government, which the court was labouring to introduce; and that the spirit of liberty, which reigned in the two last Parliaments of King Charles II, was the occasion of their being dissolved. 6. In the new edition of Moreri, they may add, that on the 23d of March 1710, the House of Lords caused the decree of the university of Oxford, which we have been speaking of, to be burnt by the hand of the hang-man. NEW OBSERVAT.

(b) These

MILTON. MONTROSE. MORIGGIA. NITARD.

The two most tolerable poems of Milton (*b*) are in blank verse; the first is intitled, *Paradise Lost*: the second, *Paradise Regained*. The first is much better than the second; which gave occasion for some people to say, that Milton is readily found in *Paradise Lost*, but not in *Paradise Regained*. Salmasius was the great (*c*) antagonist of Milton, he discredited him much.

(*b*) These two poems are in English, and they are accounted master-pieces. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(*c*) This expression is too indeterminate: Salmasius having written an Apology for King Charles I, was confuted by Milton. He wrote a Reply, which was

not printed till long after his death. It is therefore certain that he published nothing at all against Milton. Can this be a sufficient reason for saying that he was his great antagonist? MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

MONTROSE.

It is surprising, that in speaking of this Marquis, they have forgot the name of his family: this is the first thing that should be observed when a person of distinction is treated of; and when a circumstance so essential to History is omitted, it is to be feared that the whole body of the article suffers by the author's negligence. But it would not be enough to make the reader take notice of this omission, if I did not supply it: I must therefore tell him, that the name of the Marquis of Montrose was *John Grene* (1).

(1) This Marquis was not called *John Grene*. In the edition of 1712, they have put *James Grene*; and in that of 1725, *James Grene, or Grabam*. *James* is right; but the other word was never spelt *Grene* nor *Grenne*. If our author had consulted some English book, he would have seen that it ought to be written *Grabam*. It is true that the pronunciation of *Grabam*, comes near the French *Gréam* or *Gréme*: but we are not allowed to change the Orthography of foreign names, and to express their pronunciation according to the French Orthography. By this means they would be entirely disguised. For example, if a Frenchman should write *Lak*, or *Lac*; who could guess that he speaks of Mr *Locke*, that celebrated Philosopher? As for the rest, in the edition of 1712, they had wrongly writ *Mont-Rose*, and placed

that article among the names which are so divided: in that of 1725 they have put *Montrose*, which is right; but they have thereby misplaced that article; since it comes in before those of *Montagnana*, *Montagne*, &c.

I shall add, that speaking of the Marquis of Montrose, they should have observed after Father d'Orleans, that *this lord had at first gone with the torrent, and carried arms for the cause of liberty*. They should likewise have set down the reasons which the Scotch alledged to justify their manner of putting him to death; &c. The laws of History require that the pro and con should be fairly stated. Lastly, they might have consulted authors who were more impartial, and better informed, than *Du Verdier*, and *Abbé Raguet*, who are quoted at the end of this article. NEW OBSERV.

MORIGGIA.

In this article they confound the Jesuits and Jesuates, since they give the title of General of the Jesuits to Paul Moriggia, who was only General of the Jesuates: these are two very different orders. This error has escaped all the editors of Moreri; and it is so much the less excusable, as it is not natural to suppose that one should be ignorant to what order a writer of Father Paul Moriggia's reputation belonged; a writer, I say, who has enriched the Republic of Letters, with sixty-one different Treatises (1).

(1) In the last edition, at the word MORIGIA (*Paul*), they have very well said that he was General of the Jesuates. NEW OBSERVAT.

N.

NITARD.

THE editor is mistaken with respect to Cardinal John Everard Nitard, whom he styles Confessor to the King of Spain, Charles II. Father Nitard the Jesuit, was not Confessor to the King of Spain, but to the Queen his mother, Mary-Anne of Austria (1); and the thing is so much the less to be doubted of, as it was the blind confidence which that Prince repofed in him, that brought upon him those disgraces of which the late Madame d'Aunoy has given us such a particular and curious account in her *Memoirs of the Court of Spain*. It is true that this good Father was obliged to leave the kingdom of Spain somewhat abruptly, but to comfort him he was presented with a Cardinal's cap, upon his arrival at Rome. They had no other rewards to give him; for it is well known that the Jesuits do not accept (*a*) of Bishopsrics, and that consequently there is no way of crowning their services, but by the Roman purple.

(1) This is corrected in the last edition. NEW OBSERVAT. Mr Daillé says of it in the twentieth chapter of the third part of his Reply to Father Adam and to Cortibi.

(*a*) It will be proper to read upon this subject what MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

PATRICIUS.

P.

PATRICIUS.

MR Bayle had taken care to warn the editors of *Moreri*, that Francis Patricius the Venetian, who lived towards the end of the XVIth century, never was a Professor of Padua. If they had consulted Thuanus's History, they would not have copied this fault from the old editions. Patricius, after having been seventeen years a Professor at Ferrara, retired to Rome, whither he was brought by the liberalities of Clement VIII, and from that time he never left it (1). This Antiperipatetic proposed such singular tenets (2) concerning the five Categories of Porphyry, that the greatest part of the Philosophers of his time fell upon him.

(1) In the edition of 1707, and the following, they have put, that he taught Philosophy at Ferrara, and at Rome, &c. NEW OBSERVAT. words, you must consult Mr Bayle's Dictionary, in the article PATRICIUS (FRANCISCUS), remark [B]. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) To know the error that is contained in these

PAUL III.

Moreri and his Continuator, only say that Paul III had a son and a daughter, before he was created Pope. That expression is not particular enough; they should have said that this Pope had two children by a lawful (a) marriage, and this declaration was so much the more necessary, as the obscure expression of *Moreri* authorises the opinion which prevails among the greatest part of readers, that the children of Pope Paul III were not legitimate, and consequently that the present family of Parma is derived from the bastards of the first house of Farnese; which is absolutely false: Alexander Farnese, before he was Pope under the name of Paul III, had Constance, who married (b) Basio Sforza, the second of that name, Count of S. Fiore, and Peter Lewis Farnese, who was first Duke of Castro, and afterwards of Parma and Placentia (1). The famous Alexander Farnese, who came into France at the head of a numerous army, was his grandson.

The Abbot Faydit, speaking in his new book of the tragical death of Peter Lewis Farnese, whose interest obliged him to join the Fieschi against the Doria's, calls the latter *Dauria's*, as in another place, where he mentions the Abbot Cotin of the French Academy, he calls him *Cautin*. This odd Orthography serves only to disfigure names, and to make it impossible to know them. Thuanus, in giving them a Latin turn, has corrupted them, and others disfigure them by spelling them ill: both he and they only affect to be (c) singular.

(a) It would have been proper here to give proofs of the marriage contracted by Alexander Farnese, before he had entered into the Ecclesiastical Order; to name the wife that he married, to point out the time and place, and to quote creditable authors: till this is done, it is in vain to condemn those who express themselves as *Moreri* does. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(b) He ought to have said *Basio*, and as I observed, before, he should have named the wife, by whom Alexander Farnese had this daughter, and the son from whom the Dukes of Parma descend. This was so much the more necessary, as he confesses here, that the greatest part of the readers believe that the children of Paul III were not legitimate. Sanfovino, a famous Italian author in the XVIth century, expressly says, in his book of the Families of Italy, fol. 170, that Peter Lewis Farnese was natural son to Paul III. He speaks thus immediately after having bestowed great encomiums upon that Pope. Could he have been ignorant of the marriage, which a man of so distinguished a family, and who in the character of Cardinal, and afterwards in that of Pope, signalized himself so many ways, is supposed to have contracted? The Abbot Faydit, *ubi supra*, pag. 376, says that Peter Lewis Farnese was lawful son to Alexander Farnese, who after his wife's death, was

created Pope, under the name of Onuphrius III, and afterwards under the name of Paul III. Our author has perhaps only this voucher for that Pope's marriage. We desire both one and the other in a very serious manner, that they would communicate to the public, the proofs of a thing so little known as this is. I observe, by the by, that according to Sanfovino, *ibid*. Alexander Farnese at first took the name of Honorius V. This is more probable, than to say that he took the name of Onuphrius III, for there has been no Pope called Onuphrius. He must therefore have taken the name Onuphrius I, and not of Onuphrius III. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the edition of 1712, and those that follow, they have said that, Paul III had been married before he entered into the Ecclesiastical Order, and by his marriage, had a daughter named Constance, who was married to Basio Sforza, second of that name; and a son called Peter Lewis Farnese, whom he made duke of Parma. But they give no proof of his marriage. NEW OBSERVAT.

(c) I believe that they who spell names ill are only to be charged with negligence, or a bad memory: I do not however pretend to excuse them upon that account. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

PAULICIANS.

Moreri and his Continuators are only mistaken in about a century, as to the time in which Paul and John, two brothers, who were heads of the sect of Paulicians, lived. If the editor had given himself the trouble to read the celebrated Bishop of Meaux's *Histoire des Variations*, he would have seen in the 11th book, that these two brothers lived in the VIIth century, and not in the VIIIth, as he has too slightly advanced upon the credit of those who had compiled before him the great Historical Dictionary (1). The fundamental doctrine of these Heretics, was, that there were two principles, Co-eternal, and Independent the one upon the other.

(1) In the last edition they say, after Mr Bayle, who made himself the head of that sect in Armenia that the Paulicians were so called from one Paul, in the VIIth century. NEW OBSERVAT.

PELISSON.

I do not know whether the editor designed in this article to correct Mr Bayle, on the subject of Raymund Pelisson, one of the ancestors of Mr Pelisson, Member of the French Academy: in the Critical Dictionary, Raymund Pelisson is First-President of the Parliament or Senate of Chambery: and in the new edition of Moreri, they change this title into that of First-President of Dauphiné. It is nevertheless very certain that this Raymund was First-President of the Senate of Savoy, and not of the Parliament of Dauphiné: this is a fact known all the world over (1).

(1) In the edition of 1725 we find that Raymund Pelisson was First-President at Chambery: notwithstanding this our author expresses himself as if Mr Bayle had said that of his own head. NEW OBSERVAT.

PENELOPE.

I was surprized to find in the article of this Queen of Ithaca, the question so ill discussed, whether Homer was really one of her lovers. The editor contents himself with telling us in general terms, that, according to some authors, Homer praised Penelope so much, only because he had been in love with her: he would have been able to determine it in the negative, if he had taken the trouble to read Meziriac's notes upon Ovid's Epistles: that learned man brings demonstrative reasons (a) to prove, that Penelope was a very chaste woman; besides, what Aufonius says of her in his 135th Epigram (b), is an unanswerable proof of her virtue. The kisses of Penelope were hardly known during so great a number of years to her son Telemachus, because he was not her husband, for whom she kept all her careffes. I agree that Floridus Sabinus, in his book *Lectionum subcifarum*, Lycophron, Herodotus, and Dempsterus, in his *Paralipomena*, do not say the same thing: but after all, the proofs of Aufonius (c), set in their full force by the learned Mr de Meziriac, ought to prevail on this occasion; and the editor should have declared what he thought on this question, as he has done on several other questions, perhaps much less interesting (1).

(a) The reader will be a little at a loss to understand our author's reasoning, for to prove it to be false that Homer commended Penelope so much, only because he had been in love with her, would require other reasons than this, viz. that Penelope was very chaste, which is nevertheless the only reason that he makes use of. Besides, he does not think that Meziriac has proved by demonstrative reasons, that Penelope was a very chaste woman, nor even that he has so much as attempted to confute those who have spoken ill of her. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(b) This Epigram is no proof. Aufonius makes Penelope speak, it is therefore no more than a testimony which she bears to herself, and one could only infer from it, that the Poet had a very good opinion of that lady's virtue. Every body sees the difference

there is between praising a woman, and shewing by unanswerable proofs, that she was virtuous. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(c) To make a right judgment of the solidity of these words one needs only examine the two foregoing Remarks. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) All the learning which our author displays here did not cost him much; he has taken it from Mr Bayle: but the reasonings are entirely his own. In the last edition of Moreri, after these words: *Some ancient authors have spoken in a very disadvantageous manner of Penelope's conduct, and have written that Homer commended her so much, only because he had been in love with her*; they add, *see upon this head Bayle's Dictionary*. NEW OBSERVAT.

PHILIP D'AQUIN.

It was not a circumstance to be omitted in the new edition, that Philip d'Aquin, who was Professor of the Hebrew tongue at Paris, in the reign of the late (a) King Lewis XIII, and of whom great mention is made in the trial of the late (b) Marshal d'Ancre, had been a Jew. The very nature of that trial should have engaged the editor

(a) See the following remark at the end. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(b) It was needless to put here the word *late*, considering what a long time it is since that Marshal died; besides, that his memory has always been held in abhorrence. Several people think that we should never make use of this word *late* but when those to whom

we direct our speech are ignorant whether the persons talked of be alive or not. They maintain, that a woman, speaking to people who know very well that she is a widow, should only say *my husband*, and not *my late husband*. They would not therefore approve of our author's writing in the year 1706; *The late King Lewis XIII*. MR BAYLE'S REMARK. (1) In

tor to examine this fact in a particular manner; besides, the religion of authors should always be the chief thing minded by Historians (1).

(1) In the edition of 1725, the article AQUIN (Philip) is taken from Mr Bayle's Dictionary, which is cited; but they have not taken all that was essential in Mr Bayle. They should have observed, 1. That d'Aquin had been a Jew. 2. That we find some curious particulars concerning him in the trial of the Marshal d'Ancre. 3. That Flavigny accused him of having corrupted the Hebrew text of Mr le Jay's Bible. 4. They say that he taught Hebrew at Paris in the reign of Lewis XIII, in the XVIIth century. After naming Lewis XIII it was needless to add, in the XVIIth century. NEW OBSERVAT.

P H R Æ A.

In the article of the Englishman John Phræa (not *Phreas*) the editor has forgot to speak of that author's master-piece, which, at the same time, was the first attempt he made in writing: I mean his translation of the discourse of Synesius, who, among the Greek authors, is the most difficult to be understood, and whom all the translators before that time had been afraid to meddle with. That discourse was an encomium upon baldness; Moreri and his editors are not the only persons that have forgot to speak of this translation (1).

(1) In the last edition, at the word PHRÆA, they speak of the translation of Synesius's discourse, copying after Mr Bayle's Dictionary, from whence our author has taken what he says here. NEW OBSERV.

P H I L O S T R A T U S.

Moreri did not consult this author, when he placed the death of Apollonius Tyaneus in the year 97 or 99. This fault should have been corrected in the new edition, since it is certain that this Philosopher died in the reign of Nerva, that is to say, in 96, or at most, in the beginning of the following year (1). There has been published, in the year 1704, a new book upon this subject, which ought to be consulted (2).

(1) In the edition of 1725, at the article APOLLONIUS TYANEUS, it is observed that *some make him die in the year 97, and others in the year 99.* NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) This book is intitled, *Histoire d'Apollonius de Tyane convaincu de fausseté & d'imposture.* Mr du Pin is the author of it. They have made use of it in that edition, in relating the judgments of ancient and modern authors concerning Apollonius Tyaneus. NEW OBSERVAT.

P R Æ T E X T A T U S.

It is a long time since Moreri has been censured for relating ill the story that is told of the young Papyrius Prætextatus; but this has not hindered his Continuators from copying the faults which he had committed in this article, and for which he had been so many times reproved. First, it is not true that Prætextatus, in order to get rid of the importunities of his mother, who pressed him to tell her what had passed in the Senate, where his father had carried him one day, declared to her, that a resolution had been taken, by which, for the time to come, every husband should have two wives; on the contrary, he told her the debate had been whether that would be more for the advantage of the Republic, than to order that a wife should marry two husbands. Those two things, you see, are very different. Secondly, Moreri had been called upon to confirm that tradition by an authority of greater weight than that of Macrobius; in effect, that author's testimony alone would not be enough to silence the Critics. It is very well known that he loved a jest, and sought rather to divert his reader, than to inform him of the truth of facts; but for all this they have added no other testimony to that of Macrobius in the new edition; they should have quoted that of Cato, and that of Aulus Gellius, who speaks of that affair in his first book (1).

(1) In the edition of 1725, they have corrected this article, at the word PAPYRIUS, from Mr Bayle's Dictionary, from which our author has taken all he says here. NEW OBSERVAT.

P R I O L O.

I own they have done justice in the new edition to the memory of the late Mr Priolo, which had been cruelly bespattered in the first edition of Mr Bayle's Critical Dictionary (a), and in the *Sorberiana*; but still the editor might have been more particular in describing the works which Mr Priolo had written, and which, I believe, have not yet been published: here follow the titles of them, which they may insert, if they please, in the next edition of Moreri's Dictionary. *Libri iv. de stultitia humane gentis.* (He might at least have composed a dozen more upon the same subject) *Libri iii. questionum naturalium, &c. Opus emunctum, triginta annorum meditatio, quod jam celebratur sub aperiore titulo, &c. De vita & gestis Henrici Robanni Ducis. De vita & moribus Cesaris Cremonini.* It is even said that he wrote notes upon that author's treatise of the Soul. *Vita Benjamin Prioli. Judicium de Scriptioribus Græcis & Latinis. Epistolarum senilium ad*

(a) Our author should have observed here what he observes at the end of the article; viz. that Mr Bayle had only spoken upon the credit of the *Sorberiana*, which he had quoted in Italicks without warranting any thing. All readers should take notice of this, and should always go directly to the source and stop there, without making those answerable who barely quote from it. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In

• Essay for
Febr. 1703.

† Essay for
April 1703.

ad maximos Europe proceres centuria singularis (1). The author of the *Essais de Littérature*, had likewise used that author very ill *, upon the credit, no doubt (b), of Mr Bayle; as the latter had done upon the credit of Messieurs Sorbier and (c) Graverol; but he (d) retracted afterwards †.

(1) In the last edition, they have said at the end of the article *Priolo*, that this author 'promised seven different books, the titles of which are in the last page of his History. Among these we find his own life, and that of the Duke of Rohan, which are not yet published.' This is taken from Mr Bayle's Dictionary, of which our author is barely the transcriber here. NEW OBSERVAT.

(b) To know whether it was upon credit of Mr Bayle, we should consult the *Memoirs of Trevoux*,

pag. 476 of the fifth volume, Amsterdam edition. Our Author would have spoke, otherwise if he had seen the censure passed in that Journal upon the *Essais de Littérature*. MR. BAYLE'S REMARK.

(c) Mr Bayle has neither quoted, nor was he obliged to quote upon that occasion, Mr Graverol who has not joined his testimony with that of Sorbier, MR. BAYLE'S REMARK.

(d) That is to say, the author of the *Essais de Littérature*. MR. BAYLE'S REMARK.

PRISCILLIAN.

Mr Bayle often censures Moreri; the Continuator of the latter, might, in his turn, have attacked that celebrated Critic. He furnished him with sufficient matter for censure in the article of Priscillian, especially when he says that the Priscillians (a) were condemned, in the IVth and Vth centuries, upon certain points that were canonized in St Augustin, and confirmed by the decisions of the Church: we must consult upon this head the XCIIIrd Epistle of St Leo (1).

(a) He should have said the *Priscillianists*. It is very true that the matter is ample and considerable, but it does not properly belong to a Dictionary purely Historical. In an Historical and Critical Dictionary, such a thing might properly be placed; it is a most curious subject, the question is to know whether, as St Augustin makes liberty to consist in this, that the mind wills without constraint although necessarily, we can approve his doctrine, and condemn that which

supposes the acts of the human will to proceed from a fatal necessity, as the Priscillianists taught. It is easy to prove that there is no distinction alledged by the followers of St Augustin, which the Priscillianists had not adopted, and consequently that their doctrine is at bottom the same with that of St Augustin. MR. BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) See Mr Bayle's Dictionary at the article PRISCILLIAN, remark [H]. NEW OBSERVAT.

PRODICUS.

An Heretic of the IIrd century, being founder of a new sect, which, at that time, made a great noise, should not have been forgot in the new edition; I speak of the sect of the Adamites (1).

(1) In the edition of 1725 we find the article of this *Prodicus*. They have made use of Mr Bayle's Dictionary there, though without quoting him. NEW OBSERVAT.

PUTEANUS.

The Continuator of Moreri had been told that they should correct their Chronology concerning the death of Erycius Puteanus; but not much minding the informations that are given them, which they seldom take the trouble to read, they have continued to place his death in the year 1646 (a). Mr Bullard, in his second volume of the *Académie des Sciences*, places that author's death precisely (b) in the year 1644. Speaking of the book *Statera pacis & belli*, they might have added, (c) that it was a book wholly to the advantage of his Catholic Majesty (1).

(a) They were in the right to continue to say that Puteanus died in the year 1646. MR. BAYLE'S REMARK.

(b) Bullard does not say in express terms, that Puteanus died in the year 1644. We can only infer this from his making him seventy years old, and placing his birth in 1574. MR. BAYLE'S REMARK.

(c) But to add this so as to be understood, it would have been necessary to observe 1. That Puteanus advised the King of Spain to make peace with the United-Provinces (they insinuate this in Moreri). 2. That this peace would have been serviceable to the King of Spain, if we judge of it by the ill success of the war which he continued, and which, after a world of expense and disgrace, he did not get rid of at last in the year 1648, but by an ignominious peace where-in he granted the Dutch every thing that they were

pleased to ask. MR. BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) Our Critic, who has taken all that he says here from Mr Bayle, would have us place, as Bullard does, the death of Puteanus in the year 1644. Yet Mr Bayle had observed, that having consulted the list of Puteanus, he had found there that he died in the castle of Louvain, on the seventeenth of September 1646. The editors of Moreri have corrected the article of Puteanus from Mr Bayle's Dictionary. They had said first: It is observed in his life, that he died in the castle of Louvain, on the seventeenth of September 1646: other writers place his death in the year 1644. They added afterwards: the Funeral Oration upon Erycius Puteanus was pronounced at Louvain, on the nineteenth of September 1646, the day of his burial . . . which shews the true time of his death. NEW OBSERVAT.

QUINTUS

Q.

QUINTUS CURTIUS.

IN this article the editor has corrected part of the faults that had been censured in Moreri: but after all he tells us nothing about the time or age in which Quintus Curtius lived. Nay he seems afraid to declare his opinion. But why not prefer to any other the sentiment of Father le Tellier, who makes that famous author to have lived in the reign of the Emperor Claudius? This opinion appears more probable than that which the editor seems to favour: he does not venture to say that he lived in the reign of Vespasian, but he insinuates it; such caution shews his uncertainty (1).

(1) Our Critic pretends that the opinion of Father le Tellier, concerning the time in which Quintus Curtius lived, is the most probable; but as he does not prove it, his Remark cannot be of any use. NEW OBSERVAT.

R.

RAMUS.

THIS article should have been more enlarged; the exact temperance of this Philosopher, compared with the delicacy and profusion at the tables of those who live now-a-days, particularly deserved some reflexions (1).

(1) The article of *Ramus* is very large in the last edition. They have corrected and improved it from Mr Bayle's Dictionary: but an error has crept into it. They say that *Ramus* was *son to a gentleman, who . . . was obliged to follow the business of a coal-man for his livelihood*: it was not his father but his grandfather, as may be seen in Mr Bayle. They do not speak of the temperance of *Ramus*, which has furnished Mr Bayle with a Remark. NEW OBSERVAT.

RAPIN.

They have forgot a good many things in making an encomium on this learned Jesuit, especially when they give an account of his books; they have not said a word of that which did him the greatest honour: I mean the *Disertatio de nova doctrina, seu Evangelium Jansenistarum*. This book was printed at Paris in the year 1658. The anonymous letter (a) which he published in 1680, likewise made a great deal of noise, and annoyed the party which he attacked: the late Cardinal Cibo, to whom it was addressed, gratefully thanked the learned author for it (1).

(a) See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, January 1686, at the fourth article of the catalogue of new books. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) Our author copies Mr Bayle here, according to custom. In the last edition of Moreri they have made great use of the Critical Dictionary to improve the article of Father Rapin. NEW OBSERVAT.

RIPAMONT.

All the editors of Moreri have forgot, in the article of Joseph Ripamont, to speak of his History of the Milanese; they have indeed quoted the Ecclesiastical History of the city of Milan, which he published; but besides that work, he composed the History of the Milanese; and these are two different books: besides, those editors constantly write *Ripamont*, whereas I maintain it should be *Ripamonte* (1).

(1) In the edition of 1725, at the article of *Ripamonte*, they have added nothing concerning the History of the Milanese, written by this author. Mr Grævius has inserted it, together with the continuation, in the second volume of his *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Italiae*. NEW OBSERVAT.

RONSARD.

This article is not very exact: the editor places the birth of that famous Poet in the year 1524, and several authors say that he was born the same year that Francis I. was taken prisoner in the battle of Pavia: this æra will appear singular to the reader: however, some authors have made use of it. Now Francis I. was taken prisoner before Pavia,

Pavia (and who does not know it?) on the twenty-fifth of February (a), in the year 1525. Ronfard was therefore born in the year 1525 (1). The editor names the mother of that Poet *Jane Chaudrier*, whereas it is *Jane Cbandrier* (2). The family of Chaudrier was so illustrious, that they ought to have known the true way of spelling its name. They might have told us something of the law-suit, which Ronfard carried on against Joachim du Bellay, for the recovery of some Odes, which the latter had stole from him. This affair was for a long time an amusement to the Court; but Ronfard did not consider it as a trifle, he was extremely warm in it. Mr Gueret, in his ingenious fiction *, censures Ronfard, for the harshness and obscurity of his style, they are faults that other authors have likewise reproached him with; besides this Poet often transgresses the rules of modesty; and we find in his works some expressions that give us no great idea of the purity of his morals. The Critics especially have very much exclaimed against some verses in the second Ode of the second book, and not altogether without reason.

* Le Parnasse réformé.

The editor should have cleared the question whether Ronfard was really a priest, as some Protestant ministers called him by way of reproach: for my part, I am convinced that he was in Holy Orders; but I do not believe he had taken that of priesthood. I ground the first part of this proposition upon the very terms of his answer, to the ministers who had attacked him (3).

(a) Apply here, what has been observed above, in the article *Francis II*, Note (a), concerning the way of making the year begin at Easter. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.
(1) In the last edition, they say, that Ronfard was born on the 25th of February, 1525. NEW OBSERV.
(2) This error, is still in the edition of 1725. NEW OBSERVAT.
(3) All that our author says here, is taken from Mr Bayle's Dictionary. NEW OBSERVAT.

RUFINUS.

Mr Bayle refers us to Moreri's Dictionary, concerning the circumstances, and the year of the death of this favourite to the Emperor Theodosius. I readily agree to the circumstances, but I absolutely reject the epoch (a) of his death: in effect it is more reasonable, upon this occasion, to follow Mr Flechier, who places this death (b), under the year 397, in his History of Theodosius the Great, than to follow Moreri (1). Besides some reflexions of the editor, upon the doubts which the insolent fortune of Rufinus, raised in Claudian, whether there was any such thing as a providence, would certainly have been a great embellishment to this article.

(a) That the readers might not have the trouble of consulting other books, this author ought to have set down the year, in which, according to Moreri, Rufinus was killed. It was the year 395. He is in the wrong to reject this epoch; it is a true one, as might easily be proved. I content myself with saying that Socrates in the first chapter of the sixth book, of the Ecclesiastical History, fixes the death of Rufinus on the 27th of November, of that same year, in which the Emperor Theodosius died. Now Mr Flechier says, and he says right, that this Emperor died on the 17th of January 395. For the further information of the reader, I must tell him, that Mr Flechier does not say, in express terms, that Rufinus died in the year 397. It can only be inferred from this, that under the year 392, speaking of some injustices, committed by Rufinus, he adds, that *five years after*, Rufinus was one of the causes, &c. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.
(b) If our author had consulted Mr Flechier's book, he would have expressed himself otherwise. See the foregoing remark. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.
(1) In the edition of 1712, and the following, they have said that Rufinus was killed in the year 395; or 397, according to Mr Flechier. NEW OBSERVAT.

S.

SCHOMBERG.

IN the article of this Cardinal, the editor has forgot to speak of the fine letter which he wrote upon the death of Sir Thomas More, Chancellor of England. This Cardinal was a near relation (a) to the Nun whom Luther married (1). It was upon this subject, that he pronounced in the Sacred College a discourse so moving, that it drew tears from several

(a) Mr de Seckendorf has confuted this: it would be necessary to know whether in the *Essais de littérature*, they quote any author who has mentioned this moving discourse, on the subject of that Cardinal's relation having married Luther; for, as I said before, the author of the *Essais de littérature*, is only to be credited so far as he brings good vouchers. It is even

proper to consult the authors whom he quotes, for sometimes he makes them say more than they have said. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the last edition, they have corrected the article of this Cardinal, from Mr Bayle's Dictionary; but they have not thought fit to speak of the letter which he wrote upon the death of Sir Thomas More, nor

several of the Cardinals: mention has been made of this discourse in one of those periodical pieces * which have appeared in so great number for some time.

* Essais de
Littérature.

nor of his pretended relation to the Nun whom Luther married; the first of these facts being not of consequence enough to be inserted in Moreri; and

Mr Bayle having observed, that Mr de Seckendorf had affirmed the second to be false. NEW OBSERVAT.

SCIOPPIUS.

It would seem that the editor could not clear up the true date of Scioppius's death, for he says nothing at all of it. It is true, that people have spoke very differently as to the time when it happened, but that very reason should have obliged our author to declare what he thought of it. Mr Baillet relates the different opinions of the authors of that time on this point; but most certainly Scioppius died in the year 1649. The proofs which Mr Bayle alledges are decisive: Patin likewise places his death in the same year, and we cannot doubt of it, when we read the fifteenth Letter (of the first edition) in the collection of that author's letters which are published (1). They have forgot in the new edition to speak of the most virulent book which he published against the Jesuits, for whom he had an implacable hatred; it is intituled, *Anatomia Societatis, (a) & de Stratagematis Jesuitarum*. This book made a great noise, and did not do Scioppius all the honour he expected. His best books are those (b) which have not been published, and which remained in the hands of the learned Pieruccius his universal heir. The conformity between the principles of that famous Critic, and those of the Jesuit Melchior Inchoffer has giving occasion to believe that the memoirs of the one had passed through the hands of the other, who had made use of them against the Jesuits.

(1) In the editions of 1707 and 1712, they had said that Scioppius died in 1649, aged above fourscore: but in that of 1725, they take notice that he died in the year 1649, at the age of 73. In effect, Mr Bayle quotes a passage of Scioppius, where he affirms that he was in his seventeenth year, in the year 1593. NEW OBSERVAT.

(a) The *Anatomia Societatis* is not the same book, with that *de Stratagematis Jesuitarum*, as our author supposes here. They are two different works: the Jesuit Forerus, who has answered this *Anatomia*, reckons up several other of Scioppius's books against the society, and proves that he had often copied himself. He falsely ascribes to him the *mysteria Patrum Jesuitarum*, which is a book written by Andrew Rivetus, Professor of Divinity at Leyden. For the rest, I think the editors of Moreri should labour to find out the cause of Scioppius's hatred to the Jesuits, for he behaved in a civil manner to them for some time. He vindicated them in his *Ecclesiasticus*, from the accusations which the King of Great Britain had brought against them. It is true that his apology is indirect, for it only consists of a numberless heap of passages from Luther, which animate the Protestants, &c. to extirpate the Kings and Princes who adhere to the Pope, and oppose the reformation of the Church. Never did any man more warmly excite the Roman Catholic Princes, to the extirpation of Heresies than Scioppius, and nevertheless he charges (in his *Stratagemata*) that spirit of violence, as a crime upon Fo-

rerus. So true it is that he only wrote out of passion. He rather chose to contradict and criticize himself, than not to censure his enemies. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(b) This may be true as to some of them; but there are others (those for example which he wrote to explain the prophecies) that are not so good as what he published. Few people were more masters of the Holy Scripture than he: upon all occasions he found means to apply passages of Scripture in his disputes against the Protestants: one may particularly observe this method in his *Ecclesiasticus*, which was printed in the year 1611, and is a confutation of King James's apology for the oath of allegiance. But he puts new and forced constructions upon the greatest part of the passages which he quoted from Scripture. If he did this before, he was a visionary, judge what his writings upon the prophecies must be, when he was become a kind of fanatic. It is to be observed that his controversial works have always some new turn; and as he had read from end to end, all Luther's works, in order to extract out of them every passage which a satirical wit can so represent, as to make that Reformer odious and contemptible, he improved his talent in this particular, more than the greatest part of the other writers in controversy have done. He shews more strength in quoting facts than in alledging reasons, tho' in this last respect, he is not weak. His fine Latin is no small ornament to his writing. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

SENNERT.

The editor is mistaken as to the year of this famous Physician's birth, and he puts it five years back, without having any probable reason for it. He places it in the year 1577, whereas most certainly it comes under the year 1572; besides our author says in a very concise and dry manner, that the opinion of this Philosopher, viz. that *the souls of beasts are not material*, caused him to be charged with impiety. Speaking of this tenet, he should have told us every thing that accompanied it, and the arguments by which Sennert supported it. This Physician did not only affirm, that *the souls of beasts are not material*, but he rejected (*lib. 1. de plast. seminis facultate*) the opinion of those who maintain, they are not of a more noble nature than the elements (1); and he said that they are naturally as much immortal, as the soul of man; so that if the latter does not perish with the body, as well as the former, it is owing to a particular favour of the Creator. He owned indeed that the souls of beasts were not produced from matter, consequently

(1) Our author, who has seldom or never given himself the trouble of quoting, has altered his method here; and to prove that Sennert rejected the opinion of those, who maintain that the soul is not of a more noble nature than the elements, he quotes, in a parenthesis, (*lib. 1. de plast. seminis facultate*;) to inform us that this was the book where Sennert rejected that opinion. He

imagined, no doubt, that this stroke of learning, would embellish his remark. What pity it is, that he did not succeed! He went very artfully about it. Thus; Mr Bayle, whom he copies here *verbatim*, had quoted Sennert. *ubi sup. c. 9. p. 137*. Our Critic being willing to fill up this *ubi sup.* and to give the title of the book, to which this quotation refers, ran backwards

over

SENNERT. SEXTUS AB HEMMINYA. SIMONIS.

consequently he laughed at the education of the schoolmen. But after all, so long as he did not say that their souls were really immortal, there was no room for taxing him with impiety (2).

over a dozen of quotations; but unluckily for him he stopped at this: *vide Jacobum Schegkium, lib. i, de plast. feminis facultate, apud Sennert. ibid. cap. v, pag. 127*; where, as you see, Mr Bayle quotes a book of Schegk's, and not of Sennert's. NEW OBSERVAT. (2) In the last edition this article is corrected from Mr Bayle's Dictionary, which has supplied our author with what he says here. NEW OBSERVAT.

SEXTUS AB HEMMINYA (a).

This article has been omitted, or perhaps this author is not known (1); he should be very well known to the Astrologers, since he was in his (b) time with respect to them, what the famous Picus of Mirandola was in his: no man was ever more attached to that science than Sextus in the first part of his life; but having had time to discover the fallacy and uselessness of it, he became afterwards one of its greatest adversaries, and gave it terrible blows (c). Happy had it been for the world, if he could have succeeded in wholly undeceiving mankind as to an art which has already seduced such great numbers. The Sextus, of whom I speak, was a great Geometrician, and it was by the progress he had made in that mother of the sciences (d), that he discovered the vanity of Astrology, and resolved to write against its principles. Astrology has had illustrious favourers; Mr Faydit, in his Remarks upon Virgil and Homer, says, that Pope Paul III was strongly attached to it, and that he gave the bishopric of Civita Vecchia to Luke Gauricus de Fano, because he was very well skilled in it: this fact wants some proofs (e).

(a) He should have said *Sextus ab Hemminga*. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) We find this article in the edition of 1707, and the following ones, at the word *Sixte de Hemminga*. NEW OBSERVAT.

(b) Our author's Remarks should be suited to the character of Moreri's Dictionary, which is a work chiefly designed for the instruction of readers that have no learning. A work of that nature should explain every thing without making it necessary to consult another book. Our author, after the manner he speaks here, does not inform us when Sextus ab Hemminga and Picus of Mirandola lived; instead of *his age*, he should have said *the XVth century*; and a little lower instead of *in his*, he should have said *in the XVth*. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(c) He should have told us what method Hemminga took to combat Astrology. It was this. He drew the horoscope of thirty persons, most of them Princes, Kings, Popes, &c. observed in these horoscopes the rules of art with great exactness, and shewed that nothing had happened to these thirty persons of what should have happened to them according to the rules of judicial Astrology. Those who will give the article of that author may consult Suffridus Petri, in the ninth chapter of the thirteenth decad of authors born in Friesland. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(d) I wish our author had quoted some authority upon this head, it does not appear, that, in order to know the vanity of Astrology, a person must make a progress in Geometry. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(e) It is certain that Thuanus relates, in the fourth book of his History, pag. m. 87. that Paul III being much attached to judicial Astrology, had for that very reason a great friendship for Luke Gauricus, admitted him to his conversation and table, and at last gave him the bishopric of Civitate. *Ac tandem Civitatenſi Episcopatu donavit*. There are books written by Luke Gauricus, in the titles of which he is styled *Episcopus Civitatenſis*. The Abbot Faydit is only mistaken in believing that the bishopric which Paul III gave to Gauricus was that of Civita Vecchia, and that Gauricus was a native of Fano. Civita Vecchia is

not an episcopal city, and it belongs to the Pope, but the bishopric which Gauricus had lies in Apulia, in the kingdom of Naples, under the Archbishop of Benevento, and is not the same with that of Civita Ducale, as is affirmed in Moreri at the word *Gauric (Luke)*. Gauricus was not born in Fano, but in a place called in Latin *Geophanum*, and in Italian *Gisani*, which is in the kingdom of Naples, in the hither principality five miles from Salerno. Consult Mr Baudrand under the word *Geophanum*.

It will not be amiss to confuse here a thing which Mr Teiffier, in his additions to Thuanus, has related on the testimony of Tollius, in *Appendice de infelicitate Litteratorum*. He tells us that Luke Gauricus having foretold that John Bentivoglio should be banished out of his native country, and deprived of his sovereignty, incurred the indignation of that Prince who caused him to be tortured to death. This cannot be true for John Bentivoglio was expelled Bologna by Pope Julius II, in the year 1506, and died at Milan in 1508; and it is certain that Luke Gauricus was made a Bishop by Paul III, whose Papal dignity commenced only in the year 1534. Mr Teiffier should have contented himself with saying, that John Bentivoglio, enraged at Gauricus's threatening predictions, caused him to be put to the rack; and he should have added, that he did not die on that occasion. Cardan treats him as a Quack, and accuses him of having rather conjectured the ruin of the Bentivoglio's from the situation of things, than of having foreknown it by the stars. Gauricus, says he, in libro *Genitarum*, pag. m. 206. *à Bentivolis tortus in eculeo. Id certe ex astris non viderat, quamvis excidium familie ominaretur plus ex conjectura rerum quam astrorum, fuit enim Symplicius egregius*. Thuanus having said in one place that Gauricus was a Bishop, and in another, that he died in the year 1559, it was easy to infer that he did not die upon the rack. Is it reasonable to think that a Bishop of Italy should have been treated in this manner, especially by a family such as that of the Bentivoglio's, who had no where any sovereign power. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

SIMONIS.

Theodore Simonis, or Simon, is an author who has made noise enough to deserve a place among the many articles of the Simons and the Theodores that we find in the new edition. I confess I expected with impatience to see how the editor would treat this article: I do not know whether he had any reasons for omitting it, or if it was a mere forgetfulness (1). Simonis was one of the most particular friends of the famous Bishop

(1) The article of SIMON or SIMONIS was still omitted in the edition of 1712: it is in that of 1725, taken from Mr Bayle's Dictionary. NEW OBSERVAT. (a) This

Bishop of Ypres (*a*), and if any thing did hurt to the memory of Janſenius, it was chiefly his intimacy with that German, to whom (*b*) is aſcribed the book *de Atheiſmo in Polonia, ex atheo libello*, &c. Some authors have attempted to clear him of this terrible accuſation, but they have not had all the ſucceſs they expected. There was one Francis Simonis, to whom has been aſcribed the book *de fraudibus Hæreticorum*, written by Father Heſtrier (*c*) (2).

(*a*) This appears to me very falſe, and is at leaſt very contrary to the facts which have been related in the Critical Dictionary, in the remark [*f*], of the article JANSENIUS, and in the remark [*g*], of the article SIMON. MR. BAYLE'S REMARK.

(*b*) It is by no means true that the impious book of which our author ſpeaks is aſcribed to Theodore Simon or Simonis, who had ſome conferences with Janſenius. He does not give us the right title of it which he might eaſily have found in the Critical Dictionary, pag. 2719, of the ſecond edition. The title of that book, printed at Cracow in the year 1588, is *Simonis Religio*. By the date of the impreſſion it is

evident that the Theodore Simonis, of whom we ſpeak here, is not the author of that book, for he was a young man when he had ſome diſputes with Janſenius, about the year 1630. MR. BAYLE'S REMARK.

(*c*) He ſhould have ſaid that Father Eſtrix, a Flemiſh Jeſuit, is the author of the book *de fraudibus Hæreticorum*, which has appeared under the falſe name of Francis Simonis. MR. BAYLE'S REMARK.

(2) Our author has confounded himſelf ſtrangely in relating what he had found in Mr Bayle: this is a pretty common thing with him; but he may be ſaid to have out-done himſelf here. NEW OBSERVAT.

SOPHRONIA.

The editor has not corrected the faults which Moreri had committed on the ſubject of this Roman lady. It is true Euſebius Cæſarienſis ſpeaks of her beauty and chaſtity in the fourteenth chapter of his eighth book; but he does not name her, neither do we know from whence it comes that Hiſtorians afterwards gave her the name of Sophronia. Mr Bayle, whom few things eſcape, owns that he no where found the name of *Sophronia*; conſequently the editor ſhould not have cited Euſebius, as his voucher with reſpect to this name. This is not the only fault which he has copied from the firſt editions; for example, his expreſſion is not juſt when he ſays that this lady may be called the Chriſtian Lucretia; this is not the meaning of Charles Stephens's words, which Moreri and his Continuators have ill tranſlated (1).

(1) In the laſt edition the article of this lady is corrected from Mr Bayle's Dictionary, which our author continues to copy here. NEW OBSERVAT.

SPANHEIM.

In this article mention is made of the late King of England, William III, as if he were ſtill living: that Prince died in the year 1702, and the Dictionary was finiſhed about the end of 1704; conſequently the article *Spanheim* being in the laſt volume, which was printed more than two years after that Prince's death, they ſhould have avoided this expreſſion, *William, Prince of Orange, (a) now King of England*, ſince that King had been dead two whole years when they made uſe of the word *now* (1).

(*a*) That cenſure is well-grounded, and I ſhall take this opportunity to warn thoſe who ſhall publiſh new editions of Moreri in Holland, that they ought to rectify certain things in the article of William III, King of England. In the firſt place, they have ſaid in this article that while he was yet Prince of Orange he gave battle thrice to the French, at Senef, at St Denys, and at Mons. This ſhews they did not know that the battle of St Denys, and that of Mons, are the ſame; and thus inſtead of three battles they only mention two. They have forgot that of Caſſel. Beſides this they ſhould have ſet down the date of every one of theſe three battles, and not have made uſe of the word *gave*, as it ſignifies that the Prince of Orange was the attacker: which is not true. He was attacked at Senef; they met him at Caſſel; he attacked only at St Denys, and that too when the French, knowing that the peace was ſigned at Nimeguen, were not upon their guard. Laſtly, they ſhould have told us whether the Prince was victorious or vanquiſhed in every one of theſe three battles. In the ſecond place they affirm, that he ſet out in his expedition to England on the firſt of November 1688. They ſhould have ſaid the twenty-ninth of October 1688. In the third place they ſay, that contrary winds having obliged him to put back, he ſet out a ſecond time on the eighth, they ſhould have ſaid the

eleventh. In the fourth place they affirm, that he afterwards gave battle twice to the French, once at Steenkerken, and another time near London (they ſhould have ſaid *Landen*). The ſame negligences that I have obſerved upon the firſt article are to be found here; the date is wanting as well as the circumſtance whether this Prince was the attacker or attacked, the vanquiſher or vanquiſhed. I make uſe of the Dutch edition of 1698. That of Paris 1699 has ſtruck out the greateſt part of this article of William III. I hope what I have been ſaying will be of ſome uſe to thoſe who ſhall take the trouble to give us new reviſals of Moreri. They will ſee in what manner an hiſtorical article ſhould be filled up, and that without being very long, it may contain the moſt eſſential circumſtances. They will do well to correct the article of the Marſhal de Luxembourg. It is falſly affirmed there that the Prince of Orange was obliged, in the year 1674, to raiſe the ſiege of Charleroi, and that he was worſted at the battle of St Denys near Mons, in the year 1678 (2). MR. BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) This has been corrected in the edition of 1712. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) See the advertiſement to the ſecond edition of the *Critical Dictionary*, near the end. NEW OBSERVAT.

STOFLERUS.

In the article of this famous Mathematician, it was natural to expect ſome account of the friendſhip which he had for his diſciple Munſter, to whom he left copies of all his works, of which the latter knew afterwards very well how to make a profitable uſe

VOL. V.

8 U

to

STOFLERUS. STROZZY. SULPICIUS SEVERUS. TASSO.

to himself, and by that means to publish excellent treatises in his own name (1).

(1) Mr Bayle, in the article of *Stoflerus*, says, that he had a great friendship for his disciple *Munster*, and that this did no small service to the learned world; since if it had not been for the copies which he allowed him to take of his books, they would have been lost for ever when the originals were burnt. Here is the use that our author makes of these words, according to his manner of conceiving things, and of relating them. 1. He pretends that it was natural to expect, in the new edition of *Moreri*, some instances of the friendship which *Stoflerus* had for his disciple *Munster*, but this is said at a venture, for Mr Bayle, his sole and his only author, takes notice of no other mark of his friendship than what we have just seen. 2. He af-

firms that *Stoflerus* left *Munster* copies of all his works, which is as much as to say, that *Stoflerus* did himself write, or caused others to write, copies of his works, and that he left them at his death to *Munster*: but neither of these things is true, he only suffered him to take copies of his books. 3. He adds, that *Munster* knew afterwards very well how to make a profitable use of them to himself; and by that means to publish excellent treatises in his own name: that is to say, that *Munster* gave himself for the author of *Stoflerus*'s works, published them as his own, and took the glory of them from his friend: but what proof does he give of this? None at all: it is not his way to give proofs of what he asserts. NEW OBSERVAT.

STROZZY.

The article of Philip Strozzy is very dry: that generous citizen, who made himself a sacrifice for the liberty of his country, deserved to have something more said of him: particularly they should not have forgot this line of Virgil, which that brave Florentine wrote upon his chimney with the point of his dagger, a moment before he died (a):

Exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor (1).

(a) He should have said *before he killed himself*. This would have instantly informed the reader what kind of death that Florentine died, a remarkable particular. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the last edition we find a very good article of this Strozzy, taken from Mr Bayle's Dictionary, from which our author has borrowed what he says here. NEW OBSERVAT.

SULPICIUS SEVERUS.

The Continuator of *Moreri* had already been told, that it is not certain this Historian was of the Agenois, and that his saying in his works that Phœbadius of Agen was his Bishop, is no reason for concluding he was himself of that diocese; they have nevertheless made short work with the difficulty, which, notwithstanding their decision, subsists still, and is even favoured by many (1).

(1) Mr Bayle, in the article of *SEVERUS* (*Sulpicius*), observes, that he was undoubtedly of the province of *Aquitaine*; but that it is not certain whether he was of the diocese of *Agen*: and he puts the following note in the margin: he says, that *Phœbadius*, Bishop of *Agen*, was his Bishop. This does not prove that he was born in that diocese. This occasioned our author's say-

ing, that the Continuator of *Moreri* had already been told, &c. They have not yet made use of Mr Bayle's Remark. In the edition of 1725, we find that *Sulpicius Severus* was born at *Agen* in *Aquitaine*, or in that diocese, since, according to his own testimony, *Phœbadius* of *Agen* was his Bishop. NEW OBSERVAT.

T.

TASSO.

THE name of the author of this Poet's life is wrong, the editor writes it *Decharné*, instead of *de Charnes*: he is Dean of Villeneuve lez Avignon, a man distinguished by his love for learning, and by the works he published some years ago: he is now writing the Life of Petrarch; but what the editor might have added to his article, and which would have been a great embellishment to it, is, that John Baptista Pigna, who composed the History of the Princes of Este, to whom he was a domestic, was that enemy to Tasso, of whom Tasso complains on several occasions without naming him, and whose character and manners he has described so ingeniously in his *Aminta*, under the name of Mopsus. This observation was neither made by Mr Menage in his Commentary upon the *Aminta*, nor by the Abbot de Charnes in his Life of Tasso; I owe it to the author of the *Essais de Littérature*, who gave an extract of the Life of that Poet in his Essay (a) of June and July 1703 (1). Mr Bayle, who has said

(a) As I have not read that Essay, I do not know whether the author quotes any writer who may have told him this particular concerning John Baptista Pigna: if he has cited no authority, the editors of *Moreri* would be very much to blame if they inserted this particular in the article of Tasso: they ought to

mistrust, as a romantic invention, every thing that is asserted without proof in the *Essais de Littérature*. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the last edition no mention is made of Pigna in the article of Tasso. They have written the name of the Abbot de Charnes well. In the *Mémoires*

said but two words of Tasso, in the first edition of his Critical Dictionary, had promised to enlarge the article of that Poet in the second edition; he has not kept his word; I call upon him in the name and behalf of the learned, to fulfil his promise in the Supplement to that Dictionary, which, as they write from Holland, he is going to publish.

Memoirs de Littérature, of Mr de Sallengre, Tom. I, pag. 184, he is called *Mr de Charner*. This is, no doubt, an error of the press. NEW OBSERVAT.

T A V E R N I E R.

In the article of this famous traveller, the editor has forgot to tell us something of the disputes which he had formerly with the Dutch authors. He was the aggressor in his *Histoire de la conduite des Hollandois en Asie*, wherein he used the directors of the East-India company very ill. Soon after, the author of *l'Esprit de Mr Arnauld* vindicated these gentlemen: Mr Jurieu espoused their cause, and inveighed in a base manner against the poor Mr Tavernier, who likewise found himself engaged afterwards in the quarrel between Father Tellier, and Mr Arnauld. This traveller did not speak of the Jesuits with due moderation in the relation he gave of his travels; which conduct drew upon him some satirical strokes in the second part of the *Defense des nouveaux Chrétiens*. Mr Arnauld, it is true, afterwards vindicated him in the third volume of his *Morale pratique* (1). Who could ever have imagined that a Merchant should have any-wise been concerned in the controversy between these two learned Divines? Methinks this fact, and the first that I mentioned would have been no small embellishment to the article *Tavernier* (2).

(1) Our author has taken all this from Mr Bayle. NEW OBSERVAT. conduct of the Dutch in Asia: but no notice is taken of Father Tellier's complaints, nor of Mr Arnauld's answer. It was thought these particulars did not belong to Moreti's Dictionary, NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) In the edition of 1725, where the article of *Tavernier* is corrected from Mr Bayle's Dictionary, they mention this traveller's book concerning the

T E T T I.

This article deserved a place in the new edition: Scipio Tetti made so much noise in the XVth century, that he ought not to have been forgotten in this work: he was a man, they will say, who held bad principles of religion, the remembrance of which, it is proper to extinguish. According to this way of reasoning we must say, that St Epiphanius had given himself a very needless trouble, and even that his work may have dangerous consequences, he who has given us a collection of all the Heresies that had been formed in the bosom of the Church down to his time. Such a work as that is so far from being dangerous to religion, that, on the contrary, I believe, with an holy Father, it is very useful towards the establishment of it. Is not that diversity of sentiments, that perpetual opposition between those who have abandoned the fixed point of unity, an invincible proof for the Divinity of our religion? Does it not shew, that without this unity of the Church, there is nothing but illusions, precipices, and dangers?

To return to Scipio Tetti; what brought troublesome disgraces upon him, such particularly as they are described by Thuanus (*in vita sua lib. 1.*) was his short treatise *de Apollodorus*. Mr Baillet, who speaks of it in his works, puts a high value upon it; that Bibliographer should nevertheless have praised it moderately; the errors of which Tetti was accused, and which they pretended were to be found in that small piece, were not a just ground for Baillet to ground his esteem upon (a). That work excepted, Tetti's morals were good, and Benedictus Ægius, who published that author's book, praises him very much in his notes; and I am persuaded, that, if Tetti had not lived in a country where the appearance and shadow of a crime in certain matters passes for the crime itself, he would not have found himself in those melancholy circumstances to which he was reduced in his latter days (1).

(a) The treatise of Scipio Tetti *de Apollodorus*, was printed at Rome in the author's life-time, and from thence we may conjecture that it contains no Heresies. But we shall be fully convinced by reading it, that there is nothing in that small book which can offend the Inquisition: neither indeed was this the thing which caused him to be persecuted, and sent to the galleys. Mr Baillet therefore was not in the wrong to commend that treatise, and could not have been hindered from doing it by the errors which they said were to be found there: no body had said so. Mr. BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the edition of 1712 we do not find the article of *Scipio Tetti*: but they give it in that of 1725, taken word for word from Mr Bayle's Dictionary. NEW OBSERVAT.

T I M O M A C H U S.

The editor sometimes is mistaken in his Arithmetical calculations; for instance, in the article of *Timomachus* he says, that Cæsar bought of this Painter the picture of Medea and Ajax, for 80 talents, which are equal to the sum of 48000 crowns: he is mistaken, 80 talents make a larger sum in French money; if we believe the learned Jesuit, who has given us that fine edition of Pliny, where mention is made of

Timomachus,

TIRANNION. TIRESIAS. TANAQUIL. TANNERUS. TRUSCHES.

Timomachus, and of the purchase which Cæsar made, we shall find that 80 talents are equal (a) to 19200 livres (1).

(a) Our author's Printers have omitted a cypher here, and have thereby made him contradict himself, for 19200 livres are a smaller sum than 48000 crowns. Father Hardouin, (in Plin. tom. 5. pag. 230.) who is the Jesuit quoted here, pretends, that the 80 talents of Pliny make 192000 livres. MR BAYLE'S RE-MARK.

(1) Our author, in copying Mr Bayle here, has

very ill expressed himself. He says the picture of *Medea and Ajax*, as if it were only one picture. Mr Bayle observes that this Painter drew an *Ajax and a Medea, which were bought, &c.* In the last edition of Moreri, where they have corrected this article from the Dictionary of Mr Bayle, they have said, that, among other pictures, he drew a *Medea and an Ajax, which Cæsar bought, &c.* NEW OBSERVAT.

TIRANNION.

This article has been pretty well corrected; but they should not have forgot to mention the number of books which that author wrote. That which he composed to prove that the Latin tongue was derived from the Greek, deserved particularly to be taken notice of in a book of the nature of a Dictionary (1).

(1) In the edition of 1725 the article of *Tirannion* there is a fault committed in it. They say that *Tirannion* was before called *Diocle*; it should be as which our author has taken what he says here. But Mr Bayle writes it, *Diocles*. NEW OBSERVAT.

TIRESIAS.

Several things are wanting in the article of this antient soothsayer: by correcting it too much, they have entirely disfigured it. They say nothing concerning Necromancy, which *Tiresias* openly professed, nor concerning the opinion which *Lucian* ascribes to him in his treatise of *Astrology* (1).

(1) They have likewise corrected this article from Mr Bayle's Dictionary: but they have not inserted the two particulars which our author mentions here, and which he has taken from Mr Bayle. NEW OBSERVAT.

TANAQUIL.

This article is maimed, the merit of that illustrious Queen is not known, by what Moreri and his Continuators say of her. The single merit of knowing how to make stuffs (which is all that the editor says of her) would not have been a sufficient reason to transmit her name to posterity, and to engage St Jerom to speak of her so advantageously, in his book against Jovinian. That Father observes, that *Tarquinius Priscus* is much less known than his wife, and that the virtue of that Queen will ever have a place in the memory of men. The only fault she was reproached with, is that of having been too imperious; *Juvenal* seems to charge her with it in his sixth satire: but this reproach is not consistent with the excessive praises which St Jerom has bestowed upon her. The editor should have employed his parts in reconciling these contradictions (1).

(1) In the last edition we find a very good article of this Queen, drawn up from Mr Bayle's Dictionary: but they tell us nothing of the fault which it seems she was charged with, of having been too imperious. Let the reader decide whether this reproach, allowing it to be well-grounded, is inconsistent with the praises of St Jerom; and whether the too imperious humour of a woman, destroys the great virtues which she may otherwise be possessed of. NEW OBSERVAT.

TANNERUS.

This article has been omitted, and I think that it ought not to be so in a new edition. *Tannerus* was a very learned Jesuit in Germany, who has made himself famous by his works, and particularly by the anatomy of the Confession of Augsburg, which he published, and which raised terrible adversaries against him (1).

(1) We find the article of *Tannerus* in the last edition. NEW OBSERVAT.

TRUSCHES.

The editors of Moreri should long ago have discovered a gross fault, which they have committed in speaking of Gebhard Trusch, Archbishop of Cologne, whom they make immediate successor to John Gebhard of Mansfeld, likewise Elector of Cologne. Ought they not to know that there were three Electors between Mansfeld and Trusch; in this the last editor is less excusable than the preceding ones, since if he had taken the trouble to consult the works of the Critics, he would have discovered the error of those who published the first editions, and of late he needed only to have consulted the *Réponse aux questions d'un Provincial*, of the celebrated Mr Bayle, where he would have found a particular article, in which that subject is very minutely handled. As *Trusch* is near the end of the Dictionary, which was only finished in the last months of the last year; and as Mr Bayle's book had appeared in France about the middle of the same year, the editor had still time enough to correct that fault, but it costs people too much trouble to do things with the utmost exactness. There is a great resemblance between the conduct of these two Electors. Trusch, after the example of Mansfeld, finding

finding the law of celibacy too harsh for him, shook off the yoke, and married; but he did not imitate the docility of his predecessor, who, being convinced of the inconsistency between a wife and an Archbishopric, submitted to the laws of the Church, and quitted his dignity with a good grace; whereas Trusch, to the last hour of his life, insisted upon keeping both. The likeness that there is between the adventures of these two Prelates, is, no doubt, what obliged Moreri and his Continuator to bring them so near one another (1).

(1) Mr Bayle had censured this fault of Moreri, in his *Réponse aux Questions d'un Provincial*, Tom. I, Chap. LX, pag. 536. In the edition of 1725, they have made use of the particulars which he relates concerning Gebhard Trusch, though they do not cite him at the end of that article. NEW OBSERVAT.

U.

URCEUS.

THE native country of this learned man should not have been the subject of a paradox (a): the editor finding Mr Bayle uncertain in this point, and wavering (b) between the different sentiments of Pierius Valerianus and Gesnerus, hesitated after his example. But the doubt was not difficult to remove, upon this occasion the authority of Pierius Valerianus ought not to counter-balance that of Gesnerus, because the latter speaks upon the credit and testimony of Bartholomæus Bononiensis, who has written the Life of Urceus. Now an Historian, an author who has laboured *ex professo* (to make use of that phrase) in writing the life of a man, is much more to be credited than another who has done no more than compiled, and who has rather studied to give us the eulogies of some learned men, than to give us an exact History of their Lives. An author of this last kind is not much solicitous to go to the bottom of every subject; that would carry him too far: he makes it more his business to collect a vast number of materials than to choose the best; but a particular Historian, such as Bartholomæus Bononiensis, an author, I say, whose exactness is so well known, is much rather to be credited than Pierius Valerianus, who had more at heart the publishing his book (*de infelicitate Litteratorum*) as well as he could, than the giving a well connected and particular History of every one of those whom he mentioned in his work. Thus it is much more probable that Antony Urceus was born in Herberia, a little town in the territory of Reggio, seven miles from Mantua (c), than in Ravenna, as Pierius Valerianus affirms.

The editor might have given us the prayer which Spizelius puts in the mouth of Urceus (d), just as he was ready to expire. It is remarkable, and very proper to convince Atheists, if any such there be in the world, that there is no intrepidity which can hold out against the terrors of death, and that in these last moments the soul, being ready to break through the bonds of sin, begins to dispel the darkness which environed it, and at last to see things such as they are in themselves. Here follows the prayer.

‘ Qui cœlum incolis, fer quæso opem peccatori, noli me, qui tuum in sinum confugio supplicem rejicere. Si unquam peccantem hominem voti reum fecisti, sic mihi extrema oranti dextram ab alto porrigas oro. - - - O thou who dwellest in heaven, help a sinner, I beseech thee, and do not reject me, while I thus fly, in a suppliant manner, to thy bosom. If ever thou didst bear a miserable sinner, stretch forth, I beseech thee, thy right hand to me from on high, now that I am making my last prayer.’

For

(a) He should have said of a problem. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(b) An author cannot be charged with being uncertain and wavering, unless he has confessed that he does not know which to choose between the two opinions he relates: for to relate two opinions without saying, in express words, that he embraces this or that, is not a good proof that he wavers and hesitates, it is only shewing that he contents himself with being an Historian, and that he leaves the reader the liberty of choosing. Mr Bayle has plainly enough intimated which is the preferable side of the question, since he says that Gesnerus, QUOTING BARTHOLOMÆUS BONONIENSIS, makes Herberia the native town of Urceus, and since he observes that Bartholomæus Bononiensis wrote the Life of Urceus. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(c) He should have said *Modena*, and the same fault must be corrected in Mr Bayle's Dictionary. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(d) Note, That Spizelius only relates what he had read in the Life of Urceus, composed by Antony Bononiensis. It is the latter who may justly be said to have put that prayer in the mouth of Urceus. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

8 X

(1) In

For the rest, never did any learned man more justly deserve a place in Pierius Valerianus's book, than Antony Urceus. The despair he shewed at the burning of his library and papers, is enough to terrify all those who shall read the circumstances of it. And indeed the resolution which he took to withdraw for ever from the sight of men, and to retire into the thickest part of the forests, could only have been dictated by the greatest despair (1).

(1) In Moreri's edition of 1712, they corrected the article of *Urceus Codrus* from Mr Bayle's Dictionary: but what Mr Bayle says of that author is not exact. He had not the life of Codrus: and he was obliged to follow Spizelius and Pierius Valerianus, who have committed several faults in speaking of Codrus. His life, written first in Italian by the brother of Codrus, was translated into Latin, and published with additions by Bartholomeo Bianchino, *Bartholomæus Blanchinus*, who had been Codrus's disciple, and his intimate friend. The authors quoted by Mr Bayle, call him *Bartholomæus Bononiensis*, taking the name of his country for his true name. This life is prefixed to the works of Codrus. See what Mr de la Monnoye has said concerning Codrus, in his Additions to the *Ménagiana*, Tom. I. pag. 336, and Tom. III. pag. 180, & seq. of the Paris edition.

Mr de Saint Hyacinthe has given us a very long extract of Codrus's Works, in his *Mémoires Littéraires*, Tom. I. Art. V. pag. 259, & seq.

I shall take from that extract almost word for word a continued narrative of Codrus's life, which may serve as a corrective and Supplement to Mr Bayle's Dictionary; and the new editors of Moreri, may make use of it if they please.

URCEUS (ANTONY) surnamed CODRUS, was born at Herberia, a small town in the territory of Reggio, on the 15th of August 1446. His great-grandfather, a Potter's son in the country of Brescia, was the first of the family, who settled at Herberia. He was so poor that all his labour could scarcely supply him with bread. He had a son called *Bartholomew*, who got his livelihood for some time by fishing; afterwards as he was digging in a field, he found a pot filled with a pretty large sum of money, part of which he laid out in the purchase of the field itself, and with the rest, he set up a Perfumers shop. *Cortefius*, son to Bartholomew, had by his wife *Gherardine*, two sons: *Antony*, who is the subject of this article, and another called *Peter-Antony*; the birth of the latter, cost his mother her life. The father died after the eighty-first year of his age. He did not neglect the education of his sons; he provided them with proper masters: but it is said that our Codrus, while he was still very young, left him and went to Modena, with a design to study under *Tribac*, a man sufficiently learned for those days. Some months after, he returned to Herberia, from whence his father sent him to Ferrara, to study under *Baptista Guarini*, a famous Professor in the Greek and Latin tongues: he likewise attended the Lectures of *Lucas Ripa*, Professor in Rhetoric, and a man whose modesty was equal to his parts. Codrus made such progress under these two masters, that he far surpassed all his other companions, and thereby confirmed the great hopes, which his relations had conceived of him.

Some say that he began to teach children at Ferrara, tho' he was then scarce twenty-two years old; but *Blanchini* doubts of this particular. What we know for certain, is, that he remained five years at Ferrara, and afterwards was called to Forlì, to teach the languages, where they gave him more considerable appointments, than had been allowed to his predecessors. He writes in his letter to *Mengo*, that he was there for ten years public Professor of the *Belles Lettres*; and his Historian says (which does not at all contradict this) that for thirteen years Codrus instructed the youth there, and in particular *Sinibaldo*, son to the Prince of Forlì, at whose house he had his board and lodging.

About this time an accident happened to him, which had like to have made him distracted. He had in the inner part of the palace, a room so dark, that without the assistance of a lamp, he could not so much as distinguish the walls of it at break of day; this obliged him when he had a mind to study early to make use of a lamp, which was very neatly wrought, and upon the top of which he had engraved these words, *studia lucernam olentia optime olent. Studies that smell of the lamp, have an excellent odour.* One day

that he went abroad without putting it out, his papers took fire, which spread to every thing that was in the room: (for no body perceived it till such time as the flames came out at the windows:) a book which he had composed with the title of *Pastor*, was burnt with all his papers. It is said that when he heard the first news of this fire, he was so transported with rage, that he ran to the palace, and stopping at the chamber-door, (for the flames would not allow him to enter) 'O Christ, said he, what great crime have I then committed? Whom of thine have I ever offended, that thou shouldst exercise such an implacable hatred against me?' Afterwards turning towards an image of the Virgin Mary: 'O Virgin, said he, hear what I say to thee sedately, and from the bottom of my heart, if peradventure, at the hour of death, I shall come in a suppliant manner to implore thy assistance, do not hear me, I beseech thee, neither receive me into the number of thine, I am resolved to take up my residence in Hell.' Here follow the very words of his Historian: *Ad primum incendii nuntium, tantam animo imbibisse iram, ut exclamans veluti furor quodam concitus ad Regiam usque præcipiti gradu ire pergeret: pro foribusque cubiculi aditus, (neque enim ob incendium late cuncta depopulans ingredi licebat) Quodnam ego, inquit, tantum scelus concepi, Christe? quom ego tuorum unquam læsi, ut ita inexpiabili in me odio debaccheris? Conversus postmodum ad simulacrum Virginis, Audi, Virgo, ait, ea quæ tibi mentis campus ex animo dicam, si forte cum ad ultimum vite finem pervenero, supplex accedam ad te optem oratum, neve audias, neve inter tuos accipias, oro; cum in Inferni diis in eternum vitam agere decrevi.* Those who were present, endeavoured to soften his passion, but he would hear nothing; he earnestly begged his friends not to follow him, and, like a mad-man, he rushed with a precipitant pace into the middle of an huge forest, where he passed the remaining part of the day in the deepest affliction. He came back to the city in the evening; but finding the gates shut, he lay down upon a dunghill, and there waited the return of morning. At break of day, having got into the city, he went and hid himself in a Joiner's house, where he remained six months alone, and without books.

After the death of the Prince of Forlì, and of *Sinibaldo*, his son, who died six months after him, Codrus stayed ten months longer in that city, being uncertain what resolution to take. Then he went to Bologna, where he was chosen Professor of the Greek and Latin tongues, and of Rhetoric, in the university. He continued there all the rest of his life, and died in the year 1500, in the monastery of St Salvatore, whither he had desired to be carried. Codrus was at that time, fifty-four years of age.

The day before his death, his disciples on their knees, and with their eyes bathed in tears, so earnestly besought him to tell them something worthy of himself, that he found himself obliged to comply with their request. His Historian relates the discourse, which, as he says, Codrus made upon that occasion: this discourse is an exhortation to virtue, but it is so long and so methodical, that there is reason to suspect *Blanchini* of having embellished it. Codrus there betrays marks of an extreme vanity. He says to his disciples, *pray to God that you may be like me.* The day on which he died, he made another short discourse, wherein he proves that death is the supreme good. He complained that he had not been able to write before he died what he had designed: 'If I die, said he, for I can perceive that the hour of my death draws near, alas, how many fine things shall be buried with me!' *Si ego, inquit, moriar, nam prope ineluctabilem legem fati mei adesse sentio, bene quæ bona mecum interibunt!*

The night of his death, he shewed marks of a disordered imagination; he fancied that he saw a person of an enormous size, with his head shaved, his beard reaching to the ground, and flaming eyes, carrying torches in either hand, and having his whole body in

in a violent agitation: Codrus quaking for fear, said to this spectre, Who art thou, that thus alone with the air of a Fury, walkest about at the time when every body is asleep? Come not to me as an enemy, to me, I say, who am God's friend. Tell me, what seekest thou? Whither wouldst thou go? Having said this, he jumped out of bed to shun the spectre.

People had always doubted, whether he had any religion while he lived, his Historian confesses, that he gave occasion to it by his conversation, *circa Christianum dogma, si non re, saltem verbis, plerumque claudicabat*. Nevertheless, at the hour of death, he himself desired to have the Sacraments administered to him, and when they brought him the host, he beat his breast like a man truly touched with repentance, saying, that he was a wretch, who had always been in a state of blindness. He likewise raised his eyes and hands towards heaven, and fervently implored the assistance of the Holy Virgin: *ser quaeso opem misero peccatori, noli me, qui tuum in sinum confugio, supplicem rejicere*. He received the Viaticum with great respect, shedding tears, and recommending himself and his soul to God: *Deo & se animamque suam commendans*.

After his death, he was carried to the grave by his scholars, followed by all the students of the university. Blanchini caused the following words to be engraved upon his tomb, CODRUS ERAM. Codrus had so desired it.

The name of Codrus, was given him in this manner. Being at Forlì, the Prince met him on the road, and recommended himself to him, the Professor answered, smiling, 'things go well, Jupiter recommends himself to Codrus: 'Jupiter Codro se commendat. From that time, every body called him Codrus.

Codrus was of a middle stature; his person was thin and slender, his face pale and meagre, his eyes whitish, and somewhat hollow, he had a Roman nose, few hairs, and his looks were sometimes silly, but always mild. He had been always sickly, from his birth to the age of forty-four years. He had a weak stomach, and sometimes laboured under so great a decay of his spirits, that he remained the whole day in bed, like a dying man, without speaking, or even bemoaning himself; but as soon as the evening returned, his strength returned also. He had a bad memory, which gave occasion to his often reading his speeches in public, instead of pronouncing them by heart; and tho' his pronunciation was disagreeable, he was nevertheless heard with extraordinary pleasure. He was such a rigorous judge of the works of others, that the old Beroaldus used to say he knew no Critic of more severity and penetration. He excelled in the art of teaching boys, he knew how to correct them, and make them fond of him, being ever ready to do them all the services that lay in his power: it nevertheless sometimes happened that he chastised them immoderately; for tho' he had a mild and complaisant air, he was at the same time extremely severe and passionate. Blanchinus gives us instances of it. Another fault he censures in him, is, that he never praised any Modern. When any body asked him his opinion concerning the great men of that age, he commonly answered, with respect to them all, *Sibi scire videntur*, they fancy themselves to be learned.

No man of his time gave more credit to prefaces than he, he believed that there was a particular providence concerned in them. For example, if his boy's lamp went out, 'take care, unhappy youth, take care, would he cry to him, some great misfortune 'threatens you;' and to preserve him from it, if any thing was then to be done, Codrus would do it himself. But the most singular thing of all was, that when they told him of any prodigy, instead of thinking that it was either a Prince, or a country threatened with some misfortune, he only believed that it was a preface which threatened him or some other Professor. His Historian tells us, that in his orations, he pronounced several facetious things, which have not been preserved in writing. We may judge by those which Codrus has left in them, what these facetious things were, which he struck out. When somebody asked him upon this subject, why he mingled so many pleasantries in his discourses, he answered, 'men are so 'framed by nature, that jesters are agreeable, and 'story-tellers entertaining.'

Codrus made his will some days before his death. The will begins thus: I ANTONY URCEUS, son to Cortheus Urceus, hope and wish for Salvation from the eternal God. . . . Afterwards he recommends his soul

to God, and adds that he always believed it immortal, against the opinion of Epicurus, and of those, who under the name of Christians, do nothing that is Christian. After certain pious legacies, and some other, which he bequeaths to his brothers and sisters by a second marriage, he names with a great deal of friendship, Peter Antony his brother by the mother's side, for his sole heir and executor.

Concerning his works, Blanchinus says that Codrus has not put the last hand to them: that he applied himself first of all to make Greek and Latin verses: that he added many things to the *Greek Vocabulary*: that he corrected many other books: that he restored some other things which had been lost in the ruins of the Latin tongue. 'Among the most considerable 'works of this learned man, we find, says he, several 'fine orations, which may be compared to a table of 'rect, elegant, sprightly, full of learning, and of a 'profound erudition. I never heard, continues he, 'any thing more agreeable: the diction of them is so 'pure, that one would be apt to say, that none but 'Codrus speaks Latin: and tho' his orations be so 'full of graces, pleasantries, mirth, and good humour, 'the gravity of the discourse, is nevertheless not at all 'weakened by it.' This is the judgment of Blanchinus, in which friendship may possibly have had a great share. After all, Codrus has passed for a learned man, and he deserves that title better than many others, on whom it has been bestowed, if it was not vanity that made him say, when speaking of the learned, *Hic vivimus ambitiosa paupertate omnes, sumus litterarum pauperes, & volumus videre omnia scire*. 'We live all in a state of proud poverty, we are poor 'in knowledge, and we would seem to know every 'thing.'

Among the friends of Codrus, they reckon the Princes of Forlì and of Ferrara, those of Bologna, Politian, Buti, Aldus, Tiberti, Magnani, Garzoni, Guarini and Ripa who had been his masters, Lambertini, Mimo Roscio, Lorenzo Roscio, and Pompeo Folcarini. Galeazzo Bentivoglio, Apostolical Protomotary, had his picture drawn by Francia, a man that wonderfully kept up the reputation which the Francias had acquired by painting.

Among the great number of his scholars, they distinguished John-Baptista Palmari, Cornelius Volta, Camillus Paleotti, Antony Albergatti, Peregrin Blanchini, and Philip Beroaldus the younger, who was also Professor at Bologna.

The works of Codrus were printed for the first time at Bologn in the year 1502, by John Antony Platonides, in folio. They consist of fifteen *Orations*; ten *Letters*; two books of *Sylva*; with some *Odes* to the number of twenty-two; two *Satires*; one *Eclogue*; ninety-six *Epigrams*; and one *Song* for Martinmas-day. But among the pieces of Codrus, we likewise find in this edition a preface written by Philip Beroaldus the younger, and inscribed to Antony Galeazzo Bentivoglio, where we are informed that it is to the latter we owe the collection of Codrus's works, of which several people were endeavouring to take the honour. We likewise find there a letter of Beroaldus; seven Poems of Virgilius Portus; a Letter and an Epigram written by a learned man of Toulouse called John Pin, and an Epitaph which he made for Codrus; an Epistle of Blanchinus; and the Life of Codrus, written by the same Blanchinus. The works of Codrus, together with the pieces just mentioned, were reprinted at Venice in the year 1506, in folio: at Paris, in the year 1515, in 4to; and at Basil, in the year 1540, likewise in 4to.

We have seen that Blanchinus, speaking of Codrus's works, says 'that he restored some things 'which had been lost in the ruins of the Latin 'tongue: 'he means chiefly the *Atulularia* of Plautus, which Codrus restored by supplying the end, which was lost. This Supplement contains 122 verses. There is an edition of that Comedy, printed at Leipzig in 1513, in folio, with the following title: *Plauti lepidissimi Poetae Atulularia, ab Antonio Codro Urceo, utriusque Linguae doctissimo, pristinae formae diligenter restituta; illius enim finis antea desiderabatur*.

Codrus had written a book of antiquities, which is lost; and another of fables, which death hindered him from finishing. He likewise designed to write, as well in Greek as in Latin, a book of secrets and hidden things.

Blanchinus

Blanchinus says that several persons made fine epitaphs upon him, but particularly Hermico Caiado, a Portuguese Poet, and Philip Beroaldus the younger. They have not published them in the works of Codrus, though they have inserted those which Virgilius Portus made upon him: I shall quote one of them:

*Codrus eram, natale solum Herberia, sed que
Me sepelit Graium dixit & Ausonium.*

'I was Codrus, Herberia is my native place; but that where I lie buried says that I was both a Grecian and a Roman.' NEW OBSERVAT.

W.

WESTPHALUS.

IT is true that the editor has corrected the article of John *Westphalus*, who is an imaginary Divine, to whom Moreri ascribes abominable errors. But he has done more than was required at his hands, for it was not demanded of him that he should suppress the whole article, but only that he should take from John Westphalus the title of Divine, which certainly was not his due, and restore to him that of Printer, which belongs to him. This John Westphalus, or John de *Westphalia*, was not such an obscure person but that he deserved a place in the Dictionary. He was the first Printer in the Low-Countries; he settled at Louvain in the year 1475, and Aristotle's Ethics was the first book (a) that he printed (1).

(a) This is the opinion of Gabriel Naudé, but the Sieur de la Caille, in his History of Printing, pag. 30, affirms, that as early as the year 1473, John de Westphalia printed at Louvain several books, such as *Petr. Crescentius de omnibus Agriculturae partibus*, &c. in folio. MR. BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) Here again our author does no more than copy Mr Bayle, who has made it appear that the *Joba Westphalus* of Moreri, a *Lutheran Heretic*, &c. is an imaginary person. It is true, adds Mr Bayle, there was a John de WESTPHALIA; but this was a Printer who settled at Louvain in the year 1475; and for that he quotes Gabriel Naudé. This Printer called himself sometimes *Jobannes de Westphalia*, sometimes *Jobannes Westphalia Paderbornensis*, sometimes *Jobannes de Paderborn in Westphalia*, and sometimes *Jobannes Padelborn de Westphalia*. He printed not only at Louvain, but likewise at Aloft and Nimeguen. In the year 1475 he entered into partnership with *Theodoric Martini* of Aloft. He put out in the year 1475 *Juveniani Institutiones cum Glossa*, in folio, and added to it this kind of enigmatical advertisement, according to the custom of the first Printers: *Institutionum præ-*

sens opus insignis . . . Jobannes de Paderborn in Westphalia alim in universitate Lovanienfi residens non siccis calamo sed Arte quâdam characterisendi modernissimâ suo proprio signo consignando feliciter consummavit Anno incarnationis Dominice MCCCC LXXV. mensis Novembris die XXI, &c. Twenty years after he printed *Aur. Augustinus in libr. de Trinitate*, Lovanii per *Jobannem Padelborn de Westphalia*, folio. At the end of the book we find this:

*Numine sancte tuo Pater ô tuare Jobannem
Padelborn: præsens qui tibi præsit opus.*

Lovanii per Jobannem Padelborn de Westphalia in præfatio natiuitatis Christi finiente anno nonagesimo quinto.

Guard holy Father by thy pow'r divine
John Padelborn, a Printer here of thine.

See Mr Mattaire's *Annales Typographici*, Tom. I. NEW OBSERVAT.

X.

XENOPHANES.

THE article of this Philosopher is very deficient: if we were to judge of his doctrine by what is said of it in the new edition of the Historical Dictionary, and by what Diogenes Laërtius says of it in the Life of the Philosophers, and Cicero in his book *de natura Deorum*, one would be tempted to think that they were speaking of two different persons. The editor only tells us that *he believed there were four elements, and an infinite number of worlds*. If his whole doctrine had been reduced to these two principal heads, would it have appeared so pernicious to some learned men? and would it have given them room to infer that Spinoza had taken the foundation of his impious system from this ancient Philosopher? In short, would there be any thing more in this doctrine than what we find contained in the ingenious works of the celebrated Mr Huygens and Mr de Fontenelle. But Xenophanes had other principles of a very different nature

nature; he expressly affirmed that the understanding is God, and that every thing which is infinite is God. Eusebius Cæsariensis charges him with having taught that nature is eternal *à priori*, and *à posteriori*, and that she is always like to herself. If we believe the conjecture of a learned Critic, this Philosopher pretended that the divine understanding endeavoured to give to all creatures a state of perfection; but that having met with invincible obstacles in matter or body, he could not always execute his designs; and consequently was forced, on certain occasions, to produce bad things: and this, without doubt, is the detestable source from which Manes took the doctrine of his two principles, the one the author of all good, and the other that of all evil. I do not say but that this principle, when considered in one particular light, is susceptible of a favourable interpretation; for if this Philosopher meant that the sweets of life do not equal the bitters which accompany it, we shall easily judge that he was not much in the wrong, and that his moral seldom fails to be true; and I am of opinion it was from Xenophanes that the famous Natural Historian, who appeared several ages after him, borrowed this thought, when he said in the beginning of his seventh book, that the good things which nature measures out to us, are mixed with so many evils, that he does not know *si parens melior homini an tristior noverca fuerit*. - - - *whether nature is not rather a cruel stepmother, than an indulgent parent, to mankind* (1).

(1) All this is taken, whether right or wrong, from Mr Bayle's Dictionary. In the edition of 1725, after these words, *be believed there were four elements, and an infinite number of worlds*, they have added, *be believed that the moon was inhabited, and had several other impious principles, as may be seen in Mr Bayle*. But why should they rank among the *impious principles* of Xenophanes his having believed that *the moon is inhabited*; an opinion, which, on the contrary, does him a great deal of honour, as Mr Bayle has observed. NEW OBSERVAT.

THESE are the Remarks which I have made upon the last edition of Moreri; I might have enlarged their number, but I was willing before-hand to know how the public would relish them: if they are approved of, and be esteemed useful towards a new edition, I may possibly give the sequel of them.

I must not however conclude without mentioning the considerable additions that we find in the new edition of 1704. It contains several articles that were not in the former ones; as Differtations, Genealogies, and other important Remarks. For example, we find in the first volume a very curious Differtation upon the title of *Royal Higbness*, which has been given to so many Princes of late years. The article which concerns Mr de Sallo (*the father and author of all the literary journals*) has been corrected with a great deal of exactness (a). The article of Duranti is improved by a curious Differtation upon the book *de ritibus*, &c. It is the business of Father Mersenne (b), or his followers to examine the worth of it.

(a) I am nevertheless told that an Arithmetical error, which has passed from edition to edition, is not corrected in that of 1704, no more than it was in that of 1699. This error consists in saying that Mr de Sallo, who was born in 1626, died in 1669, aged forty-nine years. It plainly appears from these years of his birth and death that he lived no more than forty-three years (1). I wish the editor had confuted a lie which traduces Mr de Sallo in a cruel manner, and which, having at first been published by the Carthusian Friar, who disguised himself under the name of Vigneul Marville, has already appeared in a Latin book printed in Germany, and will, no doubt, in a little time pass from book to book, and from country to country, if a stop be not put to the unlucky spreading of it. For this reason I affirm here, upon the authority of the Abbot Gallois, that nothing is more false than the following passage of Vigneul Marville, (tom. i. des Melanges, pag. 304.) *that Mr Sallo died in the year 1665, of a distemper to which the children of the Muses are very little subject, and for which there is no remedy either in Hippocrates or Galen, for he died of grief for having lost at play 100000 crowns, that is to say, his whole estate*. It is certain that he died in 1669, and that gaming did

not in the least contribute towards it. The book of a learned German (Struvius) where this passage of Vigneul Marville has been quoted, pag. 79, was printed at Iena in the year 1704, with the title of *Introductio ad notitiam rei literariæ et usum Bibliothecarum*. We may justly wonder, that though Mr de Sallo left both children and friends, yet no body has contradicted a public lie which traduces him in such a cruel manner, and that the authors of the *Journal des Sçavans*, who have a greater interest than others in his glory, and who have not spared Vigneul Marville upon other occasions, have nevertheless spared him upon this. There is in the new letters of Mr Bourfault, pag. 357, of the Dutch edition of 1698, a thing so singular, and so much to the honour of Mr de Sallo that they will do well to adorn his article with it in the next edition of Moreri. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) This fault continued in the editions of 1707, 1712, and 1718, and was only corrected in that of 1725. NEW OBSERVAT.

(b) He should have said *Martens*. He is a Benedictine Monk of the congregation of St Maur. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

The article of the Abbey of la Trappe has been added: the genealogies are reduced to a very convenient and intelligible method. That of Saulz-Tavanes, it is true, wants revising, for the two branches of that family are not well enough distinguished, and we do not know who was father to the last Count de Tavanes, who married Madam d'Agueffau. I know that he was son to James de Saux, and Louisa-Henrietta Poitiers-Trêmes, whereas they make the latter to have been the father of the Marquis de Tavanes, who married N de Bourbon Buffet, descended from a natural son of the Cardinal Charles de Bourbon (1).

V O L. V. (1) This is corrected in the last edition. NEW OBSERVAT.

8 Y

The

CRITICAL REMARKS.

The genealogy of Savoy has been very well cleared up, and several others have been added, such as those of Rouffelet-Chateau-Renaud, of Roisin, of Marca or la Marque, of Servient; of Tonnelier-Breteuil; of Tournebu; of Hoffung-la Baume; of Tournemine, the same family from which the learned Jesuit Tournemine is descended; of Constantin-Tourville; of Valbelle; of Vincent de Mauleon; of Saignez-d'Austraud de Caufans; of Frezeau la Frezeliere, and Fouquet.

That of Phelipeaux has been corrected. That of Bignon has been put in its proper order.

In the genealogy of Voyer they should correct the word *Revau*, which is wrong spelt, it ought to be *Rivau* (1).

(1) This is also corrected in the last edition. NEW OBSERVAT.



A. DISSER-

A

DISSERTATION

CONCERNING THE BOOK OF

STEPHANUS JUNIUS BRUTUS,

Printed in the year 1579.

IT is universally agreed, that he who composed under this name the book intituled, *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos, five de Principis in Populum, Populique in Principem legitima Potestate*, was not called so; but there are still different opinions concerning his true name. The most virulent of all the libels that were sent us from France by the post, in the year 1689, on account of the Revolution of England [A], ascribes Junius Brutus's book to Mr du Pleffis Mornai: which is somewhat surprizing; for after the proofs that the author of another libel (a), has taken from several very common writings, no body ought to be ignorant, that Hubert Languet and Junius Brutus are the same person. Here follow some mistakes concerning this famous book.

(a) Important Advice to the Refugens.

I. Deckher's error.

Mr Deckher (b) Advocate in the Imperial Chamber of Spire, pretends, that if the author had called himself Lucius Junius Brutus, he had taken a name more proper, and better founded on Livy's History, than that of Stephanus Junius Brutus, which he took in the Hanaw edition of the year MDVC; and he observes that Boeclerus (c) has cited him under the name of *Lucius Junius Brutus*. But first, this shews he was ignorant that the Prænomen *Stephanus* had appeared in the preceding editions, and even in the first, which is pretended to have been made at Edinburgh in the year 1579. The French version printed in the year 1581, in 8vo, bears also the name of Stephen Junius Brutus. Secondly, why must the author have had more regard to Brutus, who delivered Rome from Tarquin's tyranny, than to Brutus, who delivered it from Cæsar's? If there was no reason for his preferring one of them before the other, there was no reason for his calling himself Lucius rather than Marcus; he might therefore, as well have taken this Prænomen Stephen, as any other. Let no man say, that the manner of Marcus Brutus's resisting the tyrant, is not as agreeable as that of the other Brutus to the author's principles; nor let it be added in confirmation of this, that he allows persons in any office, as Lucius Junius Brutus, who was tribune of the Celeres, to excite the people to take up arms, but that he denies that privilege to private persons, and much more, that of assassinating the tyrant, except in case of a Divine Inspiration, in which he will even have a man to examine himself carefully. Let no one use these arguments, I say; for the author has clearly declared (d), that Brutus and Cassius are in the case of those murderers of tyrants, to whom the laws promise rewards, and erect statues. He has ranked Cæsar in the number of those usurpers, against whom it is lawful for any man to conspire. And so Mr Deckher's criticism is false, and little better than the pitiful and infipid jest of some people, who have said, that Hubert Languet disguised himself, amongst other names, under that of Stephen, not with respect to that Stephen, who assassinated the Emperor Domitian, to whom Apollonius Tyanæus cried out at

(b) De Scriptis Adefpotis, pag. 89, Edit. Amstel. 1686.

(c) In Grotium de Jure Belli & Pacis, lib. i, cap. iv, pag. 271.

(d) See his Question III, pag. 193, & 211.

three

(1) It was printed at Paris, in the year 1696; but neither the place of the impression, nor the name of the Printer was put to it.

[A] The most virulent of all libels . . . concerning the Revolution of England. It is intituled *The new Abolition*, &c. and it is ascribed to Mr Arnauld: this opinion is printed in a book, called, *The History of the troubles caused by Mr Arnauld after his death; or Mr Santeuil's quarrel with the Jesuits* (1). This is found at page 29. If the author of this History is not mi-

staken as to the author of the libel, he is so at least, as to the place of the impression; for it is false that Mr Arnauld published this book in Holland. Nay, I do not think he was there at that time. The Historical and Political Mercury of the year 1696, has occasioned the discovery of the author of this libel, speaking of this Controversy of Mr Santeuil.

II.
Barclay's
error.

III.
Hotman
thought to be
the author of
the book.

IV.
The author of
the News
from the Re-
public of
Learning cen-
sured.

COLOMIE'S
cited, and a
reflexion upon
the citation.

V.
Three obser-
vations on
d'Aubigné.

three hundred leagues distance, *cheer up, strike the villain (e)*; but with respect to St Stephen, the first martyr of the Gospel, and the first victim of Christian patience.

But Deckher's criticism is nevertheless more tolerable, than the argument used by William Barclay (f), to prove Stephanus Junius Brutus's book to be pseudonymous, and that the author only chose the name of Brutus, to set out with greater distinction, on the foot of deliverer of the people; because, says he, it is not probable, that the posterity of him, who expelled Tarquin, continued to our age, since one of the best Historians affirms *, that he died the last of his family, in the war against the Veientes. Certainly, this is racking one's brain to no purpose: for it could never have entered into the head of any reader, that this writer might be defended in a right line from Junius Brutus, who abolished the Roman monarchy; and I do not think, that in reading the books of modern authors, whose true names are Brutus, any one will be so fully as to believe they are defended from the family of the ancient Brutus's.

The error of those, who father the book on Francis Hotman, is nothing near so great as the foregoing (g). There are still some learned men, who ascribe it to him; such as Mr Constant (h), a famous minister and professor at Lausanne, in his abridgement of Politics (i).

He who wrote the three first years of the *News from the Republic of Letters*, having said by the way (k), that Hotman was thought to be concealed under the name of Junius Brutus, gave some time after (l), for his voucher, a book printed at Paris in the year 1589, intituled, *A Treatise concerning the power of Kings against the King of Navarre*. But if he had been well acquainted with d'Aubigné's History, he might have likewise informed us, both that Hotman was the reputed author of Junius Brutus's book, and that it was ascribed to him without any foundation. I am going to shew what d'Aubigné has said of it: I begin with an author, who has been very curious in these sorts of inquiries (m); his words are these: 'Mr Daillé told me, he heard that the author of the book, intituled, *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, under the name of Stephanus Junius Brutus, was Hubert Languet, a learned man, and a great Politician. Which I have had since confirmed by Mr Legoux of Dijon, who added, that Mr de la Mare, Counsellor of the same town, had observed this in making Hubert Languet's elogy. Others attribute this book to Mr du Pleffis, to whom I could as readily ascribe it on this testimony of d'Aubigné: There came out another book, called *Junius Brutus, or a defence against tyrants, written by a learned gentleman of this kingdom, famous for many excellent books, and still living with great figure*. In another place of his History, d'Aubigné says, that this gentleman confessed to him, that he was the author of it. There was just reason upon such passages to attribute the book to Mr du Pleffis, as readily as to Hubert Languet. But if this author had known d'Aubigné's second edition, he could not have been in suspense; for he would have seen that after the year 1616, the date of the first edition, d'Aubigné had discovered the whole mystery. Let us hear then what he says in the second edition, which is of the year 1626.

(n) Many pens in all kinds of writing were employed both on account of religion and government. The first subject produced a great many books; as for the second, there was one in vogue, of which I will take a particular notice, called *A Defence against Tyrants*: in this, it was fully examined how far obedience to Kings extends, for what causes, and by what means, people may take up arms, and to whom it belongs to authorize them; whether foreigners may be called in; whether they may lawfully give assistance. Hotman was a long time wrongfully suspected to be the author of it; but afterwards a French gentleman, who is living when I write, confessed to me, that he was the author of it. But it appeared at last that he was the editor, it having been deposited with him by Hubert Languet, of Franche Comté (o), agent in France for the Duke of Saxony. In another place of his History (p), he repeats the same thing in these words: *There appeared another book which was intituled, Junius Brutus, or A Defence against Tyrants, owned by one of the learned gentlemen of this kingdom, celebrated for many excellent books, and living still in great repute; treating the questions concerning the bounds of our obedience to Kings; in what cases it is lawful to take up arms against them; who ought to attempt it; whether neighbouring foreigners may justly give their assistance; in what manner all things ought to be managed: all this he handles like a great Lawyer, and a great Divine. Since that, Hubert Languet (q) is known to be the true author of it.*

I shall make three observations upon these two passages of d'Aubigné.

The first is, that I do not believe the book in question was ever called *Junius Brutus*, and so this Historian must have taken the name of the author for the title of the work; which, at most, is but a little deviation from rigorous exactness. Not but at bottom, the book might have been intituled, *Junius Brutus*, and might be cited so. But this is not the matter in hand; we know well enough that a proper name has often been the title of a book, and that there is a tract of Cicero intituled *Brutus*; we know likewise that custom gives great privileges for the abridging of a citation. This is not therefore the matter in question. The question is, Whether the book we speak of had the title which d'Aubigné and Boëclerus give it.

My

(r) See the article ACIDALIUS, remark [G]; and the second article MALDONAT, remark [I], at the end.

(s) Printed
Giesse Hassorum
1687.

(t) *It is his*
Musæum, robers
be says, qui se
Bruti nomine
disimulat, sive
Mornæus is est,
sive Hubertus
Languetus.

(u) *At Stras-
bourg in 1674,
with his Institu-
tiones Politicæ.*

(x) See the *Ild*
Dissertation, p.
322, and the
XVth, p. 209.

8 Z

(3) According to Voetius, Draudius, pag. 973, says, Stephani in the Supplement
Juui Vindicia contra tyrannos, ec. Ederbergae 80 & 81. La-
tine & Gall. Drauidii's edition, which I use, is of 1625. If since this Supple-
ment's book four times, viz. pag. 809, (where the Edinburghelement concerns
edition 1579, and the Straburgion in 1210, are mentioned,) pag.
1235, where the edition of Amsterdum 1611 is mentioned: pag.
1275, where the Straburg edition again is mentioned; and p. 84,
of French books, where we find the title of the translation as is (5) Pag. 300.
is in Du Verdier.

(4) *Pag. 766, and thereby it appears that Voëtius ought not to take any advantage of Du Verdier's not mentioning Junius Brutus*

*in the Supplement
to this Epitome,
since this Sup-
plement concerns
only the omissions
of the Epitome.*

(5) *Pag. 100.*

tius of being
Junius Brutus.
How justified
by Rivetus.

Voluntatis falsi, Discussio. In a former writing, I mean, in his *Appendix de Anticristo*, he would not name Mornai. Boucher's execrable book, says he (y), concerning the deposition of Henry III, King of France, was taken, both as to the arguments and expressions, not from Mariana, or Santarel, but from Junius Brutus, (I know very well who he is; but let him be concealed, since he defers it), and some other learned men of the same sect. Liber flagitiosissimus Boucherii de abdicatione Henrici III Galliarum regis non argumentis tantum sed & verbis desumptus est, non ex Mariana aut Santarello, sed ex Junio Bruto (quis is sit sat scio, sed quia latere voluit, lateat) & ex viris doctis quidem at factionis ejusdem. In a letter (z) which he wrote from Paris on the twenty-eighth of February 1643, he does not use that reserve. I think I have written, says he, that the author of Junius Brutus is Philip de Mornai, and that Lewis Villiers was he who got it printed; I repeat it again, because Marefius says that he is an unknown author: the thing however is known to a great many. Puto scripsisse me antebac auctorem Junii Bruti esse Philippum Mornæum Pleffiacum, editorem Ludovicum Villerium, Loifelerium. Repeto id quia ignotum esse scriptorem dicit Marefius, cum plurimis ea res nota sit: & idem Pleffiacus testamento generos & amicos suos hortatus sit, arma ut sumerent, si Edicta à Rege non servarentur (aa). In another letter (bb) he speaks of one Rufford, a German author, who has cited Junius Brutus under the name of Mornai. The Printers have blundered here; for instead of Ruffordius in *Defensione causæ Palatinæ*, they have put *causæ politicæ*.

It is certain that Marefius, in his answer to Grotius's Appendix in 1642, still maintained that Junius Brutus was an unknown and obscure person, whose work none of the Reformed would maintain, nor had ever praised or approved. He went so far as to say, that perhaps it was a Papist, as King James had suspected, who had published this work under the disguise of a Protestant, in order to render the Protestant religion odious. Quid quæso ille ipse Junius Brutus quem nobis exprobrat (homo anonymus, obscurus, ignotus, cujus scriptum privata emissum auctoritate Reformatorum nemo tueri velit (cc)); Junius Brutus quisquis ille sit (dd) . . . Nobis multo crimini dandum quod qua secus quam par esset ille (Junius Brutus) scripserat, homo à nemine nostrum nec laudatus, nec approbatus, Boucherius ex malis pessima fecerit & in virus transmiserit (ee) . . . Qui verà posset conferri Junius Brutus, qui sine Autoris nomine, sine ulla approbatione prodit, forte etiam confusus ab aliquo Pontificio in odium Reformatorum, ut suspicabatur Rex Jacobus, cum hoc Santarelli Tractatu, &c (ff).

Rivetius, answering Grotius's posthumous book, says indeed, that no proofs can be given of what is advanced against Mr du Pleffis; but that in case he was the author of Junius Brutus, some regard must be had to his age, and the circumstances of time, that is, he ought to be excused on account of his youth, and the horrible persecutions the Protestants suffered at that time (gg). From whence it follows, that if Rivetus does not confess that Junius Brutus is the fictitious name of Mr du Pleffis Mornai, he does not deny it neither: which shews that he was more inclined to believe it than not. The only thing he clearly affirms, is, that the book was printed out of the kingdom, during the heat of persecutions and massacres, when Mr du Pleffis was very young. But this plainly shews that Rivetus was not initiated into the mystery, and that he knew little better than d'Aubigné the true date of the book. It is surprising that neither Grotius, whom hardly any thing escaped in the Republic of Letters, nor Rivetus, nor Marefius, whose reading was very extensive, should know nothing either of what d'Aubigné had said concerning Junius Brutus, in his second edition in 1626, or of Simon Goulart's Funeral Oration, spoken and printed at Geneva, in the year 1628. The Learned are a strange sort of people, they run after remote and fleeting things, and neglect what they have as it were under their very noses (bb). It is much like a hunter,

Transvolat in medio posita & fugientia captat (ii).

As a huntsman loves to chase his prey
But would not take it if it lay in 's way.

CREECH.

VIII.
The discovery
made by
Goulart's Fu-
neral Oration.

At the death of Simon Goulart, the seals were opened for a full revelation of the mystery. Theodorus Tronchin (kk), Divinity-Professor, making this Minister's Funeral Oration declared, that his memory and reading were almost infinite; and that people resorted to him as to an oracle, to know the truth of what they desired to know. A proof of which is, that King Henry III being exceedingly desirous to know the author, who was concealed under the fictitious name of Junius Brutus, and all the means he used for this purpose having failed him, resolved, at last, to effect it by a shorter way, as he supposed; which was to apply to Simon Goulart. But he, that he might not expose those who were concerned in it, was silent at that time; though he had seen the original of the author, and knew it was composed by Hubert Languet, and that du Pleffis Mornai having got the manuscript into his hands after the author's death, caused it to be printed by Thomas Guarin.

By this it clearly appears, 1. That this book, as soonest, was not printed till the end of the year 1581, since Languet died but on the first of October of that year.

2. That

2. That all was fictitious in the title of the first edition, the time and place of the impression, as well as the name of the author; for the book was said to be printed at Edinburgh in 1579 (ll). Besides, there was a preface added to it in the name of the Publisher, in which, he took the fictitious name of *Conon Superantius, Vasco*, and a false date both of time and place was used; viz. Soleurre, the first day of January 1577. It is easy to prove, that du Pleffis was not in Switzerland, in the interval between Languet's death and the publication of Junius Brutus's book; and I do not think, that any one will affirm, that Thomas Guarin was a Bookseller of Edinburgh (mm). It appears in the third place that the excuses alledged by Rivetus are not good, since it is certain, that when Languet died, France was no longer in a condition of persecuting the Protestants, except by civil-wars, in which each party suffered, and that Mr du Pleffis who was thirty-two years of age, had already written some very excellent books, the best perhaps he ever wrote, viz. his Treatise concerning the Church, and that concerning the Truth of the Christian Religion.

(ll) See the remark [B].

(mm) They feigned at that time, that several books were printed at Edinburgh; such as in 1574. The *Revelation des François*, written by Eusebe Philadelphus Cypriote (it is a fictitious name) and the treatise *de Furoribus Gallicis* published under the false name of Ernestus Varumundus Frisius, 1573.

(nn) Giffertus Voëtius.

IX. Voëtius's Dissertation censured by Placcius.

Voëtius (nn), Divinity-Professor at Utrecht, a man of immense reading, might perhaps, as well as Grotius, Rivetus, and Mareflus, have been ignorant all his life, of this unriending of Theodorus Tronchin, had not the *Vindicia contra Tyrannos* been reprinted at Amsterdam, in the year 1660, in which, to these words, *Stephano Junio Bruto Celso*, this was added, *sive, ut putatur, Theodoro Beza Autore*. The magistrates of Geneva being informed of it, thought themselves obliged to vindicate Beza's name, from this false imputation. They feared it would be a blot upon his memory, seeing that Junius Brutus's book was treated with the utmost ignominy: for when King James undertook to vindicate the Protestants, from the objections occasioned by that book, he answered, that probably, some Papist had fathered it on the Protestants, with a design to make them odious. *Quem nobis objicit Junius Brutus, auctor est ignotus, & forte Romanensis Ecclesie emissarius, ut per illum reformatæ religioni apud Principes conflarent invidiam*. (oo). And when the Protestant writers were harassed on the same account, they failed not to say, that they objected to them an unknown person, a man without any name or figure in the Church, or in the world, a phantom. This was a new reason for them to justify this great servant of God; however, it was much better that the reproaches should fall upon Lay-men, who were the true authors of the opinions objected against, than upon innocent Divines. For these causes, and other considerations, the Magistrates of Geneva wrote to the Magistrates of Amsterdam, the proofs of Beza's innocence (pp); and thereby, probably Voëtius came to the knowledge of the mystery revealed by Simon Goulart. Be it how it will, Voëtius published in the year 1662 (qq), an anonymous Dissertation, which he inserted four years after, in the fourth volume of his Theses, wherein he shewed by many arguments, that Beza was not Junius Brutus, and enlarged much upon Hubert Languet.

(oo) *Opus Regiorum*, pag. 478, which has been thus translated; Junius Brutus, whom he (Cardinal de Perron) objects to us is an unknown author; and perhaps one of the Romish Church hath writ it on purpose to make the Protestants odious to Princes, pag. 127, 128, of the Vindication of the Rights of Kings; printed in 1615, against Cardinal du Perron's harangue.

(pp) Placcius, de Script. Anonym. pag. 169.

(qq) He himself mentions that year in the fourth volume of his Theses, p. 230. Placcius, *ibid.* puts it in 1661.

Mr Placcius has criticized one of his proofs in defence of Beza. For Voëtius having said, that before the year 1660, no body, either among the friends or enemies of Beza and Languet, or among the editors of Junius Brutus, had ascribed this book to Beza, either expressly, or by way of suspicion; and that therefore the new conjecture of an unknown man given at random (rr), was of no weight; Mr Placcius shews him, that in the year 1652, one John Philips an Englishman, who wrote an answer to an apology for the King and people of England affirmed, that Beza was the author of Junius Brutus's book.

X. Beza accused before the time mentioned by Placcius.

The thing might have been carried higher, since some French Jesuits had a long time been beforehand with this John Philips; so that Voëtius is wrong in taking advantage from the silence not only of Becanus, Gresserus, and Eudæmon Johannes, but also of the whole society of the Jesuits, *totaque Jesuitarum natio*; for in the year 1611, we find that Father Cotton (ss) having collected several passages from Protestant authors, which he thought afforded matter for recrimination, and having not forgotten Junius Brutus, put in the margin *Theodorus Beza, sive Stephanus Junius Brutus, in Libro cui titulus, Vindicia contra Tyrannos*, &c. The Jesuit Richeome (tt), with the very same view, and on the same occasion, thus addressed himself to his adversary: *How will you excuse desbatvri Beza, who, being concealed under the sham-name of Junius Brutus, as you under that of Anti-Coton with the addition of three letters, wrote a book, concerning the lawful power of a Prince*, &c. A minister of Gergeau, called David Home, answering in the year 1612, the *Apology of the Jesuits*, written by a Father of the Society of Jesus of Loyola, denied what the author of the apology had asserted, that Beza had taken the mask of Junius Brutus. David Home's book is intitled, *le Contr' Assassin*. It has these words in page 329: *As for Stephanus Junius Brutus, whom he afterwards produces, we know no such man; but we say, that the Jesuit, in affirming him to be Theodorus Beza, without offering the least conjecture in the world for his assertion, lies Jesuitically, that is, impudently, and like a Machiavelist, who holds that tho' a lie be spread about but for half an hour, it still does good in state matters; tho' God forbids us to bear false witness against any one, as this man does against Beza, in whose writings there is not one word of exhortation to kill tyrants*, &c. After some citations, the author goes on thus: *This is what Beza says, which sufficiently disproves the Jesuit, who affirms that he is the author of the treatise produced under the name of Junius Brutus, which has no conformity with that of Beza*.

(rr) The Greek phrase he uses, is perhaps more emphatical; *ὡς ἂν ἐκκατακρύψει*.

(ss) Réponse Apologétique à l'Anti-Coton, &c. à ceux de la suite, p. 2. 173.

(tt) At page 471, of the Categorical Examination of the li-tel Anti-Coton, printed in 1613. He puts in the margin, Junius Brutus de Beza de legitima potestate, &c.

Beza, and is in all probability, the true name of the author, since there are several learned men, who are surnamed Junius. An Irish Jesuit (uu) cited Junius Brutus's book as Beza's performance, in the year 1614. I question not, but many others, both before, and after the answers to the Anti-Coton, have employed this calumny against Beza, and I expect to have quickly returned to me, what I have lent Mr Placcius; I mean, that I shall be shewn, that I might have still gone higher; from whence it will still be more apparent, how reserved we ought to be upon general affirmations, tho' we should have the vast reading of the famous Professor of Utrecht; for after all, the great knowledge he had of all sorts of books, prevented not his being ignorant: 1. That before the year 1660, Beza had been often accused of writing the book of Junius Brutus. 2. That two years before the Funeral Oration of Simon Goulart, the public was informed by d'Aubigné, that Hubert Languet had taken that fictitious name. 3. That Grotius had publicly named Mr du Pleffis Mornai as the author of that piece.

XI.
The Protestants apology for the Roman Church, by Brereley.

Expecting the return of my loan, I will say here that one John Brereley, an English priest, in his book, intituled, *The Protestants Apology for the Roman Church* (a), cites an author, called Sutcliffe (b), who said, that the *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, was a book written either by Beza or Hotman. Tho' I cannot discover at what time this apology was first printed; yet I doubt not but it was before the Jesuits answer to the Anti-Coton, since I learn from the translator, that as soon as it appeared in English, Bancroft, then Archbishop of Canterbury, ordered some learned Divines, and particularly Morton, to answer it, and that Morton's answer is called, *Catholica Appellatio pro Protestantibus*. Now this doubtless is the book of Morton, which according to the Oxford Catalogue appeared in 1606, under this title, *A Catholic Appeal for Protestants*; and therefore I ought not to believe that this Catalogue mentions the first edition of the apology, in these words of page 107, *The Protestants Apology for the Roman Church* 1608. Now, as Sutcliffe's book, cited by Brereley, is an answer to a petition of the Presbyterians, and the Oxford Catalogue places the impression of this answer in the year 1592, with this title, *An Answer to a Petition of the Consistorian faction, presented to her Majesty*, it is evident, that Junius Brutus's book was attributed to Beza long before the Jesuits answered the Anti-Coton.

It does not appear that Brereley, who produces a prodigious number of Protestant authors upon all subjects, had read Junius Brutus; for he cites nothing out of it: and for that reason the Bishop of Luçon (c) did not cite it in the book he published against the Protestants, in the year 1618, wherein he objects to them some other writers tainted with Hubert Languet's maxims, whose passages he had found in Brereley, as Rivetus intimates, in answering the Jesuit Petra Sancta. *A quo (libello Episcopi Lusitanensis) video non pauca te mutuatum fuisse, quemadmodum ille, aut potius sacerdos Anglicus qui tum ei fuit à manu ex laciniis Anglo-Papistarum* (d). I have not seen this book of the Bishop of Luçon; but what makes me think that he has not mentioned Junius Brutus, is, that David Blondel (e) answering this prelate, says nothing to him concerning this disguised author. We may easily see now, why Petra Sancta (f) speaks not of this author neither; it is because he borrowed from the Bishop (as Rivetus taxes him with it) all his citations of Anti-Monarchical Protestant authors. Hence it appears, that the author of the large answer to Maimbourg's History of Calvinism is mistaken in saying, (g) *That the Method ascribed to Cardinal Richelieu, and the Jesuit Sylvester à Sancta Petra, have furnished Mr Arnauld with the objection he makes to us about the royal authority*, in his Apology for the Catholics: for first, it is not in the Method, which was not published till after Cardinal Richelieu's death, but in a book he published before his Cardinalship, that he objected such republican writings: In the second place, if Mr Arnauld had taken his arguments from these two sources, he would not have found there Hubert Languet's work, nor the Magdeburg writing, which make the strength of his attack.

XII.
The Magdeburg writing.

This piece of Magdeburg is intituled, *de Jure Magistratum in subditos, & officio subditorum erga Magistratus*. Brereley (b) speaks of it only in general, and upon the credit of Sutcliffe, who ascribes it to Beza. This book was published in 1550, under the name of the inhabitants of Magdeburg. I cannot tell whether it be the same with that of which Sleidan has given the abstract (i). I know it only by the French edition of 1578, in 12mo. It is intituled, *du Droit des Magistrats, &c. Of the Right of Magistrates over their Subjects. A Treatise most necessary at this time, to admonish both Magistrates and Subjects of their duty: published by the Magdeburgers, in the year MDL: and now revised and enlarged with several reasonings and examples*. There were several editions before this. Mr Arnauld (k) made use of a Latin translation, printed in the year 1576, apud Joannem Marefcballum Lugdunensem, in 8vo, and done from the French. The author of the Commentaries *De statu Religionis & Reipublicæ in regno Gallie*, makes mention of a book published in the year 1573, which is the same with this. He owns that the author's design was to make an apology for the Protestants, who were then engaged the fourth time in a civil-war against Charles IX (l). Thuanus expressly observes under the year 1574 (m), that there came out a new edition of a book which had been printed in Germany, at the time of the siege of Magdeburg, and that this new edition was enlarged with several examples and reasonings. John Beccaria, who an-

ferred this book in the year 1596, represented it as a very new book: 'Quum superi-
 oribus diebus commentabamur aliquid de bello, liceret ne scilicet Christiano bellare,
 vel non, prodiit libellus quidam cui hic erat titulus, De jure Magistratuum in subdi-
 tos, & officio subditorum erga Magistratus (n). - - - A few days ago, when I was
 writing something concerning war, namely on this question; whether it is lawful for a
 Christian to go to war: there came out a little book intituled, Of the Right of Magistrates
 over their Subjects, and the Duty of Subjects to their Magistrates.' This shews
 there was lately a new edition of it, and that he knew nothing of the preceding. Some
 suspect that John Beccaria is not the true name of this author (o). What is certain, is,
 that he was not a Catholic: he was perhaps a kind of a Socinian. He uses his adversary
 very ill, and treats him as a sanguinary soul, and an enemy to peace. 'Videri homi-
 nem esse verè sanguinarium, bello, armisque amicum, hostem capitalem paci, nomini
 regio infensissimum, versatum in literis humanis, præsertim historiis, atque si divinare
 licet leguleium, in divinis haud adeò multum: nihil prorsus habentem illius mansue-
 tudinis & clementiæ illius pacifici, & mitissimi agni Jesu Christi (qui quidem dixit:
 † Discite à me, quòd mitis sum, & humilis corde: non autem dixit, Discite à me
 contendere, & litigare, multò certè minus bellare) sed abundare spiritu contentionis,
 ambitionis, & superbiæ: nescire prorsus quid sit vera concordia, quid pax, quid hu-
 militas, quid patientia, quid sit injuriam pati: sed optimè scire quid sit injuriam in-
 ferre, vel illatam vindicare: ignorare etiam omnino quid sit proximus, illud bene
 scire, † Proximus sum egomet mihi: Christi crucem nec scire, nec scire curare: om-
 nia humana ad trutinam, id est, ad suum arbitrium ponderare (p). - - - This author
 seems to be a sanguinary man, a friend to war and to arms, a mortal enemy to peace, an
 implacable biter of the name of King; he seems to be skilled in human learning, especially in
 History; and if I may be allowed to conjecture he is some petty-fogger, very little versed in
 Divinity, utterly void of the meekness and clemency of the mild and peaceable lamb Jesus
 Christ (who said, Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of heart; but did not say,
 Learn of me to be quarrelsome and litigious, much less learn of me to make war
 upon your neighbour) he seems to be full of the spirit of contention, ambition, and pride,
 to be an intire stranger to concord, peace, humility, patience, and the bearing of inju-
 ries; but to know perfectly well what it is to do an injury; or to revenge an injury re-
 ceived; to be utterly ignorant of charity, but to abound with self-love; he seems neither to
 know, nor care to know the cross of Christ; and in judging of all human affairs to be guided
 by nothing but his own fancy.' We must confess that Mr Arnauld had but little know-
 ledge of this piece of Magdeburg.

A Civilian of Bavaria, named John Baptist Ficklerus, knew only the edition of 1576,
 which induced him to answer it in a book which was printed at Ingolstadt in 1578,
 with this title: De jure Magistratuum in subditos, & officio subditorum erga Magistratus:
 Contra Libellum cujusdam Calviniani, sub eadem inscriptione, sed relicto nomine Autoris,
 & loci Typographiæ, superiori anno editum; nunc autem veritatis studio reformatum, retento
 quidem illius stylo, sed plerisque argumentis ad rei veritatem applicatis. Tractatus brevis
 & perspicuus, bisce ambiguis temporibus Christiano homini lectu admodum utilis & ne-
 cessarius.

XIII. Let me observe by the by, that it is dangerous to speak of books which we have
 not seen. Father Labbe, who had an almost infinite reading, and yet had not
 seen Brekeley's Protestants Apology, heard of it whilst his Dissertation upon Ec-
 clestical Writers was in the press; he would add to it something that was
 told him, but in three lines he made two faults (q): The one is, that he
 calls the author Breleius, instead of Breleius; the other is, that he ascribes to
 him the preface in which the Pope, St Gregory, is justified, whereas it is the
 translator who has wrote it.

XIV. What I have said of Sutcliffe, shews, that the proof Voëtius has founded upon the
 silence of all the Episcopalians, is not better than that which he has grounded on the
 silence of all the Jesuits. Besides, I observe that among Beza's adversaries, who Voëtius
 says, would not have spared him, if they could have fastened Junius Brutus's work upon
 him, he reckons at least five, whose silence proves nothing. These he names (r);
 viz. Charpentier, Baudouin, Castalio, Eraustus, Morellus, Saravia, Montague, Tilenus,
 Ladus, and Dr Bramble. As for Charpentier, who spoke very ill of Beza, in the
 violent satire he wrote to Francis Portus, in the year 1572 (s), he could not speak of
 Junius Brutus's book, which did not appear till some years after (t). Baudouin and
 Castalio, who died, the former in the year 1573, the latter in 1563, were still less able
 to speak of him. Thomas Eraustus, it is true, wrote against Beza on the subject of Ex-
 communication; but this was long before Junius Brutus's book appeared. Eraustus's
 answer is dated on the twenty-fourth of December 1569: Beza's name was not in the
 original (u); it was inserted by those who published it in the year 1589, after Era-
 ustus's death. These two antagonists had been very civil to one another at Basil after
 the dispute. As for Morellus I do not think, that after the national synod held at
 Nîmes in the year 1572, where his opinion was condemned, he entered the lists.
 This man had maintained, in the year 1562, that the right of Excommunication be-
 longed not to the Consistories and Synods, but to the whole body of the Church.

VOL. V. No. CXL.

9 A

He

(n) Jo. Beccaria,
 Refutat. cujusd.
 Libelli, pag. 1.

(o) Voët. Disp.
 Tom. iv, pag.
 238.

† Matth. xi.

† Terentius.

(p) Beccaria,
 ibid. pag. 9.

(q) Tom. i, p.
 786.

(r) Voët. ibid.
 pag. 234.

(s) Concerning
 this Letter see
 the remark [A],
 of the article
 CHARPEN-
 TIER.

(t) I do not
 think Charpentier
 wrote anything
 after the impres-
 sion of Vindiciæ
 contra Tyrannos.

(u) See Beza's
 preface to the
 tract de Vera
 Excommunicatione.

He was excommunicated for this opinion; and the writing he published on that subject was burnt, and the reading of it was forbidden (w). He nevertheless persisted in his opinion, and in the year 1572, was one of the members of the cabal, which endeavoured to make such a change in the discipline of the churches, that thence forward the power of the keys should be administered by the whole body of the people (x). Ramus was one of the heads of this cabal (y). Beza, who assisted in the national synod of Nîmes in 1572, opposed this faction *viva voce*, and by writing, and made it vanish into nothing. However, it cannot be denied, but that before the year 1660, Junius Brutus's Treatise was often ascribed to Beza in printed books: nevertheless, he who published it that year at Amsterdam, knew nothing of it; for the only reason he gives why he would have the title lengthened out with these words, *five, ut putatur, Theodoro Beza Autore*, is, that he had seen a copy upon which a learned professor had writ, that Beza had composed this book. This overthrows Mr Placcius's conjecture (z), viz. That the English author he cites, was the cause of Beza's name appearing in the edition of 1660. I wonder he did not quote Milton, who speaks thus, in one of his books: 'Doctrina hæc nobis haud magis quam Gallis, quos tu hoc piaculo cupis eximere, debetur: unde enim Francogallia illa nisi ex Gallia? unde Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos? qui liber etiam Bezæ vulgo tribuitur (aa). - - - This doctrine is not derived from the English, more than it is from the French, whom you desire to vindicate from this crime. For whence comes Francogallia, but from France? Whence the Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos, a book which is also commonly ascribed to Beza?' For the rest, several persons believed, that Milton was the author of John Philips's Apology. Salmasius affirms it roundly (bb). Others say, that he either wrote it, or advised the publishing of it: 'Eandem culpam commissam fuisse in Responso Philippi Angli ad Apologiam Anonymi cujusdam, &c. aliquando Hartlibo scripti, cujus libri authorem esse Miltonium, falem ejus consilio publicatum, firmissime creditur (cc). - - - I formerly wrote to Hartlib, that the same error was committed in the Answer of John Philips, an Englishman, to the Apology of an Anonymous Writer, &c. a book, which it is firmly believed was written by Milton, or at least published by his advice.'

XV.
Some late authors have been ignorant who was Junius Brutus.

XVI.
The libels of some private persons disowned.

Since Voëtius's Dissertation, it has been easier to know what to depend upon, as to Junius Brutus; and yet Mr Colomiés, and the author of the *News from the Republic of Letters*, had but a superficial knowledge of this matter, the one in the year 1668, the other in 1686 (dd). Nay, Mr Arnauld, composing his apology for the Catholics in the year 1682, and taking from Junius Brutus's book all that he could find capable of rendering the Protestant doctrine suspected to sovereigns, never attempted to strengthen his proofs with considerations taken from the person of the author; which makes it evident, that he knew not who he was. I observe all these little things to shew that those Protestants, who have said these last years (ee), that Junius Brutus was an unknown man, without name, character, or authority, might speak in this manner without any fraud; tho' one of the libels I have mentioned at the beginning of this dissertation, would insinuate the contrary: I mean, that kind of sermon wherein we are censured, for a pretended proneness to libelling and civil-wars, with as great vehemence, as ever a minister expressed in a fast-day sermon, when he lays the breach of the whole Decalogue to the charge of his hearers.

And since occasion offers, it will not be improper to say, that this man's violent reproaches have had a good effect. They are not perhaps the cause that little sorry satirical books, do not come so thick among us as before [C]; but it is certain at least, that they have obliged the most excellent writers of the party (ff), to inform the public, that it was unjust to make the body of the Refugees answerable for these bad books. So that posterity will always have some cotemporary records, to clear them from the malicious imputations that may be cast upon them. Let it not be said, that these ex-

[C] Perhaps they are not the cause, that little sorry satirical books come not so thick among us as before. This perhaps, is not improper here; for it is very probable that two other things have lessened their numbers; 1. The indignation that all honest men expressed against them. 2. The readers beginning to be tired with them; which never fails to happen when the same ragoo is served up too often, and when amongst the multitude of those who pretend to cook it, many of them make it very flat and insipid. It is a maxim that authors ought carefully to study; viz. that the greediness of the public, ought never to be abused, that satiety is to be avoided even in subjects of admiration; and therefore we ought not to yield with too great complacency, to this compliment of the Italian academies, *Di gratia, Signor, un'altra volta. -- Again, Sir, if you please*. This compliment is doubtless a testimony of approbation, and it is generally used to a Musician, who has charmed more than ordinary; and then the company is not sorry to be taken at their word: but he who should abuse the courtesy so far as to exceed

the rule of the Greeks, *δὶς καὶ τρίς τὸ καλὸν*, bis et ter quod pulchrum, --- a good thing may be twice or thrice repeated; and even what a Latin Poet (6) has said, that there are some poems which please, tho' ten times repeated, *decies repetita placebit*, would deserve to be referred to the old proverb, *twice seldem cabbage is death*, *δὶς κράμβη θάνατος*, crambis bis posita mors. It is not fit the public should be exposed to the miserable condition of those teachers of Rhetoric heretofore, who were forced to hear the declamations of a whole class variously turned, concerning the overthrow of tyrants.

Declamare doces, ô ferrea pectora Vetti!
Cum perimit favos classis numerosa Tyrannos.
Nam quæcumque sedens modò legerat, hæc eadem
stans
Perferet, atque eadem cantabit versibus iisdem.
Occidit miseris crambæ repetita Magi-
stros (7).
But

cellent writers, who disowned those libels, have done it without naming themselves; for having answered for their brethren in general, whilst none has excepted against their declaration, it is a proof that the whole body acquiesces in it. Add to this, that the name of him, who writes every fortnight on the affairs of the present time, in so polite and judicious a manner, is known to every body. And as for the author of the inimitable *History of the Works of the Learned*, is any body ignorant of his name? A name, that has so long been famous both at the bar and in the church, both *viva voce*, and in writing; a name, which two brothers render more illustrious every day; the one (gg) by his eloquent sermons, and learned answers to the Bishop of Meaux; the other (bb) by the incomparable journal I have mentioned. To say nothing of a cousin (ii) who has relieved Casaubon in the attack of Baronius's Annals. As to the defence of the Refugees against the *Important Advice*, the author of it is no doubt very worthy of credit (kk) when he affirms any thing in the name of his brethren. He fully answers the reproaches that concern the satirical spirit, and sets forth his opinion on the other point, with a great dexterity of wit. All things well considered, it must be owned that tho' a disavowal which had preceded the severe reproaches of the adversary, and had been made by persons appointed for this purpose by the Synod, would have been much more honourable and more authentic; yet none but extravagant cavillers, can henceforth renew these accusations. But to return to my subject.

(gg) Mr. Bagnage, Minister of Rotterdam.

(bb) Mr. Bagnage de Beauval, a Civilian.

(ii) Mr. Bagnage de Flotteville, Minister at Zutphen.

(kk) It was a Minister called Coulan, who died in England two or three years ago. I write this in 1696.

XVII.
The Funeral
Oration of
Goulart leaves
some doubt.

Voëtius did not so far trust to Simon Goulart's testimony, as to think it strange, that any person should still be a Sceptic, with respect to Junius Brutus; and for my part, I confess, that I still perceive in it some difficulties and intricacies, tho' I seemed so strongly to declare for Hubert Languet, who is the person to whom Mr de la Mare adjudges the book. He does it in a work not yet printed [D], and I do not know whether the thing be there particularized, as in the oration of the Geneva Professor, or otherwise; nor what proofs are given. If it could be proved that Junius Brutus's book was published before Languet's death, farewell Goulart's deposition. This will perhaps excite some person, well furnished with books and time, to seek for some light upon this subject; and I hope Mr Baillet will exhaust the matter in the great work the public expects from him, concerning authors who have disguised their names.

XVIII.
A fault in the
continuation
of the *Menagiana*.

There is in the Continuation of the *Menagiana* an error which I ought not to pass by. Languet's letters have a great many good things in them. Mr Languet was Counsellor in the parliament, and a man of great merit. It is he who was the author of that admirable work intitled, *Vindiciæ Regiæ contra Tyrannos*. He wrote this book in defence of Henry the fourth's right. As the declaring himself the author, would have endangered his life, he took for good measures with his Printer, and the secret

was

*But oh, what stock of patience wants the fool,
Who wastes his time and breath in teaching school!
To hear the speeches of declaiming boys,
Disposing tyrants with eternal noise!
Sitting or standing, still confin'd to roar,
In the same verse the same rules o'er and o'er.*

DAYDEN.

The condition of schoolmasters is not better at present. They dictate an exercise to a whole class, to have it turned several ways by their scholars; literally by some, paraphrased by others; in verse or in Greek by a third sort, and in two sorts of Latin prose by a fourth. It is still the same exercise, still the same thing under different words. The public not being paid for this, has no reason to suffer it. Now it is certain our ears have so often tingled with the same things, and the number ten hath been left so far behind, that we need not wonder that these showers fall not so thick as formerly. Every body set up for the same trade (8); it is no wonder therefore that it proved good for nothing.

[D] Mr de la Mare adjudges the book to Hubert Languet. He does it in a work not yet printed. I spoke thus in the year 1696; but now I must say that it has been printed at Hall in Saxony, in the year 1700. I have not found in it what I expected, but am left in all the uncertainty I was in before. Mr de la Mare says (9), that the year 1580 abounded with Political Writings, since besides the treatise of Voluntary Slavery, composed by la Boëtie, and the *Francogallia* of Hotman, there came out *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, written by Hubert Languet. This is most certain, says he, I have a great many proofs for it, and had I only this I am going to mention it would be sufficient. *Ad Vindicias redeo, quas est nonnulli tribuere videantur Francisco Hotomano, certissimum tamen est illarum auctorem esse Languetum, cujus rei quamvis alia me deferrent argumenta, sunt autem quam plurima,*

unum instar omnium hoc erit, quod modo sum prompturus Antonii Vioni Heroualli fide (10). This great proof, the only one that Mr de la Mare has been pleased to communicate to the public, consists in this, that he had heard Mr Vion d'Herouval say, that Henry III, understanding that Simon Goulart knew who was the author of the *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, immediately sent for him, and asked his name; that Goulart only answered, that his oath obliged him to conceal it during the author's life; that the King in vain added threatenings to entreaties; and that nothing was capable of shaking Goulart's resolution, who by a rare instance of fidelity and friendship, persisted to conceal, during Languet's life, the secret which had been trusted to him alone. *Cui (Henrico III) cum Gularius prefractè respondisset, non nisi post auctoris obitum nomen illius revelare sibi licitum esse, quod solemnè sacramento observaturum se promiserat, Rexque precibus minas adderet, persistit tamen in proposito Gularium, neque precibus neque minis adduci unquam potuisse, ut priusquam fato functus fuisset Languetus, quod sibi soli commiserat arcanum proderet, raro constantis fidei & amicitiae exemplum* (11). Now here is a proof which can be of no use to us: for though Mr Vion d'Herouval should

(10) Ibid. pag. 124.

(11) Ibid. pag. 125.

have better known the circumstances of the fact, he would have taught us only what we knew before. It is plain that he had mediately or immediately, from the Funeral Oration of Simon Goulart, the particulars he related to Mr de la Mare. He could not therefore be a new evidence. Now either for want of memory, or because others had misinformed him of Theodorus Tronchin's account, he related it very ill, since it is false that Henry III sent for Goulart, entreated and threatened him, and that Goulart answered, his oath engaged him to be silent, and that the secret was committed only to him. I wonder Mr de la Mare believed that a Minister answered Henry III, in that manner, with impunity. I say nothing of the false dates he gives of Stephen de la Boëtie's, and Francis Hotman's books.

[E] An

(8) Espectes eadem à summo minimoque poetæ. Juven. Sat. I, vers. 14.

(9) Vita Huberti Langueti, pag. 123.

was so well kept, by the mutual interest they had in it, that it was not known to be his book till long after his death; and the Printer, who after the peace declared he had printed it, discovered also to Henry IV how the matter was ordered. 1. This expression, *Counsellor in the parliament*, ought to signify here that Hubert Languet had that place in the parliament of Paris. But it is certain he had it not in any parliament of France. 2. His book had not the title of *Vindiciæ Regiæ*, nor ought to have it. 3. Mr Menage would never have called it *admirable*, if he had known what subject it treats, and upon what principles it goes. 4. Nothing could be more pernicious to Henry IV, than Languet's book, since it authorized the French to depose Henry III, and to place the crown on the head of the Duke of Guise. 5. Lastly, all the rest of the account, the secret of the Printer, and the discovery of the mystery after the peace, are quite contrary to truth, and all probability. I do not deny that in some sense Mr Menage might have thought that this work of Languet is an admirable piece: he might have found in it learning and art, a great order and method, and the best and most solid arguments that can be offered for the rights of the people, which is a very problematical point. It has several fair sides (ll), and may be maintained with so many plausible reasons, that it must not be thought strange, that not only factious, turbulent, and restless men should have espoused it, but also several persons of great judgment and of an exemplary virtue. I may reckon among the latter Stephen de la Boétie, who wrote the discourse intituled, *de la Servitude volontaire, or du CONTRE-UN*. There never was a better citizen, nor a greater enemy to commotions than he, and he would have much rather employed his skill and learning in order to suppress them than to raise them (mm). What cannot be justified is, that frequently the same persons who write for the rights of the people, would write for arbitrary power, if affairs should change; that is, if a despotic power came to be exercised in their favour, and to the great prejudice of a party which they hate. When the Catholics of France, in the XVIth century, saw the wars of religion arise, they wrote very much for the right of Kings; but when they saw the right of succession devolved on a Protestant Prince, they changed their principles (nn), and wrote very much for the right of the people. We have seen this ridiculous caprice in the article of Claudius de SAINTES. I question whether, after the death of Henry III, Arnaud Sorbin would have written what he published in the year 1576 (oo). Would Peter Charpentier have written against the civil-wars in the year 1590, what he wrote a little after the death of Charles IX? He received a smart answer intituled, *Petri Fabri Responsio ad Petri Carpentarii famelici Rabule sacrum de retinendis armis & pace repudianda Consilium ad V. C. Lomanium Terridæ, & Seriniaci Baronem*. - - - Peter Faber's answer to the advice of Peter Charpentier, a hungry pettifogger, concerning the continuance of the war, and the rejecting of a peace: dedicated to Mr de Lomanie, Baron of Terride and of Seriniac. It was printed at Neustad in the year 1575, and published in French the year following with this title, *Traité duquel on peut apprendre en quel cas il est permis à l'homme Chrétien de porter les armes, & par lequel est répondu à Pierre Charpentier, tendant à fin d'empêcher la paix, & nous laisser la guerre: par Pierre Fabre, à Monsieur de Lomanie, Baron de Terride & de Seriniac*. - - - A treatise wherein we may learn in what case it is lawful for a Christian to bear arms; and in which Peter Charpentier is answered, tending to hinder a peace and continue the war: by Peter Faber, dedicated to Mr de Lomanie, Baron of Terride and of Seriniac. It was necessary I should set down this French title; for the readers had never believed, by the Latin title, that Charpentier exhorted the people to lay down their arms, and only proposed to them an evangelical submission (pp). In all parties there are some indiscreet persons who publish books, which are afterwards upbraided to the whole body. An Englishman, named William Allen, under Cromwell's usurpation, published a book intituled, *Killing no murder*. A Canon of Ancis immediately imputed this doctrine to the Protestants, in a work that was answered by the late Mr Turretin. Was not this reproach ridiculous? Can the wisest and the best regulated communions restrain the unruly pen of every private member? Guy Patin spoke judiciously of this English book, but he was ill-informed of the circumstances. They have printed in Holland, says he (qq), a little book intituled, *A Political Treatise, &c.* that the killing of a tyrant is no murder. It is said to be translated from the English, but that book was first written in French by a gentleman of Nevers, called Mr de Marigni, who is a great wit. This doctrine is very dangerous, and it were better to be silent about it. I do not love that there should be so many books de venenis (concerning poisons) for the same reason: I have always the public good in view, and I do not love those who do any thing that may be prejudicial to it. It is not true that the English piece was written by Marigni: an Englishman is the author of it, and Marigni was not capable of writing so grave and so serious a book.

XIX.
Another book
published under
the false
name of Ju-
nius Brutus.

For the rest, Languet is not the only person who disguised himself under the name of Junius Brutus. The famous Socinian Crellius did it also in a book concerning liberty of conscience. The catalogue of the Bodleian library mentions it in this manner: *Junius Brutus Polonus; Vindiciæ pro Religionis libertate*, and refers us to *Val. Magnus*. But if you consult the article of Father Valerian Magni, you will find nothing relating to this Junius Brutus Polonus, except that there is mention made of a book printed like his

his at Eleutheropolis (rr); and there also the catalogue refers us to Pet. Haberkornius, though Dr Hyde has not put under that name any thing relating to Father Valerian, or Junius Brutus Polonus. We are referred still from the article Petrus Haberkornius, to that of Feurbornius, where we find nothing that has any affinity with the other articles. I am not ignorant of the relation that is between the Capuchin Valerian Magni, and the Professor Haberkorn; they disputed against each other *viva voce*, and Haberkorn has published, amongst other books, an *Anti-Valerian* [E], which Mr Baillet has not forgotten in his curious collection of Anti's (ss). But since Dr Hyde mentions nothing of this, methinks his references are to no purpose, and that it is a little want of exactness, in one of the most exact works that have been made in that kind.

I shall conclude this Dissertation with a passage of the preface to the *Sorberiana*. I have not been able to know what is become of his (tt) little treatise *de Pace & Concordia inter Christianos concilianda*, nor of the translation he made of a book printed in the year 1637, and intitled *Junii Bruti Poloni Vindiciæ pro Religionis libertate*, which was not written, as some have thought by the learned Hubert Languet, tho' he formerly disguised himself under that name in his *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, and which ought to be looked upon as a continuation of the treatise *de Libertate Ecclesiastica*, printed in the year 1607, which was doubtless written by Casaubon, who, besides, speaks of it plainly enough in his 539th letter of the Hague edition, though he had spoken of it in ambiguous words in two or three other foregoing letters.

Since the first edition of this Dictionary I have learned a particular which I thought very curious (uu). It is in an English book which was printed at London in the year 1649, as an apology for a book which the Ministers of that great city had lately published, and as an answer to the invectives dispersed in a book of John Price. The book in which this particular is to be found, is intitled, *A modest and clear vindication of the serious representation, and late vindication of the Ministers of London, from the scandalous aspersions of John Price, in a pamphlet of his intitled, Clerico Clauicium, or The Clergies Alarum to a third war*. John Price had made this reproach to the Ministers that several of them had published books which tended only to raise rebellions, and he had put Beza in the fourth rank, as being the author of the *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*. You are much in the wrong, says the answer, to follow in this the Popish writer of a book intitled, *Imago utriusque Ecclesiæ, Hierosolymæ & Babylonis, per P. D. M.* This writer, who is thought to be Tobias Matthews, said in the 105th page, that Junius Brutus's book was written by Beza: can you do justice to so orthodox a Divine as Beza, when you take up the calumnies of the Papists against so zealous a Protestant? Does not the same author, who accuses him of writing the *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, accuse him also of having usurped the parish and wife of another man? The first accusation is as false as the last. It is easy to prove that he is not the author of that book: would so wise and so learned a man have affirmed, in one book, the contrary of what he had taught in another? In all his writings he labours to shew that we ought to be obedient to magistrates; he says nothing of the deposing or murdering of Kings, which is the only end of Junius Brutus's book. A great many passages, directly opposite to Brutus's principles, might be drawn from the works of Beza: here is one or two. Private persons, says he †, who are the subjects of a tyrant, have no remedy allowed them, besides amendment of life, prayers, and tears. He will indeed have them to disobey the orders of a Prince when they are contrary to the law of God, but not to take up arms against him. *Aliud esse non parere quam resistere, vel ad arma se comparare quæ à Domino non acceperis* ‡. - - There is a difference between disobeying and resisting, or recurring to arms, which God has not put in our hands. He wrote a book *de Hereticis à Magistratu puniendis*; but he never said one word *de Magistratibus ab Hereticis puniendis*. This work of Junius Brutus, continue they, which good authors, as you say, ascribe to Beza, was, in truth, written by a Jesuit. We know from good hands that the Jesuit Parsons was the author of it; some persons still living can witness, that one Rench, a Bookseller, was condemned to be hanged for printing this book with another that the same author wrote under the name of Doleman. There is a parliament-man, now sitting in the House of Commons, who has caused Junius Brutus's work to be translated into English by the same Walker who has written the monthly Mercuries. This translation has been published; but lest it should be known that it is the

VOL. V.

9 B

Jesuit

(rs) Baillet, Anti, num. xxxix.

[E] *An Anti-Valerian*.] Mr Baillet (12), says that the Anti-Valerian was written against a book of Controversy of Father Valerian Magni, printed at Vienna in Austria in 1641, with the title of *Judicium de A. catholicorum & Catholicorum Regula credendi*. This is true; but I observe that this Capuchin's work is composed of two treatises which are not twins. That which concerns the rule of faith of the Non-Catholics, is some years older than the other. It was published at Prague, in the year 1628. Several Protestants an-

swered it. John Major, in the year 1630. James Martini, and John Botfac in 1631, Conrad Bergius in 1639. A Socinian attacked it in the year 1633, without naming himself: this was Joachim Stegman, whom I have mentioned above (13). He did more injury to the cause than good. This Capuchin's book was re-printed at Vienna in the year 1641, with the author's replies to those five antagonists, and with the Treatise intitled, *Catholicorum Regula Credendi*.

(rr) The Bibliotheca Antiquariarum, num. 151, pag. 117, that Cellus wrote a book under the name of Junius Brutus, informs us, pag. 133, that this other book was written by Joachim Stegman, with this title, Brevi Disquisitione quomodo vulgo dicti Evangelici Pontifices ac nominatim Valeriani Magni de A. catholicorum credendi regula Judicium, solidè atque evidenter reatue quantæ Eleutheropoli apud Godfridum Philalecium 1633, in 12mo.

(s) Num. xxxix.

(t) That is, Sorbier.

(uu) Mr Hill, Minister of the English Church of Rotterdam, was pleased to acquaint me with it, and to lend me the book.

† Nullum aliud remedium proponitur privatis hominibus tyranno subiectis præter vite emendationem, preces & lachrymas. Beza, in Confessione Fidei Christianæ, cap. 4, circa finem.

‡ Ibid.

(13) Citation (rr).

A DISSERTATION, &c.

Jesuit Parsons's book, Junius Brutus's name has been left out, and another title put to it.

This is the substance of the Latin extracts I caused to be made out of this English book. It is a curious thing, in my opinion, that Robert Parsons the Jesuit should pass in England for the author of Stephen Junius Brutus's *Vindicie contra Tyrannos*: but I do not believe that this work ought to be ascribed to him (xx). I can hardly think it possible that an English Jesuit should write at that time upon such a question, without saying any thing relating to England, and nothing but what bespeaks him a good French Protestant.

(xx) Mr. Hill told me, that Christopher Love, M.A. of London, who was libelled during Cromwell's usurpation, maintained, in a book, that Parsons is the pretended Junius Brutus.



A DISSER-

A DISSERTATION

CONCERNING

DEFAMATORY LIBELS,

*On occasion of a passage of Tacitus, which I have recited in the article
CASSIUS SEVERUS (a), and which informs us that Augustus was the
first who proceeded against those libels by the law de Majestate.* <sup>(a) Citation
(9).</sup>

I.
An innova-
tion under
the empire of
Augustus,
with regard
to libels.

I Would fain know what reasons the Emperor Augustus went upon, to involve Defamatory Libels, under the crimes of high-treason; for as Tacitus observes, before this, treacheries, which had weakened the armies, seditions which had weakened the people, and lastly, an ill administration of offices which had weakened the majesty of the Republic, were only comprehended under this kind of crimes: and actions indeed were punished, but not words. ‘*Legem majestatis red-
erat; cui nomen apud veteres idem, sed alia in judicium veniebant: si quis prod-
tione exercitum, aut plebem seditionibus, denique male gesta Rep. majestatem populi
Romani minuisse. Facta arguebantur, dicta impunè erant. Primus Augustus cog-
nitionem de famosis libellis specie legis ejus tractavit, commotus Cassii Severi libidi-
ne, qua viros feminasque illustres procacibus scriptis diffamaverat* (b). - - - *Augustus*
*had revived the law concerning violated majesty; a law, which in the days of our ancestors,
had indeed the same name, but implied different arraignments, and crimes; namely those
against the state, as when an army was betrayed abroad, when seditions were raised at home;
in short, when the public was faithlessly administered, and the majesty of the Roman people
was debased: these were actions, and actions were punished, but words were free. Augustus
was the first, who brought libels under the penalties of this wrested law, being provoked by
the insolence of Cassius Severus, who had in his writings wantonly defamed men and ladies of
illustrious quality.* For which reason another Historian observes, that it was a novelty
to see a lady of the family of the Claudii accused before the people, as guilty of high-
treason, for having said in the hearing of a prodigious multitude, that stoop her coach,
would to God my brother would return into the world, and lose another fleet, that there might
be fewer people at Rome (c). The Commentators observe here a two-fold novelty; one
in the sex of the accused, the other in entitling a simple wish, a treason. I do not see
that even at present, it is a point of law, well established, and constantly practised, that
slanders upon the Prince’s person, even in writing, should be deemed state-crimes, or
high-treason (d). So that Augustus, did a thing, so much the more singular, because
he principally established that law against satires, which did not concern his person. I
have before related Tacitus’s words, which shew that Cassius Severus’s libels against
persons of quality of both sexes, obliged this Emperor to make this new law. I do not
find that this Cassius was accused of libelling Augustus, and I find in Suetonius, that
this Emperor did not punish satirical discourses nor writings that concerned him. ‘*Nec
quidquam ultra aut statim aut postea inquisivit. Tiberio quoque de eadem re sedulo
violentius apud se per epistolam conquerenti ita rescripsit, etati tue, mi Tiberi, noli in
hoc re indulgere, & nimium indignari quemquam esse qui de me male loquatur, satis est
enim si hoc habemus, ne quis nobis male facere possit* (e). . . . Etiam sparsos de se in curia
famosis libellos, nec expavit, nec magnâ curâ redarguit, ac ne requisitis quidem auto-
ribus, id modo censuit cognoscendum posthac de iis qui libellos aut carmina ad infa-
miam cujuscumque sub alieno nomine ederent (f). - - - Nor did Augustus make any fur-
ther inquiry after these libels, either as soon as they came out or afterwards. Tiberius ha-
ving written a letter to him, wherein he very earnestly and warmly complained of that affair,
he wrote back thus. My dear Tiberius, do not indulge the warmth of your youth
in that matter, nor be too much provoked, that there is any body who speaks ill of
me;

(b) Tacit. An-
nal. lib. i, cap.
lxviii.

(c) Novo more
judicium majo-
ritas apud popu-
lum mulier fa-
bit, quod in
conferat multi-
tudine agere pro-
cedente carpento
palam optaverit
ut frater suus
pulcher revivif-
ceret, atque ite-
rum classem am-
mitteret quo mi-
nor turba Romæ
foret. Sueton.
in Tiber. cap. ii.

(d) Aubert,
History of Car-
dinal de Richelieu,
lib. iv, p.
m. 405, quotes
an arrest of the
Parliament of
Paris, of the
27th of April
1620, which
condemned to
the galleys a man
convicted of
high-treason for
having had a
hand in a libel
against the
state.

(e) Sueton. in
Aug. cap. li.

(f) Ibid. esp.
10.

me; for it is sufficient if we have this satisfaction, that no body can do us harm
 'And when some libels which defamed him, were dispersed in the court, he was neither much concerned, nor did he take much care to suppress them; and, without inquiring after the authors of them, he only ordered that, for the future, they who published under the name of another man, poems, or libels which defamed any person, ought to be prosecuted.'

II.
 Three Historians give an imperfect account of it, especially Suetonius.

But who will not be surprized at this, that tho' three different authors have spoken one after another, of this law of Augustus, yet we do not find the circumstances of it exactly explained and confirmed, by the mutual assistance of the three witnesses? Tacitus barely tells us that the crime of writing Defamatory Libels, was brought under the law *de Majestate*. Suetonius who came after Tacitus, makes no mention of this law *de Majestate*; he only says Augustus ordered, that for the future, those, who published such Libels under another name, should be prosecuted. Dion, who comes after Suetonius, likewise makes no mention of the law *de Majestate*, and only says, 1. That Augustus, two years before he died, ordered informations to be made against Defamatory Libels, and that the *Ædiles* of Rome, and the Governors of other places, should burn all the writings of this kind that they should discover. 2. That he punished some Libellers. Of those three Historians, Suetonius has the least cleared up this matter, since his words would allow us to think, that provided a man wrote Libels under no name, or under his own (g), he might safely defame all the court and the city. Why then was Cassius Severus banished? Why were Labienus's writings burnt? Can any one believe it was because these two authors had published their books under the names of others? What a foolish conceit would this be!

III.
 Vain attempts to justify Suetonius.

Torrentius would save Suetonius's honour by substituting, without the authority of any manuscript, these words *suo alienove nomine*, - - under his own name, or that of another man, for these *sub alieno nomine*, - - - under the name of another man. But I observe that this correction has been rejected with the utmost contempt; so far that Suetonius's Commentator in *usum Delphini*, thought it did not make a new sense, so little had he examined it. Others by *sub alieno nomine*, &c. - - - under the name of another man, &c. will have the satires to be understood, in which the names of the persons satirized, did not appear. But this explanation is only looked upon as a last shift: after all, notwithstanding these expedients, might not the most abusive satires have been published with impunity, according to Suetonius; provided they had been anonymous, or had not abused a man under a false name, but under his true name? And would not this be a shameful reproach to the Emperor's council? Lastly, some say, that whereas the laws of the twelve tables had sufficiently prohibited the making satires in one's own name, Augustus thought himself only obliged to condemn those which were published under the name of another person. But 1. We do not see that the laws of the twelve tables concern anonymous satires more or less, than those that appeared under a man's true name or false one. 2. It had been very needless to forbid only those that should come out with the names of the authors: and what probability is there, that the ancient laws of Rome should have left so large a gap, for any one who had a mind to evade them? 3. Is it usual in making any addition to a law not to renew and confirm the ancient orders? 4. Can it be conceived that if the ancient Roman laws had not punished the most punishable satires, that is, the nameless ones, whose blows fall thickest and heaviest, Augustus, when he was supplying what was wanting in them, should have forgot the most necessary remedy, viz. the punishment of anonymous libels? It is far more probable, that it was he, who caused the law or the decree of the senate to be made, the words whereof, Ulpian has preserved to us; 'Si quis librum ad infamiam alicujus pertinentem scripsit, composuit, edidit, dolove malo fecit quo quid eorum fieret, etiam si alterius nomine ediderit, vel sine nomine; uti de ea re agere liceat: & si condemnatus sit, qui id fecit, intestabilis ex lege esse jubetur (b). - - If any person should write, compose, or publish a book tending to defame another man, or is unlawfully concerned in the writing or publishing of such a book, notwithstanding he should publish it in the name of another person, or without any name; let him be prosecuted: and if the author of that book be found guilty, by virtue of this law, he shall be incapable of making any last will or testament.'

I confess the modern Historians are too prolix, and that some of them write more volumes upon the age they live in, than Livy wrote upon all the ages of conquering Rome, from the time of it's foundation, to the empire of Cæsar. But on the other hand the Antients are too short, and it is better for our instruction, that a History should contain too many particulars, than omit too many.

IV.
 Whether libels were comprehended under the crimes of high-treason, because they are an usurpation of the supreme authority.

Perhaps some will think that Augustus needed no very refined reasoning to shew, that Libellers deserved to be prosecuted as guilty of high-treason, since it is evident that a subject who defames his neighbour, usurps one of the rights of sovereignty, and that it belongs solely to the sovereign to inflict the pain of infamy, as well as that of banishment, imprisonment, death, &c. But this would be a very false way of reasoning, and at once convert into high-treason, the violation of all the laws, adultery, theft, seducing a virgin, &c. for it may be said that a robber not only despises the laws of his sovereign, but also usurps a right that belongs solely to him: none but a sovereign can take away a private man's possessions, either in whole or in part. The right of fining, confiscating, &c. must flow from the supreme power, as well as that of branding any one with infamy;

infamy; and consequently we cannot say, that a satirist, who defames his neighbour, is guilty of high-treason, without concluding that a robber, and a fornicator, are so too. This would hold so much the truer with respect to fornicators, because if they debauch a married woman, they hazard the defrauding the true heirs, by the intrusion of an illegitimate coheir, and at the same time, they bring a great dishonour upon the head of the husband: if they debauch a maid, they cast upon her an ignominious blemish, which reflects upon her family, and they cause her father a real damage and a pecuniary loss, like that which consists in the waste of merchandises. For indeed a deflowered maid, is like palled wine, which sinks in its price; it is a commodity which the proprietor has still upon his hands, unless he will put it off at a great loss; I mean by undermatching his daughter, or giving her an exorbitant portion. We cannot therefore this way justify the new law of Augustus: the shortest way is probably to confess that it was not regular. I do not know but by a forced construction, it was derived from a maxim or definition, that is found in Cicero, which makes it a diminution of the majesty of the Roman people, to take any thing from the dignity, grandeur, or power of that people, or from those to whom they communicated any power. *Majestatem minuire est de dignitate, aut amplitudine, aut potestate populi, aut eorum quibus populus potestatem dedit aliquid derogare* (i). I only believe, that by the law *de Majestate*, must be meant something more, than Auberi means in the place I have cited, where he says, that Augustus did but renew the prosecution for a capital crime, which the laws of the twelve tables had enacted against the authors of Defamatory Libels. I shall observe by the way, that Mr Naudé has mistaken the twelve tables for a decree of the senate. Nay, he affords a proof of his error, for what he cites from Arnobius, manifestly proves the justice of my censure. *If the parliament, says he (k), had had leisure to cast their eyes upon all these Defamatory Libels, I dare say they would have bindred the sale of a great part of them, had it been only to imitate the virtue of that antient Roman senate, of which Arnobius said, if my memory does not fail me: 'Carmen malum conscribere, quo fama alterius co- inquinetur, & vita, decemviralibus scitis evadere noluitis impunitum. - - By the laws of the Decemviri (or of the twelve tables), you did not suffer the man to pass unpunished, who wrote any malicious poem, to defame the character and life of another person.'*

Tiberius continued this innovation of Augustus, especially on account of some slander- ing writers, who attacked his person, and touched the most tender fores of his family. 'Mox Tiberius consultante Pompeio Macro Prætor, an judicia Majestatis redderentur, exercendas leges esse respondit. Hunc quoque asperavere carmina incertis auctoribus vulgata in sævitiam superbiamque ejus, & discordem cum matre animum (l). - - Tiberius afterwards, when Pompeius Macer the Prætor consulted him, whether process should be granted upon this law? answered, that the laws must be executed. He also was exasperated by satirical verses, written by unknown authors, and dispersed, exposing his cruelty, his pride, and his mind naturally alienated from his mother.' He afterwards extended this law to every body (m): poor Cremutius Cordus in vain pleaded (n), that he had written nothing offensive, either against Tiberius, or the Emperess, who were those, said he, whom the law *de Majestate* comprehended; this was not sufficient to clear him from his pretended crime of having praised Brutus and Cassius. 'Verba mea, Patres Conscripti, arguuntur, adeo factorum innocens sum. Sed neque hæc in principem aut principis parentem, quos lex majestatis amplectitur (o). - - As to facts, I am so guiltless, conscript fathers, that my words only are accused: but neither are any words of mine pointed against the Emperor, or his mother, who are the only persons comprehend- ed in the law concerning violated majesty.' Note, That Tacitus seems to have forgotten what he had said in the seventy-second chapter of the first book: for as he makes Cre- mutius Cordus speak, one would think that only libels against the Emperor, and the Emperess were comprehended under the law *de Majestate*: But there is not any shadow of that restriction in the seventy-second chapter.

V.
Nero bore li-
bels some-
what patient-
ly.

But I must not forget to say, that this law *de Majestate*, was not always fatal. Nero, cruel as he was, not only did not annul the decree of the senate, which condemned the Prætor Antistius only to banishment, and the confiscation of his estate, for having published some satires against the Emperor (p); but he declared to the senate, that he permitted them fully to absolve Antistius. *Se qui severitatem decernentium impediturus fuerit, moderationem non prohibere. Statuerent ut vellent, datam etiam absolvendi licentiam* (q). The senate stood to their first resolution. Almost at the same time Fabricius Veiento, author of several libels against the senators, and the clergy of Rome (r), having been tried by Nero himself, was only banished Italy. His books were condemned to be burnt: they were afterwards bought up and read with the greatest eagerness, whilst there was danger in doing it; but when it was permitted to have them, they were no longer minded. *Convictum Veientonem Italia depulit & libros exuri jussit, conquisitos lectissimosque donec cum periculo parabantur, mox licentia habendi oblivionem attulit* (s). Suetonius observes, as a very singular thing, that Nero was so passive, as to detraction, that he shewed no greater mildness to any, than to such as exercised their satirical wit upon him. Some galling verses upon him were handed about and posted up; but he was not concerned at it, he made no search after the authors; and some of them having been prosecuted before the senate, he prevented their being rigorously punished for it. *Mirum & vel*

(i) Cicero, lib. ii, de Invent. I say nothing of a passage of Cicero, Epist. XI, lib. iii, ad famili. wherein he says, as some will have it, that Sylla made it high-treason to defame any person; est majestas (& sic Sylla voluit) ne in quemvis impure declamari liceret; I say, I do not speak of it, because I do not think it is well corrected. Besides, I should prefer Lambinus's explanation to that of Manutius, though I am of opinion that they are both faulty.

(k) Naudé, Dialogues de Mæcenas, pag. 18.

(l) Tacit. Annal. lib. i, cap. lxxii.

(m) See Suetonius, in Tiber. cap. lxxiii.

(n) Apud Tacitum, Annal. lib. i, cap. xxxiv.

(o) Ibid.

(p) Probræ ad- versus principem carmina facta- vit, vulgavitque celebri convivio. . . . Exin . . . majestatis delatus est. Tacit. Annal. lib. xiv, cap. xlviii.

(q) Tacit. ibid. cap. xl.

(r) Quod multa & probræ in Patres & Sacerdotes composuisset, iis libris quibus nomen codicillorum dode- rat. Ibid. cap. l.

(s) Ibid.

Et vel præcipue notabile inter hæc fuit, nihil eum patientius quam maledicta & convicia hominum tulisse, neque in ullos leniorem, quam qui se diis aut carminibus laceffissent, exitisse. . . . Vel contemptu omnis infamiae, vel ne fatendo dolorem irritaret ingenia (t). All the punishment he ordered for the galling raillery of a Cynic, who had insulted him in the open street, and for his being ridiculed on the stage, was the banishing the Philosopher and Comedian out of Italy. Suetonius could not tell whether there was more indolence than policy in it: For Nero, by shewing his repentment would have had reason to fear he should encourage the detractors; and every one knows Tacitus's sentence in the thirty-fourth chapter of the fourth book of his Annals, on occasion of a doubt like that of Suetonius: an injury, says he, that is despised, falls of itself: if you are disturbed at it, you propagate and strengthen it. 'Carmina Bibaculi & Catulli referta contumeliis Cæsarum leguntur: sed ipse divus Julius, ipse divus Augustus, & tulere ista & reliquere, haud facile dixerim, moderatione magis an sapientiâ: namque sprete exolefcunt: si irascere, adgnita videntur. - - - The poems of Bibaculus and those of Catullus, stuffed with virulent satires against the Cæsars, are still read. But even the deified Julius, even the deified Augustus, bore all these invectives and disdained them, whether with greater moderation or wisdom, I cannot easily say. For, if they are despised, they fade away, if you wroth, you seem to avow them to be just.'

VI. It is very necessary to restrain the licentiousness of libels. The ancient Heathens restrain-
ed it.

This is well enough, if the question is only about pardoning the slanders, in which a sovereign is personally concerned; but his subjects ought not to be left exposed to this outrage. Domitian would deserve to be highly extolled, had he only punished those who had slandered the persons of the best quality in Rome, in which he did not use too much rigour (u). It seems therefore that the excessive severity of Augustus against defamatory libels, if separated from the abuse his successors often made of that law, consisted only in the expression and in the pompous word *de Majestate*, and so his conduct is not in reality blamable: for this licentiousness of libels, is one of those that ought to be restrained in a government. The honour, glory, and reputation of families, things a thousand times more precious than gold or silver, would be very precarious, unless the insolence, and malignity of satirical writers were repressed. Indeed they would begin with persons of an ill life; but after such a beginning they would spread like the plague, indiscriminately upon places both sacred and profane, upon chaste as well as prostitute families. Antiquity would have had a full experience of this, had it not been at last prevented by good laws, and by submitting libellers to the secular power, when jests were carried too far, and when those who were not yet bitten by these mad dogs, considered that their turn would also come, and that therefore they ought to concur with those who had been already wounded, to put a stop to such a disorder. It is in this case as when a house is on fire; the neighbours labour as much to extinguish it, as they whose house is actually in flames (w). Let us see how Horace relates the affair.

Fescennina per hunc inventa licentia morem
Versibus alternis opprobria rustica fudit,
Libertasque recurrentes accepta per annos
Lusit amabiliter, donec jam sævus apertam
In rabiem cœpit verti jocus, & per honestas
Ire minax impune domos. Dolere cruento
Dente laceffiti, fuit intactis quoque cura
Conditione super communi: quin etiam lex
Pœnaque lata, malo quæ nollet carmine quemquam
Describi. Vertère modum formidine fustis
Ad benedicendum delectandumque redacti (*).

Hence grew the liberty of the looser Muse,
Hence they grew scurrilous and would abuse;
Hence those loose dialogues at marriage feasts,
Yet still they were but mirth, and country jests.
At last, they shew'd their teeth, and sharply bit
And railery usurped their place of wit.
Good persons were abus'd, and suffer'd wrong;
They loudly talk'd no law to curb their tongue:
The wounded griev'd, the smart provok'd their hate;
And all untouch'd bewail'd the common fate:
Till laws commanded to regard men's fame,
Severely lash the vice, but spare the name.
Fear made them civil, and design to write
With modesty, speak well, and to delight.

CREECH.

Cicero had also observed, that the ancient Greek comedies so much abused the liberty they had to censure the bad lives of private persons, by name, and directly, that no body

(t) Sueton. in
Nerone, cap.
xxxix.

(u) Scripsit
mola vulgare
culta, quibus
motus vari ac
minime notua-
tar, absque
fine satutum
ignominiam. Ju-
ven. in Dom. cap.
viii.

(w) Dente
Thronum non
circumdat,
equali
Ad te per pul-
verem parat
Genua?
Nam tu tu a-
lutar, post o-
mnia ante
Et agnita lo-
lent canis le-
more vire.
Hæc. Epil.
XVIII, l. 1.
v. 82.
Let him in the
end as thy form
depos
When every knee
for him may
bend in
The danger will
at last come to
be that:
For you're in
danger when the
rest is in peril.
And I am, as
I shall show here
the danger.
CREECH.

(*) Hæc, l.
p. 1, l. 1.
ver. 145. To
which may be
added the fol-
lowing, de Arte
Poetica, ver.
515.
Succellere
huius Comædiæ,
non sine multa
Laudis, sed in
vitium Livium
excidit & non
Dignum legem
Lex est accepta,
chorusque
Turpiter risit
falsitas jure ne-
cessarii.
Nec stultus
censuræ sed pæ-
nitentia
the apt,
But just then
Liberty was
tired to rage;
Such rage as
civil power can
force'd to have
And by good
Laws, laws were
in-act'd upon.
That was the
element left, it
was the
railing. The
Greeks, I think,
were just
in this.
CREECH.

body escaped the slanders of the stage, not even Pericles, who had so long governed the Republic both in peace and war. It had been a tolerable thing, said Cicero, if the wicked citizens had been exposed to these insults, though it were better that such men should be reprov'd by the Censor than by a Poet; but it is intolerable that such a man as Pericles should not be free from them. 'Apud Græcos antiquiores fuit lege concessum,

'ut quod vellet Comœdia nominatim vel de quo vellet diceret (y); itaque sicut in eisdem libris loquitur Africanus, quem illa non attigit, vel potius quem non vexavit, cui pepercit? Efto: populares homines improbos, in Rep. seditiosos, Cleonem, Cleophonem, Hyperbolum læsit: patiamur, inquit, etfi hujusmodi cives à Cenfore melius est quam à Poëta notari: sed Periclem cum jam suæ civitati maxima autoritate plurimos annos domi & belli præfuisse, violari versibus & eos agi in Scena non plus decuit, quam si Plautus, inquit, noster voluisset aut Nævius Publio & Cneo Scipioni, aut Cæcilius Marco Catoni maledicere (z). - - - Among the ancient Greeks, their comedy was by law allowed to censure any action, and any person by name. Accordingly, as Africanus says, whom has it not attacked, or rather whom has it not galled, whom has it spared? Be it so: it wounded popular wicked men, who were seditious in the Republic, such as Cleon, Cleophon, and Hyperbolus. Let us bear this, says he, though it is better that such citizens should be stigmatized by the Censor, than by a Poet; but that Pericles when he had now governed the Republic for many years both in peace and war, with great reputation, should be abused in plays, and these acted upon the stage, was as intolerable, says he, as if our Plautus or Nævius had reviled Publius and Cnius Scipio, or Cæcilius inveigled against Cato.' Of all the treasures in the world, none could be more exposed to moth and rust, and to the rapacious hands of robbers, than honour and a good name, unless the insolence of these satirists was restrained: for as, by I know not what dismal fatality, the spirit of slander and revenge is often united with a seeming austere life, the impunity of libels would give birth to vast numbers of them against the best men; and if a man should provoke ever so little a bigot, or a choleric Enthusiast, he would presently find his reputation stained and blackened by that bigot's pen, and the proneness of the people to believe this sort of writers would afford them a sanctuary, even with respect to the most extravagant calumnies. If these people would not postpone the virtues with which they ought to begin a devout life, the virtues, I say, which make an honest man, and if they would follow the best advice that can be given them, viz. not to pretend to be devout before they are good men (a a), they would not distinguish themselves as they do, by their satirical discourses and defamatory libels.

(y) See Horace at the beginning of the fourth satire of the first book.

(z) August. de Civit. Dei, lib. ii, cap. ix, ex Ciceronis, lib. iv, de Republica.

(a a) See the Réflexions sur les Défauts d'autrui, printed at Paris in the year 1690.

(b b) Exod. ii. 4.

(c c) Exsequi sententias haud invidiosum nisi insignes per honestum aut notabilis dedecore: quod præcipuum munus Annalium fuit, ne virtutes illeantur, utque PRÆVIS DICTIS FAC-TISQUE EX POSTERITATE ET INFAMIA METUS SIT. - - - It is no part of my purpose to trace all the virtues of particular men, unless they are memorable for integrity, or for notorious infamy: this I conceive to be the principal duty of an Historian, that he suppress no instance of virtue, and that by the dread of future infamy and the censures of posterity, men may be deterred from detestable actions and profligate speeches. Tacit. Annal. lib. iii, cap. lxxv.

VII.
What answer is to be made to those who pretend to justify the writers of libels.

Hence we see what answer is to be given to those, who say that libels are beneficial to society, in as much as they hinder several persons of both sexes from transgressing the bounds of decency: it is a bridle, say they, that restrains them: free them from the fear of being defamed to the end of the world, and in all future ages, by some ingenious satires, and there is no extravagance but what they will run into. This is all wrong: we do not find that hitherto there has been any scarcity of libels, and yet the world has not been, and is not bettered by them. Besides, would not this pretended curb become utterly useless, by the abuse that would be made of the remedy, by defaming without quarter or distinction all sorts of families?

But then, must some be allowed to commit infamous actions, whilst others shall not be allowed to punish them with all the trumpets of fame? I answer, that as it does not belong to private persons, to punish robbers and murderers, and the care of it ought to be left to those whom the supreme authority has appointed for the punishment of malefactors; the like ought to be done with respect to the punishment of infamy. It is encroaching upon the right of the sovereign, it is laying profane hands upon holy things, to pretend to inflict this sort of punishment, when we are not commissioned for it by our governors. A criminal may then justly ask the question that was put to Moses, who made thee a ruler and a judge over us (b b). What private persons may lawfully do against those who deserve infamy, is just what they may do against a robber or an assassin. They may bring him before the Judges, and witness against him what they know; they may in like manner impeach the criminal commerce, and infamous life of others; but they must do it with all the characters of a formal accuser: they must declare their names and the places of their abode; and especially prove before the Judges, if there be occasion for it, all their accusations. Now where are the libellers that take this method? The first thing they observe is to conceal their names, their profession, and abode. They are not very scrupulous about their proofs; the least suspicion or hear-say, the rattle in coffee-houses or taverns, serves them for a demonstration: and therefore they are justly liable to the punishment of slanderers and false witnesses; for to deserve this punishment, it is not necessary that what a man advances should be really false; it is enough that he maintains it without knowing it, and without being able to prove it.

VIII.
Of the right of History, and by whom

I am persuaded that justice and the public good require that evil actions should be brought to the tribunal of fame, there to receive the punishment due to them, interest *Reipublicæ cognosce malos* (c c): but every body ought not to pretend to do this. For if the evil action you desire to make public, is of such a nature that it may be punished

by

it ought to
be written.
Great abuse
in this.

by the laws of the land, you must leave it to the Magistrates, or at most help them, by a judicial testimony, that the crime may at once bear a double punishment, that of public fame, and that of the Judges. We must remember that we are not to give an account of our conduct to a Poet, or any other such writer, but to the Magistrates. This is the doctrine of a good author, as will appear by these Latin words. 'Nostræ contra duodecim Tabulæ cum perpauca res capite sanxissent, in his hanc quoque faciendam putaverunt, si quis occideret, sive carmen condidisset, quod infamiam faceret flagitiumve alteri. Præclare, judiciis enim ac Magistratuum disceptationibus legitimis propositam vitam, non poetarum ingeniis habere debemus, nec probrum audire, nisi ea lege ut respondere liceat & judicio defendere (d d). Though in our laws of the twelve tables very few crimes are made capital, yet the following is of that number: namely, if any person should publish or write verses, which defame another man, or injure his reputation. This is an excellent institution; for our lives ought to be submitted only to the lawful examination and judgments of the Magistrates, and not to the wit and railery of Poets; nor ought we to hearken to an accusation against any man, but upon condition that he is allowed to answer, and judicially defend himself.' If the evil action be of another kind, and passes unpunished, either on account of the indulgence of the Magistrate, or because of the persons who commit it, neither does it then belong to every man, to take upon him to write about it. This should be done by Historians, and none should write History but men chosen and authorized by the government. By this means the brand which History should fix on the name and memory of those who deserve the public infamy, would proceed from its true channel, being derived from the power of the sword, wherewith the sovereign is armed for the punishment of the wicked. As the sacred History was not the work of a private person, but of men who had received from GOD a special commission to write (e e); so the Civil History should be composed only by those whom the sovereign of each state appoints for that purpose, and then it might be presumed that History would not defame people upon false grounds; whereas, as the world goes at present, it distributes punishments and rewards, disgrace and praise, condemnation and absolution, upon the first reports of fame, sophisticated and wrested by a thousand passions. And what is surprising, is, that the meanest Historian claims the privilege which belong only to some; he pretends he is not bound to produce his proofs and his witnesses. *Quis unquam ab historico juratores exegit (ff)?* Whoever requires an Historian to bring affidavits for what he advances?

I do not say but that there are inconveniencies on the other side; yet there being some every where, the greatest ought to be avoided, as doubtless are that multitude of writers, who sully historical facts with their impure hands, fully them I say, not only for the present time but for future ages; since there will ever be too many continuators of Mellificium Pezelii, Setibus Calvisius, Sleidan's Commentaries &c. (g g) too many writers of abridgments, in usum studiosæ juventutis; in a word, too many writers who will fetch their informations from thence, and perpetuate the falsities that are daily divulged [A]. What is said of the first impressions in general, that they are of long continuance,

Quo semel est imbuta recens servabit odorem
Testa diu (b b),

What season'd first the vessel keeps the taste,

CREECH.

is most true especially with respect to the first alterations which events suffer from their beginning by the disguised relations that are made of them in haste, and dispersed with all the expedition imaginable. This is an original sin, the propagation whereof cannot be denied; too many examples prove it; and here lies the mischief: for as all people pretty much resemble those of whom a Cardinal Legate said, as he gave them his benediction, *since*

[A] Too many writers will perpetuate the falsities that are daily divulged. I might have spoken of another sort of writers. The Continuators of Pezelius, Calvisius; the *Theatrum Europæ*, &c; they who publish *Synopses rerum toto orbe gestarum*, and abridgements of Universal History, in usum studiosæ juventutis, are I confess the greatest propagators of false news; but they are not the only ones, nor perhaps the most dangerous preservers of falsities. There are some Historians, who taking a contrary course, deceive those very persons who pretend to be nice. I mean some Historians like Varillas: they love to say what is not to be found in common Histories: they aspire to the glory of having discovered secret memoirs, the occult qualities of the first ministers, and the secret of intrigues and negotiations, which no body knew before. If a thing has been left in oblivion by every body, they will be sure to publish it for that very reason. Nay, they go farther; they build a

whole system upon it: this serves them as a key to open the cabinets of Princes and they pretend to unfold many mysteries by this means. When those gentlemen find in the corner of a library, or among the dusty old papers of an inventory, a printed piece which was unknown to them, they read it greedily, for which they are to be praised. But if they find in it any singular rare and surprising particular they immediately take it up, and make it the basis of the conjectures they design to vent as matters of fact, or Historical illustrations. For this they are not to be commended. It is very often the way to deceive people. If any of these men should find an hundred years hence, a copy of the Pastoral Letter, which was immediately suppressed by its author, he would make his advantage of it. He would boast of having discovered things unknown to all other Historians; he would reason upon this at random, and give all Europe a new face, with respect to the secret motives of

since they have a mind to be deceived, let them be deceived; and moreover since it cannot be doubted that a false report believed for three days may do a great deal of good to a nation [B], whereas a true piece of news, believed as long, may occasion the ruin of it; it

of Princes. He would revive a falsity, which lived but a few days in the common news, and would perpetuate it; for there will always be some Historians, who will relate what they shall read in Varillas, for instance. I must acquaint my reader, that the suppression of this Pastoral Letter, came to my knowledge only by a little pamphlet of fifteen pages in 4to, dated on the twenty-fifth of January 1696 (1). I there found (2) that the author of the Pastoral Letters having cited, as a proof of the favourable intentions of the Allies, a project of peace drawn up by the Diet of Ratisbonne . . . which had been contrived by a speculative Politician of Amsterdam . . . was so ashamed of being imposed upon by that spurious piece, that he immediately printed another edition of his Pastoral Letter, in which he omitted that passage.

[B] A false report believed for three days may do a great deal of good, to a nation, &c.] This maxim is ascribed to Catherine de Medicis, that a false piece of news believed three days may save a nation (3). Histories abound with the advantages of false news. The heads of the League maintained themselves a long time in Paris by that means. The Duke of Maienne not being able to deny, that he had lost the field of battle at Ivry, made people believe that the Bearnois (the King of Navarre) had been killed, and that in other places the League was triumphant (4). These are the words of an Historian: Seeing their army thus shattered, they had recourse to their usual artifices, which were to impose upon the Parisians with lies, they published in abundance of papers, importing that at the first assault given at Dreux, the inhabitants had killed above five hundred of the King's troops, and wounded a greater number, and that the Marshal Biron had been mortally wounded. That in an encounter near Poissy the League had obtained a great victory. That in the battle the fight was long, and the loss almost equal, and that if the Bearnois was not dead, he was as good as dead (5).

Peter Matthieu relates that the Count de Charolois, being under the necessity of encouraging his troops by the hopes of a speedy success, suborned a Franciscan who pretended to come from Bretagne, and said that he had left the army so near, that it would be seen the same day . . . This artifice increased if not the courage, at least the patience of the most disheartened, and he proved useful for the little time it was believed. The great desire of seeing the troops of Bretagne, made it believed without any consideration (6). These last words are not useless here, for they shew the bent and disposition of the people to give into such artifices: they easily believe what flatters them, and they wait patiently. Peter Matthieu's marginal note, deserves to be transcribed. When an army or a town, says he (7), is in expectation of relief, they must always be told that it is coming, and if there should be news to the contrary, it is prudent in the General to spread about a different report. Syphax sends word to Scipio that he cannot assist him, and that on the contrary he is for Carthage. Scipio treats and caresses his Ambassadors, and gives them presents, in order to make his soldiers believe that Syphax was coming, and that the Ambassadors returned to hasten his departure. It is with respect to these stratagems, that it may especially be said, nil sub sole novum, - - There is nothing new under the sun. The Moderns in this point are but the imitators of the Ancients (8). Sincerity was never pretended to in the fresh accounts of public misfortunes, and it would be generally prejudicial to pretend to it. Livy justly censures the Roman Consul, who after the fatal battle of Cannæ acknowledged to the deputies of the Allies all the loss he had sustained. 'Auxit rerum suarum sui que contemptum Consul nimis detegendo cladem nudandoque (9). - - - The Consul rendered his army and himself still more contemptible, by giving too bare and naked an account of the defeat at Cannæ.' The effect of this plain dealing was, that the Allies concluded from it that Rome would never be able to raise its head again, and therefore that they ought to join with Hannibal. We learn from Plutarch that an Athenian was cruelly tortured, for telling a piece of ill news, which however was very true (10). Having heard of Nicias's

defeat from a stranger, who was come ashore at the port of Pyraeus, he went in all haste to acquaint the magistrates with that great misfortune. They asked him how he came by it, and because he could not produce his author, he was punished as a cheat and a disturber of the public peace (11): nor was he delivered from the rack till the truth of his news was known. Had he made a false report of a victory, he would not have suffered for it: the action of Stratocles makes me think so. He persuaded the Athenians to offer a sacrifice to the gods by way of thanks for the defeat of their enemies, and yet he knew that the Athenian fleet had been beaten. The news of the disaster was at last published. They were heartily vexed with the impostor; but his answer satisfied them, and there was an end of it: what injury have I done you? said he: I have made you live three days happily. Πολλὰ δ' ἂν ἔτι καὶ Σπαρτιάτας δέησαι τὴν στρατοκλήϊν ἔβριμ ὑπομένειν καὶ βαμολοχίαν, παίσανθ' αὖ μὲν αὐτοῖς εὐχυσέλια θύειν ὡς νενικηκότας. ἐπεὶ δὲ τῆς ἡττῆς ἀληθεία ἀπαγγελθείσης ἠγανάκτων, ἐρωτῶντων τὸν δῆμον, τί ἰδύκνται, τρεῖς ἡμέρας δ' αὐτὸν ἰδέας γυζονός. Nullo vero pacto arbitrator Spartanos toleraturos fuisse Stratocles scurrilem insultationem, qui fuit ut ob latum parva victoria nuncium acceptum, sacrificarent persuasit: cumque ii de accepta clade vero allato nuncio succerent, populum interrogavit equid injuriæ passi essent, qui ipsius opera triduum suavius vixissent (12).

It was so much gained over the enemy, you will say; the Athenians gained two or three days of rejoicing by it: they put off for that time the uneasiness which the ill news was to give them. But in reality it is but a small advantage; it is a sad thing to be brought off from a false persuasion that has raised a great joy; the weight of adversity fits more heavily afterwards. Besides, public rejoicings for an imaginary victory, expose a whole nation to contempt, and make the enemy very merry. If Stratocles had been treated as he deserved, he had been severely punished. For a private person to do as Cicero did is a thing of no great consequence: nay, in such particular conjunctures true prudence will not suffer us to believe any thing too lightly, Cicero battle is that of Amorgos. . . . cum Vatinius morte nuntiata cuius parum certus videbatur autem, interim, inquit, usura fruar (13). It is not certain that my enemy is dead, and perhaps in a few days I shall hear he is alive and well; but in the mean time I will take advantage of the current report, I will believe it; it is so much gain to me. This is what Cicero said; whether it was only a jest, or an ingenuous declaration of his thoughts, it matters not. But should a nation use this method, and take some measures upon the false news of the defeat of the enemy, it would sometimes run the risk of great misfortunes. An Historian relates that it having been reported that Scipio Africanus, and his brother, were taken prisoners, and that Antiochus had defeated the Roman army they commanded, the Ætolians immediately shook off the yoke of the Roman people. This must needs have been a pernicious step. I will relate Livy's words, which contain some remarkable particulars. We there find a remarkable instance of the deceits of fame: it appears from them that the very deputies of the Ætolians in the army of the two Scipios had spread that false report, and that only one Historian has mentioned it. 'Valerius Antias author est, rumorem celebrem Romæ fuisse, & penè pro certo habitum, recipiendi Scipionis adolescentis causa Cos. L. Scipionem & cum eo P. Africanum in colloquium evocatos regis, & ipsos comprehensos esse, & ducibus captis confestim ad castra Romana exercitum ductum, eaque expugnata, & deletas omnes copias Romanorum esse: ob hæc Ætolos suffulisse animos, & abnuisse imperata facere, principisque eorum in Macedonia & in Dardanos & in Thraciam ad conducenda mercede auxilia profectos: hæc qui nuntiarent Romanam, A. Terentium Varronem, & M. Claudium Lepidum ab A. Cornelio præpore ex Ætolia missos esse. Subtexit deinde fabulæ huic, legatos Ætolos in senatu inter cætera hoc quoque interrogatos esse: unde

(11) Δέας λέγοντος αἰεὶ καὶ παραμένει τὴν πάλιν εἰς τὸν πορὸν κατὰ δέας ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πάλιν χρόνον. ὅς τε πάλιν οἱ τὸ πάλιν καὶ ὡς εἶχεν ἀπαγγέλλοντες. Pro mendace & civitatis turbatore in rotam delatus & diu tortus est, donec advenirent qui totam cladem ordine annuntiarent. Ibid.

(12) Plut. de Repub. gerenda, pag. 799, F. He mentions it also in the Life of Demetrius, pag. 893, 894, and makes him answer, Εἴρα τί προσέβατε δεῖν, οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἠμέρας ἡδίας γυζονός. Quid tandem injuriæ accipitis si duos dies transegitis per luctum? This is that of Amorgos.

(13) Quintil. Inst. Orat. lib. vi, cap. iii, p. m. 294.

(1) It is intitled, Parallele de trois Lettres Pastorales de Mr. Jurieu, touchant l'Accomplissement des Propheéties.

(2) Pag. 14, he quotes the Pastoral Letter of January 1695.

(3) D'Aubigné, Confession Catholique de Saint, liv. ii, ch. vi, pag. m. 413, 414.

(4) D'Aubigné, Histoire Universelle, Tom. iii, liv. iii, ch. vi, pag. 322.

(5) Histoire des choses mémorables arrivées en France depuis l'an 1547, jusqu'à commencement de l'an 1597, pag. 720.

(6) Pierre Matthieu, Hist. de Louis XI, liv. iii, pag. m. 144.

(7) Ibid.

(8) See the article AGESILAUS II, citations (b), and (c).

(9) Titus Liv. lib. xxiii, pag. m. 355. He relates the words of the Consul to the Deputies of Campania.

(10) Plut. in Nicias, sub fin. pag. m. 541.

it cannot be thought strange that the first relations should be so falsified: Politics, which some

(14) Tit. Liv.
lib. xxvii, p.
m. 708.

unde audissent imperatores Romanos in Asia captos ab Antiocho rege, & exercitum deletum esse? Etolos respondisse, ab suis legatis se, qui cum consule fuerint, certiores factos. Rumoris hujus quia neminem alium autorem habeo, neque affirmata res mea opinione sit, nec pro vana prætermittam.

(14). - - - - Valerius Antias relates that at Rome there went a famous report, which passed almost for a certainty, that King Antiochus having called Lucius Scipio the Consul, and Publius Africanus, to a conference about the restoring of the young Scipio, had seized them, and having made the Roman Generals prisoners, had immediately marched his army to their camp, attacked and taken it, and cut off all the Roman forces; that upon the news of this pretended overthrow, the Etolians had taken courage and refused to obey the commands of the Romans, and that their chiefs had gone into Macedon, Dardania, and Thrace, to levy auxiliary troops; that A. Cornelius, the Prætor, had sent from Etolia Terentius Varro and M. Claudius Lepidus, to carry these tidings to Rome. What gave some authority to this false account was, that the Etolian deputies being asked in the Senate among other questions, Who had informed them that King Antiochus had made the Roman Generals prisoners, and cut off the Roman army in Asia; they answered That they had it from their own deputies who were with the Consul. As I have no other authority for there having been such a report, but that of Valerius Antias, I would neither affirm this as a certainty, nor pass it over as an untruth.

Don't think that Catherine de Medicis meant that a piece of false news believed three days, can save a nation upon all occasions. Such maxims as these are not without exceptions. A false persuasion is sometimes advantageous and sometimes pernicious: and the same may be said of a true one. But here is a thing more generally true, viz. that it is useful to conceal from the people, part of the loss sustained in battles and other great misfortunes. This deception is not what we call mysteries of state, *Arcana Imperii*, but the common steps of political prudence. No body ought therefore to blame a fallacious relation, that immediately follows the event. The public good requires the use of rhetorical figures, in order to extenuate our loss and our enemies advantages. But it were perhaps to be wished that these relations should not be written, or at least, that they should not be printed: for the printing perpetuates them, and makes them serve as a foundation for Historians. This brings a great uncertainty upon History, and deprives future ages of the knowledge of the truth; which is a great counterpoise, as some think, to the profit and pleasure that the reading of those daily papers occasions in the world. The most morose must acknowledge that this reading affords many useful and agreeable instructions, and even that it may be instructive to polite writers. But in short, will some say, there is no sincerity in those relations: they are rather Pleas than Histories. Now, what is a Plea? A discourse, in which a man studies to shew only the fair side of his own cause, and only the foul one of his adversary's. If they, who speak thus, could find out a good expedient to avoid what they condemn, they would have the best invention of all men living. After all, the understanding readers are not deceived by such relations: they can distinguish such as come nearest to sincerity; but it is not possible to publish in those writings all that one knows; something must be sacrificed to the public good, and even sometimes to our domestic interest. Besides; stratagems being allowed in war (15), the artifices of News-writers must be excused; for the pains they take to thwart the relations of the enemy are a kind of war; and therefore their writings have been called *arma Asnerina* by a political author. Hoc saltem indicium non abeat, quod ausu temerario quodam, *Relationes ordinarias* seu *Novellas*, uti vocantur, *Armis Asnerinis* meis non adjunxerim: nam, ut probe sciam, tales sæpe non in *Sibyllarum foliis*, sed hominum cerebris nasci, credulose facile incertæ famæ auram captare: interrim tamen etiam temporis filia comprobatur, atque hæcenus comprobavit, harumque sparsiones non semper *Orestis somnia* & vanitates esse atque fuisse. Sparguntur enim *Victoriæ*, deprimiturque pars adver-

(15) Dolus an
virtus quis in
hoste requirit?
Virgil. *Æneid.*
lib. ii, ver.
390.

† James Hu-
rault des Offices
d'Etat, fol.
210.

fa. Sic constat, quod *Literis à Pompeio* per omnes provincias civitatibusque dimissis de prælio ad Dyrrachium facto elatus inflatusque multo, quam res erat gesta, fama percubuerit, pulsus fugere Cæsarem, pene omnibus copiis amissis; quæ & fama sane Pompeianos multis partibus auxerat. Finguntur clades ad vulgum (quia mundus, ut dicitur vult decipi) de-mentandum, ut iste faveat huic vel illi parti, &c.

Ita post cladem Iovensem, &c. (16). - - - I must not forget to mention, that I have presumed, not to add the ordinary relations, or news (as they are called) to my *Arma Asnerina*: for though I well know, that such relations proceed not from the leaves of the Sibyl, but are devised in the brain of man, and that the credulous readily catch at and swallow the common reports, however doubtful; nevertheless experience, the offspring of time, shews, and has already manifested, that the dispersing of these news, is not always, nor has always been as unprofitable thing, like the dreams of Orestes. For to spread the news of our victories, and to lessen the advantages of the enemy, is an art of policy. Thus it is known that Pompey having sent letters into all the provinces and cities of the Roman empire, wherein he spoke of the battle of Dyrrachium, with much more courage and boldness than he had fought it, there went a report that Cæsar had been defeated, had lost almost his whole army, and was now making his escape: and undoubtedly this report very much strengthened Pompey's party. Overthrows are invented to impose upon the vulgar (because the world, as they say, loves to be imposed upon) and to make them favour this or that party, &c. Thus after the battle of Irvy, &c. The author adds here what I have said of the Duke of Maienne.

Note, that people are so used to the Gazettes, that they would look upon the suppression of them as an eclipse. It would occasion a kind of public mourning. The Republic of Letters would lose several pieces by it, which are the very kernel and cream of the Gazettes, and contain some rules for a profitable reading of them. Observe the following passage. Cum vero omnes novi quid sciendi mira flagremus cupiditate, certaque juxta ac incerta avidissime arripientes, quique pro voto interpretamur, itaque NOVELLAS undique conquirimus, ut rerum gestarum, imò & gerandarum (tanta enim scribentium vel credentium vanitas est) cognitione sitientem animum expleamus. Hinc anxie curiositate legimus aut rimamur, quid Novellæ apponent Nostrates, Jeneenses, Lipsienses, Norimbenses, Hamburgenses, imò & Parisienses, Hafnienses, Amstelodamenses, Bruxellenses, aut alia, nescio unde accersitæ: Ut autem varia sint illorum, qui eas legunt vel mirantur ingenia, ita fieri haud potest, quin majorem ex illis fructum alius, alius minorem accipiat, quò igitur cum Voluptate, quam novitas sua sponte conciliat, Utilitas etiam jungatur, ideo insigni cum commodo adhiberi poterit Nobilissimi & Consultissimi Dn. Ahasueri Fritschii Discursus, De Novellarum, quas vocant Reve Beutungen boderno usque & abusu. Imp. Jenæ 1676, 4to. Itemque elegantissime docti Christiani Weisii in illustri ad Salam Augustæo Polit. Prof. Schediasma curiosum, de Lectura Novellarum, quantum scilicet illæ usum habeant in Geographiis, Historiis, & Politicis, imò quovis curio-graphicis, Historicis, & Politicis, quævis curio-cleum Novellarum, scilicet ab Anno 1660. ad ann. usque 1676. *Weissenfelsæ anno eod. exc. (17).* - - -

As we all have an insatiable desire, and a wonderful curiosity to know something new, and greedily catch at news, whether certain or doubtful, whilst every man interprets them according to his own wishes, we search for news papers from all parts of the world, in order to slack this thirst of the mind after the knowledge not only of past, but of future transactions: for such is the presumption of the writers of news, or those who believe them, that they will pretend to the knowledge of things to come. Thus with anxious curiosity, we read and sift the home-news, those from Iena, Leipzig, Nuremberg, Hamburg, nay, those from Paris, Copenhagen, Amsterdam, Brussels, and others whither come from the Lord knows where. But as the genius of those who read and admire them are various, so it cannot but happen that some reap more, some less advantage by the perusal of them. To the end therefore that profit may accompany

(16) Arma As-
nerina, five As-
neria Epitheta
à Dædore
militari Tacito
fabulosa, &c.
in Dissertatione
Politica docti
à G. C. W.
pag. 19.

(17) Meiss-
Herrn, &c.
Hofbuch Com-
mission, five
Scripserunt le-
rum, &c.
pag. 12.

(ii) See the passage of Tacitus which I have cited above, citat. (57), of the article USSON.

(kk) At fubite
horresco lapsa de
montibus adfunt
Harpyie, &
magnis quantunt
elaboribus alas,
Diripiuntque da-
pes contactuque
omnium ferdant
Immondo: tum
vox tetrum dira
inter odorem.
Virg. *Æn. lib.*
iii, ver. 225.
... From the
mountain tops,
with hideous cry,
And clattering
wings the hun-
gry harpies fly,
They snatch the
meat, defiling all
they find,
And parting
leave a loathsome
stench behind.

DRYDEN.

some body has defined *ars non tam regendi, quam fallendi hominem* - - - The art of deceiving rather than of governing men [C], will have it so. But men ought to own their error, which they never can do with a good grace: and tho' some should do it, this is of little service; so many pens having already canonized the first reports, that people would at least be divided in their opinions about them (ii).

It is not enough to compare these base writers to Harpies which defile whatever they touch (kk); it may be said they are executioners who distort and wring the neck, legs and arms of Historical facts, and even sometimes cut them off, and apply false ones in their room; and this even at the very moment that an event issues forth from the bosom of its causes, and the exploits of a battle are just born:

Modo primos incipientes
Edere vagitus, & adhuc à matre rubentes (ll).

As soon as ere they wail, as ere they spring,
Still blushing, from the parent womb.

It was formerly said of the Muses that they were the prostitutes even of slaves; this may especially be affirmed of the Muse who presides over History (mm): she is a true scortum tribolare, who plies upon the high-ways, and sells her self to the first comer for a morsel of bread. Her bargain with the Booksellers is much beneath that of Baudoin and

(ll) Juven.
Sat. VII, ver.
195.

(mm) It is
Clio. Ἀδύαττοι
τῶν μισθῶν ἢ
μὴν κακῶν
συγγίναι τὴν
ἱστορίαν. Scho-
liast. Apollonii,
in lib. iii.

accompany pleasure, which novelty of itself creates, it will be of signal advantage to read the discourse of the most excellent and learned Mr ANASTASIIUS FRITSCHIIUS, intitled, Of the modern use and abuse of the news; which they call *Revee Beitungen*; printed at Lena 1676, 4to. Likewise the curious and most elegant dissertation of the learned CHRISTIAN WEISSIUS, Professor of Politics, concerning the reading of news, shewing the great use of them in Geography, History, Politics, and all other branches of curious learning. To which he has added, a Specimen, being, as it were, the kernel and quintessence of news, from the year 1660 to 1676: printed at Weissenfels in the same year.

I have read somewhere in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, that it were to be wished that some body was employed in taking an account at the end of every year, of all the false reports that had been spread during that year. This would not be necessary with respect to all of them; there are several, that the Gazettes themselves take notice of: such an employment had been more necessary when daily news were not printed. If it had been established at Rome when the Turks took Rhodes, we should know abundance of falsities that were then vented in Italy. Some of them are known by the letters which Ruscelli has collected: we know by those letters, that on the tenth of December 1522, the News-writers of Rome, gave out that the siege of Rhodes was raised (18). On the twenty-eighth of February 1523, they gave out that it was not certain that Soliman had taken the town (19); and yet it had capitulated on the twenty-second of December 1522. But what man will wonder at this news, when he knows, that in the year 1500, it was given out at Padua as a certainty, and even from Rome, that the Pope had been killed with a thunder-bolt on St Peter's day, and that all the citizens had taken up arms. It is only by chance, that we know that such an untruth was reported. It is mentioned in a letter of Matthew Boffus; without which probably we should have known nothing of it. 'Hac sub hora Augustine ad te dum scribo, ecce rumor aures implet civitatis, solempni Petri Apostoli die, paulo post vigesimam horam, Alexandrum Romanæ Ecclesiæ magnum Pontificem ictu fulminis interisse, & de periculis suis Pileatis unum tantum, pariter suum dominum parentasse, populares in armis esse, vias urbis obliquas parum tutas, Curiales quati timoribus, Hispanos infestos & hostes haberi (20). - - - At this very hour, while I am writing to you, there goes a report through the city, that a little after two of the clock in the afternoon, of St Peter's day, Pope Alexander was killed by a thunder-bolt, and that one of his merry cardinals had the same fate, that the people are in arms, that the by-streets of the city are not safe, that the magistrates are in the greatest fears, that the Spaniards are disaffected & accounted enemies.' The King of Spain, the King of France, and the Duke of Alba, were at the same time reported in Holland to be dead, in the year

1580. This falsity was preserved by chance in a letter of Justus Lipsius (21). A compilation of such things would be useful.

Mr de Vigneul Marville has made some good observations on the Paris Gazette. Here is one of his reflexions. 'There is but one thing disserviceable to the writer of it, which is, that he is not absolute master of his work, and being subject to superior orders, he cannot speak the truth with that sincerity which History requires. If this point was granted him, we should have no need of other Historians (22). The latter part of this passage is somewhat hyperbolic; however it is certain that author mentions the main cause of the mischief; the weekly News-writers, or of any other period longer or shorter, dare not speak all they know. It would cost them too dear; for not to mention the punishment they might fear from their superiors, their news would not sell well, and they would make themselves odious as disaffected persons, and in some manner enemies to the public good. No body will have them vent gross lies, for the sake of their country; but when they lie ingeniously, and with conjectures and reflexions equally witty, flattering and satirical, they are praised, admired, and loved, and every body reads their works. So that they find their account in following the example of the ancient Comic Poet, who only designed to please the people.

Poeta cum primum animum ad scribendum appulit,
Id sibi negotii credidit solum dari,
Populo ut placerent quas fecisset fabulas (23).

Our Poet when he set his mind on writing,
Believ'd he had no more to do, but make
Such plays as should be to the people's liking.

(21) *Mors Regis Hispaniæ, Gallici, & Ducis Albani nunciata nobis sub idem tempus. Vera fama sit in uno saltem ex triade illa.* Lipsius, Epist. IV ad Theodorum Leewium, pag. 9, Edit. Lugd. Bat. 1649. It is dated the first of December 1580.

(22) Vigneul Marville, Mélanges d'Hist. Tom. ii, pag. 198, Dutch Edit.

(23) Terentius, in Prologo Andriæ.

[C] Politics which some body has defined, *Ars, &c.* Guy Patin mentions this definition after having a little ridiculed the Jubilees. Thus you see new factions in Rome, that will give us a new Pope, and then pro jucundo adventu ad Papatum, - - - for his happy accession to the Papacy, a new Jubilee. The new wine of this present year, which is a liquor drawn from the vine, will produce more sensible effects in mens heads than this new devotion, which in its kind, returns but too often, ab assuetis non afficimur: - - - Things to which we are accustomed do not affect us. But the world is so made, populus vult decipi: - - - People love to be imposed upon. The late John Camus, Bishop of Belley, a learned worthy prelate, if ever there was any, said, that Politica ars est non tam regendi quam fallendi homines: - - - Politics is the art of deceiving, rather than governing men. I heard him say this once in his chamber, in the year 1632, and I have often remembered it since (24). This letter of Patin is dated on the thirteenth of December 1669. He had not recited the Bishop's words in that manner in a letter of the eighth of May 1665. He recited them on the following occasion. Six writers, says he,

(24) Patin, Letter DIII, pag. 479, of the third tome.

(18) It is thought that the succours will prove needless, if the siege be raised, as the report goes. Jerom Negro, Letter to Mark Antony Micheli, written from Rome the 20th of December 1522, folio 26, of the Epistoles of Princes, collected by Ruscelli, and translated by Belleforest.

(19) See the same Letter, fol. 28. It contains several things which shew how people deceive themselves in things which they wish.

(20) Matthæus Boffus, Part iii, Epist. XXI.

and du Ryer, whose stated price was to translate for half a crown, or a crown a sheet, and to write verses for six shillings a hundred, when they were long ones, and for three shillings when they were short (nn).

(nn) See Baillet, Jugemens des Savans, on the French translators, article 948, 949.

*Ab! pudor extinctus. doctæque infamia turbæ
Sub titulo prostant, & queis genus ab Jove summo
Res hominum supra evellit & nullius egentes,
Assè merent vili, ac sancto se corpore sadant.
Scilicet aut Menæ faciles parere superbo,
Aut nutu Polycleti, & parca laude beatæ.
Usque adeo maculas ardent in fronte recentes,
Hæsternique Getæ vincla, & vestigia flagri (oo).*

(oo) See Balzac, Entret. IV, chap. iv.

(pp) Τὸ 'Αβ-δερτικὸν ἐκεί-
νο πάθος καὶ
νῦν τὰς πολ-
λὰς τῶν περὶ
δαιμόνων πα-
ρηλαλῶν.
Abderiticum il-
lud malum
etiam hoc tem-
pore plerisque
doctorum inva-
sit. Lucian,
quemodo sit con-
scribenda Histo-
ria, pag. m.
658, Tom. i.

(qq) Ibid.

(rr) Sueton.
de clar. Rhetor.
cap. iii.

Lucian has unwittingly drawn the picture of our age, speaking of a war, which had produced such a multitude of Historians, that one would have thought it was a modish trade. He compares it to the epidemical distemper of the Abderitæ (pp). We have seen, continues he, the truth of the proverb, that war is the parent of all things. 'Αρ' ἔστι δὴ τὰ ἐν ποσὶ ταῦτα κινῆνται, ὁ πόλεμος ὁ πῶς τὰς βαρβάρους, καὶ τὸ ἐν Ἀρμενίᾳ τεγί-
μα, καὶ εἰ συνεχῆς νικαί, ἴδεῖς ὅς τις ἔχ' ἱστορίαν συγγραφεῖ. μᾶλλον δὲ Θυκυδίδαι, καὶ Ἡρό-
δοτοί, καὶ Ξενοφῶντες ἡμῖν ἀπαντες. καὶ ὅς τοις ἀλλοῖς ἄρ' ἢ ἐκείνο. τὸ, Πολέμος ἀπάντων
πατὴρ, εἰ γὰρ καὶ συγγραφεὶς τοσούτους ἀνέφυσεν, ἀπὸ μιᾶς τῇ πλῆθους. Ex quo res præfentes
moveri cœperunt, puta bellum istud contra barbaros, & acceptum in Armenia vulnus,
& continuæ illæ victoriæ, nemo non historiam conscribit. Imò verò Thucydides, He-
rodoti, & Xenophontes nobis facti sunt omnes. Et ut apparet, verum fuit illud, Bel-
lum omnium pater est, quandoquidem historiarum scriptores tam multos una hac plaga
procreavit (qq). - - Since these things happened, namely the war with the Barbarians, the over-
throw received in Armenia, and those frequent victories, all the world writes History. Nay,
every man sets up for a Thucydides, an Herodotus, and a Xenophon. And it appears to be a
true saying, that war is the parent of all things, since it has begot so many Historians in
this single country. The antient Romans had infinitely more respect for the dignity of
history; for before Pompey's time no body pretended to write it but such as were emi-
nent for their birth and merit, and when this great man's tutor undertook to write the
history of Pompey, and that of his father, some kind of inconveniency was found in
that novelty, as Suetonius insinuates. Yet this innovator had sense and learning, and
had taught Rhetoric, but he was a man of no birth. He was a freed-man. That was
the grievance. ' Lucius Octacilius Pilius servisse dicitur; atque etiam ostiarius, veteri
' more, in catena fuisse: donec ob ingenium ac studium literarum manumissus, accu-
' santi patrono subscripsit. Deinde Rhetoricam professus, Cnæum Pompejum Magnum
' docuit; patris ejus res gestas, nec minus ipsius, compluribus libris exposuit: primus
' omnium libertinorum, ut Cornelius Nepos opinatur, scribere historiam orsus, non
' nisi ab honestissimo quoque scribi solitam (rr). - - It is said that Lucius Octacilius
' Pilius was a slave, and even a door-keeper, and that he was chained to the door, after the
' antient custom; till on account of his parts and inclination to learning he was made free,
' and assisted his patron. He afterwards professed Rhetoric, and was Præceptor to Pompey
' the Great: he wrote in many books a History of Pompey, and of his father. Cornelius
' Nepos is of opinion, that Octacilius Pilius was the first freed-man who engaged in writing
' History, which was usually the employment of none but men of distinction.

What

who got their livelihood by writing news, have been sent to the Bastille, within these three days, hominum genus audacissimum, mendacissimum, avidissimum ut faciant rem, &c. - - a kind of people, who are extremely audacious, given to lying, and greedy of gain, &c. They fill their news with things they know not, and ought not to write. They have printed here and cried about the streets, the Bull of our Holy Father the Pope, against the Jansenists, and three days after it was forbidden, and even, ne quid deesset ad rationem veræ fabulæ, - - that nothing might be wanting to complete the comedy, a report was published and spread that the commissary was ordered to imprison the Printer, if he had been found in his house. The late Bishop of Belley, who was an incomparable man, told me in the year 1632. Politica est ars tam regendi quam fallendi homines, - - politics is the art both of governing and deceiving men, and this is no new invention, it is the same play acted over again: the same comedy, and farce; but they are new actors: the worst of it is that this play will last a long time, and mankind suffer too much by it (25). There is a manifest difference betwixt the second and first definition of politics: the second is more discreet than the first; but neither of them turns to the dishonour of the masters of that art, since they aim only at the public good, which they cannot arrive to without imitating Physicians with respect to their patients. If you

(25) Ibid. Letter CCLXVI, pag. 61, of the same tome.

would know Patin's judgment upon the Paris Gazette, read what follows. They write nothing here that is good for any thing except the Gazette every Saturday, which is a very diverting and comfortable thing, for as much as this prattler never tells us bad news, though we perceive a great deal at this season (26). (26) Hist. Litt. Xvi, pag. 171. Remember what Petronius says, Mandus universus ex-
ercet histrioniam, - - The whole world is a farce, and these verses of Politian against such as condemned the plays that were acted in colleges.

Sed qui nos damnant, histriones sunt maximi.
Nam Curios simulant, vivunt bacchanalia:
Hi sunt præcipue quidam clamosi, leves,
Cucullati, lignipedes, cincti funibus:
Superciliosum, incurvicervicum pecus,
Quique ab aliis habitu & cultu dissentiant,
Tristisque vultu vendant sanctimonias:
Censuram sibi quandam, & tyrannidem occupant:
Pavidamque plebem teritant minaciis (27).

But none are greater mountebanks than they
Who can't in colleges endure a play;
For whilst their lives are leud and dissolute,
Upright and pious men they personate:

(27) Politian.
in Pæd. in
Pæd. Menest.
mon. ad Cass.
Epist. vii. lib.
viii. fides m.
165, 166.

The

IX.
The abuse
just mention-
ed favours
Scepticism in
point of Hi-
story.

X.
Modern fa-
tires against
some gallan-
tries. Hol-
land com-
plained of
without rea-
son.

What would become of the enemies of Historical Scepticism, if this mischief had prevailed in the time of ancient Greece and ancient Rome? They are to be congratulated because Printing is so modern an invention, and they may justly exclaim *bono Hercule publico ista licentia post casum imperii Romani inventa est* (ss). - - - It is certainly an advantage to the public that this licentiousness came not into use, till after the fall of the Roman empire. For if the ancient Greeks, Romans, Persians, Carthaginians, &c. had done what is now practised, they would have much ado to prove any thing to us, even with the help of inscriptions and medals (tt), which the moderns boldly make use of to satisfy their caprices, without building upon any real fact.

Before I go further I must observe that there have been such men as Cassius Severus at all times. We have seen in our days a man of quality, who not content to write some relations disadvantageous to some court ladies, did not spare, as it is said, the royal family, and even the head of it [D]: which shews that one may truly say of fatires, what Malherbe said of death,

Que la Garde qui veille aux barrières du Louvre
N'en defend pas les Rois.

The guards which watch the palaces of Kings
Can ne'er secure them from fell satire's stings.

This

The chief of these are certain noisy Friars,
With hoods, and wooden shoes, and rope attires;
A supercilious stiff-neck'd generation,
Differing in dress and mein from all the nation,
Who sell with solemn face their holy wares,
Set up for Censors, and in all affairs
Assume a tyrant pow'r, and terror spread,
By clam'rous threats, among the trembling herd.

Take notice, that the definition which the Bishop of Bellay gave of Politicks, would express a very great fault, if it denoted the mutual deceptions of sovereigns. They are not so uncommon as they should be. I have read, within these three days, a very sprightly thought: it is this; *The Politicians have a language peculiar to themselves: words and phrases which they do not signify the same thing with other men. I do not know whether the gentlemen of the French academy have comprehended politics in the number of the arts and sciences of which they have given us a Dictionary. This, in my opinion, would be necessary. For instance, in the political file, to swear upon the holy Gospels to observe such or such a treaty, signifies sometimes barely that one swears it, but not that one will observe it; nay, it sometimes signifies, that nothing of the treaty shall be performed. The generality of people do not understand this language; but the Politicians understand it well, and take their measures accordingly* (28). I add, that if the gentlemen of the French academy would give us an Universal Dictionary of all arts, they would engage in an endless work. They would daily discover new arts which have terms of a particular signification. The art of weekly relations is one of them; the art of controversy is another. Words do not go there in their usual sense: you see people who charge one another with horrid doctrines; they reply, and rejoin, and still reciprocally find their adversaries doctrine more and more abominable (29). This complaint appears almost in every page; and alarms the readers as if there was reason to fear, that, without a speedy remedy, this gangrene would diffuse its infection through the whole body. Such as are not used to this stile conceive a thousand scruples; they fear they have disobeyed St Paul's precept, *a man that is an heretic reject* (30); for they have conversed with the contending parties. Who would have believed, say they, that such Divines, who have eat for a long time the bread of the Orthodox, should have nourished such monsters in their hearts? We know not whom to trust. Either one or the other of them, or perhaps both, must be disguised wolves rather than shepherds. But have a little patience; stay till some expert arbitrators, initiated in that language, have reconciled the parties, and you will find those words signify nothing less than what you believed. The accusers on both sides will be declared Orthodox. They shall not be censured, but only admonished to correct some improper expressions which had escaped them. It is supposed then that in reality they only charged each other with these expressions, and that therefore the words *pernicius Heretici*, and the like, signify with them only an ill choice of words. We may very well with that the gentlemen of the French academy would not forget, in a Supplement which they may give to the Dictionary of arts, the proper signification of the words *impious, Heretic, destroyer of the fundamentals of the Gospel, abettor of the Socinians*, &c. when they are to be found in the writings of a Theological process; for otherwise our mother tongue will grow barbarous and unintelligible to most readers.

[D] *A man of quality did not spare, as it is said, the royal family, and even the head of it.* I add, as it is said, because, though common fame has ascribed to the same author *l'Histoire amoureuse des Gaules*, and *les amours du Palais Royal*, yet this author disowned the latter. He even denied judicially that he had composed it. For it is of this book we are to understand what he wrote to Mr de Saint Aignan in these words: 'My enemies seeing me in the Bastille, thought my imprisonment would not permit me to defend myself, and that they might safely accuse me; they therefore told the King that I had written against him. But his Majesty, who never condemns a man before he be heard, surprized them strangely by sending the Lieutenant-Criminal to examine me' (31). . . . After having shewn me the History written with my own hand, I mean the original I have mentioned to you, he asked me whether I had written nothing against the King. I answered that I was much surprized to have such a question put to me. He told me he had orders to do it: I answered I had not, and that there was no probability that having served twenty-seven years without having received any favour, being twelve years Major-General of the light horse, and expecting every day some recompense from his majesty, I should be wanting in my respect to him: that to destroy this probability my own hand-writing, or unexceptionable witnesses should be produced against me. That if either of them could be produced in the least thing contrary to the respect I owed to the King and all the royal family, I would be willing to lose my head: but that I also beseeched his majesty to appoint the same punishment for those, who should accuse me without being able to convict me (32). . . . From that time not having seen the Lieutenant-Criminal nor any other judge, I have been persuaded that so black and so ridiculous a calumny had made no impression upon the King, who is so discerning and hard to be surprized (33). What he says, in another place of the late Dukes of Orleans, is an argument that the chief persons of the court did not believe him guilty of this second head of accusation. *The death of the Princess Henrietta of England*, says he (34), *was a new misfortune to me; she had done me many good offices with his majesty, and* 292.

(tt) This is a parody of Seneca, *Prefat. lib. vi. Controv.*

(tt) See Rec. Fr. in 4to, pag. 781.

(28) Lettres Historiques, September 1696, p. 251.

(29) A small piece of Dofibus, Professor of Divinity at Strasbourg, intitled, *Lutecianum Famae Theologorum*, affords some instances of this. To which one might add many others.

(30) Tit. iii. 10.

(31) Le Comte de Buffly Rabu- ein, Usage des Adverbes, pag. 271, Dutch Edit.

(32) Ibid. pag. 272.

(33) Ibid. pag. 274.

(34) Ibid. pag. 292.

(22) See, above, citation (30), of the article CASSIUS SEVERUS.

that

to say he was deceived by some reports which went in his village, and that valuing but little this work, he did not care whether this passage was right or wrong.

It had been better to have said that in his disgrace he employed himself in keeping a large correspondence by letters, and in writing the memoirs of his life; for the works that were published after his death, shew that this was his chief occupation. To this must be added the care he took to make his own History serve for an instruction to his children. His treatise concerning the use of adventures (43), shews that this was his design. It is a little book full of good morality and religion. His memoirs in two volumes published in the year 1697, are curious and well written. His letters, printed in four volumes the same year deserve the same encomium. They would have pleased more, if, upon good considerations, many proper names had not been struck out, and many passages which affected the reputation of certain persons. Perhaps some time or other there will come out an edition of them, which will not be calumniated, or will have a key to them. There are several letters which shew that Count Buffu weaned himself by degrees from the vanities of this world, that he was sensible of the emptiness of it, and that at last he was deeply affected with the importance of his salvation, and the truths of the Gospel. The best Christians in the world could not be more charmed than he was, with Mr Abadie's excellent work concerning the truth of the Christian religion (44). But observe that his conversion was somewhat slow. For a long time he looked behind him like Leto's wife, and tried all the means that the most obstinate desire of returning to court could suggest to an ambitious man, who could not live out of it. The ill success of his petitions was a terrible mortification to him, but did not discourage him from preparing others on every occasion. This we learn from the writings which his heirs have published: had they suppressed these monuments of his impatience, they had belated his memory from the censure of some people, who cannot pardon a brave man his want of courage in bearing the loss of his employments. It is not enough to say they, to be courageous in a battle, a man must also express a great steadiness and resolution under the loss of his estate. They with Count Rabutin had imitated those heroes of ancient Rome, who encountered a sentence of banishment with contempt and indifference; and they think it strange that being disgraced like Ovid, for some treatises concerning love he should have also imitated that Poet's conduct in his disgrace: every body knows what repeated complaints Ovid sent to Rome, in order to be recalled. That vast number of poems full of supplications and humble lamentations do more honour to his wit than to his virtue or courage. But have those, who censure Count Buffu, known the allurements of court life? Do they know what habits and dispositions are contracted in it? If they did, they would perhaps be more indulgent to him. However, he at last resigned himself to the providence of God. Read what he wrote on the twenty-sixth of January 1697. (45). It was a long time before I could believe it was for my good, (as my ghostly fathers told me) that providence laid these calamities upon me by ruining my fortune. But at last I have been convinced of it, for they have been years; not only for my good in the other world, but for my repose in this. GOD does already reward me some measure for the pains of my resignation, and I am at present of this good master what in my soul I just laid off love.

Il paye en un moment un siecle de travaux.
Et tous les autres biens ne valent pas ses maux. (+6)

- (35) Philosophical Transactions,
for August
1669.

- (36) See, above, citation (3), of the article **MENAGE**.

- (37) It is the
ccclxxxviii.

- (38) Patin, *Tom. i., pag. 11.* He had said in his *celebrated Letter*: Mr de Buffly Ra butin has been this day (the 18th of April 1665) committed to the Bastille, for writing a libel, at which the superior powers are offended. The Prince of Condé complained of it to the King, who has caused him to be seized and imprisoned.

- (39) Buffy, v
supra, pag.
281.

- (40) *Mercurius
Galant, of J
1693. The
Count de Buff
died of an Ap
plexy at Aut
the ninth of
April 1693.
Abbet Bignon
succeeded him
the French A
demy in June
following.*

- (41) Februar
1700, pag.
89 seq.

- (42) See *ibid.*
Nouvelles de
Republique
Lettres, *ibid.*
pag. 168.

(xx) *Am* de-
nique familes li-
belli qui statim
in vulgus effun-
dunt, quid Rex
in autem Regia
dixerit, quid
Juno fabulata sit
cum Jove. Hi
autem omnes
quoniam facta
plerumque atque
infecta canunt,
nuncique tam
facti quam veri
tenaces existunt,
Ecce. . . In
fine, there are
several other li-
bels of the same
kind which im-
mediately give
the people to
know what the
King whispered
in the Queen's
ear, and what
conversation pas-
sed between Juno
and Jupiter. As
all these writers
relate, for the
most part, things
which have hap-
pened, as well as
things which
have not, things
real, as well as
imaginary, &c.
Gabriel Naudé-
us, Bibliogr. Po-
lit. pag. m. 70.
See concerning the
words printed in
Roman, Plautus
in Trinummus,
Act. I, Sc. II,
ver. 170, pag.
m. 735.

that bad examples rise higher and higher without stint [F]. How many Histories have been published against the principal persons of the court of France, that of Brussels, &c. with the names, surnames, and titles, of every one of them, with the most secret circumstances, and discourses, and an hundred things of such a nature, that it was impossible should have come to the writers knowledge? Gabriel Naudé might, upon this occasion say, with better grounds, what he said of Procopius's Secret History, of Mar-
tineau Paris's History, of the scandalous Chronicle of Lewis XI, of the Memoirs of the League, &c. (ww). Here one might reasonably exclaim,

Quod genus hoc hominum? quæve hunc tam barbara morem
Permittit patria (xx)?

What men, what monsters, what inhuman race,
What laws, what barbarous customs of the place!

DRYDEN.

(xx) Virgil.
Æneid. lib. i,
ver. 543.

But this exclamation ought not to be applied to the Republic of Holland, since it is not true that it suffers the most illustrious families to be thus barbarously abused. That Republic made the following answer, in the year 1665, to the Bishop of Munster, who complained, amongst other things, of some writings. ' Quidquid vero seu de hoc seu de aliis negotiis in nostris terris typis divulgatum est, de iis aliud nihil dicemus nisi illud solum, non tantum hic, verum passim in aliis quoque regionibus ægre admodum frenari & inhiberi posse typographicas licentias quantumvis diligens fuerit cautela; nosque ipsi contra istiusmodi abusus severa sæpe promulgaverimus edicta, eademque sævis & rigidis confirmaverimus executionibus. . . . As to what has been printed and published in our provinces with relation to this, or other affairs, we shall only say that the licentiousness of the press is so great, not only in this country, but in many others, that it is extremely difficult to restrain and bridle it, notwithstanding all the diligence and care taken for that purpose; and that we ourselves have often published severe edicts against abuses of this nature, and have confirmed these edicts by the most rigorous and exemplary punishments.' These words contained in a Letter of their High Mightinesses, dated the twenty-ninth of September

God in a moment's bliss rewards an age of woes,
All pleasures are not worth thy afflictions be bestowed.

A thought like this had been communicated to him a long time before: these are the words: *Do not you think I converse with devout people as much as I can? It is indeed because I find them more happy, both in their life and at their death, and I would gladly partake of their condition. There is nothing like devotion for an unfortunate person; it not only solves troubles, but converts them into pleasures* (47). This confirms what I have said in the *Penites diverses sur les Cometes* (48), and the remark [R], of the article E P I C U R U S.

Note, that tho' this Count's posthumous works are ingenious and polite; yet this *Histoire amoureuse des Gaules* will make him more known as an author, than any other book he wrote. His fate in this is like that of Boccaccio (49).

For the rest, the falsehood abovementioned, concerning the passage of the Boyne, calls to my mind Father Londel's Fable (50), where we find these words on the eleventh of July 1690. *The battle of the Boyne in Ireland: Schomberg is killed at the head of the English*. This is a downright trick, which cannot be excused by the reason I have alleged to lessen Count Buffy's fault; for this work of Father du Londel, was composed with attention, and was doubtless carefully polished and revised: writings of that kind are only commendable for a great exactness. And therefore it will be no rash judgment to affirm that the author purposely used equivocal words, to conceal from the reader the disadvantage of his party, and the true success of that battle. He not only suppressed the most essential circumstance, which is to shew whether the victory was doubtful, or whether it declared entirely for this or that nation; but he has artfully slipped in a true circumstance, which is only fit to make one conclude that King James had the honour of that day. Schomberg falling at the head of the English is a principle, from which an hundred thousand readers would draw this consequence, *Therefore King William was repulsed*. Give it what turn you please, you will find nothing to excuse this author: infincerity, shame, or the fear of displeasing, made him speak as he did. Notwithstanding this fault and some others of the same nature (51),

his book is good, curious, useful, and convenient, and of a fine invention. Such books will be composed in other countries (52), but of whatever sect or nation a man be, he should get his book read by some impartial person well versed in the art of qualifying things; for prejudices do not suffer us to define things exactly, a mere fight we call a battle; the loss of a battle a check; an engagement, an encounter. The worst is, that some call a defeat what others call a victory. The definitions of these things are no less different among Historians, than the definitions of doctrines among Controversialists (53). And as an opinion which is Orthodox in one religion, is Heretical in another; that, which is a battle won in the Histories of one nation, is a battle lost in the Histories of another. It is a very ancient abuse, for which we see no remedy.

[F] *Bad examples rise higher and higher without stint.* Velleius Paterculus very well expresses this maxim, after having related that Tiberius Gracchus was massacred without any trial. This was, says he (54), the beginning of the slaughter of the citizens in Rome itself; from hence proceeded the impunity of massacres. *Quod baud mirum est*, adds he (55), *non enim ibi confidunt exempla, unde cæperunt; sed quamlibet in tenuem recepta tramitem, latissime evagandi sibi viam faciunt: Et ubi semel recto decurratum est, in præceps pervenitur: nec quisquam sibi putat turpe, quod alii fuit fructuosum.* And no wonder; for bad examples stop not where they begin: but tho' the path through which they get in be ever so narrow, as soon as they are admitted they make a new way, and extend themselves on all sides without any bounds. Thus when a man once quits the right road, he commonly arrives to the brink of a precipice: and no body thinks that can be a disgrace to him which proves advantageous to another. The same maxim may be seen in a speech of Julius Cæsar, related by Sallust. He there shews that all bad examples arise from a good beginning (56), because the innovations, which at first are good and useful, quickly give occasion to disorders, that continually increase. To this may be applied the thought of Juvenal: that man never keeps within the bounds of permission (57).

[G] *The*

(47) Buffi Rabin's Letters, Part iii, Letter CC, (dated the 14th of April 1672) p. 361.

(48) There is no sweetness in a sinful course of life, that can be compared to the sweetness which a devout soul enjoys. Penites diverses sur les Cometes, pag. 570.

(49) See, above, remark [I], of the article EUCALICE.

(50) They are mentioned in the Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, Febr. 1699, p. 223.

(51) For instance, when he says upon the 11th of Aug. 1691, The defeat at Conlarbeck, without saying who those were who were defeated.

(52) This has already been done in Brandenburg.

(53) Compare with this the Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, 1686, pag. 277, 309, 349, 354, 645, 960.

(54) Vell. Paterculus, lib. ii, cap. iii.

(55) Ibid.

(56) Omnia mala exempla ex bonis initiis orta sunt. Sallust. in Bello Catilina, pag. m. 146.

(57) Nemo satis credit tantum delinquere, quantum Permittas: adeo indulgent fuit iustis ipsi. Juven. Sat. xiv, ver. 233.

Septembre 1665, and printed with licence, may serve for a general answer to all complaints of the same nature [G].

XI.

An avowal of Count Buffu.
The Secret History of Pope Alexander VI.

It will not be amiss to insert here the public avowal of Count Buffu Rabutin. Five years ago being in the country, and not knowing how to divert my self, I verified the proverb, that idleness is the mother of all vices: for I fell a writing an History, or rather a satirical romance, indeed without any design to make a bad use of it; but only to employ my self, and at most to shew it to some friends, in order to divert them, and to be praised by them as a tolerable writer (yy) . . . As true events are never extraordinary enough to be very entertaining, I had recourse to invention, which I thought would be more pleasing; and without any scruple of offending the persons concerned, because I did it almost only for my self, I wrote a thousand things which I had never heard of. I made some persons happy, who had not so much as heard of it, and others who had never thought of being so; and because it had been ridiculous to choose two women for the heroines of my romance, who had neither birth nor merit, I made choice of two who wanted no good qualities, and even possessed so many, that envy might contribute to render credible all the ill things I could invent of them (zz).^{(yy) Buffu Rabutin's Letter to the Duke of St. Augustin, inserted in one of the Vies of Adrien, pag. 261, of the Dutch edition. This Letter is dated the 12th of November 1665.} You have here a true picture of the conduct of satirical writers. Whether they write out of revenge or jealousy; or whether they do it to display their thoughts, and exercise their pen; the main thing they aim at is the diversion of the readers, and to be praised for their parts. Now because they are afraid

[G] These words . . . may serve as a general answer to all complaints of the same nature.] And yet there are very few French Roman Catholics, but say that certainly the States are not displeased with the liberty which the Bookellers take to publish all sorts of satires against those who are not in the interest of their country, some on long and narrow slips of paper, and some in many pages, all full, say they, of heinous lies, especially during the last war: This is a master-stroke of policy, say they, the States were very glad, to foment animosities, and to keep up the hopes of the people, that they might more patiently bear the charges of the war, and by their hatred of a foreign government, grow more in love with their own country. The Athenians used the same policy, and if we had all they said and published against the Persians and Macedonians, we should find that the magistrates gave their helping hand to it, in order to inspire more zeal for the preservation of a government, which besides the public shews, and many other such things agreeable to the multitude, afforded them the pleasure of composing and reading a vast number of libels against the enemy. Besides it was a good way of purging the satirists, by giving vent to the peccant humours which might have occasioned defluxions on the internal parts; for had they been restrained with respect to strangers, they would have vomited their gall on their own masters. This is what the French say, without forgetting that their nation had been kept pure and clean from this licentiousness, and that it is one of their noblest triumphs. But a satisfactory answer is made to them, as to all those political mysteries they mention, which are only imaginary: they are desired to consider the constitution of a free state, wherein it is essential that every member should be secured from that rigorous prosecution, practised in monarchies. However I will quote an author who makes some complaints (58): 'They have printed in Holland,

(58) Diversitez Curieuses, Part. 2, p. 173, 174, Dutch Edit. 1699.

(59) Compare this with the remark [C], of the article NID-NARD.

and even of dangerous consequence to posterity; and indeed who knows but that two or three hundred years hence, they who shall write the History of our times, may take these satirical books for original and authentic Memoirs written by contemporary authors, who ought to be credited (60)? Since we cannot extirpate those plagues of History, we must at least warn those, who shall come after us, not to be deceived by them.'

We must own there are very good things in this passage, and that the author has very good reason to say that it were to be wished, that care was taken to refute what can be refuted; for what will our posterity think, when they shall read so many things made current, without any opposition? How will they be able to forbear believing that they are true? Will they not say that if they had been false, they would have been confuted for the honour of those whom they blemish? How many people are there, whom the satires of the XVIth century keep still in error? Those of our time will not be less active in future ages, and we must not imagine, that they will not last long, because they disappear in the Bookellers shops in two or three months time. They will be preserved in the most famous libraries, in which they have been carefully collected. I do not pretend that there is a necessity to confute all libels; that would be an endless work and oftentimes very needless. It were sufficient to refute those which have something of the character of an History, and to give some general rules for discerning the truth, and securing ones self against the boldness of satirical writers. For example, a man of ability, and well informed, should criticise the book, intitled, *Annales de la Cour & de Paris pour les années 1697, & 1698* (61). - *Annals of the French Court, and of Paris, for the years 1697 and 1698*. If he should demonstrate the falsity of five or six of the most remarkable particulars, all the rest would fall of itself; especially if the readers were told that they cannot reasonably believe what is advanced by such writers, unless their relations be attended with certain characters, for want of which one ought to suppose that all their stories are only the discourses of taverns and coffee-houses. These places are the magazines and store-houses of false news, and may be rightly compared to the Mythology of Nardis Comes. Such a work as the refutation I speak of, would serve as a preservative an hundred years hence, and would be of great use to those who should endeavour to find out Historical Truths.

The author whom I have quoted has forgot a necessary reflexion: he should have complained of France as much as of Holland; for it is particularly in France, that the writings of which he complains fell well. If the French would neither read nor buy them, the Bookellers would not print them, and thus the greediness of the French contributes as much as any thing else to the production of libels: the liars and the credulous feed one another mutually; each of them lives upon the purse of the other.

[H] The

afraid that meer truth would afford but little diversion, and that their work would be accounted a very indifferent performance, they season their relations with a thousand false stories; they invent extraordinary adventures, and conversations, and apply to those they speak of whatever they have read that is most proper to give a high relish. If you examine the smartest and best written satires, you will find the spirit of the author, his stile and character, in all the letters and conversations he ascribes to lovers. Is not this a proof that he writes a romance? If the History of Donna Olympia, and an hundred other pieces of the same nature, were written with the simplicity which is to be observed in Burchardus's Journal (xx*), they would be incomparably more creditable. I do not say that the readers would be more persuaded of the truth of them, but only that they ought to be so; for I know that the readers proportion their persuasion to the probability the writers observe, and to the pleasure they afford by satirical strokes in their writings, and by the wonderful events they relate. This is so true, that, notwithstanding the public confession of Count Rabutin, most people do still believe, that his relations are truly historical. Take notice of the words, in which he tells us, that his manuscript was falsified by a lady to whom he had lent it. 'She added to, or left out of that History, what she pleased, to expose me to the hatred of most of those I spoke of: which is so true, that the first copies that were seen were not falsified; but as soon as the others appeared, as every body loves the sharpest satires, the true ones were thought insipid, and suppressed as false (a).'

The journal I have just now mentioned was written by a German, Master of the Ceremonies at the court of Pope Alexander VI. His nation and the post he was in assure us of two things, one that he relates things faithfully, the other that he was able to come to the truth of what he relates. So that there is no reason to doubt of those infamous fights, wherewith the Pope and his daughter fed their eyes, I mean that collation which the Duke of Valentinois gave to fifty courtizans, and the combat of four stone-horses let loose upon two mares. Besides, as I have already said, the plain and barbarous style of the writer does not permit to suspect that he wrote for the diversion of the reader and his own commendation. You may judge of it by this little specimen. 'Dominica ultima mensis Octobris in fero fecerunt cœnam cum Duce Valentiniensi in camera sua in palatio Apostolico quinquaginta meretrices honestæ, Cortegianæ nuncupatæ, quæ post cœnam chorearunt cum servitoribus & aliis ibidem existentibus, primo in vestibus suis, deinde nudæ. Post cœnam posita fuerunt candelabra ardentibus & projectæ ante candelabra per terram castaneæ, quas meretrices ipsæ super manibus & pedibus nudæ candelabra pertranscutes colligebant, Papa, Duce, & Lucretia sorore sua presentibus & aspicientibus: tandem exposita dona ultimo, diploides de serico, paria caligarum, bireta & alia, pro illis qui plures dictas meretrices carnaliter agnoscerent, quæ fuerunt ibidem in aula publicè carnaliter tractatæ arbitrio presentium, & dona distributa Victoribus. Feria quinta, undecima mensis Novembris intravit urbem per portam viridarii quidam rusticus ducens duas equas lignis oneratas, quæ cum essent in plateola S. Petri, accurrerunt stipendiarii Papæ, incisique pectoralibus & lignis projectis in terram cum bastis, duxerunt equas ad illam plateolam quæ est inter palatium juxta illius portam, tum emissi fuerunt quatuor equi curserii liberi suis frenis & capistris ex palatio, qui accurrerunt ad equas, & inter se propterea cum magno strepitu & clamore moribus & calcibus contententes ascenderunt equas & coierunt cum eis, & eas graviter pistarunt & læserunt, Papa in fenestra cameræ supra portam palatii & Domina Lucretia cum eo existente, cum magno risu & delectatione præmissa videntibus (b). - - - - On the evening of the last Sunday in the month of October, fifty reputable barlots, called courtizans, supped with the Duke of Valentinois, in the chamber he had in the Pope's palace; after supper they danced with the servants and others who were present, first in their cloaths, and afterwards stark naked: then candlesticks were brought upon the table, with candles burning, and before them were thrown upon the ground a great many chestnuts, which these naked barlots scrambled for, creeping upon all four, and passing backward and forward before the candlesticks, while the Pope, the Duke, and Lucretia, his sister, were present and looking on. At last several silk doublets, pairs of breeches, and stockings, caps, and other rewards, were offered to those who should lie with the greatest number of these courtizans: whereupon those who were present publicly lay with as many of them as they pleased, and afterwards the rewards were distributed to the victors. On Thursday the eleventh of November a peasant entered the city, driving two mares laden with wood; when he came to St Peter's Square, the Pope's servants immediately run to the mares, cut their girths, threw off their wood and their pack-saddles, and brought them to the little court which is nigh the palace-gate: then they let loose four stone-horses, without any halters or bridles, who run to the mares, and with great noise and clamour, biting and kicking one another, mounted and covered them, and greatly bruised and hurt them. The Pope being at the window of a chamber over the palace-gate, and the lady Lucretia with him, beheld all this with great mirth and delight.'

(xx*) Johanne Burchardus, Agentis, Capellæ Alexandri Sexti Papæ Clericus Croniconum Magister. The Excerpt, out of his Dictionary, were printed at Hunsler in 1696, by the care of Mr Leibnitz, with this title, Specimen Historiæ Arcanæ sive Anecdote de Vita Alexandri IV Papæ.

(a) Buffon, ubi supra, pag. 269.

(b) Specimen Histor. Arcanæ seu Anecdote de Vita Alexandri VI Papæ, pag. 77, 78.

XII.
Laws of
Charles V.
etc. against

Was I further to enlarge upon the subject of this Dissertation, I should hope the reader would excuse my prolixity, if he considered the abundance and importance of the matter, and the care I should take, as I have done hitherto, not to transcribe the

VOL. V.

9 F

Civilians

libels. How Pope Hadrian VI was dissuaded from overthrowing Pasquin's statue.

Civilians who have written so many books upon this question [H]. It is easy to be copious upon a subject which affords so many reflexions, and wherein the public is so much concerned, that all legislators concur in severely punishing the authors of defamatory libels. We have seen that Augustus repealed them in this respect (c): we have seen the contrary above. One of the greatest Emperors that lived since Augustus, appointed the punishment of Retaliation (d); for he ordered that libellers should undergo the same punishment with those whom they defame, and who should be convicted: nay he would not have them to go unpunished, tho' they should say nothing but truth. 'Per hoc autem quod verum scripserit infamans nullam meretur excusationem, siquidem veritatem criminis per libellum famosum pandere non licet, & edens libellum famosum injuriarum tenetur, nec admitti debet edens libellum famosum & injuriarum conventus ad probationem veritatis criminis. Joannes Thilemannus de Benignis, alias Goth. Obs. Præst. 86. Quod etiam confirmatur per constitutionem Caroli V. criminal. art. 110. in f. ubi hæc verba habentur: Et licet illata injuria prætensi facti vera esset, debet tamen diffamator talis injuriæ secundum jus & arbitrium judicis puniri (e). Haec perquam est - - - But a defamer deserves no excuse, though his defamation should prove true: for it is not lawful to divulge in a defamatory libel the truth of a crime, and the publisher of such a libel is guilty of an action of trespass, nor ought he, or the publisher of many accusations, to be admitted to prove these accusations. . . . This is also confirmed by the constitution of the Emperor Charles V, where these words are to be found. And tho' the defamation were grounded upon truth, yet the defamer ought to be punished according to the power and at the discretion of the judge.' In France the famous edict of January condemned them and their abettors to be whipped, and in case of relapse, to be punished with death. *Ne quis infames libellos ad quemquam traducendum faciat, divendat, aut divendendos curet. Qui secus faxit, primum fustigium, secundum, capitalis pena indulta esto* (f). I mean here by abettors those who procured the publication, or the sale of a libel. This was renewed by King Henry III, in the year 1577. The law of the Emperors Valentinian and Valens is very severe; for it condemns to a capital punishment such as meeting with a libel by chance, divulged it instead of tearing or burning it. 'Si quis famosum libellum, five domi sit, five in publico, vel quocunque loco etiam ignarus repererit, nec statim corruerit, aut igne consumpserit, sed vim ejus manifestaverit, quasi auctor hujusmodi delicti sententiæ capitali subijciatur. . . . If any person shall meet with a defamatory libel, either in a private or public place, even if he meets with it only by chance, and does not immediately destroy or burn it, but divulges the same, let him be subject to a capital punishment, as the author of such a trespass.' See Naudé's Mascurat, at the 657th page. But so many temptations to prolixity will not hinder me from putting an end to this dissertation, when I have related a thing which I remember I have promised, and made three or four other considerations.

Pope Hadrian VI hearkened to reason, when it was represented to him that the remedy he was going to employ against Pasquinades, would be useless. I will use Mr Flechier's words: 'An infinite number of libels were then current in Spain, against the court of Flanders, and against Ximenes himself. The Flemings*, who were not used to this sort of smart and ingenious satires, complained of them, and the Cardinal had orders to search after the authors and Printers, and to punish them severely. He caused, out of form, some Booksellers houses to be searched, but so lightly that no body was disturbed at it. He was of opinion that inferiors should have the liberty of revenging themselves for their sufferings by words or writings, which last no longer than a man's offended at them, and which lose their charms and venom when they are despised. Alphonso Castile, governor of Madrid, having met with some of these works reflecting upon Cardinal Hadrian and La-Chaux, Ambassadors of Charles, shewed them to them, and they were very much displeased at it, especially Hadrian, who was for some time inconsolable. It is said that being afterwards raised to St Peter's chair, and not being able to bear the statues of Pasquin and Marforio, whom the facetious and satirical wits have chosen for the confidants and authors of their calumnies, ordered them to be thrown into the Tiber; which had been executed, if the Duke of Sessa, the Spanish Ambassador, had not very wisely told him: *What are you going to do, holy father? It is much better still to pardon those two mutes, than to open*

[H] The Civilians, who have written so many books upon this question, &c. Mr Furetiere has quoted four or five in one of his Cases. It is where he would prove that his book against some Academics deserved not to be called a libel by the sentence of the Chatelet. I have in vain searched after Gabriel Naudé's book, intitled, *Mayfore, ou Discours contre les Libelles*. It was printed at Paris by Lewis Boulenger in 8vo. I know not in what year. Leo Allatius mentions it in a book, (62) which he published in the year 1633. Mr Baillet (63) cites a book which I would fain have read. It is the celestial shield of John Baptist Nocette a Genoese, against Defamatory Libels. The abbot Michael Justiniani (64), says, the first edition was printed at Paris, in the year 1653, in 4to; and the second, at Lyons 1664, in 12mo. It is written in Italian. Ale- gambe's Continuator (65) mentions but one edition, viz. that of Paris 1655. See the Margin (66).

(62) Intituled, Apes Urbaines.

(63) Baillet, Jugem. des Scavans, sur les Préjuzes des libelles diffamatoires, &c. part II, ch. viii.

(64) Nath. Sorvel, Biblioth. Script. Societ. Jesu, pag. 415. (65) The authors quoted by Furetiere, pag. 12, of the third Case, are Franciscus Baldinus, 1562: Fredericus Banvinius: Aurelius de Vergerius, printed in the year 1564, &c. Joan. Conradus Rokembach, at Strasbourg, in 1660, in 4to; and Henricus Berrus, at Tubingen 1611, in 8vo. I believe that his Franciscus Baldinus is a ginary author, whose name has by degrees been taken from Franciscus Baldinus, some errors of the press, and the abbreviations of the names. The book of the Libellus is mentioned in such a manner by Draudius, pag. m. 783, as possibly appears with Baldinus's book.

‘open the mouths of all the town. If you throw them into the river, the frogs will croak the raileries which we read as we go by them: and what two dead stones shall no longer speak, will be divulged by all persons living.’ The Pope followed this advice, and was afterwards less nice upon this subject (g). That you may see more particularly the sensibility of this Pope, I will set down the words of Paul Jovius, who tells us that the Spanish Ambassador was forced to renew his advice. ‘Gravissime etiam tulerat se famosis carminibus apud Pasquilli statum fuisse laceratum, sed id postea civili animo tulit, cum didicisset, eam maledicendi licentiam obscurorum hominum libertati atque nequitiae dari, ut cum insignes viros impunè carperint, fortunam suam ea vindictæ voluptate consolentur. Deceverat Hadrianus uti poëtis non obscurè subiratus, Pasquilli statum, quæ erat in Parione, demoliri, atque eam in Tyberim præcipitare: sed Ludovicus Sueffanus urbano falsoque ingenio id fieri debere pernegavit, subdens, Pasquillum vel in imo vado ranarum more, non esse taciturnum, ad id verò pontifex, exuratur ergo, inquit, in calcem, ne ejus vestigii ulla omnino memoria superfit: Tum rursus Sueffanus, rectè inquit, sed tam crudeliter concremato poëtæ clientes non deerunt, qui patroni cineres invidiosis carminibus prosequantur, & supplicii locum quotannis statuto solenni die concelebrant. Quibus verborum lusibus pontifex ab iracundia ad jocos hilaritatemque sensus omnes lenissimè revocavit (b).’

Hadrian was also highly offended at some satirical verses written upon him, and fastened to Pasquin’s statue; but he afterwards bore this with great calmness, when he came to know that this licentiousness of defaming was to be tolerated in obscure and invidious men, that they might comfort themselves in their hard fortune, by the pleasure and revenge they took in being suffered to defame eminent men. Hadrian, being highly incensed against the Poets, had resolved that Pasquin’s statue should be taken down, and even cast into the Tiber. But Lewis Duke of Sessa, a man of wit and humour, represented that such a thing ought not to be done, alledging that if Pasquin was in the bottom of the river, he would not be silent, but would croak like the frogs. To this the Pope answered, let him therefore be burnt to ashes, so that there may not remain the least remembrance of him. Right, said the Duke, but if Pasquin should be so cruelly burnt, he would not be abandoned by the Poets, his clients, who would attend the ashes of their patron with many satirical verses, and would set a part a day yearly for celebrating the place of his suffering. These facetious words appeased the Pope’s anger, and put him in a merry and cheerful humour.

(g) Flechier, Histoire du Cardinal Ximenes, liv. vi, p. 814, Dutch Edit.

(b) Paul. Jovius, in Vita Hadrianæ lecti, pag. m. 277, 278. See also Camerarius’s Historical Meditations. He supposes that the second answer was made by a Cardinal, and not by the Ambassador, and that it was a wooden statue.

XIII.
Princes who have despised slanders.

Some Princes have been as insensible to slanders as Cardinal Ximenes. See in Seneca (i) how Antigonus (k) pardoned some soldiers who had lampooned him. The same author alledges (l) the patience of Philip of Macedon, and that of Augustus. This Emperor expressed an admirable good humour towards a satirical Historian (m), who had abused him, his wife and children. Nothing was more likely to exasperate a potent Prince, who besides knew that the witticisms of the Historian had been taken up and spread over all the town. This is customary. The Chevalier de Meré has wisely said, *That slanders are very much to be feared; when they are expressed in witty sayings, because people delight to repeat them, and love always to commend a good thought (n).* But Seneca says with more reason still, that witty sayings, which expose their authors to some danger, are more studiously observed than any others. ‘Multa & divus Augustus digna memoria fecit, dixitque, ex quibus appareat illi iram non imperasse. Timagenes historiarum scriptor, quædam in ipsum, quædam in uxorem ejus, & in totam domum dixerat, nec perdiderat dicta: magis enim circumfertur, & in ore hominum est, temeraria urbanitas (o).’

Many of the actions and sayings of Augustus deserve to be remembered, and manifest that he was far from being mastered by anger. Timagenes, an Historian, had passed some invidious jests on the Emperor, his wife, and his whole family; and these jests were not disregarded and forgot; for men love to spread and repeat witty sayings, when they are indiscreet, and expose the authors of them to danger. However it be, the detraction of this Historian brought but a small disgrace upon him. Add to this what I have cited above (p). Nothing can be more rational than Mæcenæ’s arguments about the contempt that this Emperor ought to express for slanders (q). He advised him not to hearken to the informers against satirists, and to punish no body for speaking ill of him. You may see in Dion Cassius the reasons of this advice. The same Historian will inform you, why Cæsar took no notice of the injurious things that Cicero, and some others divulged against him (r). He thought they aimed at the glory of equalling themselves with him they abused, and that it was better to deprive them of this advantage, by avoiding to contend with them. The reason he went upon was contained in an oration of Quintus Metellus Numidicus, if we judge of it by this discourse of Aulus Gellius; however, I would not have it to be extended so far as to Cicero. ‘Cum iniquatissimis hominibus non esse convicio decertandum, neque in maledictis adversus impudentes & improbos velitandum, quia tantisper similis & compar eorum fias, dum paria & consimilia dicas atque audias, non minus ex oratione Q. Metelli Numidici sapientis viri cognosci potest, quàm ex libris & disciplinis philosophorum. Verba hæc sunt Metelli adversus Cn. Manlium tribunum plebei, à quo apud populum in concione laessurus jactatusque fuerat dictis petulantibus. Nunc quod ad illum attinet, Quirites, quoniam se amplio rem putat esse, si se mihi inimicum dicataverit, quem ego mihi

(i) Seneca, de ira, lib. iii, cap. xxii.

(k) He was not grandfather to Alexander the Great, as Seneca says.

(l) Seneca, ubi supra, cap. xxiij.

(m) Called Timagenes.

(n) Chevalier de Meré, Discours de la Conversation, p. 81, 82, Dutch Edit.

(o) Seneca, ubi supra, cap. xxiii, pag. m. 570.

(p) At the beginning of this Dissertation, citations (e) and (f).

(q) See Dion Cassius, lib. lii, pag. m. 556.

(r) Dion, ibid. lib. xxxviii, p. m. 71, 72.

'mibi neque amicum recipio, neque inimicum respicio, in eum ego non sum plura dicturus :
 'nam eum indignissimum arbitror, cui à viris bonis benedicatur : tum ne idoneum quidem,
 'cui à probis maledicatur : nam si in eo tempore hujusmodi bomunculum nomines, in quo pe-
 'nire non possis, majore honore quam contumelia afficias (s). - - That we ought not to contend
 'in defamation and reproaches with base and dishonest, or with impudent and wicked men,
 '(for by returning the same or the like invectives and abuse we put ourselves on a level with
 'such persons) we may learn not only from the writings and doctrines of the Philosophers,
 'but likewise from the oration of Quintus Metellus Numidicus, who was a very wise man.
 'These are the words of Metellus, against Cneius Manlius the tribune, who had made an
 'barangue to the people, in which he had treated him in the most opprobrious and abusive
 'manner. Now, Romans, as for this Manlius, because he expects to pass for a man
 'of greater importance, by often calling himself an enemy to me, a man whom I nei-
 'their admit to my friendship, nor regard as my enemy, I will say no more of him,
 'for I think he is far from deserving to be commended by honest men, nor even wor-
 'thy to be censured by good men : for the very naming of such a wretch, at a time
 'when he cannot be punished, does him more honour than discredit.' But Cæsar not
 'being yet Emperor, his conduct on this occasion is not of so great weight for this part
 'of my work as that of Tiberius mentioned by Tacitus. A lady was charged with
 'having spoken ill of Augustus, of the Empress Livia, and of Tiberius. She was pro-
 'secuted upon the law *de Majestate*. Tiberius would have a distinction made ; I will
 'not, said he, have her prosecuted for what concerns me ; but if she be found guilty as
 'to Augustus, let her be punished. He answered nothing the first day about his mother ;
 'but the next day he declared, that she desired no body should be brought into trouble
 'for satirical words spoken against her. 'Adolescebat interea lex majestatis ; & Apu-
 'leiam Variliam sororis Augusti neptem, quia probrosis sermonibus divum Augustum,
 'ac Tiberium, & matrem ejus inlulsisset, Cæsariæ connexa adulterio teneretur, maje-
 'statis delator arcessebat. *De adulterio satis caveri lege Julia visum : majestatis crimen di-*
 'singuī Cæsar postulavit ; *damnarique si qua de Augusto irreligiose dixisset : in se jacta nolle*
 'ad cognitionem vocari. Interrogatus à consule quid de his censeret, quæ de matre ejus lo-
 'cuta secus argueretur, reticuit : dein proximo senatus die, illius quoque nomine oravit,
 'ne cui verba in eam quoquo modo habita crimini forent : liberavitque Apuleiam lege ma-
 'jestatis (t). - - The law of violated Majesty, in the mean time, began to be of more force ;
 'and by it an accuser impleaded Apuleia Varilia, grand-niece to Augustus by his sister,
 'for having by opprobrious words reviled the deified Augustus, Tiberius, and his mother, and
 'as she was nearly allied to the Emperor, for having stained by adultery the Cæsarean blood.
 'Concerning the adultery, sufficient provision was thought already made by the Julian
 'Law : and as to the crimes of state, Tiberius desired they might be separated : if
 'she had uttered impious speeches of Augustus, she must be condemned, but for in-
 'vectives against himself, he would not have her called to any account. The Consul
 'asked what would be his sentiments, if she was convicted of defaming his mother.
 'To this he made no answer, but next sitting of the Senate, he prayed too in her name, that
 'no words spoken against her might, to any one, be imputed for crimes, and acquitted
 'Apuleia of treason.' Suetonius will give you a more particular account of this Em-
 'peror's indolence (u), I would not repeat what I have said before of Nero's moderation,
 'and as for Vespasian, I refer you to Suetonius (w). But upon this head can any
 'thing be nobler than this edict of the Emperor Theodosius ? 'Si quis modestiæ nefcius
 '& pudoris ignarus improbo petulantique maledicto nomina nostra crediderit laceßenda,
 'ac temulentia turbulentus obrectator temporum nostrorum fuerit ; cum pœnæ nolu-
 'mus subjugari neque durum aliquid nec asperum volumus sustinere, quoniam si id ex
 'levitate processerit contemnendum est, si ex insaniam miseratione dignum, si ab injuria
 'remittendum : unde integris omnibus hoc ad nostram scientiam referatur, ut ex personis
 'hominum dicta pensemus, & utrum prætermitti an exquiri debeant censeamus. Da-
 'tum VI. Id. August. Constantinopoli, Theodosio anno III. & Abundantio Coss. - -
 'If any person, void of modesty and shame, shall by wicked and slanderous detraction, go about
 'to blast our reputation, and wantonly traduce and defame our government, it is our pleasure
 'that he be not subjected to punishment, nor suffer any harshness or severity on that account,
 'because, if this proceeded from levity, it ought to be despised, if from madness, it deserves
 'pity and compassion, if from a design to do an injury, it ought to be forgiven. We therefore
 'will that no man be punished, or prosecuted, for such slanderous speeches, and that they be
 'referred to our cognizance, that we may weigh and consider the sayings of men by their
 'characters, and may judge whether they ought to be passed by or inquired into.' This con-
 'stitution is in the Code, in the title, *Si quis Imperatori male dixerit*.

Modern History likewise affords several instances of this forbearance. You will find
 some in a Latin letter of Balzac (x), but not that of Lewis XII, which I have related in
 its proper place (y), nor that of Catherine de Medicis. We learn from Brantome (z), that
 she read even the invectives that were made against her, at which she jested and laughed,
 without any emotion, calling them babblers, and authors of idle-stories : Being told that the
 Huguenots in the second troubles had with them a very fine culverin, which they called
 the Queen-mother, she desired to know the reason of it. Some body being pressed by her to tell
 it,

it, answered, it is, Madam, because it has a greater and wider bore than any other. She was the first that laughed at it (aa). What she told some soldiers who spoke most horrible infamies of her, is to be seen in Costar's letters with some flourishes. (bb) Catherine de Medicis, tho' she was of a country where they say, God has reserved vengeance to himself, because it is the dainty bit, found nevertheless more daintiness in pardoning than in punishing, when she saw some soldiers by her coach, who said of her all the filthy things imaginable, without minding her, or so much as lowering their voice; for this Princess only looked out of the coach, and fixing her eyes upon those rogues told them: Friends, if you do not go farther off to speak ill of me, I will keep you from roasting the goose (cc), and eating it so quietly as you do. The Cardinal of Lorraine would have had them hanged for an example; but she chose rather to let posterity know that a person, who was at once a woman, a queen, and an Italian, could command her passion, and deprive herself of the pleasure she would have found in revenge. I am much mistaken, if this story is not originally in d'Aubigné's History. But to shew how Costar accommodated the circumstances of facts to his own humour, without considering the great abuses which arise from such a liberty, it will not be amiss to set down the words of that Historian (dd). I have it, says he, from the *Sieur de Talsi* (ee), that the King of Navarre, and the Queen-mother being (ff) at the window of a low room, overheard two black-guards, who were roasting a goose on a wooden spit, and singing infamies against the Queen: one often said that the Cardinal had lain with her, and that she had a pig in her belly, the other said it was a mule-colt; and then they cursed the bitch that did them so much mischief. The King of Navarre was taking his leave of the Queen to go and have them hanged; but she looking out of the window said, Why, what has she done to you? You may thank her that you roast the goose, and turning to the King of Navarre, and laughing, she told him, Cousin, our anger must not descend so low; that is beneath us. This I mention to shew that there was nothing mean in her.

Francis I, is one of the examples alledged by Balzac. But I find one thing in him to be blamed, which is that this King suffered his ministers and courtiers to be abused upon the stage, at the same time that he permitted his own faults to be censured. This was imitating a conduct which Antient Greece and Rome found detrimental to them. It was introducing an ill custom: and if it be an act of magnanimity in a Prince to despise the satires that concern his own person, and to forgive the authors of them; it is a visible neglect of his duty to suffer his subjects to be exposed to the insults of a satirical pen. He may abate of his own right; but the honour of his subjects ought to appear inviolable to him. Note, That Francis I. did not suffer the Players to name people. Accipimus tacite, libenterque etiam ferre solitum, se præcipuosque Regni sui proceres, quorum ipse opera consiliisque utebatur, in Fabulis & Comædiis publicis rodi & configi maledictis; recte id quidem & involute, sed tamen ut ab omnibus perspiceretur (gg). - - - We are informed that King Francis I, was wont patiently, and even willingly to suffer himself and the chief nobles of his kingdom, men whom he employed in the highest offices, to be inveigled against, and satirized in the public Comedies. It is true these invectives were concealed and disguised; yet so as that every body could perceive them.

XIV.

The Romans were more jealous of their honour than of that of their gods.

The Romans did not permit the Comic Poets to abuse the Magistrates, but they left them an entire liberty to make sport with the gods. St Austin upbraided them with it severely. At Romani, says he (bb), sicut in illa de (ii) republica disputatione gloriatur Scipio, probris & injuriis poetarum subjectam vitam famamque habere noluerunt, capite etiam punire facientes tale carmen condere si quis auderet. Quod erga se quidem satis honeste constituerunt, sed erga Deos suos superbe & irreligiose. Quos cum scirent non solum patienter, sed etiam libenter poetarum probris maledictisque lacerari, se potius quam illos hujusmodi injuriis indignos esse duxerunt, seque ab eis etiam lege munierunt, illorum autem ista etiam sacris solennitatibus miscuerunt. Itane tandem Scipio laudas, hanc poetis Romanis negatam esse licentiam ut cuiquam opprobrium infligerent Romanorum, cum videas, eos nulli Deorum pepercisse vestrorum? Itane pluris tibi habenda est existimatio vestrae curiæ, quam Capitoli, imo Romæ unius quam cœli totius: ut linguam maledicam in cives tuos exercere poetæ etiam lege prohiberentur, & in Deos tuos securi, tanta convitia nullo senatore, nullo censore, nullo principe nullo pontifice prohibente jacularentur? Indignum videlicet fuit, ut Plautus aut Nævius Publio & Cneo Scipioni, aut Cæcilius M. Catoni malediceret: & dignum fuit, ut Terentius vester flagitio Jovis optimi maximi adolescentium nequitiam concitaret. - - - But the Romans, as Scipio boasts in that disputation concerning the Republic, would not suffer their lives and reputations to be exposed to the reproach and abuse of the Poets, having decreed that if any person should be guilty of writing a Defamatory Libel, he should be put to death. The decrees they made relating to themselves were commendable enough, but those which related to their gods were naughty and irreligious. For knowing that though the gods were abused and reviled by the Poets, yet they bore it not only with patience, but also willingly, the Romans thought that they themselves deserved such abuse, less than their gods, and likewise made laws to protect themselves against it; but they suffered the invectives against the gods to be mingled even with their sacred solemnities. Is it so Scipio? do you commend this decree which made it unlawful for your Poets to inflict reproach and dishonour upon any Roman, whilst you see they have spared none of your gods? Have you

V O L. V.

9 G

then more regard for your Senate-house, than for the Capitol, for Rome alone, than for the whole Heavens; that the Poets who are by law forbidden to exercise their malicious tongues against your citizens, should be by no Senator, Censor, Prince, or Pontif, forbidden to load your gods with so many reproaches? Was it an heinous offence in Plautus or Mævius, to slander Publius and Cneius Scipio, or Cecilius to defame Marcus Cato, and was it commendable in Terence to exhort the youth to lewdness by the wicked and profligate example of 'almighty Jupiter.' This thought is older than St Austin, for Arnobius had made use of it before. 'Nec à vobis faltem istum meruerunt honorem (Dii) . . . Carmen malum conscribere, quo fama alterius coinquinetur & vita, decemviralibus scitis evadere noluitis impune: ac ne vestras aures convitio aliquis petulantiore pulset, de atrocibus formulas constituistis injuriis. Soli Dii sunt apud vos superi inhonorati, contemptibiles, viles: in quos jus est vobis datum, quæ quisque voluerit dicere: turpitudinem jacere, quas libido confinxerit atque excogitaverit formas (k k). . . . Neither ought you at least to pay this honour to the gods. By the laws of the twelve tables, you have not suffered the authors of libels, which defame the life and reputation of any person, to escape unpunished; and to the end, that no man might grate your ears with abusive reproaches, you have decreed that defamation should be punished as a capital crime. With you the gods alone are dishonoured, despised, and vilified, you are permitted to say of the gods what ever you please, and even to reproach them with those very things, which your lust prompted you to feign and devise.' A modern author does not mention it upon an occasion where it would have served his purpose. It is in a letter wherein he designed to attack the House of Austria. He enters upon the matter in hand, not citing Arnobius or St Austin, but Livy. (ll) The Spaniards, who first fought the same alliance (m m) which their partisans blame at present, took no care to preserve the veneration, due to holy things, or to maintain the immunities and privileges of the priesthood. Perhaps the reason of it was, because thinking themselves to be the lawful successors of the Romans, particularly in their design of forming an universal monarchy, they fancy they may say as well as they, *As for religion, it is more the interest of the gods than ours. They may give orders if they please for hindring sacred things from being polluted by impure hands. Ad * Deos id magis quam ad se pertinere, ipsos visuros ne sacra sua polluantur.* Is it not very likely that Charles V acted by this principle, when in the year 1552, he displaced three Lutheran ministers in Augsburg for abusing him, and suffered the rest to vilify God, his mother, and his saints; as the Duke of Nevers reproached him in a discourse he made to Pope Sixtus V (nn), upon the present state of affairs. Doubtless the Emperor Charles remembered this saying of Tiberius, and not without putting it in practice. *Let us leave to the immortal gods the care of revenging injuries that are done to them. Deorum ** injuriæ Diis curæ.*

XV.

The council of Trent ascribes the power of punishing the writers of libels to the tribunal of the Church.

I must not forget a thing which very much displeased the Civilians who were tender of the rights of the secular power. They looked upon the authority given to the Bishops by the council of Trent, as an usurpation. Let us hear William Ranchin (o o). This council, to the prejudice of the secular jurisdiction, assigns to the Bishops the punishment of the authors of Defamatory Libels, and of the Printers of them, &c. . . . Our Civil Laws commit the cognizance and punishment of them to the judges and magistrates, and not to Ecclesiastics. Some would except those that concern religion; but this exception is not pertinent; and here is an argument against it. The laws of Constantine the Great, and of Constantius, made against such libels, were enacted at such a time as this, that is, at a time when several writings were published in matters of religion against the honour of both sides. Dr Balduin has very judiciously observed it. *It is a material thing, says he, to remember what were the times of Constantine and Constantius, in which the contentions of religion, not unlike ours, inflamed the passions of the parties, who thereupon sent out horrid calumnies and Defamatory Libels, as is done at present.* He says this, explaining three laws of the Emperor Constantine, and two of Constantius, made upon this account, which we find at present in the Theodosian Code. These words † of the Emperors Valentinian and Valens are also remarkable: *If any one is concerned for his religion and the public safety, let him declare his name, and speak with his own mouth what he would have said in Defamatory Libels.* This very well agrees to libels in point of religion, and was never said in any other sense by those Emperors. Now * all the abovementioned constitutions, as also some others of the same Valentinian and Valens, of Arcadius, Honorius, and Theodosius, inflict penalties on the authors of such libels, and the publishers of them, and commit the cognizance and punishment of them to their officers and magistrates, directing such laws to them, that they may observe them in their sentences. A great many ordinances of our Kings mention in express words Defamatory and Scandalous Libels that concern religion, prescribe the punishment due to them, and the particular penalties to be inflicted on the authors, printers, and publishers, and expressly give this jurisdiction to the royal judges. As that of King Henry II, of the eleventh of December 1547, made at Fontainebleau, and another of the same Prince made at Chasteaubriant in the year 1551. That of King Charles IX, made at Mante on the tenth of September 1563. That of the States of Molins in the article LXXVII, and a great many others. I shall only set down the

' words of them, viz. that of King Charles IX, made at Mante on the tenth of September 1563, which speaks of Defamatory Libels, bills posted up, books, and such-like things concerning religion; and as to jurisdiction, it provides thus: *In-joining all public magistrates, justices of the peace, and our other officers to whom it shall belong, to take a due care of them, charging our attorneys and advocates to do their duty therein, and to lay aside all other affairs, in order to examine and punish the offences they shall find. And it is moreover enjoined, that they shall observe the same ordinance in every point, and proceed briefly against the infractors, by the punishments herein specified.*

XVI.
Libels com-
plained of as
being the
cause of sedi-
tion.

As there is nothing so useful, but in some respects is the cause of evil, it fell out that printing, among a thousand conveniences it has brought with it, has occasioned a notable inconvenience, which is, that it has afforded satirical and seditious men a thousand opportunities of quickly dispersing their venom every where. Du Verdier Vau-Privas has inserted in one of his books (p) a Latin Poem, entitled, *Encomion Chalcographiæ*, where, after several praises bestowed upon printing, many complaints are brought in against the licentiousness of libels. The author of this Poem being a Roman Catholic, it must be observed that he suits his style to his prejudices in the following verses:

(p) At the end
of the Supple-
mentum Epito-
me. B. Bibliotheca
Göttingensis.

Omnia dente petunt, scedant spurcaque saliva,
Digni qui Anticyræ præmia sana ferant.
A quibus & Nemesis turpissima facta repositat,
Quo meritas poenas improba turba luat.
Principis ac Princeps lacerat caput, atque tacenda
Consilia in chartis vendere quisque solet.
De rebus magnis populi suffragia vana
Captant, quæ semper mens animosa fugit.
Quid non aubebit furiosa licentia vulgi,
Talia si primi dant documenta duces?
Quæ non his oritur funesta Tragoedia nugis?
Accendit quas non hæc quoque flamma faces?
Rustica seditio belli cur cornua sumpsit?
Chartæ pellaces hoc docuere nefas.
Has quoque Gorgoneo perfudit sacra cruore
Progenies vulgi, quam nova secta tenet.
Quæque Numam simulat modo religione prophana,
Et geminos fertur ferre sub aure polos.
Omnia confundit, vertit sursumque, deorsumque,
Ac gerras præter nil sua sylva crepat.
Hæc ausa est Aquilæ Romanæ vellere pennas,
Atque aras magni commaculare Dei.
Non adeo lædunt Bombardæ fulmina dira:
Nil præter clades sit licet illa tonent:
Nec tantum nocuit cuiquam vis sæva cicuta,
Quantum famosi stigmata nigra libri.
His & mille modis essent hæc sæpe notanda,
Ast iter immodicum nostra Thaleia fugit.

With these advantages from printing sprung,
Swarms of defaming libels also come;
Where stand'ers stain and poison with their breath,
And madly rage, and tear with furious teeth.
Let vengeance overtake this odious crew,
Bare their most hidden crimes to public view
And with disgrace their blasted names pursue.
Defamers spare not the most sacred things,
Haunt and infect the palaces of Kings;
They slander Majesty, and all the great,
Divulge th' important secrets of the State,
Greedily catch th' applause of th' ignorant croud,
A vain applause shunn'd by the wise and good.
What limits can the popular fury know,
While such examples instigate to vice?
What fatal tragedies and civil woe,
What broils and discords will there not arise?
Libels of tumults first the causes are,
And then inflame them to a civil-war.
But none so bloody libels are, as those
Which Heretics with lavish hand diffuse:
This inauspicious offspring of the croud,
Subverting all things, nought but mischief brood.

Insult

A DISSERTATION

*Insult th' Imperial throne, provoke th' avenging sword,
Dare Heaven, and profane the altars of the Lord.
Not slaught'ring guns, whose issue wrapt in smoke,
And wing'd with death, flies kissing to the stroke;
Nor deadly draught, which mixing, with the blood,
Corrodes the heart and taints the vital flood,
Such woful mischief and destruction bring,
As Printing, whence defaming Libels spring.*

Erasmus exclaimed against the abuses of the press, and confuted the ridiculous excuses of the Printers, who alledged that they should want bread if they did not publish libels. 'Dicit hic aliquis: Heus divinator, quid hæc ad Typographos? Quia nonnullam mali partem invehit horum impunita licentia. Implent mundum libellis, non jam dicam nugilibus, quales ego forsitan scribo; sed ineptis, indoctis, maledicis, famosis, rabiosis, impiis ac seditiosis: & horum turba facit, ut frugiferis etiam libellis suos pereat fructus. Provolant quidam absque titulis, aut titulis, (quod est sceleratius) fictis. Deprehensi respondent: Detur unde aliam familiam, definam tales libellos excudere. Aliquanto meliore fronte respondeat fur, impostor aut leno: Da qui vivam, & definam his artibus uti, nisi forte levius crimen est, clam minuere rem alienam, quam palam eripere famam alienam: aut sine vi ad quæstum abuti tuo alienove corpore, quam vitam alterius ac famam vita quoque chariorem impetere (g). - - - Here some body may ask, what is all this to Printers? I answer, it does concern them, because the unpunished licentiousness of these men, is partly the cause of the evil I complain of. They fill the world with writings, which I will not call trifling and insignificant, such perhaps as are mine, but writings that are impertinent, unlearned, scandalous, defamatory, furious, impious and seditious libels; and there come forth such multitudes of them, that they prevent the reading of useful books, and obstruct the good effects they might have. Some come forth without any titles, or (which is still more wicked) under fictitious ones. If you discover the Printers of these libels, they say, give me wherewithal to support my family, and I will leave off printing such books. With more modesty might a thief, a cheat, or a pander say, give me wherewithal to live, and I will leave off committing these crimes; and perhaps it is not so criminal secretly to deprive another man of his property, as openly to rob him of his good name, not so criminal to prostitute one's own body, or that of another person, for the sake of gain, without using violence, as it is to attempt upon another man's life, and what is much more dear to him, his reputation.' I think that the author of the abovementioned poem does the satirical writers more honour than they deserve, by accusing them to be the cause of wars and seditions. It is certain that very often they aim at such a thing, and are over-joyed to think that their libels have produced so great an effect. They flatter themselves with it, even when they have no reason to do it, and are very well pleased to have this laid to their charge. Can one build any certain fact upon this subject? I do not think any general rule can be grounded upon it. At certain times Defamatory Libels do not stir the people, and the Publishers are disappointed in their expectations. But at other times they are real incendiaries, and trumpeters of sedition. Besides, the difference of parties and interests is to be considered; for the effects of libels are in that respect very different, and even contrary to one another: They sometimes unite those whom they would divide, and divide those they would unite. What is certain is, that the tongue and pen of a single man are sometimes more useful to a cause, than an army of forty thousand men. Francis I, confessed that the Bishop of Sion had done him more mischief by his words than all Swisserland by their arms. *Maxime vero ei gloriosum fuit Francisci Regis judicium, quum asseveraret, me audiente, aliquanto plus sibi sumptus atque periculi Sedunensis facundie indomitam vim, quam tot legionum ejus gentis cuspides attulisse (r).* I will not mention the confession of a King of England (s); for it would be departing from the matter in hand, and misapplying a thought to the present subject. The question is not here about the great things a King can do without going out of his closet, and by the sole power of his pen; nay, the question is not in general about the power of the pen in a war. A little book came out upon this subject in the year 1679 (t).

XVII.

Whether it be too severe a thing to inflict the same punishment upon the dispersers of libels as upon the authors of them. Some remarks against those who approve libels.

I have called the law of Valentinian and Valens, a severe one which condemns to capital punishment those who accidentally meeting with a libel do not destroy it, but on the contrary encourage it. Does this signify that I blame this law? By no means. For I cannot conceive that a man who in this case disperses a libel, is less desirous of doing mischief than the author himself, and therefore he deserves the same punishment with the author. But what shall we say of the pleasure that is taken in the reading of a Defamatory Libel? Is it not a very sinful thing before God? Here we must make a distinction. Either this pleasure is only an agreeable sensation, which affects us when we light upon any thought that is ingenious, and well expressed; or it is a joy grounded upon the dishonour of the person defamed. I have nothing to say upon the first case; for perhaps some would think that my morality departs too much from that of the Rigoirists, if I should affirm that a man is not master of those agreeable sensations, any more than of those occasioned by sugar or honey when they touch his tongue: but in the second

cond case, every body will own that pleasure to be a great sin. The pleasure in the first case is of no continuance; it precedes the use of our reason and our reflexion, and is immediately succeeded by the grief of seeing our neighbour's honour blasted. If it does not cease immediately, it is a sign that the insolence of the satirist does not displease us, and that we are glad to see him defame his enemy by all sorts of stories; and then we justly deserve the punishment to which the writer of the libel is liable. I have just light upon a modern author, here are his words: *St Gregory excommunicating the aubors who had dishonoured the Deacon Castorius, does not except those who read that book; because, said he, if calumnies have always been the delight of the ears, and the happiness of the people, who have no other advantage over honest men, is not he who takes pleasure in reading them, as guilty as if he gloried in composing them* (v)? It is a certain maxim, that they who approve an action would willingly do it if they could; that is, if some reason of self-love did not hinder them. There is no difference, said Cicero (w), betwixt advising a crime and approving it when it is committed. To desire that an action should be done, and to be glad that it is done, are the same thing. The Roman law confirmed this maxim, having submitted the approvers and authors of evil to the same punishment. 'Et si erat servus omni modo fugiturus, vel furtum facturus, hic vero laudator hujus propositi fuerit, tenetur. Non enim oportet laudando augeri malum' (x). - - - *If a slave designed to run away from his master, or to rob him, and if another person approved his design, the latter shall be liable to the same punishment with the slave: for evil must not be encouraged and increased by commendation.* We may therefore say, that those who are pleased with reading Defamatory Libels, so far as to approve the authors and dispersers of them, are as guilty as if they had composed them; for if they do not write such libels, it is either because they have not the talent of writing, or that they will run no hazard. See in one of the Provincial Letters (y), the mortal contagion of calumny: St Bernard is cited there, who maintained that calumny kills not only those who publish it, but also those who do not reject it. The Heathens were not ignorant of this maxim of morality: they said that slandering was criminal, both in the slanderer, and in him who believed slanders. Διαβολὴ γὰρ ἐστὶ δεινότατος ἐν τῇ δούμῃ εἰσι οἱ ἀδικούντες, ἐς δὲ ὁ ἀδικεῖ μὲν ὁ μὲν γὰρ διαβάλλων, ἀδικεῖ, ἡ τῶν παρεόντων κατηγορίαν ὁ δὲ ἀδικεῖ, ἀναπειθόμενος πρὶν ἢ ἀπρεκέως ἐκμάθοι ὁ δὲ δὴ ἀπειθὼν τῷ λόγῳ τὰς ἐν αὐτοῖσι ἀδικεῖται. Διαβληθεὶς τε ὑπὸ τῶ ἐτέρου, καὶ νομισθεὶς πρὸς τῷ ἐτέρῳ κακὸς εἶναι. Detractio namque importunissima res est: in qua duo sunt qui injuriam faciunt, unus cui injuria fit. Qui enim detrahit, injurius est, quod non præsentem accusat; item qui huic credit injurius est, quod prius credit quam rem compertam habeat; & illi cui absenti detrahitur, ob id fit injuria quod ab altero insinulatur ut malus, ab altero talis putatur (z). - - - *Defamation is a most dreadful thing: in it there are two persons who do an injustice, and one who suffers it: for he who defames does an injustice, because he accuses another man in his absence, and he who believes the defamation does also an injustice, because he believes it before he knows the truth of the matter. On the other hand the person defamed suffers an injustice from both, being accused as a bad man by the one, and deemed to be such by the other. See the book intituled, Question si Mr Arnaud est Heretique (a a)?* On the other hand, we ought to believe that the same baseness which induces some people to fire a musquet upon their enemy, would induce them to defame him by a satire, if they had no other arms but their pen. It is just as amongst beasts: some do not gore with their horns, but bite (b b), it is because they have no horns, and know how to use their teeth. Let us also say, that a satirist who attempts upon the honour of his enemy with libels, would attempt upon their life with sword or poison, if he had the same opportunity. 'Maledicum à Malefico nisi occasione non differre, non minus verè quàm eleganter scripsit Fabius: vix enim est ut qui verbis ultro lædit, re etiam lædere non nolit' (c c). - - - *It was a very true and ingenious observation of Fabius, that a calumniator and a villain differ in nothing but opportunity: for the man who, without provocation, wounds with his tongue, would very probably wound with his hand, if he had a fit opportunity.* As for the rest, it is not always a good excuse to say, such a libel has not been answered, therefore we ought to believe it: Seneca laughed at this way of reasoning. 'Res falsa & inanis nisi corrigatur habet nonnunquam fidem, multique sunt homines judicii parum firmi qui nihil audiant legantque quod non credant nisi refutatum sciant' (d d). - - - *A false and foolish assertion, unless it is refuted, is sometimes believed; and there are many men of weak understanding, who believe all they read, and all they hear, unless they know that it is refuted.*

(v) Clavigny de sainte Honorine, Usage des Livres suspects, pag. 41, 42.

(w) Tu omnium stultissime, non intelligis, si id quod me arguis voluisse interfici Cæsarem, crimen sit, etiam, lætatum esse morte Cæsaris, crimen esse: quid enim interest inter forem facti, & probatorem? aut quid refert, utrum voluerim fieri, an gaudere factum? Cicero, Philipp. II, pag. m. 722.

(x) Ulpianus, in Lige 1. D. de servo corrupto. See apud Th. Raynaud. Hypoth. pag. m. 359, 360, how great a sin it is, according to the Fathers, to praise evil actions.

(y) It is the XVth lib. towards the end, pag. m. 282.

(z) Herodotus, lib. vii, cap. 11, pag. m. 388.

(a a) Page 210, 211.

(b b) See the Penitens sur les Cometes, pag. 517.

(c c) Menagius, Epist. dedicat. Vitis Mamuræ.

(d d) Seneca.

I. .
Two sorts of
Hippomanes.
Servius and
Pliny quoted
wrong.

Hinc demum, Hippomanes vero quod nomine dicunt
Pastores, lentum distillat ab inguine virus.
Hippomanes, quod sæpe malæ legere novercæ,
Miscuerintque herbas & non innoxia verba (a).

DRYDEN.

I do not add to Virgil's authority that of his Commentator Servius, cited on this subject by Ferrugerus in his Philological Lexicon, by Calepinus, Decimator, &c. for I do not find that Servius does any thing more than explain the sense of the Poet: but I will not forget the authority of Aristotle. He says, that what they call Hippomanes is a certain thing proceeding *ex pudendis equæ similis genituræ, sed multo magis tenuis quam semen maris* (b). Now let us hear Pliny, who has this passage: 'Equarum virus à conitu in lychnis accensum Anaxilaus prodidit equinorum capitum visus representare monstrum sic: similitur ex asinis. Nam Hippomanes tantas in veneficio vires habet, ut affusum æris mixturæ in effigiem equæ Olympiæ admotos mares equos ad rabiem coitus agat (c). - - - Anaxilaus relates, that the liquor which flows from mares when ready to take horse, being kindled in lamps, shews a frightful apparition of horses heads. It is the same with asses. For the Hippomanes has so much power and efficacy in fascination, that being mixed with the brags which made the statue of an Olympic mare, it fires all the horses who are brought near to it, with a most furious desire after copulation.' Thus much concerning the first signification: now for the second. *Et sanè equis amoris inasit veneficium, Hippomanes appellatum, in fronte, caricæ magnitudine, colore nigro: quod statim edito partu devorat fœta, aut partum ad ubera non admittit. Si quis præreptum habeat affætu in rudiem id genus agitur (d).* Aristotle had said the same thing (e); Virgil hinted at it, speaking of the enchantments the unfortunate Dido had recourse to in her despair:

Quæritur & nascentis equi de fronte revulsus
Et matri præreptus amor (f).

And

*And cuts the forehead of a new born foal
Robbing the mother's love . . .*

DRYDEN.

It is easy to see that Calepinus has quoted those two passages of Pliny wrong, to prove the Hippomanes to be a little excrescence of flesh upon the forehead of a new-born colt; for Pliny speaks of it in this sense, only in the forty-second chapter of the eighth book. Besides, Calepinus (g) has quoted the eighteenth book instead of the twenty-eighth, and put *carie* instead of *carica*; and he ascribes five or six words to Servius, which are not to be found in the commentary of that Grammarian, and which signify, that the Hippomanes, being eaten by a man, makes him mad; *quod in humana viscera descendens hominem in furorem agit*. Decimator's Dictionary ascribes the same thought to Servius. Martinus, in his Dictionary, mangles the passage of the eighth book of Pliny; he puts *equi* for *equis*; *fetus* for *feta*, (which is nonsense); and a comma instead of a full-stop betwixt *admittit* and *si quis*. See Father Hardouin upon Pliny (h). It may be said in general, that the writers of Dictionaries take more pains to compile new things, than to mend the faults of their predecessors.

(g) The editor.
I make use of it
that of Lyons
1681.

(h) In the second
volume, p. 272.

II.
A plant called
Hippomanes
by Theocritus.

I had reason to say that the Hippomanes does chiefly signify two things; for there is a third kind not near so remarkable as the others, since it is found only in a passage of Theocritus: besides, one must engage in a controversy with one of the most learned men of the XVIIth century to find it there [A]. This passage says, that the Hippomanes is a plant in Arcadia, which makes mares and colts run mad (i). Salmassius will by no means admit of this plant; he maintains that Theocritus did not say *φουδόν*, but *χουδόν*, and that he meant by *χουδόν* the brazen mare that was near the temple of Jupiter Olympius, which excited lust in horses in like manner as if she had been alive; a quality she had derived from the Hippomanes that had been mixed with the brags in her casting. We have already related a passage out of Pliny where mention is made of such a thing; but it will be better to consult Pausanias, who will give us a larger account of it. And as what he says is the key of almost all the criticisms contained in this article, it is necessary to insert his words at large.

(i) Ἱππομανέϊς
φουδόν ἐστι παρ'
Ἀρκάδων, τῷ δ'
ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ
καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ
μαίνονται ἀν'
ὄρεα καὶ θανά
τῳ. Hippo-
manes planta est
apud Arcades
qua concitati
omnes & equulei
infantunt in
montibus & ce-
leres eque.
Theocrit. in
Pharmaceutria,
pag. m. 15.

III.
A brazen
horse which
excited lust.

Hear then how Pausanias speaks (k): *Phormis going out of Menalos, his native country, went into Sicily, where he signalized himself in several expeditions under Gelon son of Dinomenes, and Hiero brother of Gelon. Having acquired a great fortune, he offered up gifts not only to Jupiter Olympius, but likewise to Apollo Delphicus. Those he offered to Jupiter are two horses with two grooms, for each horse has a groom: Dionysius of Argos made one, and Simon of Ægina the other. Upon the side of the first horse was engraven an inscription, the beginning of which is in prose, and much to this purpose, viz. Phormis, the Arcadian of Menalos, but now of Syracuse, offered it. The people of Elea say, that through the artifice of a Magician some Hippomanes had been mixed in the casting of this horse, to the end it might afford a surprising show. He is both smaller and less beautiful than several other horses in Altis (l), and has a cut tail, which renders him yet more ugly; nevertheless he stirs up lustful desires in horses, not only in the spring, but all the year round; for they break their halters, or escape out of the hands of those who hold them, to rush with greater fury (m) on this statue than if they were to leap the finest mare that ever was. It is true, their feet slip, but they do not give over neighing and renewing their furious encounters till they have been forced from the brags by mighty whipping and downright strength.*

(k) Pausan. lib.
v, sub fin.

(l) It was the
name of one of the
dependencies of
the temple of
Jupiter. See
Pausan. pag. m.
156, and below,
num. VIII.

IV.
Servius justly
censured by
Salmassius.

Salmassius (n) has written a long discourse to shew that Theocritus spoke of this statue, and not of a plant called Hippomanes. Let us examine his reasons a little; we cannot fail to benefit ourselves by following the footsteps of so great a man. It is true, he seems not to love the plainest and most natural paths, but rather chooses to break a passage through the midst of bushes; yet one may sometimes learn more by running after him through wilds, than by taking a direct way to truth under other guides. He very justly censures Servius for saying that Virgil pretended that the plant Hippomanes

(m) Πάλλω δὲ
τὴν ἱμάντιν
πρὸς
Ἀμαθύναν
trans-
lates it nihil
hercle minus fu-
renter, quibus
weakens the sense.

(n) Salmass. Ex-
ercit. Plinian.
pag. 939. & seq.

(1) It is thus
perhaps that the
Greek words of
Theophrastus
ought to be ren-
dered, lib. ix,
Hist. Plant. cap.
xv, καὶ τὸ τι-
θυμᾶλλον ἐξ
τοῦ τοῦ Ἱππο-
μανέϊς, ἀρῖστον
δὲ τὸ ἐπὶ Τε-
γῆαν, καὶ ἐνὶ
μάλιστα ἐν-
δύεται. Sal-
massius, Exercit.
Plin. pag. 941,
refert ἀρῖστον,
&c. τοῦ Ἱππομα-
νέϊς.

(2) lb. p. 940.

[A] The third kind of Hippomanes is only found in a passage of Theocritus: besides, one must engage in a controversy with one of the most learned men of the XVIIth century, &c.] I am not ignorant that in Dioscorides we find an herb called ἀπόκυνος, and κυνοκράμνη, and Ἱππομανέϊς; and in Theophrastus an Hippomanes made of the herb called Tithymallum, which was excellent and much cultivated at Tegea, a town of Arcadia (1). But because Salmassius (2) pretends that none but cavillers, like him who concealed himself under the borrowed name of Cercocœtus (it was Father Petau), would make use of the authority of Dioscorides, since that would be to give us the spurious additions made to that author for his genuine writings, I think we ought to pass by his testimony. As for Theophrastus, it is not certain whether we ought to read Ἱππομανέϊς in the passage I have quoted; Salma-

sius (3) corrects the reading of it, and substitutes in its place δὲ ἀπὸς μένος, pretending that the author (4) meant, that juice only was drawn from the Tithymallum. Thus we see these testimonies are only matter of dispute. We must not say the same of that of Theocritus, since besides the reasons by which I have overthrown the *χουδόν* of Salmassius, it cannot be denied but that from the time of the Grammarian Servius the word *φουδόν* was in the text of that Poet. Nothing can be said positively as to the herb of which he has spoken. Aloisius Anguillara, Cratevas, Doneus, and Wecker, who take it for the Stramonium (4), called by the Arabians *Nux Metel*, and by the French *Pomme du Perou*, do not give us better conjectures concerning it than Rodericus à Castro (5), who has taken it for Petu, or Gaspar à Reies, who took it for the herb *Flavia* (6).

(3) lb. p. 941.
its place δὲ ἀπὸς μένος, pretending that the author (4) meant, that juice only was drawn from the Tithymallum. Thus we see these testimonies are only matter of dispute. We must not say the same of that of Theocritus, since besides the reasons by which I have overthrown the *χουδόν* of Salmassius, it cannot be denied but that from the time of the Grammarian Servius the word *φουδόν* was in the text of that Poet. Nothing can be said positively as to the herb of which he has spoken. Aloisius Anguillara, Cratevas, Doneus, and Wecker, who take it for the Stramonium (4), called by the Arabians *Nux Metel*, and by the French *Pomme du Perou*, do not give us better conjectures concerning it than Rodericus à Castro (5), who has taken it for Petu, or Gaspar à Reies, who took it for the herb *Flavia* (6).

(4) Medic. Polit.
lib. iv, cap. ii.

(5) In Campo
Elyfio jucundus.
Quest. XXIX.

[B] Concerning

was improperly so called (e). Servius's reason is, that Virgil, speaking of another Hippomanes, observes it was properly so called, *vero quod nomine dicunt*. This reason is of no force, for the Poet did not express himself after this manner, but because he saw in the very name the property of the thing: now if this property agreed with several other things, with the plant of Theocritus, with the matter that proceeded from a mare, and the like, the same name might be given them in the proper sense. Salmasius imagines with a great deal of probability, that Servius mistook Hesiod for Theocritus, when he said upon the third book of the Georgics, that Hesiod makes mention of an Herb called Hippomanes, which made horses mad; for having had occasion to speak of the same thing in his comment on the fourth book of the Æneid, he quotes only Theocritus. Had he known two Poets who had spoke of this plant, he would doubtless have named them both either in the first place or the second; but he has not done it, therefore we must believe he had only the authority of Theocritus. He has nevertheless been the cause that even at this day the Dictionary of Decimator, and the Thesaurus Fabri, have quoted Hesiod and Theocritus for the herb Hippomanes.

V
Servius and
Phylargyrus,
unjustly cen-
sured by Sal-
masius.

Servius and Phylargyrus seem to have had more reason when they say, the former, that this herb made those horses mad who eat of it; and the latter, that it excited an excessive lust in mares. Salmasius pretends that they do not understand the matter, and that Theocritus meant only that the horses were enflamed with a violent desire of possessing the Hippomanes; so that if this Poet spoke of an herb, it must be understood that the horses were transported with a furious inclination to eat of it. It is thus he explains the Greek phrase *μαίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῇ* (p). Be it so; but it seems to me that the explication of those two ancient Grammarians is not amiss. The preposition *ἐπὶ* has so many significations, that it would be strange if it had not sometimes that which we give to the preposition *upon* in these phrases: *He was enraged, he was transported, he became furious upon it*. These are all phrases where the preposition *upon* does not denote the object of the passion, but the cause of it.

I do not deny but Phylargyrus has made Theocritus say, what he does not precisely say, viz. That the herb Hippomanes excites in mares who eat of it an ardent lust; but it is nevertheless very likely Theocritus understood it so. For proof of this, we need only consider his wish, that the object of his love seized with a desire like to that of those mares, might come to him; as also what the Naturalists observe as to the excessive lust of these animals. Aristotle says (q) no female creatures equal these in lust; and that to express the lust of other females excessively amorous, they made use of the name which denotes that of mares. Ælian observes the same thing in the eleventh chapter of the fourth book of his History of Animals. Others have remarked, that they will go in quest of the males, even over mountains and through rivers (r).

Scilicet ante omnes furor est insignis equarum.

Illas ducit amor trans Gargara transque sonantem
Afcanium; superant montes & flumina tranant (s).

But far above the rest, the furious mare,
Barr'd from the male, is frantic with despair.

For love they force through thickets of the wood,
They climb the steepy hills, and stem the flood.

DRYDEN.

Lastly, Horace foretelling to a mistress who had slighted her lovers, while she was in her prime, that the time would come mankind would be even with her, tells her she would then feel the rage that transports mares.

Cum tibi flagrans amor & libido,
Quæ solet matres furiare equorum,
Sæviet circa jecur ulcerosum (t).

Let us infer from hence by the by, that gallant poetry, was not in the reign of Augustus, as now-a-days, an enemy to all gross ideas; but let us chiefly remember to conclude from the authorities which have been quoted, that Servius and Phylargyrus have well enough understood the passage of Theocritus, not to deserve the censure Salmasius passed upon them. It was much more natural to understand it of an amorous passion excited by the herb Hippomanes, than of a desire of eating that herb: and it signifies little, that only Theocritus has spoken of this plant (v), since he might have grounded his assertion on some old tradition which might be contradicted by the following ages. In truth, it would not be very surprizing that there should be such an herb, as could produce this effect. That which the Italians call *Sferra-Cavallo*, because it is pretended that horses no sooner tread on it, but they are unshod (w), seems to me much more miraculous.

(e) Phylargyrus, another old Commentator on Virgil, is also involved in this censure, since he has insinuated the same thing with Servius.

(p) *Μαίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῇ* non significat qui alioquin rei pulsus vel transfusus ad insaniam adigitur, sed qui rei causa reus cupiens est quocunque modo potius amore infans. Salmasius, ubi supra.

(q) Τὴν δὲ βῆρ καὶνὴν ἰμμερὴν αὐτὴν ἴσχει τῆς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐπιθυμίας πλεονεξία. Plin. lib. ix. c. 47. de Arte Anim.

(r) In fœcis agitantur equi, insuperant montes Per loca diruta, æque sequuntur equos. Ovid. lib. ii. ec. 487. de Arte Anim.

(s) Virgil. Georg. lib. iii. ver. 266.

(t) Horat. Od. XXV, l. 1.

(v) See the remark [A].

(w) See Martialis, lib. ii. c. 135.

VI.
Confutation
of the opinion
of Salmalius.

Pliny mentions an herb by means of which the woodpecker makes a wedge thrust into a tree jump out (x). Yet of this he seems to doubt in another book of his (y).

Let us examine more closely the opinion of Salmalius, and we shall better see that the changing the word *φύτον* into *χυτόν* was not happily conjectured. To justify that change, we must suppose, 1. That Theocritus believed that the temple of Jupiter Olympius was not in Elis, but in Arcadia; or that knowing it was not in Arcadia, he has nevertheless affirmed it, either by reason of the nearness of those two provinces, or because Phormis who consecrated this brazen mare was of that country. This first supposition is very absurd; for who can suppose that the ceremony of the Olympic games could permit a fine wit to doubt in what province of Greece they were celebrated? In this respect the Greeks were all good and exact Geographers, inasmuch that it can never enter into the thoughts of any attentive man that Theocritus could err upon this head, or dare to deprive the people of Elis, in favour of those of Arcadia, of the temple of Jupiter Olympius, one of the seven wonders of the world; and to deprive them of it for two bad reasons. But here are other suppositions not less strained than the foregoing. We must suppose in the second place, that speaking only of the lust of horses, Theocritus made use of the feminine gender *πῶσαι καὶ πῶλοι*, and all the mare-colts; καὶ θοαὶ ἵπποι, and all the mares (x). What reason for this? A brazen mare is the object desired; her Hippomanes excites the lust only of the horses, as Pausanias observes; and yet Theocritus meant only the lust of the mare-colts and mares. The reason is this: the Doric dialect made use of the feminine article to denote a horse, in like manner as the common dialect employed the masculine to denote a mare. Be it so; but as Pausanias, even in the passage which Salmalius quotes for proof of the remark concerning the common dialect, makes use of the masculine article for horses, and the feminine for mares, we must believe that those who made use of the Doric dialect applied to each sex its proper article upon certain occasions: and it would be easy to prove that no Greek author has made a horse *feminine*, as the French do the word *perdrix*; or *masculine*, as they do the word *lièvre*. Now if a like usage cannot be shewn in the Doric dialect, Salmalius's answer will appear to be no better than a chimera. 3. We must suppose that the Hippomanes of the brazen mare extended its virtue a great way, since the horses of which Salmalius will have Theocritus to speak, ran raging over mountains, and flew to enjoy their beloved object *superatis montibus*. No such thing is hinted in the relation of Pausanias, and the quite contrary is to be found in these words of Pliny, *mares ADMOTOS ad rabiem coitus agii*.

Salmalius finding himself perplexed with these mountains of Theocritus, changed them into something else that might better agree with his notions: he pretends therefore we ought to read *ἄρτα*, in the spring; and not *ἀν' ἄρτα*, *thro' the mountains*; but by misfortune nothing agrees worse than this criticism of his with the text of Pausanias, where it does plainly appear, that without any distinction of seasons, the horses were inflamed with lust after the statue, whatever time of the year it was (a a). Lastly, Salmalius had no reason to suppose that this statue, impregnated with the virtue of the Hippomanes, was a mare. I know very well Pliny has said it before him; but Pausanias, who made it his principal study to examine the monuments of Greece, and who is an author incomparably more exact than Pliny, leaves us no reason to doubt that this statue was a horse, since he every where makes use of the masculine article when he speaks of it, and employs the feminine in the same place to denote a mare (b b).

VII.
A Reflexion
upon what
Pausanias
relates.

I shall not examine what credit is to be given to what Pausanias relates concerning the virtue of this statue, which was a kind of Talismanic virtue; but shall however say, that the extreme fury of lust incident to horses, might well enough be raised by a statue without the help of any philtre. Let us suppose them to have a soul; could they not fancy that a statue is the animal it represents, or at least that it is a very fine statue? In the first case, why might not the same thing happen to them, *mutatis mutandis*, as to those birds who pecked upon the picture of a vine? An horse painted by Apelles made the living horses neigh (c c). In the second case, why should they not be subject to the infirmity many men have been guilty of, that is, to the lascivious loving of a statue (d d). I confess it may be objected amongst other things, that in love the eyes are not the sole guides of animals (e e), as they are very frequently of men; and that the smell is the principal vehicle of this passion in the machines of animals; whence it follows, that a statue is destitute with respect to them of the main springs of love. But the question is, whether the skill of the statuary might not supply this defect by imitating the attitudes of a mare excessively lustful; and whether the story so celebrated by the Greek Poets, and by Ausonius after them, concerning Myron's brazen heifer, can be doubted of [B]? Livy, more credible alone than an hundred Poets, relates that at Syracuse

[B] Concerning Myron's brazen heifer. Myron a native of Eleuthera in Boeotia, made an heifer of brass which furnished a fine topic for the Poets. There are in the Anthology (7), near forty epigrams upon this subject. Ausonius has made eleven on the same
VOL. V. No. CXL.

theme, which are ingenious enough; this is one of them:

Becula sum cælo genitoris facta Myronis
Ærea: nec factam me puto, sed genitam.
91

Sic

(x) Plin. lib. x,
cap. xxviii.

(y) Idem, lib.
xxv, cap. iii.

(x) t do not
translate θοαί,
which signifies
swift-footed.

(a a) Ἀρτὰ
πῶσαι ἐπ'
αὐτὸν ὄργισ-
σιν ἡμέραν.

(b b) Ἐπι-
πνέουσιν αὐ-
τῷ πολλὰ
δὴ τι ἐμμε-
νέρον ἢ ἐπὶ
τὴν καλλίσ-
την ἵππον
ζώσαν τε
καὶ ἡδύδα
ἀνακαί-
νισθαι.
Id. qd. iuxta
Personem Romuli
Amasii, illum
invasit nihil
hercle minus fa-
cilem quam si
viventem pul-
cherrimam e-
quam gregalem
inituri adorren-
tur.

(c c) Plin. lib.
xxxv, cap. x.
Valer. Max.
lib. viii, cap. xi,
says it was a
mare, quo excu-
sabilior est error
equi, qui visā
picturā equæ hin-
nitum edere co-
actus est.

(d d) Several
Moderns have
made a collection
of them, amongst
others Balthaz.
Bonifac. Hi-
stor. Ludic.
lib. xiv, cap.
xiii.

(e e) See the pas-
sage of Lucian,
of Perugia, in
remark [B].

CONCERNING THE HIPPOMANES.

778

author does not say that Arcas the Olympian mingled some Hippomanes, &c. but that Phormis the Arcadian discovered the virtue of the Hippomanes at Olympia, *tantam in eo vim novit Olympiæ Phormis Arcas*. I believe Cardan occasioned the error of one Peter Boasitua, surnamed Launai, a native of Bretagne, (for these are the titles he loved to distinguish himself by) highly praised by la Croix du Maine. *Who would not be surprized, of an horse, formed by a certain artist in Heraclea, a province of Peloponnesus, having a cut and deformed tail, but perfect in all the other parts of the body, which however the other horses en- devouring to leap with so much heat and transport, as to break their hoofs by their frequent rear- ings upon it, whilst the slipperiness of the brass it was composed of still cast them off; and not- withstanding all the blows that could be given them, they could not be driven away, but neighed after the statue as if they had met with a mare ready to take horse? Du Bartas hinted at the same wonder in these verses (rr).*

Cette jument d'airain sur qui les estalons
Lançoient estant en rut leurs fragiles talons.

(rr) Sixth day
of the first week,
ver. 826.

That brazen mare, by famous Myron cast
Which horses leap'd, and as a mare embrac'd.

But Simon Goulart, his Commentator, has wrongfully imagined that this related to Myron's masterpiece, *who made*, says he, *a mare or heifer of brass so very natural, that the horses ran to leap her*. If he had remembered the passage of Pausanias, or rather that of Pliny, and considered that the epigrams he speaks of in the same place do not permit us to doubt whether Myron made an heifer or a mare, he would not have fallen into this little error. See, above, the remark [B].

X.
Whether
there is a
fourth sort of
Hippomanes.

Besides the three sorts of Hippomanes I have spoken of, there are some authors who mention a fourth. They ground themselves upon Aristotle's authority, pretending that he acknowledged two sorts of Hippomanes in mares, one that flows before the horses approach, the other after they have allayed their appetite by the first congress. Salmasius, who finds this distinction in Aristotle (ss), put me upon reading attentively the words of this Philosopher (tt): but I have not found it there, tho' I saw the remark concern- ing the Hippomanes, repeated twice over in a very few lines. That repetition ought not to carry our thoughts to two different things: for tho' Aristotle be concise, it is ne- vertheless true that he considers the symptoms of lascivious mares at two different times; and the reason of his doing it is, that he particularly explains the accidents of those mares that took wind, if I may so speak, *quæ ἐξαιμῶσθαι, eventari dicebantur*. He intimates that this happened not to mares who had an horse at hand; I say, he intimates it in the place where he observes that by reason of this accident the Cretans left the mares and stallions together: and having spoken of the courses which those mares took towards the north or south, to whom this accident happened, he speaks in general of the signs by which the mares are known to want the horse; and as he had spoken of the Hippomanes with respect to those who do nothing but run, he speaks of it also with respect to all mares in general [C]. I see no ground from hence for multiplying the kinds of Hip- pomanes: but yet suppose they were multiplied (vv), Salmasius would still be mistaken, in

(ss) Differen-
tiam itaque con-
stituit Aristoteles
inter hoc ἵππο-
μανὲς quod e-
que tum eji-
ciunt ubi semel
salutem fuerint,
et quæ simile na-
turæ, & illud
ἵππομανὲς
quod illis defuit
ab inguine eo
tempore quo ma-
ris cupiditate an-
decant nec dum
admirant. Sal-
mas. Exercit.
Plin. pag. 941.

(tt) Arist. Hist.
Animal. lib. vi,
cap. xviii.

(vv) Father
Hardouin in
Plin. Tom. ii,
pag. 211, ac-
knowledges two
kinds of it.

Mares that
took wind.

[C] He speaks of it also with respect to all mares in general. It is thus I explain that passage of Ari- stotle, because otherwise there would seem to be a con- tradiction in it as may be seen by this abstract. We see there that the lust of the mares, is called a furious appetite of enjoying the male, *ἵππομανίς*; that it is said also that at that time they take wind, *ἐξαιμῶσθαι*; that in that condition they depart from other mares and horses; that they run not towards the east or west, but towards the north or south; that they suffer nothing to come near them, except they are tired down, or come near the sea-side; that then they cast out something called Hippomanes; that the mares at the season of copulation gather together; that they love company more than before; that they move more frequently their tails; that their neighing changes; that they cast the Hippomanes. *They stale also*, says Ari- stotle, *more frequently, and sport with one another when they are ready to take horse*. I am sorry, I am not clear-sighted enough to perceive much perspicuity and exactness in these words: but however it be, if *ἐξαιμῶσθαι* does not differ from *ἵππομανίς*, as the species differs from the genus, it will follow that Ari- stotle would teach us that mares ready to take horse, avoid all company, and yet that they associate with greater pleasure than before. Now, as this would be a ridiculous contradiction, it must be concluded that Aristotle by *ἐξαιμῶσθαι* meant only a kind of heat; or if it be pretended that this contains something com-

mon to all mares, we must conclude, that it was a state that preceded the maturity of the passion, and what Aristotle a little after calls *ἔξαρ τῆς ἐχέας, tempus coitus*. But this utterly overthrows Salmasius's system, I mean that explication he is so fond of, and repeats more than once in another page, after having justly censured the great man who thought that Ari- stotle's *ἐξαιμῶσθαι* ought to be understood of the wind. It is certain that Aristotle does not speak of this, and there would be no objection against Salma- sius, if he had contented himself with affirming that this Greek word signifies *the refreshing one's self with the wind sucked in with open mouth*: but he is unfortu- nate in what he adds to this interpretation. *ἔξαιμῶσθαι, sibi be (13), est eventilari & vento excepto (13) Salmas. Ex-*
hiante ore refrigerari, quod equæ faciunt ubi ad sa- ercit. Plin.
tietatem initæ non fuerint. Ex eo quidem interdum pag. 943.
& concipere autores tradidere, idque in Hispania tantum. Non tamen ἐξαιμῶσθαι significat ex
vento concipere. Loquitur Aristoteles de iis equa- bus quæ admiserint sed non satis, nec meminit eo
loco conceptionis ullius quæ ex vento fiat. -- ἔξα-
ρῶσθαι, signifies to be eventilated or fanned, and to
be cooled by taking in air with open mouth, as the
mares do, when their lust is not fully satisfied. Au-
thors indeed have said, that by this they are sometimes
impregnated, and that this happens only in Spain. But
ἐξαιμῶσθαι does not signify to be impregnated by the
wind.

A DISSERTATION

in pretending that Aristotle's distinction respects the non-enjoyment of some mares, and the enjoyment of some others far short of satiety, and that those mares who took wind, were of the latter sort. This is by no means Aristotle's doctrine; on the contrary, we should infer from his discourse, that they totally abstained, since, besides the reflexion he makes upon the conduct of the Cretans, he says in express words, that they wandered from the herd, and never suffered themselves to be approached till they were tired, or came near the sea (*(ωω)*, and that then they cast the Hippomanes. Ὅταν δὲ τὰτε πάθοςι, θένοντι ἐκ τῶν ἀλλων ἱππων . . . ὅταν δὲ ἐμπισθὴ τὸ πάλος ὑδναῖς ὡσπι παλσιδιζόν, τότε αὐτοί τοις θαλάσσας εἰλωθοῦσι τότε δὲ ἐκβάλλονσι τι. &c. Cum vero ipsæ ab aliis equis secessant . . . quandoque ad mare deveniant ; tum aliquid emittunt, &c. (<x x).
Mr Hofman

Mr Hofman

(14) See St. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, bk. xiii, cap. vi.

THE pretended fecundity of those mares.

(15) *Several authors, as Fr. Modus Nov. Antiq. Lect. Epist. Lasrio, Quæst. J. words:*

(15) Several authors, as Fr. Modius Nov. Antiq. Lect. Epist. lxxiv, Dausqueius in Silium Italicum, lib. iii, pag. m. 134, falsely father upon Aristotle those conceptions.

Continuorque avidis ubi subdita flamma medullis,
Vere magis (quia vere calor redit ossibus) illæ
Ore omnes versæ in Zephyrum, stant rupibus altis,
Exceptantque leves auras: & sæpe sine ulla
Conjugiis, vento gravidæ (mirabile dictu)
Saxa per & scopulos & depressas convallas
Diffugiunt, non, Eure, tuos, neque folis ad ortus,
In Borean, Caurumque, aut unde nigerrimus Austër
Nascitur, & pluvio contristat frigore cælum (16).

(16) Virgil.
Georg. lib. iii.
ver. 271b

Burns fiercer (for in spring the flame returns),
 On lofty rocks they stand, and in their month's,
 Op'd to the western breeze, the gentle air
 Receive; and oft (prodigious to relate!)
 Without commotion, pregnant by the wind,
 O'er cliffs, and bills, and lowly vallies fly;
 Not tow'rd the east, or to the rising sun,
 Nor tow'rd the north, or north-west, or that point,
 Whence the black south blows, frowning on the world
 With fog, and rain, and saddens all the sky.

TRAPP.

From this description it may be inferred, that it was the west wind that impregnated the mares, and that they rested upon some rising ground to receive it, turning their heads or tails to it, (for that is a point that has not yet been cleared by the critics, there being reasons on both sides) after which they ran as if they had been mad, either from north to south, or from south to north. These fictions are pardonable in the Poets; but we cannot tell how to pardon (17) Varro, Pliny, Solinus, Columella, and some others, for having affirmed, as a certain fact, that in Portugal the mares bring forth colts without any other fire than the wind. The Historian Trogus Pompeius has much ridiculed this (18). Andrew Renedius, a learned Portuguese, says (19), that there is no instance of it in his country. Francis Fernand of Corduba (20), has confuted the same story with arguments, authorities, and experience.

(17) See Jo. à
Wower. de Po-
lymath. cap.
51.

(18) Justin. *lib.*
xliv. cap. iii.

(19) Antiq. L.
stanicar. lib.

(20) Didascal
multipl. cap.
xlviii.

(21) De Civ
Dei, lib. xxi
cap. v. See
last paragraph
this remark.

nated by the wind. It was not a point that all the Heathens generally agreed in. We find it exploded in Justin, with the approbation of Leonard Coquezus (22). Euthathius, Bishop of Thessalonica (23), looks upon it as a fable, and every body at present laughs at it (24). But after all, a better reason might be given for it in the new Hypothesis, that all animals proceed from an egg, than from the courtes the mares made from one pole to the other. If Aristotle, who appears not to doubt of this fact, would have exercised his principles of Phycic upon it, he would have found himself more work than Des Cartes did in the direction of the loadstone. Mr Des Cartes might here have been put to a stand, for want of a channelling, or rebates of the insensible parts, such as would be necessary to explain the virtue of the southern and northern winds upon mares that had sucked in the western. However it be, I do not think that the present managers of the studs could supply Aristotle with memoirs to confirm those he has published. Who would believe, for example, that there was at Opus (25) a stallion which could do his office at forty years old, tho' he wanted assistance to raise his fore-legs (26)? Pliny has well copied this passage of Aristotle, when he says, *Opuntis & ad quadraginta durasse ante agistum modo in attollenda priore parte corporis* (27). But Solinus has performed the part of a very bad transcriber in these words: "Notatum etiam advertimus Opuntis nomine equum ad gregariam venerem durasse in annos quadraginta (28). . . . We find it also recorded that a stallion named Opus, was able to leap the mares when he was forty years old." This horse belonged to an inhabitant of Opus, and Solinus has taken the name of the place for that of the horse. Blamius (29) has not forgot to censure him for this slander. The omission of his wanting to be helped up by the fore-feet, which was the principle rarity of the fact, did not less deserve to be censured.

did not less deferre to be censured.

What I have said of St Augustin is applicable also
to Origin (30) and to Lactantius, who have endeavoured to persuade us of the immaculate virginity of the mother of Jesus Christ, by the examples of conceptions without the use of a male, storied by the Heathens. * Quod si animalia quædam vento aut aura concipere tolerare omnibus notum est, cur quisquam mirum putet cum Spiritu Dei cui facile est quidquid velit, gravatam esse Virginem dicimus (31). -- If (31) Lactant Div.
it is universally known, that some animals are impregnated by the wind, or air, why should any man think it wonderful that the Virgin Mary conceived by the Spirit of God, who can easily do whatever he pleases.' The Fathers made any theft, & ex omni ligno Mercurium. Infruct. lib. ix, cap. xii. pag. m. 249. 247.

If they had only allegeded this as an argument ad hominem, they could not be blamed; but they affirm it as a certain fact. I do not know whether they cite what Pomponius Mela relates of some savage Æthiopian women, who became mothers without the concurrence of any man : * Super eos grandis litoris flexus grandem insulam includit, in qua tantarum fœminas esse narrat, totorum corpore hirsutas, et cum coitu marium sua sponte secundas : adeo aspersione coitu marium sua sponte secundas : ne raris esserifque moribus, ut quædam contineri ne rarior lætetur vix vinculis possint. Hoc Hanno rebus, & quia detracta occidis coria peruleratis, sudes habitus est (32). -- Above these turnings of the great coast, (32) Pomponius Mela, lib. vi. c. 12. there is a very large island, whith, they say, is inhabited by women, whose bodies are all over hairy, and who conceive of themselves, without the help of men. Their manners are so rough and wild, that some of them can hardly be subdued and mastered, even when they are in chains. This is related by Hanno, and as be bewrote upon some of the skins of these women who had been

(w w) *The Geneva edition, 1605, and the Paris, 1629, have marem instead of mare.*

(x x) *Arist. ubi supra.*

(25) A town of
the Epicnemidii
Locri.

(26) Arist. Hist.
Anim. lib. vi,
cap. xxi.

(27) Plin. lib.
viii, cap. xlii,

en (28) Solin. esp.
xlv.

er. (19) Exhibit.
the Phil. pag. 936.
a,

also (30) In Ebris
adversus Gallia

con-
[ca-
aura

- If (31) Lactant
- Institut.

man pag. 246
ed by 247.
be

ligno
ar-
but

while-
some
with-
and

tan-
us, &
aspe-

etulic,
habita

inba- la, lb. 1
y, and ix.
f men.

of them
en they
d as be

• been

CONCERNING THE HIPPOMANES.

773

XI.
Remarks upon
Hofman
and Furetiere.

Mr Hofman (yy) speaks of the Hippomanes according to Salmasius's ideas, as well upon the passage of Theocritus as that of Aristotle; and therefore we need only refer him to what has been said above. Only let me be allowed to tell him, that if he well consults Pausanias, he will not cite him *de Arcad.* (zz), nor find there that Phormis dedicated a mare in Olympia; for that author expressly says at the end of the fifth book, that Phormis consecrated two horses and two grooms. As to Mr Furetiere, I have no considerable faults to tax him with; I only observe, that he has been a little unexact in citing Pliny only for the Hippomanes on the forehead of colts. That naturally leads us to this fallacious thought, that Pliny speaks of no other Hippomanes. I could wish also he had cited Aristotle, whose authority is justly greater than Pliny's. As to the other sort of Hippomanes, he should not have cited Servius, but Virgil; Servius being only his interpreter, without saying whether the fact be true or false. Neither Cæsar de Rochefort's Dictionary, nor Castellus's *Lexicon Medicum* copiously enlarged by Bruno, say any thing of the Hippomanes.

(yy) *Vol. iii.*
pag. 162; and
Vol. iv., pag.
495.

(zz) The book
concerning *Arca-*
dia is the eighth,
that wherein he
speaks of Phormis
is the fifth, and
the first of the
two wherein the
author treats of
Elys.

XII.
What is to be
believed of the
Hippomanes.

I will not conclude this article without observing what Aristotle has so judiciously determined concerning the Caruncula on the forehead of the foal. He says, that it is said to grow there, but that the dam takes it off by licking, and that the stories concerning its virtue are to be reckoned fables invented by women and enchanters. τὸ δὲ ἵππομανὲς καλλίμανον ἐπιφύεται μὲν, ὥσπερ λέγεται, τοῖς πωλοῖς. αἱ δὲ ἵπποι περιλείχουσαι καὶ καθαίρουσαι περιτρέφουσιν αὐτὸ. τὰ δὲ ἐπιμυθεύματα πείλασαι μᾶλλον ὑπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν καὶ τῶν περὶ τὰς ἐκβολὰς. *Quod Hippomanes vocant, heret quidem fronti nascentis pulli, ut narratur, sed equæ perlambentes abstergentesque id abrodunt: quæ autem de hoc fabulantur, figmenta mulierularum & professorum carminis incantamentorum esse credendum potius est* (a). Nevertheless this virtue has been talked of in all ages, and one may easily see that the persuasion which first obtained of its being serviceable as a philtre, was grounded upon the story, that if the mare did not swallow it, she did not suckle her young. An ancient Poet, cited by Apuleius, enumerating philtres, calls this *binnientium dulcedines*; which agrees extremely well with the *Matri præreptus amor*, which I have cited from Virgil. But as philtres rather produced fury than love, thence the Hippomanes came to be considered as a baneful drug. Juvenal says that Cælonia, by employing it upon her husband Caligula, caused that mad rage which made him commit so many crimes.

(a) Arist. Hist.
Anim. lib. viii.
cap. xxiiv., pag.
699, 700.

Et furere incipias, ut avunculus ille Neronis
Cui totam tremuli frontem Cælonia pulli
Infudit.
Ardebant cuncta & fracta compage ruebant,
Non aliter quàm si fecisset Juno maritum
Infanum.

Hæc poscit ferrum atque ignes, hæc potio torquet,
Hæc lacerat mixtos equitum cum sanguine patres,
Tanti partus equæ, tanti una venefica constar (b).

(b) Juven. Sat.
VI., ver. 614.

Some nimbler juice would make him foam and rave,
Like that Cælonia to her Caius gave,
Who plucking from the forehead of the foal
His mother's love, infus'd it in the bowl;
The boiling blood ran hissing in his veins,
Till the mad vapour mounted to his brains.
The thund'rer was not half so much on fire,
When Juno's girdle kindled his desire.

But this fierce potion calls for fire and sword,
Nor spares the commons, when it strikes the lord:
So many mischiefs were in one combin'd,
So much one single pois'n'der cost mankind,

DRYDEN.

The world is not yet cured of this superstition; for we find in a pretty late romance (c), which is a faithful and agreeable copy of the conduct of many persons; we find there, I say, some Parisian ladies passing a whole night in watching a mare, to catch I know not what they were made to believe a foal brings into the world on his forehead, and to dress it with certain ceremonies, which in their opinion, would become a wonderful and irresistible

(c) *Avantures de*
Henriette Sylvie
de Molière.
Part. iii., pag.
50, Dutch Edit.
1674.

VOL. V.

9 K

philtre.

'been slain, what he said was believed.' You see that Laëtantius quotes Hanno; but he misrepresents him, for Hanno has not said that the women of that island were without men: 'Non recte Hannoni adtingit, insulam hanc habitari à feminis solis, & quidem sua sponte fecundis, cum Hanno contrarium dicat: utriusque enim sexus homines in ea insula fuisse scribit,

'quamvis multo plures feminas (33). . . . He wrong-fully ascribes to Hanno, the having related that this island was inhabited by women only, and that these women conceive of themselves: whereas Hanno says the contrary; for he writes that there are both men and women in that island, though a great many more women than men.'

(33) Isaacus Vof-
sius, in Pompon.
Mela, ibid.
Gasp. à Reles
quem vide in
Elysi. jucunda
Quest. Campo,
Quest. XLII.
num. 13, & seq. knew not Hæle's error.

philtre. This philtre was to be given cunningly to the soldiers, and to the captain himself, if there was occasion for it, and immediately both the captain and soldiers were to run through the streets, and offer to do all that should be desired of them. The towers and gates seemed, if I may so speak, to be ready to fall of themselves, to give liberty to whomsoever the ladies pleased. If we consult the journal of the German Naturalists (d), we shall be fully convinced that the colts are foaled with the Hippomanes on the forehead; for they give us the anatomical figure and description of one of them, which had been brought quite hot to a Physician, called Mr Raygerus. He had often desired to see some of them fresh, having before seen some that were dry: he experienced that the mare gave milk to the colt as usual, tho' that part was taken from it; so that if on one hand he lends assistance to the Antients, he discredits them much on the other. His Hippomanes is much larger than Aristotle or Pliny represent it.

(d) Annus Oclavus, impressus 1678, pag. 94, & seq.



A DISSER-

A DISSERTATION UPON THE DAY.

I.
Reflexions upon the definition of the Natural and Artificial Day.

EVERY body knows that the word Day has several acceptations, and that there is the Natural Day, the Artificial Day, the Civil Day, the Astronomical Day, &c. I could make many observations to shew that in the definition of these several sorts of Days there is hardly ever any perfect exactness; but as the particularizing these punctilio's might carry me too far, I shall omit more of them than I shall mention.

It is somewhat strange that authors are not agreed in the definition of the Natural and of the Artificial Day. Some define the Natural Day, *the time betwixt sun-rising and sun-setting*; and the Artificial Day, *the space included in twenty-four hours* (a). Others define the Natural Day, *the space of time the sun takes to make a complete revolution about the earth*; and the Artificial Day, *the time from sun-rising to sun-setting* (b). I own this difference lies more in the words than in the thing it self, and that we are not obliged to give words the same sense that others give them; but it would be very convenient for readers if the signification of certain terms was fixed, and was not converted from white to black in passing from one book to another. Besides, they who define the Day, *the time from sun-rising to sun-setting*, chuse the least common signification; since, for one Cosmographer who measures each Day's extent by it, in treating of the difference of climates, (in which it is certain that the sun's rising and setting are only regarded) there are millions of people who understand by the word Day all the time that the Horizon is enlightened. This appears by these common phrases, *At break of Day*; *It was already Day*; *It was Day still*; whereby the morning twilight and evening twilight are manifestly denoted. It is therefore exposing the books of the Dogmatists to the complaints and censures of most people, to say that the revolution of the sun comprehends the Day and the Night; but by the Day is meant the time from the rising to the setting of the sun, and by the Night the time from its setting to its rising. It would be better to say that the Day is all the time we enjoy the light of the sun (c), and that the Night is only the time we are deprived of it. Besides, it is not very reasonable to call that the Artificial Day, which nature makes by the real or apparent revolution of the firmament about the earth: this title much better agrees to that part of the revolution in which artificers are employed in their labour; and even this shews that the Artificial Day ought not to be terminated by the rising and setting of the sun; it is not by that the workmen can measure their labour in the frigid Zones, nor always measure it in the temperate ones.

We see every where else that those things which borrow their names from nature, are much more general than those that take them from art: It is therefore more reasonable that the Natural Day should be that which is uniform throughout the world, and the Artificial Day that which varies according to places, than to establish the contrary. Let us say therefore that the word Day in its most proper signification ought to be taken for the time betwixt the sun's leaving the Meridian, to its returning to it again; that this is the Natural Day, which comprehends twenty-four hours [A]; that in this sense the

the duration
equality of
rural Days.

[A] *The Natural-Day, which comprehends twenty-four hours.* What I say here of the duration of twenty-four hours, ought not to be rigorously understood: for, if the Astronomers and Cosmographers do not de-

ceive us, when they unanimously affirm that the space of an hour corresponds to the ascension of fifteen degrees of the Equator upon the horizon, the sun's return to the meridian will require somewhat more than twenty-

(a) Father Labbe, *Abbrégé Chronol. Tom. i.* and before him *Conformis*, as to the Natural Day, to which he opposes the Civil Day.

(b) Coustel, pag. 13, of the *Calcul. Ecclesi. Futuriere*, and before them *Gassendus*, *Instit. Astronom. lib. i.* cap. xiii.

(c) Take in also the light that precedes the sun-rising, and succeeds the sun-setting.

the Days are not longer nor less numerous under the Poles than under the Æquator; that they are equal in all parts of the earth; but that as the most excellent parts of a whole have often the privilege of bearing the name of the whole without addition, and by way of pre-eminence, it happens that where the Natural Day is composed of two parts, one dark and the other light, this, as the more noble, has been only named *the Day*; whereupon they thought they might say, that in the temperate Zones each Day is longer or shorter than the preceding. This was doubtless the origin of this second signification of the word *Day*. Order requires, that they who treat these subjects dogmatically, should characterise it by the addition of some epithet, of *Artificial* for instance. But in common speech there is no need of any addition, in order to conceive that the Day excludes the Night (d). However, this is not universal; there are popular phrases in which the Day is taken for twenty-four hours; as when we say, that a child lived but four days, that a journey or a marriage continued but fifteen days; and thus of several other ways of speaking, in which it is plain that the Day excludes not the Night.

II.
The Gauls
and other na-
tions reckon-
ed by nights.

The antient Gauls gave the Night the preference over the Day, calling the time of twenty-four hours, which makes up the Night and Day, a Night. Cæsar informs us of this, and attributes the origin of this custom to an ancient tradition of the Druids, that the Gauls descended from Pluto (e). The Germans also practised the same thing of reckoning by Nights (f). Vigenere in his notes upon Julius Cæsar (g), pretends there are still some remains of this practice. As for the Germans, says he, they still observe this way of speaking, and commonly say, *vor drey nachten*, before it be three Nights, instead of before it be three Days; and *Sant Johans nacht*, *Sant Martins nacht*, *Saint John's Night*, *Saint Martin's Night*, for *Saint John's Day*, *Saint Martin's Day*. The French also in many places of this kingdom use the same way of speaking, *anüict* (to Night) meaning to-day (h). Nicolas Bergier, Advocate in the Presidial of Rheims, adds to these remarks of Vigenere, That the French who came from Germany, and seized on that part of Gaul which is situate betwixt the Rhine and the Maese, and were called Riparian French, used the word *Night* to signify the Natural Day of twenty-four hours, as appears from these words in one of their laws: *Si infra Ducatum est super 14 noctes auctorem suum representet*. He speaks thus in his posthumous treatise *du Point du Jour* [B]. The Printers have committed some errors in it, as Xiparian instead of Riparian, in the foregoing passage. Mr du Cange in his Latin Glossary has cited many Laws, Capitularies, and Formularies, which shew that not only the French, but also the Northern people, the Saxons, English, &c. reckoned by nights. Nay he shews, that it is a very ancient custom among the Arabians. See Cluverius chap. xxxiii. of the first book of *Germania Antiqua*.

III.
Of the Civil
and Astronomi-
cal Days.

Censorinus (i), as I have already observed, divides the Day into Natural and Civil, and calls the Natural Day the time betwixt the two suns, if I may be allowed that vulgar expression. The Civil Day he takes for the space of twenty-four hours, or for an entire revolution of the heavens. Bergier affirms (k) that Pliny and Macrobius hold the same division of the Day, calling the Civil Day that of twenty-four hours, and the natural only the time of light, commonly of twelve hours, or a little more or less: But I have not found this division in either of these two authors, or in Aulus Gellius (l), followed upon this head by Macrobius; but only that they give twenty-four hours to the Civil Day, and relate the different beginnings it had in different countries. At present most

(1) See Gassen-
dus. Instit. A-
stronom. lib. i,
cap. xxi. In
the abridgement
of Mr Bernier,
Tom. vii, pag.
80, there is 56
minutes instead
of 59.

(2) The title is,
La Connoissance
des Temps, &c.
The knowledge
of the times, or
a Calendar and
Ephemerides, of
the rising and
setting of the sun,
&c. They began
to be published in
the year 1679.

twenty-four hours. In fact, if the time taken up in the ascent of fifteen degrees of the Æquator upon the horizon be one hour, this circle will require twenty-four hours for its revolution: but when that is finished, the sun is not yet returned to the meridian, because it has a peculiar motion, by which it advances near a degree eastward, whilst the Æquator makes one revolution; and therefore the sun must be carried near the space of a degree westward, to make it answer to the same point of the firmament or the same meridian it answered to the day before. Here is therefore an Astronomical Day a little longer than twenty-four hours. But moreover, one Astronomical Day is not perfectly equal to another, because, by reason of the obliquity and eccentricity of the ecliptic, the sun does not make the same progress each day towards the east (1). It advances 59 minutes $\frac{1}{2}$ each day, by the mean motion; when it goes swifter, it advances near two minutes more; when it goes slower, it proceeds near two minutes less. Nature loves variety even in the heavens. The Ephemerides which Mr Dalencé printed at Paris some years ago (2), shew a great deal of variety in the proportions of the increase of Days. For example: the fifth of January is longer by two minutes than the fourth; the sixth is longer by two minutes than the fifth; the seventh is longer by two minutes than the sixth; but the eighth is no longer than the seventh. All the other months are full of

the like inequalities, both in the increase and decrease; and even the increases of January do not always answer the decreases of July. It is certain, says the author of those Ephemerides (3), that November and December, than September and October, tho' there are on both sides an equal number of days, viz. 61.

[B] In his posthumous treatise *du Point du Jour*. I Or Berger, we call this book posthumous, because the edition of those of the Tru-
Rheims, 1629, which I use, shews, that John Ber-
gier, Attorney in the Presidial of Rheims, printed
this work of his father deceased. The Epistle De-
dicatory to Mr du Lys, Advocate-General in the court
of Aides of Paris, is written by the same John Ber-
gier, and shews that this magistrate was the author's
patron. The Abbot de Marolles speaks of another
patron in his alphabetical catalogue of authors who
had presented him with their books. Claude du Buif,
son, says he, expressed to me the particular esteem he had
as well as I for Nicolas Berger (4) of Rheims, who has
written the book of the high-ways of the Roman Empire, le Voyage, &c.
and who had gone farther had he not been prevented by death.
for he died at Grignon, in the house of the President Bel-
lieuvre, who honoured him with his friendship. I won-
der that in the edition of 1629, there is no mention
of any preceding edition; for in the catalogue of
Thuanus's library (5), we find *Archemeron, or a treatise* (5) Pag. 61.
concerning the beginning of Days, by Nic. Berger, Paris

(d) Valgus om-
ne à luce ad te-
necuras diem ob-
servat. Plin. lib.
ii, cap. lxviii.

(e) Galli se om-
nes à Dite, pa-
tre prognatos
predicant, idque
à Druidibus pro-
dicum dicitur.
Ob eam causam
spatia omnia tem-
poris non numero
dicunt, sed
noctium defini-
unt, & dies na-
tales & mensum
& annorum initia
sic observant ut
noctem diem se-
quatur. Cæsar,
de Bell. Gall.
lib. vi.

(f) Nos dicunt
numquam ut nos,
sed noctium com-
putant. Sic con-
sistunt, sic
conducunt; nec
decere diem vide-
tur. Tacit. de
Germ. cap. xi.

(g) Pag. 2.
319.

(h) There are
four places where
anüict, signifies
the night past,
others where it
signifies the night
to come.

(i) Censor. de
Die natali, cap.
xxiii.

(k) Preface to
the Point du
Jour, citing Plin.
lib. ii, cap.
lxxviii, and Mac-
rob. lib. i, Sa-
turn. cap. iii.

(l) Aulus Gel-
lius, lib. vi, cap.
ii.

writers

writers consider the Natural and Civil Day as different, not in duration, but only as the Natural Day in a general manner signifies an entire revolution of the sun about the earth, and the Civil Day contains in particular the choice that certain nations have made of two points, to denote the beginning and end of this revolution. Some have chosen the rising or setting of the sun; others rather mid-day or mid-night. Hence the Civil Day of some countries has been included betwixt two risings or settings of the sun, or betwixt two noons, or two mid-nights. The ancient Romans followed this last way, which is at present almost universal in Europe. These different sorts of the Civil Day cannot be perfectly equal, neither to one another, nor to the true Natural Day, because of the continual mobility of the moment of the sun's rising or setting: but as this inequality is not sensible from one day to another, it is not regarded. And therefore the nations whose Civil Day reaches from one rising or setting of the sun to another, no less take the Day for the space of twenty-four hours, tho' the sun every Day advances or retards his rising and setting, and that unequally, according as it is near the Equinoctial or Solstitial points, than if they comprehended it betwixt two noons. Whence it appears, that I had reason to say that the true Natural Day in its most proper signification, is the time betwixt the sun's quitting the Meridian to his returning to it. It is by this the Astronomical Day is measured; for the Astronomers begin the Day at the instant the centre of the sun touches the Meridian Line, and end it at the instant the same centre comes to touch it again. This is the least unequal Day which it is possible to find, and that according to which all Astronomical tables are calculated. An author whom I have cited (m) tells us, that the Astronomers *begin their Natural Day at the noon of the preceding Day; that for instance the second Astronomical Day of the month of May begins at noon the first day of May, and ends at noon the following Day, which is the second of May, the noon whereof commences the third Astronomical Day.* For a greater illustration he should have added, that tho' all the Astronomers begin their Day at noon, yet they are divided; some (n), as Ptolomy, and Tycho-Brahe, begin their day where Alphonso King of Castile ends his. They, for example, begin the first day of January at the noon of the first day of our Civil Year: Alphonso begins the first day of January at the noon of the thirty-first of December; so that the first day of the year to him is the last day of the preceding year for the others.

(m) Bergier, *preface to the Point du Jour.*

(n) See Father Labbé, *Abrégé Chronolog.*

IV.
Bergier's
book upon
the Point of
Day.

Since I have cited this little work of Bergier, it will not be amiss to explain here the subject of it; it will serve for a connexion or introduction to the rest of this article. I say then, that this author's design was to assign a point upon the earth, in which the Civil Day should begin in such a manner, that the same day (Monday or Tuesday for instance) should be carried successively throughout the world, and begin again at the end of twenty-four hours in a place that should immediately touch the point given. By this means there would be two places upon the earth perfectly contiguous, one whereof should have the beginning of Monday, whilst the other had but the beginning of Sunday; whence it would happen, that each Day would last forty-eight hours, not with respect to a certain place, but to all the earth; each holy-day, for example, would be kept forty-eight hours together. The point Bergier chose for the beginning of the Day, was that wherein the 180 and 181 degrees of Longitude touch one another in Mercator's maps: and thus one of the three Subadibe islands under the Æquator, cut into two by the 180th degree of Longitude, would first receive the Day; Sunday would begin there in the western part, whilst Saturday's noon would be under the first Meridian, and the same Sunday would not begin in the eastern part till Monday began in the other. It was the Pope's business, according to this author, to make this new Establishment, and to appoint that for the future each holy-day, and each Day of the week should begin when it is midnight upon the confines of the 180 and 181 degrees of Longitude; prohibiting all the Catholics in the world to begin their Day before the midnight which followed that which was under that place. It is plain, that after such an order they who live under the 181st degree of Longitude would not be at the end of Lent till twenty-four hours after those under the 180th degree had kept Easter-day. This would be very advantageous to them, if their desire of eating flesh was very pressing; for they would have but a little way to go, to be in a country where they might eat it by the laws of the church. I need not tell the reader that this advantage was not put into the account by Bergier; it would rather be an objection against him [C]: but this

is

(6) Pag. 288, of the first part.
(7) I do not believe this version has been printed, but I know that the Italian translation made by Father Bacchini has been published. It is without notes.
(8) Géograph. du Prince, cb. viii, tom. vi, of the Edit. in 1780.

Paris 1617. We also find there the *History of the high-ways of the Roman Empire*, by the same Nic. Berger, 4to. Paris 1622 (6). It is a very learned work, Father Bacchini, a Benedictine of the congregation of mount Cassin, one of the authors of the journal of Parma, has translated it into Latin (7), and illustrated it with notes. The author deserved to be cited in a more honourable way than la Mothe le Vayer has cited him, who says (8), *one Bergier, who after his treatise of the high-ways, has written another little discourse concerning the break of day, has betought himself, &c.* It appears by Thuanus's catalogue, that this other little book did precede, and not follow the Hi-

story of the high-ways. Mr Henninius (9), has translated this History of the high-ways, and published it with learned notes in the tenth volume of the *Theaurus Antiquitatum Romanarum*. Mr Oudinet (10), and the Abbot du Bos sent him some notes, most of which were taken from the copy in which the author had written many things. There is a fine encomium on our Bergier in Father Commire's Latin poems.

[C] It would rather be an objection against him. They who censure a project, and by their adversaries answer, find themselves obliged to reply, so diligently collect whatever is not favourable to the adverse cause, that we may reasonably wonder the Sieur Michalor

(9) Professor of Duisibourg.

(10) Keeper of the King of France's cabinet of medals.

INCONVENIENCES of the line of the point of Day.

is the principal advantage he finds in this new establishment of the point of Day, viz. that there would be no more disputes about the celebration of holy-days, when in going round the world, either thro' the east or west, people should not reckon the same Day of the week with the inhabitants of the countries they would land in.

V.
They who go
round the
world, get or
lose a Day.

It is needless to explain this, for no body is ignorant that they who went round the world east-ward, found themselves older by a day at their return than those who staid at home; and that the contrary happened to those who travelled round the world west-ward. They who returned to Seville on board the Victory, which had carried Magellan as far as the Molucca islands, after the discovery of the Straits to which this great man gave his name, found by their journal that the day of their arrival was the sixth of September, but at Seville they reckoned the seventh (o). If they had gone from Seville to the Molucca islands, and then to the Straits of Magellan, they would have found the eighth of September reckoned at Seville, when they counted the ninth. Whence it is easy to understand, that there may be three calculations at the same time in the same place. For if two vessels arrived at Seville which had made the circuit of the globe, one eastward, and the other westward, it is certain that Saturday the third of September at Seville would be Sunday the fourth according to the computation of the first vessel, and Friday the second according to the journal of the other. Let each continue his own reckoning, and you will quickly find three Christmas-days or three Easter-days, &c. in one and the same week, and it would be no longer a jeft to bid people stay (as the French saying is) *till the week when three Thursdays come together*, I add, that a Day is gained or lost, not only with respect to those we find in our return home, but also to those we meet in the way. Thus, the Dutch who discovered the Strait *le Maire* in the year 1616, being arrived at the Molucca's on the thirty-first of October, found there the first of November, and were obliged to skip from Monday to Wednesday, in order to agree with the reckoning of their country-men settled in those islands (p). It is thus also, that according to the relation of Jof. Acofta, the Portugese and Spaniards who penetrated into the East-Indies, the latter by the west, and the former by the east, established there a different reckoning of Days; so that when it is Sunday at the Isle of Macao, discovered by the Portugese, it is but Saturday at Manille in the Philippine islands discovered by the Spaniards; and yet it is but about 100 miles from the island of Luffonia, in which is the town of Manille, to the Isle Macao. This was the reason why Alphonso Sanctius, being arrived from the Philippines at this Isle on the second of May in his reckoning, and going to read in his Breviary the office of St Athanasius, found that this was not the Gospel for the Day in that place, and that the calendar there noted the third of May, which is the *Invention of the Holy Crofs* (q). His surprize was probably greater than his perplexity, for it is no great matter to pass from one Day of the Breviary to another; and if Cardinal Pellevé, carried unawares from the Day of St Paul's Conversion to that of St Polycarpus, could have remedied this disappointment by the help of the Breviary, he would have harangued better than he did at the opening of the States of the League. 'Id multum Cardinali Pellævæo incommodavit qui Orationem meditatus fuerat occasione ex conversione B. Pauli sumpta, quam translato in sequentem diem conventu vix ac ridiculè ad B. Polycarpi festum accommodare conatus est (r). - - - This was very inconvenient to Cardinal Pellevé, who had composed an Harangue on occasion of St Paul's Conversion: For the opening of the States being put off till the next Day, he with difficulty and ridiculously endeavoured to accommodate his Harangue to the feast of St Polycarpus.' Nicolas Bergier had no reason to say (s), that they who travel round the world enter upon a different calculation of the Day but two ways; one is, when they compare their computation with that of the city in which they finish their circuit; the other is, when they compare it with the calculation of those whom they meet upon the Oriental Ocean, and who make the tour of the world another way. It is certain, that this Eoick Sea, as he calls it, has nothing particular in this, absolutely speaking, since in whatever other part of the world two vessels meet, making the circuit of the earth, one eastward and the other westward, they would find the difference

(o) Sir Francis Drake; and Thomas Cavendish, Englishmen, and Oliver Vander Noort of Utrecht, who made the tour of the world thro' the same Straits, never experienced such a misreckoning of a Day.

(p) See William Schouten's journal.

(q) Idem. F. Alphonso Sanctius corripit, qui cum Philippina salvet, venit expectatione sua, in insulam Macaum potridie Kalendas Maji. Rectatur autem preces horarum in honorem S. Athanasii, deprehendit loci inconvencionem S. Crucis celebrationis, quicquid enim Non. Maji facti inibi exhibebant. Idem illi, alio etiam tempore, sed contrario circulo huc redeuntis erant. J. J. J. Acofta, J. J. J. lib. iii. cap. xxiii.

(r) Thomas, lib. vii. ad ann. 1593.

(s) Ubi supra, of pag. 118, 119.

has not objected to Ericius Puteanus, that the circle he proposed, made way for a thousand abuses. In effect, through the whole extent of the hemisphere, it would be the easiest thing in the world to elude the laws of the Church concerning the days of abstinence. A man might come off with abstaining from flesh for one day a week, if he would recur to the sophistry of the Spaniards *Medianoche*. Going from home on Friday at midnight, he might find himself a moment after in a country where it is Sunday, and where without violating the canons of the holy Mother-Church, he might feast upon capons for his supper. He might leap over all the vigils by making but a journey of two or three steps under another meridian, where it is holy-day; and if he would not celebrate any holy-day, no not Sunday itself, (I speak of Holy-days that come not two together) it were only passing from one me-

ridian to another, which would cost but little time: for tho' one degree in the heavens answers to the space of several leagues upon earth, yet it is certain that each degree is contiguous to another; so that the degree where the day begins must necessarily touch another degree where the same day begins not till twenty-four hours after. To prevent therefore the passing in a small time from the place where it is unlawful to eat flesh, to another where it is lawful, it should be ordered that the eastern part of one of these two degrees, and the western part of the other, should remain uncultivated and uninhabited. Who knows not, that any one who would continue the carnival with impunity to the first Sunday in Lent, needs but go to Milan, where there is no obligation to fast till four days after Ashwednesday?

of a Day betwixt their dates. There is no reason therefore on this account to place the point of Day on the Eoick Ocean rather than in another place.

After having represented the inconvenience which Bergier would prevent by his line of the point of Day, I think I ought to say in a few words, that it might be so conveniently remedied without this, that it is no wonder his counsels had no effect. There are three calculations at once in the same place; some reckon Saturday, others Sunday, and others Monday. Well! Let the whole matter be regulated by the date of the inhabitants, and every feast be kept by their calendar, and you remove all this disorder. This remedy would fail but very rarely; namely, in case that those who had taken the eastern road, and others who had taken the western, should meet in a country wherein there were no Christians; then they could not conform to the date of the inhabitants, and each would stand perhaps upon his own calculation. This disorder would be a very little one.

VI.
Erycius Puteanus has written concerning the point of Day.

I pretend not however to lessen this author's merit: such propositions are seldom imagined but by men of a strong and extensive genius; besides, there is in the treatise I speak of, a stock of learning which alone might recommend it. If the author had lived long enough, he would have complained, perhaps, of a professor of Louvain who is celebrated for his numerous writings, and who a long time enjoyed the place of Justus Lipsius. To speak freely, Erycius Puteanus does not seem to have dealt fairly with Nicolas Bergier. That professor published a little piece in the year 1632, with the title of *Circulus Urbanianus, sive Linea archimedis compendio descripta, qua dierum civilium principium hieraticum in orbe terrarum baltenus desideratum constituitur*. The year following he published a larger book, to defend the first against the attacks of one Michalor, a Canon of Urbino. These two pieces in their most material points are wholly grounded upon Bergier's thoughts; for it is no considerable difference to place the line of the point of Day not in the Meridian opposite to that which is the first in Mercator's Atlas, as Bergier does, but in the Meridian opposite to that of Rome, as Erycius Puteanus does. This, I say, would not secure a man from the imputation of a transcriber and a Plagiary; and yet Puteanus says not a syllable of the treatise of the Point of Day, printed in the years 1617, and 1629, but sets up for the man who first spoke of this subject. Here we may admire the good fortune which presides over some books. That of Bergier, which was incomparably more an original than the other, and which we may say had been at all the charges, lay grovelling in the dust, whilst Puteanus's was enriched with the encomiums of many learned men, with the compliments of a Nuncio, of a Cardinal Patron, of another Cardinal, and of the Pope himself, and came out with those glittering ornaments. Bergier might have well said, *Hos ego versiculos feci, tulit alter honores*.

VII.
How two contiguous places may differ 24 hours as to the beginning of the Day.

It may here be asked me, whether there is any part of the world where the Day takes its rise; and whether it was possible for two contiguous countries to differ twenty-four hours with respect to the Point of Day? I answer, first, that a circle has, absolutely speaking, neither beginning nor end; and therefore the Day depending upon a circular motion, can neither begin nor end, but with respect to certain places; so that it is always beginning and ending in different respects, and is always in all the parts of its duration, at Mid-night, at Mid-day, at five, at six of the clock, &c. with relation to different countries. Secondly, it was hardly possible, otherwise than by a divine or human institution, for two contiguous countries to differ more than a moment upon the Point of Day; for in whatever point of the ecliptic we suppose the sun to have been created, it must necessarily have illuminated at once ninety degrees round, which is half the globe; and the Day must have begun all at once upon that half, naturally speaking. If the question was about the Civil Day, that is, if all men should agree not to begin the Day till a certain hour, or if God had commanded them to begin it precisely in that manner, I confess there might be two countries entirely contiguous, one of which would not enter upon Sunday till the other left it. But in this case a Day must be sunk, and this sentence of Excommunication, or rather of annihilation, should be pronounced against it:

Que ce jour soit raié des choses avenues,
Jupiter le commande aux trois filles chenties,
Qui tiennent registre des tems (t).

Jupiter commands this Day to be rased out of the records of time.

But stay a little. Chance, without the assistance of any divine or human order, or the nulling of a Day, may make two contiguous countries differ twenty-four hours as to the beginning of the Civil Day. For which we need only suppose two ships, which in making the circuit of the globe, one eastward, and the other westward, meet, for instance, in the mid-way: suppose their crews should settle, one on the one side, and the other on the other side of an island, and each should preserve their own computation: Sunday will begin on one side, whilst beyond the line of partition they will only be

(t) I have corrected these verses above, in remark [B], of the article FONTARABIA.

be beginning Saturday. This is what the Portuguese and Spaniards experienced on-wards Japan.

VIII.
Puteanus has
ill expressed
himself in say-
ing that those
who go round
the world east-
ward, lose a
Day.

Now since they who sail round the globe eastward think they are at Saturday, whilst it is only Friday at the place they return to; and since those who make the circuit westward only reckon Friday, whilst their countrymen are already at Saturday, it is plain that the former gain a day, and that the latter lose one. And yet there have been writers who have so confounded their ideas upon this subject, that they have ascribed the loss to the former, and the gain to the latter; this Erycius Puteanus did (*u*). Michalor, his Critic, did not let this fault pass uncensured; the consequence of which censure was, that Puteanus, who might easily have come off by confessing ingenuously that he had used improper terms, obstinately defended his expression. Had it not been better to have frankly owned his fault, since the dispute turned only upon words? But why must a man after so many years professorship in Justus Lipsius's chair, after being the author of so many books, confess that he has expressed himself inaccurately? No, God forbid he should do so much injury to his rank. He therefore chose rather to have recourse to all the cavils his wit and reading could suggest to him, than to own his fault. He found himself the worse for it; his adversary returning to the charge, unmercifully scanned him even to the least punctilios, and both as to this part of the dispute, and the pretended necessity and uses of the line of the Point of Day, he perfectly routed him, and remained sole master of the field of battle. His first critical book is in Latin, but the reply is in Italian.

I believe Erycius Puteanus forgot but one cavil, which would have been, to maintain that on one hand it is a loss to bring an additional Day from a long voyage, and on the other hand it is a gain to return to one's country with a Day decreased. In point of gallantry, this thesis would pass for a principle; and there is no loss more considerable than the getting of many years, nor a gain more important than the having lived less than another. The generality of people in this point follow the lovers style, looking upon the superiority they have over their neighbour in number of Days, to be a disadvantage. But how much soever such sort of cavils might avail in a dispute, where the business should be only to jest, they would be entirely useless in a dispute like that of Michalor and Puteanus: for the question betwixt them was not to know whether those who make the tour of the world eastward or westward, grow older or younger by twenty-four hours than those who stay at home. It is manifest that the age of both is precisely what it would be if they had not stirred from their houses; and that the only reason why one counts less Days than the other, is, that the Days of those who travel westward contain above twenty-four hours each, and the others contain less. I own if two men born the same day began at fifteen years of age to travel round the earth, one eastward and the other westward, and made thirty turns each year; the first would believe himself fifty-four years old, when the latter would think he was only forty-eight. But this difference, which in case of marriage, if it was real, might render the latter of these travellers the more eligible match, would be a meer chimera in this case: they would be mightily deceived who should rely upon that advantage. Western voyages are not that fountain of youth, which removes old age; and, properly speaking, a man neither gets nor loses a moment whatever way he sails round the world. However it is true that Erycius Puteanus used a most improper expression; for in short, it would be a very wrong way of speaking, to say that we get years by reckoning as the Christians, and lose them by counting as the Mahometans. It is just the contrary, since a thousand of our years answer to a thousand thirty two Mahometan years, as is manifest, since the year 1622, was the 1032, of the Hegira (*w*). This example removes all the difficulty, because the same reason that lessens our years with respect to those of the Mahometans, lessens also the number of the Days of those who go round the world westward. That reason is, that the years of the Hegira being lunar, are shorter by eleven Days than ours.

IX.
Authors who
have commit-
ted the same
fault as Pute-
anus.

Puteanus is not the only person who has been mistaken in this. I say nothing against Wendelinus (*x*), whom he calls the Hipparchus of our age, and who uses a (*y*) phrase which seems to import that he believes the eastward circuit gives a Day less, and the western gives a Day more; for he pretends that if the Pope followed Puteanus's counsel, the Rubrics of the Breviary would shew the western travellers the Day they should sink, and the eastern travellers that which they ought to intercalate (*z*). Does it not seem that the intercalary Day ought to belong to those who have fewer Days than the others? How then comes this learned man to give it to those who travel eastward, who are already at Tuesday, when the others are but at Sunday? I decide nothing upon this point; there will ever be a subterfuge by the equivocation of *exemptilis* and *intercalaris*. I shall therefore only say that in one sense Wendelin's expression is not exact. The reader will own it, if he compares the Pope to a father, who would reduce the profit his three sons had made to an equality, the first by staying at home, the second by making the circuit of the world westward, and the third eastward. Let us suppose that the capital of the first is advanced from 10 to 15, that of the second from 10 to 14, and that of the third from 10 to 16. To make all their gains equal, is it not necessary to take from the third and add to the second? And yet, according to Wendelin, the

(*u*) Ab ortu in
occidentem mari-
bus dies unus
circuito in
luero est, ab oc-
cidentem in ortum
non ita. And
a little after,
Ducet transla-
tionem quoniam
unus in occidentem
ambit addit;
addit quoniam
unus in ortum
eripit.

(*w*) It is thus
they call the Ma-
hometan Era,
or Epoch, which
begins on our
Assess of 799
622.

(*x*) Godefridus
Wendelinus, much
affected by Geli-
corides, who had
been his disciple.
See Val. Aul.
Bibl. Belg. 14.
294.

(*y*) In Appen-
dix circuli Vi-
bani.

(*z*) Ut inter Bre-
varii Rubricas
illa quoque cum
primis necessaria
lex eminet,
que diem in-
cremque so-
vigantibus in Oc-
cidentem excep-
tillum, con-
dentibus in O-
rientem inter-
calarium formula
prescribit.

Pope

Pope must do the quite contrary. The inhabitants of Seville who remained at home passed from the 10th to the 15th day; the western travellers from the 10th to the 14th; and the eastern from the 10th to the 16th. We must, says Wendelin, take one day from those that have but 14, and give one to those that have 16. Let him rather say one is to be taken from the latter, and given to the former; but the way of giving it is to reckon it to their account as if they had furnished it: for it is not giving, to quit arrears? Once more let us say nothing against Wendelin, for his expression is good in a certain sense. Take a Day from the western travellers, and they will leap from Sunday to Tuesday; oblige the eastern to intercalate their Tuesday, that is, to count it twice together, and you will take from them a Day, and so the western and they will arrive the same time at Wednesday.

X.
Bembus criticized.

A man might more easily take to task Peter Bembus, who speaking of the return of Magellan's companions, says, that they found the years of their voyage to be grown longer by a day; but that if they had failed eastward, they would have doubtless found them grown shorter by a Day: for, continues he, the farther they had advanced, the farther they would have gone towards the rising sun; and therefore, after they had finished their tour about the world, they would have seen that luminary rise a day sooner than when they set out. *Semper enim tanto citius Orienti soli occurrens quanto plus itineris post se circumvolutus reliquisset, emenso demum totius terræ globo die uno prius solem sibi Orientem, quam cum viæ se dederat, profecto habuisset* (a a). Is not this a very fine reason? This Historian proves that the year of those who circuit the globe eastward is shorter by a day, because it contains a sun-rising more. But is not this rather a proof that it contains 366 Days, and consequently that it is longer by a Day? Note, That the year being equal, that is, 365 times 24 hours, &c. both for those who stay at home, and those who go round the globe eastward or westward, is nevertheless divided into more or less sun-risings; into 365 for those who stay at home, into 366 for those who return by the west, and into 364 for those who return by the east. This is all the mystery. Michalor has not censured Bembus for this bad way of reasoning, but only for his reverting the change which a circuit round the world gives to the year. Bembus did not persist all his life-time in his error, but expressed himself as he should do in the Italian translation he published of his Latin History, and instead of these words, *Uno sibi annos illos die longiores factos . . . uno breviores die redeunt sane fuissent*, he put, *Quelli anni tutti e tre essere d'un giorno fatti minori . . . d'uno piu lungbi stati sarebbono* (b b). Bergier (c c) did not perceive this inverted sense of Bembus; for, far from reproving him, he cites him in Latin to confirm the same inversion he had been making, saying, that the time of Magellan's companions was lengthened by a Day, and that if they had returned by the west, it would have been shortened by a Day (d d).

(a a) Bemb. Hist. Venet. lib. vi. pag. 131. Edit. Paris, 1551, in 4to. Bergier, cites lib. ii. pag. 218, Basil.

(b b) I have cited this Italian as I find it in Michalor.

(c c) Ubi supra, pag. 198, 199.

(d d) These delusive expressions might be rectified, by saying that they who return home westward find, not their year, but that of their country, a day shorter; and those who return by the east, find it in like manner a day longer.

(e e) Cardan examines it, lib. iv. de Subtil. but does not examine either there or in the ninth book, cap. lxii, quoted by Erycius Puteanus (who did not know that the books de Subtilitate, are not divided into chapters) the subject which Puteanus ascribes to him.

(f f) Longiores ita dies sunt Hispaniensibus. Tum quia solis comites sunt, lux eis productior est: tum quia retrocedit sol atque in eorum occursum abit. Lusitanos autem de reliquit à meridie non solum averlus sed etiam aversos, atque ab eis mane refugit cum ejus extortum expectant, serius enim orientur. Jul. Cap. Scalig. Exercit. Ixxvii, de Subtil.

(g g) Antapocrisi, Part. i. pag. 44.

(h h) Non eadem celeritate aquitamen ventis Lusitani atque Barchini parem marium tractum metiuntur. Scal. ubi supra.

XI.
Julius Cæsar Scaliger criticized.

These confusions will the less surprize us, when we find the Great Julius Cæsar Scaliger could not avoid them. When he criticises Cardan upon this question, *Why the stars seem to sailors to follow them, and the shoars to remove from them* (e e)? He represents to him, that so common a subject as that ought to have been seasoned with something new, as for instance, that even when we sail towards the east, the stars seem to go before us. Whereupon he relates what the Portuguese and Spaniards experienced in going round the world, and gives this reason for it: *The Spaniards, says he, go to China, and from thence to the Cape of Good Hope, following the course of the sun; the Portuguese, on the contrary, sail against its course; and therefore the days grow longer to the Spaniards, both because they accompany the sun, and enjoy the light longer, and also because the sun retrogrades, and comes to meet them: but it leaves the Portuguese behind it at noon, who on their part turn their backs to it, and in the morning it goes from them when they expect its rising, for it rises later* (f f). What can be more false than to say that the sun goes before those who sail towards the Cape of Good Hope, in the course taken by the Spaniards? What falser still than to pretend that the days grow longer to those whom the sun comes to meet. It is the very reverse, for the sun brings them a new Day so much the sooner. What can be more false in the third place, than to say that the sun goes from the Portuguese in the morning, and that they see it rise later? How is this possible, since the readiest way to meet by a circular motion, is to go to China by the east as the Portuguese did, and to go thither westward as the sun did, after having left them behind it? In fine, what can be falser than to pretend that if the sun rises later, the Civil Day must be shorter? Michalor (g g) has only censured Scaliger's third fault, except that he has farther observed, that there was no need of considering whether the Portuguese had as good a wind as the Spaniards. In effect, since Scaliger did not consider the swiftness of motion, *celeritatem motus nunc non intelligo*, what signified the winds to him (b b)? Let the Portuguese finish their round in three weeks, and the Spaniards take a thousand for it, this will neither make the difference of Days, greater nor less.

XII.
Several faults of Pliny in a few words.

The Ancients were not absolutely ignorant, that the Artificial Day must be longer to a man travelling westward, and that the sun sets sooner with respect to the eastern parts of the earth than to the western: But if we were to judge of their knowledge by that of Pliny, we should conclude they had no manner of notion of this.

In the first place, this Naturalist says, that it has been often experienced that the beams kindled on high towers at the sixth hour of the day, to give notice of the approach

V O L. V.

9 M

of

of pirates, have been seen even in those places where it was then three hours night (ii). A man needs not above three lectures on the globe, to see that this is a story perfectly absurd. This sixth hour of the Day with most interpreters signifies noon. Alciatus will have it to mean sun-setting, and by this means he bates Pliny two thirds of his distance; but to little purpose, since he leaves him still too much: for to make it three hours of night in one place, whilst the sun sets in another, you must allow 45 degrees difference of Longitude betwixt these two places. Now each degree of Longitude under the Æquator, comprehends twenty-five French leagues, of 2500 Geometrical paces each; the beacons must therefore have been perceived at the distance, not indeed of 1125 leagues, but at a distance differing from it only in proportion to the space which separates the parallel spoken of by Pliny from the Æquator; notwithstanding which abatement, this distance would contain some hundreds of leagues. Judge what this would be, if Pliny's sixth hour was mid-day; the distance would then be triple, and a beacon would have been seen at a greater distance than one third of the circumference of a good large parallel. This had been a more wonderful thing than what the same author speaks of in the twenty-second chapter of the fifth book, where he says that mount Casius is so high as to be enlightened by the sun three hours before day (kk). And yet Father Hardouin will not allow of Alciatus's modification, but will have it that these beacons were kindled at noon, and pretends to have cleared all the difficulties of this passage (ll). He finds no matter for criticism in all this chapter. Note, That this passage of Pliny, concerning mount Casius is liable to several difficulties. Aristotle has said as much of Caucasus; but some learned men (mm) maintain that there is no mountain in the world from whence the sun may be seen, if he be more than four degrees below the horizon. According to this assertion, the sun itself placed upon the top of a mountain, could not be perceived above an hundred leagues distance. How then was it possible to see Pliny's fires? Father Hardouin, upon the passage where mount Casius is mentioned, affirms that Cabeus has very well shewn that Aristotle was right in what he relates of Caucasus. We shall shew the contrary under the word CAUCASUS, by examining what three learned and subtle Italians, Mazzoni, Blancanus, and Cabeus, have said upon this passage of Aristotle.

In the second place, Pliny says, that Philonides, a courier of Alexander, went in nine hours from Sicyon to Elis (nn); but in returning was forced to travel three hours by night. The distance of these two cities was 1200 Stadia (oo), and the way of the former to the latter, was an ascent: and thus this courier employed one while nine hours, and another fifteen, in performing the same journey: nine hours going to Elis ascending, fifteen hours in returning to Sicyon descending. If you ask the reason of this prodigious difference betwixt going and coming, Pliny will tell you that this messenger, as he went to Elis followed the sun, but in returning to Sicyon, he travelled contrary to it. But this reason is so far from compensating the difference betwixt nine and fifteen hours, that it cannot even compensate the advantage of the declivity of the road; for to gain an hour in following the sun, one must make a stage of fifteen degrees, and consequently the courier gained but somewhat under ten minutes when he travelled sixty leagues from east to west.

Lastly, Pliny says, that the reason before given is the cause that the Navigators towards the west proceed farther in the Day than in the Night, even when the Days are very short (pp). Here are several falsties. For not to say that our Pilots, whose observations are more certain than those of the Ancients, do not observe that ships go slower by Night than by Day, other things being equal, who sees not that this pretended slowness caused by the Night, cannot amount to the proportion Pliny assigns, nor proceed from the cause he alledges? Let us suppose that a ship in full sail westward, makes eighty leagues in nine or ten hours of a winter's day, she gains not a quarter of an hour (qq); and what is a quarter of an hour in comparison of five or six hours, more or less, by which the winter-night exceeds the Day in the countries Pliny might have had in view? Add to this, that in sailing westward, we follow the sun no less by Night than by Day; whence it follows, that a ship ought to sail as far in the dark as during the Artificial Day, since the time of darkness, when we sail westward, lengthens in the same proportion with the time of light. The navigations of these later times have taught us, that there reigns a constant wind from east to west in the Torrid Zone: so that those who sail there from east to west, have always the wind behind them, and those who sail from west to east, have always the wind against them (rr). This is the reason why a voyage from Spain to the West-Indies, requires less time than a voyage back again. But we must not believe, as the Abbot de la Roque did (ss), a story that (tt) was laughed at, viz. That the Spaniards sometimes sail to the West-Indies in twenty-four hours, but cannot return in less than four months, let them have ever so favourable weather. Pliny might easily be deceived by such as did not well understand what they had heard of the effect of this eastern wind. There is no sea in which the east winds are more favourable than the Pacific; and yet the Spanish vessels which cross it in their way from America to the Philippine islands, spend two months and an half, though they sail 130 leagues a day (uu). I wonder that the Commentary *Variorum* on Pliny, printed at Leyden, does not examine and determine this matter. There can be nothing more dry

(ii) In quibus pronuntiatio ignis sexta hora dici accensio, sepe compertum est tertiam noctem à tergo ultimam videri. Plin. lib. ii, cap. lxxi.

(kk) Cuius exaltatio alitudo quatuor vigiliis orientem per tenebras sollem aspiciat. Id. lib. v, cap. xxi.

(ll) Nihil opus istis ambagibus, ubi sunt omnia per se perspicua, necque plenissima, ut vel ex interpretatione nostra liquet. Hardouin, in Plin. Tom. ii, pag. 227.

(mm) See Isaac Vossius, in Meibom, pag. 90.

(nn) Ex Sicyone Elis mille & decem stadia novem diei cunctis horis, indeque quatuordecim itinere tota nocte hunc remens. Plin. lib. ii, cap. lxxi.

(oo) That it is say to be leagues, 98500 geometrical paces each.

(pp) Que de cause ad occasionem navigationis quatuor brevissimo die vincunt spacia nocturna navigationis, ut solem ipsum comitant. Plin. ubi supra.

(qq) To lengthen the day an hour by a progress westward, one must travel fifteen degrees, which under the Æquator make 375 leagues.

(rr) See Varin's Geography, lib. i, cap. xxi, and Robaut's Physics, Part. iii, cap. xi, where he offers the reason of this Phenomenon, by the action of the Earth according to Copernicus's system: but in the Philosophical Transactions, the Historical Relation of the Madagascari, or Trade-winds, made by Dr. Halley.

(ss) Journal des Savans, 1685, pag. 30, Dutilleul Edit.

(tt) Ibid. p. 17.

(uu) Halley, ubi supra, citat. 1701.

dry and wretched than what we find there upon this subject. We find nothing in it that insinuates any distrust, except two or three words, which inform us that Melichius (*ww*) thought the story incredible concerning the beacons of the towers, and that concerning the courier Philonides. But I much more wonder at the goodness of Salmasius, who has reported (*xx*) the story of this messenger with marks of approbation, and so little doubted of his diligence, that he makes his journey longer than Pliny did. Observe that Allatius (*yy*) relates the opinion of Julius Cæsar Scaliger without censuring it, and defends Pliny against Melichius.

XIII.
Some faults of
du Pinet and
la Mothe le
Vayer.

I would fain know how this chapter of Pliny has been interpreted by Erycius Puteanus, who boasts of being the first that understood it (*zz*). Du Pinet has put in the margin of his translation, *That the waves of the sea incline more to the west than to the east*, and that this is the reason of what Pliny relates concerning vessels sailing westward. But would not this reason be as good for the Night as for the Day? I omit the fault he has committed in translating these words, *Eundem* (Solem) *remans obviu contrario pratervertibat occursum*, thus, *He met the sun, and passed it, he went so swift*. I believe that *pratervertibat* there, signifies more than Father Hardouin thinks, more than *offendebat*; and that Pliny's meaning is, that the courier going towards the sun, went beyond it, and left it behind him. This does not signify that he went swifter than the sun. La Mothe le Vayer (*a*) alledges this example of swiftness without finding any thing false in Pliny's passage: nay, he observes that Philonides *almost equalled the course of the sun*; and yet he had been just computing Philonides's swiftness at the rate of about eight leagues an hour (*b*).

(*ww*) It should be Melichius, a Professor of the Mathematics at Wittenberg, who published a Commentary on the second book of Pliny, in the year 1534. See above, remark [E], of the article ZIEGLER.

(*xx*) Salm. Exercit. Plin. pag. 45, *vubere* he computes Pliny's 1200 stadia to 160 miles; they are but 150.

(*yy*) In Libro de Mensura Temporum, pag. 14.

(*zz*) *Quoniam locum per Massochum suppletum, hæcenus tamen non intelleximus in Theoribus nostris expressum. Putean. Vindic. Circuli Urban.* Note, That Michæler tells him, that Manzani, author of a learned apology for Dante, has only cited this place of Pliny, without adding any thing to the common reading. (*a*) Letter xxviii, Vol. x, of the Edit. in 12mo. 1681. Pliny is there wrong cited in chap. vii, (it should be lxi) of book ii. (*b*) Reckoning 75 leagues, of 2000 paces each, in nine hours.



A DISSER.

A DISSERTATION

*Which was printed before some essays or Fragments
of this work in the year M DCXCII,*

Under the title of,

A Project of a Critical Dictionary, in a letter to Mr du
Rondel, Professor of the *Belles Lettres* at Maastricht.

*It has been revised and corrected (in this second edition) but not enlarged, except
with some citations, and a few notes put at the bottom of the pages. We have
also placed there some of the citations which in the first edition were in the
margin. They will be here by way of a comment.*

SIR,

YOU will doubtless be surprized at the resolution I have taken. I have resolved to make the largest compilation I can of the faults which are met with in Dictionaries, and not to confine my self within these bounds, however large and extensive, but to make fallies upon all sorts of authors, whenever occasion offers. What! will you say, a man from whom we expected quite another thing, and much rather a work of reasoning than a compilation, is he going to engage in an enterprize which requires a much greater expence of body than of mind? It is certainly a very wrong step. He undertakes to correct Dictionaries; His most malicious enemies could not have prescribed to him a harder task, had they over his destiny the same power that Eurystheus had over that of Hercules. It is worse than going to fight monsters; it is attempting to lop off the Hydra's heads; it is at least attempting to cleanse Augeas's stables (a); in fine, it is, the penance which ought to be enjoined those turbulent men who have abused their leisure and the credulity of the people, to vent under the name and authority of the Revelation all sorts of Chimera's, *justit quod splendida bilis* (b), I pity him. Why did he not leave this employment to those robust constitutions who can study sixteen hours a day without prejudice to their health; who are indefatigable in citations, and all the other functions of a transcriber, and much better qualified to acquaint the public with matters of fact than with reasonings?

I. . .
The reasons
and design of
this undertak-
ing.

If these are your thoughts, Sir, you ought to fear lest your friendship for me should mislead you, and correct your error by this sincere confession of mine, that I find my capacity very inconsiderable which ever way I turn my self. I confess, that in this undertaking I apply my small forces by their weak side, instead of chusing a subject that might display them to less disadvantage. But, in truth, there is no difficulty in the choice, when a man is convinced, as I am, that the difference between his strong and his weak side is almost imperceptible. And besides, I will tell you freely, that if I had turned my pen on what you believe the most advantageous side, I should have been involved in the alternative, either of displeasing some persons whom prudence forbids to provoke (c), or of displeasing my self. Now you well know that in writing our genius ought not to be forced (d), and you are sensible that the judicious answer of an ancient Greek might in several senses be applied to one's self [A]. And after all what is

[A] *The judicious answer of an antient Greek.* We find it in Stobæus. Θεόκριτος ἐρωτηθεὶς διὰ τί ἔ-
συγγράζει, ὅτι εἶπεν ὡς μὲν βύλομαι, ἔ-
δύναμαι, οὐ δὲ δύναμαι ἢ βύλομαι: Theocritus querenti quare
non scriberet, dixit, quoniam ut libet non possum, ut
verò possum non libet (1). . . . Theocritus being asked why
he did not write, answered, it is because I am not allow-
ed to write as I would, and cannot write as I am
allowed.

(a) It is said
that Mr. . . .
ferry me of his
friends, so far
dressed upon from
little pieces of po-
etry the fault is
should observe in
his Dictionary,
was answered,
that it required
quies and some
of paper, and not
little pieces.

(b) Horat. Sat.
III, lib. II, vers.
141.

(c) See in Eng-
lish's Adagio,
the saying, Not
irritate crabbees.

(d) Tu nihil in-
vita dices facere
Miserere. Horat.
de Art. Poet.
vers. 385.

is the disadvantage of not shewing our selves on the best side? It is depriving our selves, perhaps, of the praises one might have received. I say perhaps; for the caprices of men and chance have a strange influence in this. But omit the perhaps; what then would this be, but a privation of praise, which is a meer nothing to a man who never acted, and at present acts less than ever by this principle? I could wish that the ancient Poet, who had so well begun to shew the emptiness of human affairs, had carried his thought so far as to say, *cornea mihi fibra est*: you would here see the application that might be made of the three verses he would have left us in this case.

Non ego cum scribo, si forte quid aptius exit.
Quando hæc rara avis est, si quid tamen aptius exit,
Laudari metuum, neque enim mihi cornea fibra est (c).

(c) Persius,
Sat. I, ver. 451.

..... If I, by chance succeed
In what I write, (and that's a chance indeed;)
Know I am not so stupid, or so hard
Not to feel praise, or fame's deserv'd reward.

DRYDEN.

If on one hand I am not ignorant that my enterprize requires great strength of body, I consider on the other, that natural patience, joined with the habit of meddling only with books, of going little out of one's study, and avoiding as the plague the ways of those turbulent men whom I have spoken of, who busily thrust themselves into all affairs, even those of state, may supply a great many things.

As for those learned men, whose erudition in matters of fact is proportioned to the indefatigable application their robust constitution allows them, I declare to you, Sir, that I do not pretend to intrude upon their province; on the contrary, I only propose to furnish them with an essay, or rough-draught, which may determine some of them to perfect this plan, and to enlarge this Critical Dictionary with several volumes. I heartily agree they should say of me in this respect, what was said to Varro upon matters of Philosophy, *that he had said enough to create a desire for it, but not to give the knowledge of it* (f). I even submit to those who shall say it would be a greater favour

(f) Philosophi-
am multis locis
inchoari ad im-
pellendum factis,
ad edocendum
parum. Cicero,
Academ. Quest.
lib. 1.

than justice in the public to treat me according to the rule that Aristotle approves in one of his writings. Οὐ μόνον δὲ χάριν ἔχειν δίκαιον τέτοις ὅν ἂν τις κοινωνήσαι ταῖς δόξαις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἔτι ἐπιπολαϊότερον ἀπορρημαίνουσιν· καὶ γὰρ ἔτοι συμβάλλονταί τι. τὴν γὰρ ἔξιν προήκονσαν ἡμῶν· εἰ μὴ γὰρ Τιμόθεος μὴ ἔγινετο πολλὴν ἂν μελοποιίαν ἐκ εἰχόμεν· εἰ δὲ μὴ Φρύνις, Τιμόθεος ἔκ ἂν ἔγινετο. Verum non solum illis agendæ sunt gratiæ quorum opinionibus quis acquiescet, sed illis qui superficie tenus dixerunt: conferunt enim aliquid etiam isti, habitum namque nostrum exercuerunt. Si enim Timotheus non fuisset, multum melodiæ nequaquam habuissimus: si tamen Phrynus non extitisset, ne Timotheus quidem (g). - - We ought to return thanks not only to those whose opinions we approve and agree with, but even to those who are meer superficial writers. For the latter contribute something to our good, as they have put us upon thinking. If there had never been a Timotheus, we should have had no excellent Music; but had there not been a Phrynus, we should never have had a Timotheus. And I very sincerely make the same declaration as the ingenious author of the History of the Royal Society: In answer for my self, says he (h), I shall alledge, that what I have to offer, so far from preventing the labours of others who could adorn so noble a subject, is no otherwise designed than as those stately edifices used at first to be represented by some few shadows and little models, which are not intended to equal the principal structure, but only to shew by way of abridgment, with what materials, how much expence, and how many hands it might be afterwards raised. I write with the same intention; proposing only to give the sketch of a design to such as shall have the capacity of executing it; and that they may fall to work as soon as may be, I will make all the haste imaginable to publish my Essay, which will contain but one volume in folio.

(g) Arist. Me-
taphysic. lib. ii,
cap. i, pag. m.
645.

(h) Dr Thomas
Sprat (after-
wards Bishop of
Rochester) History
of the Royal
Society, pag. 2.

II.
That there
are many
faults in
books.

They will not want matter for larger editions: For if this subject can furnish me with materials for a large volume, notwithstanding the other indispensable occupations which take up all my time, and the scarcity of books I am reduced to, what will not men of great learning and great leisure do, who have great libraries at hand, if they would undertake to make collections of this kind? These will be excursions from which they will always return laden with booty; and no Prince, whatever care he takes for laying the toils, and disposing all things for a great hunting match, can be more certain of catching a great many wild beasts, than a learned critic, who goes in chase of errors, can be certain of discovering a great many of them. It would be something curious, if this work should have the same fate, with that of a learned Swiss (i), intitled, *Theatrum*

(i) Theod.
Zwinger, a Phy-
sician, Native of
Basel, who died
in the year 1588.

allowed. An ancient Rhetorician gave this answer for the reason of his silence: *What I know, it is not seasonable to speak; and what would be seasonable, I do not know.*

You will find the words of this ancient Rhetorician,
VOL. V.

with those of Stobæus, in the remark [F], of the article ARISTARCHUS. And since that remark will suffice for all the comment I might have occasion for here, I need only refer to it, repetitions being to be avoided as much as possible.

9 N

A DISSERTATION

Theatrum vite humane, which has been enlarged so often, that it now contains eight great volumes in folio. Doubt not but the faults of authors would arise to as many a bulk as this: Now, Sir, would a theatre of these faults in as many large volumes, be, in your opinion, less diverting or instructive than that of human life? You may acquaint me, when you please, whether the book intituled, *The Hunters*, which contained the catalogue of Theopompus's thefts, had not its title founded on the comparison of metaphor of hunting I have used? You may acquaint me with it, I say, when you please, no body having discovered the most hidden particulars of antiquity, so well as you have done.

It will easily be granted that there are an infinite number of faults in books, if we consider that the writings of the greatest men are not exempt from them, and that the meanest critic can discover a great many. How often do we find in the contents and indexes of the meanest performances, *Scaliger notatus*, *ballucinatio Scaligeri*, - - - *Scaliger censured*, a blunder of Scaliger, and the like? Mr Morus imagined that this was a sorry affectation of a proud author, who desires to be talked of (j). This may be true; but no man of learning can deny that Scaliger may be censured justly in a great many things; we need no other proof of this than the works of Salmasius, where at every turn we find Scaliger reprehended (k). It is true, he is not named, but pointed at by the lofty title of *vir magnus*, *vir summus*: but all these great civilities do not lessen the reality of the fault, when the censure is well grounded. Salmasius, who had not the same reasons for respecting other learned men, exasperated some of them, who revenged themselves with unmerciful criticisms upon his writings. He made his defence, and attacked them in his turn. The battle was principally fought betwixt him and the Jesuit Petavius, and was so obstinate, that it hardly ceased till their deaths. We may affirm, that they were two champions worthy of each other, and that never gladiators were better matched than they: for it would be unjust to determine the matter, by what those have said who were both judges and parties in the quarrel (l). They were the two most learned men in France, and they might not only have enlightened their age, but also have done it much honour by their long controversies, if, to the shame of learning, they had not tainted them with the excessive venom of their spleen, which dictated almost as many abuses as words. All the other antagonists of Salmasius were not capable of returning blow for blow, I mean of discovering as many faults in his writings as he discovered in theirs; but nevertheless they made him sensible he was often mistaken. Who can doubt, after this, that there is a vast crop of faults of this kind? Where will the harvest be wanting, when it is so plentiful in the productions of the Scaliger's and Salmasius's; and who would be disheartened with his errors, upon this consideration?

A person of your judgment needs not be put in mind that I have proposed the example of these two great men, not so much to reason from the greater to the less, as to give some sort of consolation to authors of a second class, and to those who, like myself, are of the lowest. The consolation might be more effectual than the reasoning could be just; for it is certain that authors of the first rank are those who sometimes let slip the greatest number of faults: whether because they are too bold in their decisions, and too much addicted to new ways, or whether they yield sooner or later to the vanity of distinguishing themselves by the multitude of their writings, or for several other reasons, which I could easily enumerate, if I meant to characterize any one by them; but it is no less certain, that these examples afford some consolation. In matter of comfort, men are rather touched by popular and plausible thoughts, than by reasonings the most conformable to the rules of Logic. We may say then, that the Scaliger's and Salmasius's ought to have the same effect as to other authors, that Carthage had as to other nations: *Post Carthaginem vinci neminem puduit* (m); No body was ashamed to be conquered after Carthage was conquered.

I might join Baronius to these two famous authors. He was undoubtedly a great man: they who have examined his work in order to write against him, are perhaps his greatest admirers; and yet how many faults are there in his annals? They are not reckoned by hundreds, but by thousands. 'Baronii Annales is quem dixi Blondellus mille castigavit notis, aliquando prodituris, quibus oram exemplaris sui prætexuit: quod exemplar ære suo redemptum bene proceres Amstelodamenses Bibliothecæ publicæ inferri curaverunt. Super hæc vero & ea quæ ab aliis animadversa sunt, quæ subnotavius etiam nos justum fere volumen impleverunt' (n). - - - - *Blondel, whom I have mentioned, made a thousand corrections on the annals of Baronius; these corrections may some time be published: he wrote them on the margin of his copy, which the magistrates of Amsterdam have bought and placed in the public library. But besides these corrections, and some made by other authors, those which I have also made, would almost fill one volume.* He was mistaken, not only through a party-interest, and a prejudice in favour of the court of Rome, but even in a thousand things which are of no service to the pretensions of that court. This has been proved as often as he has been attacked, and very lately the public had an opportunity of being thoroughly convinced of it (o). Baronius seems to have taken delight in deceiving himself, and purposely to have interperfed his work with lies, so thick do they grow every where.

I am

III.
Yet a good
compilation
of them can-
not be made
without much
labour.

I am not apprehensive you should conclude from hence that there is nothing easier than to compile faults, and that these sorts of collections require but little time, it being but transcribing the censures authors have made upon one another; I am not afraid, I say, that so judicious a man as you, should argue after that manner. You know too well, Sir, that there is no dispute in which it is more necessary to hear both parties, than in those which arise among the learned. It would be madness to depend upon the observations of the aggressors; prudence requires we should hear both the answers of the defendants and the replies of the aggressors. I ask no more than this; I know that the reader's patience commonly does not go so far. But in a design like this, it is not too much, with respect to many things, to compare together four pieces published successively; two by the assailant, and two by the assaulted; and I dare even say, that in some particulars this is not sufficient. It will be granted me that there are many censors who commit more faults than they correct (*p*); at least it will be owned, that the most learned men give occasion to be censured in their turn. This is what Casaubon has been taxed with in respect to his critical work on Baronius. Some have reproached him with this very moderately (*q*); others in an outrageous manner; tho' we must own, that by I know not what fatality this work, which is very good and very learned in other respects, did more harm than good to the reputation of the author. But, in short, I desire only this example to shew that after the reading of a critical book, we must suspend our judgment till we have seen what the criticized author or his friends have to say. They who think all that is censured by the aggressor to be faulty, and whatever he does not oppose to be good, commonly find themselves in the end the dupes of that writer; for it may be proved to them, that he has condemned good things, and passed by what really deserved condemnation, and that he himself has been guilty of many blunders. An author who in other respects cannot endure to be censured, will turn Critic upon himself, when thereby he can hope to mortify his censurers, by shewing them they were ignorant that such and such things deserved to be censured. I would give you instances of this, was I not satisfied they are well known to you, with the reflexion naturally resulting from it: which is, that a man chuses rather to hurt himself, provided he hurts his enemy at the same time, than do himself any good that might turn to his enemy's advantage. Now, as the fate of the censor is sometimes the same with that of the Apologist, that is, neither of them sees but part of his adversary's defects, and both commit faults each in his turn, we see the necessity of following them through the whole progress of their dispute, when one attempts such a collection as that I undertake; For it ought to consist only of faults averred and certain, such, for instance, as are those which the authors animadverted upon, do themselves acknowledge either expressly, or by their silence, and those which they are disabled from defending otherwise than by notorious absurdities. Not, Sir, that I deny there are faults which are made evident by the first censure: so that if I resumed the metaphor of hunting I used before, I ought to say, that indeed those who pursue the faults of authors, frequently find the beast already slain, or that he bays; but sometimes also they find one that puts them on a wrong scent, or avoids the blow, or still vigorously defends himself, tho' wounded in an hundred places. The cavils suggested by vanity and a false shame, to writers who are censured, make the application of the metaphor but too just. This however proves that transcribing is not sufficient to succeed in this hunting, and that the edifice must be very costly, notwithstanding the plenty of materials. Let us go farther, and say, that of all Dictionaries there is none more difficult than this. When we write other Dictionaries, we meet with a great many things ready prepared in the preceding ones, which cost only the taking them; and as many others that want but a little alteration. Whatever we find good in them, is lawful prize. But all this is of no use to me: what I find wrong and defective is the only thing that can serve me, provided I know how to rectify it.

(p) Saepè in judicando majus est peccatum iudicii quam peccati illius de quo fuerat iudicatum. Ambrosius, in Psal. L.

(q) M. Godeau for instance, in the preface of his History of the Church of Casaubon, says he, who was a man of learning, should have treated Baronius with more civility, he who never names Scaliger without the title of Divine, and contents himself with censuring the things he believed him mistaken in, without attempting to make him pass at every turn for a man who had no good learning. If he had engaged in a career as long as his, we should have seen whether he would not have made false steps. His Exercitationes have produced other works of the same kind. Just matter of censure has been found in his censures, by which it appears that in such judgments there is nothing but may be defended and opposed with almost an equal probability, especially as to the dates.

IV.
The usefulness
of such a compilation.

You have seen a reflexion, suggested to me by the reading of some of those disputes, which contain answers, replies, rejoinders, &c. See here another arising from the same source. After having read a criticism on a book, we think ourselves undeceived in many false things, which were taken for true when we read the book. Hence we pass from the affirmative to the negative. But if we happen to read a good answer to this criticism, we seldom fail, with respect to some things, to return to our first affirmation: whilst, on the other side, we proceed to the negation of some things which we had believed upon the credit of the animadverter. We experience a like revolution of thoughts, when we come to read a good reply to the answer. Now, is not this capable of making the greatest part of readers continually diffident? What can escape the suspicion of falshood with respect to those who have not the key of the sources in their hands? If an author advances things without citing the places he takes them from, he leaves room to believe that he only speaks by hearsay; if he cites, it is feared that he unfairly relates the passage, or understands it ill, since we seldom fail in reading a critical work to find a great many such faults in the book which is criticized. What must be done then, Sir, to remove all these reasons of distrust, whilst there are such a great number of books that were never answered, and such a great number of readers who have not the books containing the sequel of these literary disputes? Were it not to be wished there

there was extant a Critical Dictionary, to which recourse might be had, in order to be ascertained whether what we find in other Dictionaries and in all sorts of other books be true? This would be the touch-stone of other books; and you know a man somewhat precise in his language, who would not fail to call a work of this nature, *The Insurance-office of the Republic of Letters*.

Thus you have a general idea of my project. My design is to compose a Dictionary, which, besides the considerable omissions of others, shall contain a collection of falsehoods concerning each article. And you may easily see, Sir, that if, for instance, I had been able to collect under the word *SENECA*, all that is falsely attributed to that famous Philosopher, it would only be necessary to consult this article in order to know whether we ought, or ought not, to believe what we read concerning Seneca in any book whatever. For if it was a falsehood, it would be noted in the collection; and whatever would not be inserted there as false, might be looked upon as true. This suffices to shew, that if this design was well executed, the work would be most useful and most convenient to all sorts of readers. I am very sensible, methinks, what ought to be done for the perfect execution of this enterprise; but I am much more sensible of my incapacity to execute it: And therefore I give here only a specimen, and leave the continuation of it to persons of the requisite abilities, in case it be thought that this project, rectified wherever it is deficient, deserves to employ the pens of the learned.

V.
Why these fragments are published beforehand, and the nature of them.

But as I soon foresaw that my specimen would be extensive enough to engage me in a most laborious task; and besides, as I am very diffident of my ability to execute this project: do you know, Sir, the resolution I have taken hastily? I design to hazzard some fragments of my specimen, and to send them abroad as the forlorn-hope to scour the country, sound the fords, and get intelligence of the enemy. If they make an unsuccessful sally, and return not with good news, I will take a Stoical resolution of lying quiet; if the success prove otherwise, I shall prosecute my design. Thus you see what obliges me to set out with this little forerunner. Whatever fate it meets with, it will afford me the opportunity of giving a public testimony of my particular esteem and friendship for you; and if any thing be capable of disturbing me for its ill success, it will perhaps be the consideration that it was unworthy of being inscribed to you.

In the mean time let me tell you a little secret; which is, that in composing this prelude, I have been so far from chusing the least exceptionable fragments of the Critical Dictionary, that I have chosen those I most suspected. It is not hard to conjecture the reason of my conduct, since common sense teaches us, that the surest way of prognosticating the fate of a book, by feeling the pulse of the public, is to take the pattern we shew, from the worst part of the piece, rather than from the best. Besides, when we desire to profit by the reader's advice, and to know which is the best way of executing a project, we ought chiefly to lay before him those parts which are of the most doubtful value. I have therefore chosen those fragments which I most suspected, or such as contained each in its kind the most obvious irregularities, as you may say a long train of remarks, a digression resembling a dissertation in form, &c. I praise the simplicity of a plan; I admire the uniform and neat execution of it; and in this I place the idea of perfection. But when I come from the theory to the practice, I own, I find it difficult to follow this idea of perfection. A mixture of several forms, a party-coloured variety, and not so much uniformity, are much my talent.

I fancy this false taste is an effect of my laziness. I would have the same book satisfy my curiosity on all the things it suggests to my thoughts, and I do not love to be obliged to pass from book to book for this satisfaction. As it is natural to judge of other people by one's self, methinks an author does a great pleasure to his reader when he spares him the trouble of going out of his place, and searching in another book for some little explanations he may desire. You now begin to fear that my book will be stuffed with parentheses all over: but fear it not; for in favour of those who love not interruptions, I will take care to keep the text clear from accessory observations, and shall place them in the margin, and at the end of each article, in favour of those who desire to know immediately the dependances or relations which connect things together. To refresh the readers, I will take care to give them now and then some gayer touches, without making too much use of the privilege allowed to works of this kind, namely of using free expressions; nothing is more necessary than such passages in a Dictionary, which is of itself a dry and fatiguing book. Would to God these were all the bad sides of it; but there are others more discouraging, since there is no work that is judged of by so bad principles as this. You find a great many readers complaining that they meet with common things in it. What then would they have? Nothing but exquisite learning, and what they knew not before? But in that case, it would not be such a book as it ought to be, that is, a book suited to the use and capacity of every reader.

I appeal to you, Sir, who are an excellent judge of every thing relating to literature: would it be reasonable to exclude from this Dictionary the censure of a fault, under pretence that this fault cannot mislead learned men, though it be spread in the works of a great many writers? Doubtless you will not be of this opinion: every falsehood which is dispersed in several books may deceive many people, and that is a sufficient reason for pointing

pointing it out in a Critical Dictionary: for this reason the faults of the first editions may be taken notice of, tho' they have been corrected in the second; for how many people use the first edition all their lives, without ever consulting any other.

Have I not reason to fear that by thus giving you the character of my work, you should ask me whether this be the way of discharging my obligations to you; and whether I am not ashamed to dedicate to you a book stuffed with the errors and blunders of authors, and a heap of the trash and filth of the Republic of Letters [B]. I am as fully persuaded as any man living, that nothing should be dedicated to you but a collection of fine thoughts, and curious erudition, and that the present might be worthy of you, it ought perfectly to resemble the writings you have published. Am not I then very blameable to deviate so much from this model; and without any reason, and even in quite different circumstances to recur to the expedient of Catullus, and put his menace in practice?

Ad librariorum

Curram scriinia, Cæcios, Aquinos,
Suffenum, omnia colligam venena,
Ac te his suppliciis remunerabor (r).

(r) Catull. Epig.
xiv.

I will run to the Booksellers shops, and collect the Cæcii, Aquini, Suffenus, and other books of that stamp, and, to punish you, I will present you with them.

But, whatever may be said of it, I am certain, upon mature consideration, that if my collection is not worthy of your patronage, it is not for the reason I have assigned. I should think it a much more tolerable present, if it was composed of a far greater number of lies; and I should not despair of procuring one day, your intire approbation of it, if I had as good a nose for the falsities of authors, as a Poet of your acquaintance boasts he had in other respects (s).

I should now conclude this long letter; but I have some difficulties to clear up, which will stay me some time longer.

VI.
Answer to
some ob-
jections;
1. That this
book may
create ene-
mies.

First, Sir, the liberty I take to gather into heaps the falsities scattered in divers books, may be taken for a notorious rashness: Is not this wantonly creating to one's self a vast number of enemies? When we censure the Antients, we provoke their numerous partisans among the Moderns; and when we censure the latter, we incur either their own repentment if they are living, or that of their family if they are dead. Now the repentment of authors is no small matter. They pass for a very touchy, choleric, and vindictive race of men; and it looks as if their relations thought themselves obliged to perpetuate, after their death, the blind love they had for their productions. As for the interest which several Moderns take in the reputation of the Antients, I cannot better represent it than by the passage I cite, where la Mothe le Vayer is angry with Balzac, who had criticized an answer of Pompey. In truth, I confess to you, that so unjust a treatment of all antiquity raises such an indignation in my soul, that I had rather it should be you, or any body except myself, who should give this sort of temerity the name it deserves. 'Exclamet Melicerta periiisse Frontem de rebus. - - Well may we say, that *'modesty is fled from the earth.'* A man must have lost all modesty and judgment to proceed to such a want of respect, and to so presumptuous an extravagance, 'ut infolenter parentis artium antiquitatis reverentiam verberemus (t). - - As insolently to censure

(s) Namque so-
gacius unus odo-
ror,
Polyppus an gra-
vis hirsutis cubet
hircus in alia
Quam canis acer,
ubi lateat sus.
Horat. Epod.
Od. xii.

(t) Macrob.
1. Saturn. Hex-
am. Rustic pag.
142, 143.

[B] *A book stuffed with the errors and blunders of authors, and a heap of the trash and filth of the Republic of Letters.* As every thing has two faces, perhaps some people will pretend that I incur the censure we read in a fine treatise of Plutarch. But this would not be considering the matter by its fair side; this would be viewing it by its wrong side. It ought to be considered according to the idea of those collections of Physical Observations, which only contain the Distempers incident to human bodies, but which treat of them only to teach us how we may avoid, or be cured of them. However it be, these are Plutarch's thoughts (2): 'If any one rummaging the writings of the Antients, should pick and cull all the worst things he could find, and make a book of them, as the defective verses of Homer, beginning with a short syllable, or the incongruities met with in Tragedies, or the obscene and base objections Archilochus makes against the female sex, disgracing himself by it; would he not deserve this tragical malediction,

(2) Plut. de
Curiositate, pag.
520.

*Pox on your taste! must you, like lice and fleas,
Be always fed with scabs and nastiness?*

But setting aside that curse, such a collection would neither bring him honour nor profit, as it rips up all the faults of other men; thus we read that Philip

V O L. V.

'gathered together the most wicked and incorrigible men of his time, whom he lodged together in a city he built for them, and called it Poneropolis, that is, the city of villains: so curious people collecting and amassing from all hands the faults and imperfections, not of verses or poems, but of the lives of men, make very disagreeable archives and registers of their memory, which they carry always about them. And just as at Rome there are persons who care not to buy handsome pictures, or fine statues, or even handsome boys and girls of those who expose them to sale, but rather affect to buy monsters in nature, such as have no legs, or their arms wrong placed, or three eyes, or the head of an ostrich, and delight in viewing them, and enquiring

*Where kinds of unlike form oft blended are
Into one hideous deformity.*

But he who should commonly carry us to such shows, would trouble and torment us with the sight of them. So those who pry into other mens imperfections, the infamies of extractions, and the faults and errors happening in families, ought to call to mind as the former, that such observations have neither conducted to their pleasure nor profit.

9 O

A DISSERTATION

'censure and stigmatize men for that veneration, which they justly pay to antiquity, the parent of arts.'

In answer to this difficulty, I say, Sir, that I do not think my design to be dangerous in that respect; and therefore this sentence might reasonably be applied to me,

Periculosa plenum opus aleæ
Tractas, & incedis per ignes
Suppositos cineri doloso (u);

(u) Horat. Od. I.
lib. ii.

*A dangerous work you write, and tread
O'er flames by treacherous ashes bid.*

CREECH.

and yet, properly speaking, I could not be called rash. I do not represent authors under the disadvantageous idea by which slanderers characterise them; I think they are too reasonable to take it amiss, that for the good of the public I should shew they have been sometimes in the wrong. I declare that in doing this I have no design to lessen the glory they have acquired, and that I shall carefully abstain, wherever civility requires it, from all disobliging terms, with respect either to their persons, or to the main of their work. The fate of a book depends not on some little faults, scattered up and down in it; nor will they deprive it of its just value, or rob the author of the praises due to him. The injustice and malice of mankind, great as they are, are not grown to such a pitch that the generality of readers will not commend a good book, because there may be a few faults here and there in it. This fine maxim of a Poet of Augustus's time will always be true:

Ubi plura nitent in carmine, non ego paucis
Offendar maculis, quos aut incuria fudit,
Aut humana parum cavit natura (w).

(w) Horat. de
Art. Poet. vers.
354.

*If num'rous graces shine in what he writes,
I'll not condemn tho' some few faults appear,
Which common frailty leaves, or want of care.*

CREECH.

Especially we forgive the faults, though numerous, of those who are the authors of large Dictionaries; and this maxim is particularly to be urged on their behalf,

Opere in longo fas est obrepere somnum (x);

(x) Id. lib. vii.
360.

*Yet if the work be long, sleep may surprise,
And a short nod creep o'er the watchful'st eyes.*

CREECH.

and in confidence of this I shall be the less scrupulous to criticise them, for I should be very sorry to lessen the regard which they deserve. The public is very much indebted to them for the instructions they have given with the sweat of their brows, and with the most oppressive toil that can be undergone in the productions of the pen. I refer my reader to Mr Morus's preface already cited, where he shews that the faults of Scaliger, Salmasius, and Baronius, ought not to deprive them of the glory they have obtained. You see, Sir, the nature of my excuses: I do not design to injure the merit of authors, nor to depart from the rules of civility towards them; and I have so good an opinion of their modesty, and their zeal for the instruction of the public, that I do not believe they will resent the liberty I shall take to shew wherein they have been mistaken. Most commonly I shall not be the discoverer of their faults, but only the relater of what others have said. I scrupulously take care never to appropriate to my self what I borrow from other hands; so that the reader may be assured, that when I note a fault without citing any author who observed it, I knew not of its being ever made public. After all, I do not think I ought to shew a greater indulgence to other authors than to my self, and it will appear that I do not spare my own faults. In fine, it ought to be considered that the interest of the public must be regarded before that of private persons; and that an author deserves no complaisance, who is so unjust as to chuse rather that his faults should be concealed, than the public undeceived. 'Nimis
' perversè se ipsum amat qui & alios vult errare ut error suus lateat: quanto enim me-
' lius & utilius, ut ubi ipse erravit, alii non errent quorum admontui errore careat:
' quod si noluerit, saltem comites erroris non habeat (y). - - - A man must have an
' excessive degree of self love, who, in order to conceal his error, desires that other people
' should err as well as himself: Is it not much better, and more useful to warn other men not
' to fall into the error which he has committed, and by thus warning them, to remove his
' error? But if he does not incline to take such a course, let him at least be contented with
' erring by himself.'

I know

I know not whether it proceeds from my judging of other men by my self; but methinks those authors whose mistakes I shall relate civilly, will not be offended at it. For this reason I mention some faults which concern persons for whom I have a very great esteem, and who honour me with their friendship. Those whom I shall spare will have some reason to complain, because it will be a sign that I think them incapable of hearkening to reason, or unable to bear the smallest loss. This last motive is not always absolutely to be rejected: for if there are any authors whose faults ought to be concealed, they are chiefly those poor ones whom we could quickly strip to their shirts, should we fall upon them; and if there be others whose faults ought to be discovered, they are principally the great and famous ones, since, besides that their errors are infinitely more contagious than those of indifferent authors, they have such ample funds of reputation and treasures of fame, that an hundred shipwrecks could not hurt them. These words of Juvenal may be applied to them for their comfort:

(a) Juv. Sat.
XIII, ver. 6.

Non
Tam tenuis census tibi contigit ut mediocris
Jacturæ te mergat onus (z).

But more Corvinus, thy estate can bear
A greater loss, and not implore thy care:
Thy stock's sufficient, and thy wealth too great
To feel the damage of a petty cheat.

DRYDEN.

For this reason there are few who retract with less reluctance (a a), or bear censure with a better grace, than those who have most justly obtained the title of great authors (b b). Prepare, Sir, to see your self in this Dictionary, if any mistake has escaped you; but I have no hopes of being able to give you this proof of my good opinion of you. You are too exact and penetrating, not to exclude all sorts of falsehood from your writings; and besides, you are so deeply skilled in the Greek and Roman antiquities, that you have taken nothing from them but what is rare and curious; so that a man ought to be I know not how much more learned than I am, in order to discover whether you have erred or not. If these answers are not satisfactory, I add on one hand, that the instruction of the public well deserves I should sacrifice my self to the ill humour of some private men; and on the other, that I shall give but too much occasion to the authors I censure to revenge themselves. I heartily consent to a retaliation either from themselves or their posterity. I will take it as a kindness done me to correct my writings, and to furnish me with better light; and I beseech this favour of all my readers. I will endeavour not to commit faults, but am very certain I shall commit but too many. The complaint therefore will not lie against me, which is urged against those critics who print nothing for fear of reprisals [C].

(a a) A futuris
se deceptum esse
Hippocrates me-
morie tradidit,
more scilicet
magnum viro-
rum & fiduciam
magorum rerum
habentium. Nam
levia ingenia
quia nihil ha-
bent, nihil libi
detrahunt.

Magna ingenio
multaque subilo-
minus habituro
convenit etiam
simplex veri erro-
ris confessio. . . .
Hippocrates habet
revelat that he
was deceived by
the futures (in
the scull). This
was acting like a
great man, whose
reputation could
not be hurt by a
few mistakes.
For men of su-
perficial parts
have nothing to
lose, as they pos-
sess but little.

But it becomes a
great genius,
who, without
standing his
faults, will still
have a great
stock of fame, to
make a plain and
ingenious con-
fession of his error.
Celsus de Me-
dic. lib. viii,
cap. iv. See al-
so Quintil. lib.
iii, cap. vi.

(b b) Nulli pa-
tius reprehendi-
duntur, quam
qui maxime lau-
dari merentur.
Plin. Epist. xx,
lib. vii.

In

[C] The complaint against those Critics who print nothing for fear of reprisals.] Regnier in his ninth satire, calls upon his censors to publish something.

Marcial had thoughts of this nature before in his xciiid epigram of the first book.

Cum tua non edas, carpis mea carmina, Læli:
Carpere vel noli nostra, vel ede tua.

Qu'ils fassent un ouvrage,
Riche d'inventions, de sens, & de langage,
Que nous puissions draper comme ils font nos écrits,
Et voir, comme l'on dit, s'ils sont si bien appris,
Qu'ils montrent de leur eau, qu'ils entrent en car-
rière.

Lælius either cease to criticise my poems, or publish your own.

And he saith in the lxvth epigram of the xliith book,

Corruptit fine talione celebs:
Cæcus perdere non potest quod aufert.

Let our censurers publish a work of theirs, rich in inven-
tion, sense, and language; which we may criticise, as
they do our writings, and may see if they can write so well
as they criticise; let them give a specimen of their per-
formances, and enter the lists with us.

The bachelor, who debauches a married woman, is no
more liable to retaliation, than a blind man is liable to
lose his sight.

To which he applies the Italian story.

See Mr Saldennus, pag. 44 & 419, of the treatise de
libris variorum eorum usque & abusu.

Qu'une fois un paissant,
Homme fort entendu, & suffisant de teste,
Comme on peut aisément juger par sa requeste,
S'en vint trouver le Pape & le voulut prier,
Que les Prestres du temps se pussent marier,
Afin, ce disoit-il, que nous puissions nous autres
Leurs femmes caresser ainsi qu'ils font les nôtres.

You will find a supplement to this in the article A-
RISTARCHUS (3). I have observed in another
place, that those readers who never write, are ve-
ry often more rigid and unjust in their censures, than
those who know by experience the pains of composi-
tion. I think I may say there are two things which
hinder the universal and unmerciful Critics from shew-
ing themselves in print. One is, the fear that every body
should fall upon their works, and make them suffer the
punishment of retaliation without mercy: the other that
they themselves perceive that they come not up to the
idea of perfection which was the rule of their censures. It
is easier to imagine an high perfection than to find it; and it
is the fate of most Critics to be able to find faults, and
not be able to do better (4): they do not seem to have the
faculty

(3) ARISTAR-
CHUS the
Grammarian,
remark [C].

Once on a time a Peasant, who, as you may easily judge
by his request, was a very knowing man, came to the
Pope, and begged his holiness would suffer the priests to
marry, that we laymen, said he, may caress their wives,
as well as they caress ours.

(4) Compare
what is above,
in the remark
[C], of the ar-
ticle ZEUXIS.

VII.
2. That it
will censure
little faults.

In the second place it will be thought very strange that I amuse my self with censuring little matters, where the want of exactness is almost imperceptible. I have my reasons for this, Sir: I well foresaw what would be said of it, and that the *minutissimum rerum minutissimus sciscitator* ----- a minute examiner of minute affairs, would be applied to me; nevertheless I have considered that these galleries were to be despised, and that even the least faults were to be observed; for the more we criticise things with reason, the more we shew how difficult it is to be perfectly exact. Now, by carrying the idea of perfect exactness so high, we oblige authors to be the more upon their guard, and to examine every thing with the utmost circumspection. Man is but too much accustomed to fall short of the rules set before him (cc); we must therefore strain them to as high a pitch as possible, if we would have him come near the point of perfection. And moreover, since this book may be serviceable to those who will compose a correct Historical Dictionary, a work which is very much wanted, I ought to descend into particulars with some kind of nicety, nay, if they will, with some captiousness. It is not out of inclination, but choice, that I insist upon trifles, and I ought to be thanked for it, since it is in some manner a sacrificing one's self to the good of others (dd). It is taking a road which does not lead to praise, to bring others to a just accuracy; and is not this a considerable sacrifice? There are not many people who would make the like, I appeal to Quintilian. 'Sive contemnentes tanquam parva quæ prius discimus studia seu, quod proximum vero, nullam ingenii sperantes gratiam circa res etiam si necessarias, procul tamen ab ostentatione positas' (ee). ----- *Whether this happens because we look down upon our early studies, as little and puerile; or, which is more likely, because we do not hope to be praised for our parts, when we employ them in studies, which, though necessary, yet are far from having a splendid and showy appearance.*

(cc) Compare with this what has been said above, in remark [F], of the Dissertation concerning Defamatory Libels.

(dd) See, above in remark [B], of the article ANTESIGNATUS, what Erasmus has said of the laborious task of compiling Dictionaries.

(ee) Quint. lib. i, in Proæm.

I shall say something hereafter, that may serve as a supplement to the discussion of this second difficulty. (ff) Lib. x, 43.

VIII.
3. That it will
contain useless
discussions.

In the third place, I may be charged with giving my self an useless trouble: for what is it to us, will they say, to know whether one Cassius Longinus has been mistaken for another; whether he was capitally punished, or only banished? Truly the public is very much concerned for this! What matters it whether Scaliger was angry or not angry with Erasmus for calling him a soldier? and so of the rest. To this, I have a thousand things to answer; and from the multitude of thoughts which now offer themselves to my mind, I could make a long dissertation upon this subject, which would perhaps be tolerable: but as it is time to conclude, I reduce my self to a few notes; the rest may appear at another and more seasonable time, or perhaps is unnecessary, since every one may easily find it, either by his own meditation or in books.

(gg) By this word I do not mean that every body is pleased with the same confutations, but that some are pleased with one just, and others with another.

(hh) If it is not necessary to know them, whether it is necessary to be ignorant of them. Scaliger, at the beginning of his notes on Catullus, has this saying, Et cæcidit lectus, hoc epigrammate poetaster carere potest, habet tamen quod se scire melius fuit quam ignorare.

----- Though, candid reader, thou mightest well be wroth that this epigram, yet it contains certain things, which is better than shouldst know them to be ignorant of. See the News from the Republic of Letters, in the advertisement of August 1684. Lipsius was curious of truth, even in the least things: Ab mirabilis Lipsii alicubi sit lectore etiam in minimis vix scire. Epistolæ Hoffm. ad Beningham, p. 120.

I say then, Sir, that this objection, which might perhaps be a solid one, absolutely speaking, and without respect to time and place, is of no force when referred to the age and the part of the world we live in. If men were perfectly reasonable, they would employ themselves wholly in the care of their eternal salvation; one thing alone would be necessary, as our Saviour told Martha, *Porro unum est necessarium* (ff), who knows not also the good and wife maxim, *nature is content with a little*? Who can doubt but that if we contained our selves within the bounds of natural necessity, we must abolish almost all the arts as things superfluous? But man can be no longer treated upon that foot; it has been time out of mind his practice to seek the conveniences of life, and all sorts of pleasures and delights. Among other unnecessary things, about which the Europeans have been pleased to employ themselves, they desired to understand the Greek and Latin tongues, or at least to know the matters contained in the books which are extant in those two languages. Nor were they content to know in general what is contained in those books, but they would examine whether every thing in them was certain, and whether they could not clear up those passages where one ancient author contradicts another: and when they have been able to clear these difficulties, and those of all sorts of Histories, they have found it a very agreeable satisfaction, have very much diverted their readers, and procured great encomiums to themselves, though these illustrations were of no use to bring down the price of provisions, or to keep off cold or heat, rain or hail. It ought not therefore to be deemed an impertinent rashness in me to expose, as wares of great value, things which have been rejected by all mankind as useless; for in this I only fall in with the taste which I find has long prevailed, and is fully established. Whether men be in the right or the wrong to be pleased that they are not in an error upon any point of Geography, Chronology, or History, is nothing to me: I am in no wise answerable for that; it is sufficient for my purpose, that the public (gg) desireth exactly to know all the falsehoods that are current, and values these discoveries (bb).

Let

(f) Vigneul-Marville, Mélanges d'Hist. & de Littérature, Tom. iii, pag. 181, Rouen, Edit. 1701.

faculty of speaking or writing, they are so dry and barren to all the folds and corners of a work, had the prudence to publish nothing of his own, and that the few things of his which came out are not very considerable.

(g) The author of this judgment observes, That Mr. Cornart, who had an excellent judgment and delicate taste, and whose criticisms were just, and penetrating in

Let it not be said that our age, being cured of that critical taste which reigned in the preceding, looks upon the writings of those who correct falsities, concerning either the particular History of great men, or the names of cities, or the like, as mere pedantry; for it is certain, when all things are considered, that men were never more devoted than they are at this day to such sorts of illustrations. For one experimental Philosopher, for one Mathematician, you find an hundred men who thoroughly study History with all its dependencies; and antiquarian science, I mean the study of medals, inscriptions, basso relievo's, &c. was never cultivated as it is at present. To what does it tend? To the better fixing the time when certain particular facts happened; to prevent one town or person from being mistaken for another; to corroborate the conjectures which have been made upon certain rites of the ancients; and to an hundred other curiosities which the public has nothing to do with, according to the supercilious maxims upon which this third difficulty is grounded; maxims that have not discouraged a great man (ii), as consummate in the affairs of state as in the study of the *Belles Lettres*, from publishing a large book upon the excellence and usefulness of medals.

(ii) *The Baron de Spaur.*

You, Sir, of all men living are most convinced of the impertinence of these maxims; they tend to nothing less than the ruin of all the liberal arts, and almost of all the sciences which chiefly polish and exalt the mind of man (jj). According to these fine reasonings, we should have nothing left but the use of Mechanical arts, and as much Geometry as is necessary to perfect Navigation, Carriages, Agriculture, and the Fortification of Towns. For Professors, we should have scarce any, but Engineers to invent only new ways of destroying mankind. It must be owned the public has a very great interest in all these things, since by these means we may commodiously store our towns with plenty, and maintain an offensive or defensive war. But it must be owned on the other hand, with Cicero's leave (kk), that all the beauties of painting, sculpture, and architecture, serve only to please the eyes, and to give an agreeable admiration to good judges. The coarse productions of all those arts serve to satisfy the necessities of men; a man may be safely and commodiously lodged without the help of the Corinthian or the Composite order, without friezes, cornices, and architraves. Much less is it necessary for the conveniences of life, to know all that is said either of the incommensurability of the Asymptotes, or of Magical Squares, or the Duplication of the Cube, &c. The Turks in the midst of their gross ignorance, are no less robust, and spend no less merrily ten thousand livres a year, when they have them, than the Christians; and that Governour of Neuhaufel, who after the raising of the siege of Vienna complained of the perfidy of the French, who had given the King of Poland passage through their country (ll), enjoyed the authority of his post as agreeably as if he had been better skilled in History and Geography. So that if a man was allowed to despise a work which treats not *de pane lucrando* - - - of earning one's bread, or is of no use *πρὸς τὰ ἀλφίτα*, for getting victuals, as your good friends the ancient Greeks said, or in short when the public may do without it, there are few books but would be contemptible, and deserve the blunt saying you have doubtless read in the life of Malherbe. Mr de Meziriac, attended with two or three of his friends, brought him his commentary on Diophantus; those friends greatly praised this book, as very useful to the public: Malherbe asked them whether it would bring down the price of bread? Another time he approved the giving recompences to those only who served the King in his armies and public affairs; and he said that a good Poet was no more useful to the state than a good player at nine-pins.

(jj) *See the News from the Republic of Letters, September 1684, Art. iv.*

(kk) *He endeavours in book iii, de Oratore, to prove this position, In plerisque rebus incredibiliter hoc natura est ipsa fabricata, ut ea quæ maximam utilitatem in se continerent eadem haberent plurimum vel dignitatis vel sæpè etiam venustatis.*

- - - *Nature itself has wonderfully contrived that most of those things, which are of the greatest usefulness, should likewise have in them very much dignity, and also frequently, very much comeliness and beauty.*

(ll) *Du Vignau, l'Etat présent de la Puissance Ottomane, pag. 177, Hague edition 1688.*

It must therefore be granted me, that there are a great many productions of the mind of man, which are esteemed, not because they are necessary, but because they divert us: and since it is so, is it not proper to observe the falsities of authors, when there are so many men who delight to know the truth, even in things wherein their fortune is not in the least concerned?

Is it not certain that a Shoemaker, a Miller, a Gardener, are infinitely more necessary to the society, than the ablest Painters or Statuaries; than a Michael Angelo, or a Cavalier Bernini? Is it not true that the meanest Bricklayer is more necessary in a town, than the most excellent Chronologer or Astronomer; than a Joseph Scaliger, or a Copernicus? And yet the works of these great men which the world might well enough dispense with, are infinitely more valued than the absolutely necessary productions of these trades. Plus interfuit Reipub. Castellum capi Ligurum quàm bene defendi causam M. Curii. Credo, sed Atheniensium quoque plus interfuit firma tecta in domiciis habere, quàm Minervæ signum ex ebore pulcherrimum: tamen ego me Phidiam esse mallem quam vel optimum fabrum lignarium; quare non quantum quicque profit, sed quanti quisque sit ponderandum est: præsertim cum pauci pingere egregie possint aut fingere, operarii autem aut bajuli deesse non possint (mm). - - - It was more beneficial to the commonwealth that the sort of the Ligurians should be taken, than the cause of M. Curius should be well defended. I believe it, but it was likewise more beneficial to the Athenians to have well built houses, than to have the beautiful ivory statue of Minerva. But I would rather be Phidias, than the best Carpenter in the world: so that we are to consider, not how beneficial every man is, but what real merit he has: especially

(mm) Cicero, in Bruto.

V O L. V.

9 P

'since few men are excellent Painters or Statuaries, whereas there are always workmen and porters abundance.' So true it is, that there are things whose worth and value is determined only with respect to an honest diversion, or a mere ornament of the mind.

IX.
The same reasons which prove the usefulness of other sciences, prove the usefulness of critical learning.

Here, Sir, you will not fail to foresee that the enemies to the *Belles Lettres* will invent an hundred exceptions. As they cannot deny that their maxims tend to revive barbarism in all respects, they will expatiate on the usefulness arising from certain sciences. But they will get nothing by it; for as soon as they place in the number of things useful, such as have an utility either by *result* or *emanation* (permit me to use this old school distinction, since it so well comprehends both those kinds of accessory utilities, which may here be alleged (*nn*),) they will find themselves obliged to bring in the *Belles Lettres* and Critical learning. I can retort all their observations against them. Here is a small specimen of it.

If they tell me that the most abstract theorems of Algebra are very useful to life, because they render the mind of man more capable of perfecting certain arts: I may also say that a scrupulous enquiry into all Historical facts, is capable of producing very great advantages. I dare affirm, that the ridiculous obstinacy of the first Critics, who lavished their time upon trifles, for example, upon the question whether we ought to say *Virgilius* or *Vergilius*, has by accident been of great use; they thereby inspired men with an extreme veneration for Antiquity; they disposed them to a sedulous enquiry into the conduct of antient Greece and of antient Rome, and thus gave occasion to their improving by those great examples. And what effect, Sir, do you think, would not a grave and majestic sentence, taken from Livy or Tacitus, and uttered as having heretofore inclined the Roman Senate to one side of a question, have upon hearers thus disposed (*oo*)? I will not scruple to say that it is capable of saving a nation, and perhaps has saved more than one. The President of an assembly pronounces those Latin words with an emphasis; he makes an impression upon their minds by the respect they have for the Roman name; every one goes home convinced, and infuses into his neighbours the sentiments of obedience; and thus you see a civil war stifled in its birth. Malherbe had no notion of this when he said, that a Poet is no more useful to a nation than a good player at nine-pins: for, not to descend to all the good things a Poet can effect (*pp*), do not you think, Sir, that one of the topping men of a parish has often by a stanza of Pibrac emphatically pronounced, happily destroyed all the contrivances of a factious declaimer? And in domestic affairs, do you think that those golden sentences recommended by Moliere (*qq*) are always ineffectual? I believe they are often so, but not always; and I do not think that Horace, in the verses I here cite, spoke only of an imaginary profit.

(nn) Here I erect a greater Ladder to this Distinction than the schools.

(oo) Compare with this Seneca's *scitibus opibus*. I have cited above some part of it in remark [B], of the article ARISTO.

(pp) Horat. Epist. I, lib. II, reckons them up. See, below, citation (*rr*).

(qq) Moliere, *Comédie de l'École des Imaginaires*.

Os tenerum pueri balbumque poeta figurat:
Torquet ab obscenis jam nunc sermonibus aurem;
Mox etiam pectus præceptis format amicis:
Asperitatis, & invidiæ corrector & iræ (*rr*).

(rr) Horat. Epist. I, lib. II, ver. 124.

They teach our boys to hate all words obscene,
To follow generous rules, and speak like men,
And then slide gently down with virtuous rules
Into the tender breast, and form their souls;
Restrain their envy, and correct their rage,
Tell them what's good, instruct their tender age
With fit examples, and their griefs assuage.

}

CREECH.

It will be said, perhaps, that what seems the most abstracted and unfruitful in Mathematics, brings at least this advantage, that it leads us to undoubted truths; whereas Historical discussions, and enquiries after human actions, leave us always in the dark, and always some seeds of new disputes. But how imprudent it is to harp upon this string! I maintain that Historical truths may be carried to a greater degree of certainty than what Geometrical truths are brought to, provided we consider these two sorts of truths in the kind of certainty peculiar to them. I explain myself. In the disputes that arise betwixt Historians, to know whether a certain Prince has reigned before or after another; it is supposed on both sides that a fact has all the reality and existence of which it is capable out of our understanding, provided it be not of the nature of those related by Ariosto and other fabulous authors; and no regard is had to the difficulties alleged by the Sceptics, to make it doubtful whether the things which seem to exist do really exist out of our minds. Thus an Historical fact is placed in the highest degree of certainty that can belong to it, when once we have been able to prove its apparent existence: for no more is required for this sort of truths; and it were denying the common principle of disputants, and going from one kind of things to another, to bid us prove not only that it appeared to all Europe that a bloody battle was fought at Senef in the year 1674; but also that the objects are such *ad extra* - - out of our understanding as they appear to us to be. Thus we are delivered from the importunate cavils which the Sceptics

X.

Sceptics call *reasons for suspending our assent*; and though Historical Scepticism cannot be rejected in a great many facts, it is certain there are several others which we can prove with a full certainty; so that Historical enquiries are not fruitless in that respect. We certainly shew the falsity of several things, the uncertainty of several others, and the truth of several others: and thus you have some demonstrations which may be of use to many more people than Geometrical ones; for few people have a taste for these, or find occasion to apply them to the reformation of manners: but it will be confessed, Sir, that a great many people may profit, morally speaking, by the reading of a collection of Historical falsehoods, well proved to be falsehoods, though it were only by growing more circumspect in judging of other men, and more capable of avoiding the snares which satire and flattery lay on all sides for the unwary reader. Now, is it of no use to correct the bad inclination we have to make rash judgments? Is it of no use to learn not to believe lightly what we see in print? Is it not the very nerve and sinew of prudence not to believe hastily? *Νῦν καὶ μέντοι ἀπιστεῖν ἄρχει τὰν φησὶν.* Sobrius esto atque illud teneto nervos atque artus esse sapientiae non temere credere (ss). (ss) Epicharmus, apud Ciceronem, Polyblum, Lucianum, &c.

In vain should we seek for these moral advantages in the most refined books of Algebra. Besides, by the leave of the Mathematicians, it is not so easy for them to arrive at that certainty which is necessary in the Mathematics, as it is for Historians to arrive at that certainty which is sufficient in History. No solid objection will ever be made against this truth of fact, that Caesar vanquished Pompey; and whatever principles we dispute upon, nothing will stand more immovably than this proposition, *Caesar and Pompey have existed, and were not a mere modification of the minds of those who wrote their lives.* But as for the object of Mathematics, it is not only very hard to prove that it exists out of our mind, but it is very easy to prove that it can be nothing but an idea of our mind (tt). And indeed the existence of a square circle without us, seems not much more impossible, than the existence of the circle of which Geometry gives us so many fine demonstrations; I mean, of a circle from the circumference of which, to its centre, as many straight lines may be drawn as there are points in that circumference. It is manifest, that the centre, which is but one point, cannot be the common subject where there terminate as many different lines as there are points in the circumference. In a word, the object of Mathematics being points absolutely indivisible, lines without breadth or depth, and surfaces without depth; it is evident that this object cannot exist out of our imagination. Thus it is metaphysically more certain that Cicero has had a being out of the understanding of any other man, than it is certain that the object of Mathematics exists out of our understanding. I omit what the learned Huetius (uu) has represented to these gentlemen, to teach them not so much to undervalue Historical truths.

The abstracted depths of Mathematics, it may be said, give us sublime ideas of the infinity of God. Be it so: But do you think that a great moral good may not result from a Critical Dictionary? The infallible Oracle affirms, that science puffeth up; and therefore there is no case wherein it is more important to humble the pride of man than in this. He who mentions pride mentions the fault which is the most remote from true virtue, and the most diametrically opposite to the spirit of the gospel. Now what could be imagined more proper to give man a true notion of the emptiness and vanity of the sciences, and of the weakness of his understanding, than to shew him the numberless false facts with which books abound. A great many men of letters, the most penetrating and sublime wits, have made it their business for many years to illustrate Antiquity. That task of the Critics having the actions of men for its object, should be more easy than that of the Philosophers, which has the actions of God for its object, and yet the Critics have given so many proofs of human infirmity, that one may compose large volumes of their falsehoods. These volumes may therefore mortify man with respect to his greatest vanity, I mean his knowledge or science. There are so many trophies or triumphal arches erected to human ignorance and infirmity.

Hence you see, Sir, that the smallest falsities will here have their use, since by the very collection of numerous lies upon every subject, man will be the better taught to know his weakness, and see the prodigious variety his errors are capable of. This will make him more sensible that he is the sport of malice and ignorance; that one seizes him when the other leaves him; that if he be intelligent enough to know a lie, he is wicked enough to vent it against his conscience; or if he is not wicked to this pitch of propagating falsehood, he is blind enough not to discern the truth. For my own part, when I think that perhaps I shall make it my serious employment for all my life to gather materials for this kind of triumphal arches, I find myself thoroughly penetrated with the conviction of my nothingness. This will be a continual lesson to me of self-contempt. No sermon, no note of the Ecclesiastes, or Preacher, by way of excellency, could more firmly rivet in me this grand maxim (ww), *I have seen all the works that are done under the sun, AND BEHOLD ALL IS VANITY AND VEXATION OF SPIRIT* (xx). You see how conceited I am of my own work: I shall think worse

(ss) Epicharmus, apud Ciceronem, Polyblum, Lucianum, &c.

(tt) See, above, the article of ZENO, the Epicurean Philosopher, remark [D], towards the end.

(uu) Prefat. Demonstrat. Evangel.

(ww) Ecclesiastes 1: 14.

(xx) Compare with this what is said by Pliny in the *Maximæ, Memor. Tom. iii. pag. 206, & seq. and pag. ult. edition of Rousset of 1701.*

of it than any body else, and I esteem that circumstance more than all the rest.

I was going to finish with this moral reflexion, when I remembered I had not intimated that I shall use the same liberty and civility towards all authors, of whatever nation or religions they may be; I therefore declare it here. Nothing is more ridiculous than a Dictionary where the author turns Controversialist. This is one of the greatest faults of Moreri's Dictionary: we find in it an hundred places that seem to be taken from a true crusade sermon. For my part, I shall not say with Hannibal, *Hofem qui feriet mibi erit Carthaginienfis, quisquis erit (yy) Civis (zz): - - - I shall look upon him, whoever he be, who slays an enemy, as a citizen of Carthage*: but rather that all those who depart from truth shall be equally strangers to me. You know some people who will complain of this, but who will rejoice at it in the bottom of their soul, because it will furnish them with pretexts for slander, and for playing the zealots, two things which in these persons always go together. But though there are not many civilities that pass between us, I shall go on my usual way, let them say what they will, and shall not envy them the bones they may find to pick in it. Here is the reason of my proceeding after this manner.

As this Dictionary does not concern errors in reasoning, partiality in it would be incomparably more inexcusable than in Historical Dictionaries; for a man is obliged in these to relate a thousand things which are true in the judgment of some, and false in that of others: he ought therefore to suppose a great difference of principles in readers, and to imagine that in the hands of some he will be in an enemy's country, and in the hands of others among friends; and for that reason it is just he should proportion his style and way of deciding accordingly. But when a man only proposes to collect errors of fact, he reasonably supposes that all his readers have the same principles, and that there is no man but will admit as false what he shews to be so: for the proofs of a falsity in fact are not the prejudices of a particular nation or particular religion, but maxims common to all men. You hereby see, Sir, that Philosophical or Theological falsities enter not into the plan of my work: however it is true that books wherein they are discussed might furnish out a kind of falsities in fact, which would not perhaps be the less useful to the reader.

It most commonly happens that disputes in writing upon any point of doctrine degenerate into personal altercations, and for the most part turn only upon the question, whether an adversary's passage has been well or ill cited, well or ill interpreted. Here the public abandons the disputants, and, as was not long since said by a man of wit, the antagonists are obliged to part for want of readers or Bookfellers. If any body had patience enough to make an analysis of these personal quarrels, he would have a great many faults within the province of this Dictionary, many false citations, or false interpretations. Now these are errors in fact. You will own, Sir, there could be no Logic comparable to this, to teach the justness of reasoning; besides this great moral advantage, that we should at the same time discover a great many frauds, or at least the imperfections of our souls; for what proceeds not from insincerity, must arise from dimness or weakness of mind.

It is a misfortune that frauds of this kind should go unpunished so much as they do, by the little care that readers take to compare the answers and replies together. But if any one took the pains to describe in a few words the progress of a dispute, he would bring to light all the windings and turnings of the caviller, and make them detested.

Pardon me, Sir, so long an Epistle Dedicatory, and make haste to enrich the Republic of Letters with the learned works they expect from you. Your modesty and our friendship forbid me to praise them: but I could gladly wish the public might soon give you the praises you will receive when they shall appear. I am with the greatest attachment

S I R,

Your most humble and most obedient servant,

May 5, 1692.

Note, that in the composing of this Dictionary I have not followed all the ideas of this Plan. The deference I had to the advices I received from some intelligent readers made me follow another method in certain matters.

REMARKS

R E M A R K S

O N

A P A M P H L E T

I N T I T U L E D,

The judgment of the public, and particularly of the Abbot Renaudot, on Mr Bayle's Critical Dictionary.

MY principal design in this piece is to acquaint the public, that I am preparing a defence, which to every unprejudiced reader will demonstrate the injustice of my censurers. But that Apology not deserving the fate of loose sheets, which commonly do not outlive the week in which they first appear, I keep it to be placed at the beginning or end of a book *in folio* (1). For the same reason I refer to it almost every thing considerable that may be said against the pamphlet which is just published. Here I confine myself to a few observations made in haste and negligently. It would be prodigal in a writer to bestow ornament and stile on a piece, like this, of seven or eight pages.

(1) That Apology was placed at the end of the second edition of the Critical Dictionary, and contains the IV Explanations which follow these Remarks

I. That libel has a very improper title: it ought to be intitled, *The judgment of the Abbot Renaudot commented upon by the publisher*; for all the other judges are less than phantoms: they are invisible beings, no body knows whether they are black or white. Therefore their evidence and a cypher are of the same value. I except the agents of the States of Holland; but upon this point, I beg the reader to take notice of what I shall mention hereafter of Tertullian.

II. What manner of proceeding is this! to make the judgment of the public consist in such pieces. I could produce a great many much stronger in my favour, if modesty would permit. And besides, how many letters could I produce, wherein my adversary is represented both as a bad writer, and a bad man. But God forbid that I should imitate him in the use he makes of what people write one to another in confidence. This is a conduct detested by the Heathens themselves. What kind of people have we here? One writes what he pretends to have heard a Bishop say, and the other publishes it to the world. Neither asks his permission. They name him without it. Can any thing be more audacious? And is not this tyrannizing over conversation, more than ever Phalaris did over the people?

III. The author of this pretended Judgment of the Public has not been very wise in the choice he has made. He conceals the names of all his witnesses, except one whom he ought chiefly to have concealed, a name odious and despised in all the countries which are at war with France. I will not take advantage of the prepossession of the public: I will not consider him with regard to his Gazette, which every where discredits him, as a man who has got a habit of giving a malicious turn to lies. I will consider him on his fair side. The Abbot Renaudot has the character of a very learned man, and of having a taste so delicate, that nothing can please him. We can therefore conclude nothing from his contempt of any thing: It is an equivocal proof. I have been told likewise that he is exceedingly devout. We must not therefore be surprized that he finds some things too free, which at bottom do not go beyond the liberties an honest man may allow himself, after the examples of so many great authors. Can a severe Moralist, Tertullian for instance, find in the house of a gentleman, any thing remote enough from luxury? It is no matter though the public be charmed with the good order observed in it. Let the mistress of the house go to plays and balls but now and then: let her engage in gaming only upon certain occasions. Let the world applaud the modesty of her dress and conversation. Tertullian, notwithstanding, exclaims that she is immodest; she shows too much her breast and her arms; she wears ribbons, and dances, and rallies sometimes. And this is enough to damn her. It is not by the taste of such a censor that we are to judge whether the commentary of a layman on the History of particular persons be not sometimes in too worldly a dress; for by following such a taste, though conformable to the rigorous laws of the gospel, we must

V O L. V.

9 Q

must

must banish all romances, and a great many other books which the civil laws authorize, and must compose works of piety only. It may be said that some persons, who are not *Rigorists*, find in my Dictionary a few gayeties somewhat too strong. But the Apology I am preparing, will, I hope, give full satisfaction on that head. I should make another Apology for what Abbot Renaudot calls *Impieties*; but as I know not upon what the accusation is grounded, I shall defer it till I am better informed. I have declared on all occasions, and I do here publicly declare, that if there are any heterodox opinions in my work, I am the first who will detest them, and that I will throw them out in my second edition. I only want to have them pointed out to me. As to the article of DAVID, the Abbé is much in the wrong to say that I have there shewn no respect for the Scripture: since the explanation I have joined to it, is full of a most respectful submission to that divine book. For this I appeal to all my readers. I add that in the way I propose to revise that article, it will furnish my censurers with no further pretence of declamation. After all, will any of them be so bold as to say that my Dictionary comes near the licentiousness of Montagne's Essays, either with regard to Scepticism, or obscenities? But did not Montagne publish several editions of his book, without being called to an account for it? Has it not been printed a hundred times over? Was it not dedicated to the great Cardinal de Richelieu? Has it not a place in every library? What a hardship and injustice would it be; if I was denied that liberty in Holland, which Montagne enjoyed in France?

IV. If ever I answer Abbot Renaudot's judgment, it will only be after being assured that he owns it to be his, such as it is printed: for it is so full of blunders, falsehoods, and impertinences, that I imagine it not to be agreeable to the original: some spurious things have perhaps been foisted into it in copying. He had prejudiced a great many people: but some judicious men having read my Dictionary, quickly put an end to that prejudice. The Abbot himself is not ignorant of this: for he says in one of his letters *that I ought to be satisfied with the approbation of so many people*. And so I am. People were surprized to find so many idle things in his report. The only question was whether my book contained any thing which could offend the Church of Rome, or France. They did not ask him whether I had read the best authors, or whether I equal the Moderns with the Antients. If several of my readers have contradicted him with respect to my ignorance, I disown them. He has not said enough on that head; I know a great deal more of it, and if he has a mind to draw my picture in that light, I will furnish him with a good many memoirs. But I beg leave to tell him that he has not well chosen his proofs of my incapacity; for example, when he would prove it by my translating *Librarii, Booksellers*, he censures me most unjustly, since in a marginal note I have apprized the reader that by *Librarii*, must be understood the *Transcribers and Bookbinders, according to the custom of fitting up books at that time* (2). I did therefore understand the thing as it ought to be understood. I do not impute to him the impertinence of the marginal note which is made on this passage of his report, published in this town. That must be laid to the charge of the publisher*.

(2) See citation (38), in the article *ATTICUS*.

* Mr Jurieu's marginal note ran thus. *This word (Librarii) signifies what weighs a pound; Libraria frustris; pieces weighing a pound. R. M. CAIT.*

V. He has published the Abbot's paper with little judgment, for it fully proves the untruth of those accusations, which he has so often trumpeted out against me, of my holding a correspondence with the court of France. A chimera which no man but himself could have devised: and for this he would have made reparation to the public at the end of this piece, which he has printed, and which so fully justifies my innocence, if it was possible for him to act the part of an honest man. But on this head he is profoundly silent, and has only laboured to throw a rank poison upon what I advanced in favour of the Protestants, and against the Church of Rome. Sure he must be an enemy to the edification of his neighbours, since he deprives the Protestants of that which Abbé Renaudot's judgment affords them; and in order to do so, copies himself twenty times over, repeating calumnies frequently detected, and which he never supported but by heaping falsehoods upon falsehoods, as it appears by the long catalogues of them, which were publicly pointed out to him.

VI. I shall take a little notice of his reflexions. In these he only gives a loose to spleen and passion: they are either rambling judgments, the fallacies of which an intelligent reader will perceive of himself, or calumnies refuted a hundred times, or new lies which do not deserve to be refuted, or which shall be so on a proper occasion. Upon the whole, after having declaimed so long, it will appear that he himself is confounded by the three examples he produces. He alledges a comparison on the fall of Eve, a passage of St Paul applied to the Abolitionists, and a phrase on the design of Abelard. The first example is an objection which I proposed to the Socinians, and expressed with that caution which the subject required, or an objection which I suppose the Manichees make to the Jesuits. There is not the least profanation in the second, nor any obscenity in the third. This I submit to the judgment of any impartial and intelligent reader, and am willing that he decide it without hearing me. Such is the common fate of declaimers. While they only make general complaints, they gain people over to their side by surprise; but bid them point to a particular passage, and it then appears that they misapprehended the matter, that they mistook for my opinions the consequences

sequences resulting from those Heresies which I attack, and made mountains of mole-hills. This obliges me to give them a charitable word of advice. *Gentlemen, I tell you as a friend, never speak of my Dictionary but before people who have it not; for if it is produced, and you are obliged to prove your assertions, you will be caught. This happens to some of you every day. You have not been artful enough; passion has blinded you, your hyperboles made people expect to find in every page, some abominable things, like those in the Parnasse Satirique, whereas nothing was found in it, but such trifles as are said every day in good company, and such as you yourselves might very well say, either when you take a walk, or are at table with your friends. Give over exaggerating; say rather too little, than too much. Such a way of bursting will not recoil on you.*

VII. We may add to the three examples he quotes what he alledges against the article wherein I recite some passages of a book of Tagereau (3). He could not chuse a worse subject for the ground of his objections; for I shall make it appear on a proper occasion that I was fully authorized to insert in my work, what I have said concerning the congress. As an Historian I might say, that Quellenee was accused of impotence, and that it was his mother-in-law, and not his wife, who commenced that law-suit. Indeed I owed this remark to the memory of an heroine of our party. It became me, as a faithful Historian, to censure those who fully the glory of that lady, by supposing that at so early an age she raised such a law-suit. This is declaring that I do not at all think it reputable in a woman to engage in such proceedings. Every author has a right to declare the reasons of his sentiments. Thus, as a Commentator on my own text, I might and ought to offer the proofs of the opinion which I advanced, and by consequence relate what Tagereau published against the practice of that time. We would appear wiser than our fathers, and we are not so wise as they were. That Advocate of the Parliament of Paris readily obtained a privilege for publishing a book wherein he described all the filthiness of the congress; and shall a clamour be raised in Holland against an author who copies a few passages of that book? Is not this a respect of persons, proceeding either from a very fantastical mind, or a bad heart?

VIII. But it may be said, that author published those particulars only with a view of obliging the judges to put a stop to a custom inconsistent with modesty and liable to iniquitous practices. And do not I declare, even with the greatest indignation, that the custom was infamous, because it weakened the principles of modesty, the most precious source of chastity? Is it possible for a man to take the honest side with greater warmth than I have done in that article.

Besides, had I not, as an Historian, the right to relate a practice which continued long in the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Paris, and which is not yet abolished in any other place. The manner of proceeding in all civil and criminal causes belongs unquestionably to Historical facts, and if there is any thing singular in it, many travellers and many writers of relations are curious to be informed of it. What pleasure would it have been to a Pietro della Valle to find a book in Persia, which would have informed him of an extravagant custom, so well as Tagereau's book might inform him of the ceremonial of the congress. I ask whether the verbal processes of Juries and Matrons, in some cases, are pieces to be rejected by those who would make complete collections of all the uses and customs of a country? Furetiere, who did not write an Historical Dictionary, with comments on it, but only a Grammatical one, made use of these verbal processes. And did any body complain of it?

IX. Let me not dismiss this subject without acquainting our bawlers, copiers, and distributors of extracts of letters, that Dr Menjot, with whom perhaps they were particularly acquainted, and who was a very honest man, has inserted many leud things in his Dissertation on the *Furor Uterinus*, and barrenness. It would be ridiculous to censure him for it, because, as a Physician, he had a right to do so: his subject required, or allowed it. Now I must inform them that a compiler who relates and comments, has all the rights of a Physician, and of an Advocate, &c. as occasion requires, and may use their verbal processes, and their terms of art. If he gives an account of the divorce of Lotharius and Tetberga, he may publish extracts from Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, who wrote the impurities which were averred in that trial. We ought never to censure an Historian Commentator, 'till after being instructed in the laws of History, and the privileges of a commentary. Had these gentlemen read Andrew Tiraquellus's commentary on the laws of matrimony, they would have found in it obscenities in much greater number. Yet he was a Counsellor of the Parliament of Paris, and one of the most illustrious men of the last century, both on account of his knowledge and his virtue.

X. Observe that it becomes no man less than my adversary to declaim against me: he, who in a sermon, which lasted almost two hours, criticized the conduct of the patriarch Jacob; he, whom a Synod censured for having been too free with the dignity of prophecies; he, from whose books a list of profane propositions was extracted, and sent to a Synod: he, who had inserted so many impurities in his answer to Maimbourg, that he was forced to suppress a part of them upon the remonstrances of two magistrates; he, who in a severe criticism on a book of Abbot Dangeau used several licentious expressions;

sions; he, who revived and bought out of a registry-office, the most monstrous obscenities that can be read, and filled a cafe with them; he, whose mystical Theology would pollute the most obdurate imagination; he, in short, who, rejecting the way of authority, avows that the way of inquiry and examination is impracticable. He therefore accuses his own doctrine of Atheism in another person.

XI. Never was romance more fabulous than what he says of the pretended hopes which I founded on my Dictionary. It is false that my friends did before-hand extol it with the triumphant airs he imputes to them. They are too judicious to fall into such a mistake. And for myself, so far was I from expecting any advantage by it, that I said and wrote on a hundred occasions to those who spoke to me of it, that it was only a rhapsody, that there would be a good deal of trash in it; and that the public would be very much disappointed if they looked for any thing better than an irregular compilation; that I was but little able to confine myself, and having the greatest indifference for praise, the fear of being criticized did not hinder me from running full career wherever my fancy guided; that being an author of no consequence, pretending to nothing less than to dogmatize, I gave a loose to my thoughts, such as they were, sometimes one way, sometimes another, being persuaded that no body would read them but by way of amusement, that is, that they would only serve to unbend the mind, tired with the reading of many other things serious, curious, and useful, which I have collected with great patience, but without hoping that the world would mind in my favour that candid maxim, *Ubi plura nitent in carmine, non ego paucis Offendar maculis*, &c. The success was beyond my hopes. A great many critical readers followed that rule. I only began to think the work not so despicable as I had imagined, when I observed how eagerly and how busily some people went about to discredit it, and with what excessive pains the partisans of a cabal, as formidable by its extent as by its credit, wrote one to another letters on that subject, and copied extracts of letters handed about among the whole fraternity, and every where else.

XII. As to the employments which he affirms I expected in the Republic of Letters by means of my Dictionary, I answer that he is as much mistaken in this, as he was in saying that Mr Arnauld had done certain things, in order to recover his benefices. He then received a mortification which ought to have made him more cautious. Had he perused my preface, he would have known my disposition with regard to employments. He may make himself very easy on that head. I never would take any employment, and will have none. My inclinations have been founded many ways, and from different places, during the printing of my work, and they always found that I would not depend on any body, nor part with the full liberty which I enjoyed of disposing of all my time. It is only by his extracts that I am informed of a report which went that a Minister had made an attempt of this kind at Amsterdam. I believe it to be false: but let that be as it will, it was a thing which never entered into my thoughts, and which I would have refused.

XIII. Let us come to the main article, to the favourite, the darling, passage of our censurer, that which chiefly induced him to draw his pen: This was surely his real motive; in short, it is that passage, where, with triumphant airs, he glories in having reduced me to live on the pension of a Bookseller. There cannot be a better picture of his pride: his ambition is so refined and so conspicuous, that it incites him to wish above all things for the latter part of Sylla's epitaph. Soon after he shews a great deal of joy in imagining that *I am completing my own ruin*. This is very ingenuous: It would be very wrong to accuse him of counterfeiting the honest man and the good pastor, never was any man less dextrous in hiding his foible. But what is become of my pensions from the court of France? Have they been stopped? and even if it was so, could a Philosophical life like mine have sunk all that fund? How; no reserve for surety: nothing remaining but the pension of a Bookseller! Very hard indeed. I knew not that my income was so well or so ill computed. A thousand diverting things might be said of him, with regard to his Booksellers: But it would be a pity to place them in this piece, which will as well as his, be thrown aside among the rubbish of libraries in a day or two: Such is the fate of loose sheets.

XIV. He boasts of having done me more harm than any man living, by discovering me to the world. He is surely a very fit person to hurt a man by his accusations. I refer him to the Synodal assembly of the Brill, which declared the same Mr Saurin orthodox, against whom he had written two volumes full of defamation, almost as black as that which he has published against me. He was confident that he should get Mr Saurin deposed, and had long caballed about it. But he had the confusion to see him acquitted. After such a disgrace, any man but my detractor would have hid himself in an hermitage, during the rest of his life. But as for him he has publicly declared that he persisted in his sentiment, notwithstanding the decree of the Synod, and now boasts to have been the accuser. What value ought we to have for his judgment? Would not the man be very simple, who should mind his calumnies?

XV. The

XV. The pleasure of boasting that he had done me a prejudice, was the more agreeable to him, as he expected to make a great advantage of his boasts: for he fancied that what I had written against him in my Dictionary would do him no prejudice, provided the public knew that I was prompted to it by a spirit of revenge. I make two Remarks against his cunning. He is mistaken both in his supposition, and his inference.

I have always believed, and am still persuaded, that he had no share in the suppression of my employment, but as a remote cause. Indeed he was very busy, for two or three years, to bring it about, but had not some persons of his cloth, and of another language, whose enmity he had formerly discovered to me, been active in it, his labour would have been in vain. Be it as it will, that suppression gave me so little uneasiness, that I never harboured the least resentment against any body concerned in it. I bless the day and the hour when it happened, and shall all my life lament my loss of the time which was spent in such employments. He will hardly believe me, because he knows very well that he would mortally hate those who should lessen his salary, notwithstanding that the greatest part of it was continued; notwithstanding, for instance, that the salary of a preacher was left him, and that he was only stripped of the wages of a Professor, which he has enjoyed almost sixteen years, without having given above twenty lessons in Latin, and a few more in French. Examining his own temper, he cannot think it possible for a man cheerfully to support the total loss of his salary. But I beg he would not judge of me by himself. I am an old fashioned man, *Vir antiqui moris*, and not like him of a modish turn. I value not the loss of that salary a rush. He would therefore do me justice, if he believed that I wrote not against him from any resentment. If he refuses to give credit to my words, let him at least give credit to my actions. Have I not spared his name on a thousand occasions, and if his friends pretend that I pointed at him, when I spoke of certain disorders, and gave the picture of some inquisitors, such as my reading had furnished me with, ought he not to impute it to the misfortune he has of resembling them, and to the penetration of his friends in discovering his resemblance? Nay, have I not avoided pointing at him on a hundred occasions which naturally admitted it, as my intelligent readers may easily perceive? Have I not commended his Apology of Theodore Beza? Was it known to how many of his false quotations and sophisms I have given quarter, my moderation would be admired. Did I not vindicate him whenever I thought him wronged? This indeed happened rarely: but it is not my fault. Why, is he not such a person that it would be an injustice to speak ill of him? He has been against all the world, and all the world against him: He has undergone all manner of abuse, complaints, and reproaches: and yet I have scarce found any occasion to criticize his censurers. I have somewhere applied to him the saying of an Emperor, *taurum toties non ferire difficile est*. But now we must turn the tables, and say, *taurum toties ferire difficile est*. It is very strange that so many authors, having pointed their arrows, and exhausted their quivers against his person, scarce one aim has miscarried. I should have been glad to discover any falsties in his censurers; for I would have mentioned them, not only as they were things which came within my province, or agreed with the Plan of my Work, but likewise with a view of doing an honour to myself. The most eminent glory of an Historian is to do justice to his greatest enemies. This is true heroism. By this Thucydides has immortalized his name, more than by all the rest of his History. Therefore, though reason and the precepts of the gospel, had not determined me to take that course, it should at least be believed that self-love alone would have induced me to it. Let my adversary's friends put me to the trial. Let them furnish me with convincing proofs that his adversaries have accused him falsely, and I promise to employ their memoirs to the best advantage. But after all, will they say, you bring him too often into your Dictionary: not more frequently than Varillas, will I answer, nor near so frequently as Moreri, two authors with whom I never had any difference. If I speak of him oftener than of many other authors, it is because I am more intimate with his writings. He thinks himself happy that I have placed him in my Dictionary; and I am very glad that he is pleased with it. Can there be a greater instance of my good nature? This is enough against his supposition; I now proceed to the consequence he draws from it.

XVI. I deny it: for granting that the Remarks which relate to him, proceeded from my design to be revenged, the concession would be of no service to him, since these Remarks are always supported by proofs. It is certain that neither of us can be admitted as evidence against the other, in any affair whatever. We are not allowed either to judge or to vote. We do not deserve to be believed when we speak, either against the other, but so far as we solidly prove what we advance. But let our motive to seek and employ proofs be what it will, these proofs are still of the same intrinsic force. This is most evident. The reader ought to take particular notice of it.

XVII. This is a full confutation of his last writing: There he rails at me in the most violent manner, and yet alledges no evidence but his own, if we except the judgment of Abbé Renaudot: and the agent's letter. He produces anonymous letters: the amount of all this is his whole authority. As if he had said to the public, you ought

V O L. V. No. CXLII.

9 R

to

to believe all this, because I affirm it. And does he know that his evidence is of no manner of authority in my affairs? How dares he then abuse the patience of the public? Was he to say a thousand times over that he has read my Dictionary, and found impieties and obscenities in it, his words would be to no purpose: for, once more, he can be no evidence against me. He is naturally and peremptorily exceptionable. He can only be admitted to copy passages, and to prove that they ought to be condemned. If he cannot prove it, he must be silent. By how much more reason ought we not to give a hearing to his reflexions, since he owns that he has neither read nor seen the Critical Dictionary, and does not let us know the persons who write to him concerning it. I make no question but that as he is the first who ever imposed, with so much assurance, upon the public, so he will be the last; for there is no probability that such monstrous things will ever be imitated.

XVIII. We have no reason to believe that his news-mongers are exact, since they tell him that I have abridged Rabelais. I am greatly mistaken if I have cited him more than once, and had I done it on several occasions, I should have only followed the examples of eminent authors. His book does not please me much; but I know, and my adversary knows likewise, that many persons of probity and honour have read it over and over, know all the fine passages of it, and take a pleasure in repeating them, when they converse agreeably with their friends. If such people were to make large compilations, there is no doubt but Rabelais would frequently appear in them.

XIX. The extracts of the *News from the Republic of Letters*, which are here objected to me, might be the subject of a curious Dissertation. I may perhaps write it one time or other. It would give me an opportunity of clearing myself to those who blame me for having bestowed too great encomiums on the writers whom I mentioned in that journal. One might make a large catalogue of authors who have said many injurious things of those persons whom they had formerly extolled. He who attacks me on this quarter, would be of the number. He very much praised, and afterwards abused Mr Simon. He has sometimes been pleased to extol me, and even a little before our quarrel, in one of his cases against Mr de la Conseillere. But I have something stronger than examples to plead: for about twelve years ago, I publicly owned myself guilty of a failing, which I have not yet wholly mended. I shall by that confession avoid the dilemma he would put me to. It is not a mere invention to serve a turn: I take it from a work which I published at a time when I did not foresee that I should ever have occasion for it.

I have said, in the 575th page of the *New Letters* against Maimbourg, that several books, despised by men of parts, appeared to me to be good. This want of discernment was excusable: if I was not very young in the world, I was so at least in the Republic of Letters. I had begun very late to study, almost never had any masters, never followed any method, never consulted on that subject either the living or the dead. All this, joined with other obstacles, rendered me a very young man with regard to learning, and however, I easily suffered myself to be duped by authors. I may even at this time make the same acknowledgment that Mr Arnauld made, which I have related in the 577th page of the same Letters. There is hardly any book which I do not think a good one, when I read it only for the sake of reading; to find its faults, I must read it attentively on purpose to discover them. I never did so, while I was writing the *News from the Republic of Letters*. I was not then acting the part of a Critic, and had put myself on the foot of civility. Thus I only observed in books what made them valuable. Their defects escaped me. If I therefore spoke civilly of them, it was not against my conscience; and surely at the worst the rules of civility cleared me from any imputation of blameable flattery. To flatter authors with the views of a parasite, or from other motives of interest, is infamous. But when a man is so fully disinterested as I was, it is only at the most, a little too much civility and complaisance. And will this be deemed a crime?

In such a disposition of mind it was impossible for me to avoid being duped by my adversary's books. His decisive manner, his lively style, his chearful, brilliant, fertile imagination unwarily dazzled me. The dangerous illusions of friendship strengthened the charm. Thus his books appeared admirable to me: I thought therefore that in order to do them justice, I ought to employ strong expressions: for common epithets of praise, when they come from an author who has put himself on the foot of courtesy and compliment, would only be an ordinary commendation, which is more offensive to proud authors than being wholly silent about them. My readers were not mistaken in this. They only took for an encomium in my journal that which was expressed in the most superlative terms. But the charm began to vanish, when, being no longer concerned in that journal, I seriously compared his books with those in which he was refuted. Then I read them critically; I observed the weak passages of them, and by degrees found many defects. Some time after I was obliged to peruse them in order to refute some of his works. This gave me a complete notion of them, and had a retrospective effect on his other productions. The same thing has happened to me with regard to him, as with regard to Moreau and Varillas, two authors of whom I have been successively

cessively the Admirer and the Critic, according as I read them either by way of amusement, or with the design of enquiring into the truth of their writings.

XX. Let us make one remark more. It will not be found that what I blame in his *Prophecies*, and his *Esprit d'Arnauld*, is the same with what I formerly commended in these pieces. I praised the invention, the wit, the turn, the stile, the fluency of thoughts, and I now blame the opinions, the slanders, &c. which they contain. He has not therefore caught me between the extremes of a *base flatterer*, and an *infamous calumniator*, as he imagined, according to his inveterate habit of departing from the accuracy of Logic. There is a very wide medium, between these two terms. The opposition had been more just between a *Panegyrist* and a *rigid Censurer*. But setting Logic aside, I answer to his question, that I formerly commended him very sincerely; and that I now censure him with reason, being better informed. Let me give an instance of my sincerity. His book of *Prejudices* having appeared to me to be inferior to the rest, I spoke more sparingly of it (which I know he complained of); and as I thought that his *Criticism* on the Abbé Dangeau was defective in some passages, I censured it very frankly.

I can therefore only be blamed for having followed the dictates of an erroneous conscience: but as these are faults which the tribunals of the Republic of Letters doth not pardon, the shortest course I can take is to lament that time of darkness, and to confess that these are productions which ought to be disowned. I do accordingly disown them; and this is the best reparation I can make.

I need not observe that in order to know a man well, we must rather view him in those writings, where he is always criticised upon good proofs, than in such as praise him without assigning the proofs of his merit.

September 12, 1697



Continuation of the REMARKS ON THE PRETENDED JUDGMENT OF THE PUBLIC.

THIS is all I thought necessary to say on that pretended Judgment of the Public, but having perused it again, before the preceding Remarks were published, I have thought it proper to add a few more.

XXI. Let us dispatch in a few words what the censurer objects to me concerning Solomon. I said that a *policy in some respects of the same nature with that of the Ottomans occasioned Adonija's death*. This means nothing more but that Solomon put him to death, to the end that he might not be exposed to the civil-wars, which he had reason to apprehend. No body is ignorant that this is likewise the reason of the Ottomans. Where is the harm of comparing in that respect a Jewish Prince with Infidel Monarchs, the Sectaries of Mahomet; a Prince, I say, who had not yet that wisdom which God gave him afterwards? Would the author make any scruple to say that Solomon took several wives, from an ostentation like that of Pagan kings, and of Sultans. Observe his artifice. He knew that the term Ottomans would not strike the populace, but that the word *Turk* would alarm them. For this reason, instead of repeating my words, he has metamorphosed them into these, a *Turkish policy*, which he has quoted in Italics. This is his habitual sin; every artifice pleases him, let it but serve to deceive the ignorant. But what will he say against so many authors who maintain that Solomon was personally an Idolater, and doubt of his salvation. This is much worse than comparing for once his policy with that of the Turks.

XXII. He accuses me of having abused Cameron and Mr Daillé. Would he have dared to say so, had he cast his eye on my Dictionary? Would he not have seen there that

CONTINUATION OF THE REMARKS, &c.

that Du Moulin his grand-father, and the works of Rivetus, brother-in-law to Du Moulin, furnished me with what I said to Cameron's disadvantage? Would he not have seen there that for what concerns Mr Daillé, I quote Marefius, Pastor and Professor of Divinity at Groningen, and plainly declare, that I decide nothing on that point? Many people do not yet know the difference between an Historian and an Encomiast. Let us take a short review of the pamphlet, in order to mark some of the falsties in fact, which may be found in it; for as to the fallacies in reasoning, it would be in vain to shew them. They are general reproaches: my adversaries affirm, I deny, and we are just where we set out: we cannot pass from this equilibrium, till every proposition with which they are displeased, is particularly examined. They shall always find me ready to satisfy them. I shall even give a little specimen of their fallacious reasonings in the XXVIIIth and XXXIId Remarks.

XXIII. There are some falsties in fact in Abbé Renaudot's judgment: I do not point them out; for I know not whether they proceed from him, or from the transcribers. Besides that every reader may easily convince himself how false it is that I bestow greater encomiums on Mr Abelli, than on Messieurs de St Cyran and Arnauld; that I commend Father Maimbourg's Controversial Treatises, more than those of Mr Nicolle, that I blacken the latter, *as having published certain Doctrines which he did not believe*. How could I blacken him on that account, since I expressly say that if his silence might be ascribed to such a principle, it might also consist with his persuasion? I leave to the reader's judgment some other falsties of the same nature.

XXIV. The Commentary on the judgment of that Abbot, among other falsties, contains this, that it was owing to the war that my Printer obtained by surprize his privilege. This lie has more heads than Cerberus; for he supposes that the States of Holland would have given my book to be examined, had they not been too much employed. A chimerical fancy! As if an order given in two words to some Professors at Leyden could have interrupted the application to public affairs. Besides this, our Commentator supposes that in times of peace privileges are granted only to such books as have been examined and approved. Another chimera! The States grant them only for the security of the Printer, and not in the least as a mark of their approbation of those books: for they do not pretend to authorize the contents of them. In fine, never was any privilege obtained less by surprize than this; for it was not granted till after a long examination of the opposition which was made to it by the Printers of Moreri.

XXV. In the first extract it is affirmed that *I suppose there was no Historian of the Moors*. But it is manifest that I only suppose we have no particular History of Abderamus. In the second extract it is said that I have composed my Dictionary by the help of memoirs, which were sent me from France. I have always given notice from what place I received any materials. If those which I have received from that country were put together, they would not fill ten pages.

XXVI. There is in the ninth extract a particular which I shall always look upon as a horrible lie, unless I see a certificate of it from the Bishop of Salisbury. Such a discourse is so little consistent with the idea I have of the sense and learning of that prelate, that I cannot believe him capable of holding it. Would a man of his parts find Atheistical opinions in a work wherein it is asserted on a hundred occasions that reason ought to be silent when the word of God speaks? Is not this the severest principle of Orthodoxy in both communions? I have another reason for believing that there are several lies in this extract. *The public has nothing to do with their personal differences*, said that Prelate *with indignation*, if we rely on the extract. Is it likely that he spoke in that manner, since it is notorious that I make no mention of these differences? I censure my adversary for the faults which I shew in his books, or by general reflexions, which may be applied to him, but I take no notice of our quarrels. In a word, all that I have done, came within the province of an author who writes a History accompanied with a Critical Commentary. This must be granted me by all those who are thoroughly acquainted with the matter. I have, for example, a full right to alledge, as facts, all the blunders and errors, with which my adversary has been taxed in Mr Saurin's four volumes. I use this example, to shew, by the way, how ridiculous his hopes are. He may be made to live in a critical book, not as the mortal enemy of Libertines, but as arraigned and convicted of a thousand shameful blunders, by a famous minister, whom a synod has declared Orthodox.

XXVII. In the second extract it is affirmed that *Abbot Renaudot taxes me with many mistakes in History, Geography, Chronology, and other sciences*. This is not true. He only says, 1. That there are many falsties in my work: 2. That in the articles of curious erudition, I commit more mistakes than Moreri. The falsties he means concern what I say either against the Popes, &c. or to the glory of the Reformers, &c. By virtue of his prejudices, he presupposes that in those articles there must be several lies. But however they will not be such with respect to me, since I take them from works which I quote, and declare in my preface, that I only warrant the faithfulness of the quotations. He places among those falsties the *project of re-union, proposed to Amyraldus, by the Jesuit Godebert, in the name of Cardinal Mazarine*. It should have been *Audebert in the name of Cardinal Richelieu*. In this I have only followed the memoir of Amyraldus the

the son, and I have cited it. It is his business to warrant it. As to the faults in erudition, the Abbot does not say, wherein they consist, and consequently the Publisher of the extracts proves the rashness of his own witnesses. He teaches us how to convict them of their having taken upon themselves to write what they were ill informed of. One of them says that *I praise too much in the opinion of several people*. The Publisher, on the contrary, maintains that I have abused all the world. Behold the persons, whom he produces to assure us of the general opinion.

XXVIII. In the thirteenth extract, it is said, that in the article *ΠΥΡΡΩΝ*, and several others, *Libertinism is taught in a very dangerous manner*, and that I have taken from Meziriac all the observations, being sometimes of a tedious length, which I make on the *Heathen gods, and heroes, and the Heathen Mythology*. The first point cannot be discussed in a loose sheet. It is sufficient for me to observe in this place, that my pretended Libertinism is a very solid justification of our most Orthodox Divines. They continually object to the Sectaries that the Socinian principles, tend to Pyrrhonism, Deism, and Atheism. Whereupon I say, either you are defamers, or it is most true that without captivating our understanding to the obedience of faith, we are led by the principles of Philosophy to doubt of every thing. But you are not defamers, therefore it is true, &c. You complain that I make it appear by evident examples, that you do not calumniate the Socinians. Ought you not rather to thank me for this? Do not you know that in Italy, under the yoke of the Inquisition, books are printed with impunity, in which it is asserted, that, setting Revelation aside, we know not with certainty that there are bodies? And would you impose on this country a yoke more galling than that of the Pope. I can prove that at Bologna, at Padua, &c. Professors of Philosophy have maintained publicly and with impunity, that the immortality of the soul can only be proved by Scripture. I shall make it appear in the Supplement of this Dictionary, in the article *ΠΟΜΠΟΝΑΤΙΟΥΣ*, which is already composed, that there was never any persecution worse founded than that which Pomponatius suffered on this account.

With regard to Meziriac, if it is pretended that I have taken any observations from him, without quoting him, I am calumniated. Neither he nor any other writer has furnished me with any thing which I have not acknowledged, by quoting them, and almost always using their own words. As the author of the letter does not say whether I quoted Meziriac, or not, I cannot accuse him of giving me the title of a Plagiary: but I impute that lie most justly to the Publisher of that extract: for he makes this reflexion on it: *One of our extracts says, that he has taken from Meziriac on Ovid's epistles, all that he says of the Heathen gods: and that Meziriac's book is pretty scarce. This is his great art: he understands books very well: he knows which are scarce and which are common: and boldly pillages the former, being sure that few people will perceive the theft*. Here we have an example of the danger which any man runs, when he takes upon him to speak of a book which he has never read. Had the Publisher of that extract perused my Dictionary, I doubt whether he would have presumed to say, that I have pillaged Meziriac. He would have seen that I always quote him. In the same manner, I have quoted all those who have supplied me either with facts or reflexions.

XXIX. I easily believe that the Mythological observations have appeared pretty tedious: some of my acquaintance wrote me the same thing, with regard to the Chronological discussions, and in general to all that may be called erudition. I had foreseen this, and therefore on a thousand occasions I considered those things as the cards thrown out of a hand at piquet. I discarded them and took in other cards, weaker indeed, but abler to win the game: for we live in an age where they read rather for amusement than in order to grow learned. If I had written my Dictionary according to the taste of Abbot Renaudot, no body would have printed it, and had any body run the hazard of putting it to the press, he would not have sold a hundred copies. If I had struck out all the literature, the first edition would have been sold off in three months. If he imagines that I took all the things I used in it, for matters of importance, he wrongs me. I have taken them for what they are, and employed them only to suit the malady of the times. Thus we must do, when we cannot cure it. If I had written in Latin, I should have taken another method; and had the taste of the former age prevailed, I should have given a place in my book to nothing but literature. But the times are altered. Good things alone do not take, but disgust. We must mingle them with others, if we would have the reader take the patience to peruse them. *Veluti pueris ab-sinthia tetra medentes, Cum dare conantur prius oras pocula circum* &c.

XXX. Here I must answer the last lines of page 29. *Those of the best taste among his own friends acknowledge that the half of his work at least, might be cut off, without hurting it*. These persons say not so much as I do. I give up two thirds, and even three fourths and more: and if I was required to abridge my Dictionary, so that in the judgment of Henry Valefius, it might contain nothing but what was good, I should reduce it to a pocket-size. Valefius and the learned men of his rank deem that to be superfluous in a book which they know already, or do not hope to turn some day to their advantage. But they ought to sympathize with the necessities of the half-learned, and the vulgar of the Republic of Letters. They ought to know that it is divided into many more

classes than the Roman Republic ever was. Each class has its wants, and it is the part of compilations to serve them all, some one way, and some another. They are therefore mistaken notwithstanding their great knowledge, when they say absolutely, *this thing is useful and necessary, that is superfluous*. Are not these terms relative? Say rather, *this is useful or useless to me, and to those that are like me, useful or useless however to a hundred other men of letters*. It is not a just way of reasoning to say, such a book would better deserve the approbation of the most learned men in Europe, if it was shorter, therefore it ought to have been shorter. Softly, gentlemen; there is nothing useless in these volumes which you mention; for what may not serve you, may serve several others: and I am very sure that if all the citizens of the Republic of Letters were brought together, that each might give his opinion upon what should be taken away, and what should be left, in a vast compilation, it would appear that the passages which some would throw out, would be precisely those which others would retain. A hundred reflexions might be made not only on the true properties of works of this kind, but likewise on the inseparable union of criticism and trifles. Many might also be made on the difference which lies between a good book and an useful one: between an author who only proposes to himself the approbation of a few scientifics, and an author who prefers the general benefit to the glory of meriting that approbation, which is not less hard to attain than a crown. But we shall find some fitter occasions of speaking on this subject.

Before we proceed any further, let us take notice of a growing lie in the thirteenth extract. The anonymous writer from London, who dates his letter the 28th of May 1697 affirms that the Bookseller Cailloué had not sold forty copies. Now it can be proved from a letter which Cailloué wrote on the 22d of March 1697, that he had sold fifty-two: and observe this circumstance; the Printer of the Dictionary had written to him that he had been informed that he (Cailloué) had sold sixty copies of it before the end of February: to this Cailloué answered, that he had only delivered fifty-two. In this he does not deny that he had sold sixty. Observe that he had only received his copies in December. From hence, I conclude, that the anonymous authors who are produced, are ill-informed, and that we cannot depend upon their intelligence.

XXXI. It is said in the fourteenth extract, that what I mentioned of Lewis XIII, particularly obliged the Chancellor to burn my Dictionary, and to prohibit it. If this means that the Chancellor burnt in his own house the copy which was sent him, I am persuaded it is a mistake. If it means that he caused my Dictionary to be publicly burnt by the hand of the hangman, I make no question but that it is a notorious falsehood. The Commentator on the extracts has taken that expression in the latter sense.

XXXII. Let us make a serious reflexion on the last extract: it is that which is fraught with the greatest fury. The anonymous writer, who is so strangely transported with passion, needs only read my additions to the Thoughts on the Comets: If he does not see that I had reason to proclaim to the whole world as Calumniators, those who have accused me of Deism or Atheism, he must be very stupid, and must be still more stupid, if he imagines that my Dictionary may excuse my slanderers. For the rest, I would have him know that of whatever profession he be, it will always be greatly to his honour, to say, that his conduct is as regular as mine has always been and is still. I make this reflexion, in order, that he and others may learn to weigh their words, when they speak of conduct. He acquaints me, that my article of ADAM, is one of those which justly raise the indignation of good men. I am glad to know it; for I should never have believed that this was the ground of such an accusation, and nothing can be more proper than this, to demonstrate to intelligent readers that offence is taken without reason. He affirms that he does not see how I can escape excommunication: this is talking like a new convert from Paganism. He must therefore be informed that we have no such custom, neither have the Churches of God. We excommunicate people only in these two cases: one, when a person by his crimes, as incest, prostitution, adultery, fornication, murder, &c. gives scandal to the public: the other, when he dogmatically maintains heretical opinions, and is obstinate in defending them, in opposition to the judgment of the Church. Thus the Remonstrant Ministers were excommunicated; for after having maintained their opinions with great warmth, during more than seven or eight years, they declared that, notwithstanding the canons of the Synod of Dort, they would live and die in their sentiments. But it was never known that a Church proceeded by ecclesiastical censures against an author who spoke Historically of the impurities of human life, or who having declared, that he firmly adheres to the faith of that Church, relates only for arguing sake, what reason may suggest on this or that point. I say, it was never known, that such an author was excommunicated, when he declares, as I do, that all these vain subtilties of Philosophy can only serve to make us take Revelation for our guide, as the sole and true remedy against the darkness with which sin covers the faculties of our mind, and that he is ready to throw out all those wild arguments, if it was thought proper. Observe that my adversary's Newsmongers have had honesty enough to tell him, *That I every where provide a screen, behind which I save a retreat for myself, in case of necessity; to wit, that we must adhere to Revelation, and submit reason to faith*. Could I chuse a better

a better retreat? The man who has sought his felicity in worldly advantages, and who, having been able to find it no where, betakes himself to God as the only sovereign good, does he not make the best use which is possible of his reason? Must we not say the same thing of a Philosopher, who having inquired in vain after certainty by the light of reason, concludes that he must have recourse to supernatural light, and adhere to that alone? Would not this be the advice which David and all the other Prophets and the Apostles would give to the wise men of this world? And should not I be sheltered from the thunderbolts of excommunication in an azyle so sacred, and so inviolable? Would Divines themselves be the first to invade it? I cannot believe this? and thus our anonymous writer judges rashly.

I cannot believe that the informers have always been sincere; for they have made my censorer believe that I only speak of submission to Scripture, *by saying, and after having said every thing imaginable in order to weaken the authority of Revelation and of the sacred writers.* This is very false, and I defy them to give the least proof of it. It does not appear that they have alledged any other reasons but those which I have refuted above in Numb. VI, and Numb. XXI, and that which they have grounded on the article DAVID. I know not whether they mentioned my explanation to him, or not; if they took no notice of it, they are very much to blame: and if they give him a faithful account of it, he cannot clear himself from being guilty of an artifice, which is very unbecoming a man of Honour: for the laws of disputation do not allow a man to suppress any thing which may justify his adversary. This is his eternal custom; he only betakes himself to that which may serve his turn, and wrefts it in the most odious manner by violent hyperboles. All that I said of some of David's actions amounts to this, that they may be accounted conformable to the art of government and human prudence, but not to the rigorous laws of piety. To conclude from thence that *I have represented him as a villain*, is trampling under foot all the laws of reasoning, by a furious passion. I only demand impartial judges. Such will never find that a man by remarking the faults of the persons inspired, attacks the authority of inspiration, we all agree that adultery and murder, did not hinder David from being a great Prophet. St Paul was not afraid that by giving a strong idea of the infirmities of the old man, which made him groan, and required a most violent remedy, he should weaken the efficacy of his writings. But this subject cannot be handled in a few words. Let us return to the anonymous author, and his menaces of excommunication.

XXXIII. Did ever the ecclesiastical tribunals proceed against the translators of Boccace's Novels, against the tales of Oville, or la Fontaine? I alledge these examples as an argument *à fortiori*; for no man dares say that I come near the licentiousness of these writers. The horrible impurities of their books, which caused the Tales of la Fontaine to be condemned to the flames by a sentence of a magistrate of Paris (4), are in some manner their own inventions; whereas I have only copied what is found in Historical books, known to all the world, and with these citations have almost always joined a mark of my disapprobation: I have only spoken of them as things which discover the exceeding depravity of mankind, and gives us reason to lament our corruption. There is hardly any Commentator whose gravity would hold out against some of Abelard's Pieces, or against the simplicity imputed to honest Robert d'Arbrisselles. A great subject of clamour truly, if I have been merry upon such things, that is, if I have censured them by turning them into ridicule. But you will say I only alledge examples of the indulgence of the Romish communion; and may not I answer that this is an argument *à fortiori*? Have you not exclaimed a thousand times against the tyrannical government of that Church? If this cannot satisfy you, let us view the affair in another light.

XXXIV. Did our fathers censure Ambroise Paré, whose French books on Anatomy, are full of obscenities? Did they censure those writers who published in shocking praises the leud practices of the Court of Charles IX, and Henry III? Did they censure d'Aubigné, who had not only a most satirical pen, but likewise a most smutty one? Did they censure Henry Stephens for having published so many foolish, bawdy, burlesque stories in his Apology for Herodotus? In this country, did not St Aldegonde, in a book of Controversy, use all kinds of jokes, and many smutty expressions? And was this censured? Did the Commentaries of Scaliger on the Priapeia, those of Douza on Petronius, full of filthy and lascivious matters, create any trouble to the authors of them, one a Professor and the other a Curator in the university of Leyden? Can any thing be more obscene than *Baudii Amores*, a book published at Leyden by Professor Scriverius? Does not the collection of the poems of Daniel Heinsius, a Professor likewise at Leyden, contain several lascivious pieces? Have not all these writings and several others been tolerated? Have the consistories and synods proceeded either against the authors, or against the books? I say nothing of the Commentary of a Professor of Franeker on the pastoral of Longus, having spoken of it in my Dictionary. I only wish the reader would observe that a Commentator, who cites impurities, is a thousand times more excusable than the Poet who composes them. When I am let into the secret of collecting in a compilation all that the Antients have said concerning the courtesan Laïs, without mentioning leud actions, I shall own myself guilty. It must at least be proved against me, that

(4) See, below, citat. (10), of the Explanation concerning Objections.

CONTINUATION OF THE REMARKS, &c.

a Commentator has not the privilege of collecting whatever hath been said of Helen; how can it be proved? Where is the legislator who hath said to compilers, *So far may go, but you must advance no further. You must not quote Athenæus, nor such a dialist, nor such a Philosopher.* Has it not been their constant practice to take their writings as full and extensive as their reading? But here is a better way of satisfying our Critics. I will correct in a second edition, the defects that are in the first. I am employing myself in this with all possible application. I shall not content myself with rectifying whatever is faulty with regard to History, or Chronology, but I shall throw out the expressions, and turns which are too free, &c. and I beseech all my readers, but chiefly those who are members of the Dutch, French, &c. universities in this country, to assist me, by their remarks, in order to improve my Dictionary for a new edition. Works of this nature, and especially when they are composed in haste and with few helps, are at first only a loose sketch. They are improved in degrees. Every body knows examples of this kind.

XXXV. The last lie which I shall point out may be found in the last page of the pamphlet. There we find, 1. That I am preparing a new Dictionary, which will contain *nothing but what is serious, sober, chaste, and judicious*: 2. That they have it from very good hands that I am inquiring for some great name, distinguished not only by birth, but merit and piety, to be placed at the head of my Dictionary. I have nothing to say to the first point: for since my adversary acquaints me, that my Dictionary suffered much by the great encomiums which were bestowed on it beforehand, I ought to make good use of so kind a hint. For how strange would it be, if I myself praised a book which I have not yet written? His malice to the Booksellers appears in this place: he would prepare the public to slight my Supplement. As to the second point I declare to you, that he has been very ill-served by his Newsmongers. By what I can perceive, they play with his credulity, as they did about six or seven years ago. I was never more surprized, than to see in his libel that design of a dedication to be prefixed to my Dictionary, of which I have no thoughts, nor ever had, any more than of discovering *Terra incognita*.

XXXVI. I observed that he lays the affair of Bellarmine much to heart: this is not surprizing: but it had been a more prudent part in him not to have made this the subject of a Postscript to his pamphlet. The best course he could take, was to be entirely silent upon that head. In certain circumstances, the less a man stirs, the less is he engaged. What I said on the subject of Bellarmine is not an example of trifles and malice. I should not have otherwise discharged the duty of an Historian, since the original design of my work was to observe the false accusations which had been imputed to the persons of whom I was to speak. Had I omitted that accusation in the article of BELLARMINE, might I not have been called partial very justly, and charged with forgetting matters of which I could not pretend to be ignorant? I have not taken it from any satirical book, as he says falsely, but from a book of Controversy, and from the *Journal des Sçavans*. I do not examine the art he uses to hide his fault. I only beg the reader to look into my Dictionary, and compare with his remark, the authorities I have alleged. Such a parallel will shew what agonies he is in, when he is obliged to make any humble and ingenuous confession. I am not surprized at this, for a bow which has always been bent to one side, can hardly be bent to the other at the first attempt. And it is thus with the fibres of our brain.

XXXVII. I conclude with a short remark on my adversary's long silence. I had expected that as soon as my two volumes were published, there would appear a little pamphlet of his, wherein he would proclaim to the whole world, (often repeating the burden of his songs, about the *Advice to the Refugees*, &c. which have been so often exploded) that my Dictionary was the most abominable, the most frightful, the most detestable book, that ever came into the world, a heap of enormous impieties, and monstrous obscenities, with such a wretched collection of literary trifles, as would disgrace a school-boy. I was assured that he would not engage in refuting my criticisms, in order to justify himself; I only expected a sudden volley of loose and general invectives. But in this I was mistaken. He was not delivered, before the time, of the pamphlet he was big with. He only brought it forth in the tenth month. *Matri longa decem tulerunt fastidia menses*. If I had less aversion to quibbling, I might add that his child is notwithstanding an abortive. I am surprized that Abbot Renaudot's two pieces, together with all the other extracts were not sent to the press on the same day that the post brought them. That he should content himself with making copies of them fly about for several months successively, is what I do not comprehend. For we must not say the *pangs of labour*, but the *pleasures*: the person I speak of is never more in his element than when he publishes invectives. I am likewise surprized that a greater number of extracts has not been produced; for during the short way of Abbot Renaudot's judgment, the literary Newsmongers no doubt wrote to their friends in the country and abroad, what was said to the prejudice of my work. Twenty men of Letters having heard it said in an assembly that a new book is not esteemed, communicate that piece of news to all the curious whom they meet that day, and in the evening they write it to their correspondents. Great books advance but slowly, and must long be expected; upon

upon that account, when they first launch forth, they have a thousand storms to encounter. The Dictionary of the French Academy composed, revised, and polished, through the course of fifty years, by the finest genius's in France, no sooner appeared but it was battered by storms on every side: ballads, epigrams, libels, private letters, conversations; all poured upon that work. It is full, said they, of smut, Billingsgate, and quibbles. Yet it bore off, and now steers on with full sail towards immortality.

I beg leave to place here a thought of Mr la Bruyere. *What say you of Hermodorus's book? That it is a bad one, answers Anthimus. That it is so bad, that it hardly deserves the name of a book, or at least that the world should take any notice of it. But have you read it? No, says Anthimus. Why does he not add that Fulvia and Melania have condemned it without reading it, and that he is Fulvia's and Melania's friend? This reflexion seems to have been made on purpose for me.*

If I have been more prolix than I at first intended to be, it is because I thought it necessary to enlarge on certain matters, in order that I might not for the future be taken off from my labours, should my enemies publish any more libels. I shall let them say whatever they please, and go forward with my undertaking. Let them clamour as much as they will; I promise to read their satires, and will improve by them if possible; but I shall lose no time, as I have already done, in answering them.

September 17, 1697.



EXPLANATIONS

Concerning certain things dispersed in this Dictionary,
which may be reduced to four general heads:

- I. *The praises bestowed on persons who denied either the providence or the existence of GOD.* II. *The objections of the Manichees.* III. *The objections of the Sceptics.* IV. *Obscenities.*

A general and preliminary observation.

WHILE I was composing this work, I easily perceived that certain reflexions crept in, which were somewhat free, and little agreeable to ordinary readers; but I did not foresee that they could give any offence. I imagined that the persons whose judgment serves for a rule, and compared to that of others, would take notice of many things which might furnish me with an apology.

I. I hoped in the first place, that the reader would consider the nature of this Dictionary. It is a vast compilation, necessarily loaded with several minute criticisms, which will disgust and tire to the last degree those who are not versed in these matters; and I was obliged in this immense variety to bear two characters, that of Historian, and that of Commentator. It was not possible to rescue it from the contempt of a great many readers, otherwise than by introducing some uncommon things into it. They who neither value Grammatical disputations, nor the adventures of an inconsiderable private person, are a numerous party, and deserve that we should have some regard for their taste. It is therefore allowable for an author to season his book with something that will recommend it to their palate; and if he writes as an Historian, he ought not only to relate what Heretics have done, but also to shew wherein the strength and weakness of their opinions consist. This must especially be done by him, if he be himself the Commentator of his narratives; for in his commentary he must discuss things, and compare together the arguments *pro* and *con*, with all the impartiality of a faithful relator.

II. I hoped in the second place, that it would be considered in what manner, and with what an air I mention some opinions; it being neither in the strain of a Dogmatist, nor with the fondness of one who seeks to make converts. They are thoughts thrown out at random, and I am willing the reader should take them for nothing more than flights of wit, and reject them as he thinks proper; and that with a greater liberty than I have taken to advance them. It is easy to perceive that an author who deals thus has no sinister intentions, and is not laying snares; and if any reflexions should escape him, which, being under another form, might be dangerous, no great offence is to be taken at it.

III. I hoped in the third place, that the readers would consider the circumstances which either make an error dangerous or harmless. The consequences of it are to be feared when it is taught by those who stand in such a relation to the people as furnishes them with great authority, and with opportunities of forming a party. An error ought to be followed close, to be observed, and carefully restrained, when a man of a venerable character, a Pastor, a Professor of Divinity, sows it in his sermons, in his lectures, in little systematical tracts, or by way of catechism, and by emissaries who go from house to house to recommend the reading of his books, and invite people to the conventicles where the author explains his reasons and his method more particularly (1). But if a layman, who bears no public office, as myself, should drop amongst vast collections of History and Learning, some error in Religion or Morality, I do not see any reason why any body should be concerned at it. It is not in such works as these that the reader seeks for the reformation of his faith. No man takes for his guide in this matter, an author who only speaks by the by, and occasionally; and who by his very throwing his sentiments, as pins into a meadow, sufficiently shews that he cares not to be followed. The errors of such a writer are of no consequence, nor deserve that the world should be disturbed about them. Thus the Faculties of Divinity in France dealt with Michael de Montagne's book. They left untouched all this author's maxims, who, without following any system, method, or order, heaped up and tacked together whatever his memory presented to him: but when Peter Charron, a Priest, and a Doctor of Divinity, came to vent some of Montagne's sentiments in a methodical and systematical treatise of Morality (2), the Divines were no longer silent (3).

IV. I hoped

(1) Note, That I join all these things together, without pretending that we ought only to guard against those who are guilty of them all. A part is a sufficient motive for it.

(2) Compare with this, remark (O), of the article MONTAGNE.

(3) See the remark (F), of the article MONTAGNE.

IV. I hoped in the fourth place, and this was the main foundation of my hope, that these two points would easily be distinguished: 1. That I never advance, as my own opinion, any doctrine, which is repugnant to the articles of the Confession of Faith of the Reformed Church in which I was born, and of which I make profession. 2. That when I relate as an Historian what may be objected and replied to the Orthodox, and when I own that by natural light we cannot solve all the difficulties of the unbelievers, I always make a digression, to draw from thence a consequence in favour of the principle which the Reformed continually oppose to the Socinians; viz. That our reason being so weak as it is, ought not to be the rule or measure of our faith.

These are the reasons which made me believe, that if I sometimes used, what they call the liberty of philosophising, it would not be taken amiss. I should not have used it, had I foreseen that the foregoing considerations would not be regarded.

But the event has disappointed my hopes. Complaints have been made, and clamours have been raised, against those passages in my Dictionary. I could never believe these complaints were just; yet I am sorry I said any thing that was disliked, and have always been disposed to remove any objections in a second edition. Having been informed wherein the grievances consisted, I thought it was no hard matter to redress them, by leaving out some pages, altering some expressions, or by explanations that might set things in a due light. I have engaged in this without any reluctance, as all authors ought to do who are not bigotted to their opinions, but are ready to sacrifice them to the edification of the reader. I wish the public may be satisfied with my conduct, both as to what has been suppressed, and to those things I am going to explain; and methinks I have reason to promise myself that they will. This has been my design, and I have used great application to effect it.

EXPLANATION I.

The observation which has been made on the good morals of some persons who had no religion, cannot any ways prejudice the true Christian Faith.

THEY who were offended at my saying, that some Atheists and Epicureans have, with respect to Morality, outdone most idolaters, are intreated to attend to the following considerations; which if they please to do, the offence they have taken will entirely be removed.

I. The fear and love of God are not the only spring of human actions. There are other principles that actuate a man; The love of praise, the fear of disgrace, the natural temper, punishments and rewards in the magistrates hands, have a very great influence upon men. He who doubts of it, must be ignorant of what passes in his own breast, and what the common course of the world may demonstrate to him every moment. But it is not probable that any man should be so stupid as to be ignorant of such a truth. What therefore I have asserted concerning these other springs of human actions, may be placed in the number of truths which are beyond dispute.

II. The fear and love of God are not always a more powerful principle than the others: The love of glory, the fear of infamy, death, or torments, the hopes of preferment, act with greater force upon some men, than the desire of pleasing God, and the fear of breaking his commandments. If any one doubts of it, he is ignorant of some of his own actions, and knows nothing of what is doing daily under the sun. The world abounds with people who choose rather to commit a sin, than displease a Prince who can either make or ruin their fortune. Men daily subscribe formularies of faith against their conscience, in order to save their estates, or to avoid imprisonment, exile, death, &c. An officer who has quitted all for his religion, finding himself under the alternative either of offending God if he revenges himself for having received a box on the ear, or of being accounted a coward if he does not, never rests till he has satisfaction for this affront, though at the peril of killing or being killed in a state that must be followed with eternal damnation. It is not likely that any man should be so stupid as to be ignorant of such things. Therefore let this moral aphorism be placed among indisputable truths, *That the fear and love of God are not always the most active principle of human actions.*

III. This being so, it ought not to be reckoned a scandalous paradox, but rather a very possible thing, that some men, without religion, should be more strongly excited to a good moral life by their constitution, in conjunction with the love of praise and fear of disgrace, than some others by the instinct of conscience.

IV. The scandal ought to be much greater, when we see so many people convinced of the truths of religion, and at the same time plunged in all manner of vice.

V. Nay, it is more strange that Heathen idolaters should do good actions, than that Atheistical Philosophers should live like virtuous men: for the former must have been

AN EXPLANATION

812

bad
rel

been excited to crimes by their very religion; they must have believed, that, in order to become imitators of God, which is the end and substance of religion, they ought to be cheats, envious, fornicators, adulterers, pederasts, &c.

VI. Whence we may conclude, that the idolaters who lived virtuously, were only guided by the ideas of reason and virtue, or by the desire of praise, or by their natural temper, or such other principles as may all be found in Atheists: Why then should we expect to find more virtue amongst the idolatrous Heathens, than amongst men who have no religion?

see below

VII. I desire it may be observed, that speaking of the good morals of some Atheists, I have not ascribed any true virtues to them. Their sobriety, chastity, probity, contempt of riches, zeal for the public good, good offices to their neighbour, neither proceeded from the love of God, nor tended to honour and glorify him. They themselves were the principle and end of all this: self-love was the only ground and cause of it. They were only shining sins, *splendida peccata*, as St Augustin says of all the good actions of the Heathens. I have therefore done no prejudice to the true religion, by what I have said of some Atheists. It will still remain true, that good actions cannot be effected without it: and what is it to the true religion, if the worshippers of the false gods are not better in their actions than those who have no religion? What advantage would accrue to it, if the adorers of Jupiter and Saturn were not equally plunged in the gulph of perdition with the Atheists?

VIII. If they who were offended thought that one cannot praise the good morals of Epicurus, without supposing it the same thing with respect to a good life, to have no religion, or to profess any religion whatever, they are ignorant in the art of drawing consequences, and perfect strangers to the question. I never compared Atheism but with Heathenism; and therefore the true religion is no way concerned in it; the question is only about religions introduced and kept up by the Devil; the question is whether they who have professed a worship so infamous in its origin and progress as this, have been more regular in the practice of Morality than the Atheists. I suppose this as a point undoubted and fully determined, *viz.* That in the true religion there is not only more virtue than elsewhere, but that out of it there is no true virtue at all, nor any *fruits of righteousness*. To what purpose then do they pretend to fear that I injure true religion? Is it concerned in the censure that may be passed on the false one? And is it not to be feared that their zeal will shock men of sense, who see that this is shewing a particular tenderness for a worship detested by God, and set up by the Devil, as is owned by all our Divines.

see above

IX. I could not justly find fault with these complaints, if I had written a romance in which the persons were both virtuous and Atheistical: For, as I had been master of their words and actions, I was at liberty to describe them in a manner suited to the taste of the most scrupulous readers. But my Dictionary, being an Historical work, I ought not to represent people as they should have been, but as they actually were. I can neither suppress their vices, nor their virtues. Therefore, since I advance nothing concerning the morals of some Atheists, but what the authors I cite relate of them, no body has reason to be offended with me. To make my censurers sensible of the truth of what I say, I need only ask them, whether they believe the suppression of true facts to be the duty of an Historian? I am sure they will never subscribe to such a proposition.

X. Not but I believe there are some persons who will frankly maintain, that a matter of fact ought to be suppressed by an Historian, when it is likely to lessen the abhorrence of Atheism, or the veneration of religion in general. But I most humbly intreat them, not to take it amiss that I continue to believe, that God has no need of these Rhetorical artifices; and if this may be allowed in a Poem, or a piece of Eloquence, it does not follow that I ought to admit it in an Historical Dictionary. They must give me leave to tell them, that it is enough for me to promote the interest of true religion; for all that should be done for religion in general, would serve as well for Paganism, as Christianity.

(1) See the Pen-
ces diverses sur
les Cometes,
pag. 437,
490, 599: and
the Additions to
that book, pag.
58, 110.

XI. I had been so much the more blamable for suppressing the truths complained of, because, besides the acting against the fundamental laws of History, I should have omitted things, which, at the bottom, are most advantageous to the true system of grace. I have shewn in another place (1), that nothing can be more proper to prove the corruption of men, which is naturally invincible, and can only be overcome by the Holy Ghost, than to shew, that those who have no supernatural assistances, are as bad under the practice of a religion, as those who live in Atheism. I add here, that no thing can be more acceptable to the Pelagians, than to say, that the fear of the false gods was able to induce the Heathens to renounce some vices; for if through the fear of incurring the malediction of heaven, they could abstain from evil, they might also rise up to virtue by the desire of spiritual rewards, and to procure to themselves the love of God; that is, they might not only have been able to fear, but also to love God, and act upon this good principle. The two handles by which man is moved, are the fear of punishment, and the desire of reward. If he can be moved by the former, he may also by the latter; for one cannot well be admitted without the other.

XII. If

XII. If some persons, more equitable and intelligent than ordinary, should alledge, as the only reason of their scandal, the affectation wherewith they think I have acquainted my readers with the good lives of some Atheists; I would desire them to consider, that in the present case, affectation is very excusable, and may even be looked upon as a subject of edification. To understand this, one needs only call to mind an episode of my treatise concerning comets. The true design of that book was to confute, by a Theological argument, what is commonly said concerning the presages of comets (2). The necessity of enforcing this argument, put me upon drawing a parallel between Atheism and Paganism, without which my proof had lain open to an objection which would have made it unfit to evince what was necessary for me to demonstrate. Therefore there was a necessity for me either to leave that objection unanswered, or to confute the arguments of those who say, that the Pagan idolatry was not so great an evil as Atheism. All the success of the combat depended very much upon the success of this attack, and therefore according to the rules of disputation, and by virtue of the rights belonging to an author, I was obliged to take advantage of whatever Logic and History could afford me, to answer the objection. It was not therefore designedly, or through any audaciousness, that I alledged some matters of fact tending to prove, that Atheists are not necessarily more disorderly in their lives, than idolaters. The laws of disputation, and the right every one has to answer the objections to which his assertion is exposed, laid me under a necessity of taking such a course. Great complaints have been made against this part of my book, and some endeavours have been used to make it appear dangerous. I was therefore obliged to justify it, as far as reason and truth would permit; and consequently, no body ought to be offended, if I acquaint my readers, when occasion offers, that History informs us, that such and such persons, who denied either the existence or the providence of God, or the immortality of the soul, did nevertheless live like virtuous men. This affectation, which would perhaps be a just subject of scandal in another book, is none at all in mine: on the contrary, it may serve to edify my readers, since it shews I have not advanced a paradox out of vanity, but made an observation, which, at the bottom, is most certain, and seems false to none, but such as have not examined it. No man renders himself more odious than he, who, in order to distinguish himself, rashly leaves the common road: and if there are any writers, who have been suspected on that account, not through their own fault, but because the readers were not thoroughly acquainted with the matter, nothing can be more edifying than to see such authors justify themselves.

(2) See the preface of the third edition.

XIII. In order to remove all suspicions of a vicious affectation, I have taken care to mention, as often as possible, the bad morals of Atheists (3). If I have not done it oftner, it was because I wanted materials. The public knows, that I called for information (4): no body has been pleased to give me any, and I have not as yet been able to make any farther discovery by my own inquiries. I do not pretend to deny, that there have been in all countries, and at all times, men, who, by their debaucheries, and long criminal habits, have stifled the explicit belief of the existence of a God; but History having not preserved their names, it is impossible to speak of them. It is probable, that among those banditti, and hired assassins, who commit so many crimes, there are some who have no religion; but the contrary is still more probable, since, among so many malefactors who pass through the hangman's hands, there are none found to be Atheists (5). The ordinaries, who prepare them for death, find them always sufficiently disposed to desire the joys of heaven. As for those profane Epicures, who, in the judgment of Father Garasse, and many other writers, are downright Atheists, I could not bring them into the list; the question not being concerning those we call practical Atheists, people that live without any fear of God, though they are persuaded of his existence; but concerning theoretical Atheists, such as Diagoras, Vanini, Spinoza, &c. whose Atheism is attested, either by Historians, or by their own writings. The question only turns upon the morals of this class of Atheists, examples of whose bad lives, I desired might be shewn me. If I had found any, I had made an exact mention of them. There is nothing easier to be found in History than some wretches, whose abominable actions make the readers tremble; but their very impieties, and blasphemies, are a proof that they believed a Deity. This is a natural consequence of the constant doctrine of Divines, that the Devil, the most wicked of creatures, but incapable of Atheism, is the promoter of all the sins of mankind; whence the greatest wickedness of man, must have the character of that of the Devil; that is, to be joined with the persuasion of the being of a God. A maxim of the Philosophers confirms this reasoning (6).

(3) As in the articles of BION the Borythenite, and CANTAS.

(4) See the additions to the Penitence for les Cometes, pag. 36. See also, pag. 75.

(5) I speak thus, because I do not remember I have ever read, or heard of any relations concerning the final Atheism of these people.

(6) 'Αν δὲ θ' ὑπάρχει ἡ κατὰ φύσιν ἀνάγκη, ἀνεύθει μὲλλον ὑπάρχειν. Propter quod unumquodque est tale, illud semper est magis tale. Aristot. Analyt. poster. lib. i, cap. ii, pag. m. 105. etiam Metaphys. lib. ii, cap. i, pag. 643, F.

XIV. If what I have been saying, is capable of edifying people of a tender conscience, since they will see that the assertion which frightened them, agrees with the most Orthodox principles, they will find no less a subject of edification in what I am going to propose. That the most wicked men are not Atheists, and that the greatest part of Atheists, whose names are come down to us, were virtuous men, as the world goes, is a character of the infinite wisdom of God, and ought to make us admire his providence. It has set bounds to man's corruption, that there might be societies upon earth;

V O L. V.

9 U

and

and if it has favoured but a few with a sanctifying grace, it has dispersed a general *Repressing* grace (7), which like a strong bank restrains the floods of sin, as much as is necessary to prevent an universal inundation, which would destroy all monarchical, aristocratic, and democratic governments. It is commonly said, that the means God has made use of to arrive at this end, have been, to preserve in the souls of all men the ideas of virtue and vice, and a sense of a providence which superintends all, punishes vice, and rewards virtue. You will find this notion in the bodies of Divinity, and in a great many other Orthodox books. What is the natural consequence of this proposition? Is it not this; that if there are some persons whom God does not forsake so far as to suffer them to fall into Epicurus's system, or that of the Atheists, they are chiefly those brutish souls, whose cruelty, audaciousness, avarice, fury, and ambition are capable of bringing a large flourishing country to speedy ruin. Is it not this. That if he forsakes some people, so far as to permit they should deny either his existence, or providence, they are chiefly persons, whose temper, education, lively ideas of virtue, love of fame, or sense of dishonour, serve as a strong curb to keep them to their duty? These are two consequences that naturally flow from the above-mentioned Theological principle. Now, as by informing my readers in some places of this Dictionary, that the most profligate wretches had some religion; and that those who had none, have lived according to the rules of virtue, I said nothing but what agrees with these two consequences; there is no longer any ground for a just offence.

XV. It will be much better to consider in this the finger of God, and the admirable conduct of his providence; he arrives at the same end by different ways: the *repressing* principle, so necessary for the preservation of societies, as Divines teach us, exerts its power by the curb of idolatry, in some countries, and in certain persons, and by the natural temper, or the vivacity of ideas, and a liking to moral virtue in some others. The Greeks, ingenious and voluptuous, and thereby obnoxious to a horrid train of crimes, had need of a religion that should burden them with infinite observances. They would have had too much time to run into vice, if the multitude of ceremonies, sacrifices and oracles, had not given them many avocations, and superstitious terrors had not alarmed them. The Scythians, a stupid people, who were neither luxurious in cloaths or diet, needed only to despise pleasures, or not to know them. 'Aurum & argentum perinde aspernantur, ac reliqui mortales appetunt Hæc continentia illis morum quoque justitiam edidit, nihil alienum concupiscentibus: QUIPPE ibidem divitiarum cupido est, ubi & usus. Atque utinam reliquis mortalibus similis moderatio & abstinentia alieni foret Prorsus ut admirabile videatur, hoc illis naturam dare, quod Græci longa sapientium doctrina, præceptisque philosophorum consequi nequeunt (8). - - - - Gold and Silver are as much neglected and despised among the Scythians, as sought after and coveted by all other nations This abstinence has produced another virtue among that people, namely justice in the behaviour of every private man, for they covet not what is the property of others. And indeed wherever the use of riches prevails, there a covetous desire of them is inseparably annexed. Would to GOD other nations were endowed with the like moderation and contentment with their own. . . . It seems very wonderful and admirable that nature should have bestowed on the Scythians what the Greeks have not been able to attain by the repeated doctrines of their wise men, and all the precepts of their Philosophers.' This alone maintained their republic, and hindered them from injuring one another. They were so framed, as to be all content with what they had at home. Such a nation has neither occasion for a Code, nor a Digest (9).

These fifteen considerations seem sufficient to remove the stumbling-block, which was thought to be laid in some places of my Dictionary. They might afford matter for a large book: I have only cursorily proposed them; for I have somewhat more largely treated of them in another place (10), and I shall treat of them more amply in a work that I have promised (11).

(7) I have been told by a Divine, that this is the expression they use, when they speak of the Providence of God, in as much as it has not permitted such an inundation of crimes as would destroy justice.

(8) Justin. lib. ii. cap. ii.

(9) Justitia gentis ingenia culta, non legibus. . . . Justice is maintained among the Scythians, not by the laws of the country, so much as by the genius and disposition of the nation. Id. ibid.

(10) See the Penitens diverles sur les Cometes.

(11) See the preface of the third edition of the just Penitens.

EXPLANATION

EXPLANATION II.

How what I have said concerning the objections of the Manichees, ought to be considered.

THEY who are offended at some things which I have observed in the articles wherein I treated of Manicheism, would be wholly inexcusable if they went only upon my saying, that the *Question about the origin of evil is very difficult*. For the Ancient Fathers ingenuously confess it (1), as does every Orthodox Divine at this day. I do not think therefore that the stumbling-block lies in this; but rather, in my supposing the objections of the Manichees unanswerable, whilst only discussed at the bar of reason.

(1) See the article PAULICIANÆ, citat. (1c8).

This must needs scandalize those, whose great zeal for the truths of the gospel persuades them, that it triumphs over error in all kinds of combat, and whatever arms it opposes. They find so much pleasure in the reading a book, wherein Transubstantiation is routed, whether it be attacked by the testimony of the senses, and the principles of Philosophy, or whether impugned by the Scripture, and the tradition of the first ages; they find, I say, so much satisfaction in so complete a victory, that they easily fancy all other disputes of orthodoxy have the same fate. Flattered with so agreeable a persuasion, they fret and fume if any one maintains, that all the articles of the Christian Faith, defended and attacked by the arms of Philosophy alone, do not come off honourably; that some of them give ground, and are forced to retire into the fortresses of Scripture, and to ask leave for the future to arm themselves in another way, or otherwise they will refuse to enter the lists.

They, who are vexed to see themselves thus disturbed in the possession of an imaginary complete triumph, fear moreover that by the confession of a sort of inferiority, religion will be exposed to a total defeat, or at least its certainty notably weakened, and the interest of the enemies of the Gospel advanced.

An offence grounded on these notions, has two favourable circumstances; one, that it proceeds from a good principle; the other that it may be easily removed. It is produced by the love of truth, and if we do but rise up to the consideration of the character of Evangelical truths, we shall be delivered from this disturbance. For we shall see, that far from being the property of those truths to be reconciled with Philosophy, it is on the contrary essential to them, not to be squared by its rules (2).

THAT the mysteries of the Gospel being above reason, it follows, that the objections of the unbelievers cannot be answered by reason.

The Roman Catholics and Protestants dispute concerning several articles of religion, but they perfectly agree in this point. That the mysteries of the Gospel are above reason. There are even some Divines who own that the mysteries denied by the Socinians, are against reason. I will not take advantage of that concession; it suffices me, that they are unanimously acknowledged to be above reason; for from thence it necessarily follows, that it is impossible to solve the difficulties of the Philosophers; and consequently, that a dispute, wherein natural light only is employed, will always terminate to the disadvantage of the Divines, who will be forced to give ground and to retire under the cannon of supernatural light.

(2) This is only to be understood of Evangelical truths, which contain mysteries; for it must be confessed, that the moral precepts of Jesus Christ, are easily reconciled with natural light.

It is evident, that reason can never reach what is above itself; but if it could afford answers to the objections which attack the Doctrine of the Trinity, and that of the Hypostatic Union, it would reach to these two mysteries, it would get the mastery of them, manage and ply them, even to the comparing them with its first principles, or with aphorisms deduced from common notions, till at last, it had concluded, that they agree with natural light. It would therefore exert it self beyond its strength, and exceed its own limits, which is a downright contradiction. We must therefore say, that it cannot furnish answers to its own objections; and consequently they remain victorious, till recourse is had to the Divine authority, and the necessity of captivating the understanding to the obedience of faith.

Let us endeavour to put this in a clearer light. If some doctrines are above reason, they are out of its reach; if they are out of its reach, it cannot attain to them; if it cannot attain to them, it cannot comprehend them; if it cannot comprehend them, it cannot find any idea or principle that can afford solutions; and consequently, its objections will remain unanswered; or, which is the same thing, will be answered by some distinction as obscure as the position itself which is attacked. Now it is certain, that an objection founded upon distinct notions remains equally victorious, whether no answer is made to it, or such an answer is made as no body can understand. Can the match be equal betwixt you and another person, if that person makes objections which each of you clearly comprehends, and you make no answers but such as neither of you comprehends?

Every

THE end of a philosophical dispute, and that it cannot be attained when the dispute turns upon mysteries.

Every Philosophical dispute supposes the contending parties to be agreed upon certain definitions, and to admit the rules of syllogisms, and the characteristics of false reasoning. After this, the whole business consists in examining, whether a position be mediately or immediately consistent with the principles agreed upon; whether the premises of an argument are true; whether the consequence is well drawn: whether the syllogism used has four terms; whether no maxim contained in the chapter *de Oppositis*, or *de Sophisticis Elenchis*, &c. be contradicted. The victory is obtained either by shewing that the subject of the dispute has no connexion with the principles agreed upon, or by reducing the respondent to an absurdity. And this may be done, either by shewing that the consequences of his position are contradictory, or by driving him to such answers as are wholly unintelligible. The end of these sorts of disputes is to clear up obscurities, and make evidence shine forth. Hence we judge, that during the course of a disputation, victory declares more or less for the opponent or respondent, according to the greater or lesser perspicuity in the propositions of the respective disputants; and at last we determine that it wholly declares against him whose answers are such as are to us unintelligible, and who acknowledges they are incomprehensible. Hereupon we condemn him by the rules of adjudging the victory to a party; and even when he cannot be pursued into the mist he has covered himself with, which forms a sort of abyss betwixt him and his antagonists, we conclude him utterly defeated, and compare him to an army, which having lost the battle, escapes the conquerours pursuit only by the favour of the night.

The conclusion we ought to draw from this is, that the mysteries of the gospel being of a supernatural order, neither can nor ought to be subjected to the rules of natural reason: they are not suited to the test of Philosophical disputes; their greatness and sublimity hinders them from stooping to them. It would be against the nature of things, for them to come off victorious from such a combat, their essential character is to be the objects of faith, and not of science: they would be no longer mysteries, if reason could solve all the difficulties of them; and therefore, instead of thinking it strange that any one should say that Philosophy may attack them, but not repulse the attack, it should be a subject of scandal to hear the contrary (3).

If they, whose scruples I would remove, yield not to these considerations, in which they will find, perhaps, something too abstracted, I intreat them to have recourse to reflexions that are more adapted to every one's capacity: I beseech them to consider a little the genius that reigns in the New Testament, and in the mission of the Apostles.

SOME considerations upon the method that Jesus Christ and the Apostles and ancient Fathers have observed in teaching.

could
it be
an
are
we
see.

The humour of disputing is what seems the least approved in the œconomy of the Gospel. The first thing JESUS CHRIST requires is faith and submission. This is commonly his first precept, and also of his apostles, *Follow me*, (4) *Believe*, and *thou shalt be saved* (5). Now, that faith which he required was not obtained by a train of Philosophical discussions and long reasonings; but was the gift of GOD, a pure grace of the Holy Ghost, which commonly fell on ignorant persons (6). It was not even produced in the apostles by their reflecting on the holiness of the life of JESUS CHRIST, and the excellency of his doctrine and miracles. They stood in need of a Revelation from GOD himself, to know that he whose disciples they were, was his eternal Son (7). If JESUS CHRIST and his apostles sometimes happen to reason, they did not take their proofs from natural light, but from the books of the Prophets, and from miracles; and if sometimes St Paul made use of some arguments *ad hominem* against the Gentiles, he did not much insist upon them. His method was entirely different from that of Philosophers: these boast of such evident principles, and a system so consistent, as to fear no other obstacles to persuasion but the stupidity of the auditors, or the malicious artifice of their competitors; and they offer to give an account of their doctrine to all the world, and to defend it against all gainfayers. St Paul, on the contrary, owns his doctrine to be obscure, that he knows it but imperfectly (8), and that nothing of it can be understood, unless GOD communicates a spiritual discernment, without which it must be reckoned foolishness (9). He confesses (10) that the greatest number of those converted by the apostles were ignorant and of mean condition. He does not challenge the Philosophers to disputation, but exhorts the believers to stand well upon their guard against Philosophy (11), and to avoid the contestations of that science, which had ruined the faith of some persons (12).

The ancient Fathers governed themselves by the same spirit; they required a ready submission to the authority of GOD, and looked upon the disputes of Philosophers as one of the greatest obstacles the true faith could meet in its way (13). Celsus the Philosopher laughed at the conduct of the Christians, *Who*, said he (14), *will neither bear your reasons, nor give you any for what they believe, contenting themselves with saying, Examine not, only believe; or Your faith will save you; and it is a maxim with them, that the wisdom of the world is an evil . . . If, as usually, they confine themselves to their examine not, only believe, they must at least tell me what things those are they would have me believe* (15). But observe how he is answered (16). 'If it were possible for all men, neglecting the affairs of this life, to apply themselves to study and meditation, we need seek no other way to make them embrace the Christian religion: for, not to say

(3) Note, that we mean not to condemn those who labour to reconcile these mysteries with Philosophy; their motives may be good, and their labour, by the blessing of God, may sometimes be useful.

(4) Luke v. 27, and ix. 59.

(5) Acts vii. 31.

(6) Matt. xii. 31.

(7) John. xvi. 17.

(8) 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

(9) 1 Thim. ii. 14.

(10) 1 Thim. ii. 14.

(11) Gal. ii. 14.

(12) 1 Tim. vi. 20.

(13) See the preface of the Fathers which Mr. de Launoy has compiled, &c. of his book, de variis Antiquis fortibus.

(14) Orig. against Celsus, book i. cap. 1.

(15) Ibid. i. 14.

(16) Ibid. i. 14.

say any thing offensive to others, no less exactness will appear in it than elsewhere; whether in the discussion of its doctrines (17), or in the illustration of the enigmatical expressions of its prophets, or in the signification of its Gospel parables, and abundance of other things which happened, or were symbolically ordained. But, since neither the necessities of this life, nor the infirmities of men, will permit many persons to apply themselves to study, what more profitable method could be found for all the rest of the world, than that which Jesus Christ was pleased to use for the conversion of the people? And I would fain be told, with respect to the great number of those who believe, and thereby have escaped the deluge of corruption in which they were plunged, which is better for them, to have thus changed their morals; and mended their lives, by believing without examination, that there are punishments for sins, and rewards for good actions; or to have put off their conversion till they not only believed, but had carefully examined the foundations of those doctrines? It is certain, that in following this method few people would have arrived so far as their plain and naked faith has conducted them; but most of them would have remained in their corruption. . . . But since they make so much noise about believing without examining, we must further tell them, that as for us who observe the profit which hence redounds to the greatest number, we frankly confess, that we recommend it to those who are not in a capacity of forsaking all things to apply themselves wholly to the search of truth (18).

(17) This must be understood not with respect to the principles of Logic and Metaphysics mentioned in this explanation (for it is certain the Fathers did not discuss the doctrine of the Trinity, and Incarnation by these rules) but with respect to principles taken from the word of God, taken the question is about a mystery of the gospel.

(18) Origen, *ubi supra*, pag. 6.

(19) 2 Cor. x. 7.

This passage of St Paul, *We walk by faith, and not by sight* (19), would alone suffice to convince us, that in a dispute between two Philosophers there is nothing to be gained by him who attempts either to prove the mysteries of the Christian Religion, or to stand upon the defensive. For herein lies the difference betwixt the faith of a Christian and the science of a Philosopher; this faith produces a complete certainty, but its object still remains invident; science, on the contrary, at once produces the evidence of the object, and a complete certainty of persuasion. A Christian therefore attempting to maintain the mystery of the Trinity against a Philosopher, would oppose an invident object against evident objections. Would not this be fighting blind-fold and with hands tied, against an adversary who has the use of all the faculties of his body and mind? But if the Christian could solve all the Philosopher's objections, only by the principles of natural reason, the assertion of St Paul would not be true, *that we walk by faith, and not by sight*: for science, and not Divine faith, would be the portion of a Christian.

Now can any man take offence at my acknowledging a truth which naturally results from the spirit of the gospel, and the doctrine of St Paul?

MAXIMS common to Romish and Protestant Divines.

If these reflexions upon the conduct of the first ages have not sufficient force; if, I say, such objects considered at a distance, make not an impression deep enough, let me intreat you to examine the maxims of the modern Divines. Both Papists and Protestants agree in this position, that reason is to be rejected in the judging of a controversy about our mysteries; which amounts to this, that this concession shall never be made, *viz.* That, if the literal sense of a passage of Scripture includes inconceivable doctrines impugned by the most evident maxims of the Logicians and Metaphysicians, it shall be declared false; and Reason, Philosophy and Natural Light shall be the rule to be followed in the choice of a certain interpretation of Scripture preferably to all others. They not only say, that all those are to be rejected who make such a preliminary demand in the dispute, but also maintain that they are engaged in a way that can lead only to Scepticism, or Deism, or Atheism: so that the most necessary Barrier to preserve the Christian religion, is the obligation to submit to the authority of God, and humbly to believe the mysteries he has been pleased to reveal, however inconceivable they be and impossible they appear to our reason.

It seems that the Papists and Lutherans ought more strongly to insist upon this principle than the Calvinists; for the doctrine of the Real Presence has a more particular need of it; and yet the Calvinists are as jealous of this position as the others, and urge it with great zeal against the Socinians; and whenever they see some of their Divines go out of this common road, to make more room for reason, they write severely against them, and make them suspected of the Socinian Heresy.

It would be easy to gather up the proofs of all I have said, but this would be to very little purpose; for whoever is acquainted with books of controversy, must know that the Roman Catholics continually recommend the sacrificing our reason, and captivating the understanding, and that the Protestant Ministers impute the Socinian impieties to the refusal of this sacrifice. The disputes of the university of Franeker, silenced by authority (20), and those of the two French Ministers (21) terminated (22) by the Walloon Synod, have made too much noise, and are of so late a date, that there is no need of proving it by any citations. I only say, that one of those two ministers maintained as the *universal doctrine of the Church, and particularly of Calvin and his followers*, that the foundation of faith is neither the evidence of the objects, nor the evidence of revelation; and that the Holy Ghost persuades us of the mysteries of the Gospel, without evidently shewing us what we believe, or the Divinity of the Scripture, or the truth

(20) In 1687. There are in the Bibliothèque Universelle, Extraits of many books published pro and con upon this controversy.

(21) Mr. Jurieu, and Mr. Saurin.

(22) In Sept. 1696.

V O L. V.

9 X

truth

AN EXPLANATION

truth of the sense of such and such passages. He was acknowledged to be orthodox; his adversary obtained a like testimony of his orthodoxy; but this proves nothing against me, for he owned that faith is inevident as to the object, and that the evidence accompanying it as to revelation is an effect of grace. He is therefore one of those who say that mysteries are not under the jurisdiction of reason, and that reason or philosophical light is not the rule we are to consult when we dispute on that matter.

Now, if all the Divines who are orthodox, with regard to the mysteries of the Trinity, and hypostatic Union, both Roman Catholics and Protestants unanimously reject the arbitration of reason, it is a manifest sign they find it incapable of giving proofs or solutions in the controversies concerning those mysteries; for when the question is about the existence of God, they desire nothing better than to dispute by the light of reason, because it furnishes arms both to attack and repulse the enemy, and to gain an entire victory. The reason therefore why they act quite otherwise, with respect to the Trinity and Incarnation, &c. is their knowing that Philosophical principles are unable, insufficient, to do good, but capable of doing much harm. If justice and prudence allow the excepting against a judge, it is only in case of incompetence and partiality. The more zeal a man has for his cause, the less he neglects his advantages; and if he has also a true sense of his interest, he never excepts against well-affected persons.

From all this I conclude, that there is nothing easier than to satisfy those who have been offended with my concession; for I need only desire them to observe, that if they will be scandalized at it, they must complain that all the orthodox Divines are a scandal to them. There is no medium in this case: they must either approve what I have said, or disapprove what is said by those Divines who are most averse to the Socinian Heresies.

An answer to some objections: the first is, that we give too great advantage to Heretics and Infidels, by owning that their philosophical objections against the mysteries of the New Testament cannot be answered.

If it is objected, that offence was justly taken at my concession, since it is giving too great an advantage to the unbelievers, to allow that their objections against our mysteries cannot be answered philosophically: I reply two things. First, that they must then be offended not only at what I have said on this subject, but also at what the most orthodox Divines have published concerning it. I say secondly, that this is not giving to the unbelievers any advantage they can justly boast of, as they might do if our preachers imitated those Philosophers, who give public notice that they are ready to defend such and such propositions against all opposers, and that at such a day, and at such an hour and place they will make them appear as clear as noon-day. If the Apostles, St Paul for example, when among the Athenians, had petitioned the Areopagus to permit him to enter the lists with all the Philosophers; if he had offered to maintain a disputation upon the three persons which are but one God, and upon the unity of the hypostasis of the Divine and human nature in Jesus Christ; and if before he began the dispute he had acknowledged the truth of the rules established by Aristotle in his Logic, either concerning the terms of opposition, or the requisites of the premises of a demonstrative syllogism, &c. In fine, if these preliminaries being adjusted, he had answered that our reason is too weak to comprehend the mysteries against which they proposed their objections, he had been exposed to all the shame that a nonplussed respondent can ever suffer. The victory of the Athenian Philosophers had been complete; for he would have been judged and condemned by the very maxims which he had already owned to be certain. But if these Philosophers had attacked him by the same maxims, after he declared to them the foundation of his faith, he might have opposed this barrier to them, viz. That his doctrines were unknown to reason, that they were revealed by God, and that we ought to believe them, though we do not comprehend them. The dispute, to be regular, must not have turned upon the question, Whether these doctrines were contrary to the maxims of Logic and Metaphysics; but upon the question, Whether God had revealed them. St Paul could not have the worst of it, except it had been proved to him that God did not require the belief of those things.

You see by this how imaginary is the pretended triumph of the unbelievers; for our Divines do not pretend to prove the Trinity and Incarnation by Philosophical arguments; they admit only the word of God for the foundation and source of their proofs and solutions. This is their fortress, their place of arms, it is enough for them to defend it, and ward off all the blows levelled at it by an Heretic, who bottoms upon the same principle with them, viz. the Divine authority of the Scripture. It is no great matter if the enemy seize the rest, being a country which they have voluntarily abandoned. It is no great victory to seize on a place which no body designed to keep. *Facile erat vincere non repugnantes* (23). - - - *It was an easy matter to vanquish those who made no resistance.*

To the end that those who read this, and have no other book on this subject, may be fully assured that I do not advance a thing at random. I will fully convince them of what I have advanced. I will cite the testimony of two famous writers (24), one a Priest, and the other a Minister, and both very orthodox upon the Trinity, Incarnation, satisfaction of Jesus Christ, and some other mysteries. This proceeding (25) is unreasonable,

(23) Cicero, *Tullius, Quæst. Tit. 1, cap. 10, p. 245, G.*

(24) Mr. Nisard and Mr. Clark.

(25) That it is to make a collection of reason which have formerly surprised against the Trinity, &c.

unreasonable, as being contrary to the first principles, and the very foundations of the Christian religion. If this religion told men, that it proposes to them a faith free from all difficulties; that nothing can be alledged against its mysteries with any sort of probability; and that the proofs on which it establishes the truths it teaches, are so clear as to overcome the incredulity and reluctance of all sorts of persons, however prepossessed; this would be a just ground for pretending to overthrow its doctrines, by thus heaping up probable objections against what it would make us believe. But it is very far from speaking thus: it not only does not tell them that the truths it teaches cannot be attacked by any probable reasons, but tells them it is necessary they should be so, and that it is an infallible consequence of the design God had in discovering himself to mankind by the true religion (26). Mr Claude having objected nothing to this passage of Mr Nicolle, must be deemed the approver of it; for if he had found any matter for censure in it, he was indispensibly obliged to censure it in refuting, as he did, the book concerning the Perpetuity of Faith.

(26) Nicolle, Perpetuité de la Foi, pag. m. 92, 93.

The second objection is, that answers have been found to these philosophical objections.

Let us see whether any just offence could be taken, under pretence that the Philosophical objections against the doctrine of the Trinity, &c. silence not the Professors of Divinity, and that in their public disputations on these points, they solve all the difficulties that can be proposed to them. I desire such as shall urge this to consider two things: one is, that their objection cannot be good against me, without being so against all the Divines who acknowledge that the great mysteries of the gospel are inexplicable by natural reason: the other is, that the Protestants cannot make use of this objection; for it proves too much; namely, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is not liable to invincible attacks, philosophically speaking. It is the general doctrine of the Roman Catholics, that a body may be in several places at the same time. The Thomists, contenting themselves with what is necessary, have not dared to affirm it can be so *circumscriptively*, but at most as Jesus Christ is under the sacramental species. The other schoolmen, especially the Jesuits, have been much bolder; they have maintained the *circumscriptive replication* (27), and in this have reasoned more consequentially than the Thomists; for if the reasons alledged against this replication were good, the *definitive replication* (28) would not be maintainable. The replication is not only taught by the Divines, but also in all the bodies of Philosophy, and it is always one of the theses ordered to be publicly maintained by the students in Natural Philosophy. All imaginable objections are discussed in the books of scholastic Divines, which treat of the sacrament of the Eucharist, and in the bodies of Philosophy, in the place where the questions *de loco* are explained: not one of those objections remains unanswered: Does this hinder the Protestants from persisting to maintain that this position, *viz.* a body is in several places at the same time, is liable to a thousand contradictions, and absolutely impossible? Nothing therefore can be inferred in favour of an opinion, from the possibility of opposing some distinction or school-term against whatever the most subtle adversaries can object (29). All does not consist in making an answer, but in giving a solution which raises some idea, and is exempt from the *petitio principii*, and which shews the objection to be grounded upon foundations that have no connexion with common notions. Here you see three requisites which are wanting in the schoolmen's answers to the objections against Transubstantiation: therefore their last and principal refuge is to say, that the omnipotence of God supplies what reason cannot comprehend, and that it is our duty to captivate our understanding, and sacrifice our reason to the authority of the Church.

(27) It is thus the Schoolmen call the position of the same body in several places, without a penetration of dimensions.

(28) Thus they call the position of the same body in many places at once, with penetration of dimensions.

(29) Compare with this what I have said in the article ZENO of Elia, concerning the objections relating to the divisibility of matter.

They have been no less subtle and fertile in inventing either difficulties, or answers, with respect to the Trinity, than with respect to Transubstantiation. But the Socinians are as ill satisfied with these two kinds of answers, as the Protestants are with those relating to Transubstantiation: Both, say the Socinians, want the three requisites above-mentioned: they take for granted what is in question; they are as obscure, or even obscurer than the doctrine itself, which is the subject of controversy; they are too inconceivable to be confuted; it is a dispute wherein night parts the combatants; for if the respondent wraps himself in a distinction wholly incomprehensible, the opponent must necessarily retire; or if he stays, he does not see where he can strike a blow. No man will shoot where there is not the least glimpse whereby to discover or guess at the mark; and as the highest degree of evidence has this property, that it cannot be proved, the lowest degree of inevidence has this destiny, that it cannot be attacked. So that no consequence can be drawn in favour of a doctrine from this, that its opponents, though never so well provided with Philosophical weapons, at last meet with an intrenchment of distinctions, involved in so impenetrable a cloud, that they are forced to proceed no farther.

There are both in the Protestant and Romish communion a great many persons who are dissatisfied with the explanations of the schoolmen, and think that these people have more confounded than explained the mysteries of religion. Some Protestant Divines could wish that the scripture-terms had only been made use of, that the whole doctrine of the Trinity had been expressed in five or six lines, and that, instead of following the disputants from one objection to another, they had been told, *We do not propose this*

AN EXPLANATION

this to you as a thing you are to comprehend, but as a thing you are to believe: if you cannot believe it, beg the grace of God that you may; if you obtain nothing by your prayers, your distemper is incurable: our distinctions and subtilties will serve only to harden you; you will never leave off complaining that we explain to you one obscure doctrine by another more obscure, *obscurum per obscurius*. It is very probable that this mystery propounded in a few words, according to the simplicity of the scripture, would much less startle and fright reason, than it does by that great train of explications which accompanies it in Thomas Aquinas's Commentators. Many Roman Catholics would heartily say, if they durst, against the subtilties of the schoolmen, what the Abbot Faydit has published of them: but though they had not the same courage he had to publish a strong invective on this subject, they nevertheless think as he does. See the margin (30).

Mr Balzac has said excellent things in the fifth discourse of his *Socrate Chrétien* (31). I shall give some part of it. 'They who have translated from one language into another with the greatest reputation, have mistaken rivers for mountains, and men for cities. The mistakes of your Divines are not less than those. Human reason falls into more strange mistakes when it treats of divine things: being weak and defective it ought to be cautious, and consider its own strength; it ought to be more discreet and reserved: there may be an excess in the desire of learning and enquiring: it is a vice to know too much news; ancient morality has condemned it: Theophrastus's characters do not forget it. And if that be true which was heretofore said, THAT WE OUGHT NOT TO BE CURIOUS IN A FOREIGN REPUBLIC; what audaciousness is it, I pray, what sacrilege, for a citizen of the lower world, an inhabitant of the earth, to meddle so much with the things above, and the affairs of heaven? In what country is he more a stranger than in that? Is there any Republic more unknown to him? Is there any foreign place he is more remote from, or has less society and correspondence with? The profound respect we owe to that majesty which conceals himself, forbids our prying into it with so much diligence and forwardness. Let us stop at his outworks and ramparts, without pursuing him into his fort and intrenchments; let us adore the veils and clouds he has placed betwixt us and him. Since he inhabits a light inaccessible, let us leave off attempting the place of his abode: let us not endeavour to surprize him by the subtilty of our questions, to force him with the violence of our arguments. If the preservation of our eyes be valuable, if our life be dear to us, let us shun that formidable presence, that fatal light, that light which dazzles angels and kills men (32). . . . At the unmeasurable distance we are from him, confined to the lowest station of the world he has built, we would ascend his throne, and touch his crown. We aspire to his strictest confidence and familiarity; at least, we pretend to see him with the eyes of flesh, to comprehend him with a mind drowned in blood, and buried in matter. We undertake to discourse of his nature and his essence, to give an account of his conduct and designs, with the jargon of Aristotle's Philosophy (33).'

Balzac, in this discourse, had the Spanish schoolmen in view; but there is no subject in which they better deserve this censure, than their explications of the mystery of the Trinity: so little reason is there to conclude they have succeeded well, under the pretence of their inventing answers to objections.

But to be impartial to every body, we must say, that those who engage in disputes with the Socinians, and take new roads, seldom fail to lose their way. This has been seen in England five or six years ago (34): a famous Divine, thinking he could not confute some Socinian tracts by the hypothesis of the schools, imagined another; but it was pretended that he established Tritheism, and his hypothesis was not suffered to take footing. From whence we may infer how impossible it is to confute the Philosophical objections of the Socinians; and since they acknowledge the scripture, they ought immediately to be attacked by it. This is the weak side of their defence; the other is the strong side.

As desirous as I am to be short, I must observe the method taken by an able Divine, who has since been many years Bishop of Salisbury, to refute the objections of a famous Atheist (35) whom he converted. He has given us an account of the conferences he had with him, where we find, amongst other things, that in answering the difficulties upon the mysteries of the gospel, he had only recourse to this, that the incomprehensibility of a doctrine is not a sufficient reason to reject it, since there are a great many most certain things in nature which it is impossible to comprehend. He mentioned some of them, and particularly the union of the soul and body. It had been objected to Dr Burnet, that it is not in the power of man to believe what he does not conceive; and that it is opening a door to all the cheats and impositions of priests, to give credit to mysterious doctrines. He excepted to the belief of mysteries in the Christian Religion; which he thought no man could do, since it is not in a man's power to believe that which he cannot comprehend: and of which he can have no notion. The believing mysteries, he said, made way for all the jugglings of priests, for they getting the people under them in that point, set out to them what they pleased; and giving it a hard name, and calling it a Mystery, the people

(30) To know
is what a strange
complexity the
Abbot Faydit has
reduced the school-
men, we need only
consult the author
who has attempted
to explain him, or the
most exact Mr de
Bourneville has
given of his an-
swer, in the Hist.
des Ouvr. des Sa-
vants, May 1699,
pag. 214. &
seq.

(31) Initiated,
Concerning the
too great subtilty
in matters of re-
ligion.

(32) Balzac, So-
crate Chrétien,
pag. m. 57. &
seq.

(33) *Id. ibid.*
62, 63.

(34) I wrote this
in November,
1701.

(35) John Wil-
son, B. of Salis-
bury, born
April 1648, who
died positive in
1680. A man
whose distinguished
himself by his
piety, and his
writings which
were full of re-
monstrances and
strictures; and
of those who
were true accor-
ding to their pre-
cepts; for he
plunged himself
into the pre-
cepts of purity,
except of those
which were in-
convenient in
his conversion in
Dr Gilbert's
people

people were tamed, and easily believed it (36). The Doctor answered (37), that we must not wonder that the essence of God is incomprehensible, since there is in every being something we cannot account for (38), and the possibility of several facts acknowledged to be true by all the world, may yet be attacked by specious arguments (39); and therefore the revelation of the mystery of the Trinity and Incarnation, and some others, being certain we ought to subject our reason to them; for the sole argument that can be opposed to them is, that they are above our reason; but is not the same difficulty to be found in several things which we admit to be true (40). He was so far from reckoning the schoolmen answers any thing, that on the contrary he confessed they only served to render the difficulties more obscure. *There have been too many niceties brought in indeed, rather to darken than explain these: They have been defended by weak arguments, and illustrated by similes not always so very apt and pertinent. And new subtilties have been added, which have rather perplexed than cleared them. All this cannot be denied; the opposition of Heretics antiently, occasioned too much curiosity among the Fathers: which the Schoolmen have wonderfully advanced of late times. But if mysteries were received, rather in the simplicity in which they are delivered in the scriptures, than according to the descantings of fanciful men upon them, they would not appear much more incredible, than some of the common objects of sense and perception (41).*

Let us not forget this observation. Luther, and several other Protestant Divines had never maintained that there are things false in Philosophy which are true in Divinity (42), if they had believed that the answers made to the objections of the Philosophers against our mysteries were satisfactory to reason; for they maintained this only on account of those mysteries (43).

I do not see therefore that hitherto the objections I had to solve in this explanation have been able to put me to any difficulty. Let us try in some others.

If it be objected, that my concession is scandalous, because it relates not to the Philosophical reasons which may impugn the Trinity, Incarnation, and some other mysteries, but to the disputes about the origin of evil; that objection will be very faulty: For, first, the objector will be ignorant that the decrees of God concerning the fall of man, and the consequences of this fall, are one of the most incomprehensible mysteries of religion; secondly, That our most orthodox Divines acknowledge it.

The writings of St Paul teach us, that this great Apostle, proposing to himself the difficulties concerning Predestination, could get out of them no otherwise than by asserting the absolute power of God over his creatures (44), with an exclamation upon the incomprehensibility of his ways. Could he more clearly signify, than by such a solution, that the doctrine of the decrees of God concerning the destiny of the Elect and Reprobate is inexplicable? Is not this telling us in plain terms, that Predestination is one of the mysteries which most overwhelm human reason, and most unavoidably require it to humble itself under the authority of God, and sacrifice itself to the scripture? The objections it suggests against the mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, are for the most part sensible only to those who have some tincture of Logic and Metaphysics; and belonging to the speculative sciences, they have less force upon the generality of men: but those it suggests against Adam's sin, and Original Sin, and the eternal damnation of an infinite number of people, who cannot be saved without an efficacious grace, which God grants only to his Elect, are founded upon principles of Morality, which are known to every body, and which constantly serve for a rule both to the learned and ignorant to judge whether an action be unjust or not. These principles are the most evident, and work upon the mind and heart; so that all the faculties of man revolt, when we must impute to God a conduct which is not conform to this rule. Nay, the solution which is drawn from God's infinity, and is employed as a powerful motive to captivate the understanding, is not exempt from a new difficulty; for if that infinite distance which raises God above all things, ought to persuade us that he is not subject to the laws of human virtues, we cannot be certain that his justice engages him to punish evil, and we could not confute those who should maintain that he is the author of sin, and yet punishes it very justly, and in all this does nothing but what is consistent with the infinite perfections of a supreme being; because those perfections are not to be adjusted to our ideas of virtue.

It is plain therefore, that the doctrine concerning Adam's sin, with its dependences; is, of all the mysteries unconceivable to reason and inexplicable by its maxims, that which most necessarily obliges us to submit to revealed truth, notwithstanding all the oppositions of Philosophical truth.

It were to be wished that this point had been always remembered; for the unhappy disputes about grace, which have caused so many troubles, were only derived from the treating of this mystery as a thing reconcilable with our weak reason. The Roman Catholics here have acted inconsistently; they have insulted Calvin with the utmost fury, for literally following St Paul's doctrine, whilst they would explain it in a milder sense, that human reason might be satisfied with it. They had not the same regard for reason in the explication of the passages relating to the Trinity, and the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Balzac's strokes against the Protestant Divines would do well against

V O L. V.

9 Y

(36) Some passages of the life and death of John, Earl of Rochester, &c. pag. 100, of the Edit. 1680.

(37) Ibid. pag. 101, & seq.

(38) For mystery it is plain there is in every thing, somewhat, that is unaccountable. Ibid. pag. 101.

(39) Ibid. pag. 103, 104.

(40) Note, That the author who published a treatise of religion against the Atheists, Deists, and new Pyrrhonists, at Paris, in 1677, strongly praised the argument, That unbelievers cannot avoid in their principles believing things incomprehensible.

See chap. iii, iv, and v, of the second part.

(41) Some passages, &c. Ibid. pag. 106, 107.

(42) See, remark [C], of the article HORMAN (Daniel), and remark [K K], of the article LUTHER.

(43) See remark [K K], of the article LUTHER.

(44) See remark [E], of the article ARMINIUS.

THE third objection, is, that I ought not to have applied to the arguments of the Manichees, what might be acknowledged with respect to the arguments against the mysteries of the Gospel.

the Papists. *The Ministers*, says he (45), *ought to be laughed at as fools*, ' after the advances they have made, and the reserves they would keep to themselves. When they have granted us the more, can they refuse us the less? Having given us the mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, they have reserved themselves nothing afterwards. By granting these two great strange and astonishing truths, they have given up the liberty of their mind; which liberty must either lie lost or preserved full and entire. The same authority which assures them of the certainty of the Apostles Creed, assures them of the validity of all the other parts of religion; and they have no better grounds for contesting the latter, than the former. The authority being infallible, it is universally infallible; it is equally infallible. The Christian being a captive to faith, and not a judge of doctrines, ought to obey the voice which speaks, without deliberating about the words, because the words would not persuade him, if the voice had not already done it. A man has no longer a right to his first freedom, after he has taken upon him the yoke of the commanding and victorious God. It is too late to make use of our reason, after we have submitted it to the *obedience of faith*. How ridiculous, I pray, would it be, one while to quit reason, and another to resume it; to make choice of some pleasing parts of Christianity, and to reject the displeasing ones; to be half Infidel, and half Believer! This would be making terms with Jesus Christ, and entering upon articles with the Church. It would be doing something worse, passing from complaisance to giving the lie, admitting part of what the popes to our belief, and maintaining the rest to be false.' Calvin might thus have defended himself against those who disliked his hypothesis of Predestination; he might have told them, You are preposterously squeamish, after having digested the difficulties of one God in three persons, and those of Transubstantiation. You will not hearken to Philosophical arguments on that head; you talk of nothing but the omnipotent power of God; you complain of our denying it, when we deny the preservation of accidents without a subject, and the presence of a body in different places: Why then do ye attack the mystery of Predestination by human arguments? Why do not ye believe that the power of God extends even to the reconciling the liberty of creatures with the necessity of his decrees, and his justice with the punishment of a sin necessarily committed?

Be it how it will, it cannot be denied that the introduction of moral evil, with the doctrines annexed to it, is one of the most impenetrable mysteries which God has revealed to men. I will cite some authors upon it.

I repeat not what may be read in another place of this work (46), *viz.* that a Protestant Divine publicly confesses that the hypothesis of St Austin and Calvin is to him an insupportable burden, and that he embraces it only because none of the other hypotheses are able to ease him. Calvin's words which I have cited (47) deserve a place here. Throughout his writings he constantly declares that wherever the question is about sin, the name of God ought not to be engaged in it, since nothing belongs to the nature of God but perfect justice and equity. It is therefore a base and horrible calumny to involve in this crime a man who has served the Church of God so well, as if he made God the author of sin. It is true he every where affirms, that nothing is done but by the will of God; and yet he maintains, that the wicked actions of men are so directed and governed by the secret judgment of God, that he has no communication with their vices. The sum of his doctrine is, that God directs all things, by means wonderful and unknown to us, to what end he pleases, so that his eternal will is the first cause of all things. And he confesses it to be an incomprehensible mystery, that God should will what to us appears unreasonable; and nevertheless he affirms, that we are not to enquire too curiously or audaciously into his conduct, since the judgments of God are a profound abyss, and that it is better to adore with all reverence the mysteries and secrets which exceed our capacity, than to scan them, or intrude too far into them (48). You see how he advises us not to approach this abyss, but with a spirit of submission and reverence for this great and incomprehensible mystery. Mr Morus being Minister and Professor of Divinity in the same city of Geneva as Calvin had been, vehemently declaimed against the reformed Divines who disputed about the universality of Grace. He had an eye to Amyraldus and Spanhemius. He gave them the same reprimand as is used to audacious writers, who have the boldness to dive into the most hidden secrets of the Creator. He puts them in mind of the weightiest maxims that are employed to recommend to us the sacrificing of our reason, and the captivating our understanding to the authority of God with respect to the most incomprehensible mysteries. His words have so much emphasis, that they cannot be translated without losing a great deal of their energy. I will therefore give the original. 'Quis non videat quæ de Trinitate, quam sibi soli notam vetus ait scriptor, deque decretis Dei, quorum non aliter constat ratio, quam si nemini reddatur, deque aliis ejusmodi, quæ nec licet scire, nec prodest, anxie disputantur, non tuto, sed frustra, disputari? Nemo cœleste mysterium discutiat ratione terrena, divina verba modis non pensemus humanis, inquit Chrysologus. Credere, quod iustum est, non est discutere permiffum, ait Ambrosius. Lauda, venerare, tuum est nescire, quod agitur, inquit Author de vocatione Gentium. Quæ Deus occulta esse voluit, non sunt scruta-

(45) Balzac, *Socrate Chrétien*, *Discours* viii, pag. m. 320, 47.

(46) See above, the article PAULICANS, citations (44), (45).

(47) See citat. (16), of the article SYMBOLISM.

(48) Calvin's brief answer to the calumnies of a certain pragmatic, attempting to defend the Doctrine of God's eternal predestination, pag. 107, of his *Treatise*, Geneva 1611.

‘tanda; quæ manifesta fecit, non sunt negligenda, ne & in illis illicite curiosi, & in his
 ‘damnabiliter inveniamur ingrati. Nos autem fastidimus aperta in scripturis, clausa,
 ‘& obfignata, in cœlis quærimus, nunquam visa perambulare, oculis quoque subducta
 ‘calcare pedibus, ἡμετέροις, Pauli vox agnoscitur, fatagimus ardeliones. Quare hi sic,
 ‘illi aliter, absit ut dicamus judicium esse luti, non figuli, quæ sunt Augustini verba, com-
 ‘pescat se humana temeritas, & quod non est, non quærat, ne id, quod est, non in-
 ‘veniat: ὅτι ἀκατάληπτον τὸ Θεῶν Damascenus aliique præscribunt. Quid æternis mi-
 ‘nore confiliis animum fatigas? Audi Tertullianum: Præstat, inquit, per Deum
 ‘nescire, quia ipse non revelaverit, quam per hominem scire, quia ipse præsumserit;
 ‘cedat curiositas fidei, cedat gloria salutis. Audi Scripturam: ARCANUM DEO, revelata
 ‘nobis, & filiis nostris. Moses Dei Vocem audivit; faciem non vidit; quia fide, non
 ‘visu, ambulamus, & cujus ferre Majestatem non possumus, à posteriori, ut loquuntur,
 ‘opera cum Mose lustramus. Deus absconditus habitat in caligine, inquit Rex Paci-
 ‘ficus; in luce, sed inaccessible, inquit cœlestis Apostolus. Hic subvectus in tertium
 ‘cœlum quæ visere potuit, non potuit enarrare: nos humi serpentes adhuc enarramus
 ‘velut conscii, quæ nunquam, ne per nebulam quidem, vidimus. Non constat sine
 ‘arcano Majestas, nubes Dei gloriam obumbrat, Arca oppanfo velo tegitur: nos in
 ‘horribile Dei Sacrarium emissitios oculos evibramus, & nondum bene initiati Epoptas
 ‘agimus. Ut ad ignem, Solemque, sic ad Deum accedamus, hætenus ut calore
 ‘foveamur, non voraci flamma, non radiis æstuantibus hauriamur (49). - - - - - As
 ‘for those disputes relating either to the Trinity, which an ancient author says that no body
 ‘knew except himself, or to the decrees of God, for which no man can presume to render a
 ‘reason, or other points of the like nature, which we are neither permitted nor concerned to
 ‘know, is it not obvious that these controversies are not only bold and dangerous, but also vain
 ‘and unprofitable. Let no man, says Chrysologus, examine a heavenly mystery by
 ‘earthly reason; neither let us weigh the word of God in the scale of human judgment.
 ‘What we are commanded to believe, let us believe, says Ambrosius, but we are not
 ‘permitted to sift and canvass matters of faith. Praise and adore the dispensations of
 ‘providence, it becomes you to be ignorant of the reasons of them, says the author of
 ‘the book on the calling of the Gentiles. We must neither pry into what God hath thought
 ‘fit to conceal from us, nor refuse our assent to the truths he hath been pleased to manifest and
 ‘reveal, lest in the former case we should be found sinfully curious, and in the latter, un-
 ‘grateful, even to our condemnation. Nevertheless, while we despise the truths revealed to
 ‘us in Scripture, we pry into the secrets of heaven, and would there discover what God hath
 ‘concealed, tread in paths unseen and unknown, intrude upon, and are busy after things the
 ‘most remote from our knowledge and discernment. From hence arises the great diversity of our
 ‘opinions, even in matters of the highest importance. Let us therefore check our rashness,
 ‘let us not seek after what is bidden, lest we should miss of what is revealed. Divine things
 ‘are to us incomprehensible, as Damascenus and others have written. Why shouldst thou
 ‘rack thy thoughts, and busy thyself about the eternal purposes of God, since they are beyond
 ‘thy reach? Hear the words of Tertullian. It is better for us not to know what God hath
 ‘concealed, because he has not revealed these things, than to know what man hath dis-
 ‘covered, because he is presumptuous; let our curiosity give place to our faith, and
 ‘our vanity to our salvation. Hear the words of the Scripture. THE MYSTERIES OF
 ‘GOD belong unto GOD, but the things which are revealed, to us and to our children.
 ‘Moses heard the voice of God, but did not see his face, because we walk by faith, and
 ‘not by sight, and of that God the glory of whose majesty we are not able to bear, we behold,
 ‘with Moses, the works, only as it were in their back parts. God being hidden dwelleth in
 ‘darkness, says Solomon; in light, but inaccessible, says St Paul. That Holy Apostle was
 ‘carried up to the third heavens, but what he beheld, he was not able to relate; whereas we
 ‘who are reptiles on this earth, pretend to relate what we never saw, no not through a cloud,
 ‘as if we were thoroughly acquainted with these secrets. Majesty never appears open or
 ‘exposed to our view, a cloud overshadows the divine glory, the ark is covered over with a
 ‘large vail. Yet we pierce with prying eyes into the tremendous mysteries of God, and before
 ‘we are well initiated, pretend to a thorough knowledge of them. Let us approach the divine
 ‘majesty, as we would the fire, or the sun, that we may be nourished by the heat, but not destroyed
 ‘by the devouring flames, and scorching beams of his glory.’ Very lately one of those who
 ‘succeeded Calvin in his chair, has in a most distinct manner acknowledged the incomprehen-
 ‘sibility of Predestination. I have not as yet had the pleasure of seeing his new system
 ‘of Divinity; but we find this account of it in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*:
 ‘He begins with a question extremely difficult, and which is a stumbling-block to
 ‘the profane and the weak; namely, why God has permitted sin, which is the cause
 ‘of such a number of evils, and which he might easily prevent? Mr Pictet does not
 ‘conceal the strength of the difficulty, but proposes it in its full force. They who
 ‘ventured to affirm that God knows not futurity, when it depends on the freewill of
 ‘intelligent creatures, easily disengage themselves from this difficulty, by saying God
 ‘has not prevented what he has not foreseen: But this is leaping into an abyss to avoid
 ‘a precipice; and it is still more difficult to conceive that God should not know
 ‘futurity, than it is to conceive he has not hindered sin, though he foresaw it. The
 ‘opinion of those who say God has permitted it to manifest his wisdom, or to exercise
 ‘his

(49) Alexander
 Morus, Oratione
 de Pace, pag.
 52, & seq. Edit.
 Amstel. 1648,
 in 12mo.

1697

AN EXPLANATION

his justice and mercy, seems more reasonable. And yet all this is not satisfactory; for, besides that it was not perhaps impossible for God to manifest his attributes otherwise, is it, for instance, a great sign of mercy, to permit a great evil which might be prevented, in order to have an occasion of remedying it? Mr Pictet sincerely confesses, that as the Scripture gives us no reason of God's conduct on this occasion, and sufficiently intimates that there are here depths impossible for us to sound, we ought not to attempt it (50).^{(50) Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, November 1701, pag. 493, 494, in the extract of the Christian Theology of Mr Pictet, Minister and Professor of Divinity at Geneva.}

Any man who can be reasonably offended at what I have said in the articles concerning Manicheism, may likewise be justly offended with this Professor of Geneva's doctrine, as orthodox as it is.

Let us add also the testimony of a Roman Catholic, that nothing may here be wanting. There are some shallow wits, who had rather condemn boldly what they do not understand in the holy Fathers of the Church, than humble themselves, as they did, under the weight of the difficulties that are found in the explication of the mysteries of our faith. For the justification of a sinner, and the sanctification of a Christian, is a mystery, and a great one. And because men do not look upon it as a mystery, they boldly attempt to remove all its difficulties, they frame systems which bring every thing to evidence and demonstration, if we believe the authors of them; and they imagine a *Scientia media* in God, invented at first by the Semi-Pelagians, and whereof Pope Clement VIII, who well understood this subject, was wont to say, as Lemos relates, that it was an human invention to accommodate all things in appearance. With those human inventions, which explain not the mysteries but by destroying them, and give not the mind satisfaction but by seducing it with the fallacious appearances of light and evidence. Let us receive with humility what the Scripture and tradition discover of them. Let us willingly be ignorant of what God will conceal from us. Let us stop where the Apostles and Doctors of the Church have stopped; and when we read St Austin, so far from insulting him as a writer who goes astray and leads his followers to the precipice of error, let us acknowledge it is not from his expressions the difficulties proceed, but from the subject itself, as he answers Julian (51).^{(51) St Augustin justifié de Calvinisme, pag. 179, 180. Il est une piece imprimée en 1686, sous le nom de l'abbé de Saint Pierre, et qui est de l'abbé de Saint Pierre de Champ.}

THE fourth objection is, that I have used a most shocking comparison.

Let us see whether they could be justly shocked at a certain comparison which I have mentioned (52). I know several people have complained of it, some because they were not used to controversial books, and others because they had not fresh ideas of what they had formerly read in such books. Whatever be the ground of the offence they have taken, it may be easily removed. We need only represent to them that the most usual method of the controversialists is what they call *reductio ad absurdum*, reducing their adversaries to an absurdity. They chiefly endeavour to make it appear that the necessary consequence of the opinion they refute, is that the conduct of God would be execrable, and they make no scruple of speaking very ill of the God of their adversaries, that is of God considered such as he would be in case the opinion in question was received. They boldly employ the most shocking comparisons. The Roman Catholics maintain that Calvin introduced a God who is deceitful, cruel, and inhumane, a God void of justice, reason, and goodness (53), less innocent and less a God, than the God of Epicurus (54). A God who hath two wills, one public, by which he declares that he is willing to save all mankind, and the other secret, by which he drives into impiety, all those whom he loves not, in order to find a pretext for punishing them (55); . . . an inhumane master, who commands his servants to do things impossible, and inflicts on them an eternal punishment, because they did not perform them, as the tyrant Caligula did (56). In fine, a God who like Caligula commands his laws to be written in so small a character that no body can read them (57). The Arminian Bertius, disputing with Piscator, charged him with making God hold such a conduct towards man, as was perfectly like that which Tiberius held towards Sejanus's daughters. He shewed this parallel (58) in two columns in one of which he set down what that Emperor did in order that Sejanus's daughters might not be strangled against the laws. He set down in the other what Piscator makes God do, in order that the Reprobate may not be punished against the usual forms. A reformed Divine makes use of a like battery against the Socinians. He maintains against them that their God is the greatest of all the monsters that ever entered the imagination (59); that Plato and Zeno would have disliked him (60); that he is a very ignorant and powerless God (61), full of imperfections (62), a fantome of a God defeated every moment by unforeseen events (63); a strange God little better than the God of Epicurus (64), and lives from hand to mouth (65).^{(52) See above, citat. (50), of the article PAULICIANI. (53) See Mr Duall, Réponse à Adam & à Cottin, Part. II, chap. 1, pag. 2. (54) Ibid. pag. 3. (55) Ibid. (56) Ibid. p. 4. (57) Ibid. pag. 11. (58) Mr Arminius Bertius, a Lutheran Divine has inserted this parallel, in his Memorabilia Ecclesiastica Seculi XVII, lib. II, pag. 385, 386. (59) See the Jugement sur les Méthodes d'expliquer la Grèce, pag. 20. (60) See the Tableau du Socinianisme, Livre I, p. 20. (61) Ibid. pag. 23. (62) Ibid. pag. 25. (63) Ibid. (64) Ibid. (65) Ibid.}

THE fifth objection is, that we ought not to own disadvantages.

Such being the custom of the controversialists, I had been a very bad Historian of the dispute concerning the origin of evil, and an unfaithful relater of the reasons on each side of the question; if I had not mentioned the comparison which has displeased certain persons. It is that of God with a mother who forcing that her daughter *Ucé*, and observe that I have shewn that this comparison may be retorted against the Socinians.

If there are any who are offended at my departing from the maxim, that we ought never to own to our adversaries that we cannot answer their objections; I shall not want a long apology, having but this short question to ask them: is it not a commendable

able thing to act sincerely? If we are not obliged, are we not at least permitted to act thus? The answer must be in the affirmative. I may therefore, shall I reply, make use of this laudable liberty, especially when there is no decree of a synod or consistory to tie a man's hands in that respect. If any one can produce a doctrinal determination signed by four Professors of Divinity, and sealed with the seal of some university, which is no great demand; if any one, I say, can shew me such an act, importing that no orthodox man ought to own, not even when it is most true, that certain objections of the heterodox are unanswerable otherwise than by Scripture, I will engage to do every thing they will have me; for I am certain I shall never see such an act.

But for a more ample satisfaction of the most scrupulous readers, I am willing to declare here, that wherever it is said in my Dictionary that such and such arguments are unanswerable, I do not desire my readers should believe they are actually so; I mean no more than that they seem to me unanswerable. This has no ill consequence; every one may imagine, if he pleases, that I am of this opinion for want of due penetration. I wish they would add, that in conforming my self to the rules of sincerity rather than to the public maxims of the spirit of a party, I nevertheless consider that neither Heresy nor Heathenism can draw any advantage from the unanswerableness of their objections against mysteries (66).

The sixth objection is, that I have not confuted the Manichees.

The remaining difficulty will require a little longer examination. It is founded on my relating at large the objections of the Manichees, and not taking the trouble to produce the arguments which confute them. What follows will give satisfaction to all reasonable readers. Four reasons hindered me from insisting on the confutation of Manicheism.

(66) See what I answer to the first objection.

The first is, that considering the present disposition of men, there is no Heresy less to be feared than this. People cannot but abhor an hypothesis which admits an eternal and increased Being distinct from God, an enemy to God, and essentially wicked. And as for Free-thinkers, or in general all those who have cultivated the study of Metaphysics, and have any inclination to make a wrong use of it, they dislike nothing more than a multiplicity of principles. The depravity of their taste inclines them rather to be perfect Unitarians (67), than to declare for the Dualists (68).

In the second place, all Christians, however ignorant they be, so clearly include omnipotence and infinity in the idea of the Divine Nature, that they have no need of borrowed arms to fight the Manichees. This idea alone renders them strong enough in an offensive war; it affords them a solid confutation of that hypothesis: I therefore did not think it necessary to shew any of my readers how it was to be attacked.

(67) Thus for brevity sake we may call those who with the Spinosaists acknowledge but one substance in the universe: but note, that below I give that name to those who acknowledge but one first cause of all things.

Thirdly, the observation I made, and sufficiently enlarged upon in the remark [D] of the article MANICHEES, contains all that is necessary to make judicious persons averse to the doctrine of two principles. I said the reasonableness of a system consists in including nothing repugnant to evident ideas, and accounting for the phenomena. I added, that the system of the Manichees has at best but the advantage of explaining several phenomena, which strangely perplex the followers of the unity of a principle, but otherwise it stands on a supposition repugnant to our clearest ideas; whereas the other system is built upon those very notions. By this reflexion alone I give the superiority to the Unitarians, and I take it from the Dualists. For all rational persons will grant that a system is much more imperfect, when it wants the first of the two qualities I have mentioned, than when it wants only the second. If it be grounded upon an absurd, confused, improbable supposition, this imperfection is not made up by a lucky explication of the phenomena; but if it does not explain them all successfully, this is made up by the clearness, probability, and conformity, that is found in it with the laws and ideas of order; and they who have embraced it for this perfection, do not use to be discouraged under pretence that they cannot account for all matters of experience. They impute this defect to the narrowness of their minds, and imagine that in time, they shall be able to discover the true means of resolving the difficulties (69). A Cartesian Philosopher finding himself pressed with an objection concerning the reason given by Des Cartes of the ebbing and flowing of the sea, answered among other things, that an opinion ought not to be lightly abandoned, especially when it is well grounded in other respects. It was objected to Copernicus, when he proposed his system, that Mars and Venus should appear much greater at a certain time, because they came nearer the earth by several diameters. The consequence was necessary; and yet nothing of this appeared. Though he knew not what to answer, he did not think himself obliged to forsake it, but only said that time would discover it, and that perhaps it was by reason of the great distance. This answer was taken for an evasion, and there seemed to be some reason for it: But the telescopes having been since invented, it appeared that what was opposed to him as a great objection, is the confirmation of his system, and the overthrow of Ptolemy's (70).

(68) Thus the Persians call the followers of two principles. See *ci-dessus* (77); of the article ZOROASTRIER.

(69) Compare the article ZENO (of Elea) *ci-dessus* (61).

(70) Oudroy, Lettre à Mr de la Grange-Trianon, pour servir de Réponse à celle que Mr Castellet a écrite, pag. 13, 14. That letter was published at Paris in 1677.

Observe here by the by, a remarkable example of what I have said concerning the perfection of a system: that of Copernicus is so disentangled, so simple, and so mechanical, that it should be preferred before Ptolemy's, though it could not so well resolve some phenomena.

V O L. V.

9 Z

Lastly,

Lastly, my fourth reason is, that I pointed out so good and so certain a remedy, that it would have been needless to use any other expedient to compensate the disadvantage. The system of the Dualists accounts much better for several matters of fact than that of the Unitarians; but, on the other hand, it contains monstrous absurdities directly repugnant to the ideas of order. The Unitarian system has the perfection opposite to this defect, and therefore, all things duly considered, is preferable to the other. This might in some measure have been sufficient, but I further observed that the Unitarian system was consonant to scripture, and that of the Dualists invincibly confuted by the word of God. Can any one desire a stronger and more demonstrative proof, that the former system is true, and the latter false? Must I after this, in order to remove all scruples, philosophically confute Manicheism! Would not he have little faith, who should want such a discussion? God speaks, and does not this fully convince you? Would you have other securities? Would you have his testimony ratified by human reason (71)? Is not this unworthy of a man of common sense? Do you fear the objections of the Manichees, when you have the authority of Revelation against them?

Why do you not say with the Scripture, *If God is with us, who shall be against us* (72)? If your reason cannot answer the difficulties which they raise against you concerning the origin of evil, and the decrees of Reprobation, answer them as the lesser Catechism of the Reformed Churches answers this question concerning the Trinity, *How is this possible? It is a mystery above our reason, and nevertheless very certain; FOR GOD HATH DECLARED IT TO US IN HIS WORD* (73). Every Philosophic subtilty, that tends to deprive us of a divine truth, ought to pass with you for one of those attacks which St Paul would have us repel by taking the buckler of faith (74). Take it therefore, and you will be pretty well armed; remember likewise that by fearing lest this should prove but a weak defence you expose yourself to the railery which fell upon a Cardinal who pitied the Popes, when they had no other assistance but that of the Holy Ghost (75). *Non ho potuto d'hora in hora non commostrarvi i Pontefici con venti fra loro contrarii e tutti infesti al corso di lei eccetta la paura dello Spirito Santo* (76). - - - *I could not help frequently pitying the sad case the Popes were in, when the course they steered was opposed by every wind except that of the Holy Ghost.*

But let us have some regard to the men of little faith, and propose in this place some arguments against Manicheism.

Some arguments
against Manicheism.

I will not attack it on its weak side; that is, I will not take advantage of the palpable absurdities the Manichees ran into when they came to particular explications of their doctrine. They are so wretched, that it would be a sufficient confusion of them, barely to relate them. We have seen a specimen of it above (77). Let us spare them as to the ridiculous part of their system, and only consider it in the greatest simplicity it can be reduced to.

I will not make use of this objection of Simplicius (78): the principle of good and the principle of evil would be contrary; but they could not be contrary without being under the same genus; therefore there would be something above them, and that thing would be but one, and have all the essence of a principle: that thing therefore would be properly a principle, and consequently there would not be two first principles; and thus the supposition of two contrary principles implies a contradiction. This is more subtle than solid; for genus's and species exist only in our understanding; and therefore the genus including the two contrary principles, would be at most but an idea of our mind, as the general idea of Being, which, according to some Christian Philosophers, is univocal to God and the creatures (79).

Simplicius's other arguments are much more solid (80). He shews to those who admit two principles, one good, and the other evil, that their opinion is highly injurious to the God whom they call good; that it takes from him at least half his power, and makes him timorous, unjust, imprudent, and ignorant. The fear, said they, he was under of an irruption from his enemy, obliged him to forsake part of the souls, in order to save the rest. These souls were portions and members of his substance, and had committed no sin. Simplicius concludes from thence, that such a treatment was unjust, especially since they were to be tormented, and in case they contracted any guilt, they were to remain eternally in the power of evil. So that the good principle not knowing how to manage his interest, exposed himself to an eternal and irreparable mutilation. Add to this, that his fears were ill-grounded; for since the dominions of evil were from all eternity, and by their own nature, separate from the dominions of good, there was no reason to fear that evil should make an inroad upon the territories of its enemy. Simplicius taxes his adversaries with giving less foresight and power to the good principle than to the evil. The good principle did not foresee the misfortune of the detachments he exposed to the enemy's assaults (81), but the evil principle had very well known what detachments would be made against him, and had prepared the necessary engines to defeat them. The good principle was simple enough to suffer a mutilation, rather than receive into his districts the detachments of the enemy, who by that means would have lost part of his members. The evil principle had always been superior (82); had

(71) See remark [E], of the article PRASOT (Nicolas).

(72) Roman vii. 31.

(73) Petit Catechisme, §. ii.

(74) Ephes. vi. 16.

(75) If the Popes, who have none but God with them, are pitied by Cardinal Pallevine a Jesuit, and appear in the same pitiful condition to other men, how could they convert the Mahometans?

(76) They must therefore have some other assistance, besides that of the Holy Ghost, in order to bring about such conversions, and truly a Pope, who had no other assistance, would be in a very pitiful case. Etienne nouveau du Cardinal Pallevine, ch. iv. Art. 1, pag. 143, Dictionnaire.

(77) Pallav. Hist. del Concilio di Trento, lib. vi. cap. xiii.

(78) I translate this word as I find them in the Evangelic novum, chap. iv. Art. 1, pag. 143.

(79) In the remark [B], of the article MA- NICHISM, and in the remark [F], of the article ZOROASTER. See also the remark [E], of this last article.

(80) Simplic. in Epistola Enchirid. cap. xxxviii. pag. 163. Edit. Lugd. Bat. 1640.

(81) See the article ANNALETT (Anthony) De: the Sakers, remark [B].

(82) Id. ibid. pag. 163.

(83) Id. ibid. pag. 166.

(84) Necesse est appere, ut in ista res non habuerit, ut non esset, ut non esset.

had lost nothing, and preserved the conquests which he had made; but the good principle voluntarily had given up many things out of fear, injustice, and imprudence. The author concludes, that by refusing to acknowledge that God is the author of evil, they make him evil all manner of ways. Τὸ δὲ ἀγαθὸν, ὡς ἔτοι φασιν, ἐκείνους ἐαυτὸ τῷ κακῷ συνείμιξε, καὶ δολῶς καὶ ἀδίκως καὶ ἀνόμως κατ' αὐτὸς, μέχρι νῦν διαγίνεται. ἔσε φεύγοντες αἰτίον αὐτὸν τῷ κακῷ εἰπεῖν, πάγκαλον ὑπογράφουσιν καὶ κατὰ τὴν παρὰ τὴν φύσιν τὸν κακὸν, εἰς αὐτὸ ἐμπεπτώκασι. Cum BONUM ultro sese cum MALO commiscuerit, seque et timide, et injuste, et amenter (si illis credimus) gesserit. Itaque dum mali causam dicere Deum recusant, ab omni parte malum describunt: et ut proverbio dicitur, fumum fugientes in ignem inciderunt (83).

(83) Id. ibid. pag. 168.

I omit several other observations of Simplicius, against the hypothesis of two principles, because they attack those parts of it, which were weak only through the particular defects in the arbitrary explications of those who defended it. There is something of this in his objections which I have abridged; but I will produce one that strikes home the doctrine of two principles, though it be considered with the greatest simplicity.

He says (84), it entirely destroys the liberty of our souls, and necessitates them to sin, and consequently implies a contradiction; for since the principle of evil is eternal and incorruptible, and so potent that God himself cannot conquer it, it follows that the soul of man cannot resist the impulse with which that principle moves it to sin. But if a man be invincibly driven to it, he commits no murder, no adultery, &c. by his fault, but by a superior external force, and in that case he is neither guilty nor punishable. Therefore there is no such thing as sin, and consequently this hypothesis destroys itself, since, if there be a principle of evil, there is no longer any evil in the world: but if there be no evil in the world, it is evident there is no principle of evil; whence we may infer, that they who suppose such a principle, destroy, by a necessary consequence, both evil and the principle of evil. Εἰ δὲ τῶν ὡς κακῶν οὐτὼν τὴν αἰτίαν ζητῶντες, ἀρχὴν ὑπένεικτο κακῷ ἐκείνους δὲ ὑποσείδουσιν καὶ διαζομένους ἐκ ἑσιν ὁδὸν ἐπὶ κακῶν χαλάντας αὐτοῖς ἐ λόγῳ συνετέλεσται. συνάγεται γὰρ, ὅτι εἰ ἔστιν ἀρχὴ τῷ κακῷ, ἐκ ἑσιν κακὸν ὅλος· εἰ δὲ μὴ ἔστι κακὸν, ὁδὸν ἀρχὴν ἂν εἴη τῷ κακῷ, ἔσε εἰ ἔστιν ἀρχὴ τῷ κακῷ, ὡς φασιν, ἔσε κακὸν ἔσται, ἔσε ἀρχὴ τῷ κακῷ. Quod si talium facinorum ut malorum causam inquirentes, MALI principium statuerunt; eoque statuto, et quidem vim inferente, malum nullum relinquitur: festiva suo ipsi (quod ajunt) gladio jugulantur. Nam inde colligitur: si MALI principium sit, nullum omnino esse malum. Si vero malum non est, ne principium quidem MALI esse. Itaque si est principium mali ut ajunt, nec malum erit nec mali principium (85).

(84) Id. ibid. pag. 169.

(85) Id. ibid.

This objection is no less solid than subtle. It may be strengthened by that which I have proposed in another place (86), viz. That the doctrine of the Manichees is destructive of all religions, since if they argue consequentially, they can hope for nothing from their prayers, nor fear any thing from their impiety. They must be persuaded, that whatever they do, the good principle will be always propitious to them, and the evil one always adverse: one of them can do nothing but good, and the other can do nothing but evil. They are determined to this by their nature, and they pursue this bent to the utmost extent of their power.

(86) In the remark [G], of the article PAULICIANS, at the end.

The argument I am going to make seems to me very strong. The best way we can take in Philosophical discussions, is to consult the ideas of order. If we consult them in the present dispute, we shall plainly see that unity, and infinite power, and happiness, belong to the maker of the world. The necessity of nature required that there should be causes of all effects; and therefore a power sufficient for the production of the world must have necessarily existed. Now it is much more consonant to order, that this power should be united in one subject, than divided into two or three, or an hundred thousand. Let us therefore conclude, that it has not been divided, and that it resides entire in one sole nature, and that therefore there are not two first principles, but one only. There would be as much reason to admit an infinity of them, as the Atomists did, as to admit only two.

If it be contrary to order, that the power of nature should be divided into two subjects, generally speaking; it would be much more strange, if those two subjects were enemies, and diametrically opposite: Nothing but all manner of confusion would arise from it: What one would do, the other would undo; and so either nothing would be done, or if any thing was done, it would be an odd and disorderly work, and very far from the regularity of this universe. Thus you see Manicheism refuted by a very strong argument. If the Manichees had admitted two principles acting in concert in all things, they had been exposed to lesser difficulties.

Such a system would have nevertheless been contrary to the idea of order, with respect to the maxim, that beings ought not to be multiplied without necessity (87); for if there are two first principles, either they have each all the power necessary to the production of the universe, or they have it not. If they have, one of them is superfluous: If they have not, that power was vainly divided, and it had been better to unite it in one subject; it would have been more active, virtus unita fortius agit say they in the Peripatetic schools. Besides, it is not easy to conceive how a cause that is self-existing, can have but a portion of power. Who could have confined that

(87) Non sunt multiplicanda entia sine necessitate.

that to such or such a portion? It depends upon nothing, but stands upon its own bottom.

Rabbi Maimonides seems to me too nice, when he rejects the five proofs of the unity of God, made use of by the Philosophers of the sect of the Speakers, and when he praises one of these Philosophers, who finding himself perplexed by the weakness of those proofs, said that the unity of God was not known or could not be proved, but by Revelation supported by Tradition. *Hæc argumentorum istorum debilitas sic defatigavit & exercuit nonnullos, ut quidam illorum dixerit, Unitatem Dei haberi ex lege per Cabbalam; sed à reliquis ludibrio tantum fuit habitus & non nisi fannis exceptus. Mihi autem videtur, Virum illum fuisse fani admodum ingenii ac judicii. Nam cum nihil solidum & demonstrativum in ipsorum rationibus vidisset, in quo animus ipsius acquiescere potuisset, dixit, per Cabbalam sive Traditionem hoc haberi ex lege (88).*

The weakness of these arguments in proof of the unity of God, so much perplexed certain Philosophers, that one of them said that it could only be proved by Revelation supported by Tradition. But this Philosopher was laughed at, and his opinion despised by the others. Nevertheless he seems to me to be a man of good understanding and sound judgment. For he found nothing solid and demonstrative in their arguments, nothing wherein his mind could acquiesce, and therefore asserted that the unity of God was known no otherwise than by Revelation supported by Tradition. The fourth of those five arguments was this: either one God was sufficient for the production of the world, or was not. If one sufficed, another God would have been needless; and if he wanted the assistance of another God, each of them wanted the necessary power; but there can lie no imperfection in the Deity. Maimonides answers, that though one God alone had not been able to frame the structure of this world, there would be no just reason to call him impotent, or insufficient, since none ought to be called so because he cannot do what exceeds his nature. It is no impotency in God not to be able give himself a body, or to make a square whose side should be equal to the diagonal line. This hinders not God from being omnipotent; the natural impossibility of some things does no prejudice to the omnipotence of God. If therefore it be asserted that it is naturally impossible for one only God to create the world, the want of two Deities to create it will be no sign of imperfection or defect in either of them. *Sicut non est attribuenda Deo Impotentia, quia non potest seipsum corporeum facere, vel alium sibi similem creare, aut quia nequit creare quadratum, cujus latus æquale sit diametro: sic illi, qui duos Deos statuunt, possunt dicere, non esse illis Omnipotentiam derogandam idèd, quia nullus illorum solus creat; eò quòd necessitas existentie ipsorum requirat, ut sint duo. Hoc verò non esse ex indigentia, quæ unus alterius ope indigeret, sed ex necessitate, contrariumque esse impossibile. Et sicut non idèd dici potest, Deum non esse omnipotentem, nulloque modo Indigentie, Impotentie, vel Insufficientie titulo appellandum, quòd non possit existere facere corpus aliquod, nisi creet Substantias individuas, illasque per Accidentia, quæ itidem creat, conjungat, ut illi Loquentes asserunt; quia scilicet, ut aliter fiat, est impossibile. Sic, qui duos Deos statuit, dicere potest, impossibile esse, ut unus solus faciat omnia, nec tamen Imperfectioni ipsius hoc adscribendum esse, quia illa talis sit, ut duo simul & una sint & operentur (89).*

It might be shewn that these are meer cavils; but to avoid too long discussions, I am contented to say that the Manichees cannot use this subterfuge; for if any power ought to be essentially contained in the nature of God, it is that of doing what he most earnestly desires. The idea of God includes no attribute more clearly and evidently than that of happiness (90). If therefore any want of power is capable of making God unhappy, we must say that it is essential to the nature of God to be without this want; but he must necessarily be subject to it, if the opinion of the Manichees was true: therefore their system is utterly false.

Such is the nature, say they, of the good principle, that he can produce nothing but good, and with his whole might he opposes the introduction of evil. He wills therefore, and most ardently desires, that there be no evil: It is therefore a great sorrow to him that there is evil in the universe. He has done all that he could to prevent this disorder; if therefore he wanted a necessary power to prevent it, his most earnest desires have been in vain, and consequently he is destitute of the power which was the most necessary to his happiness; therefore he has not the power which is the most necessary to the nature of his being. But can any thing be more absurd than this? Is not this an hypothesis which implies a contradiction?

The two principles of the Manichees would be the most unhappy of all beings; for the good principle could not cast his eyes upon the world, but he would see a dreadful multitude of all kinds of evils: nor could the evil principle view it without seeing a great deal of good. The sight of evil would afflict the one, and the sight of good the other. This would not be a sight interrupted sometimes, but continual, and without the least intermission. The most unfortunate men have not so severe a fate; they successively pass from sorrow to joy, and at last death secures them from the miseries of this life. But the two principles of the Manichees are eternal, they can see no end or interruption of those unpleasant objects, which disturb them to the highest degree.

All

CONCERNING THE MANICHEES.

829

All that the Manichees could suppose, concerning the first introduction of evil, and its first combination with good in the heart of man, was liable to a thousand difficulties. Their own weapons turned against them: they could not bear the Hypothesis, that evil proceeded from the ill use of free-will. God, said they, who is infinitely good, would not have suffered his creatures to degenerate from their original goodness; and yet they did not own them to be incorruptible in a moral sense. We have seen that Simplicius objected to them, that the souls the ill principle had seized on, and which were portions of the good principle, became evil, and lived eternally in corruption and misery, under the empire of the conqueror. But here follows something worse. We know by experience, that the same numerical soul sins and does good actions. When a man repents and implores the mercy of God, and makes amends for his ill life by alms, &c. this is not done by two substances, but by one and the same subject; we know it by our inward consciousness (91), and reason will have it so: for why should a man afflict himself for, and repent of, a fault which he had not committed? I ask the Manichees, whether the soul which does a good action, was created by the good principle or by the evil? If it was created by the evil principle, it follows that good may arise from the fountain of all evil: If it was created by the good principle, it follows that evil may arise from the fountain of all good (92), because the same soul, on other occasions, commits crimes. Thus you see yourselves reduced to overthrow your own reasonings, or to maintain against the internal and evident sense of every man, that the soul which does a good action, is not the same which does a bad one.

(91) See the article ROMANUS, remark [K], towards the beginning.

(92) That is, by the ill use of free-will bestowed upon men by the good principle.

To extricate themselves from this difficulty it would be necessary for them to suppose three first principles; one essentially good, and the cause of all good; another essentially evil, and the cause of all evil; and a third essentially susceptible of good and evil, and merely passive. Then they should say; that the human soul is made up of this third principle, and does sometimes a good action and sometimes a bad one, according to the influence it receives from the good and evil principle.

This conclusion of this explanation.

They who will attentively consider what I have alledged in this explanation, will, I presume, be no longer offended with what I said in the article PAULICIANS, &c; they will see that this article and those wherein the same matter is treated, may be read without scandal, and even with edification, provided they well remember,

- I. That it is the property of the mysteries of the gospel, to be liable to objections which cannot be cleared by natural light.
- II. That the unbelievers cannot justly draw any advantage from this, *viz.* That the maxims of Philosophy do not afford solutions to the difficulties which they raise against the mysteries of the gospel.
- III. That the objections of the Manichees, concerning the origin of evil and Predestination, ought not to be considered in general as impugning Predestination, but with this particular regard, that the origin of evil, the decrees of God concerning it, and the rest, are one of the most inconceivable mysteries of Christianity.
- IV. That it ought to satisfy every good Christian, that his faith is founded on the testimony of the word of God.
- V. That the system of the Manichees considered in it self is absurd and indefensible, and contrary to the ideas of order; that it is liable to retortions, and cannot remove difficulties.
- VI. That in all events no body can be offended at my concessions, unless he looks upon the doctrine of the most orthodox Divines as scandalous, since all that I have said is a natural and unavoidable consequence of their doctrine; and I have only related more at large what they teach more compendiously.

Some perhaps will think my confutation of Manicheism imperfect, because I answer not the objections I have set forth, as coming from the Manichees. I desire those who may start this objection to remember, that as for evident answers drawn from natural light, I know none; and as for the answers which the Scripture affords, they may be found in a great many controversial books.

They who ask of what use are the discussions that have offended them, will see my answer in the third explanation.

VOL. V.

10 A

EXPLANATION.

EXPLANATION III.

That what has been said of Scepticism in this Dictionary, cannot prejudice religion.

I. **F**IRST I lay down, as the basis of this third explanation, this certain and undoubted maxim: *That Christianity is of a supernatural order, and centres in the supreme authority of God proposing mysteries to us, not that we may comprehend them, but that we may believe them with all the humility that is due to the infinite being, who can neither deceive nor be deceived.* This is the test, the polar star, of all the discussions and disputes concerning the articles of the religion, which God has revealed by Jesus Christ.

Hence necessarily results the incompetency of the tribunal of Philosophy to judge of controversies among the Christians, since they ought only to be carried to the tribunal of Revelation.

Any dispute concerning the matter of right, or the reasonableness of the thing, ought immediately to be rejected. No man ought to be admitted to examine, whether we ought to believe what God commands to be believed. It ought to be reckoned a first principle in point of religion. It is the part of the Metaphysicians to examine, whether there be a God, and whether he be infallible (1); but Christians, as Christians, ought to suppose it as a thing already determined.

The question then is only about a matter of fact; viz. Whether God requires our belief of this or that thing? Two sorts of people may doubt of it; they who do not believe the scripture to be of divine inspiration, and they who do not think the sense of the Revelation to be such as is put upon it by this or that sect.

The only dispute therefore that Christians can enter upon with Philosophers, is on this matter of fact; Whether the Scripture was written by inspired authors? If the arguments the Christians alledge on this subject, do not convince the Philosophers, they ought to break off the dispute; for it would be to no purpose to enter into the particular discussion of the Trinity, &c. with people who disown the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, the sole and only way to judge who is in the right, or wrong in such controversies. Revealed authority ought to be the common principle of disputants hereupon, and therefore there is no disputing when one denies this principle, and the other admits of it. *Adversus negantem principia non est disputandum.*

If they who deny it, persist to clamour and dispute, they ought to be coldly answered, you depart from the question, *Non feritis istem, non probatis negatum*; and if they laugh at this answer, their laughing ought to be despised and pitied.

THE character
of the Sceptics.

II. But of all the Philosophers who ought not to be allowed to dispute concerning the mysteries of Christianity, before they have admitted Revelation for a rule, there are none so unworthy of being heard as the followers of Pyrrho; for they make profession of admitting no certain marks of distinction between truth and falsehood; so that if truth, by chance, appeared to them, they could never be sure that it was truth. They not only attack the testimony of the senses, the maxims of Morality, the rules of Logic, the axioms of Metaphysics, but endeavour to overthrow the demonstrations of Geometry, and the most evident principles of the Mathematicians. If they went no farther than the ten reasons for suspending our assent, and only used them against Natural Philosophy, we might still treat with them; but they will go much farther: they have a sort of arms they call the *diallel* (2), which they lay hold of on the first occasion; and afterwards there is no withstanding them in any subject whatever. It is a labyrinth, from which no clue of Ariadne can wind one out. They lose themselves in their own subtilties, and are wonderfully pleased with it, since this serves to shew more clearly the universality of their hypothesis, that every thing is uncertain, from which they except not even the arguments against uncertainty. They proceed so far in their method, that they who have well considered the consequences of it, are forced to say, that they know not whether any thing exists (3).

Divines ought not to be ashamed to confess, that they cannot enter the lists with such disputants, and that they will not expose the gospel-truths to such an encounter. The vessel of JESUS CHRIST is not made to float upon that tempestuous sea, but to ride secure from this tempest in the haven of faith. It has pleased the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, must Christians say, to lead us by the way of faith, and not of science, or disputation. They are our instructors and directors, we cannot err having such guides, and reason itself commands us to prefer them before its own direction.

But is it not a scandalous thing, will some say, that I have related the conversation of an Abbot, who owns that Scepticism finds several arguments in the doctrines of Christianity, which render it more formidable than it was? I answer, that this can offend none but such as have not examined the character of Christianity. It would be a false notion

(1) See remark
[L], of the second article
MALDONAT.

(2) See Sextus
Empiricus, Pyrrho.
Hypotyphlos, lib. i. cap. xvi.
& lib. ii. cap. xvi.

(3) See what
Sextus Empiricus, adv. Math.
lib. vii. relates
of Gorgias Leontinus, and remark
[E], of the article Zeno of Elea.

CONCERNING THE SCEPTICS.

831

notion to imagine, that JESUS CHRIST had any design to countenance, either directly or indirectly, some of the sects of Philosophers in the disputes they had against the rest. His design was rather to confound all Philosophy, and to shew the vanity of it. He was willing that his gospel should clash not only with the religion of the Heathens, but with the aphorisms of their wisdom; and that notwithstanding this opposition betwixt his principles and those of the world, his doctrine should triumph over the Gentiles, by the ministry of a few illiterate men, who had neither Eloquence nor Logic, nor any of the instruments necessary to all other revolutions. He would have his disciples, and the wise men of this world, to be so diametrically opposite, that they should mutually call one another fools: he designed, that as his gospel appeared folly to the Philosophers, their science should in its turn appear folly to the Christians. Consider well these words of St Paul: 'For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach * the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect. For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish, foolishness: but unto us which are saved, it is the power † of God. For it is written ‡, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent §. Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that, in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of † preaching to save them that believe. For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom: but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks, foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ, the power of God, and the wisdom of God. Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men. For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called. But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world, to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world, to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: that no flesh should glory in his presence. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us ** wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: that, according as it is written ††, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord (4). And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of †† speech, or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God ††. For I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. And I was with you †† in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling. And my speech, and my preaching was not with enticing words of mans wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit *, and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God. Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect: yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that come to nought. But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory. Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. But as it is written †; Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, † neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of man, save the Spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the Spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God? that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which mans wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth †; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned (5).'

III. Do you think, that if the Apostles had been told that their doctrine exposed the dogmatizing Philosophers to new attacks from the Sceptics, they would have been concerned at it? They would have said, Let us not trouble our selves with their disputes; Let the dead bury the dead; the more they contend and disable one another, the more they will discover the vanity of their pretended science. Neither the Dogmatists nor the Sceptics will ever be able to enter into the kingdom of God, unless they become little children, unless they change their maxims, renounce their wisdom, and make a burnt-offering of their vain systems at the foot of the cross to the pretended folly of our preaching. This is the old man they must chiefly put off, before they can be qualified to receive the heavenly gift, and to enter into the way of faith appointed by God for eternal Salvation. If the Sceptics make an ill use of our mysteries to root themselves deeper in uncertainty, and if they object against us arguments *ad hominem*, so much the worse for them, unless God make use of their errors to make them see the necessity of submitting to his word. This is what St Paul and his fellow Apostles would have answered to such objections. We ought to be fully persuaded, that if there had been

AN EXPLANATION

been occasion to give their decision upon the nature of the Heathen Philosophy with respect to the difficulty or readiness of embracing the gospel; they would have positively determined, that the method, principles, practices, and disputes of the Peripatetics, Academics, &c. were so great an obstacle to faith, that the most necessary preliminaries to enter into the kingdom of God, were to forget or lay aside all this train of a false science (6). I believe they would have made such a determination both for the present and the time to come.

I have cited an author who seems to believe that the subtleties of the schools of Philosophy, may upon favourable occasions serve to propagate the true faith. *It may be,* says he (7), *that these subtle doctors were necessary to the world; I mean the curious, disputing, and contradicting world. Perhaps they entered into the design of the providence of God, for the accomplishment of his Son's kingdom; for the last perfection of the economy of his Church. You know that the Son of God sent several Apostles to several nations; you know that all the missions he ordained, were not made at the same time, and by the twelve first Apostles. He never wanted, and will never want such Ambassadors. He has always messengers ready to receive his orders, to execute his commands, to set out for his service. We ought not to doubt that he has more than one St Peter, and St Paul. He has also more than one St Thomas. How do we know but that he has sent the St Thomas of the latter times to the successors of Aristotle, to treat them according to their own humour, and to convert them in their way, in order to gain them by their own syllogisms and Logic? How do we know but St Thomas of the schools has been chosen to be the Apostle of the Peripatetic nation, which was not yet well conquered and subdued? a presumptuous and mutinous nation, which has so little regard to authority, which goes always upon reason, which continually demands why things are so and so, which is so restless, such an enemy to peace, and so fond of innovations? Methinks this last mission has not been useless, and there is some probability in what I say. If there is no irony in this discourse; if it be all in a serious strain, it is*

A splendid nothing dress'd in lofty words.

All men in all ages have required and will require, that the knowledge of revealed truths should be searched after by other methods than those of Philosophy. Philosophy does not cure a floating mind, which must be cured, if we desire to obtain true wisdom by our prayers. Let us here give the authority of an Apostle. *If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God that gives to all men liberally and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him. But let him ask in faith nothing wavering, for he that wavereth, is like a wave of the sea, driven with the wind and tossed; for let not that man think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord* (8). Judge whether the Sceptics, who are always so much the more pleased, as the efforts they make to invent reasons for doubting of every thing, have furnished them with specious objections against certainty, are capable of receiving the grace of God by the way of disputation. The modern missionaries of the Gospel, ought to treat them as the first would have done; they ought to advise them to lay aside all disputes and contentions, and to believe God upon his word; and if they prove untractable, they ought particularly to remember this precept of St Paul; and apply it to those men, *Avoid foolish questions and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law, for they are unprofitable and vain. A man that is an Heretic after the first and second admonition, reject* (9). It would be fine work to see our Thomists and Sco-

Mary (10).

We may affirm at this day, just as in Lactantius's time, that true religion ought to be enquired after by applying to the pretended and seeming foolishness under which God has been pleased to hide the treasures of his wisdom (11). 'Quid putemus fuisse causæ, cur tot ingeniis, totque temporibus summo studio, & labore quæsitæ (sapientia) non reperiretur; nisi quod eam philosophi extra fines suos quæsierunt? Qui quoniam peragratis, & exploratis omnibus, nusquam nullam sapientiam comprehenderunt; & alicubi esse illam necesse est: apparet, illic potissimum esse quærendam, ubi STULTITIAE titulus apparet; cujus velamento Deus, ne arcanum summi sui divini operis in propatulo esset, thesaurum sapientia, ac veritatis abscondit (12). - - - What is the reason why wisdom, which has been so frequently sought after by so many men of parts, with the greatest application and labour, has never been found; unless that the Philosophers have sought after wisdom where she is not. Now since these Philosophers who have examined and explored all things, have found wisdom no where, and since she must necessarily be somewhere, it is evident that she must be sought after chiefly where there appear the characters of FOOLISHNESS, under the cover of which, God, left the mysteries of his

(6) These words in St John's Gospel, chap. iii, ver. 3. Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God, are chiefly true with respect to Philosophers: they want to be born again more than other men: they want one regeneration as men, and another as Philosophers.

(7) Balzac, Socratic Christian, Discours v, pag. m. 71, & seq.

(8) 1 Tim. i. 5.

(9) Tit. iii. 9.

(10) How shall this be, says I know not a man. And the angel answered, and said unto her, the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee. Luke i. 34-35.

(11) This ought to be understood with respect to Infidels.

(12) Lactant. lib. vi, cap. 10, pag. m. 218.

Divine

CONCERNING THE SCEPTICS.

833

'*Divine works should be divulged, hath bid the treasures of wisdom and truth.*' The same Lactantius has judiciously observed in another place, that it becomes the supreme majesty of God to speak with authority, and to say in a few words, this is true, and not to argue and add proofs to his decisions. 'Quæ (divina) quidem tradita sunt breviter, ac nude; nec enim decebat aliter: ut cum Deus ad hominem loqueretur, argumentis assereret suas voces, tanquam fides ei non haberetur: sed, ut oportuit, est locutus, quasi rerum omnium maximus iudex; cujus est non argumentari, sed pronuntiare verum (13). - - - Divine truths are declared in a few words, and without being supported by reasonings. Nor was it fit that God, when he speaks to men should support his words by arguments, as if he ought not to be believed without proofs: but God hath spoken, as it became him, like the sovereign judge of all things, who is not to argue, but to pronounce the truth.' If Seneca said that there is nothing more insipid than a law with a preamble, and that a law should not dispute, but command; if he said this of human laws, much more ought it to be said of the law of God? 'Non probo, quod Platonis legibus adjecta principia sunt. Legem enim brevem esse oportet, quò facilius, ab imperitis teneatur, velut emissâ divinitus vox sit. Jubeat, non disputet. Nihil videtur mihi frigidius, nihil ineptius, quàm lex cum prologo. Mone, dic quid me velis fecisse: non disco, sed pareo (14). - - - That reasons are annexed to the laws of Plato, is what I do not approve: for a law ought to be comprized in a very few words, that men of the meanest capacity may be better comprehend it, and consider it as a voice from heaven. Let it command, and not dispute. Nothing seems to me more insipid, nor more foolish, than a law with a preamble. Warn me, tell me what you command me to do, and I do not learn of you, but obey.'

From all that has been said, it is easy to conclude, that we cannot be alarmed with the objections of the Sceptics, without discovering the weakness of our faith, and taking things in a wrong sense, which ought to be taken in a right one.

IV. A true Believer, a Christian who well understands the spirit of his religion, does not expect to see it agree with the aphorisms of the Lyceum, nor to find it able by the mere strength of reason, to confute the difficulties of reason. He well knows that natural things have no proportion to the supernatural; and that if a Philosopher was desired to level and adjust the mysteries of the Gospel with the Aristotelian axioms, it would be requiring of him what is inconsistent with the nature of things. You must necessarily make an option betwixt Philosophy and the Gospel: if you will believe nothing but what is evident and agreeable to common notions, choose Philosophy, and leave Christianity: if you will believe the incomprehensible mysteries of religion, take Christianity and leave Philosophy; for to enjoy at the same time evidence and incomprehensibility, is a thing impossible; the conjunction of these two things is no less impossible than the conjunction of the properties of a square, and of a circle. You must necessarily make an option between them: if the conveniences of a round table do not satisfy you, make a square one, and do not pretend that the same table should furnish you with the conveniences both of a round and of a square table. Once more, a true Christian well instructed in the character of supernatural truths, and well grounded in the principles peculiar to the Gospel, will laugh at the subtilties of Philosophers, and especially of the Sceptics. Faith will place him above the regions, wherein the storms of disputation rage. He will find himself in a post, from whence, being calm and undisturbed, he can hear the thunder of argumentations and distinctions roar below him. A post, that will prove the true Olympus of the Poets (15); and the true temple of the sages (16), from whence he will see in a perfect tranquillity the weakness of reason, and the errors of men who have no other guide. Every Christian who suffers himself to be startled and offended with the objections of unbelievers, is in the same lamentable condition as they are.

V. What I am going to say, may teach us how important it is to know the true use of things. Several people have asked, to what purpose I have set forth many Sceptical and Manichean objections? They might have found the answer to this question, if they had looked for it in my Dictionary, where it is to be seen in an hundred places, and particularly in the remark [C], of the article PYRRHO (17). But since they would not, or did not attend to it, let us here examine their objection more at large. I think they could not much complain, if I should only ask them, to what purpose are so many particulars we find in Historians? Is it not certain that Historians relate several things, whose only use consists in pleasing the readers, and which may be hurtful in the hands of those who abuse the best things? Does this free an Historian from the obligation he is under, of relating the truth with all possible exactness? Must not therefore an Historian of opinions exactly and fully shew the strong and weak sides of them, tho' it should accidentally occasion some disturbance, and tho' no other good should proceed from it, but the amusement of the reader, and an example of the regard that is due to the laws of History? But this is neither the sole nor the principal answer I am to give.

Nothing is more necessary than faith, and nothing more important than to know well the worth of this Theological virtue. But is any thing more proper to acquaint

VOL. V. No. CXLIII.

10 B

us

An answer to those who ask what need was there to recite the objections, which the mysteries of the Gospel may afford the Sceptics.

(13) Id. lib. ii. cap. i, pag. 140.

(14) Seneca, Epist. xciv, pag. m. 388.

(15) Ut altus Olympi Vertex, qui spatia ventos hincque relinquit, Perpetuum nulla temeratus nube serenum, Celsior exurgit pluvias audisque ruentes Sub pedibus nimbor, & rauca tonitrua calcant. Claudian, de Mall. Theod. Consul. v. 206, pag. m. 6.

(16) Nil dulcius est, bene quam munita tenere Editâ doctrina Sapientum templa ferena; Despicere unde quævis aliorum, passimque videre Errare, atque vitæ palanteis querere vitæ. Lucræ. lib. ii, ver. 7. But above all, 'tis pleasantest to sit The top of high Philosophy, and see On the calm, peaceful, flourishing head of it; Whence we may view a deep, wondrous deep below, How poor mortals flounder mortals wandring on, Seeking the path to happiness. CREECH.

(17) See also the remark [G], in the article of ZENO of Elea, at the end.

us with it, than meditating on the attribute which distinguishes it from the other acts of the understanding? Its essence consists in imprinting in us a strong persuasion of revealed truths, by the sole motive of God's authority. They who by philosophical reasons believe the immortality of the soul, are Orthodox, but while they go no farther they do not partake of the faith we speak of. They partake of it only as they believe this truth, because God has revealed it, and humbly submit to the voice of God the most plausible arguments Philosophy offers to persuade them of the soul's mortality. Thus the merit of faith is enlarged, in proportion, as revealed truth, which is the object of it, exceeds all the powers of our understanding: for the more the incomprehensibility of this object increases by the numerous maxims of natural light which oppose it, the more we must sacrifice to God's authority a stronger repugnance of reason, and consequently we shew ourselves more obedient to God, and give him a greater proof of our respect, than if the thing was moderately difficult to believe. Whence was it that the Father of the Faithful, had so eminent and illustrious a faith? Was it not because he believed in hope against hope (18)? There had been no great merit in hoping upon the promise of God for a thing, naturally very probable; the merit therefore consisted in this, that the hope grounded on this promise was contrary to all appearances. Let us say likewise, that the most precious faith is that which upon the Divine testimony embraces such truths as are the most repugnant to reason.

This thought has been expressed in a ludicrous way by a masterly hand. *The Devil take me if I believed a syllable then*, said the Marechal d'Hocquincourt; *but ever since I could endure to be crucified for religion. Not that I see more reason in it now; but on the contrary, less than ever: but for all that I could suffer myself to be crucified, without knowing why, or wherefore. So much the better, my Lord, replied the Father, twanging it devoutly through the nose, so much the better; these are not human motions; they proceed from God. No reason! That is the true religion: No reason. What an extraordinary grace, my Lord, has God bestowed upon you!* Estote sicut infantes, be ye as children: children have still their innocence, and why? Because they have no reason. *Beati pauperes spiritu, Blessed are the poor in spirit; they sin not; the reason is because they have no reason. No reason: without knowing why or wherefore: Oh excellent words! They ought to be written in golden letters. Not that I see more reason in it now; but, on the contrary, less than ever. In truth this is Divine for them that have any taste of heavenly things: No reason. What an extraordinary grace, my Lord, has God bestowed upon you (19)!* Give this thought a more serious and modest turn, and it will become reasonable. Here is the proof of it. I take it from a book wherein some thoughts of Mr de St Evremond are examined; and this amongst others, that our understanding is not sufficiently convinced of the truth of religion.

To answer clearly to this, we must remember a maxim commonly received among Divines: viz. That the mind is induced to believe mysteries in a quite different way from that which gives it an evident knowledge of natural things. It knows the latter by demonstration, and it believes mysteries upon motives of *credibility*, such as are the miracles wrought by Jesus Christ, and his Apostles, the unanimous belief of all the faithful for seventeen centuries, &c. All which motives ought to induce us to believe prudently the faith which the church proposes to us: and this very well explains these words of St Paul, *That in this present life we see the mysteries as riddles, waiting to see them evidently in heaven.* But Mr de St Evremond requires demonstrations. He therefore admits no faith. St Thomas * says expressly in some places of his *Summa*, that no body ought to go about to demonstrate the mysteries of religion; and he adds in other chapters, that when the Fathers proved the faith, they did not pretend their arguments were demonstrative, but only solid motives to induce us to believe the doctrines propounded to us. Why, says Mr de St Evremond, is not our reason enlightened? Because, as St Thomas says, reason must submit to faith. Upon which I call to mind some words of Petrus Blesensis in his 140th epistle written to Petrus Diaconus, who was with the King of England. After he had spoke of the mystery of Transubstantiation, reason, pursues he, does not go so far, but we are carried thither by faith; a faith that is so much the stronger as it is not supported by natural reason. Reason grows weak where faith grows strong: reason is overcome that faith may be more meritorious: however, do not think, adds this Father, that reason envies the superiority of faith; on the contrary, it voluntarily and humbly submits to it. It will resume its light in heaven, where faith will not be, and then reason will reap what faith sows in the present life; and it is just it should reap the fruits of faith, since at present it debases itself, that faith may reign in its full power (20).

VI. This is the doctrine of the Roman Catholics: take from it Transubstantiation, and put the Trinity, for instance, in its room, and the most Orthodox Protestant Divines will subscribe to it. I shall quote two Protestants, whose testimony will have the more weight, because they are of such professions, as are not thought to insist much upon the humbling of reason, and the exaltation of faith: one is a Physician, the other a Mathematician; the former declares, that when he meditates on mysteries, he always stops when reason is arrived to this point, *O the depth* (21). He protests, that if rebellious reason, or the Devil, endeavour to perplex him, he disengages himself from

(19) Mr de St Evremond, in his *Conversations between Marechal d'Hocquincourt, and Father Cassey*, Tom. i. p. 181, of the English translation, London 1754.

* Part. i. q. 1. a. 2. ad 2.

(20) Dissertation sur les Oeuvres de Mr de St Evremond, pag. 249, 8^e ju. fe. 1754.

(21) I have a life myself as a mystery, in part my reason is as O Alacrida! Sir T. Brown, Religio Medici, Part. i. c. 12, pag. 46.

(17) The mathematician I am to quote, published at London, in 1699, a tract, of 36 pages in 4to, intitled, *Theologia Christiane principia Mathematica*. He pretends, that the principles of the Christian Religion are only probable, and reduces the degrees of their probability, and of the decrease of it, to Geometrical calculations. He finds that it may still last 1454 years, from whence he concludes, that Jesus Christ will return before that time. He dedicates this book to the Bishop of Salisbury, and shews, in his Epistle Dedicatory, that they who shall blame him for calling the principles of Christianity only probable, are such as have not well examined the grounds of their religion, and do not well understand the nature of faith. Whence, says he, has this virtue so many encomiums given it in the Scripture, and so many rewards promised it? Is it not because it makes men walk in the right way, notwithstanding all the stumbling-blocks they meet with, and the fetters that are put upon them? I shall set down his words: 'Quosdam fore non dubito, majori ductos zelo quam judicio qui meos prorsus concludunt. Illi utique omnia Religionis dogmata tanquam certissima amplectentes rem Christianismo indignam me præstitisse putabunt, qui ejus probabilitatem tantum evincere conatus fuerim. Illis vero ego nihil jam habeo quod dicam, nisi quod præjudiciis suis præoccupati, Religionis quam profitentur, fundamenta non accurate satis haftenus examinaverint, nec fides, quæ tan copere in sacris literis laudatur, naturam ritè intellexerint. Quid enim est fides? nisi illa mentis persuasio qua propter media ex probabilitate deducta, quasdam propositiones veras esse credimus. Si persuasio ex certitudine oriatur, tum non fides sed scientia in mente producitur. Sicut enim probabilitas fidem generat, ita enim scientiam evertit & è contra: Certitudo scientiam simul generat & fidem destruit. Unde scientia omnem dubitandi ansam aufert, dum fides aliquam semper hæsitacionem in mente relinquit: & propterea fides tantis insignitur laudibus, tantaque sibi annexa præmia habet, quod homines non obstantibus omnibus illis quibus premuntur scrupulis in recto virtutis & pietatis tramite progrediantur, quæque Creatori suo omnipotenti grata futura credunt summa ope præstare conentur: Se tam paratos esse jussis quibuscunque divinis obsequi ostendunt, ut ne ea quidem quæ probabiliter tantum ab ipso proveniant, rejicere velint (28). - - - I doubt not but certain persons, more zealous than judicious, will absolutely condemn my work, and rashly conclude that I rather subvert and overthrow religion, than support and defend it. For they, embracing all the doctrines of the Christian Religion as most certain, will think that I have

(28) Johannes Craig, Episc. Dedicat. written

AN EXPLANATION

'written a book unbecoming and unworthy of a Christian, since I there have endeavoured to shew only the probability of that religion. To these persons I have at present nothing more to say but this, that being prepossessed with prejudices, they have not yet sufficiently examined the foundation of that Religion which they profess, nor well understood the nature of that Faith, which is so much praised in the sacred writings. For what is Faith, but that persuasion of the mind, whereby we believe certain propositions to be true, for reasons drawn from probability? If the persuasion arises from Certainty, it is not Faith, but Science that is produced in the mind. For as probability begets Faith, so it destroys Science; and so vice versa Certainty begets Science and destroys Faith. Thus Science removes all manner of doubt, whereas Faith always leaves in the mind some hesitation: and it is for this reason that Faith is so highly commended, and so many rewards are annexed to it, namely, because men, notwithstanding all those scruples wherewith their minds are oppressed, walk in the strait road of virtue and piety, and with all their might endeavour to perform those duties which they believe will be acceptable to their omnipotent Creator. They shew themselves so ready to obey all divine commands, that they will not reject even those, which only appear probably to be such.'

THAT it is proper to enumerate largely the arguments which respect the difficulties of the Christian Faith.

VIII. Most men so little examine the nature of divine Faith, and reflect so seldom upon this act of their mind, that they want to be roused from their negligence, by a long enumeration of the difficulties that encompass the doctrines of the Christian Religion. It is by a lively sense of those difficulties we learn the excellency of Faith, and of this gift of God. Hereby we learn also to mistrust reason, and have recourse to grace. They who know nothing of the great contest between reason and faith, and are ignorant of the force of Philosophical objections, have but an imperfect sense of God's goodness to them, and of the manner of triumphing over all the temptations of incredulous and presumptuous reason.

The true way of humbling it is to know, that if it be capable of inventing objections, it is incapable of resolving them, and, in a word, that it is not by reason that the gospel was established. 'It is Faith alone that can teach that Divine Philosophy, which none of the princes of this world had known'. Whoever opens his eyes to so pure a light is truly enlightened. It was not by strength of syllogisms and argumentations that this Philosophy recommended itself to men; but by its simplicity and the ignorance of those who preached it to the world. . . . Faith having discovered to men the false glimpses that shone in the Heathen Philosophy, accustomed them not to reason any longer upon things which God would not submit to reasoning, and taught them, that it is better to be ignorant of what God has been pleased to conceal, and with a respectful ignorance to adore the secrets he has not revealed, than to attempt to fathom this abyss of light, by the rashness of our conjectures, and the faint views of our reason. It was to this Divine ray of Faith, that the Christian took pleasure to sacrifice that insolent curiosity, which made him too rashly examine the works of God, by examining the effects of nature, and stifle all the views of that proud reason, which fixes him to the creatures, and makes him a rebel against the Creator. It was by the rays of this celestial light, that the Christian perceived it was better to yield than to argue in point of religion; that narrowness of wit is more advantageous to a Christian, than all the force and penetration of the mind, and that the simplicity of Faith is preferable to all the pomp of science. Since, after all, the works of God, which bear the most the stamp of his omnipotence, and his character, are those we the least comprehend, therefore nothing is more just than to humble our reason, and submit it to the light of eternal reason, which is the rule of all reasons: and indeed there is no science but requires submission for the establishment of its principles (29).^{*} I conclude with two very fine thoughts of Mr de St Evremond. 'In things purely natural, it is the mind's part to conceive, and its knowledge goes before the affection for the objects: in things supernatural, the soul is taken, it is affected, it adheres and unites itself without ever comprehending them. Heaven has better prepared our hearts for the impression of God's grace, than our understandings for illumination. His immensity confounds our narrow intellects: his bounty agrees better with our love. There is I know not what within us, that secretly pleads for a God, whom we cannot comprehend. . . . To consider well the Christian Religion would make one think, that God had deprived it of the light of our minds, that it might turn more upon the motions of our heart (30).[†] *Provided a man has reduced his reason so far, as not to argue upon things which God would not subject to reasoning, it is all we can desire. I not only believe with Solomon, that a wise man's silence is better in this case than the discourse of a Philosopher, but I have a greater esteem for the faith of the most stupid peasant, than for all the lessons of Socrates (31).*

This, I think, is more than sufficient to remove the scruples which the pretended triumph of the Sceptics had raised in the minds of some of my readers.

* Veritas per Christum: *Yves, cap. i. Le quinisme latin: christianisme qu'on ne peut pas prouver: hujus mundi veritas, Paul. i. Cor. i. 6.*

(29) Rapin, *Réflexions sur la Philosophie*, pag. 447.

(30) St Evremond, *Works*, Vol. ii, pag. 24. *Rep. of the English translation, London 1734.*

(31) Oremus, *modestia*, Tom. ii, pag. 24.

EXPLANATION

CONCERNING OBSCENITIES.

837

EXPLANATION IV.

CONCERNING OBSCENITIES.

That if there are some Obscenities in this book, they are such as cannot be justly censured.

I. **W**HEN people say that there are Obscenities in any book, they may understand,

I. Either that the author gives the description of his debaucheries in leud terms, applauds and congratulates himself for them, exhorts his readers to plunge themselves into all manner of leudness, recommends it to them as the most effectual means of leading a sweet and happy life, and pretends, that the censures of the public are to be laughed at, and that the maxims of virtuous men ought to be slighted as old women's tales.

II. Or, that the author relates, in a free and gay stile, some love-adventures, feigned as to the substance, or at least as to their circumstances, and embellishments; and introduces into his narrative several immodest incidents, which he dresses in all the charms imaginable, in order to make them diverting, and fitter to raise the desire of love-intrigues than any thing else.

III. Or, that the author, in order to revenge himself on an unfaithful mistress, or to excuse the transports of his passion, or make invectives against an old courtesan, or celebrate his friend's marriage, or divert himself with merry thoughts, gives a free scope to his Muse, and writes Epigrams, Epithalamiums, &c. full of impure and smutty expressions.

IV. Or, that the author, inveighing against leudness, describes it in too lively, naked, and gross colours.

V. Or, that the author in a tract of Physic, Natural Philosophy, or Civil-Law, expresses himself filthily on the subject of generation, or, the causes and remedies of barrenness, or the motives of divorce, &c.

VI. Or, that the author, commenting upon Catullus, Petronius, or Martial, has inserted in his commentary several leud discourses or expressions.

VII. Or, that the author, giving the History of a sect, or person, whose actions were infamous, has related, in too open a manner, a great many things offensive to chaste ears.

VIII. Or, that the author, treating of cases of conscience, and enumerating the different species of carnal sins, has said many things which modesty cannot easily digest.

IX. Or, lastly, that the author relates Historical facts mentioned by other authors whom he carefully cites, which facts are filthy and immodest, and adds a commentary on his Historical narrations to illustrate them by testimonies, by reflexions, and by proofs, &c. in which he sometimes alledges the words of certain authors who have wrote freely, some of them, as Physicians, or Lawyers; others, as Gallants, or Poets; but he never says any thing containing either explicitly, or even implicitly, the approbation of impurity; that, on the contrary, he endeavours, upon many occasions, to expose it to our abhorrence, and to confute loose Morality.

These, I think, are the chief cases wherein a writer can be charged with venting obscenities.

In the first case, he deserves not only all the severest punishments of the Canon-Law, but ought also to be prosecuted by the Magistrate as a disturber of the public modesty, and a professed enemy to virtue.

As to those of the second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth classes, let every one judge of them as he pleases: I am not concerned in them, mine being only the ninth case; and it is sufficient for me to examine what concerns that ninth kind of obscenity. However, I will make two or three general reflexions upon the rest.

These general observations upon some sorts of obscenities that are to be found in several authors.

II. I say in the first place, that there are several degrees in the seven classes of writers, whom I leave to the reader's judgment (1). A man may keep himself within certain bounds, or may exceed them: this prodigiously varies the differences and proportions; and it would be very unjust to pronounce the same sentence against all the writers of the second class. The hundred *Nouvelles nouvelles* (2), those of the Queen of Navarre, Boccace's *Decameron*, la Fontaine's *Tales* do not deserve the same rigour as Aretin's *Ragionamenti*, and the *Aloisia Sigæa Toletana*. The authors of these two last works deserve, as well as Ovid, to be placed in the first class of obscene authors.

Secondly I observe, that in all times a great number of men have agreed in condemning obscenities; and yet this never seemed to be a decision of equal force with the Civil Laws, a decision to which the Poets, Commentators, &c. were obliged to conform.

V O L. V.

10 C

form

form on the penalty of being excluded the rank of honest men. The censurers of ob-
scenities seem to be so much the more capable of terminating the question by a decisive
and executive sentence, in the whole Republic of Letters, because they might make up
a Senate out of all sorts of men. There would be in it not only persons venerable for
the austerities of their lives, and sacred character, but also military men, and professed
gallants, and, in a word, many who give offence by their voluptuous life. This is an
authority of great weight; for the liberty of leud verses must needs be an ill thing,
since it is disliked by those very persons who live in debauchery. But in vain have ob-
scene writings been exclaimed against, it has had no effect to distinguish between honest
and dishonest men. There has always been in the Republic of Letters, a right or
liberty of publishing writings of this nature. This right has never been liable to pre-
scription; several persons of a distinguished merit have prevented it by the freedom they
have allowed themselves in such sort of works; and this has brought no disgrace upon
them, nor any ways incapacitated them for the enjoyment of all the honours and privi-
leges belonging to their condition, nor prevented the preferments they might hope for
from their fortune (3).

(3) I do not pre-
tend to extend
this to particular
cases, exceeding
certain bounds,
nor to persons who
are otherwise in-
famous for their
actions.

(4) See remark
[I], of the ar-
ticle PANORMI-
TA.

(5) See the arti-
cle SANCHEZ
(Thomas) cita-
tion (14).

(6) See the arti-
cles QUELIE-
NEC, and RO-
BERT.

(7) See, concern-
ing Grotius, who
wrote lascivious
verses, Rivet. O-
per. Tom. iii,
pag. 1112,
1124. Grot. in
Dissert. Rivet.
Apolog. pag.
237.

(8) Petronius.

(9) See remarks
[C], [D], of
the article QUEL-
LIE.

He would be laughed at who should go about to prove that Boccace was not a man
of probity, because he wrote the Decameron; or conclude, that the Queen of Navarre,
sister to Francis I, was not a Princess of admirable virtue, whose praises refounded
every where, because she wrote some Novels of Gallantry. Antony Panormita lost
nothing, either of his fortune or good reputation, by his smutty poem of the Herma-
phrodite (4). The same may be said of Benedicte le Court, and the famous Tiraquellus:
the former gave himself great liberty in writing a commentary on Martial d'Auvergne's
Decrees of Love: *Nonnunquam etiam*, says he in his Epistle Dedicatory to a Counsellor
of the Parliament of Paris, *quod in amore jocus fin lasciviente calamo*: and every body
knows how many obscene collections Tiraquellus inserted in his commentaries upon ma-
trimonial laws (5). Did Scipio du Pleix use any periphrases or reserves in his book
called, *La curiosité naturelle redigée en questions selon l'ordre alphabetique*? Did he not ex-
plain things in the most natural terms imaginable? What did he lose by that book?
Nothing at all. I should never have done, should I undertake to give a list of all the
Civilians, who, in trials of adultery, or impotency, have alledged many obscenities,
without any prejudice to their reputation. I have named three or four, Antony Hot-
man, Sebastian Roulliard, Vincent Tagereau, and Annæus Robert (6). This is
enough: let us name some persons of another rank.

The Dutch could not endure that any body should defame Secundus as a wicked and
profligate man, or so much as deny that he was an honest man, under pretence that he
wrote very lascivious verses (7). Ramirez de Prado, who wrote notes upon Martial,
printed at Paris with the King's licence in the year 1607, and full of leud explications,
lost nothing by this of his reputation or fortune, no more than Gonzales de Salas for
his commentary of the same kind upon an obscene author (8). Joubertus, Chancellor
of the university of Montpellier, and Physician to the King of France, and to the
King of Navarre, lost neither his pensions, nor his honourable posts, for inserting several
obscenities in his book of Vulgar Errors. Nor is he on that account esteemed a less
illustrious and honest man. Did Quiller's Callipædia hinder him from being recom-
pensed with an abbey by Cardinal Mazarin (9)? Feramus, Advocate in the Parlia-
ment of Paris, did not find that his merit was less extolled, or acknowledged after he
had wrote verses against Montmaur, wherein he sported with very obscene fictions.
And to come nearer our own time, was Mr de la Fontaine, who published so many
leud tales less caressed by every body at court and city? Lords and Princes, the ladies of
the highest rank, the most illustrious persons of the long robe, have all courted and ad-
mired him. Was he not admitted into the French Academy? And is not that honour
for a man of his character, equivalent to a mareschal's staff for a military man? I
doubt not but Mr de la Reinie would have gladly entertained him at his table the very
day that he condemned his new tales (10); for in such books wife men know how to
distinguish between the person of the author, and his writings.

III. Let us see whether the Protestants have been more rigid. I do not think that
the Consistories ever thought of censuring Ambrose Paré, whose Anatomical books writ-
ten in the vulgar tongue, were full of filthy things. There are many obscenities in
Joseph Scaliger's commentaries upon the Priapeia, and upon Catullus. There are more
still in Janus Douza's commentary upon Petronius. One of those two writers was Pro-
fessor at Leyden, and the other was one of the Curators of that university. They did
not lose upon that account their credit, and the great esteem they were in; and though
Beza mightily exclaimed against them in an Epistle Dedicatory to the States-General
(11), his out-cries were not minded. Daniel Heinsius, Professor in the same university,
enjoyed all the honours he could pretend to; he was one of the Secretaries of the
Synod of Dort, and received, on a thousand occasions, several proofs of the esteem they
had for his person; and yet he published some poems that are far from being modest.
What he and Scriverius called *Baudii amores*, is a very wanton collection; and it is to
be observed, that Scriverius was a man of merit, and of great note among the learned
in Holland. Notwithstanding Beza's exhortation, Theodore de Juges (12) put out an
edition

(10) It was on
the fifth of A-
pril 1675. The
sentence may be
seen at the end of
the third case of
Panormita, where-
by the sale of the
book is prohibited,
and it is ordered
that an informa-
tion shall be made
about the imperfec-
tion and sale of it.
What has been
said in my Re-
marks on the
Judgment of the
Public, &c.
numb. xxxiii.

(11) That the
Tales of la Fon-
taine were con-
demned in the
Parliament by the
sentence of a Ma-
jorité of Paris,
was affirmed to
me by a person
who came from
France. I am
persuaded he was
mistaken, and
that there was no
other sentence, but
that of Mr la
Reinie. I should
have been more
cautious, had I
desired to report
that particular in
my Dictionary.

(12) The piece I
then wrote being
only a leaf blank,
I was not so
careful as I ought
to have been.

(13) That of his
fronze on
Chrysis's refer-
ence.

(14) Mr Mead
under the second
name of John-
nes Cases Tili-
homous calls
him Thomas de
Judicibus, in the
preface to the Je-
dicum de Pro-
mento Triquet-
ent Petronius.
His mistake, as
the Christian
name is more ex-
cellable than the
of Mr de Court-
ny de la Re-
noine, who
page 25. of his
travels. Con-
cerning Salpa-
Book, printed
that Theod-
Juges would all
Gothicus. It
meant the Col-
lection and con-
dixit de Juges
were the same
thor.

edition of Petronius with his *Prolegomena*, wherein he endeavoured to justify those who explain the obscenities of that Roman author. It does not appear that Theodore de Juges did suffer in his reputation or fortune upon that account. He was a Protestant, and some persons of his family were Counsellors in the court of Castres, whose members were one half Protestants and the other Roman Catholics; and he spent a considerable part of his life at Geneva. Goldastus had enjoyed the same impunity after his edition of Petronius, which he published with his *Prolegomena*, wherein he undertook to justify the reading of such an author, and made a particular answer to Beza's reflexions. Shall I say that the famous d'Aubigné was very much respected at Geneva, though the cynical liberty of his pen was a notorious thing? Shall I observe that the consistory of Charenton never had any thoughts of complaining of Dr Menjot, though his writings concerning Physic are intermixed with many obscene things? Shall I add, that Isaac Vossius being a Canon of Windsor, when he published a book full of filthy things, the Dean and the Chapter did not meet to inflict upon him even the slightest punishment, viz. that of being reprimanded?

It is therefore no wonder if the faction contrary to those who condemn obscenities, did always maintain itself in the Republic of Letters: for besides their alledging several reasons for their opinion, they shelter themselves under the authority of several examples. You may see these reasons and these examples in the *Prolegomena* of Goldastus upon Petronius. All those who have apologized for the authors who as Physicians, or as Casuists, advance obscene things (13), alledge reasons against reasons, and authorities against authorities. They want neither great names nor grave authorities, *magno se judice quisque tuetur* (14). But do not think that I suppose that their reasons and those of their adversaries, have an equal force. I have declared in several places, that I absolutely condemn Catullus's obscenities, and those of his imitators, and the excessive freedom of the Casuists; and I add now, that the arguments alledged by those who plead for the liberty of inserting obscenities in an epigram, seem to me very weak, if compared with the contrary arguments (15). I further add, that an obscenity softened, and only meant as a jest, seems to me to be more blamable than a very obscene invective designed to create an abhorrence for impurity. And as for the obscenities of the stage, I am of opinion, that they ought to be severely punished by the magistrate. They are a school of debauchery, and belong rather to the first class than to the seven classes that follow it, and are the subject of these preliminary remarks. I have still one more to offer.

IV. For I say in the third place, that if any one should alledge that it were better for the writers of these seven classes, to apply themselves only to serious matters, and to treat them with all the modesty required by the gospel, he would depart from the state of the question. This advice, though very good in it self, is not pertinent on this occasion, since they might answer, that the question is not, whether they have chosen the good part, and whether they have made the best use they could make of their leisure and pen, but only whether they have taken a liberty condemned, upon pain of ignominy, by the statutes of the Republic of Letters, the regulations of civil policy, and the laws of the state? They would readily acknowledge, that they could not avoid being condemned, if they were judged by the laws of the gospel; but they would maintain that all writers are in the same case some more, some less, there being none but may be told, that he might have employed himself in a more Christian-like manner than he has done: for to give an instance of it, a Divine who has spent all his time in writing commentaries upon the Scripture, might have made a more pious use of it. Had it not been better for him to divide the day between mental prayer and works of charity? Why did he not spend part of the day in meditating upon the greatness of God, and the four last things? Why did he not spend the other in going from one Hospital to another to relieve the poor, and from house to house, to comfort afflicted persons and instruct little children? since therefore no man, will they say, can give a good account of his time at the severe tribunal of the Divine justice, and every body stands in need of mercy on account of many useless things, and for having erroneously chosen what was not the most necessary part; we appeal to another jurisdiction, and desire it may be enquired whether we have done any thing for which in the Judgment of the Public, and before the tribunal of the magistrates, we deserve to lose the title of good men, and to be deprived of the rank and privileges of men of honour. We desire a thing, would they say, which cannot be refused to several virtuous women who go to plays and to balls, who love gaming and fine cloaths, and who have such regard for their beauty, that they carefully study what ornaments will set it off to the best advantage. They know very well that their conduct is not agreeable to the precepts of the gospel; but whilst they do nothing else, they may lawfully pretend to the quality, rank, and privileges of virtuous women. They deserve to be censured by the Preachers and the Christian Moralists, I grant it: but till the public, or the magistrates, have fixed a note of infamy upon such a course of life, they cannot be called bad women; and whoever should call them so, would be obliged to make them a public satisfaction. They may alledge the practice of all ages, since there have been at all times many virtuous women, who loved gaming, plays, balls, and jewels; and after all, they do

not

An answer to those who blame a thing for this reason, that a better one might be done.

(13) See remark [D], of the article ALBERTUS Magnus; and remark [C], of the article SANCHEZ (Thomas).

(14) Lucian, Phars. lib. i. ver. 127.

(15) The reasons pro and con may be compared together, by reading Father Vauvafleur's book de Epigrammate, ch. ii. intitled de Obscenitate in Epigrammate vindanda.

not offend against the Civil Laws, nor against the rules of human honour, and are not guilty of that kind of disorder, which is the peculiar character of gallant women. The Poets, who in an *Epithalamium* make too naked a description of a wedding-night, may alledge the same reasons: they will own that their Muse might have pitched upon a more laudable subject, and that the composition of a Christian sonnet was preferable to that; but this very compofure would not have been the best thing they could have done. It had been better for them to spend their time in praying, and serving the poor in Hospitals, &c. There is hardly any business but what may be blamed for this reason, that a better one might have been pitched upon; and of all the occupations of this life, there is hardly any that is more blamable, if we judge of it by the rules of religion, than that which is most common; I mean the occupation of those who endeavour to get money either by trading or other fair means. Humanly speaking, the most lawful means of growing rich are contrary, not only to the Spirit of the Gospel, but also to the literal prohibitions of Jesus Christ and his Apostles. And therefore it highly concerns all men, that God should be merciful to them for not making the best use of their time. The Poets I speak of, having laid down this principle, add, that they only tread in the steps of many persons illustrious for their virtue and wisdom; that the liberty they take, always prevailed among honest men; that if it had been laid aside for some ages as the peculiar character of debauchery, they could not be excused; but that it will appear they may claim the right of possession, and that a thing which has been practised by so many honest men, cannot be accounted dishonest (16). This is a maxim of Pliny on the present question. He was one of the greatest wits, and one of the most honest men of his time; he made some verses that were thought to be somewhat impudent (17), and was blamed for it: he alledged many great examples in his vindication, and would not instance in the Emperor Nero, though, said he, I am not ignorant that things do not grow worse, because they are sometimes practised by wicked men, but that they continue to be honest, when they are often practised by honest men (18).

Thus much for the Poets. Now I must observe in a few words that the authors belonging to the other classes abovementioned, may alledge the same reasons. Nay, some of them may say something more specious: A natural Philosopher, for instance, and a Physician, may maintain, that their profession requires they should explain what concerns generation, barrenness, the green-sickness, a woman's delivery, and the *furor uterinus*, as well as fermentation, and what concerns the Spleen, the Gout, &c. A Casuist will say, that it is no less necessary that confessors and penitents should be informed of the several ways of offending against chastity, than of the several frauds that are committed in purchases.

At least we ought to do those authors the justice they claim, viz. not to judge of their morals by their writings (19). No necessary consequence can be drawn from either of those two things to the other. Some Poets are chaste in their verses, and in their morals; some are neither chaste in their verses nor in their morals; some are only chaste in their verses; and some are not chaste in their verses, but they are so in their morals, and all their fire lies in their heads (20). All the wanton strokes of their epigrams, are only witty conceits; their Candida's and their Lesbia's are fictitious mistresses. The Protestants cannot deny it of Beza, since he declares that he lived a regular life when he wrote the Poems, intitled, *Juvenilia*, of which he did so much repent (21).

V. After these general observations, I shall proceed to the examination of what concerns this Dictionary; and the first thing I shall observe upon this head is, that if those observations are not looked upon as a solid justification, I shall not be prejudiced by it; but if they are approved as such, they will be of great use to me. I am in far better circumstances than all the authors I have mentioned (22); for though Catullus, Lucretius, Juvenal, and Suetonius, be never so much condemned, a writer who cites them, cannot be blamed for it. Those authors are to be had in all the Booksellers shops; the passages quoted out of them, cannot be more dangerous than they are in those authors themselves; and there is a vast difference between the first authors of an obscenity, and those who mention it only as the proof of a fact, or of an argument which the subject in hand obliges them to alledge. Granting that Joubertus expressed himself too immodestly, does it follow from thence that I could not alledge his authority, when I was to criticize a very weak argument alledged against those who accused the Physician Herlicius of lewdness? However it be, if the excuses alledged in favour of Suetonius, Joubertus, &c. are good and solid, so much the better for me; if they are not good, it can do me no prejudice; my case is different from theirs, and much better. By the argument *a fortiori* what they may say in their vindication, may be alledged by me with greater reason; and what is a weak argument for them, may be a very strong one for me. You need only compare together the nine classes I have mentioned, and you will find that the last, which suits my work, is less liable to a just censure.

This will more clearly appear, if to what I have said above (23), concerning the nature of my case, I add this consideration, viz. That I have avoided three things that might have occasioned just complaints.

(16) I say nothing of the liberty Mr. de Vautour takes in his poems. It is no new thing for the Poets to take this vicious liberty. They have long ago prostituted the chastity of the Muses. They alledge their multitude in their vindication. There is no counting with them concerning a possession, which they have enjoyed for so many ages by the consent of all nations. *Grec. Réponse à la Défense de Vautour, pag. 74.*

(17) See the fourteenth Letter of the fourth book of Pliny, and the third of the fifth book.

(18) *Netem tranco, quamvis sciam non corrumper in deterius, que aliquando etiam à malis, sed honesta manere que legum à bonis sunt.* *Plin. Epist. vii. lib. vi. pag. m. 289.*

(19) See remark [D], of the article VAYRA.

(20) Compare with this what Count Buffon says concerning *Madam*.... The picture of jelling is pronounced with her, and when she is in that humour, she joyfully listens to the freest discourses, provided they are disguised. Nay the answers with improvements, believing that her wit might be called in question, if she did not improve upon what was said to her.... She is of a cold constitution; at least if we may rely on her husband: to this he partly owed her virtue, as he said, all her fire lies in her mind: indeed she makes ample amends for the coldness of her constitution. *Hist. de mademoiselle des Gouttes, pag. m. 174. & 175.*

(21) See the article BEZA, remarks [F], & [A].

(22) That is the cycle class of authors, abovementioned.

(23) See, above, number 15.

In

PARTICULAR remarks concerning the obscenities pretended to be in this Dictionary, three precautions which I have taken.

CONCERNING OBSCENITIES.

841

In the first place, whenever I have said any thing as my own, I have avoided all words and expressions that are contrary to common civility and decency. This is sufficient in a work of this nature, intermixed with Historical narratives, and all sorts of discussions; for to pretend that a compilation which is to contain matters of Literature, Law, or Natural Philosophy, according to the various subjects treated on, ought to be written according to the most strict rules of decency observed in a sermon, or in a book of devotion, or a novel, would be confounding things, and setting up a kind of tyranny over mens minds. A word that would be thought unbecoming in the mouth of a preacher, and in a small romance designed for the entertainment of the ladies, would not appear so in a case written by a lawyer, nor in the verbal process of a Physician, nor in a book of Natural Philosophy, nor even in a piece of Literature, or in the faithful translation of a Latin book, such as for instance, the relation of Abelard's misfortune. It is therefore certain, that there are several degrees of decency, with respect to the style: the highest degrees belong to some writers, and not to all. If an ingenious man was desired by some ladies to write a romantic History of Jupiter's or Hercules's adventures, he would do well never to use the words, *to geld*, *to deflower*, *to get with child*, *to lie with a nymph*, *to ravish her*; he should either lay aside the particulars that might excite those ideas, or keep them at a distance by general and enigmatical expressions. But if the writers of an Historical Dictionary, wherein the reader expects to find an exact translation of what is to be found in the ancient Mythology concerning Jupiter's adventures, used long circuits, and far fetched expressions, whereby the fate of some nymphs might be guessed at, they would be accounted finical and ridiculous. They do not offend against decency, provided they keep within the bounds of common civility, that is, provided they abstain from such words as are used by the rabble, and which even a debauchee carefully avoids in a serious conversation. They may boldly use all the words that are to be found in the Dictionary of the French Academy, and in that of Furetiere, unless the authors of these Dictionaries give notice, that those words are odious and obscene. This is the first thing I have observed; viz. that I keep to the rules of common decency, when I say any thing as my own. I now proceed to give an account of the course I have taken as to passages quoted by me out of other authors.

I have avoided, in the second place, to express in our language the meaning of a quotation, which contained some immodest thing, and have only set it down in Latin. The passages I cite out of Brantome and Montagne are not the most offensive which may be found in those authors; and I may say the same with respect to D'Aubigné, and other French writers somewhat too free, whom I have sometimes quoted to prove what I said.

In the third place, I have avoided mentioning, in any language whatsoever, such things as had a character of extravagancy and enormity unknown to the vulgar; and I have quoted nothing out of certain books that are little known, and which I had rather leave in darkness than excite the desire of buying them, in those who should find them cited in this work. I never cited on this subject any authors but such as may be had every where, and are reprinted almost every year. I could name a very honest man, who never was a debauchee, who wrote from London to one of his friends, that he expected to find quite other things in my Dictionary, from the clamours of certain people. I imagined, said he, that it contained unknown obscenities, but I could find nothing in it, but what myself and my companions knew before we were eighteen years old.

After what has been said, it will be no difficult matter to know whether I have been justly or wrongfully blamed. The whole affair may be reduced to these two points, 1. Whether I am liable to censure, because I have not sufficiently wrapped up in ambiguous periphrases the obscene facts which have been found in History. 2. Whether I am to blame, because I have not wholly suppressed those facts.

THE first of the two questions to which the present dispute may be reduced, runs upon words or expressions. An answer to that charge.

VI. The first of these two questions, properly speaking, belongs only to the Grammarians: Morality is not concerned in the matter; the civil Magistrates have nothing to do with it, *Nihil hec ad editum prætoris*; neither are the Moralists or the Casuists concerned in it. If an action was to be brought against me, it could only relate to the politeness of my style; whereupon I would appeal to the French Academy, as the proper and competent judge of such causes. I am sure those gentlemen would not condemn me; otherwise they would condemn themselves, since all the words I make use of, are to be found in their Dictionary, without any note of dishonour. When they do not declare that a word is obscene, all writers are thereby authorized to use it; I mean such words as they have defined. But further, I should readily consent to be condemned by them; for I do not pretend to politeness of style, I have declared in my preface that my style is very incorrect, and not free from expressions either improper, or which begin to be obsolete, or even from barbarisms, and that in these respects I am not very scrupulous. Why should I pretend to it, since several famous authors, who lived at Paris (24), and were members of the French Academy, did not care for it? Why should a man hamper himself in a book designed for things, and not for words, and which containing all sorts of matters some serious, and others ludicrous, necessarily requires

(24) Mr. le Et. Bourcier, for the French, (See the preface to his Additions to Ca. Relau's Mémoires) and Mr. de Mazarin, Secretary to the French Academy.

V O L. V.

10 D

requires

AN EXPLANATION

requires one should use various sorts of expressions? The author of such a work needs not to be so cautious as a preacher; and though the latter ought, in the pulpit, to avoid this phrase, *They who get a maid with child, ought either to marry her, or give her a portion*, yet he may use it without any indecency in a book concerning cases of conscience. So true it is, that an author may express himself differently, according to the nature of his books.

But if any thing can excuse the writers, who have no regard to I know not what refined delicacy which increases every day, it is this, that there will be no end of it; for, in order to act consistently, a vast number of words which the French tongue cannot be without, must be accounted obscene; and the writers who pretend to be so nice, may easily be convicted of absurdity. It may be proved to them, that according to their principles there are no precise or foppish women, and that those whom we call so, are very reasonable, and argue consequentially. I desire them to tell me, why the verb *to geld* appears obscene to them. Is it not because it offers an obscene object to our imagination? But for the same reason the word *adultery* cannot be pronounced without a greater obscenity. Thus this word must be banished. There will be a necessity to banish likewise the words *marriage*, *wedding-day*, *bride's-bed*, and a vast number of such expressions, which excite very obscene ideas, and incomparably more offensive than that, at which the precise lady in one of Moliere's plays was so much offended. *For my part, uncle, says she, all that I can say is, that marriage seems to me to be a very shocking thing. How can a woman endure the thought of lying by a naked man* (25)?

According to the principles of our Purists nothing could be more reasonable than such a discourse, and every virtuous maid should turn out of her chamber all persons who should come and tell her of a design to marry her. She might justly complain, that they have so little regard for her modesty, as to offer to her a frightful obscenity without any veil or disguise. To ask a married woman, whether she has had any children, would be a monstrous obscenity; politeness would require that we should use figurative expressions, and imitate, for instance, the finical lady, who said, 'That her companion had given into lawful love (*which was marriage*), and that she knew not how she could resolve to taste brutish pleasures with a man; That she had done it to leave behind her some traces of herself, *that is, some children* (26).'

According to the notions of the Purists, it would be a very reasonable thing to exclude against Moliere's School of Women, with all the fury he has so handsomely ridiculed, and which is, at the bottom, a downright extravagance. Every virtuous person should say that expression, *Children coming out through the ear, is abominable . . . Can any one that has any virtue, be pleased with a piece that keeps modesty in a constant alarm, and continually defiles the imagination? . . . I positively affirm, that an honest woman cannot see that play, without being put to shame, I have discovered so many leud and filthy things in it* (27). . . . *Those obscenities, God be thanked, appear bare-faced, they have not the least covering: The boldest eyes are frightened at their nakedness . . . That passage of the scent, wherein Agnes mentions what was got from her, is more than sufficient to prove what I say.*

. . . . *Ey . . . (28). I repeat it again, the filthy things of that piece fly into one's face.* . . . *Is not modesty visibly offended by what Agnes says in the place we speak of* (29)? If

some Urania ventured to answer, 'Not at all. Agnes does not say a word but what is

very modest; and if you will have it, that she means something else, the obscenity

proceeds from you, and not from her, for she speaks only of a ribbon that one got

from her (30):' the following answer would be a wise one: '(31) Ah! you may

talk of a ribbon as much as you please; but that my where she stops, was not put

there for nothing: it occasions strange thoughts; that my is furiously scandalous: and

say what you will you can never justify the infolence of that my . . . There is an

tolerable obscenity in it (32).' That discourse, though never so impertinent, would

be proper and honest, according to this principle, *All words which defile the imagination,*

that is to say, which denote an obscene object, ought to be laid aside. According to

this principle, all those who have some modesty, would be like the Marquise Araminta,

whose character is as follows: 'She says every where it is a horrid piece (33), and

that she could never endure the obscenities it is stuffed with . . . She follows the ill

example of those women, who being in the decline of their age, have a mind to

supply what they see they are losing, by something else; and would have the gri-

maces of a scrupulous prudery serve them instead of youth and beauty. This lady

carries the thing farther than any body, and is so nicely scrupulous, that she finds ob-

scenities where no body else had discovered any. It is said her scruples are such as

will disfigure our language, and that there is hardly any words but what she would

curtail, either at the beginning or end, by reason of the immodest syllables she finds

out in them (34).'

I think I have read somewhere, that preciseness has been carried so far that ladies

would not say *J'ai mangé des confitures*, but *des sûres*. At this rate, above one half of

the words of the Dictionary of the French Academy should be struck out, and then

the rest would be insignificant, for they would want a connexion; and thus we should

be obliged to explain ourselves by signs only, which would occasion more scandalous and

more dangerous obscenities than those that come into one's ears (35). Here follows a

(25) Moliere, *Précieuses ridicules*, Scene 10, Act 1.

(26) Sorel, de la *Cocquetterie des bons Livres*, page 470, *Duclé E-dit*.

(27) Moliere *Critique de l'Ecole des Femmes*, Scene 11, Act 1.

(28) *Ibid.* *Ibid.* page 14.

(29) *Ibid.* page 16.

(30) *Ibid.*

(31) *Ibid.*

(32) *Nice, The*

in this passage of

Moliere, every

body expects to

hear Agnes say,

that some body has

got her mandarin

head; which co-

stitutes a very ob-

scene idea.

(33) *That is,*

the play remarks

The School of

Women.

(34) Moliere, *Les*

lignes, Scene 10.

(35) *Scrupulous*

examine

démontre per

renes,

Qu'on que l'on

occulte l'impud-

icité, à qui

l'on fait tout

spectacle.

Hérot. de An

Pour. par. l'ho

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

l'ho. quel est

CONCERNING OBSCENITIES.

843

passage of the *Chevreana*, whereby my assertion will be extremely well confirmed. A lady who has a great deal of wit, but is too finical, told me one day she never used any words which might excite an obscene idea, and that when she was in company with polite people she said, *Un fond d'Artichaut; un fond de Chapeau; une rue qui n'a point de sortie*, for what we call *un Cul de sac*. I told her she did very well, and that I would not fail to do the same. However, I added, that on some occasions we were obliged to speak like others. She very civilly defied me to give her any instance of it; and I asked her how she called in common conversation a piece that is worth sixty pence? Sixty pence, replied she. But, Madam, how do you call that letter of the alphabet that comes next to P? She blushed, and at the same time replied, *Truly, Sir, I did not think you would bring me back to my a, b, c* (36). You see Mr Chevreau approves that we should never use any words, which may excite an obscene idea; and by virtue of that principle, he is of opinion, that we should never say, *un Cul de sac*. He must therefore strike out not only above two pages of Furetiere's Dictionary (37), corrected by one of the politest writers of our days (38), but also a vast number of words, whose first syllable excites more immodest ideas than the syllable *Cul*. He must also banish the words *adultery, fornication, incontinence*, and a thousand more: but as rigid as he is with respect to obscene words, he was not willing to grant upon one single point what that precise lady required; therefore he was not consistent with himself [A]. But let us forgive him that inconsistency; for the consequences of his assertion are so absurd, and so impracticable, that he is not to blame for not keeping to them

(36) Chevreau, *Part. ii, pag. 101, 102, Dutch Ed.*

(37) At the beginning of the syllable *Cul*.

(38) Mr Baufnage de Baurval.

[A] As rigid as Mr Chevreau is with respect to obscene words . . . he was not consistent with himself.] Immediately after having said with Marshal de Bassompierre, that all men carry about them the key of the treasure, FAIRE DES ENFANS, is an obscene expression (b), and that it ought never to be used before ladies, who have nice ears. Those two observations were not fit to appear close together. Here is another that is a

(a) Chevreau, *Part. i, pag. 350.*

(b) See what Mr Arnauld says in his *Défense de la Traduction de Mons. Irv.* iv. ch. ii, pag. 334.

(c) Note, That Quintilian, lib. viii, cap. iii, observes, that instead of cum nobis hominibus, it should be said cum hominibus notis.

(d) Liberis dare operam quem honeste dicitur? Cicero, *Epist. viii, lib. ix ad fam.* pag. 58. Edit. Grav.

(e) Chevreau, *Part. ii, pag. 122.*

(f) Menage, *Observ. upon Malherbe*, pag. 338.

(g) Id. *ibid.* pag. 581.

(h) Chevreau, *Part. ii, pag. 122.*

(i) *Ibid.* p. 124. Note, That Girard, in his Reply to Cyprien, lib. viii, pag. 74, pretends this expression of Cicero is too obscene, viz. the thigh of a boy so white and so well shaped.

(k) *Ibid.* pag. 125.

country breeding. But to proceed, 'One cannot too carefully avoid such obscenities as leave filthy ideas in the mind, and offend ears that are not over nice. C. Servilius Glaucia Quæstor in the year of Rome 641, was looked upon as the filth of the streets, by reason of the meanness of his soul; and yet the most eloquent man among the Romans, could not bear that he should be called *Curia stercus* *, nor that the great loss the commonwealth sustained by the death of Scipio, should have been expressed in these words, *Reipublica morte P. Scipionis Africani castrata*. Mr de Balzac did not observe decency, nor the precepts of the ancient Rhetoricians, whom he often called his masters, when he wrote to a friend concerning a certain person, *Qu'il étoit tout composé de parties bouterfes*. Our language has been so modest for these sixty years, that we seldom use the words *subore* and *barudy-bouffe*, which the preachers formerly used without any scruple in their best sermons (l). From all these passages, it appears, that Mr Chevreau was very severe in his theory; but his practice was not answerable to it: for should one strike out of his works every thing that defiles the imagination, there would be abundance of gaps in them. To speak only of the *Chevreana*, wherein he appears so rigid a Moralist; how many things are there in it that excite very obscene ideas? Some of those passages are quotations, and others are his own compositions. Why should a man prescribe any rules which cannot be observed either in a general History, or in a collection of observations of all kinds?

* Quintilianus *Instit. Orat.* lib. viii, cap. vi. De Tropis.

(l) Chevreau, *ibid.* pag. 275, 276.

It will not be improper to give here an instance of what he says concerning the preachers of former times; and therefore I shall set down some passages out of a sermon of John de Monluc, Bishop of Valence, and one of the most eminent preachers of the XVIth century. 'He who deflowers and corrupts a virgin, is guilty of fornication, a crime mentioned in *Deuteronomy* xxii, and yet in our days no account is made of acts of Fornication, which are daily committed: many poor maids are enticed, seduced, and brought to perdition; and those who have debauched them, glory in it, and think it much to their honour that they have been able to conquer those women, who had for some time resisted the temptations of the flesh. But if they are not punished in this world, the most high God, who sees every thing, will in time call them to an account: they shall give an account of the time they have lost, of the money they have spent upon pimps and bawds, they shall be answerable for the sins committed by the maid after she has been seduced, and for her being forsaken and finding no body to marry her. Then they will know whether they had any reason to boast of such an execrable action (m). . . . They likewise infringe this commandment who contrary to the order of nature, commit that enormous and detestable crime called Sodomy: such persons are condemned to death by the law of God, as we read in *Leviticus* xx. (n). That command is also transgressed by those, who commonly

(m) Monluc, Bishop of Valence, Sermons sur les dix Commandemens de Dieu, pag. 504. Edit. of Papey 1558, in 8vo.

(n) *Ibid.* pag. 506.

them. His only fault lies in not perceiving the falsity of a principle, whereof the most necessary consequences are absurd, and plainly tend to the destruction of the use of speech. It is to be observed, that there are some ladies as virtuous as that precise woman, who do not scruple to say, *Cul d'Artichaut*, and *Cul de sac*. This you may see in a passage of Costar; which has a great affinity with the subject in hand [B].

I have already observed that it is impossible to satisfy the Purists, against whom I am writing. The ground they go upon will make them lay aside, whenever they please, abundance of words not yet condemned by them, which, according to their maxims, do not less deserve to be rejected than those which they have actually laid aside. There is no avoiding their censure. Though you relate things in modest words, as has been done in the second volume of the *Menagiana*, they will say, *That there are some passages in it plainly contrary to modesty, which cannot be read without horror, by virtuous persons* (39). Could Father Bouhours avoid being criticised, though in his French

(39) *Journal des Savans*, for February 21, 1695, pag. 145, Dutch edition.

(40) See the third letter of a learned lady to another lady her friend, pag. 8.

(41) See the preface to Boileau's Works.

(42) In the tenth satire.

(43) This is in the second volume of his Chronological Abridgement, ad ann. 1313, where he speaks of some sparks who courted the daughters-in-law of Philip the Fair.

translation of the Gospels he took all possible care to lay aside every word that might appear never so little unbecoming (40)? Was not Mr Boileau, whom the illustrious President de la Moignon often commended, for having purged satirical poetry from the obscenity, which till then had been, as it were, peculiar to it (41), charged with smuttness, for having used (42) the words *Embryon*, *voix luxurieuse*, *morale lubrique*? If such words cannot be admitted, there will be no end of censuring.

I know several persons who blame Mezerai for saying that some sparks, who had committed adultery, were mutilated in the parts wherewith they had offended (43). Their censure is grounded upon these two reasons: one is, that there was no need to mention a circumstance which offers such an obscene object: the other is, that he should at least have omitted all the words after *mutilated*, that word being sufficient to express the thing. I desire those Critics not to take it ill of me, if I believe that the circumstance which they say should have been omitted, is one of those which an Historian ought never to forget; for if there is any thing extraordinary in the punishment inflicted upon a malefactor, it ought to be particularly mentioned. The second Remark does not appear to me better. A sentence of death may import that a malefactor's hands, nose, or ears shall be cut off, before he be put to death; and therefore the word *mutilated* would not sufficiently express the circumstance which Mezerai was to inform us of. But supposing that this word is sufficient, does it follow from thence, that the addition of the rest is a fault? Do not we commonly say, *I have seen it with my own eyes*, &c. There are several needless words in such phrases, and yet no body finds fault with them. Lastly, I say that those Critics contradict themselves: they only blame this addition as being unnecessary; the thing, say they, had been well enough understood without it. They are not therefore against offering an obscene image to the mind, they would only have two or three needless sounds omitted. Their zeal for purity would have been edifying, had they been altogether against the use of any thing in History that may excite an obscene idea; but they allow of it, provided it be done without any needless words. Thus they destroy in this last Remark what might have been edifying in the first. Such is the nice taste of our Purists: they blame one expression, and

(e) *Ibid.* pag. 507.

(f) *Ibid.* pag. 501.

(g) See the eleventh edition, of Girac's answer to the apology for Voltaire.

'commonly live in delights and pleasure, who spend their time in feasting and banquetting, and pamper their body to make it a vessel of luxury and whoredom. St Peter gives a lively description of them in the second chapter of his second epistle (e) . . . Sporting themselves with their own deceivings, whilst they feast with you; having their eyes full of adultery, and cannot cease from sin, beguiling unstable souls. That is, their only end and intention is to deceive poor souls, and by their banquets and feasts, to allure them to adultery and all manner of filthiness. So that their habitations are bawdy-houses, where assemblies are held, matches are made, and women are seduced: in a word, they are the plague of a country; and yet such people are most esteemed and honoured, especially those who are the ring-leaders, and as it were, the cocks of their parish (f).'

The use we may make of the passages extracted from that sermon, is to know that the liberty of expressing one's self in such a plain manner, is not sinful in itself, for then it would not have been lawful in Henry the second's time. Now if it was lawful then, should a preacher use it in our days, his only fault would consist in not conforming to the mode. But if any one ventured at this present time to wear a ruff, would he not offend against the mode? And yet it would be no sinful action.

[B] A passage of Costar, which has a great affinity with the subject in hand.] The polite Voiture (who would believe it?) was charged with using obscene expressions (g), tho' he was so well acquainted with the genteel part of the world, and kept company with persons of quality. Let us see what his apologist an-

swered: 'There is hardly any lady who scruples to repeat and sing the verses which Mr de Voiture made upon a lady's back-side, and I do not know one who makes any difficulty to say, *un cul d'artichaut*, and *un cul de sac* (r). The apologist alleges afterwards the passage I have recited in another place (i), and adds these remarkable words: *Let us bear our perverts Critic* †. It was feared there was not enough of this sort of wit in Mr de Voiture's letters, and that in this respect he would not come up to Plautus and Aristophanes; and therefore it was thought necessary to add these words in the last edition, which were wanting in the 178th letter. I consent to the castrating of Ulpian, since you will have it so, and even of Papius; for they begot nothing but law-suits. This thought is very ingenious. Hitherto I have always heard people say, without any scruple, that a book was castrated, to denote a book which is not entire, but curtailed. If our adversary had any interest in the academy, he would get this licentious expression abolished, and this modest phrase substituted in its room, to injure books and make them eunuchs. The passages of Quintilian † quoted by him, are wrongly quoted, and that author maintains, that if some expressions of Sallust were accounted obscene, it was not the writer's but the reader's fault. As for Celsus, who pretended to find an obscenity in a hemistich of Virgil, Quintilian blames him for it, and says, that if Lucianus against the same Quintilian blames him for it, and says, that such a niceness was allowable, no man could be sure he speaks well, and every body should be silent (d). It is to be observed, that Costar, who affords me this passage, was none of those learned men who are unacquainted with the genteel part of the world. He was acquainted and kept company with people of fashion.

(r) Costar, suite de la Dedicace de Voltaire, pag. 189.

(i) In the anti-Michaelist (Michael de l'Etat), (113).

† Pag. 75, 76.

† Page 71.

Dictionnaire des

littéraires, le par-

littéraires, le par-

littéraires, le par-

littéraires, le par-

littéraires, le par-

littéraires, le par-

littéraires, le par-

littéraires, le par-

littéraires, le par-

littéraires, le par-

and approve another, though they equally offer the same obscenity to the mind. The *Observations* printed at Paris in the year 1700, against Mezerai, will be very acceptable to those Critics. See the margin (44). He is blamed in that book (45) for commonly using the words concubine, bastard, and adultery, which are inconsistent with the niceness of our age. I am sure they would not condemn the words *favourite*, *natural son*, and *conjugal infidelity*, which have the same signification. How inconsistently do they argue!

IX. The new whims of those, who, as I am told, begin to reckon the words *glister* (46) and *physic* among obscene terms, and use the general word *remedy* in their room, would be less unreasonable. The word *clistere* (*glister*) was laid aside, as including too many circumstances of the operation, and the word *lavement* took its place as having a more general signification. But because the idea of the word *lavement* is become specific, and takes in too many circumstances, it will be quickly laid aside for fear of fullying the imagination, and none but general phrases will be used, such as *'Étois dans les remèdes*, *un remède lui fut ordonné*, &c. which do not more particularly denote a glister or a purge, than a bag of herbs hung about the neck. These are certainly very strange whims, and were they approved and followed in all their consequences, they would destroy a great many expressions, to which every body is used, and which are very necessary to those who recover from a sickness, and to their visitants; otherwise it would be no easy matter to keep up a conversation in their chambers, and there would be a necessity to use the whole jargon of the precise ladies: But after all, those whims are better grounded than those of the Purists, who are willing that an obscene image should be imprinted in the mind, provided it be with such and such words, and not with others.

To sum up what I have said upon this head, I observe,

I. That the question is not about a point of Morality, but is a mere Grammatical dispute, which ought to be decided by those who are judges of the politeness of style.

II. That I shall ingenuously confess, I did not aim at the honour that may be acquired by such politeness.

III. That I do not think all authors are obliged to submit to the new notion of politeness of style; for were it exactly followed, there would be no need at last of any Dictionary but that of the precise ladies.

IV. That the title of this new politeness is not so well established as to obtain the force of a law in the Republic of Letters. The antient title remains still (47), and may be used till a prescription begins.

V. That in such a book as this, it is enough not to act against the common practice; but any one who keeps within those bounds as carefully as I have done (48); may use several expressions which would be improper in a sermon, or a book written by a finical author. It is enough for him that they are used in Anatomical books, in cases drawn up by Lawyers, and in the conversations of learned men (49).

An examination of what some allege, viz. that certain things offend modesty.

X. But that it may the better appear that Morality is not concerned in the present question, I must obviate another objection of my censurers. Let us see whether they can allege this pretence, that every phrase which offends modesty, is an attempt upon Morality, since it is prejudicial to chastity.

Whereupon I observe in the first place, that they who say that certain things offend modesty, must needs mean either that they weaken chastity, or exasperate the persons who are chaste. In the first sense their position cannot be admitted; and if women are to decide the case, the censurers will be infallibly cast. But doubtless women are the most competent judges of such a thing, since shame and modesty are allotted to them in a much greater degree than to men. Let them therefore be pleased to tell us what passes in their soul, when they hear or read a discourse which offends modesty. They will not say, I am sure, that it not only fills their minds with obscene thoughts, but also that it excites in their hearts a lascivious desire which they cannot restrain without great difficulty; and, in a word, that they feel themselves exposed to temptations which stagger their virtue, and carry it to the brink of ruin. We may be sure, that instead of such an answer, they will say, that the idea which rises against their will in their imagination, fills their mind at once with the highest degree of shame, indignation, and anger. Now it is certain that nothing can be more effectual than this, to corroborate chastity, and remove the contagious influence of an obscene object imprinted on the imagination; so that instead of saying, according to the first sense, That what offends modesty, endangers chastity, it ought to be said on the contrary, that it is a fence, a preservative, a bulwark for that virtue; and consequently, if we understand this phrase, *Such a thing offends modesty*, in the second sense, we ought to believe, that instead of weakening chastity, it revives and corroborates it.

An observation concerning the vexation of readers. Gross obscenities are least dangerous.

Therefore it will still be true that the censuring of an author for not following the most refined politeness of style, is a mere Grammatical controversy, in which Morality is not in the least concerned.

XI. If it be replied, that Morality is concerned in it, since the author has expressed himself in such a manner as angers the readers: I answer, that this argument is grounded upon

(46) See Garfield's Apology, pag. 107.

(47) Mr. Menage's friends were, in the year 1695, charged with publishing obscene things in a book printed with the King's licence.

(48) Nay, I have observed Quintilian's precept in relation to some words that are grown obscene by the depravation of the readers. Vel hoc vitium sit quod καὶ παρὰ τὸν νομῶν: five mala consuetudine in obscenorum intellectum sermo detortus est, ut *Duflare exercitus*, & *Patrare bellum*, apud Salustium dicta sancti & antiqui, ridetur à nobis, si diis placeat; quam cum prius non scribentium quidem iudicio ledentium, tam men vitanda quatenus verba honesta moribus perdidimus, & evincemus etiam vitis credendum est, five junctura deformiter sonat. Quintil. lib. viii cap. iii, pag. m 367.

(49) As those that were held in Mr. Menage's house.

VOL. V.

10 E

upon

upon a false hypothesis; for no writer can prevent the spite, vexation, and anger of the readers, on a thousand occasions. Every Controversialist, who defends his cause with great art and subtilty, continually vexes the zealous readers of the contrary party. Whoever in an account of a journey, or in the History of a nation, relates things that are glorious to his own country and religion, and shameful to foreigners and other religions, cruelly vexes the readers, who are not prepossessed as he is. The perfection of an History consists in being unacceptable to all sects and nations; for it is a sign the writer neither flatters, nor spares any of them. Many readers fall into such a rage when they meet with certain things in a book, that they tear the leaf, or write in the margin, *Thou liest, rogue, and deservest to be bastinadoed* (50). None of these things (51) can be alledged as a reason why authors should be tried at the bar of Morality: the Critics are their only judges.

(50) I have in
the margin written
in the margin
of some books,

The only thing therefore that may be further objected, is, that Morality is concerned in the representation of obscene objects, because it is apt to excite unlawful desires and leud thoughts. But this objection is not so strong against me as against those, who use the covers, reserves, and nice ways of wrapping up things, which some complain I have neglected; for they do not hinder the impression of the object upon the imagination, but imprint it without exciting any shame and indignation. They who use such covers, do not intend to make themselves unintelligible; they know every body will understand what they say, and it is certain they are perfectly understood. The delicacy of their touches has only this effect, that people look upon their pictures the more boldly, because they are not afraid of meeting with nudities. Modesty would not suffer them to cast their eyes upon them, if they were naked obscenities; but when they are dressed up in a transparent cloth, they do not scruple to take a full view of them, without any manner of shame, or indignation against the Painter: and thus the object insinuates itself more easily into the imagination, and is more at liberty to pour its malignant influence into the heart, than if the soul was struck with shame and anger; for those two passions exhaust almost the whole activity of the soul, and put it into such a trouble that it can hardly have any other sentiment. At least it is certain, that obscenity cannot act so strongly upon a soul overwhelmed with shame and anger, as upon one that is free from confusion and vexation. *Pluribus intentus minor est ad singula sensus*. When the soul is affected with one passion, it is less susceptible of another.

(51) I except however, the reading of which may have caused the obscene Characters.

Add to this, that when an obscenity is expressed only by halves, but in such a manner that one may easily supply what is wanting, they who see it finish themselves the picture which sullies the imagination; and therefore they have a greater share in the production of that image, than if the thing had been fully explained. In this last case they had been only passive, and consequently the admission of the obscene image would have been very innocent; but in the other case they are an active principle, and consequently, are not so innocent, and have more reason to fear the contagious effects of that object, which is partly their work. Thus this pretended regard to modesty, is really a more dangerous snare; it makes one dwell upon an obscene matter, in order to find out what was not clearly expressed. And is this a matter fit to be suggested to the reader's meditation? Were it not better to prevent his stopping at it?

XII. This is still of greater force against the writers who seek for covers and reserves. Had they used the first word they met with in a Dictionary, they had only touched upon an obscene thing, and gone presently over that place; but the covers they have fought out with great art, and the periods they have corrected and abridged, till they were satisfied with the fineness of their pencil, made them dwell several hours upon an obscenity. They have turned it all manner of ways; they have been winding about it, as if they had been unwilling to leave such a charming place [C]. Is not this *ad strenum scopulos consensere*, to cast anchor within reach of the tyren's voice, and the way to spoil and infect the heart? It is certain, that excepting those who are truly devout, most of our other Purists are not in the least concerned for modesty, when they avoid so carefully the expressions of our ancestors; they are professed gallants, who cajole all sorts of women, and have frequently two mistresses, one whom they keep, and another who keeps them. Truly it becomes such men very well to exclaim against a word that offends modesty, and to be so nice when something is not left to be supplied by the reader's imagination! We may apply to them what Moliere said of a pretended

[C] They have been winding about it, as if they had been unwilling to leave such a charming place.] This puts me in mind of an inscription engraved in golden letters on a black marble upon the bridge *Noire Dame* at Paris.

Sequana cum primum Regine allabitur urbi,
Tardat precipites ambitiosus aquas.
Captus amore loci, cursum obliviscitur anceps,
Quo fluat, & dulces nescit in urbe moras.

Hinc varios implens fluctu subeunte canales,
Fons fieri gaudet qui modo flumen erat.
ANNO MDC LXXVI (a).

When the Seine first enters the metropolis of France, he ambitiously plays his rapid streams, and being enamoured with the place, he forgets his course, is uncertain whither to flow, and winds in sweet meanders through the town, thence filling the pipes with his waters, he who was once a river, joys to become a fountain. ANNO 1676.

These verses were made by Mr de Santeuil.

(a) Descriptions
Nouvelle de la
Ville de Paris.
Tom. II. pag.
206, Paris
Edit. 1687.

pretended prude: 'Believe me, those women who are so very formal, are not accounted more virtuous for it. On the contrary, their mysterious severity, and affected grimaces, provoke all the world to censure their actions. People delight to find out something to blame in their conduct. And to give an instance of it, there were the other day some women at this play opposite to our box, who by their affected grimaces during the whole representation, and turning aside their heads, and hiding their faces, made people tell many ridiculous stories of them, which had never been mentioned if they had not behaved so; nay, a footman cried out, that their ears were chaffer than all the rest of their body (52).' The men I speak of, think only of making themselves admired for the delicacy of their pen.

(52) Molière, Critique de l'École des Femmes, Scène III, pag. 15.

The Jansenists are accounted the best Moralists; and I do but follow their opinion, when I say, that a gross obscenity is less dangerous than one that is nicely expressed. I am not ignorant, says one of them (53), 'that people call *ordures* only such words as

(53) Réponse à l'Apologie du Père Bouhours, pag. 73, & seq. Edit. 1700. See also the Lettres curieuses de l'Abbé de Bellegarde, pag. 253, Hugué Edit. 1702; and the article Accords, remark [C], at the end.

'are grossly obscene; and *gallantries*, those which are expressed in a nice, delicate, and ingenious manner; but gross obscenities, though covered with a witty ambiguity, as it were with a transparent veil, do not cease to be obscenities; they do not less offend chaste ears, defile the imagination, and corrupt the heart; a subtle and imperceptible poison, is not less mortal than a violent one. There are some encomiums upon modesty, which modesty itself cannot bear, Witness that of * Father le Moine. The gross obscenities of a Carman or Porter, are not by a great deal so pernicious, as the ingenious words of a cajoling spark.' This Jansenist having mentioned some

* Lettre Provinciale xi, Peintures morales, by Father le Moine, livr. vii.

gallant thoughts vented by Father Bouhours, under the name of an interlocutor in a dialogue, which are expressed in very nice words, goes on thus (54): *All parents, not excepting those who are most engaged in the world, will acknowledge that those pernicious fooleries are more dangerous than gross obscenities (55); that they corrupt the hearts, and make the worst of impressions upon the minds of youth.* I have quoted in my Dictionary (56) a passage of Mr Nicolle, wherein he positively affirms, that unlawful passions are the most dangerous, when they are covered with a veil of modesty.

(54) Ibid. pag. 78.

This cannot be denied: Nay, women of an imperfect virtue would run less danger among brutish men, who should sing filthy songs, and talk rudely like soldiers, than among polite men who express themselves in respectful terms. They would think themselves indispensably obliged to be angry with those brutes, and to quit the company, and go out of the room with rage and indignation. But soft and flattering compliments, or at most such as are intermixed with ambiguous words, and some freedoms nicely expressed, would not startle them; they would listen to them, and gently receive the poison.

(55) See the *Treux's Journal*, for February 1703, Edit. of France, on the romance intitled *La Princesse de Porcien*.

A man who courts a maid would immediately destroy all his hopes, should he grossly and filthily propose his ill design: he is a perfect stranger to the Art of Love, if he has no regard to modesty in the choice of his expressions.

(56) In the article *MARRIAGE* (John des), citat (11).

There is no father but would rather have his daughters blush than laugh at some stories told in their presence. If they blush, they are safe (57); shame prevents the ill effect of the obscenity; but if they laugh, it makes an impression, and nothing diverts the stroke. If they laugh, it is doubtless because the obscenity was artfully wrapped up, and seasoned with an apparent modesty. Had it been grossly expressed, it would have excited shame and indignation. Farces in our days are more dangerous than those of our ancestors: in former times they were so obscene, that virtuous women durst not appear at them; but now they do not scruple to see them under pretence that obscenities are wrapped up, though not in impenetrable covers. Are there any such? They would bore them through, were they made up of seven hides like Ajax's shield.

(57) *Erubuit*, *salva res est. Terrent*.

If any thing could make la Fontaine's Tales very pernicious, it is their being generally free from obscene expressions.

Some ingenious men, much given to debauchery, will tell you, that the satires of Juvenal are incomparably more apt to put one out of conceit with lewdness, than the most modest and most chaste discourses that can be made against that vice. They will tell you that Petronius is not so dangerous, with all his gross obscenities, as he is in the nice drefs of Count de Rabutin; and that the reading of the book intitled, *Les Amours des Gaules*, will make gallantry much more amiable than the reading of Petronius.

It were wrong to conclude from what has been said, that the least evil would be to use the expressions of Porters. That is not the case. I know the Stoics laughed at the distinction of words, and maintained, that every thing ought to be called by its proper name, and that there being nothing dishonest in the conjugal duty, it could not be denoted by any immodest word, and that therefore the word used by clowns to denote it, is as good as any other. You may see their sophisms in a letter of Cicero (58). Perhaps, it were no easy thing to silence them by the way of disputation (59), but they do not deserve to be admitted to dispute on that subject. What has been accounted a rule of decency and modesty in all societies, time out of mind, and with the unanimous consent of the public, ought to be looked upon as a first principle,

(58) The *xxiij*, of the ninth book, ad Famil.

(59) Compare with this what has been said in the article *HYPARCHIA*, remark [D].

which

AN EXPLANATION

which no man is allowed to contradict. And therefore when a whole nation are agreed in calling some words immodest, inasmuch, that the very Porters who use them most, are persuaded of their obscenity, and abstain from them before persons of honour, and would be offended to hear them pronounced in a public assembly; no private person can be admitted to oppose such a judgment. All the members of the society are obliged to respect it. The courts of justice afford us a remarkable instance of it; for Lawyers are not allowed to repeat such words, when they plead for the punishment of those who have used them in reviling their neighbours. They will have public modesty respected in the hearing of a cause; but when they judge by report, they not only permit the reporter to mention the very words of the offender though never so obscene, but also command him to do it. This I have from a Counsellor in the Parliament of Paris, who told me within these few years, that having used a circumlocution the first time he reported such a cause, the President gave him to understand, that there was no occasion to have a regard to chaste ears, but to judge of the nature of the offence, and that therefore he was obliged to speak the very word it consisted in. I fancy the Inquisition uses the same method [D].

The Stoics must have followed very near the same rule, and if in their private conferences they did not think fit to prefer one word to another, there was at least a necessity for them to conform in public to the common way of speaking. The unanimous consent of nations ought in that respect to be the standard of all private persons.

Wherefore if the word *putain* (a whore) which our forefathers used in their gravest books (60), as freely as the Romans used the word *meretrix*, begins to be generally decried, it is fit all authors should begin to disuse it, and substitute the word *courtezan* in the room of it, since the world will have it so. But this is at the bottom a ground-^{(60) The translators of the Bible of Geneva used it.} less nicety for either the word *courtezan* excites as strong an idea as the other, or a weaker one. If the former, there is nothing gained by it, every body will still have a notion of an infamous object: if the latter, it is lessening the abhorrence which the public ought to have for a prostitute. But does such a creature deserve such a regard? Were it not better to aggravate the infamous notion of the trade she professes? Are you afraid of making her too odious? You are for giving her a favourable name which formerly signified a court-lady (62). One would think you are afraid of offending her, and willing to soften peoples mind by giving her a quaint name. The consequence of which would be, if people reasoned right, that the word *courtezan* would quickly grow^{(62) See the Chironomus, Part. II, pag. 415.} obscene, and a softer one should be used for it. One should say, *a woman who behaves herself ill*, and then, *a woman that is talked of*, and then, *a suspicious woman*, and then, *a woman who does not live a holy life* (63), and at last desire the most finical ladies to in-^{(63) Note, That Sandoval speaking of the abominable actions committed at Rome by the army of Charles V., in the year 1527, is contented to say it was not a holy action, but no finer. See La Motte le Vayer, pag. 177, of the second volume, of the edition in 1700.} vent some other circumlocution.

AN answer to the objection grounded upon incivility.

I am just now sensible of another objection. It is a piece of incivility, will some say, to insert in a book what cannot be spoken in the presence of virtuous women; and therefore since incivility is blameable, morally speaking, the fault for which you may be blamed, does not concern Grammar, but Morality.

I answer in the first place, that incivility morally speaking is an ill thing only when it proceeds from pride, or a wilful contempt of other men; but when one is wanting in point of civility, either because he knows not the way of expressing it, or does not think himself obliged to follow it, he is guilty of no sin. Do ye think that an old Professor of the Sorbonne, is bound to know all the arts that are practised by the young Abbés of the court, to express their respect to the ladies with great politeness? That Professor has other things to learn, which are much more important; and though he were informed what sort of civility is in fashion, he might lawfully dispense with it. His age and character do not require he should conform to it, but rather the contrary. I add,

[D] I fancy the Inquisition uses the same method.] I do not think the inquisitors will allow such abjurations, as contain horrid obscenities, to be publicly read; but during the trial they hear them, and when they are written down, they are read with a loud voice in some private place. Such was the method of the inquisitors of Rome in the year 1698, towards brother Peter Paul, of St John the Evangelist, a bare-footed Augustin Friar, convicted of prophanation, impiety, and of an abominable leudness. I have a copy of the abjuration, *Abjura semipublica*, which he made in a chappel al *Sacello di Casa Granisi*, and I find that among other things this was read to him: *Dicesti haver tu mostrato e rimostrato alle tue sopradette devote con le quali tu prosequivi gl' abbracciamenti in parte nascoste che tu per la dolcezza di quelli eri rapito in estasi, e sentivi un godimento infinito dell' amor divino, e che tu t'inferoravi in quell' estasi . . . Hai detto haver bacciate alle tue donne le parti vergognose, e che dopo ha-*

verle così bacciate e toccate l'hai benedette & li hai averti li meati, e pregavi dio che li conservasse in tutto quello benedetto clauistro verginale . . . Hai detto che alcune donne ti hanno lavato le parti basse tre volte, la prima per purgarsi dalle colpe mortali, la seconda dalle veniali, e la terza dalle imperfettioni. Hai detto che alcune volte in godere delle donne tu sentivi specie di martirio . . . che un giorno parimente l'hai fatto radunare e ad una per una invocare e bacciare il tuo membro genitale (vv).

It is not to be questioned that the Inquisition would publish those things, were it necessary to undeceive a formidable cabal, and an exasperated populace, who should maintain that a Monk had been severely punished for small faults. Thus it was thought necessary to publish the informations made against the Knights Templars, tho' never so full of horrid obscenities, rather than people should think their order had been destroyed without a just cause.

CONCERNING OBSCENITIES.

849

I add, that new civilities are a slavery introduced by great men, or invented by their flatterers to the prejudice of ancient liberty. But if it be lawful for every private person to depart from the old custom, it is also lawful to keep it till every body has laid it aside, and it becomes some persons not to be too hasty in taking up new modes. It is with this as with fashions in cloaths. Worldly people immediately appear in the new fashion, but the grave and wise do it only when it is grown adult, if I may be allowed to say so. A medium ought to be kept in those things; a man must not be one of the first who takes them up, nor the last who leaves them; and none makes himself ridiculous by keeping the old fashion, but when it is quite out of doors.

I answer in the second place, that an author is not bound to suppress all the words that cannot be civilly spoken in the presence of virtuous women: witness Mr de St Olon, who is no stranger to the ways of the court: he would not have said before the ladies in a serious conversation what he has writ concerning the marriages of the Africans (64).

There are many reasons for taking a greater liberty in a book than in conversation. An obscenity spoken before virtuous women in good company, makes them very uneasy; they cannot ward off the shocking blow; it is not in our power to hear or not to hear, what we are told in the Vulgar Tongue. The accidental meeting of a naked man, or the sight of a lewd picture, is not without remedy; we may immediately turn aside, or shut our eyes; but we cannot stop the mouth of a talking man. The shame occasioned by an obscene idea, is much greater when we are surrounded with people who observe our looks. The confusion and perplexity of a virtuous woman on such an occasion, makes her very uneasy: this uneasiness is attended with indignation, because men do not use to talk so before women whom they respect, and think to be honest, but before women of whom they have an ill opinion. There are no such inconveniences with respect to a book. If there is any thing in it which in your opinion is unchaste, you may read it or let it alone. For instance, you may foresee that the article of the courtesan LAïs in my Dictionary, will contain some lewd quotations; do not read it. Let some trusty persons take a view of the book, before you undertake to read it, and let them inform you of what is to be passed over. Besides, a woman who is alone when she reads a book, is not exposed to the looks of a company, which is the thing that most perplexes and confounds her (65): and because an author speaks to no body in particular, she does not think herself slighted or offended.

(64) In his relation of the empire of Morocco, printed at Paris in the year 1695.

(65) The most virtuous persons, when alone, are not ashamed when they get out of bed, but they would be ashamed if they were seen by others.

But after all you could not but know, will some say, that there are now many women who read books of literature; and therefore you should not have been contented with what you call common civility; you should have observed the nicest and the most rigid civility, that the fair sex might not find any thing in your book that might fully their imagination. My answer is, that had it been possible by observing such a rigid civility to prevent the reader's finding any such thing in my Dictionary, I had willingly submitted to the rules of the Purists, who come nearest to the taste of precise women; but I was fully convinced that the greatest niceness cannot remove any image of an obscene object from the mind of the reader. This will not be easily believed, unless I shew the truth of it with the utmost evidence.

THAT the nicest words fully the imagination as much as the most obscene.

In order to do it, I need only prove this single proposition, *the most obscene and the most modest words that can be used to denote a filthy object, do both paint it with an equal force and liveliness in the imagination of the bearer, or the reader.* This seems at first a great paradox, and yet it may be made sensible to every body by a popular argument. Let us suppose one of those adventures, which are sometimes the talk of a whole town, a marriage ready to be celebrated, and suspended all of a sudden by the opposition of a third person. This third person is a young woman, who happens to be with child, and demands that the marriage her lover has contracted with another should be declared void. Let us suppose that a very virtuous woman, who has only heard of this opposition in general, is willing to know what reasons that young woman has for it. She might be answered a hundred different ways, without using the words which a porter, or a debauchee uses in such cases. She might be told, *she has the misfortune to prove with child; he has enjoyed her; he has kept her company; they have been too intimate together; he has had to do with her; he has had the last favour of her; she has granted him the most precious thing she had, as it appears from the consequences; what passed betwixt them, cannot be modestly spoken, chaste ears would be offended at it; she is obliged to get her honour repaired.* Several other phrases better wrapped up might be found out in answer to the question of that virtuous woman; but all of them would imprint in her mind the filthy and brutish action, which has produced that young woman's pregnancy, as strongly as Michael Angelo could have done it upon a cloth: and if that virtuous woman had heard by chance the bawdy word whispered by a debauchee in the ear of another debauchee, to let him know the matter, she could not have a clearer notion of the thing. No person though ever so modest, can sincerely deny what I have been saying, if they will examine what passes within their breast: It is therefore certain, that the most modest and the most obscene words equally defile the imagination, when the thing denoted by them is a filthy object.

VOL. V.

10 F

Though

AN EXPLANATION

Though you use the most modest expressions employed in the Scripture, to represent what we call conjugal duty: *Adam knew his wife Eve* (66): *Abraham went in unto* (66) *Gen. iv. 1.* *Hagar* (67): *I went unto the prophets* (68): you will never be able to blot out the image of that object; it will be imprinted in the mind as strongly as if you used the most portly language. The same may be said of the phrases, *to consummate a marriage*, (67) *Ibid. xvi.* *the marriage was consummated*, *the marriage was not consummated*, expressions which, if I may say so, are consecrated, and cannot be avoided in the most serious relations, and the most Majestic Histories (69): those words raise the same idea as the words of a ploughman. See the margin (70).

But how comes it then, will some say, that a virtuous woman is not offended with veiled expressions, and is angry with a filthy word? I answer that their indignation proceeds from the accessory ideas which attend such a word, but do not attend a phrase which is veiled. The impudence of those who express themselves like porters, and their want of respect, is the true cause of such an indignation. Their expression excites three ideas: one is a direct and main idea; the others are indirect and accessory. The direct idea represents the filthiness of the object, and does not do it more distinctly than the idea of another word. But the indirect and accessory ideas represent the disposition of the person who speaks, his brutishness, his contempt of the hearers, and his design of affronting a woman of honour (71). This is what she is angry at. She is not offended, as she is a modest woman; for under this notion nothing can offend her but the object itself which sullies the imagination: but she is not offended at that object; for if it had been represented to her imagination with other phrases expressing the obscenity as effectually as the filthy word, she would not have been angry; and therefore her vexation proceeds from some other reason, I mean from her being uncivilly used. Hence it is that a woman of gallantry will often express a greater indignation against those who talk obscenely to her, than a virtuous woman, because she takes it for an insult, and a bloody affront. Her resentment does not proceed from the love of chastity, but from pride and a desire of revenge. As for virtuous women, who are provoked at a gross obscenity, they are so out of a reasonable principle of self-love; for reason requires they should resent an injury which deprives them of the respect due to their sex; and besides, it is very reasonable they should keep up a good reputation, which they could not do, should they suffer the same things to be said to them which are said to lewd women.

Thus I prove that it was impossible to leave out of this Dictionary every thing that sullies the imagination. It must be sullied, which way soever the reader be told that Henry IV had natural children.

It is impossible to prevent objects from fully-
ing the imagination.

It is therefore enough for me to keep within the bounds of common civility. If any one was so great a lover of purity, as to wish not only that no immodest desire should arise in his mind, but also that his imagination should be constantly free from every obscene idea, he could not attain his end without losing his eyes and his ears, and the remembrance of many things which he could not choose but see and hear. Such a perfection cannot be hoped for whilst we see men and beasts, and know the signification of certain words which make a necessary part of our language. It is not in our power either to have or not to have certain ideas, when certain objects strike our senses; they are imprinted in our imagination whether we will or not. Chastity is not endangered by them, provided we do not grow fond of them, and approve of them. If chastity was inconsistent with impure ideas, we should never go to church, where impurity is censured, and so many banns of matrimony are bid: we should never hear that office of the Liturgy that is read before the whole congregation on a wedding-day: we should never read the most excellent of all books, I mean the holy Scriptures; and we should avoid, as so many infectious places, all the conversations where people talk of pregnancies, childbirths, and christenings. Imagination is a rambler which runs in a moment from the effect to the cause, and finds the way so well beaten, that it goes from one end to the other, before reason has time to stop it.

There is another consideration which may teach the compilers of Literature, that it is enough for them to keep within the bounds of common decency; I mean, that they must not expect to be read by people, whose ears and imagination are so tender as to receive dangerous impressions from the least obscene object. I do not know whether it was reasonably supposed in ancient Rome, that the filthy words which little children were taught to speak in the chamber of a bride (72), were the first she had heard; but I am persuaded, that in our days, any person of either sex, who has been conversant in the world four or five years, has heard abundance of obscene things, especially in such countries where jealousy is not tyrannical: there people enjoy a great freedom; merry conversations, parties of pleasure, feasts, and country-journies are very common; they only think of passing away the time merrily. It is true, the presence of the fair sex prevents obscenities from appearing bare-faced, but they appear in a disguise; which, as I have shown above, does not hinder the impression of a filthy object, no more than if one should use the plain words of a clown. Women dare not be angry when things are wrapped up (73) for fear of being accounted finical and precise (74). This is a mere dispute about words: the thing signified is admitted, but not all the words

(68) *Ibid. viii.*

(69) *Those for instance which treat of the divorce of Henry VIII, and Catherine of Aragon.*

(70) *This expression, The parts which it is not fit to name, is accounted very modest, and very chaste; yet it is as significant as any other: It is at bottom naming the thing which we say it is not fit to name; and denoting it in such a manner, that no body can be at a loss to know what it meant.*

(71) *Compare with this the article BERA, derivation 'bera', where I cite the Art of Thinking.*

(72) *See the article LITURGY, and remark [6].*

(73) *See, above, [52].*

(74) *See, above, [50].*

CONCERNING OBSCENITIES.

851

words which signify it. Therefore an author may very well believe that his readers will not be surprized, being strengthened and hardened by custom.

It is certain, that women who read a book of Literature, do not begin with that: they have already read romances, plays, and love poems. They are therefore sufficiently experienced. There is nothing in my Dictionary that can daunt them, after they have encountered such enemies. If the *luxurious* (75) Music of Opera's, the tenderness of Tragedies, the licentiousness of Comedies, and the affecting descriptions of the effects and disorders of love, make no dangerous impressions upon them, they need not be afraid of reading the articles of ABELARD and HELOISA. If they find shocking passages in my Dictionary, their pain will soon be succeeded by the agreeable pleasure they will feel, in having given to themselves fresh proofs of the strength of their modesty. If they delight in such passages, and spoil themselves by dwelling on them, that will not be my fault, they must blame their own depravity. Do I not shew these things to be criminal?

SECOND question. It cannot be said that there are any obscenities liable to censure in this book, as they consist in the very facts related by me.

This is what I had to say upon the first of the two questions which I was to discuss. I hope the reader will be sensible of the whole force of my justification, and own, that if there is in my Dictionary any obscenity liable to censure, it does not consist in the expressions I use when I speak of myself. Let us inquire now whether it authors, or have only given the sense of them. This is the question I have undertaken to examine.

No man can answer this question in the affirmative, without laying down these two positions: 1. That an Historian is obliged to suppress all the leud actions which are to be found either in the lives of Princes, or in those of private persons. 2. That a Moralist, who condemns leudness, ought never to mention any thing that offends modesty. The Purists I have been speaking of, must necessarily admit these two positions, and it is certain, there have been at all times many people, who have condemned the histories and invectives, in which the disorders of leudness appear under dreadful images.

If our Purists are willing to argue consistently, and to keep constantly to their maxims, they must admit the two positions I have mentioned. They must say, 1. That an Historian ought barely to observe, that Charlemagne, the two Joans of Naples, and Henry IV of France were not chaste. 2. That a Preacher, and a ghostly Father, and any other man who desires the reformation of manners, ought to censure leudness only in general. I have quoted (76) an author, who continually condemns the Historian Mezerai for mentioning some particular facts which offend chaste ears. He censures him particularly for what he says of Margaret de Valois, the first wife of Henry the Great.

There have been such Purists in all ages; but there have always been also great authors who laughed at the scruples and fancies of these men; so that the Republic of Letters has always been divided into two parties upon this head: each of them alleged their reasons and authorities; each of them raised objections, and made answers, and no supreme tribunal did ever determine the matter. I am therefore dispensed with entering upon a long discussion; this affords me a short way to come off. For if they who despised the maxims of the Purists, did always make a considerable party in the Republic of Letters, if they always maintained their right, if that difference has never been decided, every private man may lawfully side with them, and believe at least, that it is probable they are in the right. No man can reasonably be denied the privileges of the doctrine of probability in this case. They who follow the Anti-Purists (77), are not reduced to two or three grave authors: they may be reckoned by hundreds, and may strengthen their cause by the decisive example of the inspired writers (78). If you peruse the book of Genesis you will find that Moses tells us, without any compacts of words, that two daughters having made their father drunk, lay with him, and had children by him (79); that Dinah, Jacob's daughter, was ravished (80); that Judah, the son of the same Patriarch, defiled himself in an open road with a woman he took for a prostitute, but she was his daughter-in-law, and knew him very well (81); that one of the sons of Judah * * * (82); and that Reuben, eldest brother to Judah, committed incest with a wife of his own father (83). There are many things in Leviticus, which are not proper to be read in Protestant churches. An abominable action is related in the book of Judges (84). The Prophets used the most energetic expressions to represent the turpitude of leudness. See also the description of the whore in the Apocalypse. They have used some comparisons which the Ministers durst not mention entire [E]. All the Protestant tradefmen in France could tell the Popish missionaries, disputing

[E] The Prophets used some comparisons, which the ministers durst not mention entire. The following passage of Dr Menjot will serve for a commentary on the text of this remark. *Hic obiter observabimus mulierem menstruam dici ἀποκαθήμενν ἅ σήταγμα. . . veteris Testamenti Græci interpretibus, ως πᾶνδς ἀποκα-*

*ἐκείνην πᾶσα ἡ δεικασμένη ἡμῶν, † omnis nostra justitia est quasi pannus menstruatus; ed quod Israelitica semina dicitur ὅν τὰ κατ' ἑαυτὸν τῶν γυναικῶν, † ut alibi loquuntur, iidem interpretes, during their monthly courses, sedere consueverunt, ut constat ex bis- storâ Rachelis † . . . Idem Eſaias antea dixerat * xxx.*

(75) It is an epistle of Mr. Boileau in his tenth satire.

(76) See, above, citat. (44), (45).

(77) So I call for decency sake those who laugh at the pretended niceness of the Purists.

(78) See the article SPORZA (Catherine) citat. (18).

(79) Gen. xix.

(80) Ibid. xxxiv.

(81) Ib. xxxviii.

(82) Id. ibid.

(83) Ibid. xlix.

(84) Chap. xix.

disputing about the merit of good works, that *all our righteousness is as filthy rags*; but the remaining part of the passage was unknown to them, because it was not put into Controversial books. Has St Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans (85), such a regard to chaste ears as our Purists require? Does he not describe, both in strong and plain expressions the abominable impurities of the Heathens?

If it be objected, that the sacred writers have privileges peculiar to them, *sunt superis sua jura*; I answer, that not only the gravest Heathen writers, but also the antient Fathers of the Church, wrote with the same freedom. When Livy does so gravely and majestically relate the suppression of the Bacchanalia (86), he discovers several abominations, which fully the imagination, and cannot be read without horror. Seneca, the gravest and most rigid Philosopher of antient Rome, describes the most infamous lewdness in the plainest words (87). He condemns it with all the severity of a Censor, but at the same time he makes a plain and almost naked description of it. When the Fathers of the Church speak of the Gnostics or Manichees, or such sects, they relate several things which not only defile the imagination, but also make one's stomach rise, and might serve for a vomit. Arnobius, in his invectives against the Heathens, is so little cautious in his words, that Mr de la Fontaine would certainly have dressed such things more cleanly, and had been more reserved in what concerns Priapus. St Augustine, on some occasions, expressed himself in very plain and obscene words (88). St Ambrose and St Chrysostome have done the like; nay, the latter maintained, we ought to do it in order to inspire a true abhorrence for such lewd actions as we describe. Cafaubon did not approve this method [*F*]; but he must permit us to believe, that his opinion about moral questions, is not to be compared with that of so great a Saint.

If a catalogue was made of all the Historians from Suetonius down to Mezerai, who have grossly related leud actions, it would fill up many pages; and if it be said, that Suetonius has been blamed by famous authors, my adversaries can take no advantage of

(86) Titus Livius, *lib. xxxix*, pag. m. 749, & seq. Note, That Antony de la Faye in his French translation of Livy, has not weakened the original.

(87) See the
Héxameron Ru-
stique, *Journée*
II, pag. m. 45,
& seq.

(88) Ibid. pag. 58, & seq.

(x) Antonius Menjotius, de Passione uterina, pag. 4, 5.

λεημύσης ὡς ὕδωρ τῆς ἀποκαθιμένης, ventilabis,
hoc est disperges ea (de idolis loquitur) sicut immunditiam
menstruat. ut fert textus vulgatae lectionis (x).

[*M.*] *Cajaban* did not approve this method.] It becomes him very ill to pretend to be wiser than the ancient Fathers. If the question was about the sense of a passage of Polybius, Suetonius, or Athenaeus, one might reasonably prefer his judgment. But for a man, who made the study of Philological learning his chief business, to pretend to tutor the most holy Fathers of the Church, upon matters of conscience, is what cannot be digested. However, we must acknowledge his candour : he did not dissemble that his censure upon Perusius, might be confuted by the maxims of St Chrysostome ; he very ingeniously quotes the words of that Father, " Poeta aliquin gravissimus, & verecundissime viralis, ut testatur de illo veteres, à moribus suis heic discessit. Sic enim alienam impudicitiam castigat, ut sermonis licentia, etque figuris obfcurati, castas aures offendat merito. Omnino satis eret verecundiam silentio vindicare. Sed nefcio quomodo pervasis etiam sapientissimorum hominum mentes alia opinio, obfuscantem obfuscatante at libere falfam ditione effe castigandum. Quod quam à recta ratione alienum ? & tamen summis viris ita olim placuit. Quis fine robore que de speculo Hostii scriptis Seneca legat, paulo qui fit αἰδουμένωτες? quid beatus Hieronymus, ille taustus calificatis & virginitatis buccinator? nonne & ipse aliquando in turpia turpicule invether? sane quidem: neque id uno loco. Sed caufam quem viros graves compulsi, ut ita sentirent, attaque scriberent, aperit Johannes Chrysostomus, plenum ille omni virtute & sanctimoniam pectus. At ille homilia quarta in epistolam ad Romanos, eos quorum est scopus flagitia hominum nequam attaque impudicum reprehendere, cogi necessarium fedatitate illorum denudare, & quasi ob oculos spectandum proponere: quia parum aliter profecturi sint." *Αν μὲν γὰρ, inquit, σιωπῶς εἴπωσι, ὁ δυνήσκει καθίστασθαι τὸ ἀκούον· ἐάν τε βαλόντις κατὰ ψαλμοὺς σφοδράς, ἀναγκηὴν ἔχεισι ἀπογυμνάσαι τοὺς σαφένους τὸ λεγόμενον. Solet etiam in eam rem chirurgi exemplum afferre, qui ut tabo ac fanie manans ulcus sanet, non venter sibi manus inquinare, atque in feculentiffimum pus immittere. Οἱ ἱατροί, inquit, in priorem ad Corinthios, συνεπέδοις ἐκβαλλοῖν βυχομένοις, ὡς σκοπεῖ πῶς καθερὰ διατηρήσει τις χεῖρας, ἀλλ' οὗτοι αὐτὸν ἐν ἀπειλάσιν συνεπέδοι. Quam sententiam totidem fere verbis sepe repetit, idemque in eam ad

Theſſalonienſes diſtinguendum monet, utrum dicantur ejufmodi ſermones, ἐξ οὐκείων ἀνδρῶν, καὶ ἀνεπιτορίας: ex loquentis affertus, an curandi voluntate (y). --- *Perſus*, a Poet, very grave, and exceedinglꝝ modest; as the *Antients* testify of him, did bere depart from his character. For he laſhes immoderately and leudeſis in ſuch a manner, that the licentiouſneſs of his expreſſions, though veiled and wrapped up in figures, gives juſt offence to the moſt ſober reader. It had been much better for him to have cenſured immoderately by ſilence. But I know not how it has happened, that even the wiſeſt men are come into an opinion, that obſcenity muſt be laſhed by obſcenity, or at leaſt by licentious expreſſions. How unreaſonable and abſurd is this opinion! and yet it has been received in antient times by the moſt eminent men. Can any moſt perſon read without bluſhing what *Seneca* has written concerning the mirror of *Heliſius*? And even *St Jerom*, who is highly extolled chaſtity and virginity, do he not ſometimes twiſt againſt filthy manners, in a filthy manner? He certainly does, and that in more than one place. The reaſon wherewith induced ſober and grave men to think and write in this manner is explained to us by *John Chryſoſtome*, a man of the moſt conſummate virtue and piety. In his fourth Homily on the Epistle to the Romans he ſays, that they who purpoſe to censure the vices of leud and proſtigate men, lie under a neceſſity of unveiling their leudeſis, and of expoſing it as it were naked; becauſe otherwiſe their cenſures would do no good. For, ſays he, if your expreſſions are decent and modeſt, you will not be able to gain the attention of your hearers; but if you would force their attention, and ſtrike your audience, you are under a neceſſity of giving them an open and naked account of things. He likewiſe alludes upon this ſubject the example of a ſurgeon, who when he would cure a ſore that emits a filthy corrupt matter, is not afraid of ſtaining his hands, and putting them into the moſt filthy ſore corruption. The Surgeon, ſays he, upon the firſt Epistle to the Corinthians, when he would remove the corrupt matter, is not follicitous about keeping his hands clean, but only about curing the ſore. This ſentence he frequently repeats almoſt in the ſame words; and upon the Epistle to the Theſſalonians, he obſerves that we muſt diſtinguiſh between licentious expreſſions, when they come from the heart, and have the approbation of the perſon who uſes them, and when they proceed only from a deſign of reſtraining men from immodesty. See the margin (z).

(g) *Casab.*
Comment. in
Perf. Sat. IV,
pag. m. 344, 8
seq.

(u) Note, That St Crysostom, and Cajetan hold upon this a true point of morality: we will leave it to be discussed in a controversy in good manner, and the other is contrary to them. Wherefore I might say, that in a case of conscience and morality Cajetan's judgment ought not to be preferred; and I might say it without answering any thing contrary to what I have just said, that the thing I could be hard for social to be a Grammarian affair.

[G] Those ^{of} the

of it, since those who vindicate him, are as eminent as those who find fault with him [G].

There is a vast number of Moralists who have deplored the corruption of their age, and given a plain and naked account of the several excesses committed in it (89). I do not pretend to excuse all the Casuists; but I can positively affirm, that in the Church of Rome none of them can avoid saying many things that offend modesty. It is well known, that Father Natalis Alexander declared for rigid Morality, and was engaged in many quarrels upon that account. I perused the other day in his Moral Doctrines what concerns the sins forbidden by the seventh commandment (90), and hardly found any period in it, but what contains gross obscenities: and yet I think he is one of those who treat such matters with the greatest modesty; but it is a subject that does not permit a writer to have a tender regard for modesty. The same may be said of the Canonists (91), and those who write Anatomical books: and to shew that to this very day men of a good taste and great politeness side with the Anti-Purists, I shall set down a passage of the author, who criticized Mr de St Evremond. Do not we see still, says he (92), in the Theological treatises of human actions, the explication of all the leud thoughts and actions that can be suggested by lust? Those explications are not contrary to modesty, being necessary to those whom God has appointed for the direction of others, who ought to have a perfect knowledge of sins, with all their circumstances, in order to make a sinner sensible of the condition he is in, and work his repentance. But if you insist, that those treatises are inconsistent with modesty; find out a science more contrary to it than Anatomy, wherein all the parts of human bodies are viewed? Yet there is no law against those who teach it (93).

The party of the Anti-Purists would be more numerous than it is, were it not that the vanity or malice of the Critics engage several writers to side with the contrary faction. There is hardly any book but what is criticized, and narrowly examined; and if there are any thoughts or expressions in it that want a certain niceness, with regard to obscenity, several writers will rise up against it, and express a great zeal for offended modesty (94). They fall upon that topic, and raise many clamours. Nothing can be more easy, nor more proper to prepossess the public. A Critic who strikes upon that key is cried up by devout and polite people, and accounted the protector of purity: this is the reason which induces him to declare for the Purists. He raises his reputation two ways: he sets up for a man who is concerned for good manners, and who converses with the polite world. This is only a piece of craft in an author: Morality is no farther concerned in it than is necessary to form a fair out-side. Many who criticize books only in conversation, follow the footsteps of the Critics in print.

How many people inveighed against the book *de contactibus impudicis*, and the *Historia Flagellantium* (95), because Dr Boileau was none of their cabal in the faculty of Theology? Had the author been of their party, who is a man famous for his probity and learning, they would have approved his giving a lively description of the obscenities censured by him; but because they did not love him they sided with the Purists.

But though this faction be ever so numerous, either through such motives, or more honourable ones, it is certain the contrary party is considerable enough to justify those who stand for it. The authority of the ancient Fathers of the Church who followed it, and therein imitated the Prophets and Apostles, makes their opinion so highly probable, that if any one should obstinately maintain that it cannot be held with a safe conscience, he would not deserve to be minded.

If the Purists were contented to say that their opinion is better, we might think ourselves obliged to debate the matter with them, and to compare together the reasons

[G] Those who vindicate Suetonius are as eminent as those who find fault with him. Besides what I have quoted in another place (a e), I shall set down here a fine passage of Henry Glareanus. De vitiis differtio sive disputatio duplex est. Una, qua ad vicia homines allicimus suasionibus, exhortationibus, ac leuociniis: ut qui amare docent nostra ætate, prohi-
[8].

(bb) Henricus Lorius Glareanus, Prefat. in Sueton. apud Goldast. Prolegom. in Petronium, cap. ii, pag. m. 30.

lor! etiam potare, qui amatoria ludunt, ut iuuenum mentes veluti inebriant, quales impudici Poetæ. Ea differtio vitiosa est ac detestanda, maxime homini Christiano, plus etiam illis, qui iuuentuti ut magistri præsent. Altera est differtio de vitiis, ut ea detestemur ac execremur: imò quoties de eis fit mentio, ut ab iis dehortemur, ab iis abstinemus, & execremur. Hæc differtio nequitiam reprehendenda est; multi enim sancti viri ac Doctores quemadmodum de virtutibus scriperunt, ita e regione de vitiis copiose differuerunt. Itaque Cæsarem refert vicia Suetonius, in odium illorum monstrorum id facit, ut ea scilicet fugiamus ac evitemus: imò cogitemus in quanta cæcitate fuerint perditii illi nebulones: & multò magis in quanta stupiditate mundus, qui talia portentosa dignatus est ullo honore, cum nihil illis terribius ac magis abominabile fuerit (bb). - - - Discourses on vice are of two sorts, one wherein by persuasions, ex-

hortations, and allurements the authors entice us to the practice of vice; such are they who in our days instruct people how to carry on intrigues and amours, (how shameful a thing is this?) they who bring people into a habit of drinking, they who write amorous plays, and thereby, as it were, intoxicate the minds of youth, such as the leud Poets. This sort of discourse is vicious and to be detested by all men, especially Christians, and still more by those who have the charge and inspection of youth. The other kind of discourse on vice is that which is designed to raise an abhorrence and detestation of it, and to refrain, dissuade, and frighten, us from the practice of vice, as often as it is mentioned. Discourses of this kind are far from being blameable, for many pious men and many Divines, as they have employed their pens on the subject of virtue, have on the other side written at large concerning vice. Thus Suetonius, by relating the vices of the Cæsars, designed to raise our hatred and abhorrence of those monsters, and to make us avoid their example; nay, to make us consider how blind those abandoned wretches must have been, and in what a woful stupidity the world must have been sunk, when they went so far as to pay them any honours, since nothing in nature could be more base, foul, and abominable, than those prodigies of vice.

(89) See among others Joannes Sarisburiensis, Bishop of Chartres, de nugis Curialium, lib. iii, cap. xiii, who alludes to the example of St Paul in his excuse.

(90) Or, the sixth, according to the Roman Catholics.

(91) When they explain the title de Frigidis and other matrimonial subjects.

(92) Dissertat. sur les Oeuvres de Mr de St Evremond, pag. 216, 217. Paris 1698.

(93) Mr De-vaux, Prevost of the Society of Surgeons at Paris, has published a book mentioned in the xxix Journal des Savans, for the year 1703. Tho' the Journalists censure the obscenities of that author, they nevertheless transcribe some of them.

(94) Luther, whose expressions were very free, censured Erasmus. See the answer of the latter, pag. 34, 35.

(95) That there were other books much pernicious, printed at Paris, and written by some Doctors, against which the sacred faculty should thunder out anathemas, whereas they were silent; whereupon he named a set of books, among which that of Dr Boileau de *Of Contactibus impudicis* was one. Afsire de Marie d'Agreda, pag. 11.

AN EXPLANATION

of both parties, though in truth it seems very strange that Christians should question whether there is a better course to be taken than that of the sacred writers. However we might yield our right, hear their objections, and propose our difficulties. I have no need of such discussions; it is enough for me that the conduct of the Historians or Censurers, who relate obscene things, is not only allowed and authorized by a constant practice, but also very good.

For if those authors could lawfully write what I have written, I might imitate them, and lawfully quote them. I desire no more. Others may examine, if they please, whether I had done better in taking quite another method.

The right I have to quote what I have quoted, is grounded upon two reasons: one is, that if every body is allowed to read Catullus and Martial, &c. an author may be allowed to quote out of those Poets such passages as he thinks fit: The other is, that if it be lawful for an Historian to relate a lewd action of Caligula, an author may relate an obscene thought or remark of Montagne or Brantome; for such a thought or remark is not near so criminal as the infamous actions of Caligula. Whoever has a right to mention the latter, has *à fortiori* a much greater right to mention the former: and it would be a contradiction or an absurdity, to suffer that Petronius and Suetonius, and the most lascivious Poets, should be printed and publicly sold with notes explaining their most brutish obscenities, and to forbid the author of a Critical Dictionary, attended with a Commentary, to alledge a passage of those writers for the confirmation or illustration of some particular.

An answer to
three objections.

Here I must examine three objections that are commonly raised: It is said that a Physician and a Casuist are obliged, by the nature of their subject, to rake into many filthy things, but that my work required nothing like it. 2. That they who write in Latin, may take a liberty which the French tongue will not bear. 3. That what was allowable in former ages, ought to be forbidden in ours, because of its prodigious corruption.

The first objection can only be made by such readers as are utter strangers to the nature of my book. It is not a book like those that are intituled *Bouquet Historial*, *Fleurs d'Exemples*, *Parterre Historique*, *Lemnici Historiarum*, in which an author inserts only what he pleases. It is an Historical Dictionary with a Commentary. LAIS ought to have a place in it as well as LUCRETIA; and because it is a Dictionary which comes out after several others, it ought chiefly to contain what is not to be found in others. The reader must find in it, not only a general account of such actions as are most known, but also a particular narrative of those which are least known, and a collection of what is dispersed in several places. Proofs ought to be alledged, examined, confirmed, and cleared. In a word, it is a compilation. Now every body ought to know, that a compiler, who relates things, and comments upon them, has all the privileges of a Physician, and of an Advocate, &c. as occasion requires; he may use their verbal processes, and their terms of art. If he gives an account of the divorce of Lotharius and Teiberga, he may publish extracts from Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, who wrote the impurities that were averred in that trial (96). This is what I said in my Remarks upon the pretended Judgment of the Public, in the year 1697. I repeat it with this other passage: 'When I am let into the secret of collecting in a compilation all that the Antients have said concerning the courtesan LAIS, without mentioning lewd actions, I shall own myself guilty. It must at least be proved against me, that a Commentator has not the privilege of collecting whatever has been said of Helen; but how can it be proved? Where is the Legislator who has told the compilers, *Hilberto you may go, but you must advance no further: You must not quote Athenæus, nor such a Scholiast, nor such a Philosopher?* Has it not been their constant practice to make their writings as full and extensive as their reading (97)? I could name many Divines, who having pitched upon a certain subject, have quoted out of all authors whatever they thought fit, though they were things that defiled the imagination; I shall only name three, Lydius (98), Saldenus, and Lomeier. They were Dutch Ministers, the first at Dort, the second at the Hague, and the third at Zutphen. They were very much esteemed for their learning and virtue. Whoever reads the dialogues of the first concerning nuptial ceremonies (99), the Dissertations of the second *de Canis pretio*, and *de Eunuchis* (100); and the Dissertation of the third concerning kisses (101); will find in them horrid obscenities, and abominable quotations.

It will be said, that those books are written in Latin. This is the second objection I am to answer, and I shall shew easily the weakness of it: for an obscene object is no less offensive to modesty, when it offers itself in Latin to those who understand Latin, than when it offers itself in French to those who understand French; and if it were a fault to imprint obscene objects in our own and the reader's imagination, these three Ministers could not be justified. They understood what they wrote, and made it intelligible to their readers, and consequently they have defiled their imagination, and do every day defile the imagination of those who read their books. But were it not a very unjust thing to charge them with such immorality? They who write in French ought not therefore to be charged with it, for they do no more than understand what they write, and make it intelligible to their readers.

I know

(96) These words are taken from my Remarks upon a piece intituled, *The Judgment of the Public*, &c. &c. &c.

(97) Ibid. xxxv.

(98) *Yam.*

(99) I have given the title of it in the article LYDIUS, remark [B].

(100) In the book intituled, *Orta Theologia*, printed in the year 1684.

(101) In a book, intituled, *Diserta Genialium five Differentiarum Philologiarum Decas I.* printed in 1694.

CONCERNING OBSCENITIES.

855

I know two differences will be alledged, one is, that they who understand Latin, are not so many as they who understand French: The other is, that they who understand Latin are better provided than others, against the malignant influence of obscene objects. I make three answers to this. I answer in the first place, that Latin is understood by so many people all over Europe, that the first difference would not be sufficient to justify those who relate or quote obscene things in that language; the mischief would still be great, and very great. I answer in the second place, that it is only by degrees Latin obscenities would still have a dangerous effect upon young scholars. We hardly find, generally speaking, that they are more chaste and less debauched than other young men. Lastly, I say that most of my readers are persons who have applied themselves to study; for they who have not studied, little mind a book intermixed with Greek and Latin passages as mine is. However, they cannot understand the chief obscenities, since they are in Latin. I conclude, that if there is any solidity in the differences objected to me, I may make an advantage of it.

I proceed to the third objection, which concerns the great corruption of our age. We have lost say they, modesty both in morals, and in expressions. The words that were formerly modest, are no longer so; we must use others which only excite modest ideas: otherwise we should lose the little virtue that remains. I shall not examine whether there is any reason to believe that men are now more corrupt than they were in former times (102). The same complaints have been made at all times (103), and that corruption of our age is equal to that of the reign of Charles IX, and Henry III. But allowing it to be so, I shall draw a quite contrary conclusion from it; for it is never so necessary to represent in a strong and lively manner the turpitude of vice, as when it prevails most [H]; and it is a wrong way of stemming the current of lewdness, to cry it down with soft words, and to scruple to give an odious name to a prostitute. Besides, if there is so great a corruption, what benefit has the world got by that chastity of words introduced into the French tongue within these sixty years, according to Mr Chevreau's calculation (104)? Is it not a proof that the proscription of pretended obscene ideas is an insignificant remedy? Who told you they ought to be proscribed, for fear of entirely destroying modesty? Have you consulted the women for whose sake you chiefly abstain from those words? Have they confessed to you, that their honour is very much endangered by them? Would they not rather say, that you slander them if you

(102) I am willing to own that certain orders of men are more corrupt than they were formerly; this is what I meant by these words in my Remarks on the Judgment of the Public: We would appear wiser than our Fathers, and we are not so wise as they were.

(103) See a fine passage relating to this in the third volume of Vigeneul Marville's Melanges.

(104) See, above, citat. (1).

[H] It is never so necessary to represent in a strong and lively manner the turpitude of vice, as when it prevails most. See, above (cc), what induced Peter Damian to write the Gomorrhæus, and consider how the Dominicans resolved to preach against Sodomy, when they came to know that it was grown very common. Preaching being allotted to them, they deliberated whether they should thunder out against that sin, or say nothing of it; and they concluded that there was a necessity to thunder out against it, since it was grown so crying. Frater Ordinis Prædicatorum, qui eum apud Christianos locum invasissent, quem olim apud Gentiles obtinebant Poeta & Satyrici, in tracta, de Turciis: Quæsitum extitit de gravi infectione populi Christiani, quoad prædicta vitia (Sodomitica) an videlicet tam gravis infectio ex negligentia officii prædicationis contingeret, dum ipsi prædicatorum gravitatem hujus vitii fidelibus non proponerent? Quæsitumque ulterius extitit, an propter simplices & innocentes expediret Prædicatoribus sub silentio pertransire de hujusmodi vitii differendo? Responsum fuit, quod quia officium prædicationis est præcipuum in Ecclesia ad extirpationem vitiorum & plantationem virtutum, si gravitas hujus vitii fidelibus ardentius proponeretur, ut quia videlicet pro vindicta clamat ad cælum, &c. Ad secundum quæsitum responsum fuit, quod omnino sub silentio pertransire non expediret, etiam propter quoscunque innocentes, multiplici ratione. Primò, quia videmus quod tales innocentes, etiam ex diabolica suggestione continuè seducuntur abque auditione verbi Dei, & declaratione illorum vitiorum. Unde utrique tam reis quam innocentibus expedit talis declaratio verbi Dei. Secundò ad hoc nos admonet Scriptura, prout est illud; Si non annuntiaveris iniquitatem ejus, sanguinem ejus de manu tua requiram. Et iterum; Clama, ne cesses: annuncia populo meo scelera eorum. Ratione etiam concludatur. Nam Apostolus Paulus expressissimè loquitur ad Roman. i. de hujusmodi vitiiis, & sicut cuncta alia scripta ipsius necessariò prædicantur, ita & præsens hæc materia, cum non sit data distinctio inter suas doctrinas, quare videlicet

(cc) Remark [B], of the article DAMIAN.

una magis debeat esse prædicabilis quam altera. Ad hoc est Gregorius in Moralibus; Sicut incauta locutio in errorem pertrahit, ita indiscretum silentium in errore relinquit (d.d.). - - - A question was started (dd) Goldast. concerning the exceeding corruption of manners; which prevailed among the Christians, namely, whether the Sodomitical practices to which they were addicted, ought to be imputed to the remissness of the preachers, who forbore to inculcate the heinousness of such crimes? There was also started another question, viz. Whether out of a regard for the simple people, who were ignorant of these crimes, the preachers ought to pass them over in silence? To the first of these questions it was answered, that because the chief office in the Church, was that of preaching, an office designed for the rooting out of vice, and implanting of virtue, if the heinousness of that crime was represented to Christians in its strongest colours, and as crying for vengeance from Heaven, &c. To the second question it was answered, that it ought not to be passed over in silence, for the sake of over so great number of people ignorant of these crimes; and that for many reasons. First, because we see that such people are continually seduced to vice by the suggestions of the Devil, when they hear not the word of God preached to them, and the heinousness of these vices declared. And therefore such a declaration of the word of God was necessary both for the guilty and innocent. In the second place the Scripture enjoins it; as in that passage. If thou declarest not to the wicked the iniquity of his ways, I will require his blood at thy hands: and again in this, cry aloud and spare not, and declare to my people their transgressions. This was further confirmed by reason. For the Apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, mentions this kind of vice in expressive terms, and as all his other writings ought to be the subject of preaching, so ought also the present matter since there is no distinction made between the doctrines of that Apostle, nor any reason assigned why one may not be preached as well as any other. Moreover Gregory says in his Morals, as an unwary speech seduces people into error, so an injudicious silence suffers them to abide in it.

you believe they are not proof against an idea and a word? Would they not tell you, that if they are for words, that express lewdness faintly, it is in order to give a better idea of their virtue which has a stronger attachment to modesty, than that of their predecessors? They are not therefore afraid to be seduced by obscene objects. Such objects would rather give a new strength to their modesty. They are only offended with them, because they think there is some unpoliteness and incivility in certain words. They who pretend that considering the prodigious corruption of our age, all stories which they call obscene, ought to be avoided, are like a traveller, who in order to keep his dirty cloak from soiling, should take care not to put it in a smocking room. If the depravation is so great, that the reading of an obscene Historical fact might excite young people to commit adultery, you may be sure these young people are so many persons infected with the plague, whom you are afraid of making worse, by placing them near a man who has got the Itch. A polite style, and nice expressions will not cure such people, and stop them upon the brink of a precipice.

Certainly this is the Sophism called, *à non causa pro causa*. - - - - - To assign for the cause of a thing, what is not the true cause of it. The fate of chastity does not depend upon that: you do not go to the source of the evil; it requires a quite different remedy. Young people have their minds full of obscene thoughts, and go through a course of filthy obscenities, at least in words, before they read Suetonius. Ill conversations, unavoidable to every lad who is not under continual inspection, are a thousand times more dangerous than Histories of debauchery. A learned man says, that the French translation of Plutarch by Amyot, is dangerous to morality, because things are described in it with too great freedom and plainness, and there are some words in it that have now an immodest signification (105). He will give me leave not to be of his opinion. The descriptions and phrases of Amyot's translation have nothing in them that comes up to those that are daily heard and used in the world. To which I add, that if this version of Plutarch was dangerous to Morality, any other version of Plutarch would be so too, unless the translator took care to leave out all the passages wherein things are described with too great freedom and plainness.

(105) Dacier, Preface to his translation of some lives of Plutarch.

There is no medium: either a book must never mention any impure action, or our censurers must own it will always be dangerous, though written ever so nicely. One translation will be more polite than the other; but if they are faithful, the obscene objects that are in the original will appear in them.

Mr Chevreau affirms, that *faire des enfans* is a gross expression, and that we should say *avoir des enfans* and this may be granted to him; but if any one should further say, that the first expression is very prejudicial to good manners, and that the second is very beneficial to them, he would be accounted a silly foolish man.

Upon a due examination of things, it will appear that the word *paillard* ought to be rejected only for the same reason that we reject the words *contaminer*, *vilipender*, *viluperer*, and a great many old French words: That is, it has no other fault but to be obsolete. They who have nice ears would be grated with the words I have just now mentioned. For the same reason they are offended with the words *paillard*, and *paillardise*; for if the thing signified by them was the cause of their disgust, they could not endure the word *impudique*, whose idea is no less significant than that of *paillard*.

THE inconsistency of the Purists.

I shall make two further observations: the first is, that our Purists approve in general what they condemn in particular. Ask a Roman Catholic who is an enemy to the Quietists, whether an Historian ought not to avoid touching upon things that fully the imagination? He will answer you, *it is his duty to do so*. Tell him some days after, that a relation of Quietism is come out, containing a particular account of the abominable impurity of Molinos's followers; give him to understand that you have been offended with the reading that book, and that modesty cannot bear such things; he will answer you, that it is necessary to discover the abomination of those hypocrites, in order to undeceive many people who are inclined to Quietism, and that the author of that relation is therefore to be commended for exposing to the public view the infamous practices of that sect. You will find a thousand other persons who will agree with you, that we cannot have too great a regard for modest ears, and will exclaim with great zeal against Suetonius and Lampridius: but if you ask them some days after, whether we ought to excuse the Historians who have related so many abominable things concerning the Albigenses, the Fratricelli, Adamites, Picards, Lollards, and Turlupins, they will answer that the character of Historians and zealous Catholics, engaged them to acquaint the world with the obscenities of those heretics, the forerunners of the Lutherans.

The English Papists, who fled into France or Spain, did not offend the chaste ears of their friends, when they published several satires against Queen Elizabeth, wherein they represented her as a monster of lewdness. The Leaguers did not blame the libels, which contained impudent descriptions of the lewdness of the court of Henry III.

CONCERNING OBSCENITIES.

857

The same inconsistency is observed among the Protestants. They did not complain that those libels against Henry III their persecutor, were offensive to chaste ears. Buchanan, who published a book concerning the lewdness of Mary Queen of Scotland (106), is a man of blessed memory among all the Presbyterians; and yet that book horribly defiled the imagination. Nicolas de Clemangis, Pelagius Alvarez, Baptista Mantuanus, and several others, who made a very plain and obscene description of the lewdness of the Court of Rome, are placed by the Protestants among the witnesses of truth. They quote them to this very day upon all occasions, and long passages out of those authors are to be found in most controversial books. You will find many of them in a French book of the famous du Pleffis Mornai (107): not long since three Ministers, two of whom are Swifts, and the third a French-man (108), have revived those quotations. Henry Stephens, who tells so many obscene stories in his apology for Herodotus, did not displease those of his party: that book was thought very proper to ridicule the Church of Rome, and was approved upon that account; there are several editions of it, of silly jests, quirks, and mean and obscene words, than what is to be found in some books of Sainte Aldegonde, who nevertheless was very much esteemed and praised. The book which a German advertised in the *Nova Literaria Maris Baltici* in the year 1699, which is to be intitled, *Sacra Pontificiorum Priapeia, seu obscene Papistarum in auricularibus confessionibus questiones, quibus S. Confessionarii innocentes puellas feminasque ad lasciviam sollicitant*, will doubtless meet with a very favourable reception, and yet it will be very offensive to chaste ears, since it will contain a collection of the obscene questions of confessors. This puts me in mind of the illustrious Peter du Moulin, who objected to the Roman Catholics the obscenities that are to be found in their books concerning auricular confession. He took notice (109) of some that are horrid, and no less abominable than the lewdness wherewith Procopius accuses the Empress Theodora. Several Protestants controversialists (110) have published the obscenities that are to be found in the books of confessors.

But to speak of a thing of a later date, I say that the book intitled *Les Aventures de la Madona & de François d'Assise*, published (111) in the year 1701, is indeed written in very modest words; but the ideas which the author (112) excites in the mind of the reader, are so infamous, horrid, and monstrous, that none but Lucian, and such like men, can bear their enormity. The Protestants are not offended at it; on the contrary, they believe that the author designing to make every body sensible of the ridiculousness of Popery without engaging in any controversy, has done a service to the good cause. Some complaints have been made of what he says in favour of Nestorius, but he has not been blamed for the other things he advanced, which, as I have said already, startle, terrify and smite both the soul and body (113). The Bishop of Meaux being obliged to mention a thing of the same nature in order to shew the extravagance of a fanatical woman (114), thought he had contracted some uncleanness, and for a remedy had recourse to this prayer: 'But let us pass to another subject: and thou, O Lord, If I durst, I would beseech thee to send one of thy seraphims with a hot burning coal to purify my lips defiled with this narrative, though necessary (115).' Take notice of this last word: it makes much against those who say that the imagination of the reader ought to be regarded even at the expence of truth. That prelate, who is otherwise so careful to avoid obscenities, that he dares not use the word *paillarde* (whore) without making an excuse for it (116); did not think that the obscene and horrid extravagances of Madam Guyon ought to be suppressed.

I do not mean, that generally speaking, all the Protestants who have behaved as I have mentioned, design to bring Histrorians, Compilers, and Commentators under the yoke of the Purists. I only believe that several of them pretend to do it in general; but since they approve afterwards when they come to particulars, what they had condemned; their taste and their testimony can do me no prejudice, and I may take advantage of the opinion of all the rest who are consistent with themselves, both in general and in particular.

It cannot be pretended that for the good of the Church, an author may be allowed to write things that sully the imagination, and that in this case he is to be commended for doing it: this assertion I say cannot be admitted; for if the publishing of obscenities was an ill thing in itself, it could not be used for the benefit of the good cause, without transgressing against a command of God, importing that we must not do evil, that good may come (117).

I proceed to the second observation. Have I not acted against this precept of Isocrates, believe that whatever cannot be honestly done, cannot be honestly spoken (118)? And ought not this precept to be a law to all Christians, since St Paul would not have any thing that is filthy to be named among them (119)? I answer, that this excellent axiom condemns only the ill custom [I] which prevails both among young people and married men,

[I] That excellent axiom condemns only the ill custom. Here follows the observation of a Commentator upon these words of Isocrates. Prohibetur hic omnis vis- VOL. V.

* χρονολογία καὶ βλασφημία καὶ κακηνόρεια: qui- bus nihil est indocto vulgo jucundius aut usitatus, cum nihil sit turpius & homine indignius. . . Huc accerfator D. Pauli

(106) See the article BUCHANAN, citat. (9).

(107) *Intituled, Le Myſtere d'Iniquité.*

(108) Mr. Piddgott, in his *Hiſtoria Papatus*, in the year 1684; and in *Magna Babyloae*, in the year 1687; Mr. Zuinger, in *Traſtatu de ſeſſo Corporis Chriſti*, in the year 1688; and Mr. Jurieu, in his *Prejuices Le-gitimes contre le Papiſme*, in the year 1685.

(109) *Le bis Nouveauté du Papiſme.*

(110) Mr. Jurieu among others, in his *Apologie de la Reforma-tion*, Tom. i, pag. 150, & ſq. Edit. in 4to.

(111) *At Am-ſterdam.*

(112) See the article NESTO-rius, remark [H].

(113) But what dream was it, and what did that woman ſee? A mountain, in which ſhe was received by Jeſus Chriſt; a chamber where ſhe aſhed, whom ſhe ſaw were for it There is one for my mother, and another for you my ſpouſe. And a little after, I have choſen you to be here with me. *Biſhop of Meaux's Relation, ſur le Quiet-tiſme*, pag. 28. *Bruxelles* 1698.

(114) *Id. ibid.*

(115) This holy Apoſtle took care not to call the prostitute he ſpeaks of, an adul-teress, μοιχεύουσα, but a public wo-man, and if I may be allowed to uſe but once theſe odious names, a whore, a prostitute, πόρνος. *Id.* Preface to the *Revelation*, pag. 27, of the edition printed at the Hague.

(116) *Rom. iii. 8.*

(117) * Ἄ πορ-νὴν ἀνθρώπου ταῦτα νομίζετε ἵνα λέγουν, εἶναι καλόν. Quæ factu ſunt turpia, ne dictu quidem decora eſſe puta. *Iſocrates ad Demoni-cum*, pag. m. 6.

(118) *Eph. v.*

men,

(120) Nec vero audiendi sunt Cynici, aut si qui fuerunt Stoici pene Cynici, qui reprehendunt & irident, quod ea, quæ re turpia non sint, nominibus ac verbis flagitiosa dicamus: illa autem quæ turpia sint, nominibus appellamus suis. Latrocinari, fraudare, adulterare, re turpe est; sed dicitur non obicere: Liberi dare operam re honestum est, nomine obicere: pluraque in eam sententiam ab eisdem contra verendum disputantur. Nos autem naturam sequamur, & omne quod abhorret oculorum auriumque approbatione, fugiamus. . . . Nor should we listen to the Cynics, or those almost Cynical Stoics, who censure and deride us, because we esteem some things scandalous and filthy in names and words, which in reality are not so; and call some things by their proper names, which are really filthy. To rob, defraud, or commit adultery, are in themselves scandalous actions, but they are mentioned without obscenity. To get children,

men, to speak on all occasions of their lewd practices, and impudently to discourse of every thing relating to that sort of sensuality. It is at least certain that the apostle never meant that men should forbear talking seriously, honestly, and historically of a lewd action. He did not deprive parents of the liberty of examining their children concerning the Historical facts contained in the Bible, and making them repeat that Jacob's daughter was ravished, that a son of David ravished his own sister, &c. nothing can be more dishonest than this action of David's son; and yet there is no dishonesty in repeating, preaching, and printing it? Could St Paul forbid the mentioning of it? Would he have prohibited the reading of the Bible? Was he not willing that his letters should be read, and that the very children should know what he wrote to the Romans concerning the abominable lives of the Heathens? A man must be mad to think that the precept of Iſocrates means that a school-boy should never give an account to his tutor, or to his father, of such passages of the Iliad as concern the adulteries of the gods.

If one had a mind to carry the dispute to the utmost, he might say that robbing, betraying, lying, and killing, are dishonest things, and that there is no dishonesty in mentioning those crimes; but as it is evident that the precept of Iſocrates concerns only sins contrary to chastity, such an objection would be a meer cavil. The Cynics and the Stoics made use of it to justify their doctrine, that there is no obscenity in any word: Cicero confutes them only by supposing that there is a natural shame (120).

It is time to conclude this long dissertation. The clearing up of this matter is more difficult than people imagine. I hope my justification will be fully approved, not by those who are too presumptuous to see that we labour to undeceive them, but by those who have been induced to believe on the credit of other persons, or upon light and superficial reasons. If they were excusable for being dazzled with specious appearances, before I published these four EXPLANATIONS, they can be no longer so if they obstinately persist in their error. They would have done well to follow the command of Jesus Christ, *judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment* (121). They have yielded to the first impressions of the objects, without waiting for the reasons on both sides; which is always necessary, especially when we are to judge of a writer who does not follow the most common road. We should immediately suspect that he has some reasons for it, and that he would not make such a step, if upon a long examination of his subject, he had not considered it on every side more carefully than those who only read his work. This well grounded suspicion should have made people very cautious and slow in giving their judgment: but what is done cannot be undone; all that can be hoped is, that their second thoughts will be better than the first.

I shall here acquaint my readers, that in several places of this Dictionary, they will find some apologetical reflections (122) immediately after such things as may offend scrupulous persons.

(121) Hieronym. Wolfius Annotat. in Parmenest. Iſocratis, p. 132.

* D. Pauli præceptum: *ἡ ἡμετέρα ἀναλογία ἐν ὑμῖν* * *grateful to, or more frequently used by the unlearned vul-*
* *γὰρ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο τι.* Christum etiam *ματαιὸς λό-* * *gar, and nothing more scandalous and unworthy of a*
* *γὰρ ὑπευδύς ἐποίησε.* Sed nos parum curamus, * *man. Here let us cite the precept of St Paul; All un-*
* *proh dolor; reddendam Deo rationem de verbis.* * *cleanness . . . let it not be once named amongst you.*
* *Nec mirum, cum tam flagitiosa & conscelerata vitæ* * *Our Saviour likewise says, we shall be accountable to*
* *fit & morum licentia. Væ væ nobis, nisi maturè* * *God for our very words. Nor is it to be wondered at,*
* *resipuerimus (12).* . . . *since our lives and manners are so wicked and licentious.*
* *course is here forbidden, than which nothing is more* * *Woe, woe unto us, unless we timely repent.*

(122) Especially with respect to obscenity.

F I N I S.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

Of all the

EMINENT PERSONS

Treated of in this

DICTIONARY:

Exhibiting the Synchronisms of the times wherein they flourished; and shewing, at one view, which of them were cotemporary.

N. B. We make use of three *Æra's*, viz. *the year of the World*, *the year of Rome*, and *the year of our Lord*.

A. M.		A. M.		U. C.	
100	A <i>DAM</i> , and <i>Eve</i> , his wife.		<i>Andromache</i> , Hector's wife, and <i>Astyanax</i> , their son.		<i>Brutus</i> (Lucius Junius) who expelled the Tarquins.
	<i>Abel</i> , and <i>Cain</i> , his elder brother.		<i>Briseis</i> , a concubine of Achilles.		<i>Bupalus</i> , a Sculptor, and son to Anthermus.
800	<i>Lamech</i> , a descendant from Cain.		<i>Calchas</i> , a Soothsayer.		<i>Calenus</i> (Olenus) a Soothsayer.
1000	<i>Lamech</i> , the father of Noah.		<i>Cassandra</i> , daughter of Priamus.		<i>Darius I.</i> , King of Persia.
1700	<i>Cham</i> , one of Noah's sons.		<i>Cbryseis</i> , a concubine of Agamemnon.		<i>Hippomach</i> , a Greek Poet.
2000	<i>Pharon</i> , King of Egypt.		<i>Egialta</i> , wife of Diomedes.		<i>Lucretia</i> , wife to Collatinus.
2100	<i>Abimelech</i> , King of Gerar.		<i>Helen</i> , wife of Menelaus.		<i>Pythagoras</i> , the Philosopher.
	<i>Abraham</i> , the Patriarch.		<i>Oenone</i> , wife of Paris.		<i>Xenophanes</i> , the Philosopher.
	<i>Agar</i> , his concubine; and <i>Sarah</i> , his wife.		<i>Tecmessa</i> , concubine of Ajax.	250	<i>Cassius Viscellinus</i> (Spurius) a Roman Senator.
2350	<i>Job</i> , the Patriarch.		<i>Tenes</i> , son of Cygnus.		<i>Horatius</i> (Publius) firnamed Cocles.
2525	<i>Aaron</i> , High-Priest of the Jews.	2850	<i>Teucer</i> , son of Telamon.		<i>Simonides</i> , a famous Greek Poet.
	<i>Mary</i> , or <i>Miriam</i> , his sister.		<i>Ulysses</i> , King of Ithaca.	275	<i>Archamenes</i> , brother of Xerxes.
2650	<i>Gazymede</i> , son of Tros, King of Troy.		<i>Ajax</i> , the son of Teucer.		<i>Ameftis</i> , wife of Xerxes.
2700	<i>Europa</i> , daughter of Agenor.		<i>Alcinous</i> , King of the Phæaciens.		<i>Aristides</i> , firnamed the Just.
	<i>Melampus</i> , a famous Soothsayer.	2875	<i>Harpalicus</i> , King of the Amynians.		<i>Ariabannus</i> , the son of Hytaspes.
	<i>Olen</i> , a Greek Poet.	2900	<i>Nauficaa</i> , daughter to Alcinous.		<i>Artemisia</i> , Queen of Caria.
2725	<i>Gorgophone</i> , daughter of Perseus and Andromeda.	2950	<i>Pyrrhus</i> , son of Achilles.		<i>Cbrysi</i> , Priestess of Juno at Argos.
	<i>Perimede</i> , a famous witch.	3075	<i>Samson</i> , a Judge of God's people.		<i>Cimon</i> , the son of Miltiades.
2750	<i>Alcmena</i> , wife of Amphitryon.	3100	<i>Thamyris</i> , a Greek Poet.		<i>Cleonece</i> , a young lady of Byzantium.
	<i>Amphiarauus</i> , the son of Oicles.		<i>David</i> , King of the Jews.		<i>Elcbylus</i> , a tragic Poet.
	<i>Amphitryon</i> , the son of Alcæus.		<i>Agessius I.</i> , King of Sparta.	300	<i>Hiero I.</i> , King of Syracuse.
	<i>Byblis</i> , the daughter of Miletus.		<i>Elijah</i> , the Prophet.		<i>Anaxagoras</i> , the Philosopher.
	<i>Cbryseppus</i> , natural son of Pelops.	3125	<i>Pygmalion</i> , King of Tyre.		<i>Diagoras</i> , a famous wrestler.
	<i>Pelias</i> , the son of Neptune.		<i>Elisba</i> , the Prophet.		<i>Diogenes</i> of Apollonia.
	<i>Talaus</i> , King of Argos.		<i>Lycurgus</i> , the Lacedæmonian Legislator.		<i>Hiero</i> , head of the colony which rebuilt Thurium.
	<i>Tiresias</i> , a famous Soothsayer.	3200	<i>Jonas</i> , the Prophet.		<i>Leucippus</i> , a Greek Philosopher.
2775	<i>Alderus</i> , Hercules's favourite.				<i>Simonides</i> , grandson to the Poet of that name.
	<i>Adonis</i> , minion of the goddess Venus.	U. C.			<i>Zeno</i> of Elea, an eminent Philosopher.
	<i>Adrastus</i> , King of Argos.	1	P <i>Sammatichus</i> , King of Egypt.		<i>Agathon</i> , a tragic and comic Poet.
	<i>Alcinoi</i> , wife of Amphilocheus.	50	<i>Crantor</i> , a Greek Philosopher.	325	<i>Archelaus</i> , a Greek Philosopher.
	<i>Alcmaeon</i> , son of Amphiarauus.	75	<i>Alcman</i> , a Lyric Poet.		<i>Archelaus I.</i> , King of Macedon.
	<i>Amphilocheus</i> , a famous Soothsayer.	100	<i>Archilochus</i> , a Greek Poet.		<i>Aristo</i> , a Greek Philosopher.
	<i>Archifus</i> , father to Æneas.		<i>Judith</i> , a Jewish heroine.		<i>Alphæa</i> , mistress to Pericles.
	<i>Aristus</i> , son of Apollo and Cyrene.	125	<i>Timefius</i> of Clazomenæ.		<i>Democritus</i> , the Philosopher.
	<i>Callirhoi</i> , wife of Alcmaeon.	150	<i>Periander</i> , King of Corinth.		<i>Diagoras</i> , firnamed the Atheist.
	<i>Cinyras</i> , father of Adonis.		<i>Archamenes</i> , grandfather to Cyrus.		<i>Doræus</i> , son of Diagoras the Wrestler.
	<i>Hercules</i> , son of Alcmena.		<i>Alcæus</i> , a Lyric Poet.		<i>Euripides</i> , a tragic Poet.
	<i>Hippote</i> , daughter to Thoas, King of Lemnos.		<i>Lycophron</i> , son to Periander.		<i>Pericles</i> , the Athenian.
	<i>Manto</i> , daughter of Tiresias.		<i>Pæon</i> of Mitylene.		<i>Prodicus</i> , a celebrated Sophist.
	<i>Myrrha</i> , the mother of Adonis.		<i>Sappho</i> , famous for her verses and amours.	350	<i>Zeuxis</i> , a famous Painter.
	<i>Peribæa</i> , wife of Telamon.		<i>Tanaquil</i> , wife of Tarquinius Priscus.		<i>Alphæa</i> , mistress to Cyrus the younger.
	<i>Pygmalion</i> , King of Cyprus.		<i>Tales</i> , one of the seven wise men of Greece.		<i>Berenice</i> , daughter of Diagoras the Wrestler.
2800	<i>Telamon</i> , King of Salamis.	175	<i>Abaris</i> , the Scythian.		<i>Camillus</i> (Marcus-Furius) the Roman Dictator.
	<i>Naufibous</i> , King of the Phæaciens.		<i>Ezop</i> , the first or chief author of fables.		<i>Cyrus</i> , son of Darius Nothus.
	<i>Tamiras</i> of Cilicia.		<i>Ezekiel</i> , the Prophet.		<i>Conon</i> , an Athenian General.
2825	<i>Acamas</i> , son of Theseus.	200	<i>Rhadope</i> , a Courtizan.		<i>Critias</i> , one of the thirty tyrants of Athens.
	<i>Achilles</i> , son of Peleus.	225	<i>Anthermus</i> , a Sculptor.		<i>Euclid</i> of Megara, a Philosopher.
	<i>Ajax</i> , son of Oileus.		<i>Aristas</i> , the Proconnesian.		<i>Hanno</i> , a Carthaginian General.
	<i>Ajax</i> , son of Telamon.		<i>Anacreon</i> , the Poet.		
	VOL. V.		<i>Anaxandrides</i> , King of Lacedæmon.		
			<i>Bathylas</i> , Anacreon's Minion.		

U. C.		U. C.		U. C.	
	<i>Lais</i> , a famous Courtesan.	525	<i>Alcæus</i> , cousin-german to Antiochus the Great.	700	<i>Antipater</i> , an Idumean.
	<i>Metredorus</i> of Chios, a Philosopher.		<i>Apollonius</i> of Pergamus, a famous Geometrician.		<i>Artaxerxes</i> I, King of Armenia.
375	<i>Agesilaus</i> II, King of Sparta.		<i>Archimedes</i> , a Greek Poet.		<i>Atticus</i> (Titus Pomponius) one of the most honourable men in ancient Rome.
	<i>Agisipolis</i> I, King of Sparta.		<i>Chrysippus</i> , a Stoic Philosopher.		<i>Berenice</i> , daughter of Ptolemy Auletes.
	<i>Alcæus</i> , a tragic Poet.		<i>Lacydes</i> , a Greek Philosopher.		<i>Catullus</i> (Caius Valerius) a Roman Poet.
	<i>Anaxandrides</i> , a comic Poet.		<i>Pergamum</i> (Attalus, King of).		<i>Cæsar</i> (Caius Julius) first Emperor of Rome.
	<i>Calisthratus</i> , an Athenian Orator.		<i>Pyrrhus</i> , King of Epirus, grandson to the Pyrrhus abovementioned.		<i>Cornelia</i> , wife of Pompey.
	<i>Eneas</i> , or <i>Eneas Tacticus</i> , a Greek author.		<i>Aristarchus</i> , a Greek Philosopher.		<i>Cratippus</i> , a Peripatetic Philosopher.
	<i>Eurydice</i> , wife of Amyntas, King of Macedonia.	550	<i>Dicæarchus</i> , a Macedonian Admiral.		<i>Deiotarus</i> , King of the lesser Armenia.
	<i>Philistus</i> , a Greek Historian.		<i>Artabanus</i> I, King of Parthia.		<i>Demetrius</i> (Magnes) a Greek author.
	<i>Tachus</i> , King of Egypt.	575	<i>Artaxias</i> I, King of Armenia.		<i>Dolabella</i> (Publius Cornelius) Cicero's son-in-law.
400	<i>Artemisia</i> , wife of Mausolus.		<i>Carneades</i> , a famous Greek Philosopher.		<i>Fulvia</i> , wife of Clodius, and afterwards of Marc Antony.
	<i>Asclepiades</i> , a Greek Philosopher.		<i>Diogenes</i> , the Babylonian.		<i>Glaphyra</i> , wife to Archelaus, High Priest of Bellerophon.
	<i>Cotys</i> , King of Thrace.		<i>Metredorus</i> , a Painter and Philosopher.		<i>Hortensius</i> (Quintus) son to the great Orator of that name.
	<i>Diogenes</i> , the Cynic.		<i>Porcius</i> (Marcus) commonly called Cato the Censor.		<i>Mamurra</i> , a Roman Knight.
	<i>Euphratus</i> , a disciple of Plato.		<i>Aristarchus</i> , a Grammarian.		<i>Metellus</i> (Lucius) a tribune of the people.
	<i>Hegesilochus</i> , a licentious debauchee.		<i>Fannius Strabo</i> (Caius) a Roman Senator.		<i>Nigidius Figulus</i> (Publius) a learned Roman.
	<i>Lycurgus</i> , an Athenian Orator.	600	<i>Hipparchus</i> , a great Astronomer.		<i>Surena</i> , General of the Parthians.
	<i>Mausolus</i> , King of Caria.		<i>Titius</i> (Caius) a Latin Poet, and Orator.		<i>Tarpe</i> (Spurius Metius) a licentious plays.
	<i>Olympias</i> , mother to Alexander the Great.		<i>Alburtius</i> (Titus) an Epicurean Philosopher.		<i>Tarruntius</i> (Lucius) surnamed Firmianus, a Mathematical Philosopher.
	<i>Philomelus</i> , General of the Phœceans.	625	<i>Apellicon</i> , who bought Aristotle's library.		<i>Timomachus</i> , a famous Painter.
	<i>Stilpo</i> , the Philosopher.		<i>Attilius</i> , a Latin Poet.		<i>Tullia</i> , Cicero's daughter.
	<i>Theopompus</i> , an Orator and Historian.		<i>Cassius Hemina</i> (Lucius) an Historian.	725	<i>Antony</i> (Marc) one of the Triumvirs.
425	<i>Ada</i> , Queen of Caria.		<i>Cassius Longinus</i> (Lucius) a Judge, famous for his severity.		<i>Antony</i> (Caius) and
	<i>Amastrius</i> , wife of Dionysius, tyrant of Heraclea.		<i>Castor</i> , the Chronographer.		<i>Antony</i> (Lucius) his brothers.
	<i>Apelles</i> , a famous Painter.		<i>Catius</i> , an Epicurean Philosopher.		<i>Archelaus</i> , King of Cappadocia.
	<i>Arifander</i> , a famous Soothsayer.		<i>Fannius</i> (Caius) an Orator.		<i>Artaxerxes</i> , King of Media.
	<i>Arifteus</i> , the Geometrician.		<i>Fannius</i> (Caius) an Annalist.		<i>Artaxerxes</i> II, King of Armenia.
	<i>Arifotle</i> , the Philosopher.		<i>Licinia</i> , a Vestal Virgin.		<i>Bathylas</i> , a freedman of Mæcenas.
	<i>Cleopatra</i> , sister to Alexander.		<i>Lucilius</i> (Caius) a Latin Poet.		<i>Bathylas</i> , a Latin Poet.
	<i>Cleophis</i> , an Indian Queen.		<i>Perfius</i> (Caius) a learned Roman.		<i>Berenice</i> , niece to Herod the Great.
	<i>Dionysius</i> , a Greek Historian.		<i>Sulpicia</i> , wife of Fulvius Flaccus.		<i>Brutus</i> (Marcus Junius) and
	<i>Dionysius</i> , tyrant of Heraclea.		<i>Sulpicia</i> (Lucius) a tragic Poet.		<i>Cassius Longinus</i> (Caius) two of Cæsar's murderers.
	<i>Ephorus</i> , an Orator and Historian.	650	<i>Antony</i> (Marc) the Orator.		<i>Dellius</i> (Quintus) a Greek Historian.
	<i>Harpalus</i> , a Macedonian Lord.		<i>Druſus</i> (Marcus Livius) tribune of the people.		<i>Fannius</i> (Quadratus) a Latin Poet.
	<i>Hipparchia</i> , wife to the Philosopher Crates.		<i>Lævius</i> , a Latin Poet.		<i>Lycoris</i> , alias <i>Cyberis</i> , a famous Courtesan.
	<i>Isfimachus</i> , tutor to Alexander.		<i>Soranus</i> (Quintus Valerius) a learned Roman.		<i>Ligarius</i> (Quintus) one of Cæsar's murderers.
	<i>Macedonia</i> (Alexander the Great, King of).		<i>Andronicus</i> , a Peripatetic Philosopher.		<i>Lollius</i> (Marcus) a Roman Consul.
	<i>Memnon</i> , a Persian General.	675	<i>Andronicus</i> (Marcus Pompius) a Grammarian.		<i>Olavia</i> , wife of Marc Antony.
	<i>Philias</i> , a Grammarian, Critic, and Poet.		<i>Antony</i> (Caius) Cicero's colleague in the Consulship.		<i>Parthenius</i> , a Greek author.
	<i>Philla</i> , daughter to Antipater, Governor of Macedonia.		<i>Antony</i> (Marc) surnamed Creticus.		<i>Pylades</i> , a famous Pantomime.
	<i>Pyrrho</i> , a Greek Philosopher.		<i>Asclepiades</i> of Prusa, a famous Physician.		<i>Porcia</i> , wife of Marcus Brutus.
	<i>Pytheas</i> , author of some Geographical books.		<i>Castorius</i> (Marcus) a Magistrate of Placentia.		<i>Quirinus</i> (Publius Sulpicius) a Roman Consul.
	<i>Pythias</i> , Aristotle's daughter.		<i>Chelidonia</i> , a woman of an ill life.		<i>Severus</i> (Cornelius) a Latin Poet.
	<i>Silanius</i> , a famous Sculptor.		<i>Eſop</i> , reader to Mithridates.		<i>Tyrannion</i> , disciple to the Tyrannion abovementioned.
	<i>Tbais</i> , a Greek Courtesan.		<i>Eſop</i> (Clodius) a celebrated Comedian.		<i>Trebatius</i> (Caius) surnamed Teda, a great Civilian.
	<i>Timoleon</i> , General of the Corinthians.		<i>Fannia</i> , wife to Caius Titinius.		<i>Virgil</i> , the Poet.
	<i>Xenocrates</i> , a Greek Philosopher.		<i>Flora</i> , a Courtesan.		
450	<i>Arceſilas</i> , a famous Philosopher.		<i>Fulvia</i> , who discovered Catiline's conspiracy.		
	<i>Asclepiades</i> , a Greek Philosopher.		<i>Hortensius</i> (Quintus) a great Orator.		
	<i>Bion</i> , the Boryſthenite.		<i>Laberius</i> (Decimus) a Roman Knight and Poet.		
	<i>Craterus</i> , author of a collection of the decrees of the Athenians.		<i>Laudice</i> , sister and wife of Mithridates.		
	<i>Dicæarchus</i> , a disciple of Aristotle.		<i>Lucretius</i> (Titus) Carus, a Roman Poet.		
	<i>Epicurus</i> , the Philosopher.		<i>Metellus Celer</i> (Quintus) a Roman Senator.		
	<i>Hermesimachus</i> , an elegiac Poet.		<i>Monima</i> , wife of Mithridates.		
	<i>Lamia</i> , a celebrated Courtesan.		<i>Mucia</i> , wife of Pompey.		
	<i>Lycophron</i> , a Greek Poet.		<i>Ptolomy Auletes</i> , King of Egypt.		
	<i>Timæus</i> , a Greek Historian.		<i>Ratilia</i> , wife of Marcus Aurelius Cotta.		
475	<i>Aristo</i> of Chios, a Philosopher.		<i>Servilia</i> , mother to Marcus Brutus.		
	<i>Arſinoë</i> , wife of Magas, King of Cyrene.		<i>Servilia</i> , wife to Lucullus.		
	<i>Bion</i> , a Bucolic Poet.		<i>Tyrannion</i> , a celebrated Grammarian.		
	<i>Cleonymus</i> , son to a King of Sparta.		<i>Valeria</i> , wife to Sylla.		
	<i>Danaë</i> , daughter of Leontium.		<i>Zeno</i> of Sidon, an Epicurean Philosopher.		
	<i>Duellius</i> (Caius) a Roman Senator.				
	<i>Fabritius Lucinus</i> (Caius) a Roman General.				
	<i>Leontium</i> , an Athenian Courtesan.				
500	<i>Pyrrhus</i> , King of the Epirotes.				
	<i>Agis</i> , King of Lacedæmon.				
	<i>Amphares</i> , one of the Lacedæmonian Ephori.				
	<i>Berenice</i> , wife of Antiochus Theus.				
	<i>Cheloni</i> , wife of Cleombrotus, King of Lacedæmon.				
	<i>Conon</i> , a Mathematician.				
	<i>Hiero</i> II, King of Syracuse.				

A. D.

A *Liberius Silus* (Caius) a famous Orator.
Alfennius Varus (Publius) a Roman Consul.
Antony (Marcus Julius) son of the Triumvir.
Antonia, sister to the foregoing, and mother of Germanicus.
Antonia, younger sister to the foregoing, and wife of Lucius Domitius Ænobarbus.
Cassius Severus (Titus) a famous Orator.
Druſus (Nero Claudius) brother of Tiberius.
Glaphyra, wife to Alexander the son of Herod.

Ovidius

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE, &c.

[861]

A. D.		A. D.		A. D.	
25	<i>Ovidius Naf</i> (Publius) the Poet. <i>Apelles</i> , an excellent Tragedian. <i>Apion</i> , a Mathematician. <i>Artabanus</i> II, King of Parthia. <i>Artaxias</i> III, King of Armenia. <i>Caligula</i> (Caius Cæsar) Emperor of Rome. <i>Cassius Cherea</i> , Captain of Caligula's guards. <i>Drufilla</i> (Julia) sister to Caligula. <i>Drusus</i> , son of Tiberius. <i>Drusus</i> , son of Germanicus. <i>Lutarius Priscus</i> (Caius) a Roman Knight. <i>Macro</i> (Nævius Sertorius) Captain of Tiberius's guards. <i>Numantina</i> , wife of Plautius Sylvanus. <i>Paulina</i> (Lollia) wife to Caligula. <i>Phædrus</i> , author of the fables. 50 <i>Afer</i> (Domitius) a famous Orator. <i>Afranius Quintianus</i> , a Roman Senator. <i>Apollonius Tyanæus</i> , a most extraordinary person. <i>Burrus</i> (Afranius) Nero's Governour. <i>Claudius</i> (Tiberius) Drusus, Emperor of Rome, and <i>Othavia</i> , his daughter. <i>Phil</i> , the Jew. <i>Quintus Curtius</i> , a Latin Historian. <i>Suetonius Paulinus</i> (Caius) Governour of Numidia, and afterwards of Britain. 75 <i>Akiba</i> , a famous Rabbīn. <i>Andromachus</i> Physician to Nero. <i>Ariabanes</i> III, King of Parthia. <i>Berenice</i> , daughter of Agrippa I, King of Judea. <i>Cassius Longinus</i> (Caius) a great Civilian. <i>Domitia Longina</i> , wife of Domitian. <i>Drufilla</i> , wife of Felix. <i>Fannia</i> , wife of Helvidius. <i>John</i> (St) the Evangelist. <i>Quintilian</i> (Marcus Fabius) a teacher of Rhetoric at Rome. <i>Vespasian</i> (Titus Flavius) Emperor of Rome. 100 <i>Apollodorus</i> , a famous Architect. <i>Aristo</i> (Titius) a Roman Lawyer. <i>Plotina</i> (Pompeia) the wife of Trajan. <i>Tacitus</i> (Caius Cornelius) a great Historian. <i>Trajan</i> , a Roman Emperor. 125 <i>Aminous</i> , Hadrian's Minion. <i>Artemidorus</i> , the Ephesian. <i>Barcocebas</i> , a famous impostor. <i>Cassius</i> (Titus) a teacher of Rhetoric. <i>Fannius</i> (Caius) a Latin author. <i>Hadrian</i> (Publius Aelius) Emperor of Rome. <i>Prodicus</i> , founder of the sect of the Adamites. <i>Suetonius Tranquillus</i> (Caius) an Historian. 150 <i>Apollinaris</i> (Caius Sulpitius) a Grammarian. <i>Apuleius</i> (Lucius) a Platonic Philosopher. <i>Phlegon</i> , surnamed <i>Trallianus</i> , a Latin Author. <i>Polyænus</i> , a Greek author. 175 <i>Athenagoras</i> , an Athenian Philosopher. <i>Cerintus</i> , an Arch-Heretic. 200 <i>Julia</i> , wife of Septimius Severus Emperor of Rome. 225 <i>Artabanus</i> IV, the last King of Parthia. <i>Athenæus</i> , a Greek Grammarian. <i>Babylas</i> , Bishop of Antioch. <i>Origen</i> , a Father of the Church. <i>Amelius</i> , a Platonic Philosopher. 250 <i>Arnobius</i> , Professor of Rhetoric at Sicca. 275 <i>Aurelianus</i> (Lucius Domitius) Emperor of Rome.		<i>Zenobia</i> , wife of Odenatus a Saracen Prince. 300 <i>Sophronia</i> , a Roman lady so called by some modern writers. 325 <i>Acyndinus</i> (Septimius) a Roman Consul. <i>Ahpius</i> , a Philosopher of Alexandria. <i>Arius</i> , the Heretic. <i>Cyril</i> , Deacon of the Church of Heliopolis. <i>Fausla</i> , wife of the Emperor Constantine. 350 <i>Marcellinus</i> (Ammianus) an Historian. 375 <i>Ajax</i> , an Ecclesiastic. <i>Alypius</i> of Antioch. <i>Alypius</i> (Falconius Probus) Prefect of Rome. <i>Arsenius</i> , a Deacon of the Roman Church. <i>Aufonius</i> , a Latin Poet. <i>Heliodorus</i> , Bishop of Trica. <i>Hierocles</i> , son of Alypius of Antioch. <i>Leontius</i> , an Athenian Philosopher. <i>Naxianzen</i> (Gregory) a celebrated Father of the Church. <i>Obsequens</i> (Julius) a Latin writer. <i>Priscillian</i> , a Spanish Heretic. <i>Prudentius</i> , a Christian Poet. <i>Rufinus</i> , a favourite of the Emperor Theodosius. 400 <i>Tbeon</i> , a Greek Sophist. <i>Alypius</i> , Bishop of Tagasta. <i>Augustin</i> (St). <i>Honorius</i> , a Roman Emperor. 425 <i>Nemesius</i> , a Christian Philosopher. <i>Abdai</i> , a Bishop in Persia. <i>Hierocles</i> , a Platonic Philosopher. <i>Nestorius</i> , Bishop of Constantinople. <i>Orosius</i> (Paul) a Spanish Priest. <i>Sedulius</i> (Caius Cælius) a Priest. <i>Severus</i> (Sulpitius) a Lawyer, and afterwards a Priest. 450 <i>Vigilantius</i> , a Spanish Priest. <i>Attila</i> , King of the Huns. <i>Leo</i> I, Pope, surnamed the Great. <i>Marullus</i> a Poet of Calabria. <i>Quintus</i> (Calaber) a Greek Poet. 475 <i>Amable</i> , a Priest of Riom in Auvergne. <i>Bafina</i> , mother to Clovis, King of France. <i>Honorina</i> , sister of Valentinian III. Emperor of Rome. 550 <i>Jornandus</i> , Bishop of Ravenna. 625 <i>Mabomem</i> , the grand impostor. 650 <i>Fatima</i> , daughter of Mahomet. 675 <i>Alpaide</i> , a concubine of Pepin. 700 <i>Lambert</i> , Bishop of Maestricht. 725 <i>Abderame</i> , a great Saracen General. <i>Abumuslimus</i> , a Saracen General. <i>Damascen</i> (John) an illustrious Father of the Lower Empire. <i>Eudo</i> , Duke of Aquitain. <i>Munusa</i> , a Moorish Captain. <i>Virgil</i> , Bishop of Saltzburg. 750 <i>Abucaras</i> (Theodore) a Prelate. 800 <i>Abgillus</i> (John) called in English Prester John. 825 <i>Eginhart</i> , Secretary to the Emperor Charlemagne. 850 <i>Achmet</i> , the son of Seirim. <i>Pope Joan</i> . <i>Radulphus</i> , Archbishop of Bourges. 925 <i>Abudabab</i> , chief of the Karmatians. 975 <i>Aragon</i> (Mary of) wife of Otho III, Emperor of Germany. <i>Capri</i> (Hugh) King of France. 1000 <i>Bolislau</i> , King of Poland. <i>Emma</i> , wife of Ethelred King of England. <i>Otho</i> III, Emperor of Germany. 1025 <i>Artin</i> (Guy) a Benedictine. <i>Alcindus</i> , an Arabian Physician and Astrologer. 1050 <i>Damian</i> (Peter) Cardinal, &c. 1075 <i>Anselm</i> , Archbishop of Canterbury. <i>Bennon</i> , Bishop of Mifnia. 1100 <i>Alcuarius</i> , a Greek Physician.		<i>Arbriffel</i> (Robert d') founder of the Abbey of Fontevraud. <i>Hildebert</i> , Bishop of Mans, &c. <i>Urraca</i> , daughter and heiress of Alphonso VI, King of Leon and Castile. 1125 <i>Abelard</i> (Peter) a famous Divine. <i>Berengarius</i> (Peter) disciple to the foregoing. <i>Bernard</i> (St) Abbot of Clairvaux. <i>Foulques</i> , Prior of Deuil. <i>Helisa</i> , concubine and afterwards wife of Abelard. <i>Tandemus</i> , a German Heretic. <i>Alchabitius</i> , an Arabian Astrologer. 1150 <i>Averrois</i> , an Arabian Philosopher. <i>Bulgarus</i> , a famous Civilian. <i>Jarchi</i> (Solomon) a famous Rabbi. <i>Lewis</i> VII, King of France. <i>Noradin</i> , Sultan of Aleppo. <i>Radulphus</i> , a Benedictine Monk surnamed Flaviacensis. 1175 <i>Harravad</i> (Isaac Ben) a noted Rabbi. <i>Henry</i> IV, Emperor of Germany. <i>Innerius</i> , a German Civilian. <i>Sarifieri</i> (John of) Bishop of Chartres. 1200 <i>Ammonius</i> , surnamed Saccas, a famous Philosopher. 1225 <i>Accursius</i> , Professor of Civil Law. <i>Capile</i> (Blanche of) Queen of France. <i>Elmacin</i> (George) a Saracen Historian. <i>Francis</i> of Assisi, a saint of the Romish Church. <i>Gualdrada</i> , a Florentine lady. <i>Scotus</i> (Michael) a learned author. <i>Thibaut</i> V, Earl of Champagne. 1250 <i>Accursius</i> (Cervot) son to the Professor abovementioned, and <i>Accursius</i> (Francis) his elder brother. <i>Albertus Magnus</i> , Bishop of Ratibon. <i>Colonna</i> (John) Archbishop of Meffini. 1275 <i>Abulparage</i> (Gregory) a Physician. <i>Arsenius</i> , Patriarch of Constantinople. <i>Bacon</i> (Roger) an English Franciscan. <i>Balbi</i> (John) a Dominican. <i>Burnettus</i> (Latinus) author of several books. <i>Capile</i> (Alphonso X, King of). <i>Cavalcante</i> (Guido) a noble Florentine. <i>Guillelma</i> , or <i>Guillemina</i> , the head of an infamous sect. <i>Polonus</i> (Martin) a Dominican. 1300 <i>Apona</i> (Peter of) a famous Philosopher. <i>Aurelius</i> (Peter) a Franciscan. <i>Barberini</i> (Francis) a Poet and Civilian. <i>Dante</i> , an Italian Poet. <i>Reynier</i> (Peter de) Knight of the Order of St John of Jerusalem. 1325 <i>Abulfeda</i> (Ismael) Prince of Hama. <i>Acyndinus</i> (Gregory) a Greek Monk. <i>Arsenius</i> , Bishop of Monembafia. <i>Ciccu</i> , an Italian author. <i>Cinno</i> , a famous Civilian. <i>Laurentio</i> (Nicolas) author of a surprising revolution at Rome. <i>Menandrino</i> (Marfilus de) a learned Civilian. 1350 <i>Andreas</i> (John) a famous Canonist. <i>Aristia</i> (Lippa) concubine and afterwards wife to Opizzo Marquis of Est and Ferrara. <i>Cauliac</i> (Guy de) a Physician. <i>Coronel</i> (Alphonfus) a Spanish Lord. <i>Naples</i> (Joan I, Queen of) <i>Padilla</i> (Mary de) mistress to Peter the Cruel, King of Castile. <i>Rimini</i> (Gregory of) a schoolman. <i>Roquetaillade</i> (John de la) a Franciscan. <i>Ruybroeck</i> (John de) founder of a Convent of Canons regular of the Order of St Augustin. <i>Tauterus</i> (John) a Dominican Fryer. <i>Baldus</i> ,

A. D.
 1375 *Baldus*, a famous Civilian.
Freisford (John) an Historian.
Guifelin (Bertrand du) Constable of France.
Guise (James de) a Franciscan Monk.
Wickam (William) Bishop of Winchester.
 1400 *Willi* (Peter de) Bishop of Cambray, &c.
Montaigne (John de) High Steward of France.
Savonarola (Michael or John-Michael) a Physician.
 1425 *Alamandus* (Lewis) Archbishop of Arles.
Artin (Charles) Secretary to the Republic of Florence, and
Artin (Leonard) his immediate predecessor.
Barbarus (Francis) a noble Venetian.
Blondus (Flavius) Secretary to several Popes.
Burgundy (Philip Duke of) firnamed the Good.
Caraccioli (John) gallant to Joan II, Queen of Naples.
Camaldoli (Ambrose de) Abbot-General of the Order of Camaldoli.
Capistran (John) a Franciscan.
Chastellux (Clausius Sire de) Viscount d'Avallon, &c.
Chastel (Tanneguy du) Marshal of the wars of the Dauphin.
Conecte (Thomas) a Carmelite Fryer.
Eugenius IV. Pope.
Francisca, a devout lady.
Naples (Joan II, Queen of)
Paris (James des) a Physician.
Patricius (Francis) Bishop of Gaeta.
Sebaste (Raymundus) Professor of Physic, &c. at Toulouse.
Sforza (Giacomuzzo) founder of the family of Sforza.
Vegius (Maphæus) an Orator and Poet.
Vergerius (Peter Paul) a Civilian.
 1450 *Amyratus*, a Peripatetic Philosopher.
Andreas (John) author of a book against the Mahometan religion.
Andronicus of Thessalonica, a Professor at Florence.
Artin (John) firnamed Tortellius, Chamberlain to Pope Nicolas V.
Aristotle, a famous Architect.
Auripe (John) Secretary to Nicolas V.
Buridan (John) a famous Philosopher.
Franc (Martin) Provost and Canon of Laufanne.
Guarinus, one of the first revivers of learning in Italy.
Naples (Alphonfus I, King of) and
Panormita (Antony) his Secretary.
Philippus, an Italian author.
Sforza (Francis) Duke of Milan.
Villa (Laurence) a great critic.
Wejalia (John de) Doctor of Divinity.
 1475 *Abraham* (Isaac) a celebrated Rabbi.
Acciacoli [Donato] a learned Florentine.
Agricola [Rodolphus] a learned Priest-lander.
Altius [Gabriel] a Latin Poet.
Artin [Francis] a translator of some of Chrysostome's works.
Argyropylus [John] a learned Greek.
Barbarus [Hermolaus] a learned Venetian.
Barletta [Gabriel] a Dominican.
Bergamo [James Philip de] an Augustin Monk.
Bosfinus [Antony] an Historian.
Bosius [Matthew] a regular Canon.
Brandolinus [Aurelius] an Augustine Fryer.
Brené [Peter de] Lord de la Varenne, &c.

A. D.
Britannicus [John] a learned Commentator.
Burgundy [Charles Duke of] and
Burgundy [Mary of] his only daughter.
Calderinus [Domitius] a teacher of polite learning.
Campanus [John Antony] a learned Prelate.
Catibo [Angelo] Archbp of Vienne.
Chastellan [Geo.] a Flemish gentleman.
Donatus [Jerome] a noble Venetian.
Dante [Peter Vincent] an Italian Poet.
Edward IV, King of England.
Experien [Philip Callimachus] tutor to Albert King of Poland.
Fonius [Bartholinus] a teacher of Rhetoric at Florence.
Fulgins [Sigismund] an Historian.
Gentilis de Becis, Bishop of Arezzo.
Guarinus [Baptist] Professor of the *Belles Lettres*.
Hibten [John] a German Franciscan.
Innocent VIII, Pope.
Lamponiano [John Andrew] a domestic of Galeazzo Sforza Duke of Milan.
Lascaris [Conft.] a learned Greek.
Lascaris [John] firnamed Rhyndacenus.
Leonicens [Nicolas] Professor of Physic in the University of Ferrara.
Lewis XI, King of France.
Mabomet II, Emperor of the Turks.
Mainus [Jason] a Civilian.
Majus [Jurianus] teacher of the *Belles Lettres*.
Mancinellus [Antony] a Grammarian.
Marbe [Oliver de la] High Steward to Maximilian of Austria.
Marfus [Peter] a Commentator.
Marullus [Michael Tarchaniota] a Poet.
Monfretet [Enguerrard de] Author of a Chronicle of France.
Nannius [John] a Dominican.
Nero [Bernard del] a Florentine Nobleman.
Newsers [John of Burgundy Count of] *Omnibonus*, a noted Grammarian.
Oricellarius [Bernard] a Florentine author.
Patricius [Aug.] Bishop of Pienza.
Politian [Angelo] a learned and polite author.
Præpositus [Nicolas] a Physician at Tours.
Savonarola [Jerome] a Dominican Fryer.
Scala [Bartholomew] a learned Florentine, and
Scala [Alexandra] his daughter.
Sforza [Catherine] wife of Jerome Riario.
Sixtus IV, Pope.
Subitius [John] firnamed Verulanus.
Tibernas [Gregory] Greek Professor in the University of Paris.
Torquato [Antony] a famous Astrologer.
Trifan [Hermite] [Lewis] Great Provost of the King's household.
Valla [George] a Physician, &c.
Valla [Nicolas] Doctor of the Civil Law, &c.
Vaquerie [John de la] first President in the Parliament of Paris.
Urceus [Antony Codrus] a learned Italian.
Utinus [Len. de] a Jacobin Monk.
Wessius [John] a learned Dutchman.
 1500 *Abstemius* [Laurence] teacher of the *Belles Lettres*.
Acciacoli [Zenobius] a Dominican.
Alexander ab Alexandro, a Civilian.

A. D.
Alexis, a Piedmontois.
Almain [James] Doctor of Divinity.
Ammonius [Andrew] a Latin Poet.
Andrada [Diego de Payra d'] a Portuguese Divine.
Andrelinus [Publius Fauftus] Professor of Poetry in the University of Paris.
Antefignanus [Peter] a good Grammarian.
Aquaviva [Andrew Mathew] Duke of Atri.
Aragon [Isabella of] wife of John Galeazzo Sforza, Duke of Milan.
Auton [John d'] Abbot of Angle.
Badius [Jodocus] firnamed Accensius, a learned author.
Berfala [Anne] wife to Philip of Burgundy.
Bristot [Peter] a Physician.
Bunel [William] Professor of Physic in the University of Toulouse.
Bulleiden [Jerome] illustrious for his embassies, &c.
Cartromachus [Scipio] a learned Italian.
Decius [Philip] a famous Civilian.
Delphinus [Peter] General of the Order of Camaldoli.
Durer [Albert] an excellent Painter and Engraver.
Flaminus [Antony] Professor of Polite Literature in the college of Rome.
Gonzaga [Isabella de] wife of Guido Ubaldo de Monticeltro, Duke of Urbino.
Grapaldus [Francis Marius] a learned Italian.
Hadrian, a Cardinal, &c.
Jacettius [Francis Cataneus] an excellent Platonist.
Julius II, Pope.
Krantius [Albertus] a famous Historian.
Langius [Rodolph] Provost of the Cathedral Church of Munster.
Lewis XII, King of France.
Linacer [Thomas] an English Physician.
Machiavel [Nicolas] Secretary to the Republic of Florence.
Manard [John] a Physician.
Marianus [Raimond] a learned Frenchman.
Molla [Francis Maria] a Poet.
Majus [Marc] Greek Professor in the University of Padua.
Parrabusius [Janus] a Professor of the *Belles Lettres*.
Phædrus [Thomas] Professor of Eloquence at Rome.
Pomponatus [Peter] teacher of Philosophy at Padua.
Prierias [Sylvester] a Dominican.
Ritius [Michael] a Civilian.
Sylvius [Francis] Professor of Eloquence, &c. at Paris.
Simonetta [Hyacinthus] a brave and experienced soldier.
Stoferus [John] a famous Mathematician.
Thomæus [Nicolas Leonicus] a Professor in the University of Padua.
Valdes [John] a handsome young Spaniard.
Vigerius [Mark] a Cardinal, &c.
Zabarella [Francis] Archbishop of Florence, &c.
 1525 *Accursius* [Mariangelus] a Critic.
Adrichomia [Cornelia] a Nun.
Agricola [George] a German Physician.
Agricola [John] a Saxon Divine.
Agrippa [Henry Cornelius] a Physician.
Athalia [Martin] a Professor of Physic.
Alciatus

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE, &c.

[863]

<i>A. D.</i> <i>Alciatus</i> (Andrew) a great Civilian. <i>Alconius</i> (Peter) a learned Italian. <i>Aleander</i> (Jerome) a Cardinal. <i>Alfius</i> (Alexander) a famous Divine. <i>Alenflaig</i> (John) Doctor of Divinity. <i>Amajcus</i> (Romulus) Professor of Greek and Latin at Bologna. <i>Ammonius</i> (Livinus) a Carthusian. <i>Andronicus</i> (Tanaquillus) a teacher in the university of Leipzig. <i>Apianus</i> (Petrus) a German Mathematician. <i>Aqueus</i> (Stephen) Lord of Beauvais. <i>Aragon</i> (Joan of) wife to the Prince of Tagliocozi. <i>Astin</i> (Peter) a satirical writer. <i>Aventine</i> (John) an Annalist. <i>Avogallus</i> (Matthew) a Professor in the university of Wittenberg. <i>Balmis</i> (Abraham de) a Jewish Physician. <i>Bandel</i> (Matthew) a Dominican. <i>Barbara</i>, wife to the Emperor Sigismund. <i>Barbarus</i> (Daniel) author of some Commentaries. <i>Barnes</i> (Robert) Chaplain to Henry VIII, King of England. <i>Beda</i> (Noel) Doctor of Divinity, in the university of Paris. <i>Bellai</i> (William du) Lord of Languey. <i>Bellai</i> (John du) a Cardinal. <i>Bembus</i> (Peter) a Cardinal. <i>Berauld</i> (Nicolas) Tutor to Admiral de Coligny. <i>Bibliander</i> (Theodorus) Professor of Divinity at Zurich. <i>Bigot</i> (William) a Physician and Philosopher. <i>Blumberg</i> (Barbara) a Lady of a good family at Ratibon. <i>Boley or Bullen</i> (Anne) wife to Henry VIII, King of England. <i>Bombafius</i> (Paul) Secretary to Cardinal Pucci. <i>Bombert</i> (Daniel) a famous Printer. <i>Bore</i> (Catherine de) wife of Luther. <i>Bouchet</i> (John) a French author. <i>Brasavolus</i> (Antony Musa) a Physician and Professor at Ferrara. <i>Brodeus</i> (John) a learned Critic. <i>Budaeus</i> (William) a learned Frenchman. <i>Bunel</i> (Peter) a good Latin writer. <i>Barana</i> (John Francis) a Professor at Bologna. <i>Buto</i> (John) a famous Mathematician. <i>Casarius</i> (John) a Physician and Philosopher. <i>Caldarius</i> (John) a Professor of the Civil-Law. <i>Capeyus</i> (Scipio) a famous author. <i>Capifuccbi</i> (Paul) Canon of the Vatican. <i>Carian</i> (John) Professor of the Mathematics, in the university of Francfort. <i>Carmiliannus</i> (Peter) a Latin Poet. <i>Castellan</i> (Peter) great Almoner of France. <i>Ceratinus</i> (James) a good Grecian. <i>Changy</i> (Peter de) Eq; <i>Charles V</i>, Emperor, and King of Spain. <i>Chateau-Briand</i> (the Countess of) <i>Ciolek</i> (Erasmus) Bishop of Plocko. <i>Cochleus</i> (John) Doctor of Divinity. <i>Cordier</i> (Maturin) a Schoolmaster. <i>Coricius</i> (John) an encourager of learned men. <i>Cornelius</i> (Antony) Licentiate of the Civil-Law. <i>Dales</i> (Stephen) a learned Frenchman. <i>Dryander</i> (John) a Protestant martyr. <i>Driedo</i> (John) Doctor of Divinity. V O L. V.	<i>A. D.</i> <i>Durant</i> (Samuel) Minister of Cha-renton. <i>Egnatius</i> (John Baptist) a learned Ecclesiastic. <i>Emeri</i> (Sebastian) Advocate in the Parliament of Paris. <i>Emilius</i> (Paul) an Historian. <i>Eppendorf</i> (Henry) a German nobleman. <i>Erasmus</i> (Desiderius) a famous Latin author. <i>Eftampes</i> (Anne de Piffleu, Duchefs of) <i>Ferrariensis</i>, a Scholastic Philosopher, whose true name was Francis Sylvester. <i>Ferretus</i> (Æmilius) an able Civilian. <i>Ferus</i> (John) Warden of the Franciscans at Mentz. <i>Fevr of Etaples</i>, a learned Frenchman. <i>Finaw</i> (Orontius) Professor of Mathematics, in the royal college of Paris. <i>Flaminius</i> (Marc Antony) a Latin Poet. <i>Florimont</i> (Galeacius) Bishop of Sessia. <i>Francis I</i>, King of France. <i>Francis</i> (Sebastian) an Anabaptist. <i>Geldenbaur</i> (Gerard) a Monk, and afterwards a Protestant. <i>Gelenius</i> (Sigismund) corrector of a printing-house. <i>Gonzaga</i> (Eleonora) wife to Francis Maria de la Rovere, Duke of Urbino. <i>Gonzaga</i> (Julia) Duchefs of Trajetta, &c. <i>Gonzaga</i> (Lucretia) wife of John Paul Manfrone. <i>Grammont</i> (Gabriel de) a French Cardinal. <i>Graftis</i> (Paris de) Master of the Ceremonies under several Popes. <i>Grynæus</i> (Simon) a Professor of Greek at Heidelberg. <i>Guvvara</i> (Antony de) Preacher and Historiographer to Charles V. <i>Guicciardin</i> (Francis) the Historian. <i>Guindano</i> (Sigismund) a Poet. <i>Guise</i> (Claudius de Lorraine, Duke of) <i>Hadrian VI</i> (Pope). <i>Helvicus</i> (Christopher) Professor of Divinity in the university of Giefen. <i>Hochstratus</i> (James) a Dominican, &c. <i>Hoffman</i> (Melchior) a dogmatical Preacher. <i>Hortensius</i> (John) a Physician. <i>Hungary</i> (Mary Queen of) <i>Hungary</i> (Isabella Queen of) <i>Hungerus</i> (Wolfgang) a Civilian. <i>Hutten</i> (Ulric de) a Poet. <i>Jovius</i> (Paul) an Historian. <i>Justiniani</i> (Augustin) Bishop of Nebbio. <i>Lacifus</i> (Paul) a regular Canon of the congregation of Lateran. <i>Lambert</i> (Francis) a Franciscan Monk. <i>Landa</i> (Catherine) a learned Italian lady. <i>Langius</i> (Paul) a German Monk. <i>Leland</i> (John) Antiquary to Henry VIII. <i>Lemnius</i> (Lævinus) a famous Physician. <i>Leo X</i> (Pope) <i>Lizet</i> (Peter) first President in the Parliament of Paris. <i>Leyola</i> (Ignatius) founder of the Jesuits. <i>Lucidus</i> (John) author of a book of Chronology. <i>Luther</i> (Martin) a Reformer of the Church.	<i>A. D.</i> <i>Macrin</i> (Salmon) a Poet. <i>Majoragius</i> (Marc Antony) Professor of Eloquence at Milan. <i>Marot</i> (Clement) a French Poet. <i>Marulus</i> (Marcus) a Dalmatian author. <i>Melanchthon</i> (Philip) a famous Protestant author. <i>Micyllus</i> (James) a Professor at Francfort. <i>Mutius</i> (Huldric) Professor at Basil. <i>Navagiers</i> (Andrew) a noble Venetian. <i>Navarre</i> (Margaret de Valois, Queen of) <i>Nevisan</i> (John) an Italian Civilian. <i>Niphus</i> (Augustin) a celebrated Civilian. <i>Nonius</i> (Peter) a learned Portuguese. <i>Ochinus</i> (Bernardin) a Capuchin. <i>Oecolampadius</i> (John) one of the Reformers of the Church. <i>Padilla</i> (John de) one of the ring-leaders of a sedition in Spain. <i>Palingenius</i> (Marcellus) a Latin Poet. <i>Parthenai</i> (Anne de) wife of Antony de Pons, Count de Marennes. <i>Periers</i> (Bonaventure Des) Valet de Chambre to the Queen of Navarre. <i>Pigbius</i> (Albertus) a Sophistical writer. <i>Pin</i> (John du) Bishop of Rieux. <i>Pinet</i> (Antony du) Lord of Noroy. <i>Poitiers</i> (Diana de) mistress to Henry II, King of France. <i>Polydamus</i> (Valentinus) an Italian Physician. <i>Prat</i> (Antony du) Chancellor of France, &c. <i>Quiqueran</i> (Peter de) Bp. of Senez. <i>Régis</i> (Urban) a Lutheran Divine. <i>Ricius</i> (Paul) Professor of Rhetoric at Pavia. <i>Rorarius</i> (Hierome) Nuncio of Clement VII. <i>Rucellai</i> (John) a noble Florentine, and good Poet. <i>Sabius</i> (Fauftus) keeper of the Vatican library. <i>Sambiancai</i> (James de Beaume, Baron de) Superintendent of the Finances. <i>Schombert</i> (Nicolas of) Cardinal, &c. <i>Scherus</i> (Antony) a Grammarian. <i>Seymour</i> (Anne, Margaret, and Joan) three sisters illustrious for their learning in England. <i>Selve</i> (John de) first President in the Parliament of Paris. <i>Sforza</i> (Isabella) a learned woman. <i>Sylvius</i> (James) a famous Physician. <i>Socinus</i> (Marianus) a Professor of the Civil-Law. <i>Stifelinus</i> (Michael) a Lutheran Minister. <i>Sturmus</i> (James) famous for the deputations he performed. <i>Tapperus</i> (Ruardus) Professor of Divinity at Louvain. <i>Tartaglia</i> (Nicolas) a famous Mathematician. <i>Tiraquellus</i> (Andrew) a learned Frenchman. <i>Turrel</i> (Peter) Rector of the College of Dijon. <i>Valdes</i> (John) a Civilian. <i>Villamarini</i> (Isabella) wife to the Prince of Salerno. <i>Virgil</i> (Polydore) an Historian. <i>Volfus</i> (Paul) an Abbot. <i>Urfinus</i> (John) a French Physician. <i>Wechel</i> (Christian) a famous Printer. <i>Wida</i> (Hernan de) Archbishop of Cologne. <i>Wimpina</i> (Conrad) Professor of Divinity at Francfort.
---	---	---

[10 K]

Ziegler

A. D.		A. D.		A. D.	
1550	<i>Ziegler</i> (James) a Professor of Divinity.		<i>Grypius</i> (Sebastian) a famous Printer at Lyons.		<i>Radziwil</i> (Nicolas) Palatin of Vilna, &c.
	<i>Acronius</i> (James) a Philosopher, Civilian, and Divine.		<i>Guise</i> (Francis de Lorraine, Duke of).		<i>Ramus</i> [Peter] Royal Professor of Philosophy and Eloquence.
	<i>Acronius</i> (John) teacher of Mathematics, &c. at Basil.		<i>Hartungius</i> (John) Professor of the <i>Belles Lettres</i> at Friburg.		<i>Rafario</i> [John Baptist] an Italian Physician.
	<i>Adriani</i> (John Baptist) an Historian.		<i>Henry II</i> , King of France.		<i>Rattaler</i> [George] President of the Council of Utrecht.
	<i>Agricola</i> (Michael) a Lutheran Minister.		<i>Herold</i> (Basil John) a Protestant Minister and author.		<i>Rauber</i> [Andrew Eberhard] a German Knight.
	<i>Albamps</i> (Mark) a Cardinal.		<i>Hyperius</i> (Andrew Gerard) a Professor of Divinity.		<i>Richer</i> (Peter) a Carmelite, &c.
	<i>Albanerus</i> (Andrew) a Lutheran Minister.		<i>Hortensius</i> (Lambert) a learned Dutchman.		<i>Robert</i> (John) Professor of the Civil-Law in the university of Orleans.
	<i>Ambaisé</i> (Michael de) Esq.		<i>Huarte</i> (John) a Spanish author.		<i>Roban</i> (Renata de) wife of Francis de Rohan, Lord de Gié.
	<i>Amoy</i> (James) Bishop of Auxerre.		<i>Illyricus</i> (Matthias Flacius) a learned Protestant Divine.		<i>Ronsard</i> (Peter de) a French Poet.
	<i>Arumont</i> (Gabriel) an Ambassador of France, in the reign of Henry II.		<i>Julius III</i> (Pope).		<i>Rofe</i> (Mambrin) an Italian author.
	<i>Baduel</i> (Claudius) a learned author.		<i>Junius</i> (Hadrian) a Physician.		<i>Ruffianus</i> (Tiberius) a subtle Philosopher.
	<i>Baronius</i> (Dominic) a Florentine Priest.		<i>Knox</i> (John) a Scotch Reformer.		<i>Saint-Cyrt</i> , a brave soldier.
	<i>Baudouin</i> (Francis) a Civilian.		<i>Labe</i> (Loyla) a Courtisan of Lyons.		<i>Serbellone</i> (Gabriel) a great Captain.
	<i>Bellaun</i> (Remi) a French Poet.		<i>Leon</i> (Peter Cieqa de) a Spanish Historian.		<i>Serbellone</i> (Fabricius) brother to the foregoing.
	<i>Bertolier</i> (Philibert) Register, &c. at Geneva.		<i>Leovicus</i> (Cyprian) a famous Astronomer.		<i>Saubise</i> (John de Parthenai, Lord of) a zealous Protestant.
	<i>Billon</i> (Francis de) Secretary of William du Bellai.		<i>Lippoman</i> (Aloisio) a learned Prelate.		<i>Spifame</i> (James Paul) Bishop of Nevers.
	<i>Bonfadius</i> (James) Historiographer to the Republic of Genoa.		<i>Lismanin</i> (Francis) a Doctor of Divinity, &c.		<i>Stancarus</i> (Francis) a zealous promoter of the Reformed Religion in Poland.
	<i>Bononia</i> (John de) Archdeacon of Palermo.		<i>Longiano</i> (Faustus da) an Italian author.		<i>Strigelius</i> (Victorinus) a Protestant Divine.
	<i>Bonquin</i> (Peter) a Carmelite Fryer.		<i>Longvic</i> (Jaqueline de) Duchefs of Montpensier.		<i>Sturmus</i> (John) Rector of the college of Strasbourg.
	<i>Brette</i> (James de) a great warrior.		<i>Lotichius</i> (Peter) Abbot of the convent of Solitar.		<i>Sulacha</i> (Simon) a Nestorian Monk.
	<i>Braschius</i> (Gaspard) a Latin Poet.		<i>Lotichius</i> (Peter) surnamed Secundus, and nephew to the foregoing.		<i>Sufanneau</i> (Hubert) Doctor of Law and Physic.
	<i>Buchanan</i> (George) a famous Latin Poet, &c.		<i>Lotichius</i> (Christian) younger brother to the foregoing, and Vicar to the Abbey of Solitar.		<i>Taifhier</i> (John) a teacher of Mathematics.
	<i>Bullinger</i> (Henry) one of the Reformers of the Church.		<i>Maldemat</i> (John) a Priest of Burgos.		<i>Tauvau</i> (Renata) wife to Francis Rochechoiart, Lord of Tonny Charente.
	<i>Calvin</i> (John) Minister at Geneva.		<i>Marillac</i> (Charles de) Archbishop of Vienna.		<i>Tetti</i> (Scipio) a learned Neapolitan.
	<i>Caninius</i> (Angelus) a Grammarian.		<i>Marinello</i> (John) a Physician.		<i>Tillet</i> (John du) Protonotary and Secretary to the King, &c.
	<i>Casipucchi</i> (John Antony) a Cardinal by the title of St Pancrace.		<i>Marius</i> , surnamed <i>Aquicola</i> , an Italian author.		<i>Tillet</i> (John du) younger brother to the foregoing, and a learned Ecclesiastic.
	<i>Caraccioli</i> (John Antony) Bishop of Troyes.		<i>Martineghus</i> (Titus Prosper) a Benedictine.		<i>Truberus</i> (Primus) a Slavonian author.
	<i>Cardan</i> (Jerome) a Physician.		<i>Maffarius</i> (James) a Doctor of Physic.		<i>Tulenus</i> , a learned Frenchman.
	<i>Carranza</i> (Bartholomew) a Dominican.		<i>Maugin</i> (John) a French translator.		<i>Tuppis</i> (Laurence) a Civilian.
	<i>Cassali</i> (Sebastian) Professor of Greek at Basil.		<i>Madrevius</i> (Andrew Fricius) Secretary to the King of Poland.		<i>Valla</i> (Nicolas) Counsellor in the Parliament of Paris.
	<i>Cassaberto</i> (Lewis) a subtle writer.		<i>Menardus</i> (Nicolas) a Spanish Physician.		<i>Velfus</i> (Justus) Doctor of Physic.
	<i>Chabot</i> (Peter Gualtherus) a good Humanist.		<i>Martin</i> (Joachim) Professor of Divinity at Konigsberg.		<i>Vergerius</i> (Peter Paul) famous for his embassies, &c.
	<i>Chequet</i> (Lewis) a French Poet.		<i>Musculus</i> (Wolfgang) a famous Divine.		<i>Villagaignon</i> (Nicolas Durand de) a Knight of Malta.
	<i>Cipierre</i> (Philibert de Marcelli, Lord of).		<i>Musjo</i> (Cornelio) Bishop of Bitonto.		<i>Viret</i> (Peter) a Protestant Minister.
	<i>Clarus</i> (Julius) a Civilian.		<i>Nangeorgus</i> (Thomas) a Latin Poet.		<i>Weidnerus</i> (Paul) a Jewish Physician.
	<i>Couffe</i> (Gilbert) a Canon at Nozeret.		<i>Navarre</i> (Joan d'Albret, Queen of).		<i>Wistphalus</i> (Joachim) a Lutheran Minister.
	<i>Crespinus</i> (John) a famous Printer.		<i>Orichevius</i> (Stanislaus) a Polish gentleman.		<i>Wicelius</i> (George) a Divine.
	<i>Curio</i> (Caelius Secundus) a learned Piedmontois.		<i>Osarius</i> (Jerome) a Portuguese Prelate.		<i>Zanchius</i> (Basil) Keeper of the Vatican library.
	<i>Daurat</i> (John) a learned Humanist and Poet.		<i>Palearius</i> (Aonius) Professor of the <i>Belles Lettres</i> at Siena.		<i>Abdissi</i> , Patriarch of Mosul in Assyria.
	<i>Doni</i> (Antony Francis) an Italian author.		<i>Paré</i> (Ambrose) Surgeon to Francis II, King of France.		<i>Abelly</i> (Antony) Doctor of Divinity.
	<i>Donzellinus</i> (Jerome) an Italian Physician.		<i>Pariset</i> (Lewin) a Latin author.		<i>Accordis</i> (Stephen Tabourot, Lord of).
	<i>Esmendreville</i> (John du Bosc, Lord of).		<i>Patricius</i> (Andrew) Bp of Wenden.		<i>Acidalius</i> (Valens) Rector of the school at Bressaw.
	<i>Effé</i> (Andrew de Montalembert, Lord).		<i>Peraxylus</i> (whose true name was Arnoldus Arlenius) a great Grecian.		<i>Adrichemius</i> (Christian) a Dutch Priest.
	<i>Fauno</i> (Lucio) an Italian author.		<i>Pereira</i> (Gomefius) a Spanish Physician.		<i>Aguirre</i> (Michael de) a Civilian.
	<i>Fernelius</i> (John) a Physician.		<i>Piccolomini</i> (Alexander) Archbishop of Patras, &c.		<i>Ayraud</i> (Peter) Lieutenant-Criminal in the Prefidial Court of Angers.
	<i>Feron</i> (John le) Advocate in the Parliament of Paris.		<i>Piccolomini</i> (Francis) a famous Philosopher.		<i>Alakia</i> (Martin) Doctor of Physic of the Faculty of Paris.
	<i>Ferrara</i> (Renata of France, Duchefs of).		<i>Pienne</i> (Joan de Halluin) maid of honour to Catherine de Medicis.		<i>Alciatus</i> (John Paul) a gentleman of Milan.
	<i>Ferrier</i> (Arnau du) President of the Parliament of Paris.		<i>Place</i> (Peter de la) President in the court of Aids at Paris.		<i>Aldrovandus</i> (Ulyffes) Professor of Philosophy, &c. at Bologne.
	<i>Fancius</i> (John) a Lutheran preacher.		<i>Pointet</i> (John) Bishop of Winchester.		<i>Alibufius</i> (John) a Civilian.
	<i>Gallars</i> (Nicolas des) a Minister of Geneva.		<i>Pontius</i> (Constantine) preacher to Charles V.		
	<i>Gambara</i> (Laurence) a Latin Poet.		<i>Quintin</i> (John) Professor of the Canon-Law at Paris.		
	<i>Garnache</i> (Francis de Rohan, Lady de la).				
	<i>Gentilis</i> (John Valentinian) an Arian.				
	<i>Gratarolus</i> (William) a Physician.				
	<i>Gribaldus</i> (Matthew) a Civilian.				
	<i>Gropper</i> (John) a Cardinal.				
	<i>Grynæus</i> (Thomas) a Professor at Basil.				

A. D.	A. D.	A. D.
<i>Anania</i> [John Laurence d'] an Italian author.	<i>Ghabort</i> [Matthew de] President of the Inquests in the Parliament of Toulouse.	<i>Hospital</i> [Michael de l'] Chancellor of France.
<i>Angiolo</i> [Maria] an Historian.	<i>Charpentier</i> [Peter] a teacher of the Civil-Law.	<i>Hottman</i> [Francis] teacher of the Civil-Law.
<i>Antoniano</i> [Sylvio] a Cardinal.	<i>Charron</i> [Peter] a French author.	<i>Hunnius</i> [Giles] Doctor of Divinity.
<i>Arigoni</i> [Pompeio] a Cardinal.	<i>Chastel</i> [John] a famous Assassin.	<i>Jodelle</i> [Stephen] a French and Latin Poet.
<i>Arvera</i> [John d'] Counsellor in the Parliament of Bourdeaux.	<i>Cipierre</i> [Renatus de Savoie, Lord of]	<i>Joubertus</i> [Laurence] Counsellor and Physician in ordinary to Henry III, King of France.
<i>Audebert</i> [Germain] a Latin Poet.	<i>Clavius</i> [Christopher] a Jesuit.	<i>Junstin</i> [Francis] a Mathematician, &c.
<i>Auge</i> [Daniel d'] Greek Professor in the university of Paris.	<i>Cologne</i> [Peter de] Minister of Metz.	<i>Junius</i> [Francis] Professor of Divinity at Leyden.
<i>Austria</i> [Don John of] natural son to the Emperor Charles V.	<i>Corbinelli</i> [James] Preceptor to Henry III, King of France.	<i>Kilianus</i> [Cornelius] a corrector of the press.
<i>Babelot</i> , Chaplain to the Duke of Montpensier.	<i>Cotta</i> [Catellian] a Latin author.	<i>Koornbert</i> [Theodore] Secretary of the town of Haerlem.
<i>Bachovius</i> [Reinier] a Civilian.	<i>Croquet</i> [Peter] a Celestia Friar.	<i>Kuchlin</i> [John] a Minister and Professor of Divinity.
<i>Baius</i> [Michael] Professor of Divinity, at Louvain.	<i>Crispus</i> [John Baptist] a Divine and Poet.	<i>Languet</i> [Hubert] Counsellor to the Elector of Saxony.
<i>Barclay</i> [William] a learned Civilian.	<i>Criton</i> [James] a prodigious wit.	<i>Lafcius</i> [John] a Polish Gentleman.
<i>Barleus</i> [Melchior] a Latin Poet.	<i>Dalmatin</i> [George] a Lutheran Minister at Laubech.	<i>Latius</i> [John] a Schoolmaster.
<i>Baron</i> [Peter] Professor of Divinity, in the university of Cambridge.	<i>Dalmatin</i> [George] a Lutheran Minister in Upper Carniola.	<i>Launoy</i> [Matthew] a violent Leaguer.
<i>Basta</i> [Nicolas] an Officer in the Spanish service.	<i>Dante</i> [Ignatius] a Jacobin Monk.	<i>Laxxarilli</i> [N.] a Priest, and Provost of Miranda.
<i>Beaura Des Matras</i> [Maurice] chief Lieutenant of the Provostship of Angers.	<i>Dinotb</i> [Richard] an Historian.	<i>Lentulus</i> [Scipio] Minister of Chievonne.
<i>Beaucaire de Peguillon</i> [Francis] Bishop of Metz.	<i>Doneau</i> [Hugh] a Civilian.	<i>Leon</i> [Aloisio] Professor of Divinity in the university of Salamanca.
<i>Beaumont</i> [Francis de] Baron Des Adrets.	<i>Dresserus</i> [Matthew] Professor of Polite Learning, in the university of Leipzig.	<i>Leon</i> [Gonalez Pontius de] a Spanish author.
<i>Begat</i> [John] Counsellor in the Parliament of Dijon.	<i>Eimeric</i> [Nicolas] a Dominican.	<i>Leonclavius</i> [John] a learned German.
<i>Belliforsy</i> [Francis de] a French author.	<i>Eisingerius</i> [Martin] Doctor of Divinity.	<i>Leonin</i> [Elbret] Professor of the Civil-Law.
<i>Bene</i> , murderer of Admiral de Chatillon.	<i>Elizabeth</i> , Queen of England.	<i>Leri</i> [John de] a Protestant Minister.
<i>Bencius</i> [Francis de] an Italian author.	<i>Faucher</i> [Claude] first President of the Court of the Mint at Paris.	<i>Lydius</i> [Martin] Professor of Divinity at Franeker.
<i>Bernaldus</i> [Francis] Sieur de Verville.	<i>Fenardent</i> [Francis] a famous Franciscan.	<i>Liebaux</i> [John] a Physician.
<i>Bernaldus</i> [Matthew] Teacher of the Hebrew.	<i>Freigius</i> [John Thomas] Rector of the college of Altdorf.	<i>Lipfius</i> [Justus] a Great Critic.
<i>Berttram</i> [Cornelius Bonaventura] Hebrew Professor at Geneva.	<i>Fugger</i> [Hildric] Chamberlain to Pope Paul III.	<i>Limeuil</i> [Isabella de la Tour de Turenne Demoiselle de] maid of honour to Catherine de Medici.
<i>Beza</i> [Theodorus] a famous Protestant Minister.	<i>Furius</i> [Frederic] a learned Spaniard.	<i>Lyserus</i> [Polycarp] a famous Protestant Divine.
<i>Belli</i> [James de] an Abbot.	<i>Galls</i> [Peter] a learned Spaniard.	<i>Lwinus</i> [John] a Chanter and Canon at Antwerp.
<i>Blandrata</i> [George] a Physician.	<i>Gallatius</i> [John Paul] an Italian Astronomer.	<i>Lorme</i> [Philibert de] a famous Architect.
<i>Bodin</i> [John] a learned author.	<i>Gardie</i> [Pontus de la] Great Marshal of the armies of Sweden.	<i>Louet</i> [George] a Counsellor of the Parliament of Paris.
<i>Boi</i> , a famous player at Chess.	<i>Gedicus</i> [Simon] Doctor of Divinity, and Minister at Magdeburg.	<i>Magius</i> [Jerome] a famous Engineer.
<i>Boiffard</i> [John James] Governour to the Baron of Clermont's Children.	<i>Gentilis</i> [Alberic] Professor of Civil-Law at Oxford.	<i>Mabomet</i> [Galadin] Emperor of Mogol.
<i>Bolfe</i> [Jerome] an abusive writer.	<i>Gentillet</i> [Innocent] a Civilian.	<i>Maldonat</i> [John] a Spanish Jesuit.
<i>Borgarnius</i> [Proper] an Italian Physician.	<i>Gifanitus</i> [Obertus] a good Humanist and Civilian.	<i>Malherbe</i> [Francis de] a French Poet.
<i>Bosquet</i> [George] an Advocate in the Parliament of Paris.	<i>Golius</i> [Theophilus] Professor of Ethics at Strasbourg.	<i>Margunius</i> [Maximus] Bishop of Cythera.
<i>Bossu</i> [James le] Doctor of Divinity, in the university of Paris.	<i>Gontaus</i> [Armand de] Baron de Birou.	<i>Mariana</i> [John] a Jesuit and Historian.
<i>Bosfulus</i> [Matthew] a great Orator.	<i>Gorlaeus</i> [Abraham] a man curious in collecting medals.	<i>Martellus</i> [Hugolin] Bishop of Glan-deves.
<i>Botal</i> [Leonard] Physician to Henry III, King of France.	<i>Gostlini</i> [Julian] Secretary to several persons of a high rank.	<i>Mofa</i> [Tarquinea] an eminent Italian lady.
<i>Botero</i> [John] tutor to the Duke of Savoy's children.	<i>Gregory</i> [Peter] a learned author.	<i>Montanensis</i> [Henry de] King's Professor of Mathematics at Paris.
<i>Boucher</i> [John] Doctor of the Sorbonne.	<i>Grillon</i> , a valiant gentleman of Provence.	<i>Momin</i> [John Edward du] a French Poet.
<i>Bouchet</i> [William] Sieur de Brocourt.	<i>Guarini</i> [Baptist] author of the Pastor Fido.	<i>Montecatini</i> [Antony] Professor of Philosophy at Ferrara.
<i>Braun</i> [George] Archdeacon of Dortmund, &c.	<i>Gaignard</i> [John] a Jesuit.	<i>Mont-joseph</i> [Lewis de] an excellent antiquary.
<i>Brocardus</i> [James] an Apocryphical writer.	<i>Guise</i> [Henry de Lorraine, Duke of]	<i>Navarre</i> [Margaret de Valois, Queen of]
<i>Brutus</i> [Jordanus] a Philosopher.	<i>Hacket</i> [William] an English Fanatic.	<i>Nipbus</i> [Fabius] Professor of practical Physic at Padua.
<i>Brutus</i> [John Michael] a learned author.	<i>Hay</i> [John] a Scotch Jesuit.	<i>Offat</i> [Arnaud d'] a Cardinal.
<i>Bufoquius</i> [Augerius Giffenius, Lord of]	<i>Haillan</i> [Bernard de Girard, Lord of] Historiographer of France.	<i>Pacard</i> [George] Minister at Rochefoucaut.
<i>Canicous</i> [James] author of a romance.	<i>Hall</i> [Richard] an English Divine.	<i>Pacheco</i> [Alvarez] a Spanish Colonel.
<i>Capilupus</i> [Camillus] author of a book called <i>The Strategem</i> .	<i>Harchius</i> [Jodochus] a Physician.	<i>Pareus</i> [David] a Reformed Divine.
<i>Capitucchi</i> [Blasius] Marquis of Monterio, &c.	<i>Hardenberg</i> [Albert] a Protestant Divine.	<i>Parthenai</i> [Catherine de] wife to Renatus de Rohan, the second of the name.
<i>Carbon</i> [Lewis] Professor of Divinity at Perugia.	<i>Hemmingius</i> [Nicolas] Professor of Divinity at Copenhagen.	
<i>Caurres</i> [John des] principal of the college of Amiens.	<i>Henry</i> III, King of France.	
<i>Caraf</i> [Tiberius] an Advocate.	<i>Helbusius</i> [Telemannus] a Divine of the Augburg confession.	
<i>Cesalpinus</i> [Andrew] a Professor at Pisa.	<i>Hoffman</i> [Daniel] Superintendent and Professor at Helmstadt.	
	<i>Hofius</i> [James] Professor of Physic in the university of Helmstadt.	
	<i>Hofius</i> [Stanislaus] a Cardinal.	

Pafibali

A. D.	A. D.	A. D.
<i>Paschali</i> [Giulio Cesare] an Italian Poet. <i>Patricius</i> [Francis] Bishop of Gaeta. <i>Peckius</i> [Peter] Professor of Canon-Law at Louvain. <i>Perrot</i> [Nicolas] an Italian author. <i>Pezzelius</i> [Christoph] Professor of Divinity at Bremen. <i>Pincier</i> [John] a Protestant Minister. <i>Pistorius</i> [John] Doctor of Physic. <i>Poncet</i> [Maurice] Doctor of Divinity. <i>Puccius</i> (Francis) a Protestant Divine. <i>Quellenec</i> [Charles de] Baron of Pont, &c. <i>Raphelengius</i> [Francis] Professor of Hebr. in the university of Leyden. <i>Rapin</i> [Nicolas] a Provost-Marshal and Poet. <i>Remond</i> [Florimond de] Counsellor in the Parliament of Bourdeaux. <i>Rhodoman</i> [Laurence] Professor of History in the university of Wirtemberg. <i>Rochefoucauld</i> [Alexander de la] Abbot of St Martin. <i>Rofe</i> [William] Bishop of Senlis. <i>Rofier</i> [Hugh Bureau du] a famous Minister of the Church of Orleans. <i>Rotan</i> [John Baptist] Minister of Rochelle. <i>Rua</i> [Peter] a learned Spaniard. <i>Ruggeri</i> [Cosmo] Abbot of St Mahé. <i>Sabellius</i> [Marc Antony Cocceius] an Historian. <i>Sacratas</i> [Paul] a Canon of Ferrara. <i>Saint-Aldgonde</i> [Philip de Marnix, Lord du Mont]. <i>Santa-Croce</i> [Prosper] Cardinal. <i>Sanctifus</i> [Claudius] Bp of Evreux. <i>Sanders</i> [Nicolas] an English Priest. <i>Sarnanus</i> [Constantius] a Cardinal. <i>Schilling</i> [Christopher] Rector of the college of Heidelberg. <i>Schomburg</i> [Theodorus of] a brave soldier. <i>Schomburg</i> [Gasper de] Count of Nantueil. <i>Schultingius</i> [Cornelius] a Licentiate in Divinity, &c. <i>Schutze</i> [John] a Lutheran Minister. <i>Scribonius</i> [William Adolphus] a German Physician and Philosopher. <i>Simonides</i> [Simon] a good Latin Poet. <i>Simonius</i> [Simon] a Physician and Philosopher. <i>Socinus</i> [Faustus] founder of a sect that goes by his name. <i>Spina</i> [John de] a Protestant Minister. <i>Spinosa</i> [John de] a Spaniard of great abilities. <i>Spondanus</i> [John de] Lieutenant-General to the Prefidial of Rochelle. <i>Stevin</i> [Simon] an excellent Mathematician. <i>Strozzi</i> [Philip] son to Peter Strozzi, Marshal of France. <i>Surgier</i> [Francis] a Friar. <i>Taffo</i> [Torquato] a famous Italian Poet. <i>Taurelius</i> [Nicolas] a Physician and Philosopher. <i>Texera</i> [Joseph] a Portuguese Friar. <i>Ypotius</i> [James] a Civilian. <i>Tyffander</i> [N.] a French author. <i>Torelli</i> [Pomponio] Count of Montechiarugola. <i>Tori</i> [Jeffery] King's Printer at Paris. <i>Toucheb</i> [Mary] mistress to Charles IX, King of France. <i>Valerius</i> [Augustin] Cardinal. <i>Valle</i> [Rolandus] an Italian Civilian.	<i>Verforis</i> [Peter de] Lord of Fontenai le Visconte, &c. <i>Villavicentius</i> [Laurence] preacher to Philip II, King of Spain. <i>Ulfeld</i> [James] a Danish Senator, &c. <i>Urfinus</i> [Zachary] a famous reformed Divine. <i>Urfus</i> [Nicolas Raimarus] author of some Astronomical tracts. <i>Vukanius</i> [Bonaventura] Greek Professor in the university of Leyden. <i>Xylander</i> [William] Professor of the Greek tongue at Heidelberg. <i>Zabaralla</i> [James] a Professor in the university of Padua. <i>Zanchius</i> [Jerome] a famous Protestant Divine. <i>Zarlino</i> [Joseph] an excellent Musician. <i>Accarisi</i> (Francis) a Civilian. <i>Adam</i>, Archdeacon of the Patriarchal Chamber, and Superior of the Monks of Chaldaea. <i>Akasia</i> (Martin) Doctor of Physic at Paris. <i>Alabaster</i> (William) an English Divine. <i>Alcasar</i> (Lewis de) a Spanish Jesuit. <i>Amboise</i> (Francis d') an Advocate, &c. <i>Amboise</i> (Adrian d') Bishop of Freguier. <i>Amboise</i> (James d') Doctor of Physic. <i>Arminius</i> (James) Professor of Divinity at Leyden. <i>Arnauld</i> (Anthony) Advocate in the Parliament of Paris. <i>Arriaga</i> (Robert d') a Spanish Jesuit. <i>Baldus</i> (Bernardin) Abbot of Guastalla. <i>Bandole</i> (Anthony de) Advocate in the Parliament of Provence. <i>Barclay</i> (John) a Latin author. <i>Basta</i>, a famous General. <i>Bauderon</i> (Brice) a French Physician. <i>Baudius</i> (Dominic) Professor of History in the university of Leyden. <i>Bautrus des-Matras</i> (John) Mayor of Angers. <i>Bellarmin</i> (Robert) a Cardinal. <i>Beley</i> (Peter de) Advocate-General in the Parliament of Toulouse. <i>Beni</i> (Paul) Professor of Eloquence in the university of Padua. <i>Berauld</i> (Michael) Minister, and afterwards Professor of Divinity at Montauban. <i>Bergier</i> (Nicolas) an Advocate. <i>Boccalini</i> (Trajan) an Italian author. <i>Bocbius</i> (John) a Latin Poet, &c. <i>Bonciarius</i> (Marc Antony) a school-master at Perugia. <i>Bongars</i> (James) famous for his Embassies, &c. <i>Botereius</i> (Rodolphus) Advocate in the grand Council at Paris. <i>Breault</i> (Charles de) a Norman gentleman. <i>Broughton</i> (Hugh) an English Divine. <i>Broffer</i> (Martha) a woman that pretended to be possessed with a Devil. <i>Bustomantinus</i> [John] a Professor in the university of Alcalá. <i>Caget</i> (Peter Victor Palma) Doctor of Divinity in the Faculty of Paris. <i>Camden</i> (William) an Historian. <i>Caribagena</i> (John) a Jesuit, and afterwards a Franciscan. <i>Chamier</i> (Daniel) a famous Protestant Divine. <i>Chefne</i> [Joseph du] Sieur de la Vallette. <i>Ciconia</i> [Flaminius] a Philosopher. <i>Concini</i> [Concino] known by the name of Marshal d'Ancre.	<i>Cremontinus</i> [Cesar] Professor of Philosophy at Padua. <i>Criton</i> [George] Greek Professor in the royal college at Paris. <i>Criton</i> [William] a Jesuit. <i>Dailly</i> [John] minister of the church of Paris. <i>Dandini</i> [Jerome] a Jesuit. <i>Dausqueius</i> [Claudius] Canon of Tournay. <i>Dempster</i> [Thomas] a Schoolmaster. <i>Dryfus</i> [John] Hebrew Professor in the university of Franeker. <i>Elieb</i> [Lewis Philip] a German author. <i>Elmenhorst</i> [Geverhart] a learned Hamburguefe. <i>Emmuis</i> [Urbo] a Professor at Groningen. <i>Eremita</i> [Daniel] Secretary to the Duke of Florence. <i>Feitibus</i> [Everard] a learned Dutchman. <i>Fenoillet</i> [Peter] Bishop of Montpellier. <i>Ferrier</i> [Jeremiah] Professor of Divinity at Nismes. <i>Frachetta</i> [Jerome] a Political writer. <i>Gaigneur</i> [William le] a man who excelled in the art of writing. <i>Galligay</i> [Leonora] wife of the Marshal d'Ancre. <i>Gallenius</i> [Anthony] a priest of the Oratory of Rome. <i>Gamen</i> [Christopher de] a French author. <i>Gentilis</i> [Scipio] Professor of the Civil-Law at Altorf. <i>Gemarus</i> [Francis] a Professor of Divinity. <i>Gontaut</i> [Charles de] Duke of Biron. <i>Goulart</i> [Simon] Minister of Geneva. <i>Gournay</i> [Mary de Jars de] a learned Frenchwoman. <i>Grain</i> [Baptist le] an Historian. <i>Grauwerny</i> [Albert] a Doctor of Divinity. <i>Gretferus</i> [James] a Jesuit. <i>Gruterus</i> [Janus] a learned Philologist. <i>Guaguin</i> [Alexander] Governor of the fortress of Witschk in Poland. <i>Guise</i> [Lewis de Lorraine, Cardinal de]. <i>Hacker</i> [James] Professor of Divinity at Friburg. <i>Hamelar</i> [John] a Canon of Antwerp. <i>Henry IV</i>, King of France. <i>Herlicius</i> [David] a Philosopher, &c. <i>Hervart</i> [John George] Chancellor of Bavaria. <i>Hæschelius</i> [Dav.] Rector of St Anne's college at Augsbuurg. <i>Hospinian</i> [Rodolphus] a Swiss author. <i>Hutterus</i> [Leonard] Professor of Divinity at Wittemberg. <i>Jemischius</i> [Paul] a learned Flemish man. <i>Jonas Arngimas</i>, a learned Islander. <i>Jungerman</i> [Godfrey] a corrector of the press. <i>Kackerman</i> [Bartholomew] Professor of Philosophy at Dantzick. <i>Keller</i> [James] a Jesuit. <i>Kormannus</i> [Henry] a German Civilian. <i>Labourlote</i> [Claudius] a brave Captain. <i>Langius</i> [Joseph] Professor of Mathematics, &c. at Friburg. <i>Laurens</i> [Andrew du] Professor of Physic in the university of Montpellier.

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE, &c.

[867]

A. D.		A. D.		A. D.	
	<i>Lingelheim</i> [George Michael] Preceptor, and afterwards Counsellor to the Elector Palatine.	1625	<i>Wouwer</i> [John de] Counsellor to the Duke of Holstein.		<i>Blondel</i> [David] a Protestant Minister.
	<i>Lorne</i> [N. de] a French Physician.		<i>Arfens</i> [Francis] Lord of Someldyck, and Spyck, &c.		<i>Borfel</i> [Adolphus de] a German gentleman.
	<i>Loyer</i> [Peter le] Counsellor in the Presidial Court of Angers.		<i>Abbot</i> [George] Archbishop of Canterbury.		<i>Bofe</i> [N. du] a Franciscan.
	<i>Lubert</i> [Sibrand] Professor of Divinity at Franeker.		<i>Abbot</i> [Robert] Bishop of Sarum.		<i>Bouchin</i> [Stephen] Counsellor and King's Attorney in the Royal Courts of Beaune in Burgundy.
	<i>Lubin</i> [Eilhard] Professor of Poetry, and afterwards of Divinity in the university of Rostoc.		<i>Abram</i> [Nicolas] a Jesuit.		<i>Braunbom</i> [Frederic] a Protestant author.
	<i>Maccius</i> [Sebastian] a learned Humanist.		<i>Accarifi</i> [James] Doctor of Divinity.		<i>Brezi</i> [the Marshal de] and <i>Brezi</i> [Armand de Maille] his only son.
	<i>Magnus</i> [John Antony] Professor of Mathematics in the university of Bologna.		<i>Acofa</i> [Uriel] a Portuguese gentleman.		<i>Bervius</i> [Abraham] a Dominican.
	<i>Martinella</i> [Lucretia] a Venetian lady.		<i>Acuna</i> [Christopher] a Spanish Jesuit.		<i>Cameron</i> [John] a famous Protestant Divine.
	<i>Marnix</i> [John de] Baron des Potes.		<i>Adam</i> [Melchior] Rector of a college at Heidelberg.		<i>Capriata</i> [Peter John] a Civilian and Historian.
	<i>Matman</i> [Rodolphus] a Jesuit.		<i>Agrada</i> [Mary de] a religious visionary.		<i>Causin</i> [Nicolas] a Jesuit.
	<i>Mendoza</i> [John Gonfales de] an Augustin Friar.		<i>Airault</i> [Renatus] a Jesuit.		<i>Cerjantes</i> , a Swedish Resident at Paris.
	<i>Montgailard</i> [Bernard de] Abbot of Orval.		<i>Alamos</i> [Balthazar] a Civilian.		<i>Charnaie</i> [the Baron de].
	<i>Magne</i> [Roberta] a learned Protestant lady.		<i>Alciatus</i> [Terence] an Italian Jesuit.		<i>Croius</i> [John] a Protestant Minister.
	<i>Narni</i> , an Italian Capuchin.		<i>Aldringer</i> , a famous General.		<i>Dicu</i> [Lewis de] Minister of Leyden.
	<i>Newton</i> [Adam] Dean of Salisbury.		<i>Alexander</i> [Jerome] Secretary to Cardinal Octavio Bandini.		<i>Digby</i> [Sir Kenelm] an English gentleman.
	<i>Pineau</i> [Severin] a Surgeon.		<i>Alogambus</i> [Philip] a Jesuit.		<i>Donaldson</i> [Walter] Principal of the college of Sedan.
	<i>Pineau</i> [Gabriel du] Counsellor in the Presidial of Angers.		<i>Allatius</i> [Leo] Librarian of the Vatican.		<i>Druslicki</i> [Gaspar] a Polish Jesuit.
	<i>Pinsfon</i> [Francis] Professor of the Civil-Law at Bourges.		<i>Alstedius</i> [John Henry] a German Divine.		<i>Elickman</i> [John] a Physician.
	<i>Pitiscus</i> [Bartholomew] Preacher to the Elector Palatine.		<i>Altingius</i> [Henry] Professor of Divinity at Heidelberg.		<i>Emilius</i> [Antony] Professor of History in the university of Utrecht.
	<i>Plantvoit-la-Paule</i> [John] Bishop of Lodeve.		<i>Amama</i> [Sixtinus] Hebrew Professor in the university of Franeker.		<i>Episcopius</i> , a learned Arminian.
	<i>Politian</i> [Giovanni Angelo] teacher of Logic.		<i>Amesius</i> [William] Professor of Divinity at Franeker.		<i>Espagne</i> [John d'] Minister of the French Church in London.
	<i>Politian</i> [Antony Laurentin] Professor of Logic in the university of Pisa.		<i>Amyraut</i> [Moses] Minister and Professor of Divinity at Saumur.		<i>Espagnet</i> [John d'] President of the Parliament of Bourdeaux.
	<i>Puteanus</i> [Erycius] Historiographer to his Catholic Majesty.		<i>Aquinas</i> [Philip] a converted Jew.		<i>Essars</i> [Charlotte des] wife of the Marshal de l'Hospital.
	<i>Refuge</i> [du] author of a treatise on the court.		<i>Archireta</i> [Alexander] an Abbot.		<i>Fakreddin</i> , Prince of the Drufians in Syria.
	<i>Remon</i> [John de] Counsellor and Physician to Henry IV, King of France.		<i>Arnauld d'Andilly</i> [Robert] eldest son of Anthony Arnauld the Advocate.		<i>Farel</i> [William] a Protestant Minister.
	<i>Rinuccini</i> [Ottavio] gentleman of the bed-chamber to Henry IV.		<i>Arniens</i> [Henningus] Professor of Physic in the university of Helmstadt.		<i>Farnaby</i> [Thomas] a learned Philologist.
	<i>Rocco</i> [Girolamo] a great master in the art of writing.		<i>Arfenius</i> , a Greek Monk.		<i>Faucbeur</i> [Michael le] a Protestant Minister.
	<i>Rubenus</i> [Leonard] a Benedictine.		<i>Aubertin</i> [Edmund] Minister of the Church of Paris.		<i>Ferrand</i> [James] Doctor of Physic.
	<i>Sanchex</i> [Francis] a Physician.		<i>Audiguier</i> [N. d'] a French author.		<i>Ferri</i> [Paul] a learned Divine.
	<i>Sanchex</i> [Thomas] a Spanish Jesuit.		<i>Bacon</i> [Francis] Lord High-Chancellor of England.		<i>Fevret</i> [Charles] Advocate in the Parliament of Dijon.
	<i>Scot</i> [Reginald] an English gentleman.		<i>Bagni</i> [John Francis] a Cardinal.		<i>Forbes</i> [Patrick] Bishop of Aberdeen, and
	<i>Scalutus</i> [Abraham] author of several books.		<i>Balzac</i> [John Lewis Guez, Sieur de].		<i>Forbes</i> [John] his son.
	<i>Segla</i> [William de, Sieur de Cayras] Counsellor in the Parliament of Toulouse.		<i>Baranxon</i> [Redemptus] a Barnabite Friar.		<i>Forbes</i> [William] Bishop of Edinburgh.
	<i>Smiglecius</i> [Martin] a Jesuit.		<i>Barleus</i> [Gaspar] Professor of Physic at Amsterdam.		<i>Gallutius</i> [Tarquin] a Jesuit.
	<i>Stappa</i> [John Nicolas] Professor of Physic at Basil.		<i>Barleus</i> [Lambert] Greek Professor in the university of Leyden.		<i>Gamache</i> [Philip] Doctor of the Sorbonne.
	<i>Sutcliffe</i> [Matthew] an English Divine.		<i>Barnes</i> [John] an English Benedictine.		<i>Garaffe</i> [Francis] a Jesuit.
	<i>Kal</i> [John du] a Physician.		<i>Barbius</i> [Gaspar] a famous author.		<i>Garijoles</i> [Antony] Professor of Divinity at Montauban.
	<i>Valdes</i> [James] an Advocate at Valladolid.		<i>Bastoge</i> [Benjamin] Minister of Charenton.		<i>Gillet</i> [Peter] a Protestant Minister.
	<i>Verferus</i> [Mark] a learned Civilian.		<i>Baudier</i> [Michael] a French author.		<i>Gioachino</i> [Greco] a famous player at Chess.
	<i>Volkilius</i> [John] a Socinian Minister.		<i>Bautru</i> [William] Count de Serant, and		<i>Goldast</i> [Melchior Haiminsfeld] a learned Calvinist.
	<i>Verfius</i> [Conrad] a Professor of Divinity.		<i>Bautru</i> [Nicolas] Count de Nogent, his brother.		<i>Gombauld</i> [John Ogier de] a French Poet.
	<i>Usher</i> [Henry] Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland.		<i>Bedell</i> [William] Bishop of Kilmore.		<i>Goelens</i> [David] a learned Dutchman.
	<i>Windick</i> [John Paul] Doctor of Divinity.		<i>Belot</i> [N.] Advocate in the King's Privy-Council.		<i>Gouls</i> [John] General of the Feuillants.
	V O L. V.		<i>Berigardus</i> [Claudius] Professor of Philosophy at Pisa.		<i>Gouts</i> [Jerome] a Physician of the Faculty of Paris.
			<i>Bernillo</i> [Peter de] Cardinal.		<i>Gramond</i> [Gabriel Bartholomew de] President in the Parliament of Toulouse.

[10 L]

Gramont

A. D.	A. D.	A. D.
<i>Gramont</i> [Scipio de] Lord of St Germain. <i>Grandier</i> [Urban] Curate and Canon of London. <i>Grævius</i> [John] an Arminian Minister. <i>Grutius</i> [Hugo] a famous author. <i>Gruterus</i> [Peter] a Physician. <i>Grypblander</i> [John] Doctor of the Civil-Law. <i>Guadagnolo</i> [Philip] Reader of Arabic and Chaldee at Rome. <i>Guebriant</i> [Renata du Bec] widow of the Marshal de Guebriant. <i>Guimené</i> [the Princes of]. <i>Guise</i> [Charles de Lorraine, Duke of]. <i>Guyet</i> [Francis] a great Critic. <i>Hall</i> [Joseph] Bishop of Norwich. <i>Heraldis</i> [Defiderius] Advocate in the Parliament of Paris. <i>Hoe</i> [Matthias] a famous Lutheran Minister. <i>Hoelzelin</i> [Jeremiah] Greek Professor in the university of Leyden. <i>Horsius</i> [Gregory] first Physician of the city of Ulm. <i>Hortensius</i> [Martin] Professor of Mathematics at Amsterdam. <i>Hospital</i> [Francis de l'] Marshal of France. <i>Jansenius</i> [Cornelius] Bishop of Ipres. <i>Jérôme</i> [Peter] a Jesuit. <i>Joussier</i> [N.] a French author. <i>Juchet</i> [Melchior] a Jesuit. <i>Jungmann</i> [Lewis] an excellent Botanist. <i>Junius</i> [Francis] son to the above-mentioned Francis Junius. <i>Kepler</i> [John] a great Astronomer. <i>Keller</i> [Andrew] a Lutheran Divine. <i>Kircher</i> [John] a profelyte to the Church of Rome. <i>Kirchman</i> [John] a famous author. <i>Knot</i> [Edward] an English Jesuit. <i>Kosterus</i> [Christopher] a Fanatic. <i>Kyriander</i> [William] a German Civilian. <i>Langle</i> [John Maximilian de] a Protestant Minister. <i>Lanbergius</i> [Philip] a Mathematician. <i>Lescarbot</i> [Mark] an Advocate. <i>Louis</i> XIII, King of France. <i>Lingendes</i> [Claudius de] a Jesuit. <i>Lingendes</i> [John de] a celebrated Preacher. <i>Loges</i> [Mary Bruneau, Lady des]. <i>Longomontanus</i> [Christian] Professor of Mathematics at Copenhagen. <i>Loticus</i> [John Peter] a Physician. <i>Lugo</i> [Francis de] a Spanish Jesuit, and <i>Lugo</i> [John de] his brother; a Jesuit and Cardinal. <i>Lydiat</i> [Thomas] an English author. <i>Linde</i> [Sir Humphry] an English gentleman. <i>Maets</i> [Charles de] Professor of Divinity at Utrecht. <i>Magni</i> [Valerian] a Capuchin. <i>Mayerus</i> [Theodorus Turquet, Sieur de] a Physician. <i>Makowski</i> [John] Professor of Divinity at Franeker. <i>Marefs</i> [John des] Sieur de St Sorlin, and <i>Marefs</i> [Roland des] his elder brother. <i>Marillac</i> [Lewis de] Marshal of France.	<i>Mascardi</i> [Augustin] Chamberlain to Pope Urban VIII. <i>Meynier</i> [Honoratus de] a French author. <i>Mesplede</i> [Lewis] a French Dominican. <i>Mestreaz</i> [John] a Minister of the Church of Paris. <i>Mexiriac</i> [Claudius Gaspar Bachet, Lord of]. <i>Micraeus</i> [John] Professor of Divinity at Stetin. <i>Millietiers</i> [Theophilus Brachet, Sieur de la] a Lawyer, and afterwards a Divine. <i>Monferrat</i> [Montanus Michael] a Spanish Protestant. <i>Montmaur</i> [Peter de] Professor of the Greek tongue in the College Royal of Paris. <i>Morgues</i> [Matthew de] Sieur de St Germain. <i>Morinus</i> [John Baptist] Physician and Royal Professor of Mathematics at Paris. <i>Motte-Aignon</i> [James de la] a French author. <i>Moulin</i> [Peter du] a famous Protestant Minister. <i>Musac</i>, a gentleman of Burgundy. <i>Mustapha</i>, Emperor of the Turks. <i>Neuffermain</i> [Lewis de] a French Poet. <i>Nibysius</i> [Barthold] a famous Divine. <i>Oginiski</i> [Charles] a gentleman of Lithuania. <i>Oholki</i> [Simon] a Dominican. <i>Oregias</i> [Augustin] a great Philosopher. <i>Ozman</i>, Emperor of the Turks. <i>Ottoboni</i> [Peter] Pope under the name of Alexander VIII. <i>Padilla</i> [Louisa de] Countess d'A-randa. <i>Pallaovicino</i> [Ferrante] a satirical author. <i>Paravicin</i> [Vincent] a Protestant Minister. <i>Pareus</i> [Philip] a Grammarian, and <i>Pareus</i> [Daniel] his son. <i>Pajor</i> [Matthias] Professor of Divinity at Groningen. <i>Peyre</i> [James d'Auzoles] a ridiculous author. <i>Peyres</i> [Nicolas Claudius Fabri, Lord of]. <i>Petravius</i> [Dionysius] a Jesuit. <i>Prideaux</i> [John] Bp of Winchester. <i>Racan</i> [Honorat de Beuil, Marquis de]. <i>Raynaud</i> [Theophilus] a Jesuit. <i>Reibing</i> [James] Professor of Divinity at Tubingen. <i>Reinefsus</i> [Thomas] a Physician. <i>Ryer</i> [Andrew du] Sieur de Malezair. <i>Rittangelus</i> [John Stephen] a converted Jew. <i>Rohan</i> [Anne de] sister to the Duke of Rohan. <i>Roreno</i> [Marco Aurelio] Grand Prior of St Roc at Turenne. <i>Ruarus</i> [Martin] a Socinian Minister. <i>Saint-Cyran</i> [John du Verger de Hauranne, Abbot of]. <i>Sancta-Clara</i> [Francis of] an English Franciscan. <i>Sanjon</i> [James] a barefooted Carmelite. <i>Saporita</i> [Antony] Royal Professor of Physic in the university of Montpellier. <i>Scheiblerus</i> [Christopher] Superintendent of the Church, and Rector of the College at Dortmund.	<i>Schiller</i> [Elias] author of a book of Controversy. <i>Schomburg</i> [Henry de] a Marshal of France. <i>Simon</i> [Theodorus] famous for frequently changing his religion. <i>Soubise</i> [Benjamin de Rohan, Duke of]. <i>Sozomenus</i> [John] a Civilian. <i>Spanheim</i> [Frederic] Professor of Divinity at Leyden. <i>Strozzi</i> [Philip] a zealous republican in Florence. <i>Theron</i> [Vital] a French Jesuit. <i>Thomas</i> [Paul] Sieur de Girac. <i>Trifan l'Hermite</i> [Francis] Gentleman in Ordinary to the Duke of Orleans. <i>Tronchin</i> [Theodore] a Minister and Professor of Divinity. <i>Vedelius</i> [Nicolas] a noted reformed Divine. <i>Villareal</i> [Emmanuel Fernandes] Consul for the Portuguese nation at Rouen. <i>Vinay</i> [Alexander de] Minister of the Reformed Church of Annonay. <i>Vorbius</i> [William Henry] Minister of the Arminian congregation at Warmond. <i>Usher</i> [James] Archbp of Armagh. <i>Wart</i> [John de] a great warrior. <i>Wilhem</i> [David le-Loe de] Counsellor in the Council of the Princes of Orange. <i>Abelby</i> [Lewis] Bishop and Earl of Rhodes. <i>Acheri</i> [Lukae de] a Benedictine of the congregation of St Maur. <i>Adam</i> [John] a Jesuit. <i>Aituma</i> [Leo de] Resident for the Haas-towns at the Hague. <i>Altingius</i> [James] Professor of Divinity at Groningen. <i>Ancillon</i> [David] a Protestant Minister. <i>Andreas</i> [Tobias] Professor of History, &c. at Groningen. <i>Angus</i> [Thomas] an English Priest. <i>Annas</i> [Francis] Confessor to Lewis XIV. <i>Anselm</i>, a barefooted Augustine. <i>Antonie</i> [James] Knight of the Order of St James, and Canon of Seville. <i>Apriso</i> [Angelico] a learned Italian. <i>Apriso</i> [Paulo Augustino] a Lawyer, &c. at Florence. <i>Arnauld</i> [Antony] Doctor of the Sorbonne. <i>Aubertin</i> [N.] a French Historian. <i>Baldus</i> [James] a Jesuit and Latin Poet. <i>Balestus</i> [John] Advocate in the Parliament of Paris. <i>Balthasar</i> [Christopher] a learned Protestant in France. <i>Banc</i> [Laurence] Professor of the Civil Law in the University of Franeker. <i>Bangius</i> [Thomas] Doctor and Professor of Divinity in the University of Copenhagen. <i>Berde</i> [John de la] Counsellor of State, Marquis de Marolles, &c. <i>Baron</i> [Vincent] a Dominican. <i>Baroni</i> [Leonora] a fine Singer. <i>Beaulieu</i> [Lewis le Blanc Sieur de] Minister and Professor of Divinity at Sedan. <i>Benedictus</i> [Elpidio de] Cardinal Mazarin's Secretary, and afterwards his Agent at Rome. <i>Benferade</i> [Isaac de] a celebrated French author.

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE, &c.

[869]

<i>A. D.</i> <i>Billaut</i> (Adam) a pretty good French Poet. <i>Blondel</i> (Francis) Professor of Physic in the University of Paris. <i>Bebart</i> (Matthew) Minister at Alençon. <i>Bebart</i> (Samuel) Minister at Caen. <i>Besquet</i> (Francis) Bishop of Montpellier. <i>Beslu</i> (César Egasse du) Register and Historiographer of the University of Paris. <i>Bourignon</i> (Antoinette) a famous Fanatic. <i>Brezé</i> (Clara Clementia de Maille) daughter to the Marshal of that name. <i>Brygn</i> (John de) a Professor at Utrecht. <i>Brun</i> (Antony le) Ambassador of Spain at the Hague. <i>Chigi</i> (Fabio) Pope under the name of Alexander VII. <i>Cygn</i> (Martin du) a Jesuit. <i>Comenius</i> (John Amos) a Grammarian and Protestant Divine. <i>Costa</i> (Margaret) an Italian Poetess. <i>Daffauci</i> (Charles Coypeau Sieur) a Musician and French Poet. <i>Des-Larreaux</i> (James de Vallée Lord). <i>Diana</i> (John Nicolas de) a Jesuit. <i>Drabicius</i> (Nicolas) a famous Enthusiast. <i>Drelincourt</i> (Charles) Minister of the Church of Paris. <i>Duaren</i> (Francis) Professor of the Civil Law at Bourges. <i>Dury</i> (John) a Protestant Divine. <i>Eccellenfius</i> (Abraham) a learned Maronite. <i>Eufache</i> (David) a Protestant Minister. <i>Fabricius</i> (Vincent) a good Poet, Physician, &c. <i>Ferrier</i> (John) a Jesuit. <i>Gaffarel</i> (James) a learned Provincial. <i>Gallatus</i> (Angelus) a Jesuit. <i>Golius</i> (James) Mathematic and Arabic Professor in the University of Leyden. <i>Grafwinckel</i> (Theodore) a Civilian. <i>Grenaille</i> (Francis de) a Monk. <i>Guichenon</i> (Samuel) an Historian. <i>Guise</i> (Henry de Lorraine) Duke of. <i>Hali-brigg</i>, first Dragoman at the Grand Seigneur's court. <i>Heidanus</i> (Abraham) Professor of Divinity at Leyden. <i>Hemicbius</i> (John) Professor of Divinity in the University of Rintel. <i>Hobbes</i> (Thomas) author of the Leviathan. <i>Hoornbeck</i> (John) Professor of Divinity at Utrecht, and afterwards at Leyden. <i>Hottinger</i> (John Henry) a learned Swiss. <i>Hugues</i> (James) a Divine and Canon. <i>Joly</i> (Claudius) Chanter and Canon of the Church of Notre Dame at Paris. <i>Jye</i> (Alexander d') Minister of Grenoble. <i>Larrogue</i> (Matthew de) a famous Protestant Minister. <i>Launoy</i> (John de) Doctor of Divinity in the University of Paris. <i>Leffeville</i> (Eustachius Leclerc de) Bishop of Coutance.	<i>A. D.</i> <i>Lautentracti</i> (Stanislaus) a Socinian Minister. <i>Macedo</i> (Francis) a Jesuit, and <i>Macedo</i> (Antony) his brother, likewise a Jesuit. <i>Maignan</i> (Emmanuel) a Philosopher and Minim Friar. <i>Maimbourg</i> (Lewis) a Jesuit. <i>Marca</i> (Peter de) Archbishop of Toulouse. <i>Marefius</i> (Samuel) a Minister and Professor of Divinity. <i>Margarin</i> (Cornelius) Abbot of mount Cassin. <i>Mey</i> (John de) a Doctor of Physic, &c. at Middelburg. <i>Menage</i> (Giles) one of the most learned men of his time. <i>Milton</i> (John) a famous English Poet. <i>Montfaueri</i>, a famous Comedian. <i>Morinus</i> (Simon) a Fanatic. <i>Morison</i> (Robert) a Physician and Professor of Botany at Oxford. <i>Morus</i> (Alexander) Professor of Divinity at Middelburg. <i>Nidhard</i> (John Everard) a Jesuit. <i>Pafcal</i> (Blaise) a famous French author. <i>Patin</i> (Guy) Professor of Physic in the Royal College of Paris. <i>Peyrared</i> (John de) a Latin Poet and Critic. <i>Peyrere</i> (Isaac la) famous for his Treatise concerning the Pre-Adamites. <i>Perrot</i> (Nicolas) Sieur d'Ablancourt one of the great wits of his age. <i>Piaficki</i> (Paul) Bishop of Premisla in Poland. <i>Pinon</i> (James) Abbot of Condé. <i>Pinfon</i> (Francis) an advocate at Paris. <i>Poquelin</i> (John Baptist) known by the name of Moliere. <i>Pries</i> (John) a learned Englishman. <i>Prienac</i> (Daniel de) a Member of the French Academy. <i>Prynn</i> (William) an English Lawyer. <i>Priolo</i> (Benjamin) a French Historian. <i>Quiller</i> (Claudius) a Latin Poet. <i>Reverend-de-Bougy</i> (John) Marquis de Bougy. <i>Ryer</i> (Peter) a Member of the French Academy. <i>Robertwal</i>, Professor of Mathematics at Paris. <i>Rodon</i> (David de) Professor of Philosophy at Die, and afterwards at Orange. <i>Refen</i> (Reinhold) a good warrior. <i>Rovenius</i> (Philip) a titular Archbishop of Philippe. <i>Ruffi</i> (Antony de) Counsellor in the Seneschal's court of Marfeilles. <i>Scheffer</i> (John) a Professor in the University of Upsal. <i>Scheffad</i> (Annibal) a Danish Nobleman. <i>Schomburg</i> (Charles de) Duke of Haluin and Marshal of France. <i>Sengbere</i> (Polycarp) a Civilian. <i>Sennertus</i> (Andrew) Professor of the Oriental Tongues in the University of Wittemberg. <i>Soubes</i> (Lewis Rattuit Count de) <i>Tabor</i> (John Otto) a German Civilian. <i>Tavernier</i> (John Baptist) Baron d'Aubonne, a great traveller.	<i>A. D.</i> <i>Vayer</i> (Francis de la Mothe le) Member of the French Academy, &c. <i>Vander-Linden</i> (John Antonides) Professor of Physic at Leyden. <i>Verdier</i> (N. du) Historiographer of France. <i>Wart</i> (Bernard de) a Dominican Friar, &c. <i>Zurrius</i> (Boxhornius-Mark) Professor at Leyden. <i>Zeytichem</i> (Constantine Huygens Lord of) Secretary and Counsellor to the Princes of Orange. <i>1675</i> <i>Apafi</i> (Michael) Prince of Transylvania. <i>Arnoldus</i> (Nicolas) Professor of Divinity at Franeker. <i>Bacone</i> (Leo) Bishop of Glandeve. <i>Barlow</i> (Thomas) Bishop of Lincoln. <i>Bafange</i> (Henry) an Advocate in the Parliament of Normandy. <i>Berault</i> (Claude) Régius Professor of Syriac. <i>Bigos</i> (Emeric) a learned Norman. <i>Blondel</i> (Francis) the King's Professor of Mathematics and Architecture. <i>Borri</i> (Joseph Francis) a famous Chymist, Quack, and Heretic. <i>Borricbius</i> (Olaus) Professor of Philology, Poetry, &c. in the University of Copenhagen. <i>Bofc</i> (Peter du) a French Minister. <i>Bombours</i> (Dominique) a Jesuit. <i>Boursault</i> (Edmund) a French author. <i>Brun</i> (Charles le) chief Painter to the French King. <i>Capifacchi</i> (Raimond) a Cardinal. <i>Cbeureau</i> (Urban) a French Historian. <i>Claude</i> (John) Minister of the Church of Paris. <i>Collatus</i> (Peter Apollonius) a Priest of Novarra. <i>Colomids</i> (Paul) reader in the French Church at London. <i>Cuin</i> (Charles) one of the French Academy. <i>Dati</i> (Carlo) Professor of Philology at Florence. <i>Donatus</i> (Marcellus) Count of Ponzano. <i>Drelincourt</i> (Charles) Professor of Physic at Leyden. <i>Felibien</i> (Andrew) Sieur des Avaux, &c. <i>Flavigny</i> (Valerian de) Doctor of Divinity. <i>Fente Moderata</i>, a Venetian Lady, whose true name was Modesto Pozzo. <i>Gabriel</i> (Giles) Licentiate of the University of Louvain, &c. <i>Gonet</i> (John Baptist) a Dominican. <i>Guarini</i> (Guarinus) a Theatin Monk, &c. <i>Hallé</i> (Peter) Professor of Canon-Law in the University of Paris. <i>Henault</i> (N.) a French Poet. <i>Hermant</i> (Godfrey) Doctor of the Sorbonne. <i>Hubert</i> (Peter de) Lord of Burgh, &c. <i>Jardins</i> (Mary Catherine des) famous for her romances. <i>Innocent XI</i>, Pope. <i>Kirftenius</i> (Peter) Professor of Physic at Upsal, &c. <i>Kruzen</i> (Matthias) an avowed teacher of Atheism. <i>Konig</i> (George Matthias) Professor of Poetry, &c. in the University of Altorf. <i>Kortolt</i>
---	---	--

<i>A. D.</i> <i>Koribolt</i> (Christian) Doctor and Professor of Divinity at Kiel. <i>Kuhlman</i> (Quirinus) a Visionary. <i>Lambecius</i> (Peter) first Librarian to the Emperor. <i>Lancelot</i> (Claudius) a Benedictine Monk. <i>Lefela</i> (Francis de) a man famous for his embassies. <i>Lefrus</i> (John) author of the <i>Polygamia Triumphatrix</i>. <i>Marescia</i> (Joseph Vincent) of the Oratory of St Jerom de la Charité. <i>Mafkaron</i> (Julius) Bishop of Agen. <i>Nicajis</i> (Claudius) a learned Frenchman. <i>Nicolls</i> (Peter) one of the finest Pens in Europe. <i>Orobis</i> (Isaac) a Jewish Physician. <i>Pagtas</i> (N.) an Advocate of the Parliament of Paris. <i>Pays</i> (Renatus le) a Knight of St Maurice. <i>Peliffon</i> (Paul) one of the French Academy. <i>Perex</i> (Joseph) Professor of Divinity in the University of Salamanca.	<i>A. D.</i> <i>Penzlin</i> (Christopher) a Protestant Divine. <i>Pinciar</i> (John) a Protestant Minister. <i>Portugal</i> (Alphonso VI, King of). <i>Pradillon</i> (John Baptist) a Feuillant. <i>Quetif</i> (James) a Dominican. <i>Rangouze</i>, a French author. <i>Rapin</i> (Renatus) a Jesuit. <i>Refinius</i> (Peter) Counsellor and Professor at Copenhagen. <i>Rex</i> (Antony de) Advocate in the Parliament of Paris. <i>Ricci</i> (Michael Angelo) a Cardinal. <i>Rocaberti</i> (John Thomas de) Archbishop of Valencia. <i>Roy</i> (James le) Baron of the Holy Empire, and Lord of St Lambert. <i>Rofs</i> (Touffaint) Marquis de Coye, Secretary to the King's Cabinet, &c. <i>Schomburg</i> (Frederic de) Marshal of France. <i>Serroni</i> (Hyacinthus) first Archbishop of Alby.	<i>A. D.</i> <i>Spinosa</i> (Benedict de) a Jew by birth, and a Systematical Atheist by profession. <i>Tellier</i> (Michael le) Chancellor of France. <i>Tristan de Saint Amand</i> (John) an Antiquary and Medallist. <i>Turretin</i> (Francis) a Minister and Professor of Divinity at Geneva. <i>Vaumoriere</i> (Peter Dortigue Sieur de) Sub-Director to the Academy of the Abbot d'Aubignac. <i>Viviani</i> (Vincenzio) a great Mathematician. <i>Weile</i> (Frederic Raghat de) Minister at Spilk. <i>Wittichius</i> (Christopher) Professor of Divinity at Leyden. <i>Aulney</i> (Maria Catherina le Jumel de Berneville Countess d') famous for her writings. <i>Tawvry</i> (Daniel) Doctor of Physic of the Faculty of Paris.
--	--	---



A LIST

A LIST of those ARTICLES which are not mentioned in the CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

A *Abbeville*, the capital city of the Duchy of Ponthieu in Picardy.
Abdera, a maritime town in Thrace.
Abdias of *Babylon*, a Legendary Impostor.
Aberdeen, an Episcopal city of Scotland.
Abydos, a city of Egypt.
Acarnania, a country situated on the Ionian sea.
Acco, a fabulous old woman.
Achilles, the name of several persons.
Achillea, an island of the Euxine sea.
Achar, the name of several persons mentioned in fabulous History.
Adamites, a ridiculous sect.
Agricola, a name which a vast many authors bear.
Aguirre: persons of this name.
Aguillon, a small town of Guienne.
Almon, a Prince in Romance.
Alains, a barbarous people.
Alais, a city of France.
Alalcomenium, a small town of Berothia.
Albret, a family.
Albunea, a famous place in Italy.
Alcmaeon: persons of this name.
Alitieri: Cardinals of this name.
Amelia, a city of Italy.
Ammonius: writers of this name.
Anabaptists, a sect.
Anlo (Petrus ab) a fictitious name.
Andrinople, or *Adrianople*, a city of Thrace.
Andromachus: persons of this name.
Anicius, a Roman family.
Anna, the name of some persons mentioned in the Scripture.
Antinoi, or *Antinopolis*, a town in Egypt.
Antony, a Roman family.
Apicius: persons of this name.
Apollodorus: persons of this name.
Archelaus: persons of this name.
Arminius, one of the chief deities of Persia.
Arion, a wonderful horse.
Arnauld, a family of Auvergne.
Arodon (Benjamin d') a Jew.
Arria, the name of some Roman ladies.
Arfines: Queens of this name.
Artaxata, the capital city of Armenia.
Athenaeum, a public edifice in Rome.
Arax, or *Atracia*, a city of Thessaly.
Auriège, or rather *Ariege*, a river in France.
Avatus, a city of Palestine.
Babylon, a city of Mesopotamia.
Balbus, some persons of this name.
Balzac, a small lordship in Angoumois.
Bellai, a family in Anjou.
Belley, a city of France.
Berenice, the name of several women and Cities.
Berytus, a maritime town of Phoenicia.
Bezantites, or *Bezantians*, an imaginary sect.
Byblis, a maritime town of Phoenicia.
Bigeis, a Tuscan nymph.

VOL. V.

Bodegraven, a village of Holland on the Rhine.
Boreas, one of the four Cardinal winds.
Brachmanis, Indian Philosophers.
Burgundy (House of)
Burgundy, one of the circles of the empire.
Bufris: persons of this name.
Butas, a Greek Poet.
Cainites, a sect of Heretics.
Capitucchi, a family in Rome.
Cappadocia, a country in Asia.
Caraccioli, or *Caraccioli*: persons of this family.
Cassius, the name of a Roman family.
Cetbegus, a Roman family.
Chiderles, which among the Turks is, what St George is among the Christians.
Chigi, a noble family of Siena.
Comana: cities of this name.
Combabus, a Syrian Lord.
Conrad (Herimannus) a fictitious name.
Constance, a city of Germany.
Cris, the name of several ancient authors.
Dinant, a city in the Netherlands.
Dioscorides, an island in the Red-Sea.
Dioscurias, a city of Colchis.
Dryades: the name of certain Pagan female deities.
Drummond, a most noble and ancient family of Scotland.
Drusus, a Roman family.
Egnatia, a city of Italy.
Erebus, a place in the isle of Lesbos.
Erfurt, a city of Germany.
Esep, the name of several ancient Personages.
Esep, a Greek author of a romantic History of Alexander the Great.
Estampes, a city of France.
Eurydice, an Illyrian lady.
Faheddin, a Mahometan author.
Fannius, a Roman family.
Fervaux (John) the true author of the Annals of Bavaria.
Flora, an imaginary Courtesan.
Foutarabia, a city of Spain.
Fontevraud, or rather *Frontevaux*, a famous Abbey in the diocese of Poitiers.
Frangipani, a very ancient Roman family.
Fratricelli, a sect of Heretics.
Garonne, one of the four great rivers of France.
Gergenti, a town of Sicily.
Gesselin, authors of this name.
Guiscard, the name of a family.
Guise, a town of Picardy.
Gymnosophists, a sect of Philosophers.
Hay, a family of Scotland.
Halicarnassus, the capital city of the kingdom of Caria.
Hamadryades, a kind of nymphs.
Harpalice, a beautiful young woman in fabulous history.
Hierocles, a Greek author.
Hierophylus, an Athenian Physician.
Hirpini, a people of Italy.
Hortenfius, the name of a Plebeian family of Rome.
Japan, the name of a country.

Joachim, the fabulous husband of St Anne.
Ipres, or *Ypres*, an episcopal town in the Earldom of Flanders.
Istebians, a sect.
Italica, a town in Spain.
Juba: Princes of this name.
Julis, a town of the isle of Cea.
Juno, sister and wife of Jupiter.
Jupiter, the greatest of all the Heavens gods.
Kermatians, a sect in Arabia.
Lamia, a Roman family.
Lamia, a town of Thessaly.
Lamia, the daughter of Neptune.
Landau, a city of the Lower Alsace.
Lemnos, an isle in the Aegean sea.
Lesbos, an island of the Aegean sea.
Lefley, an illustrious family of Scotland.
Lestrygens, or rather *Lestrygons*, a very brutal people.
Leucas, first a Peninsula, then an island.
Leventz, a town of Hungary.
London, an ancient town in the Upper Poitou.
Lupercalia, a feast celebrated by the Romans.
Luxemburg, the capital city of the province of that name.
Macon, a city of Burgundy.
Mamillarians, a sect among the Anabaptists.
Manducus, a name which the Romans gave to certain figures.
Manichaei, an infamous sect of Heretics.
Marcionites, a sect of Heretics.
Mary, the Egyptian.
Mausoleum, the name of a magnificent monument erected to Mausolus.
Mecca, a town of Arabia.
Melchiorites, an imaginary sect.
Metella, name of some Roman ladies.
Methydrium, a city of Peloponnesus.
Mintoli, persons of this family.
Molionides, two brothers who have a good share in the fabulous History.
Montauban, a city of Guienne in Quercy.
Mopis, persons of this name.
Mosynians, or *Mosynocians*, certain mountaineers in the neighbourhood of the Euxine sea.
Motte, or *Motte* (La) a town in Lorraine.
Naucratis, a city of Egypt.
Nymphodorus of Amphipolis, a Greek author.
Nully, persons of this name.
Paraclete, an Abbey of Nuns founded by Abelard.
Parthenai, a city of Poitou.
Parthenai, a family.
Paulicians, a sect of Heretics.
Pelias, the name of a lance.
Perga, a city of Pamphilia.
Pergamum, a city of Asia in Mysia.
Phaselis, a sea-town in Lycia.
Phasis, a river that runs through Colchis into the Euxine sea.
Phihra, daughter of Oceanus.
Picardi, the followers of a certain Heretic.
Pitbon, a city of Egypt.

[10 M]

Ponzuoh,

Pozzuolo, a town in the kingdom of Naples.
Prætextatus (Papyrius) a Patrician of Rome.
Reckheim, a county, &c. of the empire.
Rigoristi, a name given in the Spanish Netherlands, to the Janfenists, the Fathers of the Oration, &c.
Rofes, a town in Catalonia.
Rotterdam, a city of Holland.
Sadducees, a sect among the Jews.
Santta-Maura, an island.
Salmacis, a fountain at Halicarnassus.
Scamander, a river of Phrygia near Troy.
Serbellone, an Italian family.
Sicyon, a town of Peloponnesus.
Synergists, a name given to certain Germ. Divines in the XVIth cent.

Siris, a river of Italy.
Sommona-codom, a name given by the Siamese to a certain extraordinary man.
Soubise, a town in Saintonge.
Stellingi, a name which certain Saxons took.
Teleboæ, a people who inhabited an island in the neighbourhood of Acarnania.
Telmessus, a sea-port town in the furthest part of Lycia.
Tenedos, an island in the Ægean sea.
Teos, one of the twelve cities of Ionia.
Termessus, a town of Pisidia.
Tettix, a native of Crete.
Thesmophoria, festivals celebrated in honour of Ceres, considered as a law-giver.
Tibarenians, a people of Asia.

Tibur, a city of Italy.
Tilli, or *Thilli*, a Lordship in Brabant.
Toulouse, a city of France.
Trabea (Quintus) a comic Poet.
Traerbach, a small town in the Palatinate.
Turlupius, a sect of impudent and scandalous Heretics.
Verona, a city of Italy.
Villena, a Marquitate on the confines of New Castille.
Ulm, an Imperial city.
Usson, a small town in Auvergne.
Westphalus (John) an imaginary person.
Zaburis, a name bestowed on a certain fort of men in Spain.
Zia, or *Zea*, an island of the Archipelago.



AN INDEX

A N I N D E X

Of the most

M A T E R I A L T H I N G S

Which are mentioned or explained in this Work.

For the use of this Index it must be observed, that the Roman numbers denote the volume, and the figures the page; when the figures stand alone they denote the text, and when they are followed by the letter *a* or *b*, they denote the first or second column of the remarks: and if the letter *n* be added, it denotes some marginal note.

A.

ABBEY of St Denys, the court had so much the more authority over it, as the Monks thereof were debauched. I. 31. *b*.
Abby. An Abbey given as a reward for a song. I. 428. *n*. (*c*).
Abbs. Court-Abbots compared to lap-dogs. IV. 64. *b*.
Abbs (George) Archbishop of Canterbury; it was adjudged that an involuntary murder had not disqualified him. I. 11, 12.
Abbreviators ought to have a good taste. I. 74. *b*. Should not suppress singular facts. 422. *b*. 423. *a*. Often give us balderdash. II. 712. *a*. See *Abridgements*.
Abdera, a city of Thrace, where on certain days a person was devoted, and then stoned to death. I. 20. Its laws set a note of infamy upon those who had spent their patrimony. II. 635. *a*.
Abderams compared to Alexander and Scipio in point of continence. I. 14. *b*. He did not plunder the city of Tours. II. 851. *a*. How he disposed of the daughter of Eudo, Duke of Aquitain. IV. 283.
Abderites, the distemper which they had. I. 19. *a*. *b*. The opinion which they entertained of Democritus. 20. *b*. Whether they wrote to Hippocrates to desire him to come and see Democritus. II. 638. *a*. What Cicero understands by an Abderite. 642. *b*.
Abderus, Hercules's favourite. I. 18. *a*.
Abdias's book the source of several fabulous stories. III. 577. *b*.
Abdissi, Patriarch of the Nestorians, whether he assisted at the Council of Trent. III. 359. *a*. *b*.
Abel (Leonard) is sent to the Levant with the character of Apostolic Nuncio. III. 259. *b*. He composed a book concerning the state of the Oriental Christians. *ibid*.
Abelard, his turn of wit. I. 27. *a*. Vanity was his distinguishing foible. *ibid*. He had an inclination to retire among the Infidels in order to secure himself from the prosecutions of the Inquisitors. 199. *a*. A catalogue of his manuscripts. 248. *b*. the printing of which did him no honour. 249. *a*. A list of his particular sentiments whether truly or falsely ascribed to him. 759. *a*. He continues still to be charged with the errors that were imputed to him. 760. *a*. *b*. St Bernard endeavours to prepossess all the world against him. 773. *b*. 774. *a*. His apology is laughed at. II. 533. *b*. His learning draws auditors to him from all parts. III. 70. *a*.

He is reduced to indigence by women. 71. *a*. Suffers an irreparable loss. 73. *a*. His misfortune is lamented. 75. *a*. particularly by his wife, who goes the length to murmur against providence. *ibid*. *b*. The arguments made use of to comfort him were not all good ones. 73. *b*. Two of his assassins were punished. 76. *b*. He would believe nothing but what was proved by natural reasons. IV. 80. *b*. Is persecuted, by whom, and for what. 469, 470. To whom we are indebted for the edition of his works. I. 248. and *b*. There are copies of them which carry the name of Francis d'Amboise, and others which carry that of Andrew Du Chesne. 249. *a*. *b*.
Abensberg. What name that city bore in the Roman History. I. 548. *a*. *b*.
Abiram. It is pretended that the Pagans alluded to the story of Corah, Dathan, and Abiram. I. 275. *a*.
Ablancourt (Fremont d') facts that concern him. IV. 589. *b*. 590. *a*. An examination into one of his notions, *viz*. that Princes ought to understand Latin. 590. *b*.
Ablancourt (Perrot d') revised six times the books he had a mind to publish. I. 487. *b*.
Abuspes, Grammarians are not agreed upon the signification of that word. II. 709. *b*.
Abortions, untimely or anticipated, are real murders. IV. 500. *a*. Have been practised a great while. *ibid*.
Abortive children, or untimely births, how great their number is. IV. 498. *b*. 499. *a*. *b*. as far as 502. *a*.
Abraham, his books are full of venom against the Christians. I. 43. *b*. His impious notion about the motive of God's forbidding our first parents to touch a certain fruit in the garden of Eden. II. 854. *a*.
Abraham, his dissimulation. I. 37. *a*. *b*. Is the Patriarch of the Refugees. 44. *a*. It is said that he became a convert. 45. *a*. Idle traditions touching the most considerable circumstances of his life. 44. *a*. *b*. as far as 46. *a*. *b*. The print of his feet honoured by the Saracens. 124. *a*. He lies with Hagar in obedience to Sarah. V. 54. *b*. 55. *a*. He is falsely said to have written the book of the creation. I. 173. *a*. Whether he authorized a law of Solon's touching marriage. II. 504. *b*. Whether he feared death more than any conjugal dishonour. V. 50. *b*.

Abraam

- Abram* (Fathet) his notes upon the paraphrase of Nonnus. I. 47. *b.* He draws a strange consequence from a passage of Cicero, relating to the Lupercalia. III. 933. *b.*
- Abridgments*: The necessary qualities of a good abridgment. I. 510. *b.* It requires a very good discernment. 518. *a.* Advice to those who write abridgments. II. 685. *a.* They would be found very faulty, if compared with the originals. 703. *b.*
- Abridgments and copiers of abridgments*: great sources of falsification. IV. 609. *a.*
- Abolition* from the crimes of Fornication, Sodomy, Bessiality: what it costs. I. 628. *a. b.* An abolition of a very rigorous kind. 96. *b.*
- Abstinence*: It is possible that a man may abstain long from eating and drinking. III. 582. *b.* Objections made to Laurence Joubert, touching the abstinence of Moses, Elias, and Jesus Christ; his answer. *ibid.*
- Abu-Gabshan* parts with a considerable employment for a bottle of wine. IV. 176. *b.*
- Abuses*, in what case it is thought that they should be tolerated in the Church. II. 374. *a.* When they have taken such deep root that a Magistrate would only endanger his authority by opposing them, in that case they ought to be tolerated. V. 179. *b.* Monks and parish-priests at this day call for a reformation of abuses, though they continue to be Catholics and great enemies to the Protestants. 68. *b.* The remedy of one abuse is often-times the introduction of another. II. 106. *b.*
- Abysini*, why their Emperors have born the name of Preftor-John. I. 36.
- Academy*: the founder of the middle or second Academy. I. 409. *a.* The founder of the third followed the doctrine of the second. II. 326. *a.* III. 697. *a.*
- Academy* (the French) injuriously treated. IV. 257. *a.* The History of it has always been looked upon as a master-piece. 534. *n. (b).* A disagreement between two lists of its members. I. 627. *b.*
- Acamas*, the isle of Cyprus had formerly that name. I. 53. *a.*
- Acarie*, Master of Accompts, called the *Lacquey* of the *League*, and for what reason. IV. 243. *a.*
- Acarnanians*, often at war with the Etolians. I. 55. Their generous policy. *ibid.*
- Acatalepta*, see *Incomprehensibility*.
- Acciaoli*, his daughters portioned for marriage at the public expence. I. 56.
- Acciaulus* (Zenobius) his paraphrase upon a poem of Marc Musurus in praise of Plato. IV. 295. *a.*
- Accidents*, Peter d'Ailli explained them in the same manner as Des Cartes does. I. 166. *a.* The idea which Philosophers give us of them. V. 221. *a. b.* They are not distinct from substances. III. 558. *a.* Their manner of subsisting without a subject in the Eucharist. IV. 59. *a.*
- Acissare*, or *ακκισαρος*, the signification of that word. I. 63. *a. b.*
- Accius* (Lucius) his character. I. 60. *b.* 61. *a. b.*
- Accords* (the Sieur des) cited. I. 346. *b.* III. 762. *b.* IV. 157. *a.*
- Accommodation*: worried Princes generally defer an accommodation with the victor as long as they can. V. 661.
- Accords (des)* an imaginary Lordship. I. 66. *a. b.*
- Account*; the first that was given of what had been said was unfaithful. II. 852. *a.* which was a bad omen for the time to come. *ibid.*
- Accursus* (Mariangelus); a passage of that author explained. I. 33. *a.* Why he called Sallust his countryman. 69. *a.*
- Accusations*; Some admirable heads of accusation. I. 391. *a.* Who those privileged persons are that may accuse with impunity. I. 758. *a. b.* 759. *a.* It is almost in vain to oppose reasons drawn from probability to an accusation that is attended with circumstances of fact. II. 240. *b.* To accuse people of state-crimes an ordinary artifice with persecutors. I. 30. *a.* It was not lawful to receive accusations against those who were absent in the service of the Republic. 351. II. 345. *a.* Whether a person is always obliged to repel accusations in order to be reckoned innocent. I. 784. *a. b.* A sure way of knowing whether they be slanderous. 795. *a. b.*
- Accused*. In certain cases nothing can be concluded from the silence of accused persons. I. 784. *a.* They ought to be believed, when they publicly deny things which may be easily proved, and which their adversaries do not prove. IV. 217. *b.*
- Accusers* meet with too much indulgence. I. 327. *a.* ought to undergo the punishment of retaliation when they accuse falsely. *ibid.* Those whom we have most reason to fear are the priests. 468. *a.* Professed accusers were hated among the Pagans, and that too at a time when accusing gave young Advocates of quality an opportunity of exercising themselves. II. 356. *b.* A reflexion upon that. *ibid.* Accusers have at all times taken notice of the manner how people talk of news, in order to ground their accusations thereupon. 627. *a.* The character of those who make it their business to accuse others of Heresy. IV. 780. *b.* Very often make use of religion for a pretence. I. 307. *a.* If people were reasonable they would make accusers stand in awe of them. 780. *a.* Ought to be severely punished when they suborn domestics to depose against their masters. II. 627. *a.* Are capable of doing any thing to make their adversaries odious. V. 170. *b.* See *Informers*.
- Acchillea* (a fountain so called), whether that word be a noun substantive or adjective. I. 86. *b.*
- Achilles*, that name was given equally to the champions of Venus, and to those of Mars. I. 82. *a.*
- Achilles* appeared to Homer surrounded with so much glory, that he could not bear the splendor of it. I. 85. *b.* Birds swept the temple of Achilles every morning. 85. *a. n. (20).* Whether love made a part of his character. II. 140. *a. b.* He would not suffer any other Greek to shoot darts at Hector. III. 183. *b.* By what name he was called whilst he wore woman's cloaths. IV. 659. *a.* How his designs upon Hemithea were prevented. V. 315. *a.* What was to be his destiny. *ibid. a. b.*
- Achilleum Argumentum*, what it signifies, and why. I. 82. *b.*
- Achilles Index* (the) of Mr Drelincourt very much improved in the second edition. II. 140. *b.*
- Acidalius*, why the Dissertation intitled *Mulieris esse homines* was ascribed to him. I. 89. *a.*
- Acotius*, what has been said of him and of his book of the stratagems of the Devil. I. 92. *a. b.* 93. *a.*
- Acrotatus*, the ingenuous exclamations with which the women and old men of Lacedemon followed him, as he was returning from the place where he had repulsed the enemies assaults. II. 523.
- Act*: An act that has been purloined from the records of the parliament of Paris. III. 297. *b.* 298. *a.*
- Action* of a Catholic gentleman the most singular and strange that ever was known. II. 91. *a. b.*
- Actions*: We find examples of good actions in each country, age, and religion. I. 561. *a.*
- Actions* (human), the fear and love of God are not their only spring. V. 811.
- Actions* (remarkable) are ascribed by the people sometimes to one King, sometimes to another. The same thing is practised with regard to saints. II. 770. *b.*
- Actors on the stage*, the advantage they have over Advocates. I. 61. *b.*
- Acts of the Apostles* and *Apocalypse* in French rhyme calculated for the stage: a very uncommon work. II. 477. *a. b.* Acted at Paris in the year 1541. *ibid.* The undertakers and Booksellers prosecuted. *ibid. b.* Extracts from that work. *ibid. a. b. c.*
- Acts* (public): at what time they began to be drawn up in the vulgar tongue in France and Spain. II. 379. *a.* III. 97. *a.* and in Germany. *ibid.* They were made in Latin for several ages almost all over the west. II. 517. *a.* The Spaniards, Germans, and French, began very late to make use of their own language in those writings. 518. *b.*
- Actuarius*, a particular dignity belonging only to the Physicians at the court of Constantinople. I. 99. *a.*
- Actuaria* (Don Antonio d'), to what length his violence proceeded in the civil-war of Castile. IV. 456. *a. b.*
- Adam*, how long he continued in the state of innocence. I. 22. *a. b.* Dreams of the Rabbins about his mourning for Abel's death, and divorcing himself from Eve's bed. 23. *a.* and about his knowledge. 101. *b.* 102. *a.* What the Talmudists say of his stature. *ibid.* From whence proceeded his fall according to Agrippa. 154. Whether he was an Hermaphrodite. 102. *a. b.* II. 856. *a. b.* An hypothesis which is not at all well calculated to justify the providence of God with respect to his fall. 857.

857. *a.* What was his escutcheon. III. 27. *b.* His article in this Dictionary raises the indignation of divers persons; the author's answer. I. 103. *b.* V.
- Adam* (Antonius ab): what that author was. V. 461. *a.* *b.*
- Adam* (Father), what he said of St Augustin, and St Paul. I. 106. *a.* *b.* One of his sermons gave occasion to a jest. 108. *b.*
- Adam* (Melchior) censured for several anachronisms. I. 139. *a.* He does not much examine what he compiles. V. 520. *a.* *b.*
- Adamites*, were calumniated. I. 111. *b.* Whether there be still any such in England and Italy. 112. *a.* *b.* Their error with respect to nakedness renewed, and carried to a more extravagant length in the XVth century. IV. 628. *a.* *b.* 629. *a.* *b.* Their uncleanness. 784. *a.* *b.* 785. *a.* *b.*
- Additions*. It is difficult to make pertinent additions to a book. IV. 79. *b.*
- Adelfra* (Marques) a Preacher who converted a Mahometan by one of his sermons. I. 326. *n.* (*a.*)
- Adiatorix* basely massacres a colony of the Romans. II. 532. *b.* But he is punished for it by Augustus. *ibid.*
- Adjectives*, whether those ending with an *é* masculine, may be placed before their substantives. IV. 887. *b.* 888. *a.*
- Adolphus*, an Epic Poem dedicated to Christina Queen of Sweden. III. 140. *b.* 141. *a.* *b.*
- Adolphus of Nassau* chosen Emperor of Germany. V. 67. Killed in an engagement by Albert of Austria. *ibid.*
- Adonijah*, why Solomon caused him to be put to death. V. 803.
- Adonis* (the) of Cavalier Marini, censured and defended. I. 387. *a.*
- Adonis*, son to Cinyras by Metharme his wife. IV. 641. Or son to Cinyras by his own daughter. 642.
- Adoptions*, what the practice of them was in old times. I. 325. *b.* *n.* (10).
- Adrian* (Matthew) a converted Jew, was the first Professor of the Hebrew tongue in the college of the three languages at Louvain. II. 236. *b.*
- Adversaria*, that word ridiculously translated *Adversarius*. V. 43. *a.*
- Adversarius*: An adversary accused of a false doctrine cannot mortify his enemies more than by appearing quite different from their representations. I. 654. *b.* One ought never to deny their good qualities by affecting an air of contempt for them. 696. *b.* Some people are concerned that they have not a sufficient number of adversaries. 339. *b.* People have always endeavoured to turn the person and doctrine of their adversaries into ridicule. III. 698. *b.* It is prudent, when one gets the better of them, to be satisfied with a moderate advantage. 972. *b.* Authors hardly ever consult their writings. IV. 637. *a.* *b.* 638. *a.* See *Antagonist*.
- Adversaries* in point of religion, a person should never make a merit of their hatred. II. 695. *b.* Why he should not. *ibid.*
- Adversity*, the unsettled way in which people have reasoned upon adversity and prosperity. IV. 194. *a.* False consequences that are drawn from adversity and prosperity. 55. *a.* *b.* 216. *a.* The manner in which adversity is accounted for, makes the condition of human life incomprehensible. 468. *b.*
- Advice*: it is dangerous to give advice about public affairs. IV. 795. *a.*
- Advocates*: who is their idol. I. 66, 67. They are subject to contradict themselves and for what reason, 351. *b.* 352. *a.* II. 626. *a.* *b.* IV. 805. *a.* It is even a privilege which Cicero allows them. I. 352. *b.* The humorous answer of an advocate touching the bad causes which he had taken upon him to plead. 224. *b.* Their business is more difficult than that of preachers. 61. *b.* Their labours avail nothing against the rashness of a corrupt judge. 224. What Ammianus Marcellinus says against those of his time. 226. *a.* *b.* They lay hold of every thing which they think advantageous to their cause. II. 343. *b.* The disadvantage which modern advocates lie under, when compared with those of antiquity. 724. *b.* Their qualities described in verse. 309. *a.* *b.* 310. *a.* An advocate refuses to charge himself with the interests of the Dukes of VOL. V.
- Angoulême at the time of her difference with the Constable of Bourbon. 761.
- Adultery*, whether it may be innocently committed to save the life of an husband or wife. I. 91. *a.* *b.* In what manner the ancient Romans punished women that were taken in the fact. 592. *a.* *b.* And by whom that custom was abolished. *ibid.* Adultery wished for by way of imprecation. II. 247. *b.* The encouragement people have to commit that crime. V. 17. *a.* *b.* How common it is. 425. *a.* *b.* Reflexions upon a trial for adultery. 112. *a.* *b.* 113. *a.* *b.* A very odd kind of punishment that was antiently inflicted on adulterers. I. 191. *a.* *b.* And which serves to explain a passage of Catullus. *ibid.* How those were punished that were taken in the very fact. III. 74. *a.* *b.* Adulteries punished with death at Orleans, and the reflexions which people about court made upon that punishment. V. 17. *a.* What punishment the Roman laws inflicted upon those that were guilty of it. 113. *a.* *b.* A plant that hindered women from committing adultery. IV. 610. *a.* *b.*
- Æneid*, a dislich on the order which Virgil gave to burn it. I. 375. *a.* *b.*
- Ædapius* gives a governor of Egypt a box on the ear. III. 445. *a.* *b.*
- Ælii*, the Antonini, Emperors of Rome were descended from that house. III. 711. *a.*
- Era* (Christian) a new beginning which a Visionary gives it. II. 123. *a.*
- Ætius*, the method he followed in explaining the Catechism. I. 472. *a.*
- Ætna*, a city built by Hiero King of Syracuse. II. 823. *a.* 825. *b.*
- Affairs*, what sort of people great affairs require. I. 178, 179. *a.* There are few great affairs but what owe their success as much, at least, to the misconduct of one of the parties, as to the prudence of the other. 588. *a.* To excel both in learning and the transaction of affairs is a very rare talent. II. 314. *b.*
- Affairs of State*, there are persons who render you suspected if you differ from them on these affairs. I. 681. *a.* Savonarola meddled too much with state affairs, and ruined himself thereby. V. 61. *b.* 62. *a.*
- Africa*, a design to send some persons secretly there to inform themselves of the state of Christianity. III. 527. *a.*
- Agamemnon*, according to the Scholiast on Theocritus was the same with Perimede. IV. 585.
- Agamemnon*, his amorous disposition makes one question the truth of his having observed the oath which he made to Achilles. II. 139. *a.*
- Agathon*, his discernment with respect to a vessel of milk that was presented to him. II. 636. *b.* Philostratus called him a *Diviner* upon that account. *ibid.*
- Agathocles*, plunders and ravages the islands of Corfu and Ithaca, the ridiculous reason he gives for it. I. 54. *b.*
- Agathon*: some of his sentences. I. 126. *a.*
- Age*, women are not the only persons that conceal it. III. 177. *a.* It is the only only thing which they never tell. 309. *a.* *n.* (8). Princesses cannot conceal their age. IV. 333. *a.* The extent of its autumn, and when a man is in the winter of life. I. 125. *b.* IV. 163. *a.*
- Age*. Our age is almost as easy to be imposed upon as any whatsoever. I. 7. *b.* In every age they can hardly believe what Historians say of antient times, if it is too remote from the modern customs. II. 710. *a.*
- Agésilas*, despised by the Egyptians on account of his small stature. V. 278. *a.* *b.* 279. *a.* *b.* Why his stratagems of war did not succeed. IV. 654. *n.* (9). He lived in great simplicity. I. 130. *a.* The theory of that Prince. *ibid.* *b.* 131. *a.* He was rather willing that the Persians should break the truce. 131. *a.* What answer he made to the person that surprised him riding on a hobby-horse. *ibid.* He regrets the loss of Agésilas. 134. *a.* *b.* A fine answer that Agésilas made. 130. *b.* He is compared with Conon. 550. *a.* *b.*
- Agésilas*. II. what answer that Prince made to those who told him that he had been an hostage. I. 133. *b.*

INDEX.

- Agatoridas* goes to Memphis, and on what errand. I. 208. *b.*
- Agis*, is the first King of Laedæmon, who was put to death in the city. I. 273. *a.*
- Agnes*, widow to Henry III. A question which she put to Peter Damianus. III. 80. *b.*
- Agnes Castus*, what the virtue of that herb is, and why it was firewed on the beds of the Greek women, during certain solemn rites. V. 334. *a. b.*
- Its virtue not near so great as that of the plant *Leucophyllus*. IV. 610. *b.*
- Agreda* (Mary d') extracts from a pamphlet touching the condemnation of her book. I. 137. *b.* 138. *a.*
- Aggressor*. Whether in personal reproaches he should suffer the defendants writings to go without an answer. I. 697. *a.* The aggressor is not he who gives the first blow, but he who prepares to give it. II. 104. *a.* Puffendorf's opinion in this point. *ibid.*
- According to John Bouchet and the Baron du Villars, this was the case of Henry II, with Charles V. *ibid.*
- Agricola* (John) was founder of the Antinomian sect. I. 140. Was one of those who drew up the *Interim*. 141.
- Agricola* (Rodolph) dedicates his Latin version of the *Axiarchus* of Plato to Rodolph Langius. III. 725.
- Agrigentum*, at what time and by whom that city was founded. III. 157. *a.* In what condition it was when the Romans settled there. *ibid. b.* What the qualities of it's soil were, and what use St Augustin made of those qualities. *ibid. and 158. a.* To what a pitch the devout zeal of the inhabitants for the fame of Hercules rose. 158. *b.*
- Agrippa* (Henry Cornelius) had not much credit with the Devil. I. 148. *b.* He at first looked upon Luther as a deliverer of the oppressed. 149. *b.* Was not for the raising of altar against altar. 155. *a.* Foretold that the confutable of Bourbon would still be victorious in the year 1526. For which he was disgraced. 147. *b.* 148. *a.* Sutcliffe charges him with having spoke dishonourably of Sixtus IV. V. 164. *b.*
- Agrippina* wife to Germanicus, what the said of the orator Afer. I. 120. *a.* Overcame the weakness of her own sex, by imitating the fortitude of the other. 523. *a.* An encomium which a Roman Historian has bestowed upon her. II. 757. *a.* She wanted to marry a second husband. *ibid. b.* What Tiberius said to her. IV. 143. *b.*
- Agrippina*, Nero's mother, all her rivals with the Emperor Claudius were reduced to two. III. 860. *a.* She caused one of them to be murdered in her exile. 861. *b.*
- Agrippina*, a piece writ by Cirano Bergerac, which was suppressed on account of some impieties which he had inserted in it. II. 825. *a.*
- Agropoli* (the Marquis of) particulars that concern him. V. 467. *a. b.*
- Aguirre* (Cardinal d') writ against the decisions of the Clergy of France assembled in the year 1682. I. 157. *a. b.* His zeal for the court of Rome raised him from being a simple Monk to the dignity of a Cardinal. *ibid. b.*
- Ajax*, what answer he made to his father who recommended to him that he should pray to God. I. 160. *b.* Invoked by the Greeks. 161. *b.* He and his son were extremely honoured by the Athenians. V. 304. His descendants were not very illustrious. *ibid. b.* His stature was like unto Saul's. I. 160.
- Ajax* (the Locrian) in what manner the crime which he committed upon Cassandra was expiated by the Locrians. II. 340. *a. b.*
- Aysha*, the History of that woman. IV. 48. *a. b.*
- Ailli* (Peter d') bigotted to judicial Astrology. I. 164. *b.* 165. *a.* He condemned several tenets of the Church of Rome. 165. *b.*
- Aymar* (James) relies upon the virtue of his wand. I. 7. *a. b.* 8. *a. b.* 9. *a. b.* Confounded at the palace of Condé, where he confesses his imposture. 7. *b.* reflexions thereupon. 8. *b.* 9. *a.*
- Air* is the principle of all things according to some Philosophers. II. 672. *a. b.* III. 649. *b.* 650. *a. b.*
- Aliba* is accused of having altered the Hebrew text of the Bible. I. 173. *a.*
- Alamanni* (Lewis or Aloisio) III. 90. *a.* IV. 11. *b.*
- Alarcon* charged with the person of Francis I, after his being taken prisoner at the battle of Pavia. III. 97. *b.*
- Alba* (The Dukes of) his answer to Henry II. II. 444. *a.* As a mark of his serenity. III. 274. *b.* 275. *a. b.*
- Albert* (the Archduke) the author of his History printed at Cologne in the year 1693 shews very little exactness. II. 128. *a. b.*
- Albertus Magnus*, it is said that his body was preserved from putrefaction. I. 183. *b.* He was so little that he was thought to be on his knees, while he was really standing. 184. *a.* His sagacity made him discover the mis-conduct of his servant maid by the tone of her voice. III. 636. *b.*
- Albertus* (Leander) his description of Italy. III. 693. *a.* When it was published. IV. 165. *b.*
- Albigenses*, it is not true that they were Manichees. IV. 97.
- Albret* (a certain Lord) killed in his tent, in the arms of his mistress. IV. 302. *a.*
- Albret* (Joan d') Queen of Navarre: Garasie sharply censured for publishing the tale of her Tapestry. III. 134. It was affirmed that he had cast gross reflexions on that Princess, but he cleared himself from that charge. *ibid.*
- Albumen*, a goddess worshipped by the Heathens. V. 350. *b.* 351. *a. b.*
- Alcazar*, whether it is a village, a borough, or a town. IV. 382. *a.*
- Alcademus*, Professor of Philosophy and Physics: several Princes desired very much to have him. IV. 763. *a.*
- Alceus* in describing his house speaks of nothing but helmets and bucklers. I. 426. *b.*
- Alexander* (the Great) the History of his amours praised with notes. II. 245. *b.*
- Alezius* (Andrew) united polite Literature with the Civil Law. I. 67. *a.* In what manner he justified himself as to his inconstant humour 195. *a.* He learned by the action of a peasant the lesson of a passage of Plautus. III. 154. *b.* He talks pretty freely of the Pope, in a letter to one of his friends. III. 590. *b.* 591. *a.* His mistake as to the time when Marc Antony harnessed a set of lions. 960. *a.* He never was Professor of the Civil Law at Milan. V. 139. *b.*
- Alcibiades*, by whom he was recalled to Athens. II. 571. *a.* He was always attended by two concubines. III. 703. *a.* He was the greatest lover of pleasures in the world, and the readiest to quit them when the exigency of his affairs required it. 414. *a.*
- Alcinoi Menfis* and *Alcinoi Apologus*, are two different proverbs. I. 201. *a.*
- Alcmena*, the story went that she disappeared during the ceremony of her funerals, and that the Thebans paid her divine honours. I. 208. She wore three moons on her forehead, and for what reason. 284. *a.* She is a very fit example to prove that a sincere ignorance is a good excuse. 206. *a.* Upon what conditions she offers herself for a wife. V. 306, 307, 308. Different opinions on that head. 307. *b.* 308. *a. b.*
- Alcoran*, it's text corrected by Bibliander. I. 801. *b.* The veneration which the Turks have for it. IV. 41. *a. b.* Whether Mahomet declared to some, that only the third part of it was true. 47. *a.* After what manner it was composed. *ibid.* It's chapter of the Elephant. 177. *a.* Revealed in one night to Mahomet at Mecca. I. 326. *a.* Composed in twenty years. *ibid.* Translated into the language of Arragon. 326. Andrew du Ryer's French translation of it censured by Winder. IV. 872. *b.* The English translation which is made upon the French one is alike faulty. *ibid.*
- Alcoran of the Cordeliers*, adorned with marginal notes: What it is. III. 82. *a. b.*
- Alcyonide*, a tragedy very much esteemed. IV. 873. *b.* 874. *a.*
- Aldegonde* (the Sieur de Sainte) receives a commission to go upon a new translation of the Bible into the Dutch tongue. II. 705. *a.*
- Adelmo* (Saint) in what manner he mortified his lust. III. 80. *a. b.* And how he likewise exposed himself to danger, to make the Devil mad. *ibid.* What he required of one of his devotees, in order to make trial of himself. 280. *b.*
- Aldobrandin* (Thomas) commits three faults in speaking of the temple of Venus Lamia. III. 715. *b.*
- Alexander* (Cardinal) whether he was a Jew. I. 215. *a. b.* 216. *a.*
- Alegambe* (Father) publishes a falsehood touching Theodorus Beza. I. 726. *a.* Commits a fault for which Mr

INDEX.

- Mr Ogier should have demanded reparation. III. 133. *b.* Alegambe and his continuator were ignorant of the disguises which a writer of their order made use of. 657. *a. b.* Alegambe is not always so exact as people imagine. IV. 76. *a. b.* He does not suppress what may enhance the birth and riches of the writers of his order. I. 747. *a.* is confused in his computations. *ibid.*
- Alston* (The Duke of) there was a prodigious antipathy between him and the King his brother. III. 407. *b.* 408. *a.* He is put upon very wicked designs by two of his favourites. IV. 935. *a. b.*
- Althaus* (Theophilus) a fictitious name which Lyferus borrowed. III. 973.
- Alexandra* (a Statue) why so called. II. 342. *b.*
- Alexandra*, a Poem that has very much exercised the Critics. III. 957. *a. b.*
- Alexander the Great*, his answer to the person that offered him the lyre of Paris. I. 83. *a.* A fine answer which he made to a Queen who sent him delicious refreshments. 100. He is alarmed on the proposals of Pexodares's Ambassador. *ibid. b.* He desires to see and honour the tomb of Ajax. 161. *a.* Whether he was chaste. 366. *b.* Whether he was treated by Apelles in the manner as is pretended. *ibid.* and 367. *a. b.* He was very superstitious, and put an extreme confidence in soothsayers. 447. *a.* His soothsayer did him more service than any of his generals. *ibid.* He sometimes lends a helping hand to the soothsayers, in order to make their predictions succeed. *ibid.* Sometimes also he disregards them. *ibid. b.* One ought not to be too much surprized at his superstition. *ibid.* He acquired no small skill both in the theory and practice of Physic. 465. *a.* Whether in the like situation others would have done no less than he. II. 414. *a. b.* Democritus could not have laughed at him. 637. *a.* He said that if he was not Alexander he would wish to be Diogenes. 666. *b.* Had once a design of returning into Europe, and upon what occasion. III. 356. *b.* Had books sent him into Asia, and particularly the productions of the Poets. *ibid.* Whether he had drank the cup of Hercules when he fell sick. 428. *a. b.* The thought which he made use of to comfort the King his father afflicted with a wound that he had received in a battle. 485. *b.* He draws these words from the mouth of the Priestess of Delphi, *My son, thou art invincible.* 568. *b.* By what invention his tutor made himself agreeable. 973. *a. b.* The opposition between his character and that of his father. IV. 8. *a. b.* Whether he could have any reasons for suppressing miracles that had been wrought in his favour. 607. *b.* 608. *a. b.* In what other Kings endeavoured to imitate him. 660. *b.* 661. *a.* He ruins Persepolis. V. 320. *a. b.* A reflexion upon his birth-day. III. 59. *a. b.* V. 360. *a.* He expended fourscore thousand talents upon learning the properties of animals. 351. *b.* He deprives Cleopha of her kingdom, enjoys her, and settles her again upon the throne. II. 523.
- Alexander*, King of the Indies, son to Alexander the Great by Cleopha. II. 523. *a. b.*
- Alexander Severus* (Emperor) had the image of Apollonius in the same place where that of Jesus Christ was. I. 381. *a.* He had in his chapel the images of Apollonius, Jesus Christ, Abraham, Orpheus, &c. and practised religious ceremonies in honour of them. *ibid. b.* Encolpius's History of that Emperor is not extant. II. 770. An impostor pretends to have translated it from the Greek. *ibid. a.* He associates to the empire Ovinus Camillus, who had aspired to it, and who renounces it. *ibid. a. b.*
- Alexander VI* (Pope) loses his life, by drinking of the poison which he had caused to be prepared for another. III. 321. *a.* There was in him neither truth, nor faith, nor religion. 765. *b.* Journal of his life. V. 757. He had like to have been crushed to death on St Peter's day. II. 472. *a. b.* He orders Mancinellus's tongue to be cut out, and his hands to be cut off. IV. 89. Causes Lorenzo to be thrown into the Tyber. 90. *b.* His conduct with respect to Savonarola, &c. V. 61. *b.* 62. *a. b.* & sequent.
- Alexander VII* (Pope) a story that is told about his religion. II. 474. *b.* 475. *a.* He disapproves the Duke of Savoy's conduct towards the Vaudois. 475. *b.* He speaks to some English gentlemen with a great deal of good-nature. *ibid.* He preaches up to them, maxims, which Mr Jurieu has praised, without foreseeing that he should one day oppose them. 476. *a.* It is pretended that he was related to the Grand Signior. *ibid.* He was basely deceived by three Dutch Bookellers whom he had brought to Rome. *ibid. b.* He died much more lamented by the Jesuits than by the Janenists. 476.
- Alexander* (Natalis) the character of his *Theologie Morale* V. 853.
- Alexandria*: the feast of Adonis was celebrated there in the time of St Cyril. I. 116. *a.* Its school deprav'd by the vain subtilties of the disputants. 268. Restored to a wonderful lustre by Ammonius. *ibid.* A Heathen Philosopher, teaches there openly the eternity of the world in the VIth century. 270. *b.* The inhabitants thereof, send Embassadors to Caligula to complain against the Jews. 374. Its chronicle gives us a pleasant chimera touching the daughter of Aquila. III. 316. *b.* 317. *a.*
- Alypius*: Astronomical tables, who the author of that work is, and what it cost. II. 379. *a.*
- Alban*, what he writ on the twilight, joined to Father Nonius's treatise upon the same subject. IV. 382. *b.*
- Alypius*, instead of persuading St Augustin to live single, suffers himself to be persuaded to marry. I. 503. *a. b.* The character of his disposition of mind. II. 401. *a. n. e.*
- Alatius*, no man ever carried the power of the Pope a greater length than he. I. 231. The pleasant reason he gave to Pope Alexander VII, why he did not take orders. *ibid. b.* The character which Mr Claude, Mr Simon, and Mr Sallo give him. *ibid. a. b.* 232. *a.*
- Alliance*: A monstrous alliance between the worship of the gods and the most filthy passions. I. 597. *a. b.*
- Alliances*, reflexions on those that are entered into with Heretics or Infidels. I. 407. *a. b.* The mutual reproaches which the French and Spaniards bestow upon one another, on account of their entering into alliances with Heretics. II. 338. *a.* The Pope may with a safe conscience make use of Infidel soldiers. *ibid. a.*
- Allix* declares that Antichrist shall perish either in the year 1716, 1720, or 1736. II. 125. *b.*
- Allum*, whether there be a virtue in Allum to make wood incombustible. I. 424. *a. b.*
- Allysons*: ridiculous allusions borrowed from a passage of St Bernard. I. 492. *a.*
- Almachius* (St) killed by the Gladiators. I. 230. *b.* It is nevertheless conjectured that he is an imaginary saint, and for what reason. 230. *b.* 231. *a. b.*
- Almanack*, that word being abridged was taken for a man's name, and the man supposed to be a martyr. I. 230. *b.* 231. *a. b.*
- Almanack*: Leon Morgard condemned to the galleys, on account of the predictions which he had put in his Almanack. III. 955. *b.* The contempt which the Physician Sylvius expressed for the Almanack. V. 138. *a.*
- Almonen Calif*, disturbs the devotion of the Mussulmen V. 286. By what means. *ibid.*
- Almoner*, at what time the title of the King's Great Almoner, and that of the Great Almoner of France, began to take place. II. 393. *a.* When and upon what occasion the Great Almoners of France were created, in virtue of their office, commanders of the order of the Holy Ghost. I. 258. *b.*
- Almi*, bad reasons to excuse one's self from giving any. II. 110. *a. b.* 112. *a. b.*
- Almucheft*, a looking-glass, what the virtue of it is. I. 598.
- Alisia Sigaa Tolatana*, the book composed under her name is absolutely to be condemned. V. 837.
- Alopo* (Pandolfo) is beheaded, and for what reason. IV. 306. *b.*
- Alphonso* King of Naples, how far he expressed his esteem for Ovid. IV. 433. *a.*
- Alphonso X*, King of Castile, the censure which he is said to have passed on the works of God. II. 379. *b.* 380. *a.*
- Alphonso*, two Kings of that name have been confounded, and several things taken from the one and ascribed to the other. II. 381. *a.* But neither of these took the pains to compile the Law-book or Code. 380. *b.* 381. *a.*

Alface

- Alface*, whether the free towns of that province could have continued to hold immediately of the empire, under the protection or guardianship of a King of France. III. 717. *b.* 718. *a.*
- Altieri* (Cardinal) was greatly concerned when he received the news of the conquests which Lewis XIV made upon the United Provinces. II. 758. *b.*
- Altieri*: Cardinals of that name. I. 237.
- Altingius*, a ready reply which he made. I. 240. *a.*
- His shift compared to that of St Athanasius. *ibid.*
- Alviano* (Bartholomew d'): Navagiero goes to the wars with him, and composes his Funeral Oration. IV. 315.
- Amadeus Guimenius*, who the author of that book was. IV. 833. *b.*
- Amadis*: the reading of the *Amadis* inclines one to lasciviousness. I. 65. *b.*
- Amalricus Augerii*, what he says of the She-Pope. IV. 739. *a.*
- Amama* (Sixtinus) proves Rosweide to be in an error. II. 150. *b.*
- Amend Flavien*, the fictitious name of an author. II. 27.
- Amantius*, the praises which he bestows on Capriata. II. 309. *a. b.* 310. *a.*
- Amaseus* (Romulus) has misunderstood a passage of Pausanias touching the epitaph of Æschylus. II. 826. *a.*
- Amasti*, the transmigration of his soul into the body of a lion. I. 382.
- Amastrii*, the History of that Princess. II. 676. *a. b.*
- And of the town which bore her name. *ibid. b.* 677. *a. b.*
- Amasury*, an Heretic condemned at Paris, and for what reason. I. 103. *a.* His doctrine touching the reunion of the two sexes. *ibid.* A reflexion upon that head. *ibid. b.*
- Amawi*, King of Jerusalem, assists Dorgan. IV. 383.
- Amazons*, their impiety punished by Achilles. I. 85. *b.* 86. *a.*
- Ambition* confounded for being too refined. II. 737. *a. b.* The want of it often proves the best sanctuary. III. 438. *a.* It stifles all natural affection. 647. *a.*
- Ambitious*: The ambitious live in a state of servitude. II. 427. *b.*
- Amboise* (Adrian d') publishes his father's treatise of devices. I. 248. *a.* His moral devices. *ibid.* His other works. *ibid.*
- Amboise* (Francis d') is mistaken when he fancies that Accursius spoke of Abelard. I. 32. *b.* 33. *a.*
- Ambrus* castle: it is not true that Francis I. was carried to that place. III. 97. *a.* The Marechal de Villeroi is shut up there. *ibid. b.*
- Ambrose* (St) his apology for the conduct of Sarah and Abraham. V. 55. *a.* In what manner he treated Theodosius. I. 593. *a. b.*
- Ambrosians*, a title which some sorcerers of Nancy in Lorrain gave themselves. III. 126. *a.*
- Ambrun*. The Archbishop of Ambrun presents a petition to the King against the Jansenists. IV. 765. *a.*
- Amé II*, Count of Savoy, a piece of History concerning him. I. 739. *a. b.*
- Amelat* translates a passage of Father Paul ill. III. 499. *b.* 500. *a.*
- America*, the first voyage that was made into that part of the world, under the protection of France. III. 783. *a. b.*
- Americans*, the depravity of their manners. III. 773. *a. b.* 774. *a. b.*
- Anyrius*, how he touched the judges that were ready to condemn his brother. II. 824. *b.*
- Anyrius*, what he did in favour of Antony, and how he was rewarded for it. II. 628. *a.*
- Anyot* misleads Vigenere in explaining a passage of Plutarch. I. 75. *b.* Whether he changed his religion. 260. *a. b.* He is censured for translating some passages of Plutarch ill. II. 14. *b.* 486. *a. b.* III. 56. *a.* What occasioned his being made Great Almoner of France. III. 323. *b.* He does not understand a passage of Plutarch touching Laius. 705. *b.* Nor another passage of Plutarch where mention is made of Lyfimachus. 713. *b. n.* (12).
- Amyraus* is reconciled to his most violent opposers. I. 261. *b.* 262. *a. n.* (9). His resolution in withstanding an Arrêt of the Council of State. 265. *b.* He was much esteemed by the Duke of Longueville. II. 475. *a.* A great imitator of Cameron. 288. *b.* 289. *a.*
- Ammianus Marcellinus*; Mariangelus Accursius pretends to have corrected five thousand faults in that Historian. I. 69. Quoted. 228. *a. b.* Ridicules the Advocates of his time. 226. *a. b.* Is censured for confounding one Mopius with another. IV. 253. *a.*
- Ammonius*, an excellent master in Philosophy. IV. 688.
- Ammonius Saccas*, upon what account he was called Theodidastus. I. 269. *a.* All his works are lost, if we may believe Henry Valefius. 270. *a.*
- Amours of the royal palace*, an order to buy up all the copies of that book, and to burn them upon the spot. IV. 506. *b.* Whether Bussi-Rabutin be the author of it. V. 753. *b.* 754. *a.*
- Amphiaras* was called the royal Prophet. I. 278. *a.* He won the prize in a horse-race by the fall of Polynices. 446. *a. b.*
- Amphibolus* was both a King and a Prophet. I. 281.
- Amphitheatre of honour*, a book against the royal authority, wrote by a Jesuit. I. 220. *b.*
- Amphytrion*: The Amphytrion of Moliere surpasses that of Plautus. I. 283. *a.* Observations upon the piece which bears that name. V. 308. *a. b.* 309. *a. b.*
- Amuratb* causes Fakreddin to be strangled in his own preference. III. 4.
- Anabaptism*, the reasons of the great progress which it has made. I. 287. *a.* The beginning of its fury. II. 83. *a. b.* A woman of that sect makes a judicious reflexion. IV. 852. *a. b.*
- Anabaptists* refuted by a Protestant writer in the same manner as the Catholics refute the Protestants. I. 287. *a. b.* Reasons why they are tolerated in the United-Provinces. 288. *b.* 289. *a.* They are charged with an extravagant doctrine. 290. *a. b.* The answer they return, when asked what would become of the magistracy, if all the world was of their opinion. III. 313. *a.* Who was their first Patriarch in the Netherlands and Lower Germany. 481. *b.* They are very rigid in their morals. IV. 86. *a. b.* 87. *a.* Certain Fanatics among them had a mind to renew the extravagancies of the Adamites, and were put to death for it. 628. *a. b.*
- Anchoret* (an) who boasts that he had seen the place where heaven and earth touch one another. IV. 678. *a.*
- Anacronisms*, most of the eulogies of illustrious men are full of them. II. 403. *b.* The Annalists themselves are not always exempt from them. *ibid.*
- Anacron*, his dissolute life excused by le Fevre. I. 675. *a. b.* His statue placed near that of Xanthippus in the citadel of Athens. V. 48. *a.* Of what country he was. 316. *b.*
- Anagrams*, who was the first restorer of them. II. 618.
- And where he found the pattern. *ibid.*
- Anarchy*: There is a source of anarchy in the state of man, which can never be wholly rectified. I. 499. *a.*
- Anastafius the Library-keeper*: It does not appear that he has mentioned the She-Pope. IV. 725. *a. b.* 726. *a. b.* That fable has been foisted into the manuscripts of his History. 725. *a. b.* Blondel observed that they were the very words of Martinus Polonus. *ibid. b.* Sarrauius observed that in the manuscript of the King's library the story of the She-Pope was an additional piece. 726. *a.* It is only told there by an *it is said, that, &c. ibid.* An examination into what Salmassius said touching an edition of that author published by the Jesuits of Mayence. *ibid. b.* 727. *a. b.*
- Anatomy*, a doubt proposed to Casuists touching a curious point of Anatomy. I. 109. *a.*
- Anaxagoras*, his indifference about the good things of this world. I. 294. *a. b.* II. 635. *b.* His doctrine touching the first formation of men and animals. I. 296, 297. *a. b.* 414. *a. b.* 415. *a. b.* His false supposition in establishing Homogeneties. 303. *a. b.* 304. *a. b.* 305. *a. b.* He was surnamed *ψῆς*, or *the mind*. 297. *b.* His sentiments explained. 298. *a. b.* He was the first who supposed that an intelligence was the efficient cause of the world. 299. *a. b.* 300. *a. b.* Was surnamed *the Atheist*. 301. *b.* His doctrine of the *Homocameria* is full of contradictions. 303. *a. b.* 304. *a. b.* 305. *a. b.* He was accused of impiety, and in danger of being stoned as an Atheist. 307. *a. b.* IV. 566. *b.* His witty sayings. I. 308. *a. b.* He suffers persecution for having dogmatized against the popular religion. II. 864. He taught a rational religion, while

I N D E X.

7

- while he explained by natural reasons what appeared extraordinary. IV. 565. *a.* He is accused of irreligion, under pretence that he explained meteors by philosophical reasons. 579. *b.*
- Anaximenes*, his hypothesis corrected. I. 302. *a. b.* 303. *a.* He taught that the air was the principle of all things. III. 649. *b.*
- Ancients*, a great many of them gave no credit to fables. I. 76. *a.* They had not variety enough of invention. 115. *b.* A controversy which has been raised of late years, about the superiority or inferiority of the Ancients. 283. *a.* If they were to come back to the world, they would see that many things were supposed to be contained in their books, which they never dreamt of. 462. *a. b.* A reflexion upon the comparison between the Ancients and Moderns. II. 553. *a. b.* How people come to be so ready to praise and support the Ancients. IV. 414. *b.* The difference between them and the Moderns, with respect to comedies. 743. *a. b.* The disease of admiring only them prevailed no less formerly than now. V. 492. *b.*
- Ancre* (the Marshal d'), a passage cited out of his trial. I. 397. *b.* Feigned by Malherbe the Poet to be cured by the god of the Seine. II. 543. *a.*
- Ancremum Monumentum*, a most curious and instructive inscription, but not entire. II. 231. *a.*
- Andlo* (Daniel ab) his book against Samuel des Marets. I. 322.
- Andradus*, his book very scarce, is nevertheless very often quoted. I. 324. *a.* The reason of it. *ibid.*
- Andreas* (James) attacked by Hemmingius. III. 391. A great promoter of Ubiquitism. *ibid.*
- Andreas* (Valerius) censured with respect to Balbequius and his embassies. II. 230. *b.* He is mistaken in the title of a book which he ascribes to Badius. I. 602. *b.*
- Andresii*, a province of Boeotia so called from Andrus, the son of the river Peneus. IV. 626. *a.* It was afterwards named Phleggyantis. *ibid.*
- Andrimple*, built by Orestes whose name it bore. I. 331. *a. b.*
- Androgynæ*, those of Plato a kind of Hermaphrodites. I. 102. *b.* What they were, what they attempted, and what became of them. V. 6. *a. b.* 7. *a.*
- Androis*, what it was. I. 182. *b.* 183. *a.* A word absolutely unknown, and invented by Naudé. 184. *b.*
- Andromache*, a tragedy fit to kill players. I. 333. *a.*
- Andromachus*, founder of a city in Sicily. V. 357. *a.*
- Andromeda*, a tragedy of Euripides. I. 19. *a.*
- Andronicus* (Emperor), what he did to upbraid the inhabitants of Constantinople with their wives leudness. III. 631. *b.*
- Aneas* (Bartholomew) is killed in a religious tumult. III. 624. *b.*
- Anecdotes*, what their sources are. I. 361. *a.* A curious fact for such as are fond of them. 724. *a. b.*
- Angelocrater*, there was little honour to be got by confuting him, and for what reason. III. 388. *b.* He publishes in 1601 a piece on Chronology, and is deputed in 1618 to the Synod of Dort. IV. 731. *a.*
- Angels*, there were two sorts of bad angels according to Athenagoras. I. 532. *b.* Nothing can be more needless than to dispute, whether they form unto themselves an human body when they appear. V. 215. *a. b.*
- Angels* (tutelar or guardian) the doctrine of the Heathens concerning them. II. 249. *b.* 250. *a.* And of some Protestants. III. 595. *a. b.* The doctrine of these angels antienter than the Christian religion. IV. 689. *b.* 690. *a.*
- Angerone*, a goddess that was the patroness of Silence. V. 184. *b.*
- Angers*, the corruption of that city. III. 60.
- Angevin* (the) or the little *Angevin*, John Maugin was thus surnamed. IV. 173. A sign of his mean extraction. *ibid.* *a. b.*
- Angevin*. Who was the most learned Angevin. III. 308. *b.*
- Anglara*, a town in Tuscany which Thuanus confounds with one in the Milanese called *Angleria*. II. 294. *a.* Quenstedt is almost guilty of the same mistake. *ibid.* *n.* (2).
- Angoulême* (the Duchess of), at the time of the difference between her and the Constable of Bourbon, V. 1. V. No. CXLIV.
- an Advocate in the Parliament of Paris refused to charge himself with her interests. II. 761.
- Anicetus*, his baseness and villany. IV. 399. *a.*
- Animals*, how they were produced according to Anaxagoras and Archelaus. I. 296. 415, 416. III. 650. *a. b.*
- Anjou* (Fulk Rechin, Earl of): his wife leaves him. III. 62. *a.* He makes a thousand mean submissions to her. *ibid.* *b.*
- Anjou* (Charles of) created King of Naples and Sicily by the Pope, did not obtain the peaceable possession of them, till he had defeated Manfred and Conradin. IV. 300. *a.*
- Annals*, it is proper that he should have several copies of his annals, and that he should lodge some of them in the hands of his friends. II. 283. *b.*
- Annat* (Father), a parallel betwixt his conduct and that of Father Nidhard. IV. 366. *b.*
- Anne* (St), how many husbands and children she had. III. 572. She is no where spoken of in the Scriptures, nor in the writings of the three first centuries. I. 342. The ridiculous stories that are told about her. III. 570. *a. b.* 571. *a. b.*
- Anne*, daughter to Phanael: whether she was a cloistered religious. I. 342.
- Anne*, sister to Dido: persecuted after her sister's death by their brother Pygmalion. IV. 642. *a. b.*
- Anne of Austria*, Queen of France, liked the relish of the fruits which came from Pomponne. I. 487. *b.* The King could not consent to declare her Regent. III. 816. *b.* 828. *a.* She gets the Parliament of Paris to make the King's last will void. *ibid.* *b.* Mascarion makes her Funeral Oration. IV. 172. Provoked at the scandalous reflexions that were thrown out against her during the siege of la Motte, she causes that place to be raised contrary to the articles of capitulation. 278. *a. b.* This piece of resentment blamed by the Marquis de Beauvau. *ibid.* *b.*
- Anonymiana* quoted. V. 280. *a. b.* 330. *a.*
- Anselme* (Father) much less intelligible than Mr le Laboureur, whom he epitomizes. II. 133. *b.* He is mistaken when he says that a good part of the inheritance of the house of Bourbon was restored. III. 864. *a.* His error with respect to the age of Madam de Rohan. IV. 481. *a.*
- Answer*; whether it be better to answer certain fiery and impetuous tempers, or not to do it. II. 195. *b.*
- Antagonist*. Whether a person ought not to take as much pains to represent his antagonist's reasons as his own in a fair light. II. 486. *b.* 487. *a. b.* 488. *a. b.*
- Anti-Anicianus*, a book that was never printed, and for what reason. I. 341. *a. b.*
- Anti-Baillet*, a passage of that book examined and censured. II. 180. *a. b.*
- Anti-Coton*, the author of that book quoted and censured. IV. 772. *b.* 773. *a. b.*
- Antichrist*, a very singular opinion concerning him. II. 113. *a. b.* In what manner he was to seize on fortified towns. IV. 265. *b.* 266. *a.* An author who describes all the periods of his reign. II. 122. Aloisio de Leon applies to Mahomet the predictions of the Apostles concerning Antichrist. III. 772. *b.*
- Antyllus* betrothed to Augustus's daughter, but murdered on account of his virile gown. III. 119. *b.*
- Anti-Mondori*, who was called by that name, and for what reason. IV. 82. *a.*
- Antoninians*, the followers of John Agricola were so called. III. 597. Father Garasse's scurrilities on that head. *ibid.* *a. b.* 598. *a. b.*
- Antioch*, the feast of Adonis was still celebrated in that city when Julian the Apostate made his entry there. I. 114. *b.*
- Antiochide* finding herself barren, has recourse to a pretended delivery. II. 304. *b.*
- Antiochus the Great* vanquished by the Romans. IV. 559. *a. b.*
- Antiochus* was desperately in love with his mother-in-law. V. 45. *a.*
- Antipater*, his disputes with Carneades. II. 329. *a.* How that Philosopher defined God. IV. 572. *a.*
- Antipathy* is the true cause of quarrels between husband and wife. III. 663. *a.*
- Antiphrasisti* takes place in religion. III. 949. *a.*

- Antipater*, King of the Lestrygons: eats one of Ulysses's Deputies. III. 786. *a.*
- Antipodes* placed by Pope Zachary in the number of chimeras that are pernicious to religion. V. 493. *a. b.*
- Antiquarians*, snares are often laid for them. III. 215. *a. b.*
- Antiquity* can never be admitted as a proof for any doctrine, without first determining the duration that is sufficient to distinguish truth from error. III. 744. *a.*
- Antiquities* (Roman), Flavius Blondus was almost the first who attempted to restore them. II. 32.
- Antiphones*, whether at the time that Diogenes was his scholar, he could have had Socrates for his master. II. 665. *a. b.* 666. *a.* In what manner he made the Athenians sensible of the abuse committed in the promotions to public posts. III. 616. *b.*
- Antiochus*, what health he drank with Epicles. IV. 571. *b.*
- Antony* (Caius), the ill treatment that he met with from his nephew. III. 115. *a. b.* 116. *a.*
- Antony* (Caius), the Triumvir's brother, what his end was, and how his death was revenged. III. 496. *a. b.*
- Antony* (Lucius), to whom he was indebted for his authority, and his triumph. III. 111. *b.*
- Antony* (Marc) sends to signify to Cleopatra, that she should come into Cilicia to justify her conduct. II. 631. The debauching of his wife hindered the city of Rome's being involved in an horrible confusion. 679. His answer to Julius Cæsar upon his demanding an account of the sale of Pompey's goods. *ibid. b.* 680. *a.* His difference with Dolabella. 680. *a.* He harangues the Senate upon peace and concord, and his harangue charms the men of probity. *ibid.* He sends his son for a hostage to the conspirators, who durst not come down from the capitol. *ibid.* With what spectacle he entertained himself at table during the time of the proscriptions. III. 113. *a.* How his first wife was called. *ibid. b.* How his second wife was called, and why he put her away. 114. *b.* He commits a thousand extortions at Rome. 119. *a.* He has even the audaciousness to sell Pompey's goods by inch of candle. *ibid.* He did not marry Cytheris. *ibid.* He causes lions to be yoked in his chariot. 959. *b.* 960. *a.* The trick which he served his wife, and the construction that was put upon it. 991. *a. b.* He enters himself into the society of the Luperci. 932. *a.* He causes Arfinoë to be killed, out of complaisance to Cleopatra. IV. 791. *b.*
- Antonia*, whether that family was a Patrician or Plebeian one. I. 356. *a. b.* 357. *a.* How it should be divided. 356. *a.* And what names belong to its different branches. *ibid.*
- Antoniana Margarita*, that book is grown very scarce. IV. 546. *a.*
- Antoninus*, Archbishop of Florence, quotes John Columna, and in several places copies James Columna. II. 529, 530. *a. b.*
- Antoninus Liberalis*, what he tells us about Alcmena. I. 208.
- Antonie*, King of Portugal: Philip II takes Portugal from him. V. 319.
- Antonio* (Don Nicolas), the faults of that author censured. I. 41. *a. b.* 42. *a.*
- Anti*, a false reason given for their wisdom. III. 528. *b.*
- Antwerp*, how the five bastions of its fortrefs were called. IV. 453. *a.* The King of Spain is advised to order that city to be burnt. V. 293. *a.* A popular insurrection there in 1567. II. 121.
- Apelles*, his adventure at the court of Egypt. I. 366. *a. b.*
- Apelles*, the tragedian, cried out in a musical tone while he was whipped. 370.
- Apellicon*, his library transported to Rome. V. 378. *b.* The history of him. 379. *b.*
- Aphrodisiasus* (Alexander), whether he believed the mortality of the soul. II. 567. *a.*
- Apicius Cælius*, who the author of that book is, and what it treats of. I. 371. *a. b.*
- Apion* tells an incredible story of a certain Physiognomist. I. 370. *a. b.* Boasted that he bestowed immortality on those to whom he dedicated his works. 373. *b.*
- Apocalypsa*. See *Revelations*.
- Apelle*, surnamed the Hyperborean. I. 4. *b.* The wonderful effects of the dart with which he had killed the Cyclops. 5. How he recovered that dart. *ibid.*
- Apello* is blamed for commending a Poet that had wrote a thousand obscene things. I. 427. *a.* His temple and oracle at Daphne rendered very famous by superstition and debauchery. 594. *a.* He asked the Merchant; for he did nothing *gratis*. II. 258. *a.* The priests of Apollo at Daphne was to be a virgin. 339. *a.* The virtue of his spittle. *ibid. b.* Apollo tells a lie in the oracle which he pronounced upon the destiny of Euripides. 863. *b.* 864. *a.* Who it was that built him a temple at Claros. IV. 97. *a.* The Athenians plunder him by sea and by land. 621. *a. b.* 622. *a. b.* Why he is called *Smintheus*. V. 312. *a.* Why spared by Verres. 315. *b.* He gets Coronis with child, and kills her father Phlegyas with arrows. 626.
- Apollonius Pergæus*: Mr Viviani restores the fifth book of his Conic sections. V. 498.
- Apollonius*, the Poet, is very excusable in having followed the crowd with respect to Chiron. I. 79. *a.*
- Apollonius Tyanæus* had mimicked the Son of God. I. 380. *a.* How he censured the Athenians. II. 81. *b.* The story that they tell of him with respect to the assassin of Domitian. V. 731, 732.
- Apologia pro Puritanis*, what that book is. II. 681.
- Apology for John Chastel and the Jesuits*: An analysis of that work. II. 457. *b.* 458. *a. b.* 459. *a.* Ascribed to the Jesuits, but it is highly probable that it was composed by John Boucher. 459. *b.* It is very scarce. *ibid.* The Jesuits suppress it, and for what reason. *ibid.*
- Apologies* should be consulted by those who write the lives of learned men, and by the author of such a book as this. II. 8. *b.*
- Apologist*: There is often room to believe that the sharpness of an Apologist offends people more than that of the aggressor. II. 296. *b.*
- Apologists*: It is a difficult matter to reduce the Apologists for certain people to a non-plus. V. 66. *a.* Savonarola's Apologists. *ibid. b.* 67. *a. b.* They are suspected of being guided by insatiation, or the interest of their community. 70. *a.*
- Apologues*, to whom the glory of inventing them belongs. II. 832. *a.* Whether the Antients believed that they came down from heaven. *ibid.*
- Apotampæus*, a name which the Jews gave to one of their victims. IV. 828. *b.* 832. *b.*
- Apostate*: a certain English Lord called an Apostate by the people of Geneva, because he did not believe that their discipline was Apostolical. II. 150.
- Apotropeia*, what the surest way of obtaining it was. IV. 572. *a. b.*
- Apparition*, whether, from the apparition of a soul, one can draw any proof of its immortality. II. 66. *b.* 67. *a. b.* An apparition may occasion a mortal distemper. 715. *b.* 716. *a.* There are apparitions against which the most ardent warriors could not be proof. *ibid.* Observations upon some of them. III. 881. *a. b.* See *Phantoms*.
- Appearances* are deceitful. I. 126. *a. b.* 127. *a.* A proof of the rash judgments which are only grounded on first appearances. *ibid.* 733. *b.*
- Applause*: The hopes thereof a great encouragement to authors. IV. 450. *a.*
- Apple*: The golden apple adjudged to Venus. III. 644. *a. b.*
- Application*. Too long application produces bad consequences. III. 342. *a.*
- Apuleius*, if he was a Magician, his crime was less than that of the Magicians of these times. I. 390. *a.* What things he was reproached with. 391. *a. b.* The Pagans compared his miracles to those of Jesus Christ. 394. One of his episodes has furnished Moliere with matter for a dramatic piece, and Mr de la Fontaine for a romance. 396. *b.*
- Aquapendente* (Fabricius d'), it is not true that du Laurens profited by his conversation with him. III. 746. *b.*
- Aquaviva* (Andrew-Matthew), celebrated for the false thing as Mr de Montausier. I. 397. *b.*
- Aquaviva*, General of the Jesuits, whether he approved Mariana's book *de Institutione Principis*. IV. 130. *a. b.*
- Aquila*, a city that rose upon the ruins of Amitemum. I. 69. *a.*
- Aquilis*.

- Aquila*, the sentence of Pilate found in that city was a supposititious piece. II. 556. *b*.
- Aquinas* (Thomas) knew something of the Cabala. II. 114. *a*. Was called the *murex* by his school-fellows, and for what reason. 802. *b*. Is censured by Vogelkang. 877. *b*. 878. *a*.
- Aquitain* (Eudo Duke of) what his daughter's name was. IV. 282. *a*. *b*. How she fell into the hands of the Calif of the Saracens. 283. *a*. *b*.
- Aquitain*. The annals of Aquitain by John Bouchet. II. 103. The judgment which Robert Cenalis and John Quintin pass upon it. *ibid.* *a*. *b*. 104. *a*.
- Aquitainians*, were formerly the ornament and glory of the Gauls in point of wit and eloquence. V. 124. *a*. *b*.
- Arabia*, the women there have a great deal of modesty. IV. 34. *a*.
- Arabians*, what they said of the stature of our first parents. I. 104. *a*. What they said of Adam's books. *ibid.* *b*. They worshipped a stone. 124. *b*. Their Philosophers rather chuse to swerve from the opinions of their Prophet Mahomet, than to contradict Aristotle. 469. *b*. The Arabians have introduced many things into the practice of Physic, that are contrary to the precepts of Hippocrates and Galen. II. 140. They continue exactly to observe the custom of marrying with the women of their own tribe. IV. 27. *a*. Some of their authors boast of having seen a copy of the Gospel, where mention was made of Mahomet. 46. *b*. 47. *a*.
- Aragon* (Ferdinand of) unjustly deprives John d'Albret of his kingdom. III. 623. *a*.
- Arbriſſel* (Robert d') how he lived with his Nuns. III. 63. *a*. *b*. 64. *a*. *b*.
- Aradia*, men were sacrificed to Jupiter in that country. III. 651. *b*.
- Arcadius* was ordered by Theodosius, to stand uncovered before his Preceptor. I. 507.
- Arcesilas* was a Pyrrhonist without bearing the name. I. 408. *b*. 409. *a*. He was the first disturber of the public peace among the Philosophers. 409. *b*. He carried the Hypothesis of uncertainty farther than Socrates. *ibid.* Why he espoused the side of the Epoché. *ibid.* 410. *a*. He did good and endeavoured to conceal it. 412. *b*. 413. *a*. What he said to Carneades the Epicurean. 413. *b*. Aristo of Chios was his antagonist upon the Hypothesis of uncertainty. 462. *a*. Whether he absolutely denied the existence of truths. II. 327. *a*. What difference there was between his opinions and those of Pyrrho. IV. 653. *a*. *b*. If he should return into the world he would be formidable to the Divines. 654. *a*.
- Archagathus* was the first Physician that ever came to Rome. II. 353. *a*.
- Archambald*, Archbishop of Bourdeaux, is deposed, and afterwards becomes Lord of St Maixent. IV. 479, 480.
- Archelaus*, upon what terms Pompey gave him the pontificate of Comana. II. 531. *b*. 532. *a*.
- Archelaus*, King of Macedonia, a witty saying of that Prince. I. 418. *a*. What he said upon his ordering a golden cup to be given to Euripides. II. 869. *a*. He delivers up Decamnichus to Euripides to be used by him at discretion, and why. 868. *b*. 869. *a*. One of his dogs sacrificed and eat. 870. *b*.
- Archelaus* (The Philosopher) what he taught touching the production of men and other animals. I. 416. *a*. *b*.
- Arch-Heretics*, one of them works a kind of miracle at Rome. II. 86. *b*.
- Archidamia* comes with sword in hand into the Lacedæmonian senate, to complain of the ill opinion that was entertained of the women's courage. II. 523.
- Archidamus* fined by the Ephori, and for what reason. I. 128. *b*.
- Archikochus* valued himself more upon being a soldier, than a Poet. I. 426. *b*. Whether the man that killed him was sent. V. 317. *a*. *b*.
- Archon*. Who the last perpetual Archon was. I. 208.
- Arçi* (the Marquis of) commits an assassination in Frejus, for which the Prince of Condé, and the Admiral are exceedingly concerned. II. 511. *a*.
- Arcturus* called Phafis, and for what reason. IV. 609.
- Artemberg*: (the Count d') his answer touching the troops of the circle of Burgundy, which were introduced into the Electorate of Cologne. II. 224. *b*.
- Arena*, a city, whence it was so called, and by whom it was built. III. 194.
- Areopagites*: The Areopagites could neither endure Atheists nor impious persons. II. 572. *a*. 573. *a*. A cause referred to them. 681. *b*. They cause Menedemus and Asclepiades to be summoned before them. I. 525. *b*.
- Arctin* (Peter) whether his books of devotion favour of a true convert. I. 438. *b*. His *Ragionamenti*, a book absolutely to be condemned. V. 837.
- Arexan*, the inhabitants thereof obliged to kneel before a lion of stone, and for what reason. II. 633. *a*. *b*.
- Argenis*, a famous book, translated into Italian, to satisfy the curiosity of the women. I. 644. *b*. Continually read by Cardinal Richelieu. 645. *b*. Likewise very much esteemed by Balzac. *ibid.* *b*. 646. *a*. It is nevertheless writ in bad Latin. 646. *a*. Translated into French. 646. *b*.
- Argenterius*, a Lawyer, writ every thing that he heard in conversation. III. 154. *b*.
- Argentocoxus*, how his wife excused the adulteries that were committed in Great Britain. III. 604. *a*. *b*.
- Argentum parum patum*, the meaning of these words. I. 227. *a*.
- Argentré*: (Bertrand d') confounds Francisco Sylvestro with Sylvestre Prierias. III. 32.
- Argonauts*, their arrival and their exploits in the life of Lemnos. III. 465. *a*. *b*. They are obliged to sail up the river Phasis. IV. 610. They are firnamed Minyans from Minyas. 626. *b*.
- Argonauts*: what the Argonauts of the Painter Cydias were fold for. III. 492. *a*.
- Argos*, Juno's temple there was entirely burnt down by the carelessness of the priests. II. 498. *a*. *b*. The inhabitants thereof made a vow to Apollo, when they plundered the city of Thebes. IV. 97.
- Argument*, whence it comes that the principal argument of a sect is called its *Achilles*. I. 82. *b*. In what case a negative argument takes place. II. 115. *b*. and in what case it is a good demonstration. 392. *b*. Books have been writ for and against its authority. III. 457. *a*. *a*. (15). A consideration on the force of it with respect to the She-Pope. IV. 734. *a*. *b*. 735. *a*. *b*. A refutation of the reasons that may be objected to it. 736. *a*. *b*. The Protestants allow it to be demonstrative in the question: whether St Peter was at Rome, and will not hear of it in the affair of the She-Pope. 737. *a*. Character of that argument. V. 648. *b*.
- Argumentum*: an inexcusable mistake of those who took *Argumentum* for *Argumentum* in Aulus Gellius. I. 82. *b*.
- Arianism*, its extent and duration. I. 476. *a*. *b*. The insurmountable difficulties in which a Protestant Divine has engaged himself upon that head. *ibid.* It is extirpated in Spain by Recaredus. 477. *b*.
- Arians*. The Arians seem to have been of a more tolerating spirit than the Orthodox. I. 477. *b*. Calvin's explications accused of favouring them. III. 538. *b*. A sect of them springs up at Lyons, against which Viret exerts himself. V. 483. *a*. *b*. They are solidly confuted by Lascius. III. 732. *a*.
- Ariste*, the judgment which Cardinal Hippolyto d'Est passed upon one of his poems. III. 764. *a*. A bull expedited in favour of his poems. *ibid.* The beginning of his poem cost a great deal of pains. 837. *b*. Whether he lived in lodgings. V. 400. *b*. 401. *a*.
- Aristagoras*, whether there was a Philosopher of that name, who was Socrates's master. II. 653. *a*. *b*.
- Aristarchus*, whether he was called the Prophet or Diviner. I. 451. *b*.
- Aristeus*, the son of Apollo, disappears. I. 456. Is placed among the stars. 457. The conformity of his History with that of Moses. *ibid.*
- Aristeus* (the Proconnesian) appeared in the world three ages after he had composed a poem. I. 458. *b*. 459. *a*. He boasted that his soul had left his body and rambl'd thro' different places. 458. *b*.
- Aristus*: Mr Viviani's divination on that author. V. 499.
- Aristineus*, what he tells us of his mistress. III. 704. *a*.
- Aristides*, his daughters portioned for marriage at the public expence. I. 56. His virtue. 278. *b*. From what motive he contributed towards Cimon's advancement. II. 504. *b*.
- Aristippus*, what his footman said to him about Laïs. II. 670. *a*.
- Aristodemus*, the Kings of Lacedæmon were defended from him. I. 130. *a*.

Aristomenes,

- Aristomenes*, the greatest hero that was among the Messenians. II. 650. *a.*
- Aristophanes*, why he composed the Comedy of the clouds, according to some. I. 418. *b.* To whom the public is indebted for the first edition of that author. IV. 295. In what manner he spoke of devotional watchings. V. 336. *b.* 337. *a.*
- Aristotle*, his learning compared to that of Adam. I. 101. *b.* 102. *a.* He ridicules Xenocrates. 112. *b.* His doctrine as to the necessity there is for some principle to be the first mover of matter. 299. *a.* He observes that Anaxagoras admitted an intelligence for the production of things only as a θεός ἀπὸ μυχῶν. 301. *a.* Whether he was a Profelyte of righteousness, or even a Jew. 466. *a.* *b.* His answer to those who demanded the reason of his retreat. 468. *a.* The greatest part of his works was brought to Rome with Apellicon's library. V. 377. *b.* Several copies of them were taken full of faults. *ibid.* They added to them the tables, which we have at present, after putting them in order. *ibid.* Who writ the paraphrase upon his Ethics. I. 336. *a.* Some have attempted to explain the mysteries of religion by his principles. 339. His Philosophy has been violently shaken in the XVIIth century. 464. but strongly supported by the Protestant and Catholic Divines. *ibid.* The extravagant praises that have been bestowed upon him. 468. *b.* 469. *a.* His conformity with Spinoza. 470. II. 411. *a.* 412. *b.* Whether he believed the immortality of the soul, and the Trinity, and whether he had any glimpses of the Incarnation of the Son of God. I. 470. *b.* 471. *a.* and IV. from 714. *a.* to 719. *a.* Whether he ought to be put in the number of the Refugees. I. 471. *b.* Whether he threw himself into the Eurypus. 473. *a.* *b.* 474. *a.* The professors that are strongly prejudiced in favour of Aristotle's Hypotheses, have much less reason on their side than the parliaments which proscribed all others. 470. Some authors have believed that his doctrine went the length of Atheism. 470. What is said as to his conversation with a Jew, does not seem to be well grounded. 465. *b.* 466. *a.* *b.* It is not probable that he behaved so ill to Plato, as he is said to have done 466. *b.* 467. *a.* Nor that he was guilty of impiety and idolatry in his amours. 467. *a.* *b.* It is doubted whether he acknowledged the immortality of the soul. 470. *b.* 471. *a.* It is not certain what kind of death he died. 473. *a.* *b.* 474. *a.* *b.* He was extremely honoured in his own city. 471. *b.* Who was the first and almost the last of the moderns, that comprehended Aristotle's opinions. II. 411. *a.* His Doctrine touching an universal intellect, which is the same in all men. 565. *b.* Whether he burnt all the books of those who had philosophized before him, and the books of Solomon. 643. *b.* 644. *a.* A foolish story of the Jews to that purpose. 644. *ibid.* He looks upon the eternal motion of matter to be an absurd supposition. 787. *b.* He is very ill used by Luther. III. 952. *a.* *b.* When and how nature forms women, according to that Philosopher. 144. *b.* It was with good reason that he spoke ill of the Lacedemonian women. 968. *a.* To what he compares those who leave off Philosophy, and apply themselves to other sciences. IV. 543. *a.* His opinion about the souls of beasts. 549. *a.* *b.* to 551. *b.* It is in vain that some people endeavour to find in his writings the seeds of Des Cartes's opinion, touching the souls of beasts. 551. *b.* 552. *a.* The reverse of Aristotle's Doctrine has been publicly defended, which occasioned great troubles. 835. *a.* *b.* The fate of his works Historically described. V. 377. *b.* 378. *a.* An inference very glorious for him, but which may raise some doubts concerning his works. 379. *a.* *b.* He is unjustly censured by the author of the Art of Thinking, in favour of Parmenides. 575. *b.* He advances facts which cannot be confirmed. 772. *a.* *b.* His Rhetoric translated into Latin, by M. A. Muretus, and explained by Benciis. I. 747. *b.* The agreement between the sects of Aristotle and Plato. 268. *a.* *b.*
- Arithmetic*: the authors that have writ upon that subject. V. 297. *a.* *b.* Tartaglia excels in it, and all the rest copy and plunder him. *ibid.*
- Arius*: Nicolas, Bishop of Mirra, gives him a box on the ear, in the council of Nice. II. 530. *a.* *a.* (15).
- Ark*: whether matrimonial functions were superseeded and suspended in the ark. II. 431. *a.* *b.*
- Arles*: none is admitted into the academy of Arles, but upon requesting it. IV. 459. *a.* The Cardinal of Arles. I. 178. How described by a Polander. *ibid.* *a.* *b.* 179. *a.* He dies in the odour of sanctity. *ibid.* *a.* *b.*
- Arlequiniana* quoted. I. 750. *b.*
- Arminianism*, is of an insinuating nature V. 513. *a.*
- Arminians*. The Arminians should not have exceeded the bounds set them by the Reformers. I. 481. *a.* *b.* Their Hypothesis cannot solve the principal difficulties upon the subject of Predestination. *ibid.* 482. *a.* They reject the authority of the Synod of Dort. II. 793. They are deposed and banished. *ibid.* The populace curses them as the first cause of the disorders, both in Church and State. *ibid.* *a.* They retire to Antwerp during the truce. *ibid.* *b.*
- Arminius*, a conjecture upon his disputes with Gomarus. I. 687. *a.* 688. *b.* His recommendations and those of Uytendbogard are prejudicial to Drusius. II. 705. *a.* He denies that his opinions were the same with those of Pelagius. III. 173. *a.* There is no fundamental hereby in them. 174. *a.* What he answered touching the writings which he had orders to confute. III. 676. An exhortation which Joseph Hall addresses to him. 343. *a.* *b.*
- Arms* (Coats of) John le Feron's book upon that subject. III. 27. *a.* Another book upon that subject. *ibid.* *b.* Adam's coat of arms, what? *ibid.*
- Arms*, people who have confessed that they threw down their arms when they fled. I. 189. *a.* *b.* What the arms of the Church were in primitive times, when she was persecuted. 592. *a.* Whether it is lawful for a private person, to bear arms against the allies of his sovereign, when he may either lift or not, as he pleases. II. 196. *a.* A book wherein it is maintained that ministers have a call to bear them, and the trouble which that brought the author into. I. 756. *a.* *b.* Mr Amyraut condemns one's talking up arms against his Prince upon any occasion whatever. 264. *b.* 265. *a.*
- Army*. A spiritual army, which was to be raised by the advice and inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and commanded by the King of France, to extirpate impieties and heresies. IV. 115. *a.* *b.* A Jansenist's reflexion thereupon. *ibid.* *b.* 116. *a.*
- Arnauld* (Antony) Advocate, whether he was of the Reformed religion. I. 484. *b.* 485. *a.* There were several persons of the Reformed religion in that family. II. 727. *a.* Among others Mr Arnauld, Comptroller of the Reftes. *ibid.* In his pleading against the Jesuits he employs the words of Lepidus. III. 956. *a.*
- Arnauld* (Antony) Doctor of the Sorbonne, the source of his quarrels with the Jesuits. I. 487. *a.* *b.* 488. *a.* He did not deserve to be filed *one Arnauld*. 489. *b.* 490. *a.* The secret of silencing him. *ibid.* *b.* The reasons which he gave for his silence, with regard to two books that were published against him. 494. *b.* His dispute with le Fevre Doctor of the Sorbonne. III. 70. *b.* A pretended letter from the King of France: 593. *a.* *b.* He is in the wrong to blame Quistorpius. 246. *a.* *b.* He is contradicted by Mr Claude with respect to Allatius and Hottinger. 528. *b.* Acknowledges that he had been in the wrong to Mr Mallet, as to the extravagancies of which he had believed him to be the first author. 854. *b.* Received a small ruffle on account of a citation from Luther. 950. *a.* Is quoted. IV. 719. *a.* *b.*
- Arnobius* vented very dangerous errors. I. 501. *a.* *b.* He grounds a very bad objection upon a false assertion. II. 498. *a.* He ridicules the Pagans for making nine nights necessary to Jupiter to get one child. III. 427. *b.* His way of arguing against Jupiter's adulteries. 646. *a.* *b.* He puts Paganism to a nonplus. 647. *a.* *b.* What answer he made to the Pagans when they accused the Christian religion, as being the cause of all the misfortunes which befel the empire. IV. 423. *a.* *b.* He is less orthodox upon the subject of matter considered as one of the principles, than the Stoics. 521. *a.* Has very strongly refuted those two sorts of gods, some whereof are beneficent and others mischievous. *ibid.* But he went too far. *ibid.* His notion touching the soul of man. 903. *b.* 904. *a.* A passage of his examined. *ibid.* What he observes concerning the nature

I N D E X.

11

- nature of God. V. 146. *a.* The confession he makes with respect to those who deny the Deity, or a providence. 217. *a. b.* 218. *a.* What his view was in saying that the Pagans had the Amphitryon of Plautus acted in order to appease Jupiter. 309. *b.* His answer to such of the Pagans as required some of Cicero's books to be prohibited. 506. *b.*
- Arnoldus*, the translation of a passage of his censured. I. 48. *a. b.*
- Arras*, the treaty of Arras relating to the submission of Charles VII King of France. II. 212. *a. b.*
- Arria* kills herself to give an example to her husband. IV. 594.
- Arriaga* quoted. V. 223. *b.* IV. 545. *a. b.* V. 611. *a.* 618. *a.*
- Arrian*, his extreme credulity for fables. I. 85. *a. b.*
- Arrows*: the flying arrow. I. 4. *a. b.*
- Arseus* causes Achilles to be put to death. She is received into Megabyzus's house. Marc Antony causes her to be killed out of complaisance to Cleopatra. IV. 791. *a. b.*
- Art*. The Civil Law requires that a person who excels in any art should have his life given him, altho' he may have deserved to lose it. III. 197. *b.* 198. *a.*
- Art of Love*: Ovid's books on that subject were less the cause than the pretence of banishing him. IV. 445.
- Art of Writing*: A man styled the first of all the writers of the kingdom. III. 123.
- Art of Slandering*: there is one according to Scaliger. Those who are ignorant of it hurt themselves more than they hurt others. I. 343. *b.*
- Art of War*: it was formerly very far from the state of perfection to which it is come now. I. 162.
- Art of Poetry*: one of its rules examined. IV. 744. *a. b.*
- Art of French Poetry*: Des Accords promised that work. I. 66. *a.* Daniel d'Auge's book upon that subject. 562. *a.*
- Art of Thinking*: that book referred to. I. 791. *a. n.* (36).
- Artagnan*: the Memoirs published under that name are supposititious. III. 881. *a.*
- Artemidorus* cited on the subject of dreams and their signification. I. 6. *a.*
- Artillery*, by whom invented. I. 183. *b.*
- Artists*. Famous artists are liable to be capricious. I. 377. *b.* And have often reason to repent it. *ibid.*
- Arundel*, (Earl of) his Marbles. IV. 771. *a. b.*
- Asiatics* were the aggressors in the first wars which they had with the Europeans. III. 372. *a. b.* Their readiness to believe the most ridiculous traditions. 576. *a.*
- Ascribe*: several persons ascribe to others, pieces which they themselves have composed. II. 353. *a.*
- Asking*: people often meet with a refusal, because they are too free in asking. I. 418. *b.*
- Asmodeus* transforms himself into an angel of light, in order to surprize devout women. II. 110. *a.*
- Aspasia* abused by the Poets, and upon the stage. IV. 569. *a.* Her History. 578. *b.* 579. *a. b.* 580. *a. b.*
- Aspasia*, Cyrus's mistress, an abridgment of her history. IV. 512. *b.* 513. *a. b.* 514. *a. b.* 515. *a.*
- Asprenas* accused of having poisoned an hundred and thirty guests with one dish. II. 354. *b.*
- Asi*: An asi that had a wonderful attention for Poetry. I. 267, 268. A story that is told of a Collier's asi. III. 804. *a.*
- Asi* (Buridan's), the original of that proverb. II. 226. *b.* 227. *a. b.*
- Asi* (golden), who is the author of its first translation into French. I. 395. *b.* It is a continued satire. 396. *a.* One might draw up a very good commentary on that romance. *ibid.* *a. b.* Some persons believe that it contains the mysteries of the grand operation. *ibid.* *a.*
- Asi*: Who first brought asses-flesh into vogue. IV. 768. *a. b.*
- African*: eldest son to Cleopatra an Indian Queen. II. 523. *a.*
- Assassins*, or murderers of Kings, their panegyrics rewarded by the Spaniards. II. 103. *b.*
- Assassins*, such as John Chastel, discover as much constancy as the most illustrious martyrs. II. 459. *a.* The proceed from the school of the Jesuits. *ibid.* *b.*
- V O L. V.
- Assembly*: one ought not slightly to believe all that is charged upon the religious assemblies of the Heretics. I. 111. *b.*
- Asterites*, a stone which the rays of the sun can set on fire. II. 834.
- Astrea*, what people blame in that romance. III. 866. *b.* 867. *a.*
- Astrology* (Judicial) the vanity of that science. I. 164. *b.* 165. *a.* Whether the birth and miracles of Christ could have been foretold by it. *ibid.* According to its rules a man ought sometimes to die several years before his death. 194. *b.* Persons that have been infatuated with it. 599. *a.* III. 591. *b.* 592. *a. b.* 619. *b.* 804. *a. b.* V. 254. *b.* 255. *a. b.* Its rules prove false. II. 321. *a. b.* The judgment which Castellan makes of it. III. 401. *a.* There are some fortuitous conjunctures which hinder people from seeing the vanity of it. 438. *a.* It's fatal effects. 499. *a. b.* The greatest men suffer themselves to be infatuated with it. IV. 260. *b.* 261. *a. b.* 262. *a.* A reflexion on its horoscopes. 369. *a. b.* 370. *a.* It would be a kind of Magic, if it could foretell future events. 938. *a. b.* 939. *a.* II. 391. *a.*
- Astrologer*. An Astrologer who starved himself to death, to confirm his prediction. II. 320. *b.* An Astrologer who frightens the Duke of Guise. III. 873. The greatest part of Astrologers are not cautious enough in their predictions. 436. *b.* They can turn their horoscopes to the advantage of their religion. 935. *a. b.* Astronomers sent to the Gallies, and for what reason. IV. 936. *a.* Their vanity and tricks. 261. *b.* Their subtleties. 264. *a. b.* They rather chuse to relate facts which are little to their credit, than to conceal the reasons which they can assign for them by their principles. 267. *b.* Astrologers exposed by Castendus. 531. *b.* 532. *a. b.* Astrologers confounded. V. 243. *a. b.* to 246. *a. b.* It is not an easy matter to discredit them. 245. *a. b.* Few of them venture to draw retrograde horoscopes. 295, 296. *a. b.* Why they cannot see the gallantries of their wives in the stars. 322. *a. b.* They threaten a deluge for the year 1524, and cause a general alarm. IV. 380.
- Astronomers* must needs have been free from sensuality. I. 295. *b.* 296. *a.* In what manner Ovid and Pliny speak of them. III. 462. *a. b.*
- Astronomy*, Socrates dissuaded the study of it. I. 311. *a. b.*
- Atellani* very scarce. An enquiry made at Rome into false ones. IV. 555. *b.* 556. *a.*
- Atellana*, what sort of Comedies they were. IV. 90.
- Atheism*, does not give us more false notions of the nature of God than the Pagan religion. I. 132. *a.* Whether it be a less evil than the worship of the Pagan deities. 382. *a.* Whether it be not a kind of Atheism to admit a first mover, and to maintain at the same time that the world is eternal. 562. *b.* It is almost without example among women. 639. *a.* It requires a certain degree of force and furious strength of mind to fall into Atheism. II. 450. *b.* 451. *a. b.* 452. *a. b.* 648. *b.* It is not by fables that Atheism must be combated. III. 132. *a. b.* There are three degrees of it. V. 324. *a. b.* When it began to appear in France and in Italy. 286. *a. b.*
- Atheists*, what, according to them, was the cause and origin of the laws that are established among men. II. 571. *b.* Their system. 552. *a. b.* 553. *a. b.* Those who are so by persuasion do not amuse themselves with preaching up impiety. III. 648. *b.* Whether it is possible for them to be Magicians. IV. 938. *b.* to 940. *a. b.* One is accused of being an Atheist, whenever he refuses to adopt all the particular articles of his sect. III. 470. *b.* 471. *a.* When and how men begin to turn Atheists. 768. *b.* An Atheist hanged and burnt at the Greve. IV. 845. *b.* Who, as some say, write the best against Atheists. III. 132. *a. b.* An explanation concerning the remarks which are diffused thro' this Dictionary, touching their good morals. V. 811. to 814. It is less surprizing that they should have lived like honest men, than that Idolaters should have done good actions. 811. Self-love was the end of their good actions. 812. Examples of their bad morals cited by the author, who had enquired after more. 813. Theoretical Atheists, Diagoras, Vanini, Spinoza, &c. *ibid.*
- Atbenans* is censured for a fault against good sense. I. 116. *a. b.* To whom the public is indebted for the first edition of that author. IV. 295. He makes 10 L.
- Herodotus

- Herodotus say what he does not say, with respect to the Egyptian priests, 789. *b.* 790. *a.*
- Athenæus* the Philosopher, what he said after he was set at liberty by Augustus. I. 537. *b.*
- Athenagoras*, whether as Deputy for the Christians he presented his apology to the Imperial Court. I. 531. *a. b.* 532. *a.* He had heterodox opinions. *ibid. b.* 533. *a.*
- Athenians* offer sacrifices in behalf of all the Greeks. I. 5. *a.* The worship which they paid to the god Boreas. II. 81. They introduce fictions and idle stories into their system of religion: *ibid. b.* 82. *a. b.* When and by whom they were delivered from the dominion of the thirty tyrants. 548. *a.* What value they set upon the freedom of their city. 558. *b.* They assist Aristagoras, and help him to burn the city of Sardis. 599. *b.* What they do against Diogenes. 652. *a.* 653. *a. b.* 654. *a. b.* An explication of their decree, touching the Tragedies of Æschylus. 826. *b.* A law of theirs which prohibited women and slaves to study Physics. 453. A curious piece of History on that subject. *ibid. a. b.* The Athenians censured for their want of courage, by Demetrius. 714. *a.* Their laws abrogated by Christianity. IV. 128. *a.* How they were cured of a panic that was occasioned by an eclipse of the sun. 565. *b.* 566. *a.* They put six of their generals to death most unjustly. 581. *a.* Plunder Apollo by sea and land. 621. *b.* 622. *a.* Forbid their Sophists to plead causes. 784. *a.* They suffered a man to marry his sister by the father's side but not by the mother's V. 49. *b.* Banishment the common fate of those who governed them. II. 259.
- Atheni*, a contest between Neptune and Minerva, which of them should give a name to that city. I. 445. A man was in danger of losing his life there, when he entertained certain notions touching the properties of the stars. 307. *b.* It was fertile in producing informers. 468. *a.* We have nothing but a fair representation of that Republic, which in truth was enslaved by the Demagogues. IV. 581. *b.* It was proposed there to add a new tribe to the ten old ones. 557. *b.* A collection of the decrees of the people of Athens, a work that is lost, and the loss of which is to be regretted. II. 562. *a.* The Areopagus of Athens, was formidable to Atheists and impious persons. 572. *a. b.* 573. *a.*
- Athenion*, by what means he became very powerful in Athens. V. 379. *b.*
- Athletics*, their abstinence. I. 142. *a.* The ancient Greeks and Romans made them wear girdles. III. 964. *a.*
- Atia*, the mother of Augustus, what country she was of. IV. 397. *a.* She durst not go into a bath, and for what reason. 407. *b.*
- Atlas*, the coast of Teuchira is called the mansions inhabited by him. IV. 252. *b.*
- Atomists*, are not so absurd in their system as the Spinozists in theirs: the reason of it. II. 644. *a.* They admit an infinite number of first principles. V. 827.
- Atoms*, the difference between the atoms of Democritus and those of Epicurus. II. 779. *a.* The advantage that may be drawn from the supposition of their being animated. *ibid. b.* 790. *a. b.* 791. *a. b.* 792. *a. b.* III. 790. *b.* 791. *a. b.* 792. *a.* Their motion of declination did no ways serve the two purposes for which Epicurus designed it. II. 791. *a. b.* 792. *a.* The absurdity of such a motion. *ibid.* Who was the inventor of atoms. III. 788. *a.* They are admitted with a vacuum, by a sect of Philosophers in the East. 792. *a.* An observation upon that Hypothesis. IV. 437. *b.* 438. *a.* The bare motion of atoms, is not able to produce that regularity which is to be seen in plants. 266. *b.* 267. *a.*
- Attack*: the greatest generals, and those who are appointed by Heaven to perform the greatest exploits, do not take all the towns which they attack. V. 655.
- Attention* of a profound and singular kind. II. 597. *b.* 637. *b.* 638. *a.*
- Atticus* (Pomponius) the longer his epistles were, the finer they were. I. 427. *b.* Statues were erected to him at Athens. 539. *b.* He was of the sect of Epicurus, and nevertheless a man of great worth. 541.
- Attila* kills himself on his wedding-day, by too much drinking. III. 482. *a.* Being softened by a speech he marches back beyond the Danube. 758. *b.* 759. *a.* His severity to one of his Panegyrist. IV. 169.
- Attilius*, whether he ought to be ranked among the Tragic or Comic writers. I. 60. *b.*
- Attorneys*: There never was a faint of that profession. IV. 487. *b.*
- Avarice*, a sentence of Bion's touching that vice, canonized by St Paul. II. 15. Bad excuses for that vice. V. 147. *b.* 148. *a. b.* The fordid avarice of a Professor of Physics. 136. *a. b.* 137. *a.*
- Avaux* (the Count d') sends several copies of the book intitled, *Lux in Tenebris*, &c. to Paris. III. 679. *a.*
- Auterlin*, the plan of his book on the Eucharist. I. 545. *a. b.*
- Autetierre* (the Viscount d') what trade he followed at Geneva for a livelihood. V. 187. *b.*
- Aubignac* (the Abbot d') his academy was composed of persons of merit and erudition. V. 444. *b.*
- Aubigné* (d') has improved upon a passage of Thuanus. I. 119. *a. b.* A passage of his criticized. 711. *a.* Examination of a story which he relates. II. 148. *a. b.* He renders his other stories suspected by his satirical strokes. *ibid. b.* His mistake as to the place where Goudimel was massacred. III. 197. *a.* Whether he was descended from Joan d'Albret, Queen of Navarre. IV. 331, 332. *a. b.* What he says of a book of taxes. 649. *b.* 650. *a.* Remarks upon two passages of his. V. 733. He is deputed by the King of Navarre touching the affront offered to his wife. IV. 341. *b.* Censured on that head. *ibid.*
- Aubigné* (Constant d') son to the foregoing: his children. I. 546. *b.*
- Audebert*, a Jesuit, offers in the name of his communion to give up many things for the sake of peace. I. 263. *b.* He enters into secret negotiations with some ministers for the re-union of the two religions. III. 123. *a. b.* Gives in a project of re-union to Cardinal Richelieu. V. 804.
- Audguier* (d') quoted. II. 128. *b.* 129. *b.* III. 300. *b.* 301. *a.* 857. *a.* 859. *b.* Two authors of that name. I. 548.
- Auditors*, their memory is a terrible thing to preachers, and advocates who contradict themselves. I. 351. *b.*
- Avein*, the small advantages that were reaped from that victory. III. 829. *b.*
- Aventine* (John) The Protestants published his annals from an entire manuscript. I. 549. *a.* His fate may be compared with that of Father Paul. 551. *a.* He is accused of having forged several satirical reflexions, in order to slander the Popes. III. 233. *b.* 234. *a.* He resolutely denies the story of the She-Pope, and paves the way for all those who have denied it since. IV. 731. *b.* 732. *a.* 710. *b.* He is cried down by the Cardinals, Baronius and Bellarmine. 732. *a.*
- Aventinus* (Mount) the mutinous populace withdraws to it. III. 490. *b.*
- Averroës* was Avicenna's rival and enemy. I. 553. *a.* His opinion touching the soul, or universal intellect, common to all particular understandings. 554. *a. b.* 555. *a. b.* II. 316. *b.* IV. 913. *a.* At present no body wastes time in reading him. I. 556. *a.* His irreligion. *ibid. b.* 557. *a. b.* He wished his soul might be among the Philosophers. IV. 704. *b.* N. Vernias, and A. Niphus maintain his opinion on the unity of the intellect. 377. *b.*
- Augsburg*, the magistrates of that city erect a school, which they call St Ann's. III. 145. *b.* When and how their library was enriched with good manuscripts. 478. *a.* What office is that of *Dumoir*, and that of *Prætor* in that city. V. 447. *a.* Popery is banished from thence. IV. 285. *b.* 286. *a.*
- Augurians*, reasons against the science of Auguries. II. 629. *b.* The Roman ladies went to seek for nuptial Auguries or presages. IV. 200. *b.*
- Augustin* (Saint) the reason he gives why Adam did not consummate his marriage till after his fall. I. 22. *a. b.* He is censured for his loose morality on a capital point. 91. *a. b.* In what he makes the opening of our first parents eyes to consist. 101. *a. b.* He is called an *African*, violent and full of heat. 106. *a.* is called *obscure* in his writings, and *fickle* in his notions with respect to the doctrine of Grace. *ibid.* He is ill treated by some Protestants. 109. *b.* He approves of Cicero's railery upon a religious worship which consisted in weeping. 114. *a.* His

- His exclamation on Abraham's concubinage. 123. *a.* He found an apology for perfection in Sarah's treatment of Hagar. *ibid.* Is deservedly reprimanded for it in the Philosophical Commentary. *ibid.* A passage of that Father against perfection. 287. *b.* 288. *a.* What he said of Apollonius Tyanzus. 282. *a.* and of Apuleius. 394. *a.* His authority with the Roman Catholics. 470. *a.* The picture which he has drawn of his youth. 562. *a. b.* 563. *a. b.* He gave himself up betimes to debauchery. 563. *a. b.* His system, for which the Church of Rome has engaged her respect, casts her into perplexity. 564. *a. b.* to 566. *a.* He asks of God the gift of continency, but is afraid of being taken at his word. 108. *a.* Has solidly refuted the doctrines of Democritus. 643. *a.* And has shewn us the difference between that Philosopher and Epicurus. *ibid.* He begs of God the grace of being delivered from certain dreams. III. 73. *a.* He is severely reprimanded by a modern author, on account of some notions touching the practice of the Cynics. 458. *b.* By what arguments he supports the miracles of the Scripture against the Heathens. 578. *b.* Reflexion on one of the effects of prejudice. *ibid.* and 579. *a.* He throws the blame of an ignominious peace which Jovian had made, upon Julian. 586. *a.* Ridicules Paganism. 642. *a.* One of his objections examined. 912. *b.* 913. *a.* It was an happy thing that he abandoned the Manichean Heresy. IV. 95, 96. He is unjustly censured by Tanaquillus Faber with respect to the licentiousness of the stage. 568. *a. b.* Was more fortunate than wife in his notions touching the soul of beasts. 901. *b.* His exaggeration of Sarah's decay. V. 53. *b.* He has not made a good apology for the conduct of Sarah and Abraham. 54. *b.* 55. *a. b.* People have no great opinion of the learning of St Augustin's Priars. 235. *a.* He made an improper choice of examples to convince the Heathens, that the mother of Jesus Christ was a virgin. 772. *a. b.* His maxim touching the necessity of speaking about obscene things. III. 135. *b.* What he said of the gods Stercutius and Cloacina, and of some people who seemed to sing when they broke wind. *ibid.*
- Augustin* (Antony) censured upon the subject of the *Familia Hortensia*. III. 490. *a.* He is sent by the Pope to Philip II. IV. 200. Is a friend of John Meiel's. *ibid.*
- Augustus* remits an hundred talents to the inhabitants of the island of Coos, for the Venus Anadyomene. I. 369. *a.* One of his jests. II. 356. *b.* He was the first who took cognizance of Defamatory Libels, in order to punish the authors of them. 353. *a. b.* 354. *a. b.* 355. *a. b.* 356. *a.* His design was to marry his daughter Julia to Cotison, King of the Getæ, and that he himself should marry the daughter of the same Cotison. 560. *a.* He makes choice in the enemies army of those whom he intended to admit to his greatest familiarity. 632. *b.* The Poets of his court were animated with the same spirit as the Poets of the present time. 715. *a.* He had a singular tenderness for Drusus. 717. *a.* How he would have the supreme authority called. 718. *a.* He causes a library to be erected in the temple of Apollo Palatinus. III. 8. *a.* To what length his weakness, touching dreams, proceeded. IV. 73. *b.* The empire was foretold to him when he was an infant. 369. *a.* Reflexion on that prediction. *ibid. b.* and 370. *a.* It was under him that dancing came to its perfection. 646. *b.* A fine edict of that Emperor for preserving the chastity of maids. V. 337. *a.* His treatment of Ovid. IV. 445. Idolized literally by that Poet. *ibid.* and 446. *a. b.* His grief and his anger must have been awakened when Ovid mentioned what he had seen, and what was the cause of his banishment. 443. *b.* Suetonius says nothing to insinuate his amours with his daughter or granddaughter. 444. *a.* Reasons against the conjecture of his being guilty of incest with his granddaughter. *ibid. b.* His policy in not recalling Ovid from banishment. *ibid.* and 445. *a.* He orders all instruments concerning debts, which occasioned calumnies and quarrels, to be burnt. III. 278. *a.*
- Avignon* sold to the Pope for a very inconsiderable sum. IV. 301, 304.
- Aulus Gellius*, a whole chapter of his quoted. I. 127. *a. b.* Examination of his apology for Virgil. II. 234. *a. b.* His opinion touching the absurdities that were ascribed to Democritus. 639. *b.* He did not understand a *grasshopper* by the word *salutricula*. III. 491. *b.* He is falsely corrected upon the subject of Lælius. 699. *a. b.* Censured. II. 259. *a.* The difference of that author's chapters according to the different editions. 385. *a.*
- Anno* (Madam d') quoted. IV. 365. *a. b.*
- Aurelian*, the severity of his morals was only fit for the sect of the Montanists. I. 571. *a.* What first name was given to him. *ibid. b.* The judgment which Vopiscus passed upon that Prince. 576. *b.* His elogy. 575. *b.* 576. *a.* In what manner he justifies himself for having led a Queen in triumph. V. 603. *a.*
- Aurelius* (Marcus), the piece attributed to that Emperor is not the history of his life, as Naudé believed it was. II. 321. His answer to those who advised him to divorce his wife. III. 793. *a.*
- Ausonius*, whether or not he was a Christian. I. 582. *b.* 583. *a. b.* He was censured with respect to the dead body of Hector. 81. *b.* To what a degree an epigram of that Poet was admired. II. 619. *b.* He ingeniously obviates an objection in his acknowledgment to Gratian. III. 107. *a.*
- Auspices*, reasons against the science of Auspices. II. 629. *b.* 630. *a.* Who invented it. V. 386.
- Austerities* of some Indian Philosophers. II. 115. *a. b.* 116. *a. b.* III. 312. *b.* 313. *a. b.*
- Australians*, their particular make. V. 4. *a. b.* 5. *a.* Their notion of eternal rest. *ibid. a. b.* Why they never speak of God. *ibid. b.* Their origin, and the notion they have with respect to that of the Europeans. *ibid.* 6. *a.* Who the author is that speaks of the Australians. 7. *a. b.*
- Austria* (the house of), from whence it derives its pedigree, according to the Benedictine Monks. I. 341. *a. b.* Who restored that house to all its former splendor in Germany. II. 692. It carries on the negotiation at Munster with great policy. 691. *b.* Its prosperity notwithstanding the threatenings of some pretended Prophets. 537, 538, 539, 690, 691, 692. III. 682. *a. b.* 683. *a.* Richelieu formed a design to humble it. I. 785, 786. *a.* Cardinal de Beaulieu opposes it, and is seconded by Marillac, Keeper of the Seals, &c. *ibid. a.* It causes the troops of the Circle of Burgundy to enter the Electorate of Cologne. II. 224. *a. b.*
- Austria* (Anne of) her answer to a Bookseller. I. 544. *b.* See *Anne*.
- Austria* (Don John of) headed a party that opposed the Queen-Regent. IV. 365.
- Authority* (the way of), people come back to it after having cried it down. I. 242. *b.* 243. *a.* IV. 474. *a.* Without it every sect is liable to be split into a great variety of subdivisions. I. 287. Whether the Roman Catholics and Protestants differ in that respect. IV. 65. *a.* The difficulties attending the said way. 361. *a. b.* to 364. *a.* 335. *a. b.* 336. *a.* It necessarily leads every particular man to be of the national religion. 792. *a.* To make a right use of the said way in our search after truth, we must first examine where it resides. 536. *a.* to 538. *a.*
- Authority of the Pope*: John-Thomas Rocaberti writes several volumes in defence of it, and caused to be printed at his own expence a collection in twenty volumes in folio under the title of *Bibliotheca Pontificia*. IV. 883.
- Authors*: An author divided into three, and his works in the same manner. I. 12. When a person has a mind to describe an author by his relations, he should speak of relations that are known. 652. *b.* At what time an author may be said to flourish and become illustrious. II. 396. *b.* His age may almost be as easily known by the strokes of his pen, as by the features of his face. IV. 689. *a.* Authors who quote no body hope to be quoted themselves. I. 20. *a.* They copy after each other. 23. *b.* Ought not to be cited for conjectures which other persons have advanced. 63. *b.* Ought to make their retreat in time. 120. *a. b.* II. 619. They are very unwilling to confess a mistake. 161. *b.* No authors cite themselves so often as those who suppress their names. 181. *b.* Several of them falsify facts in order to make them serve their purposes. 198. *a. b.* Some persons, thro' too much care of becoming good authors, never become authors at all. 200. *b.* Authors that were only rich in

in words. 330. *a.* Those who amplify what they quote cannot be too much censured for it. 338. *b.* They ought never to suppress the principal circumstances of a fact. 372. *a.* It would be of great use to criticize on their false Logic. 394. *b.* They sometimes put off their creditors with an assignment on the next dedication. 442. *a.* Their address and policy. 451. 460. *b.* II. 643. *b.* Their rude and unpolite behaviour in former times, when they were at war with one another. I. 514. *b.* They occasion a great deal of obscurity by their neglecting to put the words in their natural order. 602. *b.* They change maxims as their occasions require; but chiefly Divines do so. 616. *a.* 617. *a. b.* A moral reflexion which may serve to comfort authors of a low rank. 701. *a.* It is very useful to collect examples of their insincerity. 799. *b.* Authors ought continually to be on their guard against distractions of mind. 759. *a.* Profane authors may be consulted in order to explain the chronology of the Scripture. 775. *b.* They ought to be acquainted with the most common books, and the most scarce pamphlets. II. 94. *a.* There are things which authors never publish when they rightly understand their duty. 266. *b.* There are some who would never have been authors if they had not been attacked. 328. *a.* Many falsely brag of having been familiarly acquainted with an author that is grown into reputation by his writings. 284. *b.* 404. *b.* Severe tribunals should be set up against some authors. 451. *b.* An author who is a Layman is more at liberty than a Preacher to speak his sentiments. 454. *b.* There are some authors who do not publish every part of a work according to its order. 484. *b.* They relate what the Antients tell us, with a thousand alterations. 535. *b.* It is hardly possible that future ages should not put several quite different constructions upon what authors say. 595. *b.* III. 447. *b.* The different circumstances in which they are, contribute much to make them more or less famous. II. 518. *b.* Their disputes never fail to produce effects that are fatal to the reputation which they had as men of worth. 583. *b.* Persons who have wrote books concerning authors of the same name. 633. *a. b.* They do not love that another should interfere with them. 683. *a.* The gross artifice of those who make a merit of being hated by people of other persuasions. 695. *b.* Whether some Protestant authors were hated by the Romans Catholics, because they defended the good cause well. *ibid.* Authors that quote no body do not deserve to be quoted. 778. *a. b.* 779. *a.* The most effectual method of restraining such of them as are given to slander. 800. *a. b.* Those of the first rank ought to die, as soon as their glory is arrived at its meridian. 825. *a.* It is sometimes dangerous to be too lavish in bestowing praises upon them. III. 249. *b.* Their tenderness for their own works is immoderate. 377. *a.* 378. *b.* 384. *a. b.* Their fate is deplorable: for even when they think that they apply their utmost attention, they mistake the sense of the easiest passages. 838. *b.* They forget in one place of the same book, what they have said in another. 14. *b.* There are some who compose treatises which are only fit to be posthumous ones. 175. *b.* 176. *a.* There are some who seem to compose with a wonderful facility, who nevertheless take great pains in writing. 261. *b.* 262. *a. b.* IV. 85. *a. b.* 86. *a.* They ought sometimes to prefer their own judgments before the judgments of others. 337. *b.* What they ought to do in order to obtain rewards from the public. 340. *a. b.* A cause of their mistakes, that spreads itself farther than is imagined. 451. *b.* There are some who correct their writings too much. 836. *a. b.* 877. *a.* There are some who are harder to be pleased in the beginning than in the sequel of their work. *ibid. b.* There are others, who, revising a work they desire to reprint, are at greater pains, than at the first composition. *ibid.* There are some who are only learned in their collections. 195. *a. b.* One of the causes which have produced chimerical authors. 402. *b.* There are scarce any who do not complain of the ingratitude of the age. 459. *b.* to 461. *a.* It is impossible that those who have a great many adversaries should not contract an habit of reproachful language. 475. *a.* They should mistrust their memory, and not alledge any thing

without first consulting over again the books where they had read it. 568. *b.* They seldom give any thing for nothing, in point of praises and compliments. 595. *a. b.* Have a right to coin new words. 743. *a. b.* It were to be wished that they were neither poor nor rich. 894. *b.* 895. *a.* In what sense those who traffic with their works are to be commended, and in what sense to be blamed. 843. *a.* What authors have wrote collections of proverbs. V. 199. *a. b.* One is seldom at a loss to find out the religion of the present authors. 235. *a.* Their bad way of quoting. 325. *b.* 326. *a.* Famous authors get honour by indifferent performances. 340. *b.* Reflexion upon the conduct of those who procure the prohibition of their adversaries books. 343. *a.* And upon the consequences that may be drawn from their writings to their morals. 420. *a. b. &c.* There are some of them whom it would be very difficult to enrich. 403. *b.* Modern authors should advance nothing but what they have credible witnesses for. II. 639. *a.* A maxim which they ought carefully to study. V. 738. *a.* There are no authors so subject as Poets to forget their promises not to print any more. II. 83. *a.* Fontaine's verses upon that subject. *ibid.* Menage's chapters upon the same subject. *ibid. b.* It is a method of obliging an author in the most agreeable manner, to advise people to buy his books. 314. A great author of little books, who was so called, and in what sense. 528. An author who suffers some things to be inserted in his works gives a handle for saying that they are not his. 688, 689. The smallest change of letters in their proper names multiplies them without reason. III. 534. It is a crying injustice to despise authors who had great obstacles to surmount at a time when literature was but beginning to revive. IV. 166. *a.* Some authors surpass them at present, who would not have equalled them, if they had lived in their time. *ibid.* It is not without example, that a lacquey has become a distinguished author. 173. *b.* Typographical errors multiply them. 193. One cannot do an author a greater disservice than by proclaiming his works under too pompous a character. 284. *a.* Several are negligent in correcting their works, and give it over. 451. *a.* The ablest authors rather chuse to be silent than to attack a book that is too strong for them. V. 179. *b.* 180. *a.* It is allowable for them to contrive the matter so as to make their books acceptable. 810.

Automata: The hypothesis of Automata is the only way to get out of the plunge. II. 779. *b.* Whether or not, and how far, Des Cartes was the inventor of them. IV. 546. *b.* Whether the Antients taught that the souls of beasts were only Automata. 552. *a. b.* to 554. *a. b.* The greatest difficulties which attend that system. 908. *b.* 909. *a. b.* The Automata of Des Cartes are very advantageous to the true religion. 901. *b. & seq.*

Autumn of age, how far it reaches. IV. 163. *a.* *Avengerius* (in Latin *Arvernus*) boasted to have Julius Caesar's sword. II. 419. *b.* When and by what means they appeared at the court of France in the highest posts. I. 482. *a.*

Avengus (the Count Dauphin of) killed in the King's presence, and in full council. II. 463. *a. b.*

Auxerre, the rebellion of that city. I. 258. *b.* The service which the Sieur de Châtelux performed to the Chapter of that city, and what privilege was granted to him by the Chapter. II. 461. *a.*

Axtius (the Physician) condemned to make a public recantation of a calumny which he had vented. IV. 504. *b.*

Axtius, King of the Emeſenians, causes himself to be circumcised, to marry a Jew. II. 701.

Axtius, the length of its siege. I. 590. IV. 790.

Axum, twin-sister to Cain occasions the death of Abel, and how. I. 24. *a.* She marries Cain. *ibid.*

Babylonian

B.

Babylonian numbers, Horace would not suffer them to be consulted. II. 125.

Babylanius: They boasted of an antiquity which far exceeded the age of the world. I. 595. *a. b.* Father Hardouin's correction of a passage of Pliny touching the antiquity of letters among them, explained. 596. *a. b.*

Bacchus, the celebration of his feast required continence the preceding night. III. 934. *a.* He was adored by the Pagans under an infamous name. V. 134. *a. b.* He encroaches less upon Venus in the south, than Venus upon Bacchus in the north. II. 823. *a. b.*

Bacon: his new Atlantis. III. 345. *a.*

Baden, how the Swiss bathe there. V. 423. *b.*

Baden (the Marquis of) introduces the reformation in his dominions. III. 256.

Baduellus: his quarrel with William Bigot. II. 8. *a. b.*

Bagnio-keepers. The Bagnio-keepers of Paris had a mind to assassinate James des Farts, because he forbid the use of baths in time of pestilence. IV. 484. *b.*

Baiard fought a duel with Alphonso de Sotomajore, in the year 1503. V. 139. *b.*

Bajazet lets the Count de Nevers at liberty upon his paying his ransom. II. 206. *a. b.* 207. *a.* He sends to Rome the iron of the lance, which pierced the body of our Saviour. III. 566. *a. b.* He loved Philosophy. 729. *a. b.*

Baif (Lazarus de) goes as far as Rome to attend the lessons of a Greek Professor. IV. 295. *b.*

Baif (John Antony de), what he says of his poverty and education. V. 462. *a. b.*

Baillet quoted. I. 219. *b.* 220. *a. b.* III. 662. *a. b.*

Et passim alibi. Praised for his civility and equity. I. 796. *a.* His judgment upon what passed in the Conference of Ratibon. III. 536. *a.* He has forgot an *Anti* in the collection that he has made. 701. *b.* His civility to the author of this Dictionary is an excess of ceremony, prejudicial to the liberty which every body ought to enjoy in the commonwealth of learning. IV. 548. *b.* His discourse of the life of the saints. V. 433. *b.*

Bain, the Emperor Charles V is magnificently feasted there. III. 530. *a.* Henry entirely burns down the magnificent palace which was there. *ibid. b.*

Baldus, a quick repartee which he made. I. 616. *a.*

Baldus Lupatinus, upon a suspicion of Heresy is thrown into the sea, after he had been imprisoned twenty years. III. 557. *a.*

Ballets: The use of ballets was established in France, before Mary de Medicis brought Rinuccini there. IV. 879. *a. b.*

Balls dangerous to chastity. V. 23. *a. b.* to 25. *a. b.*

Balghane, a noble family in Scotland. III. 784.

Ballasarini. See *Beaujeux*.

Balucius, the history of his dispute with the Abbot Faget. IV. 102. *b.* 103. *a. b.* He has furnished the author with divers memoirs. 427. *n. (a).* V. 111. *n. (a).* *a. n. (1).*

Bahya, a river of the Peloponnesus, whence so called. V. 326. *b.*

Balzac, his pleasant reflexion on Alexander ab Alexandro. I. 224. *a.* *Balzac* and *Balsac* are very different. 622. *a.* A curious piece, which gives room to suspect that Balzac had once a mind to turn Huguenot in Holland. 623. *a. b.* Very ill used by Theophilus. *ibid. b.* His jokes on the impatience of modern women who have too cold husbands. II. 79. *a. b.* Quoted. 350. *a.* V. 333. *a. b. n. (1), (2).* He looked upon it as a sad punishment to be obliged to praise all new printed books. II. 620. *b.* He ridicules a Grammarian who heftored the Deity. 648. *b.* 649. *a.* His criticism on Alexander censured by Costar. 667. *b.* What he says of some devout women in Spain. III. 82. *a. b.* One plainly perceives that his productions cost him a great deal of pains. 262. *b.* IV. 85. *a. b.* The source of his difference with Phylarchus. III. 204. *a.* How much he contributed to the politeness which is spread over the kingdom of France. 855. *a.* He inveighs against Montmaur. V O L. V.

IV. 249. *a. b.* 250. *a. b.* He would fain have been thought the author of a work which he did not write. 279. *a. b.* 280. *a. b.* What he said of the contrariety of ingredients in the human composition. 441. *a.* He had too much vanity. 459. *b.* He expresses himself too eloquently upon the subject of his diseases. 461. *a.* How he speaks of the Prince of Condé with respect to a civil war. 488. *b.* He says that he loved the Protestants much. 528. *a.* Could not endure the word *Panglossia*. 531. *b.* He tells a witty saying of Cato the Censor. 754. *b.* 755. *a.* He is guilty of a small piece of plagiarism in making use of the words which Famianus Strada applied to Quintus Curtius. 811. *b.* A judgment passed upon his works. V. 345. *b.* 346. *a. b.* His character of d'Audiguier. I. 548. *b.* He brings a ridiculous charge against some anonymous persons. 801. *a. b.* He ridicules the vain display of reading, which was a custom that formerly prevailed at the bar. II. 105. *b.* A trick which he made use of to give one a great idea of his reading. 398. *b.* A supplement to the history of his dispute with Father Goulu. IV. 284. *a. b.* 285. *a. b.* Jokes upon his works. 284. *b.* He bestows hyperbolical praises on the Abbot de St Cyran. V. 15. *b.*

Bardel relates an elogy given to Luther by Léo X. III. 766. *b.*

Bargius, a learned Dane, would not accept the place of Hebrew Professor, but upon condition that he should go to Paris to perfect himself under Gabriel Sconita. IV. 493. *a.*

Barishment: some people have looked upon it as a piece of good fortune. I. 637. *b.* The common fate of those, who had the greatest share in the government of the commonwealth of Athens. II. 289.

Banquet of the wise-men: is a defamatory Libel composed by Father Garaffe, against the honour of one of the first Magistrates of France. III. 134. *Alegambe* does not deny it. *ibid.*

Banquets, there are some which are as dangerous to certain people, as a set battle to a Colonel. III. 846. *a.*

Baptism, in the Primitive Church, people received it naked, of what age or sex soever they were. III. 331. *a.* And several put off receiving it till the last moment of their lives. V. 257. *b.*

Bar, its tiresome wranglings. II. 724. *a. b.* The vain reading which people formerly displayed there. 105. *b.*

Baram, interpreter of dreams at the court of the King of Persia. I. 87.

Barbarossa (Frederic), whether he was trod under foot by the Pope. II. 406. *a.*

Barbarossa, King of Algiers, takes Fondi by assault, and what was his motive. III. 189. *b.*

Barbo (Nicholas), a noble Venetian, father to Pope Paul II. IV. 509.

Barbabbas passes for the Messiah. I. 173. *Akiba* declares for him. *ibid.*

Bark, how that powder was called at first. III. 931. *b.*

Barnes, editor of Euripides, his explication of Lucian's Balance examined. II. 865. *b.* 866. *a.*

Barneveldt, what he said to Gomarus and Arminius before the States of Holland. III. 174. *a.* One of his sons was beheaded at the Hague, and for what reason. 802. *b.*

Barocius (Petrus), his gentle remonstrances to Nicoletus Vernias, and Augustin Niphus. IV. 377. *a. b.*

Baronius dares not decide the point between Theodoret and Socrates, touching one of the Kings of Persia. I. 13. *a.* Is censured with respect to St Anne. 342. *a.* Deceives the Protestants in the idea of a book of Damian's, to the disadvantage of his own communion. II. 589. *b.* Why he never named, even while he confused, the centurions of Magdeburg. 643. *b.* Whence it comes to pass that he confirms certain flanders of the Pagan authors. III. 20. *b.* He commits a fault in Chronology, which was not known to Mr du Pin. 219. *a.* Is an enemy to sovereigns; and his annals are full of lies. V. 93. *b.* Expected to be made Pope after Paul V. 96. *b.* Continuation of his annals. II. 241. He is censured for what he says of Florimond de Remond's book touching the She-Pope. IV. 732.

10 M

Barrenness

- Barrenness**: The Jews say that an husband ought not to cohabit with his wife, after he has found her barren for the space of ten years. I. 122. *b.* An obfacle to a widow's marriage. 393. *b.* Philosophers who pretended to cure it. III. 311. *b.*
- Barriero**: (Don John de la) first Abbot of the Feuillants, his conduct during the troubles of the league, and his attachment to Henry III represented by Father Pradillon. IV. 764. *a. b.*
- Bartas** (du) his Week is attacked with some sort of respect. III. 128. *a. b.*
- Barth** (John) beats the Dutch men of war, and saves the corn which was in the ships under his convoy. IV. 211. *a.*
- Barthius** censured. I. 538. *b.* He passes a reasonable judgment upon the works of Marfus. IV. 166. *a. b.* The justice which he does to authors who lived in the time that learning began to revive. *ibid.* He engages himself in a superfluous refutation touching the marrow of lions. I. 76. *a.* He is not consistent with himself. 118. *a.* His causeless fear of dying without posterity. 664. *a.* He censures several great men for ranking a modern Poet among the antient authors. II. 524. *b.* His blunder touching a courtesan, whom he takes for another. III. 701. *b.* He is censured with respect to Patricius of Siena. IV. 507. *a. b.*
- Bartholomew** (Massacre of St) Charpentier's apology for that massacre. II. 446. *a. b.* 447. *a.* The cause of it falsely related. IV. 700. *b.* 701. *a. b.* An author who was not ashamed to make an ode in praise of it. II. 399.
- Bartolus** desires some time to answer an objection. I. 615. *a.* Cinus was his master, not his scholar. II. 508. *a.*
- Basilians**, a question whether there ever will be such a sect among the Anabaptists. IV. 87. *b.*
- Basil**, all its relics were, in the time of the council, carried and placed in the room of the absent Bishops. I. 178. The memory of Erasmus is very much respected there: proof of it. II. 804. *a. b.* They threw his closet, &c. there. *ibid. b.* Twelve cart-loads of images are burnt there before the town-house. 813. *a.*
- Basil** (St) would not have people trust to the mutilations of eunuchs. II. 533. *b.* A comparison which he alleges for that purpose. *ibid.* He makes a bad answer to the Manichees. IV. 112. *b.* 113. *a.* 515. *a. b.*
- Basilides** (the great Duke) plunders the country of the Livonians. II. 42. *a. b.*
- Basnage** quoted. II. 301. *b.* III. 943. *b.* IV. 91. *a.* 97. See the Dissertation upon Junius Brutus. V. 731. & seq.
- Basnage** Sieur de Beauval: his *Considerations sur deux Sermons de Mr Jurieu*. V. 642. *a. b.* His *Lettre sur les Differens de Mr Jurieu, & de Mr Bayle*. 645. *b. n.* (53). His *Mr Jurieu convicted of Imposture and Calumny*. 646. *b.* 647. *a.*
- Bassepierre** quoted. III. 301. *a. b.* 302. *a. v.* 531. *a.* 532. *a.* The head of that family is sprung from the commerce of a woman with a spirit. IV. 408. *b.* The History of some of his gallantries. V. 391. *a. b.*
- Bassora** (the Prince of) pretends to be Mahomet's chief favourite, and by his credit with him to give such or such a place in Paradise. IV. 123. *a.*
- Basford**, whether it is a dishonour to be one. III. 722. *a.*
- Basfords** have commonly a good share of wit. II. 228.
- Bath**: it was against decency among the Pagans, that a father and a son should bathe in the same place. I. 563. *a. n.* (6). See *Baden*.
- Baths** were in use at Paris in the time of Charles VII. IV. 484. *b.*
- Bats** (Violente de) causes her husband to be assassinated by her adulterers. V. 107. *a. b.* 108. *a.*
- Battle**, it is ridiculous for a man to boast of having won a battle, when he draws no advantage from it. II. 413. *a. b.* The most common cause of its usefulness, is when the commander of the victorious army fears peace. *ibid. n.* (6).
- Battles**; the gaining of battels more subject to Historical Pyrrhonism, than the talking of fortified places. III. 719. *b.*
- Bavaria** (Lewis of) excluded from the rank of Emperors, but restored to it by a public retraction. II. 238. *a.* His reign counted for nothing by Rainaldus, who affects to call him by no other name than *the Bavarian*. *ibid.* His apology by Herwart is condemned by the Inquisition, and for what reason. 238. *a. b.* Who the true author of the annals of Bavaria is. III. 43. *a. b.*
- Bavaria** (the Elector of) surprizes Ulm by an admirable stratagem which was well executed. V. 504.
- Bauderon**, the son, accuses John de Renou of Plagiarism. IV. 864.
- Baudouin**, King of Jerusalem, is poisoned by his own Physician. IV. 383.
- Baudouin** (the Civilian) changes his religion as often as his linnen. I. 690. *b.* What he advised to be done for defeating the conference of Poissy. 692. *a.* He has writ a treatise of the means of attaining to a good reformation. 697. *b.* His answers to Calvin and Beza. III. 523. *a. b.* 524. *a.*
- Baudrand** censured with respect to Antioch. I. 346. *a. b.* The change which happened to the city of Antioch, was just the reverse of what he makes it. 590. *b.*
- Baudri** (Paul) Professor of sacred History at Utrecht, made himself very much esteemed by his Lectures. I. 672.
- Beans**, who was the first that abstained from them. I. 277. *b.* The Egyptians abstained from them. IV. 670. *a. b.* The Pythagoreans likewise abstained from them, and for what reasons. *ibid. b.* 671. *a.* The *Scbola Salernitana* forbids the eating of them. *ibid. b.* Whether they can be converted into blood. 672. *a.*
- Bearn**, put in a better condition than it was in before. IV. 317. *a. b.* The progress which the Protestant religion makes there. 325. *a. b.* to 327. *a. b.* The exercise of the Catholic religion is abolished there. *ibid.*
- Bearnois** (or *He of Bearn*) a name which those concerned in the League gave to Henry IV. III. 276. *a.*
- Beast**. A discovery which was made of the number of the beast. I. 719. *b.* 720. *a.*
- Beasts**, the great disadvantages that attend moral reflexions grounded on their conduct. I. 640. *a. b.* 641. *a. b.* These moral reflexions are liable to be turned into a jest and so to be eluded. 640. *a.* Whether they could determine themselves, if two objects were present, which drew them with equal force, one one way, and the other another. II. 226. *b.* 227. *a.* Anaxagoras attributed to them an intelligent soul, to which he gave the same name as to God. I. 301. *a.* Their actions perhaps are one of the most profound mysteries, on which our reason can be exercised. 641. *b.* Several of them have been celebrated by the wits. III. 209. *b.* Whether Des Cartes may be looked upon as the inventor of the opinion which he had about them. IV. 548. *a. b.* What was the opinion of the antient Philosophers about the souls of beasts. *ibid. b.* 549. *a. b.* 550. *a. b.* Whether the Antients taught that they were no more than *Automata*. 551. *b.* to 554. *a. b.* The facts which concern the capacity of beasts are no less puzzling to the followers of Aristotle than to those of Des Cartes. 901. *a. b.* A catalogue of those who have believed that the souls of beasts were rational. 902. *b.* to 905. *a. b.* The ill consequences of the opinion which gives beasts a sensitive soul. 905. *b.* 906. *a. b.* &c. Beasts exposed for a spectacle after their death, in order to keep other beasts in awe. 908. *b.* Authors who have maintained that they have rational souls. 911. *b.* 912. *a. b.* &c. Their actions imputed to an external principle. 913. *a.* Authors who have maintained that beasts are mere machines, or who have confuted that opinion. *ibid. b.* 914. *a. b.* &c. Different opinions about their souls. V. 115. *a. b.* 116. *a. b.*
- Beausjoux** renders himself famous at the Court of France in the reign of Henry III, by his inventions of ballets, concerts, &c. IV. 879. *b.*
- Beaune Montreuil** (Francis de la) was so learned that she converted a Rabbini in a regular disputation. V. 298. *b.*
- Beauty**, the picture of a perfect beauty. I. 399. *a.* Of a lasting kind. 401. *a.* II. 514. *a. b.* 515. *a.* III. 371. *a. b.* 372. *a.* It wounds us at a distance. 65. *a.* Thirty things necessary to make it perfect. 363. *b.* Wherein its force consists. 377. *a. b.* After some

- some time the beauty of wives begins to affect their husbands less. 646. *a.* Not only the spring but likewise the autumn of beauty is agreeable. IV. 236. *a.* There have been cities where not only the women, but also the men disputed about beauty. V. 312. *b.* *n.* (15).
- Beauvais*, privileges that were granted to the women of that city. II. 217. *a.* *b.*
- Beccanus*, his calumnies, and his false consequences against Calvinism. V. 441. *a.* *b.*
- Beer*, what we are told of their acute smell. II. 636. *a.*
- Behme* was an Enthusiast. III. 689. *a.*
- Being*: whether the idea of Being may be applied synonymously to God and his creatures. I. 488. *b.* The general doctrine of Philosophers touching the idea of it. V. 221. *a.* *b.* to 223. *a.* *b.*
- Bela*, King of Hungary, in what manner he recompensed the Frangipani's who had assisted him with money. III. 101. *a.* *b.*
- Believe*. Des-Barreaux pretended that there was nothing so difficult to a man of wit as to believe. II. 649. *b.*
- Bellino* (Gentile) a famous Venetian Painter returns from the Sultan's Court loaded with presents. IV. 54. *a.*
- Bellai*: Messieurs du Bellai concern themselves extremely in the good success of Henry VIIIth's divorce. I. 716. *a.* *b.* The Cardinal's conscientious marriage. 724. *a.* The art which William du Bellai used with the Protestants of Germany. 721. *a.* *b.* Facts that concern Martin du Bellai. 721. *b.* 722. *a.* They are the patrons of William Bigot. II. 8. *a.* *b.* Tarsognota translates into Italian a treatise of the Military Art, which is ascribed to William du Bellai. IV. 918. Different editions of Martin du Bellai's Memoirs. I. 722. *a.*
- Bellay* (the Bishop of) is puzzled about the power that is attributed to the Holy Virgin. III. 84. *b.*
- Bellantes* (Antony) a Nobleman of Siena, how he got off when accused of several misdemeanors. IV. 463.
- Bellarmin*, his contradictions. I. 132. *a.* A Protestant Professor makes a recantation of what he had charged him with. 727. *b.* 728. *a.* One of his usual sayings. 732. *b.* The vow which he made in case the Papal dignity should be conferred upon him. 733. *b.* 734. *a.* Said there were too many Christians. V. 525. *b.* Acknowledges and reckons up two hundred and thirty-seven contraries of doctrine among the Romish Divines. III. 343. *b.* Censured. I. 769. *a.*
- Belleforest*, scruples to translate what an Italian Monk had writ about love. I. 630. *b.*
- Bellier* (Peter) translates into French a part of Philo's works: the version is revised and augmented by Frederic Morel. III. 623.
- Belleuvre*, his embassy to save the life of Mary, Queen of Scots, was a meer farce. II. 760. *a.* Sent by Henry III to the King of Navarre, about the affront given to the Queen of Navarre. IV. 341. *a.* *b.* His negotiation in that affair. *ibid.*
- Belleuvre* (Pomponne de) First President in the parliament of Paris, refuses to the students of the Canon-Law the privilege of pleading. III. 346. *a.*
- Bellona*; what her priests had in common with the priests of Cybele. II. 531. *b.*
- Belaï* (John) represents to the Leaguers that the Canon-Laws excommunicate those who engage in intrigues about the succession in a Prince's life-time. III. 955. *a.*
- Belonius* cited. IV. 35. *b.* His observations. III. 749. *b.* 750. *a.*
- Belvedereus* (Theodorus) his writings against the Vauds, and the refutations of them by Peter Gilles. III. 162. *b.*
- Bembus* (Cardinal) the questions which he put to Sabinus. IV. 193. *b.* Confounds himself in speaking of those who go round the world eastward or westward. V. 781.
- Bencius*: four brothers of that name, Jesuits. I. 747.
- Benedict XII* (Pope): The taxes of the Penitentiary of Rome, appeared under his Pontificate. I. 629. *b.*
- Benedictines*, of what family the founder of their order was. I. 341.
- Beneficed*. A beneficed man deprived of all his revenues for not pronouncing the letter *q* as others did. IV. 837. *a.* *b.*
- Benefices*, the Venetian ministers at the Court of Rome durst not accept of any. I. 634. What answer Pope Hadrian VI. made to those who objected to him his inconsistent conduct with regard to their plurality. III. 330. *a.* Ecclesiastical Benefices given to Poets as rewards for the leud and profane verses which they had composed. IV. 896. *b.* John du Tillet is the author or promoter of the edict, which prohibits the remitting money to Rome for the dispatching of Benefices. V. 354. 355.
- Benefit*. To receive a benefit is to lose one's liberty. II. 206. *a.*
- Benergue*, a town where the neighbours meet in arms on the 25th of April. IV. 611. *b.*
- Bengy*, Professor at Bourges, particular facts that concern him. IV. 652. *a.* *b.*
- Benvenius* (Dominic) writes a book of the miracles and prophecies of Savonarola. V. 66. *b.*
- Bennon*, his miracles. I. 749. *a.*
- Benoit* (Renatus): whether he is the author of a book which clears the Protestants from the charge of Heresy. IV. 373. *b.*
- Benjerade*; the answer he made when he was but seven or eight years of age. I. 749. *a.* Another answer which he made to a courtier. 753. *a.* He contradicts himself in his sonnet upon Job. 967. *b.* 968. *a.* One of his Roundels quoted. V. 401. *b.*
- Benjrab*, a great Cabalist, how he was conceived in his mother's womb. II. 114. *a.*
- Benzenius* (Rutilius) defends the story, that Trajan's soul was delivered from Hell by the prayers of St Gregory. V. 397. *b.*
- Berault* (John) his translation of Barclay's Euphormio, with a key and commentary subjoined. I. 647. *b.* Quoted. II. 163. *b.* *n.* (21).
- Berebere* (de la) Memoirs sent for that President's life. I. 264. *a.*
- Berenice*, her leanness. I. 765. *a.* *b.* 766. *a.* *b.* Titus sends her away. 766. *b.* Her jealousy against her sister Drusilla. 767. *b.* II. 701. *b.*
- Berenice*, a play, the judgment that was passed upon it. I. 767. *a.* *b.*
- Bergamo* (Matthew de) created a Count Palatine by the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria. I. 769. *a.* *b.*
- Bergier*, his treatise on the Point of Day. V. 776.
- Bergius* (John) his dispute with Micraelius. IV. 210. *a.*
- Berigardus* looked upon as a great favourer of Pyrrhonism, and a propagator of impiety. I. 770. *b.* 771. *a.* *b.*
- Bern*: conferences which give occasion to the reformation of that Canton. I. 235. The churches of that Canton disapproved of their abolishing unleavened bread, the baptismal fonts, and the festivals at Geneva. II. 264. *b.*
- Bernard* (St) one of his maxims. I. 126. *a.* His character. 758. *a.* *b.* & *seq.* He preaches up the crusade, and promises very different success from that which attended it. III. 796. *a.*
- Bernartius* (John) injudiciously censures Pliny, with regard to an Egyptian King. IV. 667. *a.*
- Berneggerus* (Matthew) ascribes to a Jesuit, the speech which came out against the United Provinces, under the name of Herimannus Conrad. II. 550.
- Bernier* (Francis) mistakes a word in a passage of Gassendi. IV. 763. *a.* *b.* Quoted 42. *b.* 264. *a.*
- Bernier* (John) his character and works. III. 967. *a.* IV. 897. *b.*
- Beroaldus* (Philip): how ridiculous he makes himself, while he endeavours to justify Martial and others like unto him. V. 421. *a.* He observes that Boccace has taken one of his best tales from Apuleius. II. 37. *b.* 38. *a.*
- Beroaldus* (Matthew) censured. I. 538. *a.*
- Bertelier*, a new confutation of his pretended act. I. 783. *b.* 784. *a.* *b.* II. 61. *b.*
- Bertier*, Bookseller, what answer the Queen-Mother, made to him. I. 544. *a.* *b.*
- Betrade*, Queen of France, her History. III. 62. *a.* *b.* Her death. *ibid.* *b.*
- Bertrand* (the President) is very much out with regard to the Cassius that was so renowned for his integrity. II. 347. *and b.*
- Berulle*: persons of that family. I. 786.
- Besa*, the name of a city, and of a particular deity that was adored there. I. 348. *b.* The oracle of that god was still in being in the reign of Constantius. 37. *and a.*

Bisanzon.

- Beſançon*, Thomas Buyrete admitted Miniſter at nineteen years of age, founds a private church there. II. 694. *a.*
- Beſarion* (Cardinal) ſaid that the new ſaints made him call in queſtion the old ones. III. 740. *a.* How he was hindered from being made Pope. IV. 587. *a. b.* Being threatened with excommunication by Paul II, he ſigns a decree which he had not ſeen. IV. 511. *b.*
- Beſiality*; Abſolution from it, what it coſt. I. 628. *a. b.*
- Beton* (David), Archbiſhop of St Andrews, is killed in the revolutions of Scotland. III. 666. *a.*
- Betuffi* (Joſeph) his book intituled *Imagini del Tempio della Signora Donna Giovanna Aragona*. I. 402. *a.*
- Beuningen* (Conrad van), what he ſaid in favour of the toleration which was granted to the Mennonites in the United-Provinces. I. 288. *b.* 289. *a.* His opinion of a book which the Spaniards put out, to diſprove the pretenſions of the King of France. III. 850. *a. b.*
- Beza* (Theodore) treats Joſephus as he deſerves. I. 39. *a.* One of his letters was by ſome thought to be the foundation of the pretended Mahometaniſm of Paul Alciatus. 198. *b.* He is cleared from the abominable calumny which had been charged upon him. 546. *a. b.* 547. *a.* and 795. *b.* 796. *a.* His diſputes with Baudouin. 695. *a.* Whether he owned that Bellarmine had overthrown all the Proteſtant authors. 726. *a.* A cruel and impudent inveſtive of Scioppius againſt him. 745. *b.* 746. *a.* He is calumniated. 790. and *a. b.* 795. *a. b.* 798. *a. b.* Whilt he was young he kept a woman under the promiſe of marriage, which he performed at laſt. 791. *b.* 792. *a.* and 795. *a.* He does not explain all his reaſons for leaving Laufanne. 792. *a.* II. 274. *a. b.* Is reproached on account of the frequent corrections which he made in the editions of his New Teſtament. I. 792. *b.* A little Macaronic book is aſcribed to him. 791. *b.* As like-wiſe the *Vindicia contra Tyrannos*. V. 735. Bolſec's accuſation of him is not to be credited. II. 60. *b.* 61. *a. b.* He deſerves more credit than Maimbourg and Varillas, as to the hiſtorical order of Calvin's travels, in ſuch things as neither tend to increaſe nor diminſh the reputation of the latter. 236. *a. b.* He is upbraided with having too eagerly picked up the flying reports that were ſpread about his enemies. 364. *a.* His epigram on the picture of Eraſmus criticized. 810. *b.* He preſerves a commendable moderation in ſpeaking of the death of Henry II. III. 400. *b.* Is ſtruck with the Plague. 575. *a.* A ſtanza made on that occaſion. *ibid.* He looks upon the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy as a fundamental corruption. 666. *b.* What he ſays of Marot's morals. IV. 154. *b.* 155. *a.* His verſion of 100 Palms. 157. *b.* He does not give a fair answer to Dudithius, touching the ſentence of Zurich againſt Ochinus. 389. *a. b.* Broughton aims particularly at him, and writes him very rough letters. II. 150. He is blamed by Colomies for altering a paſſage in the French verſion of the Palms. IV. 164. *b.* He expreſſes a proper indignation againſt Simon Simonius. V. 150. *b.* 151. *a.* He writes the life of Calvin in Latin and in French. II. 274. There are ſome things in the one which are not in the other. *ibid.* He retired from Laufanne for reaſons that have not been well explained. *ibid.* *a. b.* His narrative touching Caraccioli different from that of Peter Martyr. 313. *b.* 314. *a. b.* He refutes the doctrine of Harchius upon the Eucharift. III. 352. and *a. b.* He is miſtaken about Marot's age. IV. 162. *b.* How he mentioned the ſtory of the She-Pope at the conference of Poiſſi. 735, 736, 737. What he relates of a woman and her two daughters. 882. *a. b.*
- Bias*, a maxim of that Philoſopher. III. 601. *b.* His dilemma upon marriage may receive a different turn. IV. 844. *b.*
- Bible*, the Hebrew text of it altered in what relates to the age of the Patriarchs. I. 173. *a.* The deſign of publiſhing it tranſlated into the Irith language meets with great oppoſition. 718. *a.* A queſtion which Bochart is ſaid to have been aſked touching that ſacred book. II. 41. *a.* It is tranſlated into the vulgar language in Spain. 379. A comiſſion ſent to Drufius, empowering him to go upon a new tranſlation of the Bible into the Dutch tongue. 705. *a.*
- Luther's tranſlation, and that which the Churches of the Low-Countries made uſe of judged defective. *ibid.* An objection ſcandalouſly retorted againſt the authors of that holy book. IV. 373. and *a. b.* What Politian is charged with ſaying of it. 704. *a. b.* Tranſlated into the Polith language. 825. *b.*
- Bible* (French) firſt printed at the deſire of Charles VIII. I. 1. *a.* Faliſhed as well by the way of ſuppreſſion, as by that of addition. *ibid.* *b.*
- Bible of Zurich*, by whom it was reviled and corrected. I. 802. *a.*
- Bible*, tranſlated into the Slavonian tongue by George Dalmatin. II. 585.
- Biblioteca Maxima Pontificia*. See *Authority of the Pope*.
- Bibliotèque of the Jeſuit authors*; by whom it was begun, and by whom continued. I. 210. and *a. b.* Qualities requiſite to make a good Bibliothecque, and the ordinary fault of thoſe who are employed in a work of that nature. *ibid.* *b.* 220. *a. b.* 221. *a. b.*
- Bibliotèque Univerſelle* quoted. I. 116. *b.*
- Biblus*, the Egyptians ſend thither every year a paſſe-board head, without any other ceremony than throwing it into the ſea. I. 116. *a.*
- Bibulus* (Conſul) is wholly taken up in making Paſquinades. I. 425. *a. b.*
- Bigarrures & Touches* (*i. e.* The Miſcellany and Touches) of Des Accords, books which are too free and trifling. I. 63, 64. *a. b.* 65. *a.* The editions of them. 64. *b.* 65. *a.* The Touches compoſed in two months, what the nature of that work is. 65. *a.*
- Bigot* (Emeric), what he ſaid to a man who waited for the ſecond editions of books. I. 319. *b.*
- Bigot* (John), father to William. II. 7.
- Bigot* (William) promiſed a treatiſe upon the neceſſity of matrimony. I. 603. *a.*
- Bigots*, their artifices to make a great many devout women fall into the ſnare. II. 110. *a.* There is no paſſion which they do not juſtify at the expence of religion. III. 533. *b.*
- Bilia* lived to be old without knowing that her huſband, who had a ſinking breath was different in that from other men. II. 726, 727. and *a.*
- Billicius* (Everard) defends the Univerſity and Clergy of Cologne againſt Melancthon, Bucer, and others. III. 240. *b.*
- Billon* quoted. I. 720. *a. b.* III. 280. *b.* 281. *a.* IV. 359. *b.* 360. *a. b.*
- Bindoni* (Bernardino) makes additions to the Italian edition of Philip de Bergamo's Chronicle. I. 769. *a.*
- Binet* (Stephen) a Jeſuit, declares, though not without trembling, for the ſalvation of Origen, while he examines the matter in the form of a rehearing of his trial. IV. 415. *b.* 416. *a.*
- Binet* (Claudius) cenſured for an inſipid hyperbole which he makes uſe of in ſpeaking of the birth of Ronſard. IV. 890. *b.*
- Bion*, his answer to Antigonus. II. 11. *a.*
- Bionti Sermons*, what one is to underſtand by that. II. 12. *a.*
- Birds* that ſwept the temple of Achilles every morning. I. 85. *a. n.* (20). A bird which can take up into the air a horſe with his rider. III. 132. *b.*
- Birds* deſtroy an army of Ethiopians. IV. 177. *a.*
- Their language underſtood by ſome people. 181, 182. and *a.* Worſhipped in Lemnos. III. 755. and *b.* The language of birds. V. 381. *b.* 382. *a.*
- Biraot* convicted of impurities, according to the teſtimony of Jarrige. I. 108. *b.* 109. *a.*
- Biron* (the Marſhal de) receives a terrible reprimand from the Duke of Anjou, and the occasion of it. III. 178. *a. b.* He performed great ſervices to Henry IV. *ibid.* *b.* 179. *a.* He gives that Prince too ſenſible a proof of his thinking himſelf a moſt neceſſary man. 179. *b.* He could not bear to ſee the faith given to the Huguenots violated. 180. *a.* He was fit for all ſorts of employments. *ibid.* *a. b.* He was too much given to wine. *ibid.* *b.* And was unwilling to finiſh the war. *ibid.* and 181. *a.* He becomes credulous and ſuperſtitious. *ibid.* *a. b.*
- Biron* (the Marſhal Duke de) his impious wiſh. III. 182. *b.* He affects to hate the Huguenots. 183. *a.* He diſplays an inſupportable vanity. *ibid.* *a. b.* He is confounded with his father in the point of learning.

- learning. *ibid.* b. 184. a. Henry IV saves his life three times. *ibid.* b. That Prince had a mind to make him his son-in-law. *ibid.* a. b. His duel with Carency. 856. a. b.
- Birth.** Few people care to have the meanness of their birth talked of. I. 256. b. V. 125. a. b. It has ever been common to debase the birth of those whom fortune raises to the highest dignities. I. 350. b. V. 125. a. b. 126. a. 189. a. A mean birth is no crime. I. 360. b.
- Bishopric:** a bishopric procured by the Muses. I. 237. and 238. a. b.
- Bishoprics:** the abuse of giving bishoprics to children prevailed in the XVIth century. IV. 819.
- Bishops of the East** subject to the King of Portugal, acknowledge no Patriarch. I. 22. There are Bishops, who having once obtained the mitre by preaching, preach no more after they are made Bishops. 238. a. Lent-Bishops; who were so called, by whom, and for what reason. 703. a. The dignity which is possessed, and the functions that are exercised by the Bishops of the Church of England. II. 759. b. A Bishop that was of an apostolic character. III. 69. and a. Bishops were highly respected by the Pagans themselves when their morals were good. IV. 104. b. They dishonour their profession when they set up for informers. *ibid.* 105. a. Good Bishops faithfully discharge their ministerial office. III. 772. b. The Protestants acknowledged Caraccioli for Bishop, after he had publicly embraced their religion. II. 313. and a. b. 314. a. b. By divine right all Bishops are equal to the Pope. IV. 198.
- Bishops of France** prevailed with the King to deprive Caraccioli, who was acknowledged for Bishop by the Reformed, of his bishopric. II. 313. a. b. 314. a. b.
- Bitings** (of an immodest kind), Orators as well as Poets have mentioned them. III. 56. a. b.
- Bitter**, stories which the Rabbins tell concerning the slaughter of the Jews, at the taking of that city by the Romans. I. 649. a.
- Blacksmith of Salon:** It is not possible for private men to discover certainly what concerns him. II. 386. b.
- Blasius** (Junius) obtains the honour of a triumph from Tiberius. V. 277. a. b. 278. a.
- Blanc** (William le) translates Xiphilin into Latin. V. 589. a.
- Blanc** (Richard le) translates Cardan's book *de Subtilitate* into French. II. 322. b.
- Blancanus**, the Jesuit, censured for a double mistake. I. 49. a.
- Blanche** (Queen) exposed to detraction more than one way. V. 337. a. b. 338. a.
- Blanchinus** (Bartholomew) writes the life of Urceus. V. 515.
- Blasphemies.** The horrible blasphemies of a fanatic. III. 815. a. b. A blasphemy of a horrid and singular kind. V. 514. a. b. 515. a.
- Bleeding.** The practice of frequent bleeding introduced at Paris by Botal. II. 99. and a. b. A dispute on that head between Botal and the Physicians of the Faculty. *ibid.* The use that Averrhoës made of it. *ibid.* b.
- Blesinius** falsely relates several things of the Islanders, both with respect to witchcraft, III. 580. a. b. and lasciviousness. *ibid.* b. 581. a. b.
- Blind.** One born blind cured by Hadrian. III. 319. a.
- Blois:** A motion made by the States of Blois for excluding the King of Navarre from the succession to the crown of France. II. 5. a.
- Blond** (John le) translates Carion's Chronicle into French, and writes an appendix to it. II. 324. a.
- Blondel** (David), the character of his wit and memory. II. 22. a. b. 23. a. He censures Suidas touching the Sibyl Lampus unjustly. 252. b. What he says of the Fathers. III. 55. a. b. Omits several authors who have affirmed the story of Pope Joan. 78. b. Is mistaken as to the time when Lucidus flourished. 904. What he says of the story of the She-Pope. II. 24. a. b. 25. a. b. IV. 729, 730. Is not for losing time in enquiries about its origin, and censured on that account. 739. Finds that the said story in a manuscript of Anastasius the library-keeper is framed in the very words of Martinus Polonus. 725. b. 726. a. 738. b. 739. a.
- Blondus** (Flavius), certain works of his translated into Italian by Lucio Fauno. III. 18.
- Blount** (Charles) his writings condemned. I. 383. a. His translation of Philostratus. *ibid.* His tragical end. *ibid.*
- Boards:** the avarice of those who keep Boards in universities. III. 167. b.
- Bobouiski**, in Latin *Bobovius* and *Bobovius*, is the same with Halibeigh in the Dictionary. III. 341.
- Boccace** falls in love with a Princess, and writes two excellent books for her sake. IV. 302. b. 304. b. What he relates of Guido Cavalcante. II. 398. a. b. His Decameron universally known. *ibid.* Of a thousand persons who read it, scarce two or three remember any thing that is not an adventure of gallantry, or pleasantries. *ibid.* What he says of Pope Joan. IV. 730. b. 731. a. How far his Decameron is to be condemned. V. 837.
- Boccalini**, against what kind of authors he should have made Apollo hold his extraordinary session, and summon all the forces of Parnassus. II. 528. a. Does not follow the advice which he himself gives to Historians. 65. a. b. Complains with great wit of those who brought in the Neapolitan disease. IV. 284. b.
- Bochart** has read a passage in Strabo, concerning Telmessus, wrong. V. 311. b. His conjecture upon a passage of Suidas, where that author speaks of the cray-fish of Tenedos, is one of the best that he has made. 312. a.
- Bodies**, an explication of the doctrine of some of the Cartesians concerning the formation of bodies. II. 251. a. b. The difference between living Bodies and Bodies void of life according to Des Cartes. 660. b. 661. a. b. n. (51). Bodies are incapable of thinking. 661. b. n. (53). 662. a. b. The qualities of Bodies which strike our senses are only mere appearances. IV. 654. a. b. 655. a. b.
- Bodies** (dead) that have remained exempt from corruption. I. 183. a. b. II. 442. b. III. 233. a. b.
- Bodin**, one of the reasons for which he wrote his *De monomania*. I. 385. b. 386. a. His panegyric. II. 48. a. b. 49. a. He has wrote a dialogue about religions, in which he gives the advantage to the Jewish. 45. a. Is taken for a man without religion. 50. a. b. 51. a. b. An ingenious answer which an Englishman made to him. 53. a. He is censured for what he says of Cato's lending his wife. III. 495. a. Quoted. 403. b. 404. a. b. IV. 502. a. His prevarications to save the honour of the Astrologers. V. 244. b. to 246. a. b. A gross mistake charged upon him by la Mothe le Vayer. 112. b. He relates a singular answer of Henry II. III. 405.
- Borgia**, what punishment was inflicted there upon bankrupts. II. 863. a.
- Bohemia**, all the Ministers of that kingdom profcrib'd. II. 536. Facts which concern the revolution that happened there. V. 102. a. b. to 104. a. b.
- Bohemia** (the King of), Elector Palatine: his exercises are to be seen in the Vatican library at Rome. I. 239. a.
- Bohemians** divided into three sects. IV. 629. a. b. Lascius writes a book on the confession of faith of the Protestants of Bohemia. III. 732. b. 733. a. b. They degenerate from from their ancestors. *ibid.* n. (6).
- Bohorischi** (Adam): he and Dalmatin translate the Bible into the Sclavonian tongue. II. 565. and a. b.
- Boilau** (Dr), complaints against two of his books. V. 853.
- Boistead**: an edict prohibiting the public exercise of the Romish religion in that town. III. 548. a. Disputes occasioned by the said edict. *ibid.* and b. Its Magistrates tolerate a fraternity of the Virgin, and enter themselves into it. IV. 121. a. b. 122. a.
- Boissiu** (the President of) justly censures Casaubon, and Corradus for what they say about Pyrrhus, and the place of his interment. IV. 666. b. A character of his commentary on Ovid's poem against Ibis. 452. a. b.
- Bolduc**, a Capuchin. Nothing can be more scandalous than what he says of Job's distemper. III. 573. a.
- Bolgen** (Anne), her bad qualities. II. 57. b.

V O L V.

10 N

Bologna,

- Bologna*, its colony was settled four years before that of Pisaurum. I. 62. *b.*
- Bolsec*, a witness not credited even by the Roman Catholics. II. 61. *b.* 62. *a. b.* Insults Calvin for the frequent corrections of his Institution. 262. *b.* All his foolish stories against Calvin are given out as matters of fact by Cardinal Richelieu. 62. *a.* And will be so eternally by those who write against the Calvinists, if we except authors of reputation and gravity. *ibid.* and 61. *a. b.* What concerns the prostitution of his wife is not to be found in the French life of Calvin. 274. *n. (p).* A more particular account of the differences betwixt Calvin and him given in that life. *ibid. b.*
- Bona* (Cardinal). An author undertakes to criticize him, because he had never quoted him. IV. 2. *a.*
- Bona Sforza*, Queen of Poland, gives people large room to talk of her. I. 405. *b.* She is very angry with her son for marrying Barbara Radzivil. III. 847. and *a. b.* Their mutual reproaches on that head. 848. *a.*
- Bonanni* (a Jesuit) sets about composing a catalogue of the writers of his society. I. 219. *a.* Quoted. V. 164. *b.* Maintains a kind of paradox about Mofchus. II. 11. *b.*
- Bord*, the elogy of his Commentary upon Perseus. IV. 598. *a. b.*
- Bone*; what the Jews tell us of a small bone. I. 649. *b.* 650. *a. b.*
- Bons* (Honoratus) Doctor of the Canon-Law, is the author of a book, intitled, *The Tree of Battles*. III. 78. *b.* Affirms the story of Pope Joan. *ibid.* Several mistakes which concern that writer. 79. *a. b.*
- Bonfires*. What are the finest Bonfires that can be lighted up to please the people. III. 317. *b.* 318. *a.*
- Bongars* quoted. II. 69. *a. b.* What Veller wanted to have him reproached with, is probable enough. 70. *a.* The author of the new translation of his letters, censured. III. 155. *b.* V. 538. *a. b.* Bongars was somewhat credulous. III. 696. *b.* Falsely accused as being the author of the *Idolum Halliensis*. 838. *a. b.*
- Boniface VIII*, being solicited by one of the parties which divided the commonwealth of Florence, prevails with Charles de Valois, to compose the contentions of that city. II. 296. *a.*
- Bonifacius* (Balthasar) rashly attempts to criticize Athenæus touching Démocritus, and the manner in which he prolonged his life. II. 637. *b. n. (38).*
- Bonniwet* (Admiral) his attempt upon Margaret de Valois. I. 724. *a.* IV. 322. *b.*
- Book of the Creation*, the Cabalists pretend to work miracles by it. I. 173. *a.*
- Book*. A French book formerly was no more than a certain number of Latin pages, with a few lines of French. II. 105. *b.*
- Book of sentences* condemned to be burnt under the name of Abelard. I. 761. *b.*
- Book de tribus Impostoribus*, it is not probable that there ever was such a book. I. 437. *a.* IV. 861. *a.* V. 536. *b.* 537. *a.* Some say that Averroës supplied the materials of it. 557. *a.*
- Books*, their faults ought to be carefully remarked, when they may mislead a great many readers. I. 77. *b.* A book that should treat of the religion of a sovereign would sell well. 130. *b.* Some books are taken no notice of by zealots for a long time. 153. *a.* Authors who enlarge them, seldom take proper care to alter the dates. 154. *a.* They forget to make the proper alterations, when they abridge or transcribe passages. 158. *a.* The first editions of books only serve to make an author's works appear in a fairer character. 318. *a. b.* There is no edition so bad but some advantage may be reaped from it. 319. *a. b.* One should always set down the titles of books in the language that the author made use of. 344. *b.* Suppressions that are made in them only serve to draw one's attention the more. 498. *a. b.* 499. *a.* II. 94. *a. b.* Books deceive people sometimes, by the false prints that are put into them. 100. *b.* The faults of books are not excusable when they concern the principal subject. I. 579. *a.* The faults of great men lead other great men into errors. 523. *b.* Are like sparks of fire. 671. *b.* A consideration which should oblige authors to avoid the very smallest mistakes. II. 22. *a.* Books called *Gentlemen* in a compliment. 626. *b.* A person may very easily be mistaken as to those whom he fancies to be authors of such and such books. 682. *b.* V. 396. *b.* There are many books against which nothing would be said, if authors were obliged to insert them at length in their answers. II. 25. *a.* A book of admirable use, if we judge of it by the title. 236. and *a. b.* Bochart quotes it sometimes. *ibid. b.* Some books become more perfect by being revised and printed. 279. *a.* A beautiful passage of Mr Smith on that head. *ibid. a. b.* Books can never be good, when an author writes them purely for bread. 321. *a.* Faults that are often to be found in them. 323. *a. b.* Books condemned to be burnt. 355. *a. b.* 356. *a.* Callimachus said that a great book is always a great evil. 526. *b.* A book dedicated to our Lord Jesus Christ. 578. *a.* There is no book so despicable, but some advantage may be reaped from it. 582. *a.* The first that a man publishes is sometimes an accomplished piece. *ibid. a. b.* Some books are published under the names of celebrated authors, chiefly such books as concern magic. 640. *b.* 641. *a.* Considerations upon books that are full of quotations. 778. *b.* 779. *a.* Examiners of books detain manuscripts long, and strike many things out of them. 809. *a.* Some have been suppressed, others forged, and others fitted up as people had a mind. III. 67. *a.* What a man exposes himself to, when he only judges of a book by the title of it. 134. *a.* How dangerous impure books are. V. 38. and *a. b.* &c. It is of great use to publish several books upon the same subjects, when they are important. III. 335. *a. b.* Whether the condemnation of a book by a synod hinders it from being read. 377. *b.* 378. *a.* They are most of them extracts and copies of others. 471. *b.* Are often spoiled by too much polishing. 836. *a. b.* 837. *b.* The risk that posthumous books run. 848. *b.* The blind zeal of those who retrench whatever displeases them in books. 948. *a. b.* It is a more difficult task than people imagine to make additions to books. IV. 79. *b.* A book that contained nothing but the reproaches which two professors divulged one against the other. 122. *a.* In what manner those of the ancient Arabs were made. 177. *b.* A man that seeks to pass for the author of a book which he did not write, is guilty of a wilful cuckoldom. 280. *b.* Reasons which should hinder the greatest part of authors from publishing many books. 493. *b.* They generally contain nothing new. 590. *b.* Those who write books should first of all read Quintilian. 814. What Pliny says of the pompous titles of some. V. 2. *b.* Whether every word that cannot be spoken before a modest woman should be banished out of them. 132. *b.* 133. *a. b.* There are some which have been printed a great while, and which nevertheless remain unknown to the most learned authors. 462. *a.* Whether single men study better, and compose more good books, than those that are married. 524. *b.* 525. *a. b.* A great author of little books; who was called so, and in what sense. II. 528. The multiplicity of books debauches the mind. I. 65. *a.* The title of a book which alarmed the Court of Rome, and in consequence thereof was reformed. III. 122. Nothing is more apt to make them be looked upon as bad, than the pompous idea under which they are represented. IV. 284. *a.* A book too hard; the most understanding authors rather chuse to be silent, than to attack it. V. 179. *b.* Several books which are despised by men of parts; seem good to the author: how he read them. 802. How Antony Arnauld read them. *ibid.* Character of Jurieu's books. *ibid.* and 803. Why the States of Holland grant privileges to them. 804. The difference between a good and an useful book. 806. Great books are long expected, and meet with a thousand storms, when they first launch forth. 808. 809. A reflexion of la Bruyere upon the way that people judge of books. 809.
- Books of Devotion*, it does not belong to a vicious man to write them. I. 439. *a. b.*
- Books of Heretics*: whether those who prohibit the sale of Heretical books, ought to permit the objections of Heretics, to appear in the writings of the orthodox who confute them. II. 488. *a. b.* 489. *a.*
- Books* (Apocryphal) the objections made to these books are retorted. III. 601. *a.*
- Bookfellers*, what they do in order to enhance the price of books. I. 521. *b.* II. 23. *a. b.* 38. *b.* 809. *b.* Bookfellers who impose upon Alexander VII. 476. *b.* 477. *a. b.* They have a custom to print many titles for one and the same book. 524. *a.* III. 274. *b.* It

- It is not of them that we ought to complain, if they print bad books. II. 362. *b*. Some of their fly-tricks. 621. *a*. *b*. 809. *k*. Whether we can rely upon the commendations which they procure to the authors they print. 763. *b*. They give corrected editions of the French authors, with respect to the antiquated phrases. IV. 427. *k*. 428. *a*. The confusion which they cause, by reprinting the title pages of books. 476. *a*. The German Book-sellers generally add good indexes to the books they reprint. 498. *k*. Book-sellers are often ruined by authors. 834. *a*. *b*. A custom which they have, imposes on the Bibliographers. V. 547. *b*. An author who had sworn never to have any thing to do with them. II. 82. *a*. *k*. 83. *a*. The extreme negligence of a Book-seller. 322. *b*.
- Borras* was very warm in his love. II. 79. *a*. *k*. 80. *a*. *b*.
- Borael* (Adam) translates Broughton's Commentary on the Prophet Daniel into Latin. II. 150. *a*.
- Boral* (Peter) his mistake with respect to Desfontaines. IV. 538. *a*. *b*.
- Borella* (Camillo) takes a great deal of pains to prove in a book, that the sentence of Pilate found in the city of Aquila is fictitious. II. 556. *k*.
- Borri* (the Cavalier) had a strange thought concerning the conception of the Virgin. III. 571. *a*. *b*.
- Borjel* (Francis de) faults that concern him. II. 90. *a*.
- Borrell*: persons of that family. II. 90. *a*. *b*.
- Boré* (du) a minister; what a Catholic gentleman did at his return to Caen. II. 91. *a*. *b*.
- Borin* (the Count de) his treachery. II. 841. *k*. 842. *a*. Why he was not punished for it. *ibid*.
- Bouffier*, Bishop of Meaux, his error touching Ubiquity, and the first authors of that tenet. V. 549. *k*. Quoted. IV. 65. *b*. *c*. *p*. *passim* *alibi*.
- Bouchet* (Mr de) takes the *Parlement de la Place* privately to the castle of Couffy. IV. 682. *a*.
- Bouchel*, his *Bibliothèque* of the French law quoted. IV. 806.
- Boucher* (John) thought to be the author of the *apology* for *John Chastel*. II. 101. *a*. 103. *a*. *n*. (15). 459. *b*.
- Boucheras* receives an extraordinary commission to preside at trials for poisoning and witchcraft. II. 345. *k*.
- Bouches* (Peter) takes the poison which a neighbour's wife had prepared for her husband, and dies. II. 104.
- Boucheux*, his judicious advice touching the French tongue. II. 775. *b*. Quoted. V. 361. *a*. *b*.
- Bouillon* (the Duke of) promised to abjure his religion when he married Mademoiselle de Berghes. IV. 120. *a*.
- Boulai* (Du) commits faults, upon the subject of Faunus and Omphale. III. 934. *b*. His mistake touching a Roman lady, whom he took for a Vestal Virgin. V. 516. *a*. *b*. Quoted. 130. *a*.
- Boulduc* (Father) laughed at for the monasteries which he supposes to have been erected at Haran. I. 45. *b*.
- Boulogne* (Claudius Dormi Bishop of) is treated as a rebel, and cast into prison. IV. 258.
- Bourague*, what sort of an animal it is. IV. 42. *b*.
- Bourbon* (Antony de) King of Navarre, solicited to procure an agreement in religion. I. 691. *b*. See. *Antony*.
- Bourbon* (the Constable of) animated to the siege of Rome by predictions. I. 147. and *b*. 148. *a*. Makes his escape upon horses shod backwards. 482. Conspires against the state. IV. 694. *a*. *b*. How this conspiracy was discovered. 695. *b*. 696. *a*. At what time he entered into the party of Charles. V. II. 845.
- Bourbon* (Cardinal de) sets up, at the solicitation of the League, for the lawful successor to the crown of France. III. 520. *a*. *b*.
- Bourbon* (Frances de) eldest daughter to the Duke of Montpensier, openly professes the Protestant religion. III. 864. and *b*.
- Bourbon* (James de) imprisoned by his wife in the castle of Ovo. IV. 307. *b*. Escapes to Tarento, where he is besieged: he surrenders the place, and goes to be a Monk in France. *ibid*.
- Bourbon* (Nicholas) quoted. IV. 247. *b*. *n*. (19). Praises exceedingly the poem *de Crucifixio*, wrote by James Pinon. 651.
- Bourdeaux*. The parliament of Bourdeaux reprimanded. III. 512. *a*. *b*. Rejects the claim of two Protestant captains, whom it had condemned to death, not allowing them the privilege of being tried by a judicature of half Protestants and half Catholics. II. 289. *a*. *b*. And condemns a libel on that subject to be burnt *ibid*. *b*.
- Boursel*, who this author is in the translation of Thucydides's History. II. 237. *b*.
- Bourg* (Antony du) Lieutenant-Civil of the *Prévôt* of Paris, and afterwards Chancellor. II. 556. *a*.
- Bourg* (Anne du) what Henry II said to him. III. 400. *a*. He dissuades the conclusions of his advocate who tried to save his life by an officious lie. IV. 139. *b*. 140. *a*.
- Bourg on Braye*, when its citadel was seized. I. 738. *b*.
- Bourg-Fontaine*, the chimerical assembly of Bourg-Fontaine. I. 486. 491. *a*.
- Bourgeois* (Edme) Prior of the Dominicans; directs his discourse in the pulpit to James Clement, and calls him the holy martyr of Jesus Christ. III. 601. *a*. *k*. Is treated as a confessor and martyr by John Guignard. 276. *a*.
- Bourgeois* (Francis) General of the Oratory, collects the works of Cardinal Berulle, and adds a preface to them. I. 786. *k*.
- Bourgeois* (Antoinette) her visions touching Adam. I. 102. *b*. 103. *a*. *b*. The spirit which governed and led her. II. 111. *a*. *b*. Who was the learned man that she esteemed most. 540. *a*. How she discovered that John Rothe was no more than a false prophet. III. 690. *a*. Whether she had foretold the bombardment of Brussels. IV. 889. *a*. *b*. What her notion was of the perfect state of man, with respect to his generative faculty. V. 4. *a*. *b*.
- Bourgeoisism*, makes some noise in Scotland. II. 114. *a*. *b*.
- Bourgeois*, a passage quoted from one of his letters. II. 647. *b*. 648. *a*. IV. 806. *a*. *b*.
- Boutiller de Rance* (Armand) Abbot de la Trappe, understood the Greek Poets at ten years of age. I. 293. *a*. *b*. What he said upon hearing of the death of Mr Armand, Doctor of the Sorbonne. 498. *a*.
- Box on the ear*; *Edesius* gives a governor of Egypt one. III. 445. *a*. *b*.
- Boxius* (Thomas) his errors touching the *Læstrigons*. III. 786, 787.
- Braccia*, the inhabitants of Perugia, chose him for their Prince on account of his valour. II. 292. *a*.
- Brachmann* always carry a ring and a staff. I. 5. *a*.
- Braggadocio* (in learning) his character. I. 373. *a*. *b*. II. 253. *a*.
- Brandenburg* (the Elector of) what he wrote to Richard Cromwell touching the invasion of Poland by the Swedes. II. 539. *b*.
- Branden* (Charles, Duke of Suffolk) his intrigue with the Princess Royal. III. 88. *a*.
- Brandt* (Sebastian) his work intitled, *Novis Stultorum*. I. 602. *b*.
- Brantome* quoted. I. 256. *a*. *b*. 592. *a*. *b*. 723. *a*. 724. *a*. *b*. II. 207. *k*. 208. *a*. V. 36. *a*. 337. *b*. What he says of the beauty of Donna Maria of Aragon. I. 401. *a*. And of Don John of Austria's birth. II. 20. *a*. *b*. 21. *a*. His false way of reasoning about the children of great Lords. *ibid*. He speaks with too much disdain of the other Princes, who opposed the ambition of Charles V. 435. *b*. He improperly alleges the apology of the Prince of Orange, on occasion of Charles the fifth's sentiments in point of religion. 441. and *a*. *b*. His narrative touching Mary of England, Queen of France, is different from that of Mezerai, and Varillas. III. 88. *a*. *b*. According to him it is possible that a Queen may suppose a child in the midst of a numerous Court. 89. *a*. He is mistaken in two things with respect to a cup which Helen caused to be made by the pattern of one of her breasts. 363. *a*. A curious passage of his, touching a certain Prince and a certain Lady of a very good family. 835. *a*. *b*. What he says of the Cardinal de Lorraine's liberality towards the poor and the ladies. 872. *a*. What he thinks of the ladies who accompanied their husbands in the holy war. 795. *b*. 796. *a*. *n*. (25). He affirms four things touching Joan of Naples, which are all four false. IV. 305. *a*. Applauds the complaisance of Henry II, for the Duchess of Valentinois. 698. *b*. 699. *a*. His mistake touching Laurezza Strozzi, a Dominican Nun. V. 252. *b*.

Bragg.

- Brabl*, the Savages of that country have no religion. III. 781. *a. b.*
- Bravery*, whether there be any connexion between bravery and lust. III. 414. *b.* 415. *a. b.* Of all virtues it is the only one that is subject to fanatical transports. IV. 664. *a.* Joined with effeminacy and a strong inclination for pleasure. V. 271. *a. b.* 272. *a. b.*
- Brazen*: Some popular stories about certain brazen heads. I. 598. *a.*
- Breafts*; the severity of the Anabaptists against a man's handling of his mistress's breasts. IV. 87. *b.*
- Breda* confounded with Bretta. V. 357. *b.*
- Bredenburg* (John) accused of being a Spinofist, and for what reason. V. 207. *b.* 208. *a.* He dies nevertheless with lively sentiments of religion. 208. *a.*
- Bread*. What is meant by chapter-bread. II. 815. *b.*
- Bregi*, the French Embassador at the Court of Poland, what his pretensions were. III. 264. *a. b.*
- Bremen*, in what manner Calvinism was introduced into that city by Hardenberg. III. 352, 353. *a. b.*
- Brentius*, a zealous Ubiquitarian, forewarns all states not to allow the Zuinglians a toleration. II. 196.
- Bretley*, whether he and those he quotes have calumniated John Knox. III. 668. *a. b.* 669. *a.*
- Brefman* (Gregory) a Professor at Leipzig, praises Badoel, and his discourse on the marriage of men of learning, which he causes to be reprinted. I. 603. *a.*
- Bretagne* (the Duke of) neglects his wife, who was daughter to the King of Scotland, and falls in love with Antoinette de Maillezé, wife to the Lord Vil-lequier. II. 464. *b.* One of his most faithful servants makes remonstrances to him, against it in vain. *ibid.*
- Bretagne* (Anne of) becomes barren, and at length loses her life by the ignorance of the midwives, who assisted at her last delivery. III. 28. *a.*
- Breviary of Burgos*, the correction of it. IV. 76. *a. b.*
- Breuis* (William) the circumstance which he added in the story of Pope Joan. IV. 729.
- Brezi* (the Marshal de) desires to be prayed for in the Protestant Church of Saumur. I. 263. *b.* Draws his sword against the Marshal de Chastillon, and for what reason. III. 821. *a.*
- Brezi* (James de) punishes his wife's infidelity. II. 132. *a. b.*
- Briauville* (the Abbot de) invents the Heraldry cards. III. 51.
- Bride*: a bride whom a man carried to Church in his arms, to be married. IV. 324. *a.*
- Briefs*, some composers of briefs. I. 361. *a. b.*
- Briet* (Father) his faults with respect to Collatius. II. 524. *b.* 525. *a.* In speaking of Lucretius, he commits eight faults in eight lines. III. 917. *b.*
- Brin*, particulars relating to the siege of that place. V. 192. *b.*
- Brinwilliers* (the Lady de) among other proofs, her judges made use of her written confession, in order to condemn her. II. 460. *b.*
- Brissac* and *Friburg*, remained in the possession of France by the peace of Nimeguen. III. 720. *a.*
- Brissac*, his zeal for the glory of the French monarchy. III. 396. *a.*
- Briffon* (Barnaby) quoted. V. 17. *b.*
- Britons*, the barbarities which they exercised upon the Romans. V. 260. *a. b.*
- Brixen* (a town in Tirol) the assembly there declares that Gregory VII, had forfeited the Pontificate. III. 231.
- Brucard* (Bonaventure) the age in which he lived. II. 529. *a. b.* Writes a description of the Holy Land. *ibid.*
- Brodeau*, persons of that family. II. 145. *b.* 146. *a. b.*
- Bruckhusius*, his conjecture upon a passage of Propertius. IV. 585. *b.*
- Brogitarus* buys the Pontificate of Pefinus, and is put in possession of it. II. 628. *b.* But he was driven out as an Usurper. *ibid.*
- Brusse* (René de) condemned to lose his head by an Arrêt of the parliament of Paris. II. 840. *a.* How his son John entered again upon the possession of his father's estate. *ibid. b.*
- Brusser* (Simon) disputes with Villegaignon, and confounds him. V. 478. *b.*
- Brother*. A lay-brother that occasions a whole convent being set on fire. III. 284. *b.*
- Brothers*, a proverb of the Antients touching the hatred of brothers. II. 701. *b.*
- Broutalakas*, what the Greeks understand by that word. I. 508.
- Brown* (Thomas) his thoughts concerning the manner of human propagation. V. 6. *a.*
- Bruce* (Robert) in vain solicited by William Crichton to put the Chancellor of Scotland to death, and accused to the governor of the Low-Countries. II. 577.
- Brueys*, in what manner he attacks Mr Jurieu upon his prophecies. II. 683. *b.* 685. *a. b.* Wherein he is blame-worthy on that head. 684. *b.* 685. *a.* His reflexions upon Mr Jurieu's gay humour. 954. *a. b.*
- Brugenfs* (Lucas) what he says of the Scribes. V. 8. *a. b.* An observation which he makes. 11. *b.*
- Brugers* (La) quoted. II. 118. *a. b.* 119. *a.* 452. *b.* Delicately touches the curiosity of the fair sex for nudities. III. 964. *a.* The character he gives us of children. 815. *b. n.* (7). He ridicules the profusion of reading which certain authors shew. II. 105. *b.*
- Brus*, in Latin *Braunius*, his answer to Mr Stoupp's book. V. 204. *a.*
- Bruse* (La) was not sufficiently guarded in what he published, concerning the Nuncio Chigi. II. 474. *b.* 475. *a. b.*
- Bruchaut* extravagantly commended by Gregory the Great. III. 222. *b.* 223. *a.*
- Brusmas* (John) refutes the *Polygamia triumphatrix*, of Lylerus, by a book intituled, *Mongamia Vindex*. III. 973.
- Bruswic* (the Electores of) named to succeed to the crown of England. V. 194. *b.*
- Brusquet*, a King's Jester, famous in his way. II. 668. *a. n.* (32).
- Brusfeld*, whether the bombarding of that city was foretold by Mademoiselle Bourignon. See *Bourignon*.
- Brutum Fulmen*, a mistake of Thuanus and Decker, touching that book. III. 521. *a.* How the author was rewarded for it. *ibid.*
- Brutus* (Decimus) was a good judge of Poetry, and, was well versed both in the learning of Rome and Greece. I. 60. *and a.*
- Brutus and Cicero* had not the same taste in Oratory. II. 166. *a.*
- Brutus* (Lucius Junius) does himself condemn his own children to death. II. 162. *a.*
- Brutus* (Marcus Junius) his intrepidity. IV. 746. *a. b.*
- Brutus* (Stephanus Junius) a dissertation upon that disguised author. V. 731. *et seq.*
- Brutus* (John Michael) differs from other Historians in his opinion touching Constantia, Queen of Sicily. III. 395. *b.*
- Buccafoco*: the family-name of the Cardinal Sarnanus, or de Sarnano. V. 57.
- Bucer* said that if Thomas's works were suppressed, he could destroy the Church of Rome. I. 472. *b.* Conjecture upon the pretence there was for accusing him of Judaism. II. 175. *a. b.* His writing was very bad. IV. 285. *a.* He endeavours to make out that the sentiments of Luther and Zuinglius concerning the Lord's Supper, were at bottom the same. V. 103. *b.* Is recommended by Gropper to Herman de Wida, Archbishop of Cologne. III. 240. *a.* His intimacy with Gropper. *ibid. a. b.*
- Bucerism*, in what it consisted. II. 171. *a. b.*
- Buchanan*, the horrible slanders of Garaffe and Barclay against him. II. 181. *a. b.* 182. *a.* Whether his political maxims, are not the maxims of the Protestants. *ibid. and b.* His enemies cannot deny but that he was at least once in his life a Philosopher. 185. *b.* He is accused of having blackened Queen Mary. 282. *a. b.*
- Buderus* (William) compared to Badius. I. 601. *and a. b.* Represents himself as married to two wives. II. 189. *b.* Makes himself feared. 192. Gives a taste for uniting Polite Literature with the Civil-Law. I. 67. *a.* How his body was carried to the grave. IV. 845. *b.* He would have kept William Bigot at Paris, but Castellan prevented it. II. 8. *a.*
- Budos* (Louise de) wife to the Duke of Montmorency, hearkens to a proposal of marriage before her husband's death. III. 184. *b.*

Bail,

- Basil*, a bastard son to the Count de Sancerre, murdered at Orleans, by whom and for what. IV. 887. *a. b.*
- Bayette* (Thomas) falls into the hands of the murderers, at the massacre of Paris. II. 694. *a.*
- Beiffere*, his letter on the real effects of James Aymar's wand. I. 8. *a. b. and n.* (71). His letter to the author. 9. *a. n.* (75).
- Bulgaria*, the Manichean Heresy takes deep root there. IV. 512. *a. b.*
- Bulgarus*, a lecture which he makes, raises a laugh in the audience. II. 193. *and b.*
- Bull*, who it was that was devoted by the title of Bull-Carrier. I. 217. *a.* A Bull where the placing of the words, and the omission of a comma, occasions great obscurity. 607. *a. b.* One which declares the King of Navarre, to have forfeited the succession only on account of his Heresy. 739. *a.*
- Bupali Odium* and *Bupali Pagna*, whether or not they are proverbs, and what they signify. II. 203. *a. b.*
- Burcard*, his Journal. V. 757. Amply quoted, touching the affair of Savonarola. 63. *b. 64. a. b. &c.*
- Burdeus* (Peter Areas) an Augustin Monk is hanged and quartered for Adultery and Murder. V. 107. *a. b.*
- Burs* (Idelette de) Calvin's wife. II. 267. *b.* Her death. *ibid.*
- Burgundy* (Adolphus of) a letter which Erasmus writ to him. I. 782. *b.* He died in the year 1558. *ibid.*
- Burgundy* (James of) Grandson to Baldwin, a natural son of Philip the Good, turned Protestant. II. 215. *a.* But taking offence at the disputes between Calvin and Bolsec, he fell off. *ibid.*
- Burgundy* (John Duke of) after having caused the Duke of Orleans, the brother of Charles VI, to be murdered, is treacherously assassinated himself. II. 462. *b. 463. a.*
- Burgundy* (the branch of) always confederated with the greatest enemies of the French name. II. 462. *b. 463. a.* Aggrandizes itself very much. 214. *b.* The States of the province of Burgundy, resolve to disobey the King's edict. I. 720. *a. b.*
- Burial* refused from a motive of religious zeal. I. 139. *b. 140. a.* Was a thing indifferent to Diogenes the Cynic. II. 668. *b. 669. a.* We should never refuse it to our enemies. IV. 194. *b. 195. a.*
- Burlis* defended. II. 603. *a. b. 604. a.*
- Burman* quoted. III. 651. *a. n.* (67).
- Burnet*, examination of his controversy with Mr Varrillas about Camden's History. II. 283. *b. 284. a.* What he says of the Protestant Divines who were named to revise the Liturgy of Edward III. — 563. *a. b.* Makes a convert of the Earl of Rochester, and writes a book upon that head. V. 804. What they make him say concerning this Dictionary, and a confutation of it. 805. His criticism upon Sanders. 43. *a. b.*
- Burru*, by what argument he dissuaded Nero from divorcing Octavia. III. 794. *a.*
- Buſbequius*, his letters are a model of writing well for Embassadors. II. 232. *a.* Quoted. V. 529. *b.*
- Butas* made Plutarch by frequent correction. II. 237. *b.*
- Butcher*, whether that word ought to be taken in a literal sense, in Dante's satire against the third race of the Kings of France. II. 296. *a. b.*
- Butter-women* (the thanks of) it is the name of a satire, which was one of the sequels of the Anti-Coton. III. 207. *a.*
- Buxoval* very ill received at the Court of Queen Elizabeth, and for what reason. II. 754. *a. b.*
- Brevius*, whether a good answer has been made to the censurers of his Annals. II. 240. *a. b.*
- Cadnet* aspires to an alliance with the royal blood, after a Professor's widow had refused to marry him. II. 576. *a. b.*
- Calculus Apicius*, what that book treats of, and who was the author of it. I. 371. *and a. b. 372. a.*
- Cajado*, a Portuguese Poet, puts an imposture on the public. III. 215. *b. 216. a.*
- Cajetan*, his opinion about the formation of women. III. 144. *b.*
- Caille* (John de la), his mistakes touching Badius. I. 602. *b. and Wechel. V. 537. b. 538. a.*
- Cayet*, a learned man, and a fool. III. 883.
- Cain*, the occasion of his quarrel with Abel. I. 23. *b. 24. a. b.* In what manner he killed the latter. *ibid. b.* Why God took upon himself the immediate cognizance of that murder. II. 247. *b.* Abundance of fantastical conjectures about the mark which God set upon him. *ibid.* Reasons for which it is pretended that his offering was rejected by God. 248. *a.*
- Calamity* (public), exiles who would not return to their native country at such a price. II. 259. *a. b. 260. a. b.*
- Calais*, how long it was in the hands of the English, and when taken by Henry II. III. 25. *a.*
- Calanus* makes away with himself in the retinue of Alexander, to shun disgrace. III. 312. IV. 7. *a.*
- Calagnini* accused of falsehood with regard to Venus. I. 368. *b.* Attacks Cicero. IV. 69. *a.* Writes obscene verses. V. 422. *a.*
- Calchas* dies of vexation, and for what. IV. 253, 254.
- Calderinus* has been undeservedly placed among the witnesses of the truth by the Protestants. II. 252. *b.*
- Calendar*, see *Kalendar*.
- Calpin*, his Dictionary composed or corrected without exactness. I. 534. *a.* Pliny is falsely quoted there about the *Lamia*. III. 712. *b. 713. a. b.* The judgment that has been passed on that Dictionary. IV. 586. *b. 587. a.*
- Calf* (golden); the Rabbins tell us that the powder of that calf which Moses made the children of Israel swallow, stuck upon the beards of those who had worshipped it. I. 1. *a.* And had almost the same effect as the waters of jealousy. *ibid. b.*
- Caligula* takes for a reproach an inscription which was made with a design to please him. I. 121. Is charmed with a piece of his own composing. *ibid. a. b.* The question he asked a Player. 370. *and a. b.* Surprized in the act of incest with his sister. 358. II. 255. *a. b. 702. a. b.* His impiety. 255. *b. 256. a.* And his extravagancies to honour the memory of Drufilla. 703. *a. b.* He makes away with his coheir. 718. *b. 719. a.* The Jews refuse to put up his statue in the temple of Jerusalem. I. 374. *b.* What he said to his brother. 758. *b.* He restores books which had been suppressed for their invectives. II. 357. *a.* How he was killed. 359. *a. b.* At what age he took the virile gown. 702. *b.* Complains that in his reign there happened no great misfortunes. III. 433. *b.* Was not superstitious. IV. 7. *b.* How Macro endeavoured to insinuate himself into his favour. 20. *b. 21. a.* His ingratitude. *ibid. b. and 22. a. b.* He said that his mother was sprung from the incestuous embraces of Augustus and Julia. 332. *b.* In the flower of his youth he falls desperately in love with Ctesonia, who was not young. II. 256. *a. b. IV. 695. b.* A falsehood touching his nurse, which Guevara affirms, as if he had read it in Dion. II. 339. *b. 340. a.* His whimsical regard for his horie. IV. 918. *a.*
- Callimachus* had a maxim that a great book is always a great evil. II. 526. *b.*
- Callipedia*, what judgment ought to be formed of that poem and its author. IV. 808. *a. b.*
- Callisthenes*, what Suidas says of him. V. 360. *a.*
- Calonge*, Barony erected into a Marquise. IV. 866. *b.*
- Calprenede*, what he says of his Cassandra and Cleopatra. IV. 192. *b.* Made no memoirs nor collections for his works. V. 444. *a.*
- Calvary*; it is thought that Adam was buried there. I. 104. *b.*

C.

- C***Abala* finds any thing in every text of Scripture. I. 174. *b. 175. a. b. 176. a. b.* What it teaches concerning the alliance of the elementary inhabitants with our species. 314. *a.* Its followers have a great esteem for the book of the creation. 173. *a.*
- Cacus*, the son of Vulcan; why the Romans said that he cast fire and flame out of his mouth. V. 45. *a.*

V O L. V.

10 O *

Calvin,

- Calvin*, his quarrel with Baudouin. I. 694. *a. b.*
Bertelier's testimony against him of no weight. 782.
a. b. 783. *a. b.* II. 61. *b.* What weight *Bolzec's*
testimony against him can have. 58. *a. b.* 59. *a.*
b. 60. *a. b.* 61. *a. b.* He writes letters against
Blandrata. 17. *a. b.* *Bucer's* letter to him. 173. *b.*
174. *a. b.* Being accused of making God the au-
thor of sin, he pleads his own cause at Bern, but
they came to no decision there about his doctrine.
60. *a.* He was never in *Priest's* orders. 260. *a.*
Did not know that there were two *Seneca's*. *ibid. b.*
When and why he published his Institution. 261.
a. 262. *a. b.* 263. *a.* Refuses to submit to the
regulations made by the Synod of Bern. 264. *b.*
Commended for not commenting on the Revela-
tions. 265. *b.* The pleasant stories which they
spread about of his devotion for St Hubert. 266.
a. b. His disinterestedness. 269. *b.* 270. *a.* His
differences with *Castilio*. 361. *b.* 362. *a.* He is
upbraided for having too eagerly picked up the
flying news which was spread concerning his ene-
mies. 364. *a.* Has not said much more against
the Popes and the court of Rome than *Castellan*
has. 370. *b.* 371. *a.* Whether he was ever in
England. 663. *a.* Goes to Paris upon his return
from his studies of the law. IV. 318. *b.* Had
severely handled some persons whom the Queen of
Navarre protected. 319. *b.* 320. *a.* Judges freely
of the conduct of Sarah and Abraham. V. 53. *b.*
54. *a. b.* 55. *b.* In speaking of the Eucharist he
makes use of phrases which seem to imply a sub-
stantial presence. 103. *b. n.* (47). Calumniated by
a Lutheran. 548. *b.* 549. *a. b.* His sermons tran-
slated into Latin by *Claudius Badolet*. I. 603. He
had been *Maturin Cordier's* pupil, and dedicates one
of his books to him. II. 554. Divers of his books
translated by *Des Gallars*. III. 124. *a. b.* A de-
mon suggested to him his false glosses on the Scrip-
ture. 538. *b.* 539. *a. b.* Is not treated as an Arian
by *Hunnius*, who says no more than that his expo-
sitions are favourable to the Arians. *ibid.* His
Institution translated into Italian by *Giulio Ce-
sare Paschali*. IV. 492. See *Peter de la Place* at
Poitiers. 681. *a.* *Messieurs Du Tillet* were his
pupils. V. 356. *a.* He disputes at Frankfort with
Justus Velsius. 450. *b.* Some people wrongfully
ascribe the Anatomy of the Mals to him. 461. *b.*
He converts *Paul Volsius*. 507. What he says
about the origin and effects of sin. 822. What
God he has introduced, as the Roman Catholics
pretend. 824. His advertisement touching the ge-
neral inventory of relics. II. 274. *b.* His nephew
Prior of the Carmelites at Paris. V. 43. *Schul-
tingius* undertakes to refute his Institution. 86.
His Institution compared to *Martyr's* Common-
Places. *ibid. b.* The great esteem in which that
book is held. *ibid. b.* 87. *a.* Abridgments that
are made of it. *ibid.* A supplement to what has
been said of its different editions. 87. *a. b.* 88. *c.*
How they vary from one another. *ibid. a. b.* *Mar-
lorat* composes the indexes of it. 88. *a.* It has
been printed times without number. *ibid. b.* Faults
of the author of the *Essais de Litterature* touching
that Institution. *ibid. b.* His Geneva Catechism,
and a remark upon the date of it. *ibid. a.*
Calvinism, the author of the *True History of Calvi-
nism* censured for his minute observations. I. 796.
a. b. Whether Calvinism favours the passions. II.
843. *a. b.* The judgment which some Lutherans
pass upon it. III. 477. *a. b.* Introduced into Bre-
men by *Hardenberg*, and how. 352, 353.
Calvinists, violences that were exercised upon them by
the Lutherans. III. 535. *a. b.* 536. *a.* Their
martyrdom looked upon as a false martyrdom by
some Lutherans. 541. *b.* 542. *a.* Are falsely ac-
cused of designing to establish an equality of con-
ditions. IV. 919. *a. b.* 920. *a. b.* The Luthera-
rans join with the Catholics against them. II.
121.
Calvino-Turcismus cited. I. 789. *b.* 790. *a.* 797. *a.*
Who was the author of that book. V. 275.
a. b.
Calvinus Judaizans, the history of that book. III.
537. *a. b.*
Calvisius (*Sethus*) censured as to the time of *Ovid's*
death. IV. 447. *a. b.*
Calumniator (public), every one that owns himself to
be such with respect to things of consequence,
should hide himself from the eyes of men. III.
554. *b.* 555. *a.*
Calumniators meet with too much indulgence. I. 327.
a. Are capable of putting in practice the most
shameful artifices. 393. *b.* 394. *a.* The best way
to be revenged of them sometimes is to return them
no answer. 784. *b.* The way to discover them.
795. *a. b.* Their knavish tricks. 714. *b.* 715. *a.*
There are several *Escobar's* and *Banni's* who absolve
them. II. 154. *a.* Policy finds its interests in let-
ting them go unpunished sometimes. 626. *b.* 627. *a.*
A good saying of *Simonides* touching calumniators.
726. *b.* How they were treated in the time of
Gregory I. III. 221. *b.* 222. *a.* How they must
be silenced. IV. 25. *a. b.* They have nothing to
fear when they are powerful. 351. *a. b.* 352. *a.*
Bring those whom they calumniate into great trouble
sometimes. V. 249. *a. b.* 250. *a.* Calumniators on
the score of hereby, they seldom receive the punish-
ment which they deserve. 512. *b.*
Calumny, its spirit. I. 393. *b.* In what case calu-
mny should be left unanswered and despised. 491.
b. Such as are easily refuted do service to those
they were designed to defame. 727. *b.* 728. *a.*
Plain and diabolical calumnies which have neverthe-
less turned to the advantage of those that were the
authors of them. III. 90. *b.* 91. *a. b.* Advan-
tages drawn from them in religious disputes. IV.
101. *b.* What thoughts calumny raised in St Ba-
sil. V. 102. *b.* Peoples readiness to believe it.
103. *a.*
Calceoglia (*Vincent*), a Physician at *Brescia*, pub-
lishes a book, which is confuted by *Donzellinus*.
II. 689.
Cambyses, to what he compares new stratagems of war.
I. 129. *a. b.*
Cambis eats his wife, and then kills himself. IV.
563. *a. b.*
Cambry, a powerful league formed against the Ve-
netians there. III. 811. *a.*
Camden, his testimony concerning *Buchanan's* repen-
tance is not altogether solid. II. 182. *b.* 183. *a.*
But preferable at the same time to that of *Mr du*
Puy related by *Varillas*. *ibid. a.* The praises that
have been bestowed upon him. 279. *b.* 280. *a.*
A gentleman breaks off the nose of his statue. 284. *b.*
In what manner part of the memoirs he made use
of were lost. *ibid.* and 285. *a. b.*
Camleon, who is the author of the book which
treats of the occult qualities of that animal. II.
639. *b.*
Cameli, the Turks have a great veneration for them.
IV. 40. *b.* According to these a certain camel will
rise again. 41. *a.*
Camener (*Timan*) proposed by *Alexander Hegius*,
and chosen director of the school at Munster. II.
242.
Camerrarius (*Joachim*) changes the state of the question
in defending *Herodotus*, who attributes envy and
jealousy to God. IV. 575. *a. b.*
Camerrarius (*Philip*) does not find it likely that
Francis I. deliberated in his council whether he
should make *Charles V.* prisoner or not. II.
437. *b.*
Cameron, his conference with *Tilenus*. II. 285. *b.*
286. *a.* What he got by preaching up Passive
Obedience. *ibid.* and *b.* Thought that many things
in the Reformed Church wanted a farther refor-
mation. 288. *a. b.* It was from him *Mr Amy-
raut* had the doctrine of Universal Grace. *ibid. b.*
289. *a.*
Camillus, the greatest action of his life. II. 290.
His descendants lived in obscurity. *ibid. b.* 291.
a. b. Whether it be true, that he forced the Gauls
to restore the money which had been given to them,
when they besieged the capitol. 709.
Camillus (*Ovinus*) having aspired to the empire, is
associated to it by *Alexander Severus*, and begs it
as a favour that he may have leave to resign. II.
770. *a. b.* Is killed. *ibid. b.*
Campognelle (*Madam de*), *Babzac's* niece, the history
of her marriage. I. 622. *b.* 623. *a. b.*
Campanella; his city of the sun. III. 545. *a. b.*
Campanus (*John*) makes the peasants of *Juliers* believe
that the end of the world was near. V. 238.
a. b.
Campbel (*Alexander*), a Dominican, his tragical end.
I. 221. *a.*
Campion,

- Campion*, his dispute with Whitakers. III. 940. *a. b.* 941. *a. b.*
- Campi* (the Abbot of), his dissertation upon medals. V. 122. *a. b.*
- Camus* (John-Peter), Bishop of Belley, what he says of the episcopal see of that town. I. 737. *b.* 738. *a. b.* His differences with the Monks of that diocese. *ibid.*
- Cana* (marriage of), who were the two betrothed persons. III. 577. *a. b.* And whether they consummated the marriage. *ibid.*
- Canabius*, what virtue that fountain had. III. 636. *a. b.*
- Candale* (the Duke of) challenged by Cerifantes. II. 408. *a. b.*
- Canibals*; the cruelty of canibals was exercised in America. III. 774. *a.*
- Canonizations*, the vast expence made at them. III. 330. *a. b.*
- Canons* (gospel) to whom the invention of them is to be ascribed. I. 269. *b.* The difference between them and the harmony of Ammonius. *ibid.*
- Canst* (Father) his false quotation with respect to Lucius Cassius. II. 345. *a. b.*
- Canterbury* (St Thomas, Archbishop of), his persecutor becomes his votary. III. 797. *b.*
- Canterus* (Andrew) was a prodigy of learning in his younger years. III. 217. *b.*
- Capilupi*, his *Cento Virgilianus*. V. 770. *b.*
- Capistran* (a Franciscan) obliges the Jews to wear the letter Thau. IV. 309. *b.*
- Capitals* or large Greek letters, who brought them again into use. III. 732.
- Capitol*, the dogs who guarded it were not to bark in the day-time, at those who came to pay their devotions in the temple. I. 773. *b.* Application of this to mythical dogs. *ibid.*
- Capitulation*; the sudden news of one coming after a great many false misrepresentations aggravates the disgust which people have at being imposed upon. III. 719. *b.* Should not be granted to those whom there is a design to punish. IV. 278. *b.*
- Cappadocia*, at what time it became a province of the Roman empire. I. 423. *a.*
- Cappadocians* very superstitious. II. 304. *a.*
- Cappel* (William) translates Machiavel's Prince. IV. 15. *a. a.* (59).
- Caprea*, the leaps of that island immortalized. IV. 19. *a. b.*
- Captains*, what qualities they must have in order to succeed in great enterprises. II. 413. *a. b.* 414. *a.* Several have dreaded the sovereign judge of the world, upon remembering the blood that they had shed in wars which they thought just. 417. *a.* Some Captains branded with infamy, and for what reason. III. 284. There are some who love their pleasures, but who love glory still more. IV. 414. *a. V.* 271. *a. b.* 272. *a. b.*
- Capuchins*, when that order of Monks commenced. IV. 386. *a. b.* How far Pope Paul III was incensed against the whole order, and for what reason. 388. *b.* A charge of forgery which proved unfortunate to the Capuchins of Paris. III. 896. *a. b.*
- Caracalla*, a perfidious action of his, which may be looked upon as the model of the St Bartholomew. I. 513. It is not true that he married his step-mother. III. 604. *b.* 605. *a. b.* 606. *a.* He was no less Julia's son than Geta. 606. *a.* He puts four Vestals to death, one of whom he had enjoyed. 605. *b.* Kills his brother Geta in the arms of his mother. 605. When, and upon what occasion, he was proclaimed by the soldiers an associate to the empire. 607. *b.* How far his zeal for Alexander the Great went. IV. 7. *b.*
- Carben* (Victor de), a Rabbin converted to Christianity. V. 540. *a. b.* 541. *a.*
- Cardan*, there are according to him twelve sublime geniuses who have excelled in the sciences. I. 191. *a.* His heaviest misfortunes. II. 315. *b.* He was rather a superstitious man, than an hardy unbeliever. *ibid.* Had more of the Fanatic in him than the Atheist. 316. *a.* A madman. 321. *a.* He abstained from nourishment, that his prediction might prove true. 320. *b.* What he says of the Magic schools that had been in Spain. IV. 725. *b.* His ingenuity. II. 7. 8. His disputes with Tartaglia. V. 297. *and a.*
- Cardinal* of quality, a competent judge in the affair of beauty. I. 399. *a.* Why there are so few Cardinals in the catalogue of Saints according to Bellarmine. 732. *b.* They are very seldom quite unanimous in the election of Popes. II. 472. Begin to be luxurious. 860. *and b.* 861. *a. b.*
- Cardinals*; the Pope shuts the mouths of the new Cardinals, and opens them again in another consistory. IV. 284. *b. n.* (5). Obligated by Paul II to sign bulls and decrees which they were wholly ignorant of. 511. *a. b.*
- Cariani* were the first who set crests on their helmets. IV. 790. *a. b.*
- Carls* (Don), a book wrote concerning his stubbornness, caprice, whims, and maggots. II. 96. *a.*
- Carmel*, the oracle of the god so called. V. 466. *b.* 467. *a. b.*
- Carmelite-Nuns* introduced into France. I. 785. *a.* Their direction given to the superior of the oratory. *ibid.* The Monks of the same order who wanted the direction of them, clamour loudly. *ibid.* Certain Carmelite-Nuns intermeddle with the political differences of Richelieu and Berulle. 786. *a.*
- Carmelites* (Friars), upon what they ground the antiquity of their order. V. 466. *b.* 467. *a. b.* They libel Cardinal Berulle. I. 785. *a.* A narrative of that quarrel. *ibid. b.* 786. *a.*
- Carnades* censures a common-place of consolation; his objections answered. I. 280. *b.* He limits in some degree the doctrine of incomprehensibility which Arcefilas taught. 410. *b.* Is very ill used by Numerius. II. 327. *a. b.* Had doctrines for his friends, and others for his scholars. *ibid. a.* It was impossible to discover what he thought the most probable. *ibid.* 334. *b.* It is said that the sun was darkened at the time of his death. 335. *b.* What he said of Chrysippus. 486. *a. b.* He entirely demolishes an invention of Chrysippus. 494. *a. b.* In what manner he used to joke, when he happened to fall upon any subtle disputes. 675. *a.* Whether he philosophized at the same time with Epicurus. 777. *a.* How he explained human liberty. 792. *b.* He argued against justice. 330. *a. b.* IV. 752. *a.*
- Carnival*, to continue it to the first Sunday in Lent, one needs only go to Milan. V. 778. *b.*
- Caroli*, some of his tricks. III. 15. *a. b.*
- Carpenterations*, they pretended to have the image of Jesus Christ, which was procured by Pilate. I. 472. *a.*
- Carrauca*, his being suspected of heresy gave ground for suspecting Charles V of the same thing. II. 336. *a. b.* Reflexion on the justice which the people did to his memory. 337. *a. b.*
- Carroufeli*, a law which is observed in them. III. 302. *b.*
- Carula*, a town in Italy, at this day called Cascina. IV. 713. *b. n.* (66).
- Carulanus* (Martinus), the same with Martinus Polonus. IV. 713. *b.*
- Cartesianism*, what retards the progress of it. I. 472. *b.* Involved in Theological disputes. II. 696. *a. b.* 697. *a.* Introduced into the schools by Wittichius. V. 564. Which procured him a great number of opponents. *ibid.* It is the least in favour with the great and powerful in Holland. *ibid.*
- Cartesians*, the judgment which la Bourignon passes on their principles. II. 111. *b.* The ablest among them are obliged to admit of mediate intelligences. 251. *a. b.* An explication of the doctrine of some of them concerning the formation of bodies. *ibid.* A Cartesian called *learned*, for saying that this proposition *two and two make four*, admits of no difficulty. 389. *b.* The arguments of these Philosophers against substantial forms prove too much. V. 116. *b.* Their principle for proving the immortality of the soul is not evident to all the world. IV. 717. *b.* 718. *a. b.* *Et seq.* What incommodes them most in the system of *Automata*. 908. *b.* 909. *a. b.* *Et seq.* 912. *b.* 913. *a. b.* The advantage which they give to the Pyrrhonists. 654. *a.*
- Cartage* built an hundred and twenty-six years after the temple of Solomon. IV. 642.
- Cartaginians*, who was the first of all the Romans that beat them at sea. II. 726.
- Carthusians*; the pleasant answer which a Carthusian made to Philip de Comines. III. 223. *a.* Carthusians fined in two thousand pistoles by whom, and for what. 541. *b.*

Cartigni,

- Cartigni*, a demoniac in Savoy, who was tried in sixteen languages. III. 211. *b.*
- Cart-load*; whether a cart-load of skins was the source of the war between the Duke of Burgundy and the Swiss. II. 219. *a.*
- Carvial* (Cardinal) is the only one that withstands Paul II. Who obliged the Cardinals to sign bulls and decrees which they had never seen. IV. 511. *b.*
- Casa* (John de la), why the Protestants have exclaimed so much against his verses. IV. 235. *a.* He writes against Vergerius, and why. 410. *a.* What he aimed at in his abominable *Capitolo del Forno*. V. 422. *a. b.* Many have condemned it, without reading it. 423. *a.* A poem which he addresses to the Germans. 458. *a.* His book against Vergerius. *ibid. a. b. &c.*
- Casaubon* (Isaac), a considerable omission of his. I. 519. *b.* His conjecture on a passage of Strabo approved. II. 632. *a. b.* He wrongfully censures Xiphilin touching Hadrian's Genealogy. III. 316. *b.* Had freed himself from the slavery of writing over and blotting out. IV. 85. *b.* Contradicts the great Julius Scaliger, but at the same time humbles himself with respect at the foot of his throne. 597. *b.* 598. *a.* His opinion about the four verses that are ascribed to Nero, is very odd. 596. *a.* Justly censured with respect to the place of Pyrrhus's burial. 660. *b.* Is cruelly taken to pieces in a satire. V. 98. *a. b.* Laughs at the fable of the She-Pope. IV. 739. *b.* 740. *a.* Blames St Chrysostome for telling obscene stories. V. 852. *and a. b.* Is himself censured in his turn. *ibid. &c.*
- Casaubon* (Meric), his observation on Homer with respect to the good and evil that there is in nature. V. 576. *b.* In what respect he considered Euripides as an inspired writer. *ibid.*
- Caselius*, Professor at Helmstadt; those who had an eye to Ecclesiastical preferments, durst not study under him. IV. 772. *a. b.*
- Caspian Sea* taken for the *Pontus Euxinus*. IV. 678. *a.*
- Cassander*, his consultation. I. 691. *b.* 692. *a.* Composes a Latin discourse, which is the origin of a very sharp quarrel. 694. *a. b.* 695. *a.* From whom he took his conciliating spirit. V. 551.
- Cassini* commissioned to find means for preventing the inundations of the Chiana. V. 499. *a. b.*
- Cassini* (Samuel de) calumniates the Vaudois. IV. 916. *b.*
- Cassius* (Lucius), his tribunal was called the *rock of the accused*. I. 351. II. 345. *and a.* His maxim *cui bono*. 345, 346. *and b.* 347. *a.* His severity gave occasion to all rigid judges being styled *Cassiani*. *ibid. a. b.*
- Cassius Longinus* (Caius) harangues his soldiers. II. 350. *b.*
- Cassius Severus* (Titus) took pleasure in accusing people. II. 356. *b.* Gave occasion to the law which Augustus made against defamatory libels. V. 743.
- Cassock*: one ought never to despise a man in a cassock, how low an object soever he may seem. I. 361.
- Cassolus* could not answer the question that was put to him. I. 616. *a.*
- Castalo* disguised under the name of Martinus Bellius, wrote against punishing Heretics. I. 789. *a. b.* Broached some very singular opinions. II. 360. *b.* Gave signal examples of moderation. 364. *b.* His extreme poverty. 365. *b.* 366. *a.* Whether he be the author of a dialogue against the right which is allowed to the Civil Magistrate, of putting Heretics to death. V. 167. *a. b.* His differences with Calvin more particularly related in the French life of Calvin than in the Latin one. II. 274. *b.*
- Castellan*, a pleasant answer which he made to Francis I. who asked him if he was a gentleman. II. 367. *a. b.* Gets his landlord's daughter with child. 369. *b.* 370. *a. b.* His application to study was surprising. *ibid. b.* He did not stay long at Rome, and the reason of it. *ibid. and 371. a.* Was of opinion that indulgence should be used towards inquisitors and informers. 372. *a. b.* How he checked a Cardinal for the reproaches he had cast upon him with respect to Dolet. 683. *b.* 684. *a.* What he said of Astrology. 401. *a. b.*
- Castellan* (John), an account of his martyrdom wrote by Lambert. III. 708.
- Castello* (James de) was of such a small stature that Pope Boniface VIII ordered him to rise, thinking he was upon his knees. I. 326.
- Castile*, when, and on what occasion, the Kings of that country began to lay hands on the Ecclesiastical revenues. II. 378. *a.* And who was the first that permitted all the public acts to be drawn up in the vulgar tongue. 379. Disorders occasioned in that kingdom by a dream which a woman had. IV. 456. *a.*
- Castor and Pollux* make an inroad into Attica. I. 52. *a.*
- Castor*; whether the Castor who composed many books, be the same with the son-in-law of Dejoctarus. II. 630. *b.* 631. *a.* Three reasons for the negative. *ibid.* There was another Castor besides, who was an excellent Botanist. 631. *b.*
- Castrate*; persons who castrated themselves out of complaisance. II. 535. *and a. b.*
- Castration*, the punishment that was inflicted on adulterers. III. 74. *a. b.* What other persons were condemned to it. 77. *a.*
- Castritius*, his answer to the Consul Carbo was like that which had been made by some others. II. 384. *and b.* The meaning of that answer. *ibid.*
- Castro* (Alphonus de) censured for two reasons, with respect to Damascus and the time in which he lived. II. 586. *a.*
- Castro* (Roderigo à) seconds Marinello in the composition of his book on the diseases of women. IV. 148. *a. b.*
- Castrocaro* persecutes the Vaudois. III. 757, 758.
- Casulists*, a doubt proposed to them on an Anatomical curiosity. I. 109. *a.* They are obliged to treat of subjects full of obscenity, in order to solve cases of conscience. 182. *a.* Their books testify that there are married women who make use of drugs to cause abortion. II. 314. *b.* Their books contain the art of cavilling with God. III. 894. *b.* Nothing that concerns matrimonial causes escapes their curiosity. V. 40. *b.* 41. *a. b.* Loofe Casulists take a great advantage of Abraham's conduct with regard to Sarah. 51. *a.* Write down minutely all kinds of immodesty, which they only know by the report of vicious men. III. 135. *b.* Are obliged to write or say things which are shocking to modesty. V. 853.
- Casus Regius*: whether that book be justly ascribed to the Abbot de St Cyran. V. 15. *b.* 16. *a.*
- Cat*. A pension left to a cat, and a famous law-suit about it. IV. 918. *b.*
- Catalani*, what they did to obtain from heaven the recovery of Mr de Marca. IV. 100. *b.*
- Catalogue* of the witnesses of the truth, by whom collected. I. 165. *b.* The occasion of that book. III. 560. *a. b.*
- Catalogues of Heretics*, the writers of them follow one another like sheep. I. 760. *b.*
- Catalonia*, Lewis Meplede's book concerning the right which the crown of France has to that province. IV. 199. *a.*
- Catechism* explained according to the method of Aristotle's Categories. I. 472. *a.*
- Catechism of Calvin* criticized by John d'Espagne. II. 837. *a. b.* Does not differ much, in explaining the Eucharist, from the opinion of J. Poinet, who admits a Real Presence, but which is no more than sacramental at the same time. IV. 693. *b.* The date of it. V. 88. *a.*
- Categoriet*, a question concerning them. V. 436. *a.*
- Catherine de Medicis*, her conferences with the Duke of Alba. I. 119. *a. b.* Her terrible rebuke to Amyot. 258. *a.* Her own artifices played against her. III. 419. *b.* The answer which Henry the Great made to her one day. 422. *a.* It is said that she made Machiavel's Prince her peculiar study. IV. 15. *and b.* 16. *a.* A letter that was wrote to her. 160. *a. b.* 161. *a. b.* Fables uttered in her Funeral Oration. V. 36. *a.* Reflexion upon her conduct. 255. *a.* Her insensibility with regard to slanders. 760, 761. A maxim ascribed to her. 750. See *Medicis*.
- Catherine de Navarre*, sister to Henry the Great, refuses to marry with the condition of going to Mass. IV. 330. *a. b.* Found no great satisfaction in her marriage. *ibid.* 331. *a.* She continues steadfast in her religion. *ibid.*
- Catholic*: of what Prince it was said, that he was a good Catholic, but a very bad Christian. III. 809. *b.*
- Catholicism*

- Catholicism*; who was the first that made use of that word for the title of a Dictionary. I. 614. *b*.
- Catholicon*, a passage from that book; describing a procession of the League. IV. 243. *b*.
- Catholics* and Protestants reproach each other with having Adamites among them. I. 712. *and a. b*. Several Roman Catholics have all their life-time made profession of the Catholic religion, although they wished for a reformation in many things. 659. They are not at all scrupulous when the question is about the conquests which they make upon the Protestants. II. 246. *b*. What their making the sign of the cross serves for. 616. *b*. English Catholics, their threatenings and imprecations against their country. III. 521. *b*. The reason of ringing a bell at noon in Roman Catholic countries. IV. 50. *a*. The free exercise of their religion is promised them in Holland. III. 675. *a*.
- Catiline*, by what means his conspiracy began to be discovered. III. 112. *b*. 113. *a*. How we may suppose him to have passed for one of Fulvia's husbands. 112. *b*.
- Catinat* (Mr de) did not raise the siege of Sufa, on the contrary he took it, and kept it till the peace. IV. 210. *b*. Was not beaten at Coni. *ibid*. 211. *a*. Gains the battle of Marlaglia. *ibid*. It is false that he was forced by the allies, to return beyond the Alps. *ibid*.
- Cato* the Censor expels one Manlius from the senate, and why. I. 40. *b*. What he said in order to deprive Ilocrates's school. 615. *a*. It is said that no one durst ask an unjust thing of him. II. 27. *a. b*. The offers which he made to King Ptolomy, in order to engage him to surrender up the island of Cyprus to the Romans. 507. The respect which the people shewed him, at the Floral Games, and Martial's railery. III. 54. *a*. He harangues vehemently against the liberty which the women took of running in crowds. IV. 769. *b*. The judgment he passed upon the three Philosophers that came Embassadors from Athens. II. 329. *b*. And why he advised them to be sent back immediately. *ibid*. *and* IV. 751. *b*. 752. *a*. His *Origines*. 750. *a. b*. His contempt for all the Greek literature. 751. *b*. He is blamed for indulging the lewdness of his Domestics. 754. *a*. His usury. *ibid. and. b*. He is rallied. V. 434. *a*.
- Cato Uticensis* says that God does not hear the prayers of the slothful. I. 94. *b*. Desired rather to be an honest man, than to seem so. II. 420. *b*. 421. *a*. Part of his History. IV. 745. *a. b*. 746. *a*. His surprize at a letter which he read. V. 123. *a. b*. He censures Caesar's opinion touching the punishment of bad men; but he only does it indirectly and with moderation. II. 418. *a*.
- Catibo* (Angelo) his gift of prophecy. II. 391. *b*. 392. *a*. Reflexions on that head. *ibid. a. b*. 393. *a*.
- Catullus* writes verses against Caesar. IV. 88. *a. b*.
- Caucasus* (Mount) why so called. II. 82. *b*.
- Cave* (William) treats the story of Pope Joan as a mere fable, and maintains that it has been thrust into the chronicle of Martin Polonus, by another hand. IV. 709. *a*.
- Cavern*: what use the Lacedemonians made of a cavern near the mountain Taygetus. III. 965. *a. b*.
- Cause*, the Schoolmen plagued themselves to assign a cause for every effect. II. 227. *a*.
- Cause* (First) the doctrine of some Philosophers concerning it. II. 672. *a. b*. 673. *a. b*.
- Cause*, some are very easily defended, though the Defendant be a little in the wrong. I. 391. *b*. The best may be lost in certain circumstances. IV. 852. *b*. 853. *a*. Some causes which bear the name of ludicrous. 799. *a. b*. 802. *a. b*.
- Cause* (Occasional) whether the Devil makes use of the staff as an occasional cause. I. 4. *b*. Reflexion upon the Hypothesis of occasional causes. II. 251. *a. b*. Its use. 767. *b*. There is no Hypothesis more capable of giving an account of events. IV. 690. *a*. May be of some use towards accounting for dreams. 72. *a*. And explaining the Phenomena relating to bodies. 94. *b*. Whether they produced the miracles of the ancient law. 609. *a. b*. This system does not bring in God acting miraculously. 914. *b*. Whether it can be of any use towards resolving some difficulties touching Providence. V. 371. *a. b*. 372. *a*.
- Causin*, to what he compares St Paul and St Augustin. V O L. V.
- Celso*, his sympathy with the sun. II. 402. *b*. And Henry the fourth's prognostication concerning him. *ibid. and* 403. *a*. He gives us the long particulars of a story all taken out of his own head. III. 19. *b*. 20. *d*. Condemns a censure of Longin. V. 328. *b*. 329. *a*.
- Cea*, the inhabitants of that island place Aristeus, son to Apollo, in the number of the gods. I. 456. *a*. See *Zia*.
- Cedrenus*, mistaking Xiphilin's meaning falls into a gross error, touching Hadrian's extradition. III. 316. *b*.
- Ceylon*, a comical opinion of the inhabitants of that island, touching the tears of Eve. I. 23. *a*. A mountain of that island, called the Peak of Adam, and for what reason. 104. *a*.
- Celestin* III, what he did to shew that he could give the Imperial crown to whom he pleased. III. 394. *a*.
- Celibacy*; Agrippa declaimed against the law of Celibacy. I. 156. *b*. That law has terrible consequences, and is an inexhaustible source of imparities and disorders. II. 554. *b*. 588. *a. b*. III. 13. *b*. 14. *a. b*. 224. *b*. 225. *a. b*. IV. 240. *and a. b*. The vow of Celibacy is rash. III. 13. *b*. The number of Clergymen who cannot bear the yoke of it is innumerable. 235. *a*. Whether Philosophers ought to prefer it to marriage. 382. *b*. Whether it be possible to be observed. 595. *a. b*. The suppression of Celibacy was very inconvenient to the great Protestant Lords in Germany. 727. *b*. Cannot be defended by the disorders of some married persons. V. 425. *b*. 426. *a*. Joseph Hall disputes upon that subject. 344. *a. b*. 345. *a*. A curious passage of the History of Huldric Mutius on the same subject. IV. 296. *a. b*. 297. *a*. Passages from others to the like purpose. 411. *a. b*.
- Celsus* laughs at the Christians, and at their *Do not examine, only believe*. V. 816. Confuted by Origen *ibid. and* 817.
- Celsus*, has raised beasts above men. IV. 911. *b*.
- Celte*, whence so called. III. 433. *a*.
- Celtes* (Conrad) there were some famous Latin Poets in Germany before him. III. 724. *and b*.
- Cenalis* (Robert) his judgment on John Bouchet's Annals of Aquitain. II. 103. *a*.
- Centaurs*, killed in the quarrel between the Centaurs and Lapithæ. I. 537. *a*.
- Censor*. He who is very guilty, himself ought not to set up for a Censor. 210. *b*.
- Censors of Books*, their little attention. I. 101. *a*. They detain manuscripts too long, and strike many things out of them. II. 809. *a*.
- Censure*; the inclination which people have for censure. I. 696. *a*. Censures that are gross and indiscreet, produce very bad consequences. 377. *b*. The inconveniences which attend those Censures, which fall upon a multitude of propositions, in a loose and indeterminate manner, and without particularizing each proposition. 340. *a*. 607. *a*. The fatal effects of it, when it is ill managed. III. 464. *a. b*. 465. *a. b*.
- Centula*, city, why so called. I. 10. *a*.
- Centuriators of Magdeburg*, what they relate touching Gregory the Great, deserves no credit. III. 224. *b*. 225. *a. b*. *&c*. How they were treated. 600. *b*. Some facts which concern their work. 560. *b*. 561. *a. b*. *& seq*. Their Epistle Dedicatory to Queen Elizabeth. 562. *a. b*. 563. *a. b*.
- Century*, the XVth and XVIIth, compared in point of learning. I. 92. *b*. 220. *b*. 221. *a. b*.
- Cepio* favours the Knights cause against the pretensions of the Senate. II. 711. *b*.
- Ceramica*; there was in Athens, a fine street, and likewise a suburb, which were called by that name, but for different reasons. IV. 343. *b*.
- Cerdagne*, taken for the island of Sardinia, by a learned Civilian. II. 464. *b*.
- Ceremonies* (Sacred) ought not to be divulged. III. 216. *b*. It is better to hear with them, than to remember the Church. 343. *a. b*.
- Ceres*, for what benefactions the world stood indebted to her. V. 333. *a*. In what manner her feast called *Thesmophoria*, was celebrated. *ibid. b*. How Baubo cured her of her melancholy. 336. *a. b*. And what was the consequence of that. *ibid*.
- Cerrigo*. See *Cybera*.

- Crispianus* has wrote some very pretty Latin verses, which are quoted by Menage. III. 102. *b. n.* (18).
- Cervantes* (Michael) his novels translated by d'Audiguer. I. 548. *a.*
- Cesar* (Augustus) owes the greatest part of his glory to the interest he had among the learned men of his Court. V. 660.
- Cesar* (Julius) whether that which Valerius Maximus relates concerning Accius, ought to be applied to him. I. 59. *a.* Was a Poet when very young. *ibid.* His soul supposed to have been changed into a star. 348. *b.* He deserved death, but it was not the business of three or four private persons, to undertake to punish him. II. 165. *b.* What weapons his murderers made use of to kill him, and with what weapons they were killed themselves. 349. *a.* Valerius Maximus is the only Historian who speaks of his apparition to Cassius. *ibid. b.* Whether he ever returned into Gaul after the passage of the Rubicon. 304. *b.* An instance of his moderation. *ibid. a.* Whether some others in the like situation could have done what he did. 414. *a. b.* The three celebrated words which he wrote to a friend. 415. *b.* Different judgments on his Commentaries. 417. *b.* 418. *a.* Some facts relating to the same book. 425. *a. b.* Who was the first that published it in Greek. III. 620. *and a.* He does not vouchsafe to rise up to the Senate. II. 421. *b.* 422. *a. b.* V. 399. *a.* Attempts of his favourites to procure him the title of King. II. 420. *a.* Why he gave no decision in Dejotarus's cause. 626. *a. b.* 627. *a.* Said he had nothing to fear from such fat and well-dressed men as Dolabella and Marc Antony. 679. *b.* What sort of friends he made choice of, according to Cicero. 680. *a.* The effect which Cicero's oration for Ligarius had upon him. III. 831. *b.* He is too fond of discoursing upon the profession of others. 871. *a.* Seizes upon the treasure which was kept in the temple of Saturn. IV. 204. *b.* 205. *a. b.* Suppresses that action in his History. *ibid.* Makes Pompey his son-in-law. 281. *a.* Was wont to forget nothing but injuries. 488. *b. n.* (48). Receives a love-letter in the Senate-house. V. 123. *b.* Indulged his soldiers in all manner of debauchery after a great victory. 271. *a.* Withed for a sudden death. 439. *b.* The Arvernii shewed his sword hung up in one of their temples. II. 419. *b.* His Commentaries translated and commented on by Vigenere. I. 631. *a.* A parallel drawn between him and Henry IV. by Antony de Baudouin. *ibid.*
- Cesarinus*, a letter of St Chrysostome to that Monk. II. 5. *b.*
- Cest-Sancy*, on what terms he married the Countess de Moret. III. 266. *a. b.*
- Cesonia*, Caligula's wife, facts that concern her. II. 256. *a. b.*
- Cervantes*: it was falsely affirmed that the Count de Souches, was born there. V. 192.
- Chabot* (Joan) publicly professes the Protestant religion without quitting the habit of a Nun. IV. 470.
- Chains*: why Kings were loaded with Chains of gold or silver. I. 516. *b.*
- Chaise* (Father de la) a satire against him. I. 343. *a. b.* 344. *a.*
- Chakondyle* has spoke of the Bohemians from very bad authority. II. 298. *a.*
- Challenges* of a remarkable kind. II. 208. *a. b.*
- Chamber-maid*: a young fellow in the disguise of a Chamber-maid. I. 405.
- Chambers of the Edit*, when granted to the Huguenots. III. 156. *b.*
- Chambers of Meditations*: places into which the Jesuits carry the greatest sinners. &c. II. 457. *a.* Described. *ibid.*
- Chambre* (the Abbot de la) what he took for his text in the funeral oration on the French Queen. III. 601. *b.*
- Chamier* dies like Zuinglius, with his sword in his hand. II. 432. *a. b.* 433. *a.* His character. *ibid. and b.*
- Champion des Dames*, who was the author of that Poem. III. 77.
- Chanaan*, the cause of his wickedness, and the first symptoms of it. II. 431. *b.*
- Change*: we ought to continue in the communion we were brought up in, unless we can be gainers by the change. IV. 375. *a.*
- Changes in point of belief*, proved by authentic facts. IV. 737. *a.* Maintained to be impossible by the Roman Controversists, with regard to the Escharist, by Messieurs de Port-Royal, and with regard to all the articles of Faith by Langevin. *ibid. n.* (150).
- Change*; that land is in Burgundy. II. 435. *b.*
- Chantrelle*, Queen Margaret's gallant. V. 529. *b.* 530. *a.*
- Chaos*, who was the first of the Philosophers that supposed an Intelligence to reduce it into form. I. 299. *a. b.* 300. *a. b.* The ancient Philosophers went back as far as the Chaos, and the first original of all things. 302. *a. b.* 303. *a.* Whether the ideas of the Antients, who have mentioned the Chaos are just, and whether they could pretend with any show of reason, that this state subsisted no longer. 304. 305. 306. IV. 434. *b. as far as 442. b.* Different significations of that word. V. 323. *a. b.* &c. What it was according to Plato. 634. *b.*
- Chapelet du S. Sacrement*: a piece composed by a filter of Antony Arnauld, ascribed to the Abbot de St Cyrano, and condemned by the Sorbonne. V. 16. *and b.*
- Chapter of Paris*, its tyrannical treatment of the *Parlement* punished. II. 383. *a. b.* When those kind of enfranchisings became very common. *ibid. b.*
- Chapman* (Samuel) quoted. III. 93. *a.* Convinced Mr Jurieu of having reflected on the Dutch, very little less than Tavernier has done. V. 300. *a.*
- Character*. The true Character of turbulent zealots. I. 716. *a. b.*
- Character* (Round) in Printing; who was the first that brought them into France. I. 600. *a.*
- Charenton*, its national synod of 1631, charges its Deputies not to deliver their speech to the King on their knees, but standing as the Clergy of the kingdom do. I. 261. *a.* After a long contest, an audience is obtained in the manner it was desired. *ibid.* Fruidefs attempts to set up a college there. II. 686. On what occasion their was preaching in the church-yard of Charenton. 695. *b.* 696. *a.*
- Charicles* disgraces himself by his conduct, with respect to Pythonice's tomb. III. 357. *a.*
- Chariot* (Triumphal) drawn by four white horses, was looked upon by the Romans, as a thing peculiarly sacred to the sovereign of the gods. II. 290. *a.*
- Chariots* (falling) invented by Stevin; Grotius writes a Poem on that subject. V. 236. *and b.*
- Charivari* (or Mock-Music) which was given to a woman that was married again immediately after the death of her husband, authorized by law. II. 104. *a.* Approved of by a great many Lawyers. *ibid. n.* (3). Disapproved of by Faber and Chaffancu. *ibid. n.* (3).
- Charlemagne*, his life ascribed to Plutarch by Wicelius. I. 57. How that Emperor discovered his daughter's intrigue with his Secretary, and in what manner he behaved after the discovery. II. 744. *b.* 745. *a.* Whether he created the Peers of France. III. 336. *a.* The book which John du Tillet published under his name, is as old as his time at least. A dispute on that head. V. 355. *a. b.* 356. *a.*
- Charles*, Duke of Sudermania, declared King of Sweden, by the States of the Kingdom. V. 652. Proposes to the King of Denmark, that they should terminate their quarrel by a duel. 653.
- Charles V*, whether he made use of the counsels of Agrippa. I. 152. *a.* Accuses the Princes and States of the Empire, Henry II, of having entered into a League with Soliman. 407. *a. b.* Agrees with the Pope to accuse him in full council. *ibid. a.* An excellent saying of his. 587. *a.* He discovers to Philip II the true birth of Don John, and charges him to acknowledge him as his brother. 587. *and a. b.* What he said of Languey's pen. 720. *a.* What occasioned people to say that he died a Lutheran. II. 336. *a. b.* 440. *a. b.* He offers to fight Francis I, in single combat. 437. *a.* Whether he was very chaste. 442. *a. b.* Who assisted at his last moments. 336. *a.* And with what sentiments he died. *ibid.* Facts concerning his confessor. *ibid. and b.* The reason of his being preferred to his competitor for the empire. 435. *b.* 436. *a.* By what intrigues he prevented his being stopped at the Court of Francis I. 841. *a.* And reduced the Court of France to strange extremities. *ibid. b.* 842. *a.* Of which he did not know how to make a proper use. 841. *b.* His impostures against Francis I, produce all the effect that he could expect from them. III. 90. *b.* 91. *a. b.* &c. He repents of having neglected the Latin tongue. 223.

323. *a. b.* Does violence to nature two different ways in two marriages. 966. *a.* A Lord in the Low-Countries blew up the house where he had entertained that Emperor. IV. 40. *b.* A generous action of his. III. 950. *b.* He takes possession of the Milanese. V. 129. *a.* Subdues Constance. II. 551. What it was that chiefly traversed his design of an universal monarchy. V. 671. He was somewhat too late in pacifying the differences in point of religion. 672.
- Charles VI*, King of France, the misery and disorder of France under that Prince. II. 213. *b.* 214. *a.*
- Charles VII*, King of France, the bad reputation of the Queen his mother. II. 209. *a. b.* A sentence passed against him. 210. *a. b.* 211. *a.* He makes a kind of *Amende honorable*. 212. *a. b.* 213. *a.* If he had had courage and genius enough, he never would have prostituted his honour as he did. 213. *b.* What Mezerai says of him. III. 798. *b.*
- Charles VIII*, King of France; Haillan gives out that he was supposititious. III. 337. *a.* His education. 799. *a.* He was extremely infirm both in body and mind; and the reason of his being so. 813. *a. b.* Before his time the Pox was unknown in France. IV. 574. *a.* A Surgeon kneels before his statue, and for what reason. *ibid.* Savonarola had prophesied that he should return into Italy. V. 59, 60. That Monk's affection to him, and the reason of it. 72. His death. 58. *b.* 60. *a.* It contributed nothing towards Savonarola's downfall. 58. *b.* His expedition looked upon as one of the greatest misfortunes that ever befel Italy. 60. *a.* Savonarola exhorts him by letters to return into Italy. 70. *b.*
- Charles IX*, King of France, what he said to the Admiral de Coligni. I. 14. *a. b.* He harangues his Parliament with a courageous and threatening boldness. 256. *a.* III. 512. *b.* Does not esteem Amyot's Poetry. I. 259. *a.* And reproaches him with his avarice. 256. *a.* To whom he owed his ill qualities. II. 509. *a.* His policy with respect to Poets. 617. *b.* And witty authors. IV. 894. *b.* Threatens the King of Navarre and the Prince of Condé. III. 418. *a. b.* Did himself, from his chamber-window, fire upon the Huguenots that were flying from the massacre. IV. 471. *a.* It was unjustly laid to his charge that he did not love women. V. 392. *a. b.* 393. *a. b.*
- Charles X*, pretended King of France: what the League did for him against Henry IV. IV. 730. *a.*
- Charles I*, King of England; his death being imputed to the Presbyterian party, occasions the drawing of a thousand odious consequences against the Protestants of France. I. 265. *a.* His execution condemned by several Protestant writers. III. 426. *a.* He is supposed to have died a member of the Romish Church, in a book that was dedicated to his son. IV. 215. *b.* Was not the author of a book which was ascribed to him. 221. *a. b.* *See*. His *Prayer in the Time of Captivity*. 222. *b.* 223. *a.*
- Charles II*, King of England, papers that were found in his strong-box concerning the controversy between the Protestants and the Church of Rome. II. 700. *b.* A book which was dedicated to him by Milletiere. IV. 215. *a.*
- Charles II*, King of Spain, to what his recovery was ascribed. IV. 355. *a.*
- Charles*, Duke of Calabria, enjoins a Neapolitan gentleman to maintain an old horse which he had abandoned, after having received considerable services from him. IV. 918. *b.*
- Charlevoix*, what snares were laid to ruin him. III. 265. *a. b.*
- Charpentier* commits a blunder in an harangue which he had prepared. III. 649. *a.*
- Charron*, placed by Garasse in the catalogue of Atheists. II. 450. *a. b.* Had a mind to be a Cartesian. 448. *a.* Contracted a very strict friendship with Montagne. *ibid.* and *b.* Quoted. 453. *a. b.* 454. *a.* What Sorel observes concerning this author. *ibid.* *b.* 455. *a.* It has been said that he was more dangerous than Montagne. 454. *b.* His doctrine touching the incomprehensibility of the Divine Nature. V. 145. *a. b.* 146. *a.* He approves the doctrine of John Huarte concerning wits. III. 528. *b. n.* (4). How the faculties of Divinity in France dealt with his treatise *Of Wisdom*. V. 810.
- Chartier* (Alain), several pieces not composed by him were mixed with his works. IV. 163. *a.*
- Chassaneu*, what story he relates concerning the Virgin Mary. IV. 805. *a.*
- Chastel* (John), the apology for him. II. 101. *a.* 103. *a. n.* (15). His attempt on the life of Henry IV, and its consequences. 456. *a. b.* *See seq.* Who was the author of his apology. 459. *b.* A conjecture upon what moved the Parliament of Paris to involve the Jesuits in his cause. III. 280. and *a. b.*
- Chastelus* (du) quoted. III. 818. *b.* IV. 142. *b.* 143. *b.* *See*.
- Chastity* did not continue long upon earth. I. 380. *a.* A surprising example of that virtue. II. 108. *b.* 109. *a.* V. 603. *b.* 604. *a.* Chastity not only immanent, but transitive or penetrative. II. 108. *b.* 109. *a.* Why private persons stumble more in that respect, than with regard to all the other virtues. 382. *a.* The most ardent love of it does not necessarily exclude the mechanical dispositions to incontinency. 556. *b.* 557. *a.* III. 99. *b.* In order to preserve it, one ought to wish for a quality like that of the Hirpes. 72. *b.* It is not incompatible with bravery. 414. *b.* Attended with an incredible circumstance. 186. *a. b.* 187. *a.* Some nations have quite lost the ideas of honour with regard to this virtue. 580. *b.* 581. *a. b.* 604. *a. b.* and 773. *a. b.* See *Continency*. It is reported that the emerald is a great friend to chastity: a curious example on that head. IV. 864. *b.*
- Chastity of Conversation*: a new proof against what Mr Chevreau advances concerning it. V. 540. *a. b.*
- Châtel* (John du), a soothsayer and fortune-teller, his deposition against Concini and his wife. III. 126. *b.*
- Chatillard*, a French gentleman beheaded in Scotland, for making an attempt upon the honour of the Queen. IV. 896. *b.*
- Châtillon* (Marthal), the first seed of division betwixt him and Marthal Brezé. III. 821. *a.*
- Châtillon* (Admiral) plainly pointed at in a seditious harangue that was pronounced in the name of the Clergy. IV. 815. *b.*
- Chervagnac*, observations upon his memoirs. V. 191. *b.* 192. *a. b.*
- Chaumont*, his negligence when he read the books that he went about to confute. II. 580. *a.*
- Cheese*, who invented the secret of making it. I. 455. *a.*
- Chelonis* frees herself from a nice and difficult juncture. II. 467.
- Chennitius* treated as a formidable adversary by Don Nicolas Antonio. I. 323. *a. b.*
- Chenailles*, an agreeable house upon the Loire. II. 647. *a.*
- Chersistrate*, mother to Epicurus, why that woman could not fail to form a sage. II. 775. *a.*
- Cherifs* are held in such veneration among the Turks, that they alone wear the green turban. IV. 40. *b.*
- Cherifoglis* turns Mahometas out of spite. III. 730. *b.*
- Chesne* (Andrew du), it is probable that the world is indebted to him for the edition of Abelard's works. I. 249. *b.*
- Chest*, a book treating of that game is spoken of as ready to come out. II. 53. *a. b.* 54. *a. b.* A famous player at it. III. 162.
- Chevillier*, his treatise on the origin of Printing at Paris: a curious passage of that book. I. 780. *a.* Quoted with respect to Aretin's sonnets. 440. *a.*
- Chevreau* (Urban) confounds himself while he relies on the testimony of Herodotus. I. 72. *a. b.* Is put right with respect to the martyrdom of St Babylas. 594. *b.* 595. *a.* A very probable conjecture touching a mistake in his history. II. 352. *b.* What he says of old men who marry. IV. 88. *b.* And of a cause about adultery. V. 112. *a. b.* 113. *a.* His judgment concerning the quarrel between Girac and Collar. 345. and *b.* His notions with regard to politeness of stile, and a confutation of them. 843. and *a. b.* 856.
- Chevreuse* (the Duke of), as proxy to the King of Great-Britain, marries the Princess Henriette-Mary of France. III. 300. *a.*
- Chevreuse* (the Dukes of), the mischief she occasions. III. 303. *a. b.* 304. *a. b.* 305. *a.*

Chiabrera

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

- and Aristides, present apologies on their behalf. 520. Those of the IVth century, made frequent mention of the antiquity of their families. 379. *b.* The prepossession of their communions one against another. 579. *a.* It is strange that they, whose system is so pure, should be so corrupt in their manners. 649. *a.* There were Christians found among the Senators themselves who endeavoured to maintain the celebration of the Lupercalia. 933. They cannot justly reproach the Infidels, as to morals. IV. 33. *b.* 34. *a.* Have been infinitely more cruel than the followers of Mahomet. 32. *a. b.* Were accused of being the cause of all the public calamities. V. 454. *a. b.* And in their turn accused their enemies of the same thing. *ibid.* Rallied and laughed at by Celsus for their, *examine not, only believe.* 816. Defended by Origen. *ibid.* and 817. Captives to faith, and not judges of doctrines. 822. Every good Christian ought to be satisfied with his faith being founded on the word of God. 829. Their disputes should only be carried to the tribunal of Revelation. 830.
- Christina de Pise*, what she relates concerning Novella. I. 325. *a.*
- Christina*, Queen of Sweden, writes to the general of the Jesuits, desiring that two of their society might be dispatched to her. IV. 3. and *a. b.* How she was taken out of a lake, into which she fell. 526. *a. n.* (122). Never a day passed but she read some pages of Tacitus. V. 281. *a.*
- Christmas Songs*. The Catholics reproached with the prophane tunes of their Christmas Songs. IV. 160. *a.*
- Chronicle* (Martinian) so called from Martinus Polonus the author of it: translated into French with the additions of Verneron and Castell. IV. 713.
- Chronicle-Writers*, many of them copy the same false stories. I. 30. *a.*
- Chronologers*, some of them relate their own History very confusedly. I. 389. *a.*
- Chronology*; whether the Chronology of the Scripture could have been disentangled without the help of prophane authors. I. 775. *b.* There is little Chronology in most of the Greek and Latin Historians. II. 309. *b.* Several authors have neglected it, where there was no occasion to give a precise account of the time in which people lived. 352. *b.*
- Chronological Accounts*: It would be of great service to the compilers of History, if Chronological Accounts were published like that of Father de Londe. IV. 211. *b.* Chronological Accounts that clash with appearances, are never to be admitted, but in the utmost necessity. II. 162. *b.*
- Chronologies* are very liable to the glosses and additions of those into whose hands they fall. IV. 728. *a.*
- Church*, it was said to have begun in Abel. I. 23. *b.* Whether, if it had not been for Aristotle, the Church would have wanted some of its articles of Faith. 469. *a. b.* Whether it be true that the Church never employed the secular arm against the sects. 476. *b.* 477. *a. b.* The infallibility of it cannot be maintained as to facts. 494. *a.* Cannot subsist without her liturgy and discipline. II. 112. *b.* When it is proper to tolerate abuses therein. 374. *a.* Those who are possessed of great dignities in the Church, may easily give a free scope to their passions. III. 223. *a.* A Fanatic taught that there was no pure Church upon earth. 673. *a.* What rendered the reformation of the Church difficult, and even impossible. 686. *b.* 687. *a.* What use ought to be made of its revenues. IV. 271. *b.* What it has most to fear. 474. *a. b.*
- Church of England* accused of tarrying still in the suburbs of Babylon. III. 343. *a.* Looked upon as an heaven in comparison of Amsterdam. *ibid.*
- Church Militant*, those who talk so much of it, are more in the right than they think. II. 149. *b.* 150. *a. b.*
- Church* (New system of) whence that book of Mr Jureu, which has so many imperfections, came to be looked upon as his master-piece. IV. 363. *b.* 364. *a.*
- Church of Rome*, whether it may be accused of having condemned the doctrine of St Augustin. I. 609. *b.* 610. *a.* Receives with open arms any one that offers himself to it. II. 246. *b.* There are several abuses in that Church, which in all probability will last as long as it. III. 87. *b.* Junius believed that salvation might be obtained in the Church of V O L. V.
- Rome. 628. *a. b.* It seems to have adopted the religion of the god Terminus. 744. *a.* Has the advantage over the Laity in point of revenge. 567. *b.* 568. *a. b.* With what vigilance it minds the business of conversions. IV. 373. *a.* Whether there were warrantable reasons for quitting the communion of that Church. 375. *a. b. n.* (35). It has not been weakened in the last ten years of the XVIIth century. II. 125. *b.* See *Papery*.
- Church* (Gallican) its origin rendered obscure by the false zeal of the Monks. II. 94. *a. b.*
- Churches*: the privilege of some Churches in London. IV. 637. *a. b.*
- Churches of the Vaudois*: Peter Gilles, by order of his superiors, composes the History of them. III. 161, 162. They send Yse into England. 597.
- Churchmen*, great flatterers of Princes. I. 233. *b.* There are few Churchmen of great abilities, who do not endeavour to make a noise in the world. 717. *b.* See *Ecclesiastics*.
- Cicero* writes a treatise upon the deliverance of the soul of Trajan from Hell, by the prayers of St Gregory. V. 397. *b.*
- Cicero* blames those who despise their own tongue, and the authors of their own nation. I. 60. *a. b.* Ridicules the worship of Adonis. 114. *a.* St Augustin approves his raillery. *ibid.* and *b.* A passage of that Orator corrected with regard to Albutius. 185. *a. b.* Another explained. 186. *a.* His treatise *De Gloria*. 202. and *b. &c.* How he justifies himself as to the contradictions he was reproached with. 352. *b.* 353. *a.* Believed to be author of the letters to Cerealia. 395. *a. b.* What he says of his friend Atticus's letters. 427. *b.* Ridicules the interpreters of dreams. 448. *a.* Was afraid of Atticus's nails. 452. *b.* His letters to Atticus comprehend the History of those times, and in some sort a prophecy of what was to follow. 541. *b.* A thought of his concerning the dogs of the Capitol. 773. *b.* II. 372. *a.* His eloquence was not relished by all the world. 166. *b.* He is made Governor of Cilicia. 303. *b.* Demands quarter from Arcefilas, and Carneades. 330. *b.* There are certain facts with regard to which his authority is not decisive. 343. *a. b.* It was, according to him, a great blemish on the family of *Junia*, to have produced an Orator, who exercised the trade of an Accuser. 356. *b.* 357. *a.* He laughs at the notion of hell. 418. *b.* 419. *a.* If he did not believe what he said of Cæsar, he ought to have believed it. 423. *b.* 424. *a.* He is reproached as guilty of an unpardonable fault, for speaking Greek in a Greek Senate. 516. *b.* Took many things out of Crantor's book of Consolation, when he composed a book upon the same subject. 562. *a.* Contradicts himself. 626. *a. b.* 627. *a.* He displays his eloquence on occasion of the Pontificate of Pessinus being sold. 628. *b.* 629. *a.* The judgment that he passes on a tenet of Democritus. 642. *b.* 643. *a.* His deference to the authority of Diczarchus. 657. *a. b.* Either he did not understand the doctrine of that Philosopher, or else the latter contradicts himself. 660. *a.* His Rhetorical Legerdemain. 678. *a. b.* 679. *a.* He gives a very ill character of Cæsar as to the choice of his friends. 680. *a.* His wife by order of the Vestal Virgins, signifies to him that he should put his designs in execution for the good of his country. 746. *b.* The judgment he passes on an hypothesis of Epicurus. 792. *a.* What he says of a solution which Carneades invented for the Epicureans. *ibid. b.* To perfect himself in the action of an Orator, he put himself under the discipline of two famous Actors. 835. He was killed while he was reading the *Meleæ* of Euripides. 871. *b.* Whether he was confused in a demonstrative manner by his friend Atticus, on the subject of Fannius the Historian. III. 8. *a. b.* His taste is different from Plutarch's, with respect to a witticism, which concerns the birth of Alexander. 59. *a. b.* A base and brutal vengeance exercised upon him. 113. *a.* His inclination for peace. 515. *b.* He upbraids the Philosophers with having introduced gods that were destitute of life and knowledge. 653. *a. b.* His maxim, that a doctrine which grows old must be true. 744. *a.* His oration for Ligarius. 831. and *a. b.* He contradicts himself with respect to Lucilius. 907. *a.* The injury which his freed-man did by publishing after his death, a collection of his jests. 939. *a.*

- Two passages of his, which St. Augustin has preserved to us. IV. 441. *b.* His works that are lost were some of the finest that he wrote. 509. *a.* *b.* He could not answer the difficulties which Cotta started upon the question, Whether the faculty of Reason in man be a gift of the gods. 516. *b.* 517. *d.* He makes Cotta wish that his objections against the existence of the gods might be confuted. 516. *b. n.* (34). According to him providence labours to procure pleasures to mankind. 573. *a.* His taste, with respect to the history of a tyrant, who was a very crafty man. 619. *a. b.* Whether he taught that beasts were no more than Automata. 552. *a. b.* Reflexion upon what he says concerning the Divinity of Romulus. V. 77. *b.* 78. *a.* He is accused of improprieties and barbarisms by Scippius. 94. *b.* His raillery touching one of the daughters of Servilia. 123. *a.* His religion was more in his heart than in his head. 208. *a. b.* Admired the verses of Pacuvius concerning Telamon's being angry with Teucer. 317. *a. b.* 318. *a.* What Pliny relates as a witty repartee of his. 350. *b.* Whom he employed to put his library in order. 379. and *b.* 380. *a. b.* He divorced his wife Terentia several years before his death. 380. *a. b.* He treats Dolabella tenderly. 408. *a. b.* 409. *a.* Offers to go with him to Syria as his Lieutenant. 408. *b.* He inveighs strongly against him after the death of Trebonius. 409. *a.* Is inconsolable after his daughter's death. *ibid. b.* 410. *a. b.* Is accused of having had an incestuous passion for her. *ibid. b.* Wants to build a temple to her. 411. *a. b.* Was ignorant of the reason why God placed us in the world. 412. *a. b.* In his affliction he would have relished Arnobius better than Lactantius. 413. *b.* The idolaters required that some of his books should be prohibited by the Senate. 506. *b.* His observation concerning the antient Greek Comedies. 746, 747. Sentences extracted from his familiar epistles by Daniel d'Auge. I. 562. *a.* An analysis of his orations published by Martin du Cygne. II. 499.
- Ciceronians*, why so called. II. 804. *b.* The whimsical superstition of that sect. IV. 69. *b.*
- Cid*, how that piece was received by the public. IV. 620. *a.*
- Cydus* (Painter), how much his Argonauts cost. III. 492. *a.*
- Cyllene*; the height of that mountain. II. 659. *b.*
- Cymbalum Mundi*, who was so called. I. 373. *b.* One does not understand the meaning of that expression, when it is opposed to *sympannum famæ publicæ. ibid.*
- Cymbalum Mundi*, extracts from that book. IV. 583. *b.* 584. *a.*
- Cimon* had put in practice the stratagem which Agesipolis made use of. I. 133. *a.*
- Cynegirus*, we are to believe nothing but what Herodotus tells us concerning the action which he did. II. 827. *b.*
- Cynics* (a sect of Philosophers), who was their founder. II. 665. They preached up some very good moral precepts. 671. *a. b.* Why called Cynics. III. 458. *b.* 459. *a.* The sophism by which they defend their infamous practices. *ibid.*
- Cinyras*, some will have him to be Noah. II. 506. *b.* Reigned in Cyprus when the Grecians made war against Troy. IV. 641. Had Adonis by his own daughter. 642.
- Cynisca* was the first woman that obtained the prize in the chariot-races of the Olympic games. I. 131. *b.*
- Cynism*, according to the Stoics, was the shortest way to attain to virtue. II. 671. *b.*
- Cing Mars*, the source of his aversion for Cardinal Richelieu. I. 826. *a. b.* Is condemned to death. IV. 142. *a.*
- Cispanius*; his hypothesis touching Ovid's death. IV. 447. *a.*
- Cypresses*, called the *Virgins*, and for what reason. I. 210. *b.* Why they were formerly put in the houses of the dead. III. 73. *a. n.* (21).
- Cyprus*; that island was formerly called Acamas. I. 53. *a.*
- Cypselus*; the first institution of tyranny is ascribed to him. IV. 563. *a.*
- Cyran* (Abbot of St), what he thought of the Council of Trent. I. 36. *b.* The esteem which he expresses for the society of the Jesuits. III. 133. *a.* His criticism on Garaffe is an excellent piece. *ibid.*
- Circe*, the virtue of her wand. I. 5. *a.*
- Circles*, persons who pretended to have found out the quadrature of it. III. 862. *b.* 863. *a.* According to Mathematicians, it can only exist ideally. V. 612. *b.*
- Circumstances*, of what consequence it is to be placed in such and such circumstances. II. 518. *b.*
- Cyrenaics*, a sect of Philosophers. III. 424. *b.* Wherein they differed from the Cynics. *ibid.* 425. *a.*
- Cyril* (St), his conduct censured by the Emperor. IV. 347. *b.* His irregularities, with respect to Nestorius. *ibid.* 348. *a.* He does not deserve to be used tenderly. 885. *b.*
- Cyril Lucar*, his confession was conformable to the opinions of Geneva. I. 509.
- Cyrus*, how he liked Aspasia. II. 512. *b.* 513. *a. b.* Why he judged himself more worthy of the sceptre than his elder brother. 598. *a.*
- Cîteaux*, Abbey, by whom founded. II. 383. *b. n.* (12).
- Cythera*: an island of the Archipelago, now called Cerigo. IV. 124. *n.* (a).
- Cytheris*, how Mark Antony, whose concubine she was, behaved to her. III. 118. *a. b.* 119. *a. b.* He did not however marry her. 119. *a. b.* See *Lycoris* in the Dictionary.
- City*; one that was reputed holy among the Pagans. I. 420. *a. b.* Cities that oppose burthenome edicts only make their condition worse. IV. 353. *a.*
- Clarence* (Duke of), in what manner he was put to death. II. 739. *a. b.*
- Clarus*, who built a temple there to Apollo. IV. 97. *a. b.*
- Claude*, Minister at Charenton, has reproached the Jansenists with inconsistencies. I. 18. *b.* His dispute with Mr. Arnauld. 493. *a. b.* II. 518. *b.* He accuses St. Augustin of having been a turncoat in his opinion, concerning the penal laws against Heretics. I. 566. *b.* His opinion on that subject might have exposed him to censure. *ibid.* His *Plaintes des Protestans* quoted. IV. 815. *a. b.* The advice he gave to a man who had been a prodigious reader. III. 70. *a.* Reflexion upon what he says touching the Devil's conference with Luther. V. 73. *a. b.*
- Claudia*, Queen of France, how she came by a vile distemper which hastened her death. III. 89. *b.*
- Claudian*, Mariangelus Accursius said that he had corrected near seven hundred faults in that Poet. I. 69. *a.* Reflexions upon his doubts about providence. IV. 932. *b.* 933. *a. b.* &c.
- Claudian*, a famous Musician. III. 197. *a. b.*
- Claudius*, saluted Emperor in the camp of the Pretorian cohorts. II. 359. The Senate was forced to approve this election, whether they would or not. *ibid.* How his mother treated him. I. 358. *b.* He knew nothing of the infamy of his wife Messalina, when all the world knew that she prostituted herself in the stews. III. 382. *a.* All the ladies of beauty and distinction rival one another in their pretensions to marry him. 860. *b.* 861. *a.*
- Clavus* (de), an excellent Chymist of the XVIIth century. II. 468. *a.* Had the secret of making the forms of plants revive from their ashes. *ibid.*
- Cleanthes*. In what true cleanliness consists. I. 187. *b.*
- Cleanthes* said that Arcefilas destroyed the duties by his words, but established them by his actions. I. 413. *a.* What he has related touching Boreas, the mountain Niphates, &c. II. 82. *b.*
- Clearchus*, what he relates touching the conferences which Aristotle had with a Jew. I. 465. *b.* Whether he deserves to be credited. *ibid.* 466. *a.*
- Clementy* is pernicious on certain occasions. II. 528. *a. b.*
- Clement Alexandrinus*, what his opinion was concerning Diagoras, and some others who passed for Atheists. II. 656. *a. b.*
- Clement VII* (Pope), the answer which he made to Pompey Colonna. II. 529. *a. b.* And when he was solicited to grant a dispensation to some ladies. V. 161. *b.* 162. *a.* When he was created Pope. III. 592. *b.*
- Clement VIII* (Pope), in order to incline Scipio Gentilis to accept of a Professor's place at Bologna, promises him liberty of conscience. III. 155. *a.* His sentiments touching the *Scientia Media*. V. 824.
- Clement* (James) stabs Henry III, prompted thereto by a vision which was approved by a Monk. III. 601.

601. *a. b.* It is probable that the Preachers of the League had been acquainted with the design of that parricide. II. 101. *b.* Some have been so bold as to maintain that he did not kill Henry III. 411. *b.* 412. *a. b.* 413. *a.* The Jesuits commend him. IV. 129. *a.* His action is looked upon as a gift of the Holy Ghost by John Guignard. III. 276. *a.* He is instructed by Bourgoign, and compared to Judith by Guignard. *ibid.*
- Clenard* sent to Braga to set up a school there. III. 734. *a.*
- Cleopatra*, wherein the force of her charms consisted. II. 631. *a. b.* 632. *a.* She had a criminal conversation with Delliis. *ibid. b.* Did not well entertain those who made her taste the sweets of love. *ibid. a.*
- Cleopatra*, sister to Alexander, had great interest with him, and likewise with their mother Olympias. II. 675. *a.*
- Clostratus*, his cycle corrected. III. 254. *a.*
- Clerc* (le), his letter to Mr Jurieu concerning Episcopius. II. 795. *b.* 796. *a.* Reflexions upon that letter, and the consequences of it. *ibid. and b.*
- Clergy*, their debaucheries are agreeable to the court. I. 30. *b.* It is more dangerous to offend them than to offend religion. 468. *a.* They are a true *Imperium in Imperio*. II. 149. *b.* The same spirit, which, under Christianity, has enriched the Clergy, prevailed also under the Pagan religion. 531. *a.* Their lewdness in keeping concubines. 545. *b. n.* (20). And their bad lives. III. 328. *b.* 329. *a. b.* See *Concubinage and Celibacy*.
- Clergy of Africa* solicits the secular arm against the followers of Pelagius. I. 229. *a. b.* 230. *a.*
- Clergy of France* have made great use of St Augustin's reasons to justify persecution. I. 567. *a.* See *Ecclesiastics*. They make an ill-grounded complaint against the Protestants. IV. 479. *a. b.* What they propose to the court for the extirpation of Heretics. 815. *a.* They accuse the Protestants of having blotted out of their Psalms a prayer for the King. 164. *a.* Mr Daille's answer to this charge. *ibid. b.*
- Clergyman*. A Clergyman who owns that continence is beyond his power, gives people great reason to suspect his conduct in the time that preceded his marriage. III. 344. *b.* See *Ecclesiastics*.
- Clermont in Auvergne*; the history of two married persons whom the inhabitants of that city call the two lovers. III. 381. *a. b.* A synagogue of the Jews pulled down there. 220. *a.*
- Clermont* dispatched by the King of Navarre to demand the removal of the garrisons from his fortified places. IV. 341. *b.*
- Clevis* (Lewis de), Bachelor in Divinity, whose thesis concerning Episcopacy meets with difficulties, and for which Flavigny made an apology. III. 53. *and a. b.*
- Clitarchus* is not a faithful writer. IV. 9. *a.*
- Clitomachus*, what he said of Carneades. II. 327. *a. b.* 334. *b.* His book of Consolation. 331. *b.*
- Cloaths*: a man tears his cloaths, and for what reason. II. 159. *and b.* 160. *a.*
- Clodia*, Catullus's mistress. II. 394. Prostituted herself to the first Comer. *ibid.* Accuses Corlius of several crimes. IV. 202. *a.* Gets the surname of *Quadrantaria*. *ibid. b.* Was the same whom Catullus called Lesbia. *ibid. a.*
- Clodius* sells the Pontificate of Pessinus. II. 648. *b.* Which gave Cicero an occasion to display his eloquence. *ibid.*
- Closteri*, what Erasmus thought of them. I. 272. *a. b.* They have occasioned a proverb. V. 23. *b.*
- Cloze-school*: rare precepts relating to the cloze-school. I. 174. *a. b.*
- Cloviz*, whether Aimonius was the first who loaded the birth of that Prince with ignominy. I. 669. *a.* There is scarce any truth in what is told of the Kings of France before him. V. 494. *b. n.* (13).
- Cloviz*, an Epic Poem, by whose assistance it was finished and polished. IV. 114. *and a. b.*
- Coach*: learning seldom enables a man to roll about in his coach. II. 708. *a.*
- Cobourg*, a city in Franconia, Prince John Casimir, Duke of Saxony erects a famous school there. III. 660.
- Cocceius*, his doctrine was the least in favour with the great and powerful in Holland, but was most to the relief of young people, and of such as set up for men of wit. V. 564.
- Cockbus*, what kind of a machine he employed, tho' to no purpose, against the Lutherans. III. 143. *b.* 144. *a.* His accusations against Luther. 942. *a.* A book which he intitles *Luther with seven Heads*, and in which he relates all his impurities. 136. *a. b.*
- Cock*; the Jews offer a cock for their sins in the feast of Reconciliation. III. 125. *b.* The ceremonies which attend that oblation. *ibid.*
- Cock-fighting*; the Antients were exceedingly fond of that diversion, and wagered all they were worth that such or such a cock would be victorious in the battle. IV. 819. *b.* Quinquarian censured for being too much addicted to such pastime. *ibid.*
- Cocenas*, his crime and punishment. IV. 935. *a. b.* 936. *a.* His confession upon the rack. 939. *b.* 940. *a.* By whom his head was buried. V. 526. *a. b.*
- Codes*, compilation of divers Codes. II. 380. *b.* 381. *a.*
- Codinus*, who first published his book *de Officialibus Palatii Constantinopolitani et Officiis magnæ Ecclesiæ*. III. 627. *a.*
- Coffeteau* complains of Du Plessis Mornai upon the subject of Gregory VII. III. 230. *a.* Very much perplexed in one part of his answer to Du Plessis. 565. *b.* Makes but a poor answer to Du Plessis with respect to the praises which Langius bestows on Luther. 723. *a. b.* Takes a town for a man. IV. 763. *b.* Is censured by Rivet with respect to Turpin, and Pope Calixtus. V. 417. *b.* Does not make a solid answer to Du Plessis, touching John de Wefalia. 542. *a. b.*
- Coelius* defended by Cicero against the accusations of Clodia. IV. 202. *a.*
- Coffin*, whether it is possible to suspend an iron coffin between two loadstones. IV. 43. *a.*
- Cagliani*, Minion to Joan II, Queen of Naples. IV. 309. *b.*
- Coffin*; whence comes this proverb, *il est né coiffé*. III. 591. *b.* 592. *a.*
- Colbert*, his moderation with regard to a sonnet, wherein he was very much abused. III. 393. *b.* He hinders the printing of several books against the house of Austria. 767. *a.*
- Coligny* (Admiral de) refuses to be a churchman. I. 784. *b.* 786. *a. b.* The mistakes of the author who wrote his life. IV. 696. *b.* 697. *a.* How he was killed. I. 746. *and b.* Passionate verses wrote on his death by John des Caurins. II. 399.
- Coligny* (the Count de) fights a duel with the Duke of Guise. III. 303. *a. b.* &c. His brother carries off a young lady. 365. *b.*
- Calin* falls into disgrace with Francis I, and loses his office of reader. II. 371. *b.* 372. *a.* How this happened. *ibid.*
- Collado*, or *Colladon*, carries his censure against Laurens too far. III. 746. *a. b.*
- Collection* of several impertinent authors. III. 854. *b.*
- Collections*, in what case they are to be looked upon as precious treasures. I. 536.
- Collections*: The collections of men of letters resemble Virgil's fame. I. 19. *a.* Collections of spiritual songs set to the most burlesque tunes. 478. *a. b.*
- Collections* made for the churches of Germany, and particularly for those of the Palatinate. I. 241.
- College*, the foundation of that of Navarre. II. 224. *b.* The building of its library. I. 164. *a.* The college *della Sapienza* at Rome, by whom the building of it was finished, and by whom it was adorned with a fine library. II. 476.
- Collenuccio*; his Neapolitan History translated into Latin by Stouppa. V. 247, 248.
- Colletti*, what Mr Menage designed to do with respect to him. II. 159. *b.*
- Colletti* (Francis) makes an abridgment of the Annals of Paris. IV. 270. *a.*
- Collier*, a story that is told of a Collier's ass. III. 804. *a.*
- Cologne*, its Divines censured by Luther on the subject of Aristotle's doctrines. I. 470. *b.* The young people who turn Catholics are educated in a college there. IV. 372. *b.* 373. *a.* The university of that city opposes the design of Langius to make learning flourish again. III. 724. *a. b.*

Cologn

- Cologn* (the Elector of), a conversation which he had with a peasant concerning his train. III. 768. *b*. The last Elector very much exclaimed against, and for what reason. II. 224. *a. b*. Laid under the ban of the empire. *ibid*. His method of justifying himself. *ibid*.
- Cologn*: a congress held there to make peace in the Low-Countries. II. 223. *a*. The quarrel which its chapter had with Gebhard Truchses. 224. *b*.
- Colomies* cited. I. 259. *b*. Blamed for telling a certain story on the authority of Isaac Vossius. 666. *b*. What he says concerning one of Grotius's books. III. 247. *b*. He wrongfully ascribes an oration of Broughton's to Drusus. II. 150. *b*. Cenfures Blondel touching the story of the She-Pope inserted in a manuscript of Anastasius. IV. 738. *and b*.
- Colomies* usually took the arms of their mother town. I. 20. *a*.
- Colomius* is suspected of Heterodoxy because of his moderation, when the Arminian disputes began to rise. III. 360.
- Colonna* (Antony) sends Galeacius Florimond to Paris in quality of his agent. III. 58.
- Colonna* (Afcanio) his misfortunes. I. 400. *b*. 401. *a*. 402. *b*.
- Colonna* (Marc Antony) procures his father to be imprisoned for high-treason. I. 400. *b*. 401. *a*.
- Colonna* (Profer) at the age of seventy years, falls in love with Clara Visconti, and proceeds to public extravagancies. IV. 378. *b*. 379. *a*.
- Colonna* (the Conftable) his son cannot obtain the niece of Prince Marc Antony Borghese in marriage. II. 471. He marries a niece of Cardinal Mazarin. 472. *a*. Which proved an unhappy marriage. *ibid*.
- Colophos*: that city destroyed by Lyfimachus. III. 779. *a*. Who it was that built it. IV. 97. *a*.
- Colossus of Rhodus*, the inattention of Scaliger, when he computed the weight of it. II. 390. *a*.
- Colours* are not in bodies. IV. 654. *a. b*.
- Column*: a column of marble, erected in honour of Julius Caesar, has Divine honours paid to it. II. 680. *a*. What those called *Roftrates* were. 726. Miracles told of one. I. 274. *a*.
- Columna* (James) an Historian whom Antony, Archbishop of Florence copies in several places. II. 529, 530. *and a. b*. Several authors make mention of him. *ibid*.
- Com*, a city in Persia, what Saint is worshipped there by the Mussulmans. III. 16. *a. b*. 17. *a. b*. *Lela*, is the name given there to the Blessed Virgin. *ibid. a*.
- Comana*, the Pontif of that place was likewise its sovereign. I. 421. *a*.
- Combat*: a Combat, twenty-two against twenty-two. II. 128. *and a*.
- Combats*: the inequality of success in Combats where justice seems to be equal. III. 300. *b*.
- Combination*: a remarkable Combination of Moral and Physical things, which Father Malebranch speaks of. II. 16. *a*.
- Comedian*; See *Player*.
- Comedies*; one favoured with a prodigy. IV. 300. *and a. b*. Another represented before the King and Queen of Navarre. 324. *b*. 325. *a*. Wherein the difference betwixt the Antients and Moderns conflicts with respect to Comedy. 741. *b*. 742. *a*. One employed to represent the abuses of Popery. V. 85. *a. b*. Which is the same that was acted before the King and Queen of Navarre. *ibid. b*. The licence which the Greek Comedy had to vent scandal. IV. 568. *a. b*. 569. *a*.
- Comenius*, his portraiture very like that of some other Fanatics. II. 538. *a. b*. 539. *a*. Some persons have been surprized that he lived so long. 539. *and b*. The cordial and spiritual esteem which Mrs Bourignon and he had for one another. 540. *a*. How he extricated himself from the embarrassment he was in between the fear of God and the fear of man. 692. Deputed into Hungary. *ibid. a*. His *Janua Linguarum* translated into Greek by Theodore Simonis. III. 548. *b*. He is suspected of Political contrivances. 682. *a*.
- Comes* (Natalis) blamed. II. 82. *b*. See *Noel le Compe*.
- Comets*, a strange opinion about them. II. 51. *a*. Are looked upon as evil prefaces. 113. It was entirely for his book intitled, *Thoughts on the Comets*, that the Magistrates of Rotterdam deposed the author, and there was no mention made of his *Advice to the Refugees*. V. 647. *a. b*. The design of the *Pemises sur les Cometes*. 813.
- Comforters*, are troublesome, when they do not take a proper time. II. 564. *b*.
- Comines* (Philip de) Haillan's judgment of him. III. 335. *b*. 336. *a*. He praises Savonarola, and ascribes to him the glory of having prophesied. V. 58. *b*. 59. *a. b*. Reflexions upon his narrative. *ibid. b*. 60. *a*. He was better acquainted with state affairs than with the conduct of those who deal in prediction-makers. 59. *b*. Is too good-natured with respect to Savonarola, and puts too favourable a construction upon his prophecies, in order to help him out with them. 60. *a*. He serves as a witness to those who censure that Monk. *ibid. b*. 61. *a*.
- Commendon* puts a stop to a paper-war. II. 605. *a*.
- Commentaries* and marginal notes are very useful for the right understanding of satires. I. 35. *b*.
- Commentator* (Historical) should compare together the reasons pro and con, with all the impartiality of a faithful relater. V. 810.
- Commentators*; what they ought to aim at. III. 45. *a*.
- Commings* (Mr de) what he said to Mr Amyraut. I. 264. *a. b*.
- Commire* (Father) his name was Commere. IV. 854. *b*.
- Commiffary-General* of the Horfe, that office was unknown in the Netherlands before the year 1567. I. 673. *a*.
- Commiffioners* are ever suspected, and for what reason. IV. 241. *b*. A decree of the parliament of Paris relating to them. *ibid*.
- Commodus*, a Roman Emperor, exposes a man to be devoured by wild beasts, for reading the life of Caligula. V. 265. *b*.
- Commonwealib* of learning, has a greater number of subtle men now, than it had in the preceding age. I. 92. *b*. The liberty which every body ought to enjoy in it, and how far that liberty should extend. IV. 548. *b*.
- Commonwealib*, it is a misfortune to them that some Philosophers have applied themselves wholly to the study of nature. I. 295. *a*. An alteration of government will always be inevitable in such as amuse themselves with conquests. II. 165. *b*. 166. *a*. See *Republics*.
- Communion*, the effect of disputes which are raised in a Communion. I. 241. *b*. It is not for the temporal interest of any Communion, that all the members of it should be men of judgment. II. 708. *a*.
- Company*; there is nothing worse than bad company. I. 279. *b*.
- Comparison* of the minds of men with apples. I. 60. *b*. 61. *a*. Of able men with beasts for sacrifice. 619. *b*. A remark upon the design of comparisons. V. 360. *b*. 361. *a. b*. A comparison of the author's, which gave offence to several, vindicated. 824.
- Compel them to come in*. Reflexion on that maxim. III. 40. *a. b*.
- Compilations*, their ordinary defects. I. 219. *b*. Those who continue and enlarge them oftentimes, occasion confusion by their neglect. 615. *a. b*. If they every where pleased one kind of people, they would not be good. III. 337. *b*. Should be calculated to serve every body. V. 806. What the nature of them ought to be. *ibid*.
- Compilers* often want exactness, and the reason of it. I. 60. *a*. Such a Compiler whom our age might not esteem in the least, would be admired a thousand years hence. 536. A passage that ought to serve for a looking-glass to Compilers. II. 232. *b*. 233. *a*. An instance of the alterations which facts undergo, by passing through their hands. 802. *a*. They highly injure the reputation of great men, by compiling all that they say without any discernment. III. 939. *a. b*. One that relates and comments has all the privileges of the writers that he makes use of. V. 799.
- Compliments*, an example of the falsities with which they are generally stuffed. IV. 101. *a*.
- Conchini* and his wife make use of the Cabala, and the Jewish books. I. 397. *b*. 398. *a*.
- Conclave*; there is nothing more rare, than for a Cardinal to be sure of his Election to the Papal Dignity, before he enters the conclave. III. 608. *a*. How the best concerted intrigues are frustrated there. I. 361. *b*.
- Conclavist*,

INDEX.

33

- Concile*, the pleasant answer of one, whose allowance they wanted to retrench at the council of Basil. I. 178. *a. b.* 179. *a.*
- Concord in the Church*, the earnest desire of Joseph Hall to see it once established. III. 343. *b.*
- Concord*: what the book of the Concord is. III. 250. *a. b.*
- Concord* (the book of) sternly rejected by the King of Denmark. III. 390. *a.* A magnificent copy of it, which that Prince threw into the fire. 391. *a.* Does more harm in Germany, than if the Turks had entered it with fire and sword. *ibid. b.* A letter from the Reformed Churches in Holland against that book, and who is supposed to have writ the letter. *ibid.* 392. *a. b.*
- Concord* between the Lutherans, and Calvinists, why it has never been brought about, and why it probably never will. III. 526. *a. b.* By what emblem the Antients, represented the power of Concord. IV. 232.
- Concordats* passed between Francis I and Leo X, and the abuses which it occasioned. IV. 764. *a. b.* to 766. *a. b.*
- Concubinage of the priests*, the time has been, when it was hardly looked upon as shameful. III. 887. *a.*
- Concubine*: A concubine and a whore are commonly esteemed two very distinct characters. II. 315. *a.* The power of the concubines of Princes offends none but such as hardly read any thing. IV. 455. *b.* There have been parishes which obliged their priests to keep a concubine, in order to secure the honour of their wives. III. 345. *a.*
- Condé* (Lewis I, Prince of) condemned to be beheaded. III. 287. *a. n.* (11). IV. 327. *b.*
- Condé* (the Prince of) a narrative of the ceremonies that were observed at her abjuration, and a remarkable particular on that occasion. V. 319. *a. b.*
- Condé* (Lewis II, Prince of) by whom he was arrested, and by whom conducted to Bois de Vincennes. I. 184. Whether he married below himself, when he took to wife the Marfhal de Brezé's daughter. II. 135. *a. b.* 136. *a.* Particulars that do honour to his memory. 137. *b.* He writes with his own hand a little before his death, to recommend the Prince's his wife to the King. 138. *b.* The declaration which he made of his Orthodoxy at his death. IV. 504. *a. b.* How he concerned himself in the business relating to the author of the Pre-Adamites. 530. *b.* The judgment which some passed upon his conduct at the battle of Senef. V. 190. *b.* 191. *a. b.* He sends for Spinoza, and talks with him. 205. *a. b.*
- Condé* (the Prince of) wounded by one of her Domestics. II. 138. *and a. b.*
- Condé, Condous*, there was no French General of that name in the year 1691. IV. 210. *b.*
- Condé* (Henry Julius, Prince of) his discernment fatal to impostors. I. 7. *b.* He draws from James Aymar, a confession of his tricks. 8. *b.*
- Condere*, the signification of that word. I. 252. *b.*
- Conditions*, there is none more deplorable than that of a man who cannot die when he desires it. III. 319. *a. b.* Those are often the happiest which seem least to be so. I. 308. *b.*
- Conduet*, an example of a very uniform conduct. I. 580. *a. b.*
- Conette*, how he triumphed over the head-dresses and the attire of the women. II. 544. *a. b.* IV. 667. *b.*
- Conference*, the ministers once looked upon every proposal of a conference as a snare. II. 520. *b.* A conference, broke off and renewed with regard to the Duche's of Bouillon. IV. 921. *a.* A conference between Cardinal du Perron and Sieur Beraud, and the issue of it. 923. *a. b.*
- Conference of Poissy*, an intrigue designed to break it off. I. 691. *b.* The ministers of that conference consulted on the question, whether children, baptized by a woman, should be re-baptized. 704. *b.* Offence taken by the prelates of that conference. 790. *b.* 791. *a.*
- Confession* by letters maintained by Suarez, and condemned by Clement VIII. I. 661. *a.* Ought not to be revealed on any account, or in obedience to the command of any one whatever. II. 460. *a. b.* The abuses of it, and complaints that are made against them. *ibid. a.* Their own written confessions are made use of against criminals. *ibid. b.* Sick
- persons put it off as a bad omen. IV. 537. *b.* *n.* (24).
- Confession of Augsburg*; remarks upon the variations of it. II. 122. *a. b.* Presented to the Emperor at the Diet in that city, in the year 1530. IV. 185.
- Laurens Tuppius translates into Latin a book which the Princes of that Confession caused to be wrote, touching the Council of Trent. V. 514. *a. b.* 515. *a. b.*
- Confessionaries*, what impure cases are heard there. V. 41. *a. b.*
- Confessors* would not be qualified to remedy the complaints of their penitents, if they had not a thorough insight into all manner of obscenities. I. 182. *a.* V. 40. *a. b.* Whether others besides them must not know the obscenities of the confessionary. I. 182. *a.* Laymen disguised as Priests, and sent to confess criminals. II. 459. *b.* 460. *a. b.* Named with a prohibition to apply to others. *ibid. a.* Several Priests revealed confessions to Savonarola. V. 61. *a.*
- Confucius*, is as blind as the other Literati of China, with regard to the true God. IV. 81. *b.*
- Congress*, what an uncertain and shameful way it is of discovering a man's impotency. IV. 801. *a. b.* &c. The author's apology for what he has said of it in this Dictionary. 803. *b.* 804. *a.* 881. *a. b.* 882. *a. b.* The immodest practice of it condemned. V. 799.
- Coni*, Mr Catinat was not forced to raise the siege of it, neither was he beaten there. IV. 210. *b.* 211. *a.* It was Mr de Dulonde who commanded the besiegers there, and who was disgraced for retiring, as the French believed, without any necessity. *ibid.*
- Conjectures*, a person may be happier in his Conjectures, without being consequently a man of more skill. I. 148. *a.*
- Conjunctions* of the planets, how many great Conjunctions there have been since the creation of the world. I. 164. *b.*
- Conquerors*; reason prompts them both to stop, and not to stop. I. 14. *a.*
- Conquests*: though the conquests of a monarch are not the interest of his people, yet they ruin themselves with more satisfaction for the sake of a warlike Prince, than for the sake of any other. V. 664.
- Conrart*, his opinion touching the translations of Amyot and the Abbot Tallemant. I. 259. *a.* Consults Laurence Dreilincourt on the French tongue. II. 694. *b.* The verses which Lewis de Neufgermain made for him. IV. 357. *b.* 358. *a.* He is consulted by the Sieur d'Ablancourt. 591. *a. b.* Mr Rolé succeeds him in the French Academy. 917.
- Conscience*; a doubt upon a case of conscience. I. 109. *a.* A man should not hazard his conscience in order to push himself. 224. *b.* One is obliged to follow its dictates always. 166. *b.* The people whose interest it was most to defend this maxim, have been for some time the opposers of it. *ibid.* One cannot be too reserved in accusing others of preaching against their consciences. II. 374. *a.* Whether it can be forced to embrace the true religion. III. 220. *b.* 221. *a.* The contradictions which those who assert such a thing, fall into. *ibid.* The directors of consciences ought to have but short conversations with devout women. 230. *b.* The light of conscience is not able to withstand the greatest part of the passions. 375. *a. b.* 376. *a.* Its liberty. 676. *a. b.* 677. *a. b.* A comparison of the Power of conscience with that of the point of honour. IV. 500. *a. b.* A tender conscience will grieve even for a fault that is purely material. 929. *b.*
- Conscience* (erroneous), the privileges of it. I. 166. *b.* Never did any Philosopher say a more sensible thing on that subject than what Archelars said. 418. *a.* An author who confutes himself in writing upon that subject. II. 476. *a.*
- Conscientiarists*, a sect of Atheists. III. 671. *and a. b.*
- Consequences* (opposite) drawn from the same principle, but solidly refuted by Seneca. II. 14. *b.* 15. *a.*
- Consequences*: it is allowed to point out to an adversary those which result from his doctrine, whether he rejects or admits them. V. 644. *b.* 645. *a.* Some of them have such a close connexion with the principle from which they are drawn, that it is impossible

10 R

- impossible to conceive how a man of sense can admit that and reject these. 645. *a.*
- Confessory* (Walloon) at Rotterdam, their proceedings against this Dictionary. I. lxxix, lxxx, lxxxi.
- Consolation*, a common-place of Consolation examined. I. 280. *a. b.* Carneades refuted it. *ibid.* b. III. 73. *b.* A pernicious maxim of Consolation. I. 428. *a.* A common-place of Consolation. 699. *b.* 700. *a. b.* Another common-place. II. 561. *a. b.* 562. *a. b.* Another. III. 73. *a. b.*
- Conspiracy* requires dispatch; and this spoils all very often. II. 428. *a.* Some persons suffer themselves to be drawn into one by motives which they think good. 553. *b.* A law which makes those who have notice of a conspiracy, and do not reveal it, guilty of a capital crime. III. 802. *a. b.*
- Conspiracy*, the not discovering one is a crime punishable with death. IV. 346. *a. b.*
- Constance*, Queen of Sicily, is with child at the age of fifty-two, and resolves to be brought to bed publicly. III. 394. *b.* 395. *a.*
- Constantine*, the strange and surprizing extravagancy of his decree against the Arians. I. 474. *a. b.* 475. *a.* His donation. II. 594. *b.* 595. *a. b.* His cruelties. III. 18. *a. b.* 19. *a. b.* To what cause the Pagan authors ascribe his conversion. 20. *a.* He orders all contentious libels to be burnt. 278. *a.*
- Constantine* (Copronymus) fouls the baptismal font without knowing it. II. 422. *b.*
- Constantine* (Dame) the midwife, her crimes and punishment. IV. 498. *a.* 499. *a. b.*
- Constantinople*, its Patriarch strangled during the session of the Council of Florence. I. 266.
- Constantius*; why he throws himself into a terrible passion. I. 37. *a.*
- Constitution*; an effect of the strange power of it. II. 719. *a. b.*
- Consul*, whether he re-defended to the Pretorship. II. 345. *a. b.* Two Consuls deposed from their Consulate, for shewing disrespect to a letter from the Senate. 291. *a.*
- Consulate*, two brothers discharge that office at the same time, a thing which had never been seen before. I. 341. Who was the first stranger that was honoured with it at Rome. 611. *b.* There were not two degrees of it. 613. *a.* The cause of their mistake who have thought so. *ibid.*
- Contempt*: one ought not to shew contempt for any person whatever. I. 366. 376, 377. *a. b.* 421. *b.* 422. *a.*
- Conti* (the Prince of), his judgment of two sonnets. I. 752. *a.*
- Continence*, a rare example of that virtue. I. 14. *b.* 357. Found in a married life. 34. *and a. b.* Such a state between a man and a woman who have every thing else in common, is too great a violence offered to nature. *ibid.* Prejudicial to the health of the fair sex sometimes. 390. *b.* 391. *a.* The gift of it is not a thing on which a man may depend. III. 13. *b.* How those who make a vow of Continency ought to conduct themselves. 64. *b.* Men devoted to it ought to wish for the same qualities as the Hirpes had. 72. *b.* What it ought to cause in order to be a true virtue. 620. Is rather a quality of constitution than of Morality. IV. 332. *a.* Whether it be possible: Reasons *pro* and *con*. III. 344. *b.* 345. *a.* Reckoned impossible among Protestants, and among some Roman Catholics. 345. *a.* A Clergyman who owns that it is beyond the power of man, gives great reason to suspect his conduct in the time that preceded his marriage. 344. *b.* This controversy ought to be handled with circumspection. *ibid.* See *Fornication*.
- Continuation of an history*: when authors find one ready done, they chuse rather to copy it, than be at the trouble to compose a new one. IV. 210. *b.*
- Contradictions*, Polemic Divines and Lawyers are very subject to them. I. 351. *b.* 352. *a.* These have sincerity enough to own it, but not those. *ibid.* *and b.* 353. *a.* The excuses which Baldus makes for them. 616. *b.* It is an ill character to be of a spirit of contradiction. II. 376. *b.* Whether they are of any use. III. 135. *a.*
- Contraries*. One may feel one of the Contraries without having ever felt the other. IV. 514. *a. b.* &c.
- Controversies*, those who handle them give too much injurious language to their adversaries, and disguise their strongest arguments. I. 718. *b.* The way of
- handling them right. *ibid.* Who has given them the best form. 734. *a.* There are some, where neither peace nor war can be made but to one's confusion. III. 84. *a.* Cannot be ended by indeterminate, ambiguous, and intricate forms of expression, where each party finds its own account. IV. 287. *a.* It is chiefly in the matter of controversy that the understanding is the dupe of the Passions. 737. *a.*
- Controversy*, examples which are a little puzzling to those of the Roman party. I. 179. *a. b.* Two of their greatest faults. 718. *b. n.* (14). Are great liars. 790. *a.* Their zeal very often stifles their knowledge and their virtue. *ibid.* *b.* An Historian ought to lay no stress on the abusive language which they give each other. 795. *a.* Most of them aggravate the evil of the other party, and extenuate the evil of their own cause, as much as they can. II. 136. *b.* All of them mutually complain of the artifices of those who write against them. 488. *b.* Those among the Protestants who defended their cause like men of honour have never been hated by the Roman Catholics. 695. *a. b.* Of what weight the testimony of a Controversy is upon a fact reflecting on the other party. III. 764. *b.* One must take care not to be surprized by their air of triumph. IV. 56. *a.* Most of them are inclined to give things a malicious turn. 137. *b.* See *Disputes*. They know not how to distinguish between what is to the purpose, and what is mere cavilling. I. 236. *b.* After they have used all their strength against some weak part of the opposite cause, they leave the strongest unanswered, and assume a disdainful arrogance. II. 223. *b.* Ought not to stop at the authors of their own party, without consulting those who write against them. IV. 825. *a. b.* Are wont to reduce their adversaries to an absurdity. V. 824. Such as defend their cause well vex their adversaries. 846.
- Controversy* (Roman), their perplexity touching the book of Taxes. I. 629. *b.*
- Coetzen*, Jesuit, describes the violences exercised by the Lutherans upon the Calvinists. III. 535. *a.* Refutes the visions of Braumbom. II. 126. *b.* 127.
- Convents*, the institution of them ascribed to the devil. I. 272. *a.* The spirit of the gospel does not reign there. II. 109. A strange corruption of morals there in the XVth century. 276. *a. b.* 277. *a. b.*
- Conversation*, those who have the address to revive a languishing conversation, are a great help in the world. I. 701. *b.* 702. *a.* There are some who write down what they hear there. III. 154. *b.* Such persons are dangerous. *ibid.* People that are very agreeable in conversation. IV. 591. *a.* The strange slavery of those who have the reputation of excelling in it. 707. *b. n.* (93). Things are miserably confounded in the indeterminate discourses of Conversation: we have a thousand instances of it in the *Scaligeriana*, and in the *Menagiana*. 727. *b.*
- Conversions*, writers who undertake to speak of them, are apt to fall into contradictions. I. 477. *b.* Conversions wrought by dragooning will be eternally abhorred by honest men. IV. 535.
- Converts* are almost forced to speak ill of the party which they forsake. II. 130. *b.*
- Cookery*. The history of a book of Cookery. I. 371. *a. b.*
- Cooks*. What Cooks are the most excellent. I. 100.
- Coos*, Augustus remits to the inhabitants of that island, an hundred talents of the tribute which they were indebted to his Exchequer, and upon what account. I. 369. *a.*
- Cop* (Luke le) translates into French the History of the Confession of Augsberg, wrote by Chytraeus. II. 122. *b.*
- Copernicus*: the beauty of his system. V. 825.
- Copies* become imperfect in proportion as they multiply. I. 747. *b.*
- Coppenius* (Bartholomew) cannot obtain leave to go and dispute with the Jesuits. IV. 74. *a.*
- Coquets*, the fate of people depends very often upon their caprices. II. 841. *a.* A sign by which one may know them. IV. 688. *a.*
- Coras*, a famous Civilian at Toulouse. III. 580. *b.*
- Coras*, an apostate Minister, some of his adventures. III. 579. *b.* 580. *a. b.*
- Cardemisi*,

- Cordemi*, an examination of what he says concerning Eudes and Charles Martel. I. 15. *a.* His reflexion upon the boldness of some modern authors. 16. *b.* 17. *a. b.*
- Corderius* (Maturinus), his pious fraud with regard to his scholars. IV. 574. *b.*
- Cords* for discipline; two thousand crowns were laid out upon them in one week. IV. 314. *a.*
- Corcianna*, a collection of verses printed at Rome. I. 68. *b.* 69. *a.*
- Corinna*; that name does not stand for Julia in Ovid's Art of Love. IV. 444. *a.*
- Corythus* raises the jealousy of Paris, and is killed by him. IV. 401. *a.*
- Corinth*, in what manner Venus was served and worshipped there. III. 699. *b.* 700. *a.* The women of that city, at the tyrant's summons, repair to Juno's temple, where they are stripped, and their cloaths burnt. IV. 563. *a.*
- Corinthians*, what they do to discharge themselves of the infamy of having killed Medea's sons. II. 874. *a.*
- Cornarius* (John) has translated a passage of Parthenius ill. I. 52. *b.* Translates out of Greek into Latin Parthenius's book *de Amatorii Affectionibus*. IV. 482. *a.* Is mistaken about the motive of the dedication to Cornelius Gallus. *ibid. b.* 483. *a.*
- Cornelia*, her fidelity to Pompey proved the accidental cause of his destruction. IV. 282. *a. b.*
- Cornelius Gallus*: Parthenius dedicates his book *de Amatorii Affectionibus* to him. IV. 482. *b.* The false motive which Cornarius assigns for it. *ibid. 483. a.* The reason which Parthenius himself gives for the dedication. *ibid.*
- Cornelius à Lapide*, in a great passion with certain authors. I. 40. *b.* Attributes his own thoughts to the Jews. 104. *b.* 105. *a.*
- Cornelius Nepos*, Verona and Cataneus dispute between them the honour of having produced him. II. 357. *b.*
- Cornelius* (Antony), a name borrowed to conceal the true author of a book, which Father Garasse calls impious. V. 536. *a. b.*
- Cornetius* (Cornelius), upon what condition he married the daughter of Dideric de Groot. III. 241. *b.*
- Cornuel* (Madam); her frank reflexion upon seeing a man, who she had been told was impotent. II. 534. *b.* 535. *a.*
- Corona Regia*, a satire against King James I. II. 338. *a.*
- Coronis* is got with child by Apollo; where, and when, she was delivered of *Æsculapius*. IV. 626.
- Corradus* commits a blunder in not having rightly understood Asconius. II. 347. *b.* Mistakes Plutarch's meaning with respect to Lucullus, and the social war. III. 493. *b.*
- Correcting*: several authors find the correcting or revising of their works too troublesome, and give it over. IV. 451. *a.* An author should be advised by his friends in correcting his works. 591. *a. b.*
- Correctness*. There is a certain degree of correctness beyond which nothing can be done but what instead of perfecting the work, and giving it more nerves and strength, weakens and dissipates it. III. 836. *b.* 837. *a.* IV. 896. *b.* 897. *a.*
- Correctors* of the press are often very innocent of the faults that are to be met with in printed books. III. 661. *a. b.*
- Corrupt*: men can never be so generally corrupt, but some will avoid the contagion. III. 272. *b.*
- Corruption of the heart of man*: Nothing can be a better proof of it than shewing that those who have no supernatural assistance, are as wicked under the profession of a religion, as others who live in a state of Atheism. V. 812.
- Corfairs* (Turkish) made tractable by the game at Chess. II. 53.
- Corunna*, what is said concerning the foundation of it is a mere fable. III. 431. *b.*
- Cosmetic*, what is the object and use of that art. II. 575. *a.*
- Cosroes*, King of Persia, what he did to vex the Emperor Heraclius. IV. 350. *a.*
- Costar*, unjustly accused of a gross ignorance by Girac. I. 75. *a.* Took the ground or basis of his collections from Bacon's works. 599. *b.* 600. *a.* Did not comprehend Horace's thought with regard to Catus. II. 389. *b.* Justly censures Balzac, who had criticized Alexander. 667. *b.* Quoted. III. 262. *a.* 939. *a.* Has no reason to cite Erasmus on the subject of Billa. II. 727. *and b.* Was ignorant of what the Ancients had said concerning that Roman Lady. *ibid.* Is censured by Girac with respect to the custom which Pompey had of biting his mistress. III. 56. *a.* Censured for making use of one of Frangipani's jests. 102. *a.* Is charged with treason by Girac. 399. *a.* Censured with respect to Hercules, and the posture in which he desired to be painted. 430. *a. b.* How he argued against the Politician, who maintained that the most dangerous sovereigns were those who were too much sovereigns. 825. *a.* He justly censures Girac, with respect to the two vessels of Jupiter. IV. 93. *a. b.* Is rallied for his way of explaining some verses of Horace. V. 134. *a. b.* The History of his quarrels with Girac. 341. *a. b. &c.* Is strongly attacked upon his jokes of Gallantry. 343. *a. b.* A judgment on his dispute with Girac. 345. *a. b.* He does not approve a thought of Longinus. 360. *a. b.* Endeavours to find out the reasons why Sylla wanted to take the surname of Fortunate. 366. *b.* 367. *a.* Finds himself at a loss when he is obliged to account for a thing which he had advanced. 400. *b.* 401. *a.*
- Cotte* (Mr de la) a particular of which he informs the author. I. 602. *b. n.* (30).
- Cotin* (the Abbot de) quoted. I. 94. *b.* What he says of an epitaph that Menage had composed. III. 739. *a. b.* And of Epicurus. 929. *b.* 930. *a. b.*
- Coton* (Father) great outcries raised against him with respect to a woman possessed with the Devil. III. 214. *b.* Vindicated from the charge of leudness. 891. *a. b.* Discovered by his smell those who had violated the laws of chastity. IV. 125. *a.*
- Cotta* (Pontiff) his objection against the Divine providence. II. 713. *a.* His answer to those who instead of arguments only alledged public stories. III. 743. *b.* Overpowers with arguments those who say that reason is a gift which the gods have bestowed upon man. IV. 516. *b. n.* (34). 517. *a.* Why, according to him, it was dangerous to deny the existence of the gods. V. 239. *b.*
- Cottibi* (Minister) writes against a certain fast, after having changed his religion. I. 108. *n.* (4). A pleasant story which he tells. II. 581. *a. b.* Gives the epithet of Saint to Origen, for which he is censured by Daille. IV. 412. *a.*
- Coverdal* (Milon) carried always a woman about with him, and what name he gave her, according to Sanders. V. 42. *b.*
- Council of Basil*; upon a session-day, the relics of Basil were brought there, and placed in the room of the absent Bishops. I. 178.
- Council of Constance*: a project of reformation laid before it. I. 165. *b.* Cautions not to disoblige the Duke of Burgundy. IV. 605. *a. b.*
- Council of Pisa* promised the canonization of Savonarola to the Dominicans, upon condition that they would take part against Pope Julius II. V. 69, 70, 71.
- Council of Trent*, what the Abbot of St Cyran said of it. I. 36. *b.* V. 15. *b.* The spirit of that council. 704. *a.* Who was regarded as the right hand of it. IV. 291. *b.* Reasons why it was declared to Vergerius, that he could not assist there. V. 454. *b.* 455. *a.*
- Councils*, when that of Soissons, and when that of Sens was held. I. 29. *b.* 30. *a.* Whether many volumes of the councils be proper to convert Heretics. 604. *b.* 605. *a.* A satirical description of the council which condemned Abelard. 757. *a.* Who are the fittest persons to draw up the decisions of one. 703. *b.* 704. *a.* The Pope can do nothing against the canons of councils. III. 741. *a.* Compared with the States General. IV. 139. *b.* Why it is necessary that the Holy Ghost should preside in them. 348. *a. b.* They have only served to render Heretics obstinate, when they oppressed them by the Imperial authority. 349. *b.* 350. *a.* Whether general councils lawfully assembled, can err in points of faith. III. 595. *a. b.*
- Councils of war*, by what kind of proofs people sometimes maintain the opinions they have given there. I. 515. *a. b.*
- Counsellor*: a counsellor who burns the writings of the two contending parties. II. 647. *a.*

Counsellor

- Counsels or Precepts* (Evangelical) the wrong use that may be made of them, by the spinning out of consequences. I. 735. *b*.
- Countryman*, one who makes the present of a turnip to Lewis XI, King of France. III. 803. *b*.
- Courage*. Whether a man can lawfully be condemned to death for want of courage. III. 59. *b*.
- Courts*; a remarkable instance of the intrigues of Courts. I. 100. *b*. Their uneven conduct. II. 210. *b*. 211. *a*. A court without women is something absurd. IV. 354. *b*. It is the great model of most religions. 355. *b*. A description of the different parts that are acted there by those who solicit affairs. 460. *b*. How nice they are in the choice of men there. V. 419. *a*. *b*. Du Refuge's treatise on the Court, a very good one. IV. 850. *a*. *b*. 851. *a*. *b*.
- Court*. It is often the truest policy to pay one's court, even when they are in disgrace, to those whom we see in the road to high preferment. I. 422. *a*.
- Court of Rome*, its corruption. II. 370. *b*. 371. *a*. The Cardinals resent its being dishonoured in the Diet of the empire. III. 329. *a*. Was deeply dipt in James Clement's crime. 413. *a*. Its tyranny. IV. 330. *b*. 331. *a*. Marfilius of Padua, displays in a lively manner its pride, luxury, and other irregularities. 198.
- Court of France*, its corruption. IV. 329. *a*. 330. *b*. 333. *b*.
- Courtezans*; whether that word be less shocking than the word *Putain* (W. . .). V. 848.
- Courtezans* have always been, and still are, the way to preferment. II. 426. *b*. 427. *a*. And to the gaining of law-suits. 466. *a*. *b*. 467. *a*. Reduce their galants to beggary. III. 71. *a*. *b*. A courtesan who honoured and dishonoured learning at the same time. 694. *and a*. How they ought to die according to the principles of the Pagans. 702. *b*. Have very often a power over mens hearts, even when they are grown old. IV. 694. *b*. 695. *a*. Their pictures consecrated in temples. III. 57. *a*. *b*.
- Courtezans* conscientious. IV. 582. *b*. 583. *a*.
- Courtiers*, a remarkable instance of their intrigues. I. 100. *b*. The turn of a fine courtier. 583. *b*. They ought not in their court devotions to imitate the Huguenots who invoke none but God. II. 602. *b*. Compared to the Euripus. III. 585. *a*. Are commonly more ambitious than jealous. IV. 21. *a*. What talent they stand most in need of. 397. *b*. 398. *a*.
- Coufin* (President) denies a thing concerning President Ferrier, and the Chancellor de l'Hospital, which appears very probable. III. 38. *a*. Quoted. 215. *a*. *b*.
- Coza*, the name of the Sultan's Preceptor. IV. 425. *a*.
- Cragius* criticized with respect to the Lacedemonian habit. III. 968. *b*.
- Craig* (John) the design of his *Theologie Christianæ Principia Mathematica*. V. 835.
- Cramail* (the Count de) engages the Abbot of St Cyran to handle his *Question Royale*. V. 16. *a*.
- Cramier* (Daniel) Professor of Divinity at Stetin, and Super-intendant of the churches of Pomerania. IV. 210. *n*. (a).
- Crantor*, his book of Consolation. II. 561. *a*. *b*.
- Craon* (the Baron de) what effect a sermon had upon him. III. 60.
- Crapula*, the meaning of that word in the time of St Augustin. I. 567. *a*. *b*. 568. *a*.
- Craffus*, the Orator, does not desire that his readers should be altogether ignorant or very learned men. IV. 593. *a*.
- Craffus* rallies Dejotarus; but his raillery is returned. II. 630. *b*. His defeat and death. V. 273.
- Cræta* commits incest with her son. IV. 562. *b*. 563. *a*.
- Crates*, what he did to dissuade Hipparchia from the resolution she had taken to marry him. III. 457, 458. Where and how he consummated his marriage. 458. *a*.
- Cratippus*, his conference with Cicero and Nigidius. IV. 370. *b*.
- Crayfish*, whose shell represented an ax. V. 312. *b*. 313. *a*.
- Creation*; there is a book of the creation which was ascribed to Abraham. I. 45. *b*. All the Philosophers are constrained to admit of a creation. 304. *b*. 305. *a*. *b*. Those who deny it, must necessarily admit of mischievous *Genii*, as well as beneficent ones in the universe. II. 251. *a*. The importance of this doctrine. *ibid.* *and b*. It is necessary to admit of the creation of matter. III. 650. *a*. *b*. 651. *a*. And of that of motion, if we would conceive that God framed the world. IV. 436. *b*. 437. *a*. *b*. &c.
- Creators*, their *Obediential* power, according to the Schoolmen. II. 662. *a*. *b*. Their conservation is a continual creation. IV. 886. *a*. *b*.
- Credulity*, destroyed by her own fruitfulness. I. 87. *a*. Is the source of the multiplication of miracles. *ibid.* Blame-worthy in the Orthodox as well as in Heretics. 198. *a*. Reflexions upon the inclination of people to Credulity. II. 879. *b*. 880. *a*.
- Creed* (Apostles) whether the Apostles formed it by pieces. V. 435. *b*. 436. *a*.
- Cregut*, his apology. III. 596. *a*. *b*. 597. *a*. *b*.
- Crellius*, his opinion about the souls of beasts. IV. 905. *a*.
- Cremutius Cordus*, put to death by Tiberius, and for what reason. II. 355. *b*. *n*. (37).
- Cregui* (the Marshal de) his judgment of a Prior after having conversed fifteen days with him. II. 374. *b*. *n*. (57).
- Cregui* (the Duke of) Ambassador at Rome, receives an insult there which is said to have proceeded originally from a passion of gallantry. II. 470. *b*. A Legate à Latere comes to Paris to make satisfaction for it. *ibid.* *n*. (19).
- Crescentius* endeavours to retain to himself the sovereign power at Rome. IV. 428. In what manner he was punished for it. 429. *a*. *b*.
- Cressy*, reasons which facilitated the treaty of peace that was concluded there. III. 95. *a*. The Dauphin's protestation against it. *ibid.*
- Crevant*, the siege of that town. II. 461. *and a*.
- Cretutz* (Ernest John) has translated into Latin Boccalini's *Pistra del Paragone Politico*. II. 39. *a*.
- Crimes*; whether it be lawful to save one's life, or that of any other, by a crime. I. 91. *a*. *b*. Crimes of state are generally hooked in by Priests in their accusations. 30. *and a*. Crimes are maintained by crimes. II. 736. *b*. No crimes are committed without some prospect of advantage. 346. *b*. There are some which can only be committed by great men. III. 228. *and a*. The common excuse of those who commit very great ones. 858. *b*. It is a principle of the Natural as well as of the Divine law, that a man ought not to commit crimes with an intention to serve God. II. 576. *a*.
- Crinitus* (Peter) censured touching the name of a Tragedy. I. 59. *b*. His mistakes concerning Cæsius Severus. II. 358. *a*. *b*. He confounds a passage of Suetonius with regard to Cæsar and Catullus. 394. *a*. *b*. Makes verses in praise of an Assassin. III. 716. *a*. *b*.
- Crispus*, put to death by Constantine. III. 18. *a*. *b*. 19. *a*. *b*. 20. *a*.
- Critias* was an Atheist. II. 571. *b*. &c.
- Critical Learning*, the study of it is fallen. I. 220. *b*.
- Criticism*, a fatality inseparable from it. II. 773. *a*. It is permitted to jest in Criticism, but not to reason wrong. III. 631. *b*. How dangerous a work it is. 853. *b*.
- Critics* are liable to heap chimera's on chimera's. I. 35. *b*. Such as take advantage of an equivocal expression, ought not to omit the favourable sense. 119. *b*. The edge of their genius is often greatly blunted. 419. *a*. An instance of the confusion which they sometimes occasion in the commonwealth of learning. 543. *and a*. *b*. They seldom agree on the reading of the manuscripts. *ibid.* *a*. They sometimes change the readings to serve a turn, and when they do not understand them. *ibid.* *b*. It is surprizing that two excellent Critics should not have known a fact which few men of letters are ignorant of. *ibid.* Nothing contributes more to the multiplying of mistakes in their writings, than the licence which they take of extending, farther than they ought, the authorities upon which they build. II. 351. *a*. Such as criticize books, ought not to be confounded with the writers of satires and defamatory libels. 389. *a*. *b*. The reason of it. *ibid.* Those Critics who found fault with the book *de Usu Patrum*, do really commend it. 582. *a*. The most learned are apt to give us very false corrections. 633. *a*. Their illusions. 634. *a*. They were wont to put a piece of wax upon such places of

- of a book as seemed obscure to them. 640. *b.* The quarrels of Critics are useful in one sense, and scandalous in another. III. 253. *b.* 254. *a.* Whether such of them as are authors themselves, be more to be dreaded than others. 337. *a. b.* Their taste is far from being uniform. 589. *a.*
- Critolaus*, the Peripatetic, sent to Rome. II. 329. *b.*
- Cræsus* dismisses Solon without giving him any mark of his esteem. II. 831. *a.* Causes golden tiles to be consecrated in the temple of Delphos. IV. 622. *b.*
- Croisus* (or the members of the Crusade) why they did not succeed. I. 774. *b.*
- Croix* (Mr de la) his *Etat présent des Nations & Eglises*, &c. III. 4. *n.* (*f*).
- Crois*, it is said that the inscription of it was found at Rome in the Pontificate of Innocent. VIII. III. 566.
- Crotone* reformed from its luxury and debauchery by Pythagoras. IV. 667. *a. b.*
- Crown*: a woman that recovered, by her leudness, a crown which she could not preserve by her courage. II. 523.
- Crown-lands*. The States-General in France, will not consent to alienate them. III. 409. *a.*
- Croze* (Mr de) cited. I. 47. *a. n.* (3). II. 398. *n.* (a). 558. *a. n.* (3). IV. 809. *a. n.* (5).
- Crucifix*, the nocturnal apparitions of one to Bencius. I. 747. *a.*
- Crusades* justified. I. 710. *a.*
- Cræsus*, his blunder with respect to Stobæus, in a passage where he mentions Epicurus. II. 774. *a. b.* Other blunders of the same author. 775. *a.*
- Crusade* proved unsuccessful, and for what reasons. V. 339.
- Cuckold*, (voluntary) II. 239. *a.* Such an one excites the indignation of all the world against him. 60. *a.* A dispute about that word. III. 630. *b.* 631. *a. b.*
- Cuckoldom*, a common-place of consolation for that disgrace. I. 699. *b.* 670. *a.* It was what the Ancients prayed might light upon evil-doers. II. 247. *b.* Wished for in the form of an imprecation. 742. *a.* In some climates, husbands learn to bear that disgrace with patience. 743. *a. b.* Whether a man should carry it to be registered in the parliament rolls. 845. *a. V.* 112. *a. b.* In what case a husband may publish it without reproach. *ibid.*
- Cuckold*, a Comedy writ upon them, intitled, *Nepheleococcy* or *Cloud of Cuckolds*, which is very obscene, but full of invention, and seasoned with a good deal of sprightliness and wit. III. 883. *a. b.*
- Cujas*; an account of his daughter's conduct. V. 240. *b.* 241. *a.*
- Cui bono*, who was the author of that maxim. II. 346. and *b.* 347. *a.* And upon what principle it is founded. 346. *b.*
- Cunæus* abuses Aristotle for a piece of folly, which he never was guilty of. I. 466. *a.* An anecdote letter of his. V. 535. *a. b.*
- Cunilago*; the virtue of that plant. V. 334. *a. b.*
- Cups* of a prodigious size. III. 205. *b.* 206. *a. b.*
- Curate*, one who could not read the church books of the fairest character, and yet distinguished the smallest dice. III. 762. *b.* How the Curate of Midiani was excited to pray for the King. IV. 457. *a. b.* One who refused to pray for the health of a sick person, and why. 487. *b.* Those of Paris at law with the Jesuits. I. 167. *a. n.* (2).
- Curates*, there have been parishes which obliged them to keep each a concubine, that the honour of their wives might be secured. III. 345. *a.*
- Curator* of the university of Leyden, to whom that office was commonly given. I. 787.
- Curcellens* censured. II. 27. *a. b.* An extract from one of his letters to the Sieur Sorbiere touching Pope Alexander. VII. 475. *b.* He engages to attack Marelius. 583. *b.*
- Curio* (Augustin) confounds himself greatly in speaking of the Saracens. I. 15. *a.*
- Curiosity*. A remarkable example of private curiosity. I. 212.
- Cusanus* (Cardinal) quoted. I. 617. *a. b.*
- Cuspinian*, notes upon his *Cæsars* by Hungerus. III. 534.
- Custom*, its authority. I. 446. *a. b.* It concerns every body to conform to the customs of the places where they are. II. 645. *a.* Why it blunts the V O L. V. No. CXLV.
- senation. IV. 514. *a. b.* Can render innocent in one country, that which is contrary to public decency in another. II. 645. and *a.* Its caprices. 634. *a.*

D.

- Dacier* (Mr) limits the epithet of Achæmenides, to the time of Darius the son of Hyftaspes. I. 72. *b.* 73. *a.* Censures Vossius for confounding an Orator with a Poet. II. 354. *a.* Examination of that censure. *ibid.* His inattention. 388. *a. b.* III. 907. *a.* What he says concerning the genealogy of Drusus and Tiberius. II. 714. *b.* What he says of Lollius. III. 860. *a. b.* Gives a proof of his excellent judgment, in declaring for Horace against Quintilian, with respect to Lucilius. 908. *a.*
- Dacier* (Madam) understood a passage of Plato concerning Prodicus, better than Cresfollius. IV. 783. *b.*
- Dacquin*, a converted Jew, gives in a deposition against Concini and his wife. III. 125. *b.* 126. *a.*
- Demomagia*, a book of Elichius's, which the Magistrates of Marburg had a mind to suppress; but which he got published, notwithstanding their prohibition. II. 750. and *a. b.*
- Dæmons*: whether Dæmons can be the passive or active subjects of any generation. II. 751. *b.* Their original according to the Rabbins. 855. *b.* The doctrine of the Pagans concerning them. V. 572. *a. b.* A treatise on the nature of Dæmons. I. 294. Whether their apparitions were related by Rhetorical figures. V. 73. *a. b.*
- Daille*, his answer to Father Adam has remained without a reply. I. 108. and *a. b.* What he says of the Fathers in general, and of St Augustin in particular. 109. *b.* His books are commended by the Archbishop of Paris. 264. *a.* His treatise concerning the right use of the Fathers. II. 582. *a. b.* His quarrel with Marelius was soon ended. 583. *a.* He had a great share in Balzac's esteem. 584. *b.* His answer to the invectives of some passionate Lutherans. III. 218. *a.* Has not traced Campain and Whitaker's dispute. 940. *a.* The reproaches which are cast upon him by Cottibi, and Father Adam, touching Mr Morus. IV. 274. *a.* The opinion which Mr Morus had of him. 276. *b.* What censures he passes upon the title of Saint given to Origen by Cottibi. 412. and *a. b.* 413. *a. b.* &c. What he says of Tertullian. V. 142. *b.* With what view he read the accounts of travellers. 427. *b.* He filled the place of Samuel Durant at Charenton. II. 727. His answers to the reproaches of the Catholics touching the alteration of a passage in the Psalter. IV. 164. *a. b.*
- Daille*, the son, quoted touching a book of his father's. I. 108. *a.*
- Daimachus*: whether Ephorus could be his plagiarist. II. 773. *a. b.*
- Dalechamp*, a famous Physician, and of great practice. I. 536. *b.* Unhappy those who take things upon trust from him. 372. *b.* His translation of the verses of Ibius, cited by Athenæus, is neither free from faults of omission nor commission. IV. 232. *a.* A passage in his translation of Athenæus censured. II. 557. *a. b.* 558. *a.*
- Damage*; whether one is always obliged to make it up by restitution, or some other way. I. 13. *b.*
- Damagetus*, King of Jalyfus, for what reason he asked Aristomenes to give him one of his daughters in marriage. II. 650. *a.*
- Damianus* (Peter) what answer he made to the question which Agnes, widow to the Emperor Henry III, asked of him. III. 80. *b.* His Gomorrhæus. II. 588. *a. b.* 599. *a. b.* V. 855. *a. b.*
- Damnation* (Eternal) the Mystics are much exclaimed against, for giving their consent to it. IV. 943. *a. b.*
- Damned*: what the opinion of Prudentius was, concerning their state and number. IV. 788. *b.* 789. *a.*
- Damophila*; her hymns composed to the honour of Diana. IV. 554.
- Danaï*, a Courtesan, being condemned to death, when she came to the place of execution, dropt a most insolent murmur against providence. III. 779. *b.*

- Dancing* justly condemned by the Reformed Churches. V. 23. *b*.
- Dantean* (Lambert), cabals against the authority of the States of Holland in favour of England. II. 688. *a*. Commits some faults in speaking of Marcion. IV. 107. *a. b*.
- Dante* defeated in Scotland by the valour of a peasant. III. 332.
- Danger*: when the danger is over, people are apt to forget the vows which they made to God. II. 649. *a*.
- Danbawerus* overthrows the pacific design of the Elector Palatine. III. 526. *b*.
- Daniel*, neither he, nor the Angel which instructed him, nor the soul of Jesus Christ, understood his numbers. II. 122. *a. b*.
- Daniel* (Father) his hypothesis concerning the souls of beasts refuted. IV. 909. *a. b*. Quoted. I. 670. His defence of St Augustin against Mr de Launoi. III. 745. *b*.
- Danish women*, what is said of them in the memoirs of Beaujeu. II. 821. *a*.
- Dante*, the Poet; what revenge he took upon Prince Charles de Valois, and the reason of it. II. 296. *a. b*. His Comedy of Hell, Purgatory, and Paradise. 592. *b*. 593. *a. b*. He affords some proofs to those who say that he was a good Catholic, and to those who say he was not. 595. *b*. The answer which he made to the Prince of Verona. 596. *b*. He boasts of the share he had in Guido Cavalcante's friendship. 399.
- Darius*, the different anxieties which he undergoes on his wife's account. IV. 6. *a*.
- Darkness*; the removal of the darkness mentioned by Moses, was only with respect to the corporeal eye. I. 306. *a*. The darkness which happened during our Saviour's passion. IV. 624. *b*. 625. *a. b*.
- Darmstadt* bravely defended, but taken by storm during the war of Smalcalde. III. 386. *b*.
- Darnall* quoted. IV. 610. *b*. V. 528. *b*.
- Dassow* called an Heretic in point of love. II. 601. *b*. His zeal for the Dukes of Savoy. 602. *b*. 603. *a*. He is ill used by Loret. 604. *a. b*. Incurs the displeasure of the ladies at Montpellier. 601. *b*. III. 406. *a*.
- Date* ought to be nicely observed in prefaces. I. 493. *a*. The date of the setting up of a monument, taken for that of his death who was to be buried there. II. 515. *n*. (d).
- Dalbennus* (Peter) obtains, from the Elector Palatine, a retreat at Frankendal. III. 362. *b*. 363. *a*.
- Daughter*: It is not true that a daughter always follows her mother's example, whether it be good or bad. II. 702. *a*. Of what use daughters are in families sometimes. V. 34. *a*.
- Daughters of Adam*, their names. I. 23. *a*.
- David*, whether two families of his race passed into Spain at the time of the destruction of the first temple. I. 41. *a*. The explanation which the author has joined to that article, full of submission to the holy Scripture. V. 798. 807. The author's correction of that article. *ibid*.
- David*, Preacher to the King of Navarre, some particulars concerning him. IV. 324. *b*. 325. *a*.
- Davila*, his calumnies against Francis I, are unluckily too easy to be confuted. III. 94. *a*. He and Maimbourg directly contradict each other in their narrative touching the Duke of Guise. 292. *b*. 293. *a*. He falsely accuses a Minister of having preached up, that the French ought not to obey their King, and that they might lawfully kill him. IV. 920. *a*. Quoted and censured. *ibid*. and *b*. V. 529. *a. b*.
- Davison* renounces Astrology, and applies himself to Physic. IV. 258. *b*.
- Dawbin of France*; they give him Bongar's letters to read. II. 68. *a*.
- Dauphiné*; what a considerable place was that of the Civil and Criminal Recorder to the Parliament of Dauphiné. IV. 538. *a*.
- Daurat* compares the Parliament of Paris to Plato's Androgynes. III. 873. *b*.
- Day*, a Dissertation upon that subject. V. 775. Remarks on the definition of the Natural and Artificial Day. *ibid*. Nations who reckoned by nights. 776. Of the Civil and Astronomical Day. *ibid*. and 777. Inconveniences of the line of the point of Day. *ibid*. *b*. 778. *a. b*. They who go round the world, get or lose a Day. 778, 779. Puteanus has ill expressed himself in saying, that those who go round the world eastward lose a Day. 780. Authors who have committed the same fault as he. *ibid*. Pliny, Bembus, and Scaliger, criticized. 781. & *seq*. How two contagious places may differ twenty-four hours, as to the beginning of the Day. 779.
- Dead*; Urban Regius was of opinion that we should pray for them. IV. 854.
- Death*; there is little stress to be laid on the reports that are spread about the death of great men, and of distinguished authors. I. 88. *a. b*. 655. and *b*. 656. *a. b*. Moralists ought to be reserved in their reflexions on this head. I. 88. *a. b*. What should be the disposition of all men at the approach of death. 216. *a*. A thought of Arceilas concerning death. 413. Persons who promised to appear after their death. 631. II. 65. and *b*. 66. *a*. A common-place of consolation for death. I. 699. *b*. 700. *a. b*. An extraordinary death which was attributed to a just judgment of God, both by the Orthodox and Heterodox. II. 19. *a*. Rash and hasty reflexions are made on the death of Heretics. 373. *b*. 374. *a*. What some Pagans said of death. 418. *a. b*. 419. *a. b*. &c. It is a favour to the wretched. III. 643. *b*. 644. *a*. Lewis XI, King of France, had given strict charge that no man should pronounce that word to him. 803. *b*. 807. *a*. IV. 320. *b*. The grounds of consolation, which Epicurus and Lucretius alledged against death, considered. III. 926. *a. b*. 927. *a. b*. The Spinozists have no solid ground of consolation against it. 928. *b*. A resolution taken that the decrees of death should not be executed till the tenth day after sentence. 955. *b*. The doctrine of several Pagans concerning the characters of death. IV. 788. *a*. Reflexions upon sudden death. V. 439. *a. b*. How the Pagans recommended themselves to God, at the point of death. 628. *b*.
- Debauchees* raise people's contempt and horror, when they do not observe the rules of decency. IV. 232. *a. b*. They deserve to have no countenance shewn them, but their books ought to be cried down. III. 136. *a*.
- Debts*: Princes do not always make a conscience of paying their debts. II. 206. *b*.
- Decalogue*; its laws are impracticable in the state that mankind is in. II. 65. *b*. The sense of the seventh commandment perverted. 243. *a*.
- Decameron* of Boccace, facts concerning that book. II. 35. *b*. 36. *a. b*. The old translator of it. 36. *a*.
- Decannibus* conspires against Archelaus, and for what reason. II. 869. *a*.
- Deceive*: Sometimes a man deceives people by declaring his true intentions to them. I. 129. *a. b*. Nothing is more easy than to deceive those who never deceived others. 745. *a*. It is lawful to deceive children and sick persons. III. 319. *a*.
- Decemvirate* abrogated, and for what reason. I. 350.
- Decency*. The most dissolute persons are often religious observers of decency. IV. 407. *a*.
- Decibals*: his judgment of Peter Nonnius. IV. 382. *b*.
- Decimator*: a criticism on his faults touching the Preceptor of Achilles. I. 78. *a*. Statius is not in the least favourable to him. 79. *a. b*.
- Decisive* authors find themselves sometimes lead into a scrape. I. 76. *b*.
- Decius* was not denied entrance into the Church by St Babylas. I. 592. *a. b*. 593. *a. b*.
- Decius* (Philip), to what height the jealousy of profession between him and Mainus was carried. IV. 67. *a*.
- Deckber*, his mistake touching the book intitled *Brutum Fulmen*. III. 521. *a*. And touching the writing of Optatus Gallus. IV. 100. *b*.
- Deckber* (Conrad), accused by Father Labbe of having confounded Radulphus Flaviacensis with Ralph Higden. IV. 824. *a*.
- Declaimers*: their common fate. V. 798.
- Declamatory Speeches* that were made on imaginary subjects. II. 358. *b*.
- Decorum*: a decorum is always observed by the most profligate men when they can reap no advantage by offending against it. V. 160. *a*.
- Decrees* (Academical, Synodal, &c.) the manner in which they are extorted sometimes. I. 137. *b*. 138. *a. b*. 715. *b*.

Dicitur

- Decrees* often contain honourable things, which, properly speaking, are nothing but compliments. IV. 147. *b.* Were formerly stuffed with Greek and Latin. II. 105. *b.*
- Decretes* (the compilers of). The contempt and indignation which Mr de Mauillac expresses against the modern compilers of Decrees or arrêts. II. 562. *a.*
- Dedication*; one that was rewarded with a pension of three hundred crowns. I. 428.
- Defects*: some defects have given names to illustrious families. I. 610. *a.*
- Deification* (Poetical) of an illustrious lady. I. 398. *a.*
- b.* All sorts of languages were employed in it. 399. *a.*
- Dejanus* conceals his true sentiments from Cæsar. II. 625. *b.* A verse which he applied to two pieces of news which he had received at the same time.
627. *a.* He refuses to acknowledge that the science of Auguries, to which he was extremely addicted, had deluded him. 629. *a.* Cicero's Reflexions upon that head. *ibid.* n. (43). The ingenious answer which that King made to Crassus's railery. 630. *b.* His Embassadors over-reached by Mark Antony. III. 116. *b.*
- Deism*, when it began first to be talked of. V. 482. *b.* 483. *a.* See *Impious*.
- Deity*: The most profligate wretches mentioned in History have acknowledged a Deity. II. 257. *b.* A Deity which was so much the more respected by being unknown. 418. *a.* It requires a certain maniac force of mind to deny the existence of a Deity. 450. *b.* 451. *a.* and 648. *a.* 649. *a.* There are two sorts of unbelievers, with regard to the existence or non-existence of the Deity. 648. *a.* Why Lucan imagined that the Deity was better known in Greece and Italy than at Marseilles. 678. *a.* The Pagans laid great weight upon tradition, when they were to prove the existence of a Deity. 872. *b.* Whether a person that has lost all ideas of this may not still retain the ideas of virtue. III. 671. *a.* Some Heathens maintained the mortality of the deities of the second rank. 349. *a.* Numa would not have the Deity to be represented by any images. IV. 675. *a.* The fear and love of the Deity are not the only spring of human actions. V. 811.
- Delicacy*. The ridiculous delicacy of Garaffe, with regard to the word *lavement*. III. 136. *b.*
- Delivered*: a ridiculous custom observed in several countries, with respect to women newly delivered. V. 346. and *a.* 347. *a.* *b.*
- Delis*, its inhabitants were the first that crammed hens. III. 6. *a.*
- Delphians*, what they did in order to deliver themselves from the Pestilence and Famine with which they were punished for the death of Elop. II. 831. *a.*
- Delphos*, its temple seized upon and pillaged. IV. 621, 622. The gold and silver taken out of it, when turned into current money, amounted to ten thousand talents. 623. *a.* Its temple burnt by Phlegyas, and the punishment which Apollo inflicted upon him. 626.
- Del-Rio* confuted touching the Magic art of Agrippa. I. 152. *a.* 153. *a.*
- Deluge*; it is impossible to penetrate beyond it without the assistance of Moses. II. 854. *b.* Mechlinius, disciple of Albertus Magnus, maintains, that it was caused by the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn, &c. IV. 940. *b.* 941. *a.* *b.*
- Deluge*: the alarms that were occasioned by the prediction of an universal deluge. V. 243. *a.* 244. *a.* *b.* A prophecy that it was to happen in the year 1524 causes a mighty consternation. *ibid.*
- Demades* proposes to the Athenians that Alexander should be put in the number of the great gods. IV. 405. *a.*
- Δημαγωγός*, how that word ought to be translated. II. 714. *b.*
- Demagogus* kept the Republic of Athens in a state of true slavery. IV. 581. *b.*
- Demejia*: there is not any more inalienable than that which is founded upon mechanical passions. II. 531. *a.*
- Demetrius* censures the Athenians for their want of courage. III. 714. *a.* His thought has been disfigured by Athenæus's translator. *ibid.* He demands 250 talents of the Athenians, to be laid out in buying soap for his courtizans. *ibid.* Was easily induced to new marriages. IV. 662. *a.*
- Democritus*, the judgment which the Abderites formed of him. I. 20. *b.* II. 638. *a.* He neglects his temporal concerns. 635. *a.* *b.* A story that is told of his sagacity. 636. *a.* *b.* Was thought worthy of divine honours on account of some of his predictions. 641. *a.* What we are to think of his opinion about nature, which he calls God. 642. *b.* Whether it be very different from the opinion of Father Mallebranche. *ibid.* Whether a man of mean parts is capable of forming such an opinion. *ibid.* 643. *a.* His system of Atoms is not by much so absurd as Spinozism. 644. and *a.* How he defines the Vencreal Aft. *ibid.* *a.* *b.* He attributed all things to a necessitating destiny. 790. *a.* *b.* Seems to have assigned a soul to every atom. III. 790. *b.* 791. *a.* *b.*
- Demonstration* (moral), the true nature of it. I. 707. *a.* *b.* &c.
- Demonstratives*: why the brightest orations have been ascribed to the demonstrative kind. IV. 783. *a.*
- Demosthenes*: the longer his orations were, the finer they were. I. 427. *b.* A witty saying of his to those that were praising Philip as a great drinker. II. 598. *a.* He feigns a fore throat upon a certain occasion, that he might not be obliged to speak. III. 355. *b.* His apostrophe to Minerva. IV. 582. *b.* He is told in jest that his orations smelt of oil. 678. *b.* Callistratus induced him to dedicate himself entirely to the study of Eloquence. I. 259. Some pretend that he was a disciple of Plato. *ibid.*
- Demosthenes* (Polish), Stanislaus Orichovius was so called. IV. 411.
- Demyster*; there is no relying upon the authorities which he cites. IV. 542. *a.*
- Desir Royal*: a book wrote by Scipio de Grammont under that title. III. 210. What Naudé says of it. *ibid.* *a.* *b.*
- Denis the Carthusian* answers Gerfon's Critical Dissertation upon the spiritual marriage of Ruysbroeck. IV. 942. Is not one of those who turned into Latin the works of Ruysbroeck. 943. *b.*
- Denmark*; what the power of the High-Steward was there. V. 500. *a.* *b.*
- Denotes* abuses the authors of Tragi-Comic Pastorals very much. III. 259. *a.*
- Despt*, its university founded by Gustavus Adolphus. V. 660.
- Des-Adrets*; the reason why he embraced the Protestant party. I. 712. *b.* 713. *a.* He imitates St Paul's Evangelical Salutation. *ibid.* *b.*
- Des-Barreaux* was a famous Libertine. II. 649. *b.* 650. *a.* *b.*
- Des Cartes*, his epitaph. I. 309. *a.* Accused of Atheism. 327. *a.* Has justice done him. *ibid.* His argument for the existence of a God. 345. *b.* V. 495. *b.* 496. *a.* His followers have discovered a want of moderation. I. 472. *b.* From whom he borrowed some of his notions. II. 158. *b.* Des-Barreaux comes from Paris to Holland on purpose to see him. 647. *a.* His is praised in a Funeral Oration, by order of the first Magistrate of Utrecht. 766. *b.* His disinterestedness. III. 340. *b.* 341. *a.* *b.* The judgment he passes upon Astrology. 499. *a.* *b.* Who was his master in Optics. 659. *b.* 660. *a.* In what he has only revived the notions of other Philosophers. 788. *b.* 789. *a.* Reflexion upon the doubting which he requires, in order to come at the certainty of truth. IV. 81. *b.* His modesty truly Philosophical. 267. *a.* *b.* His maxim touching the suspension of our judgment ought not to be admitted in the affair of religion. 363. *a.* His notion of the manner in which the world might have been made. 437. *b.* His objections against a piece of Mr de Fermat. 485. *a.* Mr de Roberval answers these objections. *ibid.* Whether he may be looked upon as the inventor of the opinion which he had concerning the souls of beasts. 546. and *a.* 547. *a.* *b.* &c. Whether the seeds of his doctrine about the Automata are to be found in the Antients. 551. *b.* in 554. *a.* *b.* He acknowledges that his maxim, God can neither deceive nor be deceived, admits of a great many exceptions. 875. and *b.* 876. and *a.* *b.* &c. His doctrine about the souls of beasts rids us of a great many difficulties. 901. *b.* 902. *a.* *b.* &c. He is nevertheless deserted in this point by several of his followers. 902. *b.*

Deserters:

- Deferret*; their business is to please by agreeable lies. III. 719. *b*.
- Deferret* of a sect are generally not to be credited in what they say against it. II. 782. *b*.
- Defiderius* (Archbishop of Vienna), sharply reprov'd by St Gregory, and for what reason. III. 223. *b*. 224. *a*.
- Defors*; one ought to confine them within narrow bounds. II. 200. *a*.
- Deflandis* (the Abbot) has related an apocryphal story concerning Charnace. II. 446. *b*. Touching Fernelius. *ibid*. III. 25. *a*.
- Defsons* (John), Dean and Theologal of Senlis, has published some treatises against the rejoicings of the twelfth-day. IV. 299.
- Despauterius*; some of his verses taken for violent exorcisms. II. 147. *a*.
- Despaut*, a title of honour which the Greeks gave to the eastern Christian Princesses. IV. 52. *a*. *b*.
- Despreaux*; his satires stand in need of a commentary already. I. 35. *b*. n. 1. II. 600. *b*. His satire on the fair-sex. I. 639. *a*. His ruttng hind a false comparison. 641. *a*. He has perfectly well translated what Horace and Juvenal have said of the war which men make with one another. 639. *b*. 640. *a*. What it is he puts among the moral impossibilities. II. 650. *a*. *b*. Censured by Des Marets on the subject of Alexander. IV. 9. *a*. *b*. One cannot come into his opinion touching the four verses which he ascribes to Nero. 596. *b*. An observation in his *Art Poétique* examined. 744. *a*. *b*. He makes an excuse for not celebrating the King's victories. V. 361. *a*. Has not contradicted himself with respect to Moliere. IV. 744. *a*. *b*.
- Destiny*. See *Fate*.
- Devils*. The Devil mimicks God in all his works. I. 5. *a*. Whether he makes use of a rod as one of his occasional causes. *ibid*. In what case it would be better to harangue the Devils than men. 491. *b*. Two Devils examined. 698. *b*. 699. *a*. Several have been of opinion that the Devils could beget children. II. 113. *b*. 114. *a*. A compact entered into with the Devil. 243. *a*. *b*. The conquest which he obtained over the first woman was not a very glorious one. 852. *b*. It is astonishing that Christian Judges should admit the testimony of Devils as true, and reject the exceptions made against them. III. 213. *a*. The Devil opposes the truths which God declares to men. IV. 46. *a*. How he came to oppose the establishment of Mahometism. *ibid*. *b*. Whether it can well be concluded from the existence of Devils, that there is no God. 938. *b*. 939. *a*. The denying that the Devil has any power cannot be reconciled with the Scripture. 938. *b*. The great extent of his kingdom. V. 577. *b*. *c*. How far the progress of his arms goes. 578. *a*. *b*. He reigns much more in the time of war than in the time of peace. *ibid*. Martin del Rio does not argue consequentially upon certain extraordinary facts which he ascribes to the Devils. 597. and *a*. *b*. The Devil incapable of Atheism, and the promoter of all the sins of mankind. 813. The squabbles which the Devils had with Savonarola, of whom they were afraid. 72. *b*. A dramatical writer who often brings the Devils upon the stage. II. 478. *a*. *b*. The Devil suggests false glosses on the Scripture to Calvin, according to Hunnius. III. 538. *b*. 539. *a*. Discovers all his malice in Pareus's book. *ibid*. and *b*.
- Devout*; those who are fond of them, ascribe many more things to them than they themselves pretend to. V. 72. *a*.
- Devotion*; what is the most powerful motive to keep it up in the heart of man. II. 783. *b*. 784. *a*. There is nothing more dangerous to the mind, than too mystical and too abstracted devotions. IV. 87. *b*.
- Devout*. The jargon and mystical phrases of some devout women. IV. 926. *a*. *b*. *c*. A devout life suitable even to the temporal interests of men. V. 754. *b*. 755. *a*.
- Deuterofes*, or Jewish traditions, by whom compiled. I. 173. *b*. The observance of them reaches even to the close-stool. 174. *a*. *b*.
- Dexippus*, his love for his native-country. IV. 175. *b*.
- Diana*, an illustrious house. V. 194. *a*.
- Diabolus Sacramentarius*; the title of a book composed by the Lutheran John Schutzius. V. 89.
- Diacettin* conspires against Cardinal Julian de Medicis. IV. 11. *b*.
- Diagoras* (the Rhodian) a famous Athlet. I. 762. *b*. A compliment which a Lacedemonian made to him, differently related by Cicero and Plutarch. II. 651. *a*. *b*. He was the son of Mercury. 652. *a*.
- Diagoras*, firnamed the Atheist, what it was that hurried him into his impiety. II. 652. *a*. *b*. He publishes the motives of his apostacy. 654. *a*. Was really an Atheist. 656. *b*.
- DiallaBicon*, a book writ by John Poinet upon the subject of the Eucharist. IV. 692. Printed together with Bertran's treatise *de Corpore & Sanguine Christi*. *ibid*. *b*. And with the book of the Physician Harchius. 693. *b*. n. (15). And infered in the first volume of Beza's Opuscula. *ibid*. *a*. Translated into French, and ascribed to Antony Cooke. *ibid*. The Doctrine of it explained by Andrew Rivet, and John Cousin. *ibid*.
- Dialogue*; the rules of it. II. 809. *b*. 810. *a*. The title of a very pleasant dialogue, against those writers who love to make use of obsolete phrases. I. 69. *b*. 70. *a*.
- Diamond*; one sold at a very low price. II. 219. *b*.
- Diana* had not a Virgin-sacrifice, in the person of Iphigenia. I. 84. *a*. An admirable statue of that goddess. II. 203. Several Pagan cities boasted that they had the true statue of Diana. 530. *a*. *b*. 531. *a*. In what place her priestesses boasted of being able to walk on burning coals without hurt. *ibid*. *a*. An Historian's reflexion on the way how she came to let her temple at Ephesus be burnt. III. 59. *a*. *b*. IV. 405. *b*. V. 360. *a*. Where and when it was that they sung the hymns, which Damophila had compos'd to the honour of that goddess. IV. 554.
- Diana of Poitiers*; facts that concern her. IV. 160. *a*. *b*. 161. *a*.
- Dias* (John) in what manner he was massacred by his brother. II. 697. *a*. *b*.
- Dicæarchus* opposed the immortality of the soul. II. 657. *b*. A reasoning against his system. 658. *a*. *b*. The objections to that reasoning considered. 660. *b*. 661. *a*. *b*. &c.
- Diætor*; who was the first Roman that died in that office. III. 490.
- Dictionary*; what an hard matter it is to compose a Dictionary of Authors. I. 547. *b*.
- Dictionaries*, nothing should be suppressed in them. I. 80. *b*. Advice to those who make Supplements to them. 86. *b*. It is a great misfortune when people that compose them, have not all the necessary books. 331. *b*. An unpardonable omission censured. 398. *a*. The Italian Dictionary of the Academy della Crusca meets with almost as many Critics as Readers. 748. *a*. Historical Dictionaries do not sufficiently clear the chaos of facts, which they relate. 768. *b*. It is the fate of Dictionaries to improve by being often printed. II. 279. *a*. Dictionary of the Bible; a remark on one of its articles. 615. *b*. 616. *a*. *b*. The author of this Dictionary thought himself obliged to please sometimes one sort of people, and sometimes another. III. 173. *b*. Why he gives sometimes a greater extent to his remarks than the text requires. 871. *b*. The author of a Dictionary is sometimes transcribed by persons who know more than himself. IV. 496. *b*. A general observation against those who censure this one. 744. *b*. 745. *a*. Of all writers, those of Dictionaries ought least to be over scrupulous. V. 133. *b*. The nouns adjectives of inhabitants should be infered in Geographical Dictionaries. 235. The reader ought not to be surprized, when the authors sometimes make it appear in this Dictionary, that with respect to the most mysterious evangelical subjects, reason puts us to a stand. 615. *a*. If the gentlemen of the French Academy, would give us an universal Dictionary of all arts, they would engage in an endless work. 753. *a*. The writers of them take more pains to compile new things, than to mend the faults of their predecessors. 767. The nature of this Dictionary. 810. 854. Complaints made against some parts of it, and the authors conduct thereupon. 811. Had no right to represent people, otherwise than they actually were. 812. Remarks on a pamphlet intituled, *The Judgment of the Public, and particularly of the Abbot Ranaud*.

- Renaudot, on Mr Bayle's Critical Dictionary.* 797. to 809. How that libel should have been intitled, and its character. 797. The idea which the author had formed of his Dictionary. 800. &c. It is not true that the Chancellor of France burnt it in his house, or that he caused it to be burnt by the hand of the hangman. 806. Advertisement concerning the reprinting of part of this Dictionary. 808. Proceedings of the Walloon Consistory of Rotterdam against it. I. lxxix, lxxx, lxxxi. How that of the French academy was received. V. 809.
- Dictionary of French rhymes*; who the author of that book is. I. 65. b. 66. a.
- Didius* (Julianus) Emperor, caused all those to be burnt who consulted the Diviners, upon the Emperor's fortune. III. 955. a.
- Dido* no sooner saw Æneas, but she forgot all her fine resolutions. III. 189. a. An application of that. *ibid.* Was otherwise called Eliza. IV. 642. She was married to Sicharbas. *ibid.* Retires to Carthage. *ibid.*
- Die*: it is a miserable thing not to have it in our power to die when we earnestly long for it. III. 319. and a. b. A young lady who died jesting. 835. b.
- Dying*. Whether the oaths of dying persons ought to be taken for proofs. II. 55. b. They are often made to say things which they never said. III. 289. a. The Pagans applied their mouths to that of dying persons. IV. 135. b.
- Dioppe*; the precaution of Lewis XIV. was of no use to the inhabitants of that city. II. 31. b.
- Dieu* (Lewis de) in what manner he excused himself to Prince Maurice. II. 663. a.
- Difficulties*; it is only shallow wits that find difficulties no where. IV. 690. b.
- Digby* (Sir Kenelm) praised by Anglus. I. 339. a.
- Dignities*; when an honest man ought to refuse them. I. 540. a. People despise those who shew an indifference about them, and admire those who court them. II. 201. a.
- Digressions*. Effects of the spirit of digression. III. 373. b. They are a fault of which a very good use may be made. IV. 619. b. 620. a. People are not always reasonable in the censure which they pass upon them. V. 329. b. 330. a.
- Dijon*; a miracle which is told of a Senator of that city. III. 386. b.
- Dilemma against marriage*, who is the author of it. II. 13. b. 14. a.
- Dina*, a Danish woman, convicted of slander, and as such condemned to lose her head. V. 501. a.
- Dinant*; that town treated with the utmost rigour. II. 216. a. b.
- Diocles*; his surprize the first time he saw Epicurus in a temple. II. 784. a.
- Dioclesian* used to say that there is nothing more difficult than to reign well. I. 573. b.
- Diadorus Siculus*; what he says of the faults of Historians. V. 358. a. 359. b. What Pliny says of him. II. 82. a.
- Diadorus the Sophist*, a witty answer which Herophilus the Physician made to him. V. 618. b. 619. a.
- Diogenes Laërtius* generally did not know what he said, when he abridged the opinions of the Philosophers. I. 298. b. Although an Epicurean, he does not blame the *peccavi* of Bion. II. 13. b. Was not acquainted with all the stratagems of authors. 643. b.
- Diogenes of Apollonia*; his doctrine touching the first cause. II. 672. a. b. His system hardly differed at all from Spinozism. *ibid.* b. How he philosophized upon the production of the world. *ibid.* &c.
- Diogenes the Cynic*; his answer to Antisthenes, when he took a cudgel to turn him out. II. 665. a. And to Alexander. 667. b. 668. a. His eloquence. 669. a. b. He stood up in defence of the most abominable impurities. 669. b. III. 458. b. 459. a. b. Whether he was an Atheist. II. 670. and a. b. 671. a. He is taken by a Pirate, and draws an argument against providence from his slavery. III. 357. a. b. What must have been his sentiments touching the souls of beasts. IV. 547. a. b. He was not so far from Platonism, as it is commonly thought. *ibid.* b. Labourd to make himself insensible. *ibid.* Whether he made a good answer to the Philosopher who denied motion. V. 617. b. 618. a.
- V O L. V.
- Diogenes the Stic* sent to Rome. II. 675. b. Preaches by example upon patience. 674. a.
- Diomedes*; the explication of the fable which makes him to have fed his mares with the flesh of his guests. III. 712. b.
- Dion*; a wrong observation which he makes upon Hadrian's omitting the common preamble in his letter to the Senate. I. 649. b. Dion and Tacitus do not agree upon the reason, which induced Augustus to make a law against defamatory libels. II. 356. a. Dion speaks either as a bad Geographer, or as a bad Historian, touching the journey of Tiberius, towards Drusus. 716. b. He ascribes to Cicero a speech which he himself had forged. III. 114. b. He falsifies two things there, which ought to make us suspect his veracity in many others. *ibid.* An idle story which Guevara falsely warrants by his authority. II. 399. b. 400. a.
- Diomysus* the tyrant, how he expressed himself when he had a mind to say that a tyrant ought never to renounce his tyranny. IV. 564. b.
- Diomysus Halicarnassensis*; his good taste with respect to narratives. II. 635. b. What he relates touching the religion which Romulus established. III. 914. b. 915. a. b.
- Diomysus* falsely believed to be the Areopagite. II. 678. b.
- Diomysus* the Areopagite; who was called the second. IV. 942.
- Disparides*: it is believed that Fauſtus da Longiano had translated him into Italian, before Matthiolus published a like version. III. 861.
- Directors of consciences* are pretty often consulted, but seldom obeyed by the Christians. II. 419. a. Are seldom weary of the company of devout women. IV. 827. b. Have a great deal of business on their hands. V. 525. b.
- Disagreement* between Josephus and Tacitus, in the main circumstances of matters, that were near their time. I. 512. b.
- Discipline*; the terrible effects of that instrument. II. 700. a.
- Discipline* (Ecclesiastical) fallen into a very great relaxation. I. 223. a.
- Discipline* (Military) of a very strict and severe kind. I. 570. a. b.
- Discover*: not to discover a plot against the Government: a crime of itself capital. IV. 346. a. b.
- Discourse*: persons who find it much easier to discourse well off-hand, than to write a good book. II. 566. a. b. IV. 251. b.
- Discourses*: the ill effects of such discourses as are too free. III. 966. a.
- Discussions* (Philosophical) one should consult in them the ideas of order. V. 827.
- D'ſe*, or rather d'Yſe, Minister. III. 594. His disputes with Cregut. 596. a. b. &c.
- Dissease* (Pedicular) the Philosopher Pherecydes died of it. I. 211. b.
- Disgrace*. It is policy to pay one's court, even when they are in disgrace, to those whom we see in the road to high preferment. I. 422. a. The disgrace of cuckoldom and death have the same commonplace of consolation. 669. b. 700. a. Men endeavour to comfort themselves in their disgraces, by lessening the glory of the enemy, who has beat them. V. 659.
- Dispensation of marriage*; abstracts of the result of a congregation held at Rome for that purpose. IV. 633. a. b.
- Disputation*, what the laws of it require. IV. 934. a.
- Dispute*: what was the Dispute between Cain and Abel, according to the Targum of Jerusalem. I. 23. b. The effects of heat in a Dispute. 90. a. 309. b. Men who engage in Disputes, are commonly stronger in the offensive, than in the defensive. 598. a. Among all the Philosophical exercises, there is none where moderation is more necessary than in this. II. 847. a. We lose sight of truth by too much disputing. 848. b. and n. (33). A Dispute between two Divines, which lasted seventeen years. III. 972. a. There is not a more commodious way of coming off in a Dispute than a witty jest. IV. 713. a. b. The ill effects of Disputes. V. 229. a. b. In what the scandal of Disputes should be made at present to consist. I. 244. b.

- Their fate is such that one is scarce ever at full liberty to make use of maxims that are purely universal. 494. *a.* It is a great misfortune for some persons to engage in personal Disputes. One would think that their evil genius brings them to those unlucky circumstances. II. 584. *b.* Whence it comes that those about universal grace, are not considered now as Disputes of importance. *ibid.* The misfortune in Disputes of religion is, that the same persons are judges and parties. IV. 231. *a.* See *Controversies*. What a number of them would cease, would but the disputants understand one another. 347. *a.* The humour of disputing, is what seems the least approved in the economy of the Gospel. V. 816. A dislike for Disputes, and the love of ease induce Thomas Grynæus to retire from his employ. III. 256. When a person mentions the Disputes of authors, he should not forget to take notice of what first occasioned them. V. 352. *b.* Those between Calvin and Bolsec, scandalize James of Burgundy, who falls off from the doctrine of the Reformed. II. 215. *a.* The odious consequences which they force one to draw. III. 504. *b.* 505. *a. b.*
- Dispute* (Philosophical) the design of one. V. 816.
- Distempers*: the mind is subject to Epidemical Distempers as well as the body. I. 19. *a.* III. 948. *b.* Whether they made part of the primitive scheme of providence. II. 496. *b.* 497. *a.* Physicians formerly made them depend much upon the influence of the stars. III. 620, 621, and *a. b.* Feigned Distempers have been the means of preserving the lives of some people. IV. 767. *b.*
- Distillatio*; the meaning of that word when it is taken for a distemper. I. 619. *a.*
- Distrust* is often necessary. I. 71. *b.*
- Dyctatus*; a very generous action which he performed. II. 532. *b.*
- Diversions* (public) are schools of leudness. III. 261. *a.*
- Divination*; how Cratippus reasoned upon that subject. II. 565. *b.* 566. *a.*
- Diviners* are generally ramblers. I. 6. *a.* The difference between those who foretell things after the manner of an Oracle, and other Diviners. 276. *b.* A Diviner who performs greater services to a Prince than any of his Generals. 447. *a.* Is happy when he serves a Prince whom providence designs for great purposes. *ibid. b.* It is not to be wondered at, if they should boast of being masters of the science of dreams. 520. *b.* How vain their answers are. 542. *a. b.* In ancient times an army never marched without having some Diviner to go along with them. II. 251. A false argument which is alledged to prove that they certainly foretold future things. IV. 182. *b.* The sad fate of some Diviners. 254. *a.*
- Divines*, a judgment that was passed upon their debates. I. 242. *b.* 243. *a.* Their disputes occasion a great many mischiefs. 261. *a. b.* Their answers cannot always be so strong as the objections of a Philosopher. II. 455. *b.* 456. *a. b.* Their Controversies have always very much embarrassed the Princes and Magistrates. III. 504. *a. b.* 505. *a. b.* In an assembly where a re-union is treated of, they should be reduced to the bare plain function of Advocates. 526. *b.* They will always be worsted in a dispute wherein people shall only have recourse to the light of nature. V. 815. Maxims of the modern Divines concerning mysteries. 817.
- Divinus* (Polemic) apt to contradict themselves. I. 352. *a.*
- Divines*: Court-Divines concern themselves too much with Political affairs. V. 103. *b.*
- Divinity* and Philosophy are two faculties, which cannot well agree about their just boundaries. I. 472. *b.* Human sciences are the handmaids of Divinity. II. 698. Zealots would have a man to be more determinate and resolute than Bartolus in matters of Divinity. 706. *a.* Whether a thing that is true in Divinity can be false in Philosophy. III. 479. *a.* 951. *a. b.* 952. *a. b.* 953. *a.* 970. *a. b.* See *Theology*.
- Divinity* (Mythical) a specimen of that doctrine. V. 302. *a. b.* IV. 926. *a. b.* 927. *a. b.* Ruysbroeck passed for one of the greatest masters in that science. 942. and *a. b.*
- Divinities*. The Pagans imagined that there were Divinities jealous of the prosperities of mankind. II. 289. *a.* An heroic prayer on that head. *ibid. and b.* See *God, Gods, and Deity*.
- Divisibility in infinitum* would hinder all manner of contiguity. V. 611. *b.* & *seq.* Several difficulties against the Geometrical proofs of a divisibility in infinitum. 612. *a. b.* 613. *a.* It would suppose the penetration of dimensions. 611. *b.* 612. *a.*
- Divison*; there are some cases wherein societies are not destroyed by it. IV. 271. *a. b.*
- Divorce*; whether it be true that all the ancient and modern Divines are agreed about that matter. IV. 217. *b.* 218. *a.*
- Divorce* (satirical), a book wrote by the Sieur d'Aubigné, quoted. IV. 334. *a. b.* 340. *a.*
- Doctors* would often be taken for great Comedians, if it were lawful for one to judge of the thoughts of others. I. 564. *b.* It is happy for some of them that the people never trouble themselves to demand of them any account of their doctrine. *ibid.* Some of them may be compared to those English maffists which Father Maimbourg speaks of in one of his sermons. 773. *b.* IV. 64. *a. b.* Do not deserve to be blamed if their minds are not always bent in conversation. II. 566. *a.* IV. 251. *b.* Doctors in Law; when, where, and upon what occasion, the custom of creating them was introduced into the universities. III. 594. Passionate Doctors, what revenge their adversaries take of them. 542. *a. b.* It is very rare to find among them a person that is altogether exempt from avarice and ambition. 737. *b.* Many Doctors forced to renounce a thesis, in which they maintained that *Ego amat* was as good a phrase as *Ego amo*. IV. 837. *b.* 838. *a.*
- Doctors* (Ecclesiastical), whether they have any reason to stand in fear of the capacities of the people. I. 565. *a.*
- Doctors Degree*: Laurens is obliged to pass through all his exercises again, in order to take his Doctor's Degree a second time. III. 745. *a.*
- Doctrines*. There are a great many authors who can discover the weak side of a doctrine to admiration, but never where the force of it lies. I. 506. *b.* There is hardly a better way of attacking a doctrine, than by turning it into ridicule. V. 20. *a.* 481. *b.* Those who are over-fond of particular doctrines, consider all those who oppose them as false brethren. I. 739. *b.* Doctrines very opposite to the true faith. II. 156. *a.* What a person must know in order to judge of the nature of a doctrine. V. 231. *b.*
- Dogmatists*; the ordinary and inevitable rock which they split upon. I. 410. *a.* Did not propose the arguments of both parties with the same force. II. 487. *b.* Have too much presumption to be good Christians. IV. 655. *b.*
- Dogs*. Whether Agrippa's dog was not a natural one. I. 150. *b.* 151. *a.* A thought of Cicero concerning the dogs of the Capitol. 773. *b.* III. 372. *a. b.* IV. 74. *b.* Never enter into the churches or mosques of Misitra. III. 430. *b.* 431. *a.* Good dogs bark against all strangers, though they may be the greatest friends of their master's house. IV. 74. *b.* A sermon upon the different kinds of dogs. 64. *a. b.*
- Dog-star*; its raging heat abated by Aristen. I. 456. *b.* 457. *a.*
- Dolabella*, why thwarted by M. Antony. III. 115. *a.* His manners, his conduct, and the troubles of of which he was the cause. V. 406. *b.* He nevertheless performs a fine action for which he is highly praised. 408. *a. b.*
- Doler* (Stephen) his Epistle to Marot, and his Annotations on that Poet's Hell. IV. 163. *a.* The friendship between these two men. *ibid. b.*
- Domestic Affairs*; a rule which every body ought to observe in the management of them. I. 241. *b.* 242. *a.* Those who have the most interest in knowing how they proceed, are the last who receive notice of it. 28. III. 382. *a.*
- Domestics*; one ought to take pains to marry them. III. 193. *a.* How Cato the Censor regulated his domestics. IV. 753. *b.* 754. *a.*
- Domine non sum dignus*, &c. The words of the Centurion, with which a Spanish Ambassador received a visit of James I, King of England. I. 725. *a.*

Dominic

- Dominic* (St), according to Mayer, had the knowledge of the Philosophers stone. I. 182. *a.* Whether or not he gave blows with a spit to Francis of Assisi. III. 82. *b.* A Nun in an ecstasy sees him come into her chamber, and bring an ointment wherewith he rubbed her leg. IV. 137. *a. b.*
- Dominicans* are ever at war with the Franciscans. II. 239. *a.* The earnestness of their Generals to get the *Pugio Fidei* published. IV. 167. *b.* Their defenses. 199. *a. b.* See *Jacobins*.
- Dominion*; two things necessary to acquire and keep it. II. 421. *b.*
- Domini* (Marcus Antonius de), Joseph Hall writes a letter to him representing the necessity of remaining separate from the communion of the Church of Rome. III. 344.
- Domitian* returns the dignity of Empress to a woman who had prostituted herself to a Player. II. 685. *a.* Employed others to compose his letters, speeches, and edicts. III. 317. *a.* What is told of Apollonius Tyaneus, with respect to the person who assassinated Domitian. V. 731, 732. A decree of the Senate against his memory. IV. 729. *b.*
- Domna*; what that name was. III. 606. *b.*
- Donatists*; their error about Baptism condemned in a general council. III. 742. *b.*
- Doricus*, son to Diogenes, the history of him. II. 651. *b.*
- Dorotheus*; whether there was at Tyre a Bishop of that name who suffered martyrdom. II. 752. *a. b.*
- Dort*; its Synod would not admit the Remonstrants as members, but only as persons cited before them. II. 793. IV. 75. *a. b.* V. 510. *a. b.* 511. *a.* 513. *b.* 514. *a. b.*
- Dortmund*; facts which relate to the establishment of Lutheranism in that city. II. 121. *a. b.*
- Doutan* (the Sieur Count de), Constable of Scotland; is defeated and taken prisoner by the Sieur de Chastelux. II. 461. *a.*
- Douza* (George), affectionately received by Simon Simonides. V. 149. and *a. b.* 150. *a. b.*
- Dowry*. To receive a great dowry is to lose one's liberty. II. 206. *a.*
- Drabicius*; some people expected that he was to baptize the grand Turk. II. 693. *a.* Whether the name of Drabicius was unknown in France, in the year 1690. III. 679. *a.* He says nothing of Tokelley. 680. *a.* His tragical end. 681. *a.*
- Draco* wrote his laws in blood; the meaning of that expression. III. 969. *a.*
- Dragoning* will eternally be abhorred by honest men, whatever country or religion they be of. IV. 535.
- Dreams*. Cicero ridicules the interpreters of dreams. I. 448. *a.* Very judicious reasonings upon that subject. 510. *a. b.* The vanity of them. 520. *a. b.* Are ways of instructing not at all worthy of those intelligences to whom we impute them. *ibid.* *a.* Divers authors who have written on the interpretation of dreams. *ibid.* *b.* 521. *a.* Remarks upon a dream. III. 877. *b.* 878. *a. b.* 879. *a. b.* How much they employ the mind sometimes. IV. 63. *b.* A reflexion on the truth or falshood that may be contained in dreams, and whether they are sent to advertise us of future things. 72. *a. b.* 73. *a. b.* 74. *a. b.* There are dreams which confound unbelievers more than they are willing to own. 78. *a. b.* The dream of a woman produces strange confusion through a whole kingdom. 456. *a.* A Philosophical dream. V. 242. *b.* 243. *a. b.*
- Drelincourt* (Charles), Minister, the answer which he made to a Bishop. I. 505. *b.* Preached seven times in one day. II. 695. *b.* Defends the Protestant Ritual by the sentiments of a famous Franciscan. III. 43. *a.* Answers a complaint of the Clergy of France. IV. 479. and *a. b.* His reproachful words to the Bishop of Belley. 650. *a.* An extract from his answer to Prince Ernest, Landgrave of Hesse. 826. *b.* 827. *a.* Quoted. III. 267. *a. b.* IV. 356. *b.*
- Drelincourt*, Professor of Physic, his Elogium. I. 74. The information which he gave the author, touching one of the Akakia's. 172. *a. b.* His character. 335. *a.* II. 140. *b.* 694. *b.* 695. *a.* 696. IV. 497. *n. (r).* 505. *a. n.* (76). V. 504. and *a. b.* *Et passim alibi.*
- Dress*; women forbid all superfluity of dress. II. 98. *a. b.* 99. *a. b.*
- Drislenburgh* (Vincent) sets up for a prophet. I. 654. *a.*
- Drink*. Their way of drinking at Lacedæmon. II. 574. *b.*
- Drinker*. What Demosthenes said to those who praised Philip, King of Macedonia, as a great drinker. II. 598. *a.* Hard drinkers were esteemed among the Persians. *ibid.*
- Drunkness*; the horrible prevalency of that vice in the university of Franeker. I. 247. *a. b.* Who put a stop to it. *ibid.* *a.* More detested than fornication. II. 823. *b.* A fresh proof that it becomes fashionable among women. V. 540. *a.*
- Drusians*; a small part of the history of that people. III. 3. *a.*
- Drusilla*, daughter of Agrippa, whether she renounced the Jewish religion. II. 701. *a.*
- Drusilla* (Julia), her incest with her brother Caligula. II. 702. *a. b.* Impieties committed after her death to honour her memory. 703. *a. b.*
- Drusus*, the judgment which Father Simon passes upon him. II. 704. *a. b.* Accused of not being a sincere Protestant; and what answer he made to this charge. 705. *b.* 706. *a. b.* His only daughter is reduced to great misery. 707. *b.* 708. *a.* He is taken for the author of a letter of Broughton's, by Rosweide and Colomies. 150. *b.*
- Drusus* (Marcus Livius), the fine answer which he made to an Architect. II. 713. and 714. *a. b.*
- Drusus*, brother to Tiberius; it is said that he preserved his conjugal fidelity. I. 357. *b.* His elogy. II. 714. *b.* 715. *a. b.* 717. *a. b.*
- Drusus*, son to Tiberius, his friendship for Germanicus. II. 719. *a. b.*
- Drusus*, the son of Germanicus and Agrippina; a report spread that he had escaped out of prison. II. 721. *a. b.*
- Dualists*, Magi who admit of two co-eternal principles. V. 636. *a. b.*
- Duaren* was reported to have been a Protestant. II. 722. Gives a reason why he perceived the passion, which he had for going over to the Protestants, diminished. 726. *b.* Cited. III. 768. *b.*
- Dubravius*; what he tells us of the modes which a King of Bohemia brought from France. III. 969. *a.*
- Ducherius* (Gilebertus) his epigram against Julius II. III. 610. *a. b.*
- Duel*; the effects of a sermon against that way of fighting. III. 18. *a.* A book upon the true and ancient usage of duels. I. 547. *a. b.*
- Dualists*, what reason induces them to right themselves. IV. 887. *a. b.*
- Duncan*; particulars concerning that family. II. 408. *a.* 411. *a. b.* *a.* *
- Du-Plex* (Scipio), see *Plux*.
- Du Prat*, the prudent advice which he gave to the Count of Angoulême. III. 88. *a.*
- Durand* not being able to unite the Reformed and Lutherans, undertakes to re-unite all the sects of Christians. II. 731. *b.* His conference with Ferri and Ancillon. III. 34. *a. b.* He becomes a sort of visionary. *ibid.* *b.* 35. *a.* Mr Amyraut's mistake touching the time of his death. 34. *a. b.* The Oxford catalogue confounds him with a Jesuit. II. 731. *b.* A great pacificator, publishes several pieces. III. 343. *b.* 344. *a.*
- Durel*; his book in defence of Episcopacy, and the answer which was made to it. II. 313. *a.*
- Duret*, Physician; playing on the equivocal meaning *Seigneur* (Bloeder) used to say that he was a very little *Seigneur* (Lord). II. 99. *a.*
- Duronius*, while he was tribune of the people, repealed a law, restraining the immoderate expences of feasts. I. 351.
- Durazzo*; a history of the Princes of that name. IV. 305. *a. b.* 306. *a. b.*
- Durazzo* (Charles of) put to death, and for what reason. IV. 305. *a.*
- Durazzo* (Lewis of) imprisoned and poisoned in the castle dell' Ovo. IV. 306. *a.*
- Durazzo* (Robert of), Prince of the Morea, comes into France, where he is killed fighting. IV. 306. *b.*
- Duty* (Conjugal), rules touching that duty. I. 504. *a. b.* III. 80. *b.* 81. *a. b.* What the Cynics taught upon that head. II. 669. *b.* 670. *a.* III. 458. *b.* 459. *a. b.*

E.

E*ari*; a catalogue of persons who had the faculty of moving them. III. 429. *b*.

E*arib*. Aristarchus was one of the first who maintained that the earth turned round upon its center. I. 449. *a. b*. Whether it be animated. III. 659. *a. b*. Whether its bowels are divided like the air into three regions. IV. 258. *a*.

E*arib*: a kind of Earth which had great virtues. III. 751. *b*. 752. *a. b*.

E*aribquakes*; sacrifices which the Romans offered up on those occasions. V. 185. *b*.

E*ase*. There is a real and an apparent Ease in writing. III. 261. *b*. *Ec*. IV. 85. *a. b*. 86. *a*.

E*astern people*, a small specimen of their legends. I. 49. They are extravagant in their commendations. 51. The reason of it. *ibid*. It was their custom to consecrate golden figures, which represented those parts of the body in which they had suffered any inconvenience. 116. *b*. They used to say that those who recovered from a great fit of sickness, or escaped any imminent danger, were raised again out of the grave. *ibid*. They turned their faces towards one particular point of the Heavens when they prayed. IV. 176. *a*. Considerations upon their religion. 939. *a. b*.

E*at*. To die of excessive eating, is scandalous in any one, much more in men of letters. I. 443. *a*. It is a folly for people to adore what they eat. 556. *b*. Renaud de Beaune could eat a vast deal without being thereby made heavy or drowsy. V. 35. *b*.

E*aters*. We have I know not what natural aversion for great Eaters. II. 598. *a*.

E*berard*, a pretended Prince of Westphalia; what is told of him. III. 166. *b*. 167. *a. b*.

E*burones*; what people we are to understand by that. IV. 834. *a*.

E*cclēsia* (Augustin ab) writes the History of the Bishops of Piedmont. IV. 772. *a*. Another book of his intitled, *Corona Regia Sabaudica*. *ibid*.

E*cclēsiastics*; their irregular lives turned to advantage by the sovereigns. I. 30. *b*. 31. *a*. Love to change their posts. 56. *a*. Those of the XVIth century exercised their tyranny over the minds and consciences of men. 149. *b*. Are much to be dreaded, when they turn Accusers. 468. *a*. It is happy for them that the people under their direction have no great capacity. 564. *b*. Some Ecclesiastics who have writ love-verses. 630. *b*. Of what consequence it is to keep a close rein on them. II. 95. *a. b*. 96. *a*. The same spirit which has procured them so much wealth and honour, prevailed also under the Pagan religion. 531. *a*. The rigour of the ancient Canons with respect to them. III. 221. *a. b*. They praise all those who are liberal to the Church. 223. *a*. Many of them chuse rather to be excommunicated by the Pope, than to part with their wives. 229. *a*. Those of the northern countries submit to the law of Celibacy, more unwillingly than those of the southern. *ibid*. Those who cannot bear the yoke of Celibacy are innumerable. 235. *a*. Their vices incurable. 329. *a. b*. Who it was that introduced the custom of deposing such as lay with their wives after their ordination. 378. They should not be suffered to keep young servant maids, when they are not married. 736. *b*. It is dangerous to attack them. V. 434. *b*. 435. *a*. For what sum they obtained absolution from Fornication, Sodomy, Bestiality. I. 628. *a. b*. See *Clergy*. The artifices which they make use to excite a liberal piety. 738. *b*. 739. *a. b*. Those who formerly abstained from Adultery and Fornication, were looked upon as Eunuchs or Sodomites. III. 345. *a*.

E*ckius*; his Obelisks against Luther's thesis on Indulgences, published by Luther himself. IV. 772. *b*.

E*clyps*; who was the first among the Greeks, that could foretel the time of them. III. 462. *a*. An eclipse of the sun which happened during our Saviour's passion. IV. 624. *b*. 625. *a. b*. An eclipse of the moon occasions the ruin of a fleet to the Athenians. 566. *a. b*.

E*deffa* (Joffelin de Courtenay, Count of) dies in irons at Aleppo. IV. 383.

Edinburgb. When the castle of Edinburgh was built.

III. 783, 784.

Edict: what the Edict of January 1562 was, and in what situation the affairs of the Romish religion were then. III. 507. *b*. *Ec*. The parliament of Paris refuses to register it. 509. *b*. 513. *a*. Edict of July 1561, its restrictions. 507. *b*. *n*. (28). Edict of Nantes, by whom drawn up. II. 433. *and b*.

Edicts frequently contain honourable things which must not be taken in a literal sense. IV. 147. *b*.

Editions: what Mr Loyfel used to say of first editions. I. 318. *b*. The indolence of those who wait for the second. 319. *a. b*. There is no edition which some advantage may not be reaped from. *ibid. b*. There are authors who bestow more pains upon the second edition than they did upon the first. III. 837. *b*. Francis I, praised for having encouraged the printing of excellent editions. 97. *b*. The taste of preferring the most ample ones, has always prevailed. IV. 544. *b*. 545. *a. b*. There are persons who dare to falsify second editions, even in the author's life-time. 711. *b*.

Education sinks under the weight of nature. I. 80. *a*.

Edward (Saint) his simplicity contributed much to his obtaining a place in the Kalender. II. 707. *a*. He undergoes the penance of being scourged, and for what reason. *ibid. and b*.

Edward I, King of England makes an irruption into Scotland. III. 332. *a*.

Edward III, King of England, offended at an inscription that was put upon Windsor castle. V. 559. *a. b*. His mistress could do every thing with him, and her power ended only with the life of that Prince. 556. *a. b*.

Edward VI, his death occasioned great joy at Rome; but the reasons of that joy ceased in a little time. III. 617. *b*. 618. *a*. The Court of Rome offended at the title of King being given to him. 621.

Effigy: some persons have said that they had never been so cold as they were that day on which their effigy was burnt. II. 85. *b*.

Egg, according to the doctrine of the Antients, served for the generation of things. I. 101. *a*. 444. *a. b*. Compared with the words of Moses in his account of the creation. *ibid. a*. Another Egg, which, hatched by a dove, produced Venus, or Love. *ibid*. The mysterious meaning, which Dr Burnet finds in it. *ibid. and b*.

Egypt, priests in the nature of Deans or Superiors there were called prophets. I. 347. *a*. Who built the most celebrated pyramid in Egypt. III. 57. *b*. When and upon what occasion people of a different language came first to settle in that country. IV. 790. Which of their Kings drank wine first. *ibid*.

Egypt (the going out of) a Tragedy; who is the author of it. II. 880. *and b*.

Egyptians despise Agefilaus. I. 129. *a*. 130. *a*. **Egnatius** (Baptist) what answer he gave to the criticism which Robertellus had writ upon his works. III. 464. *b*.

Ebud: every Protestant has received an order like unto that which he received. II. 123. *a*.

Εἰδωλα; what Epicurus understood by that term. II. 388. *a*. And how it was interpreted by the Schoolmen. *ibid*.

Eleſtus; that word taken for a proper name, and for a title by Florimond de Remond and by Bodin. IV. 106. *a. b*.

Elegy. An Elegy composed in honour of those who had lost their lives at the battle of Marathon. II. 825. *b*.

Elements: whether the war of the Elements ceased after the chaos was disentangled. IV. 438. *b*. 439. *a. b*. 440. *a*.

Eleanor (Heiress of Guienne) is divorced from the King of France, and married to the King of England. III. 794. *a. b*. Her gallantry with Saladin. *ibid. b*. 795. *a*. Her jealousy, vengeance, and punishment on that account. 796. *a. b*. Her death. 797. *a. b*. She has been put in the catalogue of learned women. *ibid. b*.

Elect. The Elect among the Manichees were not allowed to exercise Agriculture. IV. 97. *a. b*.

Elephants:

- Elephants*; the chaſtity of thoſe animals. I. 641. *b.*
 White ones are held in great veneration in the eaſt.
 III. 549. *b.* When ſeen by the Romans for the
 firſt time. IV. 663. *a.*
- Elephantis* was a Courtezan, who had compoſed a book
 full of obſcenities. III. 703. *b.*
- Eleuſina Sacra paſſa*; who is the author of that
 book. IV. 648. *b. n.* (3). Quoted. 88. *a.*
- Eliau* (or rather *Eliau*) excuſes Anacreon. I. 292. *a.*
 Vents a corrupt maxim of morality. II. 654. *b.*
 His unjuſt partiality as an Hiſtorian. *ibid.* He or
 his tranſcribers wrote Pericles for Epicles. IV.
 571. *b.*
- Elias*; whether his complaint was that of a man in-
 ſpired. I. 106. *b.* 107. *a.*
- Eliot* (Thomas) wrote a book which he falſely aſcribed
 to Encolpius. II. 770. *a.*
- Elis*. The ſevere law which the inhabitants of Elis
 made againſt all women, who by ſtealth ſhould be
 preſent at the Olympic games. I. 762. That city
 grants the privilege of immunity to all Philoſophers.
 I. 656. *b.*
- Eliza*, ſiſter to Pygmalion, King of Tyre, is infinite-
 ly better known by the name of Dido. IV.
 642.
- Elizabeth*, Queen of England; how ſhe called Bodin.
 II. 49. *b.* Why in her reign no endeavours were
 uſed to juſtify her mother. 55. *a.* The difference
 there was between her and Agrippina. 757. *b.*
 758. *a.* In what manner the diſcourſed about the
 Earl of Eſſex. III. 182. *a.* A Fanatic curſes her
 with all manner of imprecations. 315. *b.* What
 Prince ſhe moſt deſired to ſee. 397. *b.* The reform-
 ation which ſhe eſtabliſhed. 562. *b.* 563. *a. b.* She
 commands William Criton the Jeſuit to be ſet at
 liberty. II. 576. *b.* More policy than ſincerity in
 what ſhe ſaid upon that occaſion. *ibid.* Thoſe who
 made her head of the Church, ſaid to be more crimi-
 nal than the electors of the She-Pope would be.
 IV. 735. *a. n.* (126). Called Jeſabel by a preacher
 of the League. V. 273.
- Ellenodius* (Nicaſius) his Latin verſion of Nemeſius's
 book *de Natura hominis*. IV. 345. *a. b.* He treats
 George Valla's tranſlation with the utmoſt contempt.
ibid. *b.* 346. *a.*
- Elogies*; lying is not any more allowable in a writer
 of Elogies, than in an Hiſtorian. I. 693. *b.* An
 Elogy which is a mixture of good and bad. 754. *b.*
 An ill cuſtom of thoſe who write them. II. 253. *b.*
 See *Encomiums*.
- Eloquence*. The jealousy of Eloquence. I. 317. *b.* 318.
a. III. 492. *b.* 493. *a. b.* It generally appears
 finer to one's auditors than readers. II. 358. *b.* The
 ſurprizing effects of it. 299. *a. b.* 300. *a. b.* 374. *b.*
 375. *a.* How great the force of it is. IV. 566. *b.*
 567. *a. b.* 568. *a.* The talents of Eloquence, and
 a vaſt erudition ſeldom meet together. 757. *b.* 758.
a. b. Calliſtratus's force of Eloquence, raiſed in
 Demotheſes a ſtrong deſire of diſtinguiſhing himſelf
 the ſame way. II. 259.
- Eloquent*. A perſon may be Eloquent, tho' he does no
 more than pronounce the diſcourſes which have
 been compoſed by others. III. 410. *a. b.*
- Elpinice*; why ſhe met with a refusal, when ſhe ſolli-
 cited for her brother Cimon. IV. 578. *b.* Kept
 by her own brother. *ibid.*
- Embaffador* of the United Provinces; who was the firſt
 that was acknowledged for ſuch at the Court of
 France. I. 3.
- Embaffadors*; an inſtance of their little ſincerity. I.
 721. *a.* An article of their Catechiſm. *ibid.* They
 have as much occaſion for their ſwords as for their
 tongues. 724. *b.* A compliment which a Spaniſh
 Embaffador made to James I, King of England.
 725. *a.* Embaffadors are of the ſame make, be
 their religion what it will. II. 70. *a.* Do not ſcruple
 to divulge falſe news, and calumnies forged by
 themſelves. 154. *a.* Buſbequius's letters are to them
 a model of writing well. 232. *a.* Embaffadors
 who reſuſe to make their court to ladies of pleaſure.
 427. *a. b.* Their children are reckoned natives of
 the place where their fathers would reſide, were they
 not Embaffadors. III. 930. *b.* They ought to be
 cautious in writing news. V. 19. *a.* Tricks which
 are common with them. 20. *b.* 21. *a. b.* 22. *a. b.*
 The definition that has been given of them, *wix.*
 that they are men ſent abroad to lie for the good of
 the ſtate. 667.
- VOL. V.
- Embaffadors extraordinary*, what lady was inveſted
 with that character. III. 263, 264. *and a. b.*
- Embaffy*. The denomination of an Embaffy, is not
 taken from the town where the Embaffador has his
 audience, but from the court to which he is ſent.
 II. 230. *a.*
- Embezzeling*; whether the embezzeling of the public
 moneys ought to be puniſhed with death. IV.
 143. *b.* 144. *a.*
- Embroidery* (Gold) by whom invented. IV. 561. *b.*
- Emerald* preſerves from the falling-ſickneſs, ſtreng-
 thens the memory, and enables one to reſiſt carnal
 concupiſcence. IV. 864. *b.*
- Emeritus*; no man ſhould be declared ſuch, while he
 begets children. II. 618. *b.*
- Emilius*, or *Emilius*, author of an Hiſtory of France,
 cannot be put upon the ſame level with the Salluſts
 and Livys. II. 764. *b.* 765. *a.*
- Emilia*, or *Emilia Lepida*, her crimes and death. II.
 721. *b.*
- Emilius*, or *Emilius*, (Antony) reſuſes a profeſſorſhip.
 III. 477. *a.*
- Emmerick* was formerly a good ſchool. II. 154.
- Empedocles* divided into two. III. 157. *b.* Was mi-
 ſtaken in annexing to the four elements amity and
 enmity. IV. 439. *b.* What Ariſtotele ſays of him.
 V. 584. *b.*
- Empire* (Roman) there were not ſo many diſorders as
 people fancy, committed there, after the ſoldiers
 took upon them to create and kill their Emperors.
 I. 572. *b.* In all the Roman empire there were but
 three Cities, which were permitted to have ſchools
 of law. 771. *a.*
- Empire and Emperor* did not concern themſelves with
 the troubles of the Low-Countries. II. 222. *a. b.*
 223. *a. b.* The Emperor acted only as a mediator
 between the King of Spain and the revolted Pro-
 vinces. *ibid.* The empire is diſcharged of what
 concerns the circle of Burgundy. *ibid.*
- Empiricus* (Sextus) the ſubtilty and uſeleſſneſs of his
 Logic. IV. 655. *b.* 656. *a. b.* His ways of ſuf-
 pending the judgment. *ibid.*
- Employments*, the author did not deſire any, and had
 reſuſed ſome. V. 800. How he came to loſe his
 employment, and his behaviour thereupon. 801.
- Employments* (Public) when a public employment is to
 be conferred, the vigour of a man ſhould be con-
 ſidered, and not his age. IV. 784. *b.* Great appli-
 cation to ſtudy generally diſqualifies a man for them.
 II. 314. *b.* They do not leave an author time to
 finiſh his writings. 515. *a.* It were to be wiſhed
 that every man had an employment aſſigned to him,
 ſuch as beſt fitted his natural diſpoſition and capa-
 city. III. 529. *b.*
- Εργασίαν νόμον*; the meaning of that phraſe. I.
 427. *a.*
- Encomiaſts*, many do not know the difference between
 them and Hiſtorians. V. 804.
- Encomiums*; we ought to be ſparing of them. III.
 896. *b.* 897. *a.* See *Panegyriſts*. A great abate-
 ment ſhould always be made with regard to public
 Encomiums beſtowed by friends. IV. 651. *b.*
- Encomiums* (Poetical) Expreſſions made uſe of in them,
 are not to be conſtrued literally. II. 309, 310.
- End*. In what Anaxagoras and Carneades make the
 chief end of man to conſiſt. I. 295. II. 332. *a.*
 The principle of Chriſtians, with regard to the chief
 end of life, is a principle only in Theory. 200. *b.*
 See *Happineſs*.
- Enemies*. There are no enemies worſe than thoſe who
 praife immoderately. I. 469. *a.* An author is not
 to be underſtood too rigorouſly, when he is ſpeaking
 of his profeſſed enemy. 2. *b.* We ought never to
 condemn any man upon the testimony of his ene-
 mies. III. 551. *b.* It is not always policy to op-
 poſe their conqueſts. 806. *b.* There is nothing
 more dangerous than to deſpiſe them in hard
 and difficult times. V. 22. *a.*
- Engage*; if it be an imprudence to engage in certain
 attempts, it is ſtill a greater one to abandon them
 after being once engaged. I. 365. *b.*
- Engaſtrimitis*; what they can do. III. 854. *a.*
- England*; the number of Heretics that were daily
 burnt there, ſo great, that it raiſed the price of
 wood. I. 272. *b.* The Parliament of England ex-
 erciſes an arbitrary power. II. 56. *a.* The Lu-
 therans and Papiſts burnt there at the ſame time.
 180. A project there to reform the colleges of
 the

- the nation, hindered by the civil war. 536. In what respect the English nobility surpassed in former times, and to this day surpasses all other nations. 803. *b.* What difference there was between the feasts of the churchmen there, and those of the nobility. *ibid.* The learned men of that country have not been so easily imposed upon with respect to Euripides, as those of France. 871. *a.* The Emperor Hadrian causes a wall to be built there, and for what end. III. 318. Richard Smith is sent there in quality of Ordinary over all the Catholics, but the Jesuits force him to leave the kingdom. 665. *a.* Cruelties which the Romans and Britons exercised there by turns. V. 260. *a. b.* An encomium upon the universities there. 513. *b.* *English*; how they were converted to Christianity. III. 219. *b.* 220. *a.* Taken for gods by the inhabitants of New Albion, and why. IV. 572. *b.* Whether the English did almost conquer France. II. 463. *b.* Whether they made it tributary. 739. *b.* 740. *a.* Their Divines accused of inclining to Pelagianism and Socinianism. I. 656. *a.* The English Catholics throw out a thousand imprecations against their country. III. 521. *b.* It had not begun to be an usual thing amongst them in the year 1613, to publish discourses in the form of letters. 344, 345. Joseph Hall did not approve of English gentlemen travelling in foreign countries. 345. and *b.* Sanders's History of the English Schism. An account of that book, its editions and translations. V. 41. *b.* 42. *a. b.* 43. *a. b.*
- Engraving* sometimes is the means of falsifying History. II. 100. *a. b.*
- Ennius*, what Quintilian said of him. IV. 161. *b.*
- Enoch*. The Hebraizers may say that the Pagans alluded to the history of Enoch. I. 276. *a.*
- Enochia*; that city compared with *Pontropolis*. II. 248. *a.*
- Εντέλεια*, a word essential to Aristotle's Natural Philosophy, but almost unintelligible. I. 636. *a.*
- Enterprize*. An enterprize discovered by a very surprising accident. II. 577. *a.*
- Enthusiasts*, whether their extasies be compatible with the opinion of those who say that the soul is not distinct from the body. II. 660. *a.*
- Entremangeries Monachales*; a book wrote in opposition to the *Entremangeries Ministrals* of Fenardent. V. 57. *b.*
- Envy*, its tortures. III. 643. *b.* 644. *a.*
- Enzinas*, author of a Spanish translation of the New Testament. II. 697. *b.* 698. *a.*
- Epaminondas*, his grave reply to Callistratus. II. 259.
- Eparcbus*, Bishop of Corfu, had made a collection of excellent manuscripts, with which the library of Augsburg was enriched. III. 478. *a. b.*
- Epemnon* (the Duke d') maintains his haughty spirit even on his death-bed. III. 289. *a.* A present which the city of Rothen makes to him. 409. *a.* He was satisfied with his good fortune. V. 369. *b.*
- Epemeris* of Cæsar, a work wholly distinct from his Commentaries. I. 613. *a.*
- Ephefians*, one of their laws. I. 318. *a.* Their readiness to believe the most absurd traditions. III. 576. *a.*
- Ephori*, the fortune of the Lacedæmonian Kings depended upon their caprices. I. 135. *a.*
- Ephorus*, an Historian; the character of his genius. V. 327. *b.* 328. *a.*
- Epyaxa* behaves with all manner of courtesy to Cyrus. II. 512. *a.*
- Epic Poetry* formerly admitted childish meannesses. I. 81. *a.* Does not allow of them at present. 333. *b.*
- Epicarmus*, an excellent doctrine of his. I. 275. *b.*
- Epicles*, what health he drank with Antocles. IV. 571. *b.*
- Epictetus*; at what price his lamp was sold. III. 939. *a.*
- Epicureans* would not acknowledge any thing supernatural in dreams. I. 85. *b.* Whether one Epicurean was allowed to rally another, and on what. II. 389. *a.* Some of them lived up to the rules of Morality with more exactness than the greatest part of the Heathens. 347. V. 398. Their union. II. 777. *a. b.*
- Epicurus*; no ancient Philosopher came nearer the truth than he. II. 63. *b.* Some of his followers were very regular in their morals. 350. *a. b.*
- What was the voluptuousness that he recommended. 388. *a.* The hypothesis of prefiges and fortune is directly opposite to the system of that Philosopher. 419. *b.* He did himself wrong in not owning his obligations to Democritus. 642. *b.* III. 789. *a.* His opinion touching the composition of the soul. 790. *b.* His civility and extreme meekness. II. 776. *b.* 777. *a.* Whence proceeds the ill opinion which people have of him and his sect. 781. *b.* 782. *a. b.* to 786. *b.* A fictitious dispute between him and a Platonic Philosopher. 787. *a. b.* Another between him and a Pagan Priest. 789. *b.* 790. *a.* He takes unnecessary precautions. *ibid. b.* Epicurus should have allowed spirits, if he had reasoned consequentially. III. 919. *b.* 920. *a.* Whether he could possibly have reconciled his system to the public worship, and deceived the Athenians. 923. *a. b.* Censured by Plutarch. 926. *a. b.* And by Muretus. *ibid.* The hypothesis of the existence of the gods is the weakest part of his system. 929. *a. b.* Whether he owned a Providence. *ibid. b.* 930. *a. b.* His objection touching the evil which happens in the world ill refuted by Lactantius. 513. *b.* 514. *a. b.* He rejected Geometry and the other branches of the Mathematics. V. 620. *a. b.*
- Epidemical distempers*; the mind is subject to them as well as the body. I. 19. *a.*
- Epigones*, how that word should be translated. I. 117. *a.*
- Epigrams*. An epigram rewarded with five thousand quarters of corn. I. 428. Another cruelly censured. 654. *b.* 655. *a. b.* An epigram of Ausonius admired by Daurat. II. 619. *b.* What should be the qualities thereof. IV. 364. *a. b.*
- Epilepsy*; who defined the pleasure of love a little epilepsy. II. 644. *a. b.*
- Epinac* (Peter d'), Archbishop of Lyons, a famous Anti-Royalist, at the conferences of Surane. V. 34.
- Epiphanius* (St) does not say that acts of uncleanness were committed in the assemblies of the Adamites. I. 111. *b.* Has no other ground but a false tradition for the bellowing of a golden calf. II. 752. *a. b.* 753. *a.*
- Ephrates* almost destroyed by famine, and for what cause. IV. 665.
- Episcopacy*, as distinct from the priesthood, is no sacrament. III. 53. and *b.*
- Episcoparians* (English), a Monk undertakes to shew that the thirty-nine articles of their Church may be reconciled with the Council of Trent. V. 25.
- Epistles Dedicatory*; a common-place topic which is seldom omitted in that kind of epistles. I. 346. *b.* No longer produce any thing. III. 16. *a.* Are prepared for those who are likely to reward the author best. IV. 843. *a. b.* It is a fault not to date them. V. 256. *a.* When an Historian addresses an Epistle Dedicatory to some powerful patron, he gives room to suspect that he has not strictly adhered to the laws of History. II. 311. and *b.* 312. *a. b.* That of an Historian to a Prince, whose conduct he had justly blamed, would be imprudent. 312. *a. b.* The design of such Epistles. *ibid.* Nothing is more necessary to the author of such a work as this, than to consult them. II. 8. *b.* The editors of books do wrong to leave them out. I. 225. *b.* IV. 164. *a.* A piece of railery upon those who affirm, in their Epistles Dedicatory, that their works have, in a manner, been taken out of their hands by force. 173. *b.* 174. *a. b.*
- Epistola obscurorum Virorum*; an effect which the reading of them produced. II. 812. *b.* Who the author of that book is. III. 474. *b.* 475. *a.*
- Epitaphs*. Deceitful epitaphs. I. 105. *b.* One not well understood. 216. *a. b.* That of an A Grecian buried in holy ground. 328. *a. b.* When an author cites one, he ought not to change the least letter. III. 697. *a.* An epitaph full of presumption and orthodoxy. IV. 468. *a.* Many of them are only mere sallies of wit, and were never engraved upon tombs. I. 437. *a. b.* Rules to be observed by those who cite them. *ibid. b.* 438. *a.* They are more to be relied on than Histories, as to the day of a person's death. II. 698. *b.*
- Epoch*. The epoch of an event should not be marked with the indefinite term of *this year*. I. 50. *a. b.* 329. *a.*

Epich:

- Epoch*; to whom the invention of it is to be ascribed. I. 409. *b.* The opinion of the Academics concerning it. II. 325. *a. b.* 326. *a. b.* 327. *a. b.*
- Equivoque*; Prierias Sylvester's doctrine on that subject is very loose. IV. 772. and *b. &c.*
- Eraftratus*; how he discovered the distemper of Antiochus, who was desperately in love with his mother-in-law. V. 45. *a.*
- Erasmus* confuted for his explication of a Greek proverb. I. 17. *a. b.* And for the meaning he gives to a passage of Cicero. 19. *a.* Why he did not embrace the Protestant religion. 139. *a.* What Agricola prognosticated concerning him. 144. *a.* He considered Luther in the beginning as a deliverer. 149. *b.* Abuses Alexander. 216. *b.* Passes for a favourer of Lutheranism. *ibid.* 217. *a. b.* His letters are often ill dated and misplaced. 271. *a.* II. 325. *b.* The advice he gave to one of his friends concerning the proper ways of pushing his fortune. I. 271. *a. b.* He did not hate wine. 272. *a. b.* Confutes the poems of Androlinus. 330. *a.* Misrepresents a fact which Ælian relates in speaking of Alexander. 367. *a. b.* His contests with Beda. 714. *a. b.* 715. *a. b.* 716. *a. b.* The judicious advice which he gave to Berquin. 777. *a. b.* Quoted. 781. *a. b.* 782. *a.* One of his letters which had never been made public. II. 77. *a. b.* He could never obtain the favour to be quoted by Budæus. 191. *b.* 192. *a.* Is ill used by Egnatius. *ibid.* and *b.* His works were corrected by Castellan. 369. *a. b.* His strength did not lie in Greek language. *ibid.* *a.* Employed too little time in composing his books. *ibid.* His mistake touching the impure practice of Diogenes. 669. *b.* 670. *a.* His dispute with Eppendorf. 797. and *a. b.* 798. and *a. b.* 799. and *a.* An effect which the reading of a book, intitled, *Epistole obscurorum Virorum*, had upon him. 812. *a.* Why old-age was agreeable to him. 814. *a. b.* His heroic sentiments towards one of his adversaries. III. 47. *a. b.* Turns a coward with regard to the court of Rome. 146. *a.* Was not of opinion that Princes should be exhorted to take away from the Monks the great estates which they possessed. 147. *a. b.* How he explained this proverb, *Take heed of a man with a black breast.* 429. *a. b.* His Priests play him a malicious trick. 531. *a. b.* It is strange he had not read what authors say of Jupiter's being transformed into a cuckoo, to lie with Juno. 632. *a.* He writes a false piece of news touching the too hasty lying-in of Luther's wife. 947. *b.* Opens the way for the Reformation by his raileries. 948. *a.* 954. and *b.* Understands a sentence of Aristophanes, better than Valerius Maximus. IV. 577. *b.* 578. *a.* The Magistrates of Basil offer to buy his statue. 926. *a. b.* What he says touching the usefulness of History. V. 265. *b.* Endeavours used to destroy all his works. 293. *a.* He does an action which ought to serve for a model to all authors. 494. *a.* The reproachful things Polydore Virgil said of him. 497. *a. b.* Noel Beda charges, as a crime upon him, his giving the title of *King of France*, to the King of England. I. 715. *a.* 801. *b.*
- Erfurt*; the Augsburg Confession, and Hebrew, are taught in that university, by the consent of the Professors, who were all Roman Catholics, except one. II. 697.
- Erhardus* (George), his censure on a very obscene epigram of Campanus. II. 293. *b.*
- Eric*, King of Sweden, is dethroned. III. 138. Makes William Lemnius his Physician. 750.
- Eric-son* (Gustavus) drives the Danes out of all their garrison towns in Sweden. V. 651. Is proclaimed King of that country. *ibid.*
- Eryngo* (white), the virtue of that herb. IV. 607. *a. b.*
- Erythreus* (Valentine) was the first who enjoyed the Rectorship of the college of Altorf. 105.
- Erpenius* did not understand a passage of Elmacin. I. 52. *b.*
- Err.* It requires a superiority of reason and genius, to know how to pity those who err. IV. 323. *a. b.* A Monk favourable to such as err with a good intention. V. 25.
- Errata*. In what part of the book a person that acts fairly, should place the *Errata*. III. 257. *a.* The very large *Errata* of a very small book. V. 455. *b.*
- Errors*; whether those of the Antients be more excusable than those of the Moderns. I. 501. *a. b.* 502. *a.* The servile caution that is observed with respect to errors. II. 94. *b.* A pleasing error is in some cases better than a disagreeable truth. 369. *b.* 370. *a.* Every particular man has the right of the sword with respect to error. 389. *a.* How difficult it is for men to avoid it. IV. 538. *a.* When they are, or when they are not, to be feared. V. 810.
- Errors* (popular), whether a man ought to regulate his conduct by them. I. 680. *b.*
- Errors in religion*, by accident, take deeper root when they are attacked. IV. 353. *a.*
- Errol*, an eminent family in Scotland, its greatness and original. III. 332.
- Erudition*. France seems too much disgusted with all that favours of erudition. V. 428. *a.* See *Learning*.
- Eschylus*, or *Æschylus*; for how much his table-book was sold. III. 939. *a.*
- Eschines*, or *Æschines*, ignominiously reproached, and for what reason. II. 775. *b.* A story that he tells. V. 77. *a. b.*
- Escoteau* (Peter d'), although a Huguenot, and married man, was Abbot of St Sulpice of Belley; his conduct with the Monks, &c. is assaninated by those of his own party. I. 737. *a. b.* 738. *a. b.*
- Esculapius*, or *Æsculapius*, is born near Epidaurus: his mother was Coronis, the daughter of Phlegyas. IV. 626.
- Esculapius of Germany*; Gregory Horstius had that surname given him. III. 487.
- Esep*, or *Æsep*, a Player; his son swallows a pearl of great price. IV. 200. *a.*
- Esperatus* (Claudius), takes upon him to publish a silly story against Calvin. II. 267. *a.*
- Espece* (Claude d'), exclaims loudly against the enormities of the book of Taxes of the Romish Chancellor. I. 629. *b.* The Inquisition causes this passage in the Doctor's book to be expunged. *ibid.* His six books of Contenance translated into French by Crespet. II. 567. *a. b.*
- Esprit de Mr Arnauld*; the History of that book. I. 490. *a. b.* Its calumnies. 492. *b.* The author of it did not understand what good railery was. II. 527. *a.* He reflects upon the Episcopal Clergy. *ibid.* *b.* The promise which he makes to the King of France in the name of Drabicius, and in that of all the Protestants. 537. *b.* and *n.* (8). He did not know his *Scaligerana* well. 706. *a.* Makes no scruple to lye. V. 176. *a. n.* (72). He is accused and convicted of Socinianism by his own reasonings. 177. *a. b.* 178. *a.* Could bring no proofs to support the heinous accusation which he published against the gentlemen of Port-Royal. 178. *a. b.* It is astonishing that the author of such a book should have remained without answer. 300. *b.*
- Esprit des Cours de l'Europe*, the author of that book cited. III. 234. *a. b.* 235. *a.*
- Esprit* (James), when admitted into the French Academy. V. 419. *a.* A passage of that author examined. IV. 441. *a.*
- Essays on Literature*; the author of that book commits gross blunders in speaking of Ruybroeck. IV. 943. *b.* 944. *a. b.*
- Essays* (Charlotte de), her History. III. 307. *b.* 308. *a.* 517. *a. b.* 518. *a.*
- Essex* (the Earl of), whether Queen Elizabeth shewed his head to the Duke of Biron. III. 182. *a.*
- Estampes* (the Duchesse of) desires Francis I. to take from Madam de Chateau-Briand the jewels which he had given her. II. 462. *a.* Reflexions upon her Calvinism, and the motives, which, according to Varillas, induced her to embrace it. 843. *a. b.* Her pretended Lutheranism. *ibid.* *b.* Her husband causes a judicial enquiry to be made after her conduct, and for what reason. *ibid.* 844. *a.* Justification of the Duke of Estampes concerning the enquiry against his wife. *ibid.* *b.* 845. *a.* She forms a faction to oppose that of Diana de Poitiers. III. 401. *a.*
- Estee*: an answer very like that of a Philosopher, who boasted that he carried about him his whole estate. V. 146. *b.*
- Este* (Borfa d') was the first who had the title of Duke of Ferrara and Modena. V. 57. *n.* (c).
- Ethiopians*, a people of Livonia who adored a pine-tree. IV. 928. *a. b.*

Esrix,

- Estrix*, a Jesuit, writ the book *de Fraudibus Hereticorum*. IV. 847. *a.*
- Eternal duration of punishment*, considerations upon that doctrine. V. 175. *b.*
- Eternity*; the definition which Boëtius gives of it, is more incomprehensible than the doctrine of Transubstantiation. V. 596. *a. b.* 597. *a. b.*
- Ethelred*, King of England, refused to hear the Pope's Missionaries but in the open field, and why. III. 219. *b.* Is converted to Christianity, and the greatest part of the English follow his example. *ibid.*
- Ethiopia*; Lucian pretends that the science of the stars had its beginning there. III. 311.
- Etolians* often at war with the Acarnanians. I. 55.
- Etrée* (Gabrielle d') what she said upon seeing the pictures of two Princesses, when it was reported that Henry IV would marry one of them. V. 392. *a.*
- Eu* (the Count d') his amiable and good qualities. III. 865. *a.* His marriage. *ibid.* His infidelity to his wife. *ibid. b.* His death. *ibid.*
- Evagrius*, what he tells of certain Monks. I. 112. *a.*
- Evarigius*, King of the Goths; one of his Counsellors compared with Apollonius. I. 383. *b.*
- Eubates*; his wife erects a statue to him, to recompense his fidelity. III. 704. *b.*
- Eubulides* was the inventor of divers sophisms. II. 846. *b.* 847. *a.*
- Eucharist*. The Church of England has given no positive definition of the manner how the body of Christ is present in the Eucharist. I. 718. *b.* Beza calumniated on this subject. 797. *b.* &c. to 800. *a.* The manner how God preserves accidents without a subject in the Eucharist. IV. 59. *a. b.* 60. *a.* Expressions of Calvin on this head, which seem to admit of a corporal presence. V. 103. *b. n.* (47). The advocates for Transubstantiation make a wrong use of the words *Change*, *Conversion*, or *Transfementation*. 209. *b.* Bucer's ambiguous way of speaking on this subject. II. 177. *a. b.* After thirty-four years labour, the ministers could not agree in this point. *ibid. b.* Harchius attempts to find out a middle way in the doctrine of the Eucharist, between the Catholics and Protestants, but his project is laughed at by both. III. 352. John Poinet tries to reconcile the controversies about it, and particularly those of the Lutherans and Zuinglians. IV. 692. That author's opinion. 693. *b.* The opinion of the Calvinists in this point extremely ill used by John Schutzius, and a reflexion thereupon. V. 89. *b.* The warmth of disputes on this subject, between the Lutherans and Calvinists is over. *ibid.*
- Euchracia*; a Heretic gets her with child. IV. 780. *a.* She is put to death. *ibid.*
- Eudes* (Duke of Aquitain) acts a cunning part with Charles Martel. I. 15. *a.* Did not favour the irruption of the Saracens. 16. *a.* There was much more room for suspecting Charles Martel than him in that affair. *ibid. and b.* To which of these two chiefs, the honour of the victory belongs. *ibid.*
- Eudoxia* sends privately to Giferic, and conjures him to come and revenge the death of Valentinian. III. 759. *b.*
- Eve*, what her reason was for giving the name of Seth to one of her sons. I. 23. *a.*
- Events*: what those ought to do, who relate mysterious events. II. 386. *a. b.* 392. *a. b.* There are some which occasion much speculation, and are little spoken of. 400. *a.* The most considerable may depend upon a trifle. 422. *a.* It is of the last consequence to find them ranged in their natural order. 756. *b.* The difference between the accounts of Catholics and Protestants chiefly consists in the order of events. *ibid.* Great events hit our taste exceedingly. III. 433. *b.* 434. *a.* The Antients affirmed that a man's prudence had a less share in them than his good or ill fortune. IV. 460. *a. b.* We hardly ever judge of things but by the event. V. 104. *a. b.* We cannot read with pleasure a description of those events which were disagreeable to us. II. 311. *b.*
- Eugene of Savoy* (Prince) is not a brother's son of the Duke of Savoy, but Charles Emmanuel's great-grandson. IV. 210. *b.* Commanded only the Emperor's troops of Italy. *ibid.* Did not force the lines of the besiegers at Coni. *ibid.* 211. *a.*
- Evidence*; whether it be the mark and measure of truth. IV. 654. *b.* 655. *a. b.* V. 586. *b.*
- Evil*. Chimerical evils forged by the Poets, have served as an apology for real evils. I. 54. *a. b.* How it fares with people who judge of complicated evils. 95. *a.* Such is the condition of mankind, that they can only chafe between the lesser and greater evil. II. 211. *b.* Whether there is a greater proportion of evil than of good in the conditions of men. 832. *a. b.* IV. 844. *a. b.* V. 415. *a.* 423. *b.* 424. *a.* 576. *a. b.* &c. *seq.* Whether it be nothing. II. 846. *a.* Many people complain of the evil which they suffer, and say nothing at all of that which they themselves did before. III. 42. *a. b.* A reflexion upon the Heathens saying that the gods pushed men on to do evil. 374. *a. b.* IV. 441. *b.* 442. *a.* A physical evil ought never to be remedied by a moral evil. III. 965. *a.* The difficulties about the origin of evil are very ancient. IV. 92. *a. b.* 93. *a. b.* It is impossible to solve them without having recourse to Revelation. 94. *a. b.* &c. 112. *b.* 113. *a. b.* The origin of evil is incomprehensible. 513. *a. b.* &c. 524. *b.* 525. *a. b.* &c. 788. *a. b.* 932. *b.* 933. *a. b.* &c. V. 212. *b.* &c. How some excuse providence with respect to the origin of evil. 576. *a. b.* See *Principles* (the doctrine of two). Those who approve it deserve the same punishment as those who commit it. 764, 765. 824. The question about its origin, very difficult. 815, 816. 830, 831. The introduction thereof with the doctrines annexed to it, is one of the most impenetrable mysteries of religion. 822. 830. 831.
- Eumenes*, King of Pergamum, lived in a strict friendship with his brothers. IV. 558. *a. b.* 559. *a.*
- Eumenius*, the Rhetorician, had a yearly pension of fifteen thousand crowns. I. 196. *a.*
- Eumapius* said that the History of Apollonius should have been intitled, *The Defects of a God upon Earth*. I. 382. *a.*
- Eunuchs*; whether women may be safely trusted to their keeping. I. 31. *b.* II. 533. *a. b.* What St Basil says of them. III. 56. *b.* Two sorts of Eunuchs. *ibid.* Compared to oxen, whose horns are cut off, and who nevertheless do not cease to strike with their heads. 383. *b.* II. 533. *b.* Their impotence with regard to women, is no obstacle to their having the other qualities of great men. III. 414. *b.* They may be very brave. *ibid.*
- Eurus*, the trick which he made use of in order to raise an insurrection. I. 647. *and b.* 648. *a.*
- Euphorbia*, an herb; whence it had that name. III. 598. *a. b.*
- Euphormio*; that book severely censured. I. 646. *a.* Condemned by the Inquisition. *ibid.* Which did not hinder the author from being much caressed at Rome, and receiving favours on account of that very book. *ibid.* Translated into French by John Beault. *ibid.* Two other translations which leave the work at least as difficult as they found it. 647. *b.*
- Euphorus*; whether there has been any author of that name. II. 772. *b.* 773. *a.*
- Euphrates*, when it was the boundary of the empire. III. 317. *and a. b.*
- Evreumont* (St) author of a satire against the French academy. I. 559. *a. n.* (7), (8). Quoted. IV. 492. *b.* 615. *b.* 797. *b.*
- Eurydamus*; how he was punished by Jupiter, and for what. III. 630. *b.*
- Euripides* was delighted with a maxim of Agathon. I. 126. *b.* The energy of one of his sentences. *ibid.* Said that God concerns himself only with great things, and leaves the lesser to chance. 310. *a. b.* His custom was to introduce persons upon the stage, in whose mouths he put impious sentiments. II. 572. *a. b.* 573. *a. b.* An argument *ad hominem* which a courtesan alledged to him. III. 705. *a.*
- Europe*. The Christians in Europe are addicted to drunkenness and lewdness. II. 819. *b.*
- Europeans*; it was only by way of reprisal, that they stole away the King of Tyre's daughter. III. 372. *a.*
- Eusebius*; what he says of Apollonius Tyanæus, examined. I. 381. *b.* 382. *a. b.* He makes an improper use of a passage of Porphyrius, which he has preserved to us. II. 773. *b.* How he refuted the slanders of Hierocles against the Christian religion. III. 448. *a. b.* What he quotes from Phlegon. IV. 624. *b.* &c.

Eusebius

- Eusebius Cæpticus*, a controversial work of Jerom Mas-
sarius, under that title, where he feigns that a true
believer gives an account of his faith before the Pope
and the Inquisition. IV. 173. *a. b.*
- Eutymenus*; how much his son grew in three years,
and what happened to him afterwards. V.
283. *b.*
- Eutymius Zigabenus*; the story which he tells of a
stone. I. 124. *a.*
- Eutychius*; his narrative concerning the quarrel between
Cain and Abel. I. 24. *a.*
- Eutropius*; whether a passage of that author has been
well translated by the Abbot de Marolle. II. 255.
a. b.
- Exactions* imposed under divers pretences. II.
421. *b.*
- Examination* (the way of) when people have no fur-
ther occasion for it, they return to the way of au-
thority. I. 241. *b.* The difficulties which attend it.
IV. 361. *a. b.* 362. *a. b.* 363. *a.* 535. *a. b.* 536.
a. There are some who affirm that no body makes
use of that way. *ibid. and b.* What are the greatest ob-
stacles to a proper examination. 537. *a.* A common
place against the way of examination. V. 441. *a. b.*
See *Authority*.
- Example*. An example which a modern author al-
leges to prove that a sincere ignorance is a good
excuse. I. 206. *a.* An example of the bad custom
which prevails of interesting religion in the disputes
of learned men. II. 141. *a. b.* Those who set
bad examples, ought to be severely punished. IV.
18. *a.* The contagion of bad examples. V.
755. *b.*
- Excommunication*, a severer punishment sometimes than
the afflictive pains which the civil magistrate im-
poses. I. 96. *a.* Against what authors it is made
use in the Protestant churches. V. 806. How Sa-
vonarola behaved, when he found himself lying un-
der the sentence of excommunication, and the opinion
of the Protestants upon that head examined. 70. *b.*
71. *a.*
- Excuses*; however good they may be, it is still better
not to stand in need of them. II. 794. *a. b.*
795. *a.*
- Exercises* of the King of Bohemia, preserved in the
Vatican Library. I. 239. *a.*
- Exercises* (public) Oecolampadius does not trouble him-
self about the honour that is to be gained by them
in the universities. IV. 400.
- Exile*. An Exile is not qualified to write an History.
III. 345.
- Exorcism*. Despaunterius's Grammar presented to a
woman possessed with a devil, as a formulary of
exorcism. II. 147. *a.*
- Exorcists*, and mean and mercenary employment
among the Pagans. II. 775. *a. b.* In what man-
ner it was exercised. *ibid. n. (15).* What sort of
questions they generally put to the possessed. III.
214. *b.*
- Exploits*; several give the glory of them to God,
only out of policy. V. 366. *a. b.* 367. *a. b.*
- Expressions*. Some expressions offend us, though they
import no more than other expressions at which we
are not at all offended. I. 790. *b.* 791. *a.* We
are apt to be deceived, when we stick to the first
sense, which they offer to our mind. 595. *b.*
- Extempore*. A boy of ten years of age, who composed
verses *extempore*. I. 360. *and a. b.*
- Extension*. Whether we have any idea of an ex-
tension that is immaterial. V. 143. *b.* 144. *a.* Exten-
sion is made up of parts which are each a particular
substance. 208. *b.* 209. *a.* Objections against its
existence. 608. *b.* 609. *a. b.* 610. *a. b.* & *seq.*
Whether there can be two sorts of it, the one di-
visible, moveable, and impenetrable, and the other
immoveable, indivisible, and penetrable. 615. *b.*
616. *a. b.* 617. *a. b.*
- Extraits*. Unfaithful extracts. I. 714. *b.* 715. *a.*
- Extravagancies*; to what extravagancies the human
mind is liable. I. 103. *a. b.*
- Eye-brows* (joining each other) passed for a beauty
among the Phrygians. II. 140.
- Ezekiel*; what a Rabbi affirms concerning his tomb.
V. 544. *b.*
- F.
- F**aber (Antony) his judgment concerning the greatest
Lawyers of his time. III. 201. *a.*
- Faber Stapulensis* delivered out of the hands of the In-
quisitors by the Queen of Navarre. II. 261.
- Faber* (Tanaquillus) who are the persons qualified to
judge of his books. I. 189. *a.* Censured for quot-
ing Plato and Herodotus, on the subject of Ana-
creon. 290. *b.* 291. *a.* What he says to a Journa-
list. 452. *a.* Gives us a piece of secret History.
675. *a.* A common-place which he made use of.
745. *a. b.* Censured by Mr Dacier with little
success. II. 388. *a. b.* In what he has very well
shewn the mistakes of the interpreters of Horace,
with regard to Cælius. *ibid. b.* 389. *a.* He wrong-
fully pronounces a definitive sentence upon a passage
of Plutarch, touching Critias and his Atheism. 573.
b. 574. *a.* Unjustly censures St Augustin touching
the liberties which the Comic Poets gave themselves.
IV. 568. *a. b.* He and Madlle his daughter criti-
cized on the subject of Anacreon and his cotem-
poraries. V. 44. *a. b.*
- Fables* of the Ancients very ill concerted. I. 80. *a.*
They applied the unravelling of them to too many
subjects. 115. *b.* People are unwilling to be un-
deceived as to Fables, when they find their account
in them. 362. Who invented, and who brought
them to perfection. II. 828. *a. b.* The difference
between a Fable and a fabulous narration. 829. *a.*
Freinhemius's mistake upon this head. *ibid.* Which
are the most useful of all the Fables of antiquity.
831. *b.* 832. *a.* The apology which Strabo makes
for them. *ibid.* How Seneca could say that the
Romans had never attempted this sort of composi-
tions. 833. *and b.* They should never be made use
of to explain the mysteries of religion. IV. 896.
a. A conjecture about the origin of the ancient
Fables. V. 288. *a.* Jewish Fables with respect to
a false Messias. I. 648. *a. b.*
- Faces*. Some women have disfigured their faces, lest
they should occasion a temptation. II. 109. *a.*
n. (5).
- Faciendaire*; an old French word which is very ex-
pressive, and which deserved to have been kept up.
IV. 640. *a.*
- Factions*. It is ordinary for all factions to produce li-
bels. III. 517. *b.* There is nothing more advan-
tageous, according to the notions of the world, than
to be always for the strongest faction. V. 250. *a.*
It commonly happens that men of a peaceable dis-
position, are carried down with the torrent of a
faction. 675.
- Facts*; there are some which one may pronounce to
be false, purely because they are doubtful. I. 67. *b.*
To make one a credible witness in certain facts no-
thing more is necessary than the truth of the rela-
tion. 75. *a.* A fruitful source of falsifications in
matters of fact. 186. *b.* Whether it be sufficient
on all occasions to deny a fact, when an adversary
does not prove it. 199. *a. b.* 200. *a. b.* The rea-
son why they come to be so variously reported.
308. *b.* An exactness in relating them is insepara-
ble from a tiresome prolixity. 335. *a.* Contrarie-
ty in matters of fact. II. 28. *b.* 29. *a. b.* There
are many remarkable facts for which we have but
a single testimony. 349. *b.* One should forbear to
speak of facts till time has ripened them. 65. *a.*
There are some which reduce Philosophy to a non-
plus. 391. *b.* 392. *a. b.* There are others the
publishing of which only offends, because they are
true. III. 148. *b.* We should in matters of fact
follow the advice which Des Cartes gives with re-
spect to philosophical speculations. 204. *a.* The
ill-placing of circumstances makes a fact doubtful,
though it be never so certain and true in itself. 226.
a. How the circumstances of facts come to be
changed. 314. *a. b.* There is sometimes a great
illusion in proving a fact by a reason of right. V.
11. *a. b.* They are exaggerated in passing from
mouth to mouth. I. 747. *b.* Should not be affirm-
ed as certain, when one does not find them in cre-
dible authors. III. 779. *b.* Those which are to
be found every where, have less need to be support-
ed by quotations than singular facts. *ibid.* The
probability of a thing does not warrant the affirm-
ing it as a certain fact. *ibid.* Historical facts are
10 X
very

- very subject to a metamorphosis. IV. 89. *b.* A world of transcribers and great authors confound them with their conjectures. 609. *a.* A compiler of facts should not neglect to engage the reader's attention to those which have something singular in them. V. 642. *a.*
- Feneste* (the Baron of), one of his adventures pleasantly related by d'Aubigné. II. 243. *b.*
- Fairus*, his fables. IV. 613. *a. b.*
- Faget* (the Abbot), a dispute between him and Baluzius. IV. 102. *b.* 103. *a. b.*
- Fagnanus*, his intimate acquaintance with Pradilhon, General of the Feuillants. IV. 764. *a.*
- Fay* (du), a new remark upon his writings. III. 516. *b.* 517. *a. b.*
- Faydit* (Abbot) quoted. III. 739. *b.* After what manner he speaks of the author of the memoirs of M. L. C. D. R. V. 84. *a.* A very strong invective which he makes on the subject of the Trinity against the explications of the Schoolmen. 820. The insuperable perplexities to which he reduces them. *ibid.* *n.* (30). A long passage of his *Telemaque* cited and censured. IV. 643. *a. b.* 644. *a.*
- Fair*: whether any thing is lawful and fair against an open enemy. II. 154. *a.*
- Faith*. There is a local, and a temporary faith. I. 477. *a.* Bucer's judgment on this thesis, *We are justified by faith alone*. II. 178. *a. b.* What makes it become a true act of religion. 662. *b.* IV. 592. *b.* 593. *a. b.* 717. *a. b.* *&c.* to 720. *a. b.* Nothing but Faith can convince us that bodies do really exist. 654. *a. n.* (12). All the articles of Faith defended and attacked by the arms of Philosophy alone, do not come off honourably. V. 815. The first thing required by Christ and his Apostles. 816. It is a gift of God; and is not to be acquired by reasonings, and a train of Philosophical discussions. *ibid.* Wherein the Faith of a Christian, and the Science of a Philosopher differ. *ibid.* It ought to satisfy every good Christian, that his Faith is founded on the word of God. 829. It is the way by which it has pleased God to conduct Christians. 831. The most precious Faith is that, which, upon the Divine testimony, embraces the most opposite truths to Reason. 834. A railery upon this notion. *ibid.* Confutation of that railery. *ibid.* It serves for a sword and buckler against the knots of difficulties. 835. Few people seriously examine the nature of it. 836. It is proper to enumerate the arguments which respect the difficulties of the Christian Faith. *ibid.*
- Fall of Adam*: it is one of the greatest mysteries. V. 821.
- Falshood*. There are several things the falshood whereof is sufficiently exposed by barely relating them. I. 245. Whether it may appear in the same guise as truth. 410. *b.* People are ever publishing notorious falshoods. 343. *a. b.* 344. *a.* Whether time destroys them. III. 744. *a.*
- Famagosta*; the Turks take that town. IV. 23, 24.
- Families*; there are few which may not be reproached with some adventure. I. 490. *b.* An antient Roman family that was illustrious for chastity. II. 291. *b.* Fabulous traditions that are kept up in old families. 709. *a.* V. 400. The fabulous genealogy of several families. 468. *a. b.* 469. *a. b.* See *Genealogist*.
- Families* (Patrician), some of them became Plebeian. II. 167. *a.*
- Fanaticism*; its prodigious variety. III. 692. Is a more contagious evil than is imagined. *ibid.* A proof of Savonarola's fanaticism. V. 71. *a. b.*
- Fanatics* of Amsterdam who ran about stark-naked. I. 112. How dangerous those persons are to a state. 647. *b.* 648. *a.* They are perfect incendiaries. II. 143. and *a. b.* 537. Their usual faults. 538. *a. b.* Their first works overthrow their last. *ibid.* *a.* They are touched to the quick when they are upbraided with contradictions of that kind. *ibid.* Are watchful over events, in order to amend their predictions according to the news of the Gazette. *ibid.* *b.* Have often no other aim than to stir up the people. 539. *a.* Chuse rather to expose the authority of the Scriptures, than to own themselves in the wrong. *ibid.* Lose nothing of their credit, though they have deceived the public a hundred times. *ibid.* Are never at a loss. 692. *a.* Their obstinacy in finding out evasions. *ibid.* *b.* 693. *a. b. n.* (23). They will never want patrons, provided they have cunning enough to accommodate themselves to the passions of the times. 693. There are two sorts of them: which are the most suspected. III. 682. *a.* A touch-stone to discover whether they are sincere Fanatics. IV. 36. *a.* They cannot answer for themselves, and why. 115. *b.* Do not trouble themselves about the greatest difficulties. 116. *a. b.* The XVIIIth century was fruitful in Fanatics. 269. *a.* The sect of the Fanatics very well characterized. I. 241. *b.*
- Fannia*; at what time the law, which goes by that name, was made. V. 386. and *b.* 387. *a.*
- Fano* (Barthelemi Denys de) continues the History of Tarcagnota, and of Mambrin Rokko. IV. 918.
- Farces*. The present farces are more dangerous than those of our ancestors, and for what reason. V. 847.
- Fardella*, his Logic. V. 614. *b.* 615. *a.*
- Farel* sent with the character of a Deputy into Germany. I. 790. *a.* His dispute at Basil. III. 10. *a.* His too passionate zeal. *ibid.* and *b.* His intrepidity. *ibid.* Erasmus has used him very ill. *ibid.* 11. *a.* and 14. *a.* His marriage. 13. *a. b.*
- Farellists*: a chimerical sect. 15. *b.*
- Faret*; his *Honnête Homme* translated into Latin by Charles Oginski. IV. 402. Translated into Spanish, Italian, English, and High-Dutch. *ibid.*
- Fargis*, the French Ambassador in Spain, makes a disadvantageous treaty. I. 786. *a.*
- Farmers of the Taxes* are very seldom honest. V. 465. *a. b.* Would have afflicted most of the gods if they had been suffered to go on. I. 280. *b.* 281. *a. b.*
- Farnaby* criticized on the subject of an epigram against Fulvia. III. 163. *a.*
- Farnace* (P. de) writes the life of Peter de la Place. IV. 681. *a. b. n.* (2).
- Farts*: some people could dispose of them in such a manner, that they seemed to make them sing. III. 135. *b.*
- Fasting* is a thing which the Northern nations cannot easily bear. III. 231. *a.* May be of a very long continuance. 582. *b.* An objection proposed to Laurence Joubert about the fasting of Moses, Elias, and Jesus Christ. *ibid.* A system, according to which one might elude the laws of the Church with respect to fast-days. V. 777, 778.
- Fatality* annexed by the Pagans to certain inanimate things. II. 254. *a.*
- Fate*. The doctrine of the Stoics, touching Fate, made God the author of Sin. II. 489. *a. b.* 490. *a. b.* 491. *a.* IV. 519. *b.* *&c.* How they endeavoured to reconcile it with human liberty. II. 490. *b.* 491. *a.* This doctrine does not exclude all wishes. III. 924. *a.* Invektives of the Pagans against Fate. IV. 811. *a. b.* They believed that one word was sufficient to change it. II. 253. *a. b.*
- Father*. A father who gives his son a very good education. IV. 754. *b.* Nature has given a great deal of force to the affection of a father. 637. *a.*
- Fathers of the Church*: some of them were ignorant that it is unlawful to save either one's own life, or another's, at the expence of a crime. I. 38. *a. b.* Have inserted the most shocking impurities in their works. 103. *b.* Generally believed that Adam was buried upon mount Calvary. 104. *b.* Whether those of the first three centuries taught Arianism implicitly. 477. *a. b.* People are more or less tender of them in proportion as they are more or less of their way of thinking. 564. and *a. b.* They sometimes alledge very weak arguments against the Gentiles. II. 498. *a.* III. 55. *a.* Had reason to reproach the Pagans with the infamous amours of Jupiter. 130. *a. b.* What answer they made to the raileries of the Heathens upon the adventure of Jonas. 578. *a. b.* The doctrine of those of the first three centuries concerning the Trinity. IV. 601. *a. b.* 602. *a. b.* When the Protestant Divines of France began to read them. I. 756. The Fathers have published the impieties and obscenities of the antient Heretics. III. 135. *b.* 136. *a. b.* Are blame-worthy, if at bottom it was a pernicious and sinful thing. 136. *a.* Whether it be true that they wrote only for the learned, and in a language not understood by the vulgar. *ibid.* What they required of believers in a particular manner. V. 816. Did not discuss the mysteries of religion by the rules of Logic and Metaphysics. 817. *n.* (17).
- Fausla*, Hercules's whore, has Divine honours paid to her. III. 55. *b.*

Fausla

- Faults*. A reflexion on hidden faults. I. 619. *b*. It requires a great deal of dexterity to tell people their faults, without giving them room to be angry. 753. *a*. Men do not love to be told publicly of their faults. II. 311. *b*.
- Faults* in books. See *Books*.
- Favour*; what Regnier says of it. V. 370. *b*.
- Favours*; people court their daughters, however small their fortunes be. I. 460. *b*. The judicious reflexion of a great wit on that head. *ibid*. They labour to procure to themselves, or their relations, the most profitable and honourable employments. III. 826. *and a*. A favourite can bring in to fashion not only such cloaths, but also such meats as he likes. IV. 768. *a*. People take a pleasure in charging them with more crimes than they are really guilty of. V. 370. *b*.
- Fausta*; her lewd practices. IV. 201. *a. b*.
- Faustina*; how far she carried her immodesty. III. 794. *b. n. (5)*.
- Faust*. The prodigious sumptuousness of a feast made at Rome by the Pope's Financier. II. 469. *a*. Another of a vast expence. 835. *a. b*. A law, which restrained the immoderate expence of feasts, repealed by Dronius. I. 351. A magnificent feast which was given by a gentleman of Lombardy. 402. *a. b*. Regulations for moderating the expence of them. III. 6. *a*. The Romans did not suffer maids to be present at feasts; and the Greeks did not even allow women to be there. 966. *b*. 967. *a*.
- Felix* does not go into Judaea, till after the condemnation of Cumanus. II. 702. *b*. Married three Queens. *ibid*.
- Feltri* (Victorinus of), one of the first restorers of ancient Latin. IV. 408.
- Ferdinand* I. besieges Buda, and his army is cut in pieces by Soliman. III. 532.
- Ferdinand* II, succeeding to the empire, saw himself dispossessed of two kingdoms. 819. *b*.
- Feria* (the Duke of) dies of grief, occasioned by the ill conduct of Aldringer. I. 211. *b*.
- Fermeiers*, mistress to Francis I, why infected by her husband. III. 89. *a. b*.
- Ferrand* is to be pitied for having engaged to apologize for St Francis. III. 83. *a. b*. Quoted. IV. 109. *b*. 110. *a*.
- Ferrara* (Renée de France, Duchess of) receives as many Refugees as the can at Montargis. V. 193. *a*.
- Ferris* (Father), Confessor to the King, writes a little book concerning probable opinions. IV. 64. *a*.
- Ferrier* (Arnoul du), a famous Professor of the Civil Law at Toulouse. II. 687.
- Fervent*; the impertinence of that Franciscan. II. 751. *a*. The apology he makes for the worship of the blessed Virgin. III. 85. *a. n. (49)*. The accusations which he brings against Calvin. V. 53. *b*. 54. *a. b*.
- Fever* (purple), James des Parts was the first that wrote upon that subject. IV. 484.
- Feuillant* (the little), see the article *Montgaillard*, in the Dictionary.
- Feuillants*: the abbey and chief of the order situated in the diocese of Rieux. IV. 764.
- Fevre de la Boderie* (Guy le), translates from Italian John Andreas's book, intitled; *The Selt of Mahomet demolished*. I. 326. *b*.
- Fevre* (John le), author of a Dictionary of French rhymes. I. 65. *b*. 66. *a*.
- Fevrier* (John), a Jesuit, confounded with Father John Ferrier by Southwell. III. 43. *a. b*.
- Fichard* (John) publishes the writings of Julius Clarus. II. 515. *a. b*. The praises which he bestows on him are just. *ibid. b*.
- Ficinus* (Marfilius), what we are to understand by his Commentaries. IV. 689. *a*. See *Marfilius Ficinus*. He explains the doctrine of Guido Cavalcante, touching the nature of love. II. 399. *b*.
- Figures* (Arithmetical) have both their conveniencies and inconveniencies. I. 249. *a*.
- Filleau*, the King's Advocate at Poitiers, gloried in persecuting the Protestants upon all occasions. IV. 479. *b*. His account of what passed in the chimerical assembly of Bourg-Fontaine. I. 491. *a*.
- Financier*; probity is a rare thing to be met with in that employment. V. 465. *a. b*.
- Finæus* (Orontius), Peter Nonnius corrects several of his mistakes. IV. 382. *b*.
- Finland*; who was the first that translated the New Testament into the language of that country. I. 141.
- Fire* has often fallen upon sacrifices. I. 24. *b*. The Pagans boasted of having had this mark of approbation from heaven. 25. *b*. Who invented divinations by fire. 277. *b*. Trial by fire. 405. Priestesses who boasted that they could walk upon it without receiving any damage. II. 531. *a*. A lucky presage, when it kindled of itself upon the altars. 746. *a. b*. Which nevertheless had not always that construction put upon it. *ibid. b*. The story of a people who trod upon fire without being burnt. III. 466. *and a. b*. 467. *and a. b*. Was the principle of all things according to Heraclitus. V. 323. *b. n. (23)*.
- Fish*: a fish adorned with ear-rings. I. 358.
- First-Simon*, a Jesuit, quoted. I. 756. *a*. III. 937. *b*. 945. *b*. Whether he disputed with Usher. V. 525. *a. b*.
- Flaccus*, a surname to be found in several cities of Italy. IV. 599. *b*.
- Flacius* (Matthias): a Roman Catholic having praised him without knowing him, repented of it after he came to know him. V. 124. *b*. See *Illyricus*.
- Flaminius* had like to have been refused the honour of a triumph, for not opening a letter from the Senate, till after he had routed the enemy. II. 291. *a*.
- Flaminius* (Lucius) causes a criminal to be put to death in his presence, while he was at dinner, and for what reason. IV. 17. *b*.
- Flatterers* do not regard a mere title. I. 233. *b*. Their sharpening tricks. IV. 430. *a. b*.
- Flattery*; the effect which it must naturally have upon the minds of Princes. II. 256. *b*. 257. *a*. A strange instance of that vice. III. 222. *b*. 223. *a*. Is one of the plagues of History. IV. 142. *b*. 143. *a*. A superannuated piece of flattery. I. 349. *a*.
- Flad*. Persons who owned that they had thrown down their arms and fled. I. 189. *a. b*.
- Flate* (golden), on what occasion that order of Knights was instituted. II. 215. *a. b*.
- Flemings*; whether or not their writers are passionate. II. 437. *b*. What Comines said of them. III. 806. *a*.
- Flesh*: the Brachmans eat no flesh. II. 115. *and b*. 116. *a*.
- Fleury* (Abbey). When the Protestants plundered it, they found there a great many good manuscripts. II. 69. *a*. Some of them were sold to the Queen of Sweden, and the rest fell to the Vatican. *ibid*.
- Floyd*, the Jesuit, quoted. I. 745. *b. n. (49)*.
- Floral Games*; after what manner they were celebrated. III. 53. *b*. What passed one day between the people and Cato with respect to that celebration. 54. *a*. When, and by whose authority, they were exhibited for the first time. *ibid. b*. 55. *a*. How a fund was raised to defray the charges of them. *ibid*.
- Florence*, in Savonarola's time, was split into factions. V. 61. The great authority which that Monk had there. 57.
- Florentinus*, their ridiculous gestures and motions represented in a Comedy. IV. 10. *a. b*. It is pretended that they were more effectually converted by Savonarola's Sermons, than the Ninevites were by the preaching of Jonas. V. 57. *b*.
- Florilegium*, its author and use. III. 725. *a. b*.
- Florum* (a spirit of the order of Cherubims), his answer when he was asked what the spots in the moon were. II. 498. *b*. 499. *a*.
- Florus* censured for a gross fault which had not been taken notice of in the *Variarum* of Holland. II. 161. *a*. Commits a fault in Geography, with regard to the town of Horacka. IV. 662. *b*. 663. *a*.
- Flushing*, a city in Zealand, drives out the Spanish garrison. IV. 453.
- Focaria*; the use which the Latin of the lower age has made of that word. III. 736. *b*.
- Foe*, was the first founder of a sect among the Chinese. V. 202. *a. b*. 203. *a*.
- Fetus*: the formation of it is the most exquisite production of an intelligent Being. I. 305. *b. and n. (129)*.
- Fois*, a college at Toulouse, has neither Professors nor any other teachers in it. II. 95. *a*.

Fois

- Foix** (Paul de) why he refused to see Francis Patricius at Ferrara. I. 472.
- Foix** (Gaillon de) a true thunderbolt of war. III. 812. *a.*
- Folcmbray**, a palace built by Francis I, entirely burnt, by whom, and for what. III. 530. *b.*
- Folly**. Erasmus's praise of it is very well received by the public; especially by people of distinction. II. 810. *a.* It has been printed about a hundred times, more or less. *ibid.*
- Fondi**; Barbarossa, King of Algiers, besieges and takes it by assault. III. 189. *b.*
- Fontaine** (la) quoted on the jealousy of sisters. II. 701. *b.* Makes a sophism in defence of his works. III. 260. *a.* Is censured on the subject of Æsop's life, written by Planudes. II. 829. *a. b.* Has not adjusted his reckoning in an Historical performance, so well as Madam Scuderi has done in a romance. 830. *a.* He might have given a better account of the translation which Socrates made of Æsop's fables. *ibid. b.* Whom he owns for masters. IV. 156. *a.* One of his tales is taken from Boccace and Apuleius. II. 38. *a. b.* He does not always point out the fountain he draws from. *ibid. b.* His verses on the vain promises which Poets make to print no more. 83. *a. b.* His tales, how far to be condemned. V. 837. Condemned by the sentence of a magistrate of Paris. 807. 838. *n.* (10). So much the more pernicious, as the expressions made use of in them, are not grossly obscene. 847.
- Fontanus** (Petrus) an Adulterer meets with the punishment of Abelard. II. 8. *b.*
- Fontevraud**; the complaisance that was shewn to an Abbe of that abbey. III. 67. *a.* The family of one of its Abbees. V. 298. *b.* And her death. II. 67. *b.*
- Forbes** (John) see in the Dictionary, the article *Lefley*. III. 783.
- Force** (James de la) how preserved in the massacre of St Bartholomew. III. 180. *a.*
- Forresti**; Philip de Bergamo was of that family. I. 769. *a.*
- Foretel**. Those who take upon them to foretel things to come, are happy when they serve a Prince, designed for great purposes. I. 447. *b.* Whether it be possible to foretel things to come, which have no dependence upon a necessary cause. II. 332. *b.*
- Formia** the capital city of the Læstrigons, built by Lamus. III. 786.
- Forms** (Substantial) a reflexion upon that doctrine. II. 250. *a. b.* 251. *a. b.* The inexplicable difficulties of it. III. 196. *a. b.* 362. *a.* Into how many absurdities they lead those who maintain them. IV. 266. *a. b.* Consequences that may be drawn from them. V. 594. *b.* 595. *a. b.* &c.
- Formularies**; the more general they are, the better calculated are they to prevent schisms. I. 718. *b.* It is difficult to draw up one that shall cut off all occasion of dispute. III. 390. *b.* People sign them every day against their consciences, in order to avoid imprisonment, exile, death, &c. V. 811.
- Fornication**; whether the magistrate has a right to punish it. I. 222. *a. b.* 223. *a. b.* The indulgence which is shewn to that vice. 222. *b.* 223. *a.* And for what reason. *ibid.* See *Uncleannefs*.
- Fortune**; one ought not to abuse her favours. I. 71. *b.* Her favours are sooner acquired by unlawful than by lawful means. 224. *b.* Fraudulent ways of making one's fortune. 271. *a. b.* People debate as much as they can the birth of those whom she raises to the highest dignities. 350. *b.* People often complain without reason of what they call her caprices. 698. *a. b.* The system of the Atheists is inconsistent with the account that is given of such a being. II. 419. *b.* 438. *a.* IV. 55. *a. b.* She resembles women in this, that she prefers young persons to the old. II. 438. *a.* Scioptius unreasonably acts the part of a Divine upon this head. *ibid.* She loves to have her favours snatched from her. 736. *a.* Is never so much honoured, as when cursed and reviled. III. 428. *b.* 429. *a.* What Pliny says of Fortune. IV. 933. *b.* 934. *a.* She has among her creatures some that are elect, and some that are reprobate. 460. *b.* How a man ought to behave to her. *ibid.* Complaints against her. 477. and *b.* 478. *a.* A sacrifice which the Roman ladies offered to her. V. 130. *a.* What the Ancients said of her influence. 367. *b.* &c. Whether she favours some in a manner independent on their prudence, and persecutes others in a manner independent on their imprudence. 368. *a. b.* &c. It is hard to know what to make of her. 369. *b.* 370. *a. b.* The idea which the Pagans formed of her. 367. *b.* 368. *a. b.* 369. *a. b.* People often impute to her what they ought to charge on their own imprudence. 372. *a.* But on several occasions a man that is unhappy by his own fault, has as much right to complain of Fortune as an unfortunate man, who has punctually discharged his duty. *ibid.*
- Forum**; there was a time when people could not have their statues placed there without a special privilege. II. 290. *b.*
- Fossense**; her intrigue with Henry the Great. IV. 335. *b.* 336. *a.*
- Foucher**, Canon of Dijon quoted. II. 331. *b.* 332. *a.* *n.* (101), (102), (104).
- Fougasse** has translated into French the first century of Boccacini's *Ragguagli di Parnasso*. II. 38. *n.* (a).
- Founders** of orders, have generally had female votaries, who constantly attended them. III. 888. *b.*
- Fountains** which had a singular property. III. 636. *a. b.* 644. *a. b.*
- Fracastor** dedicates one of his pieces to Marc Antony Flaminius, and to Galeacius Florimont. III. 58.
- France**; the Prelates of that country have not the liberty of proposing what they please in their assemblies. I. 157. *a. b.* Carried on a correspondence with Count Tekeli. 171. *a.* Chose to wage war with the edict of Nantes, rather than with the house of Austria. 305. *b.* From whom its Kings are derived according to some. 529. *a. b.* 530. *a. b.* Has been full of seditious preachers. II. 95. 101. *b.* 102. *a.* And exposed to horrible factions. 208. *b.* 209. *a.* Was formerly a state like the empire of Germany. 222. *a.* The court of France sends an Ambassador extraordinary to the States General, in favour of the house of Orange. 153. *b.* Formerly its Kings were not of age till twenty-one years complete. 381. Was bubbled, and shamefully betrayed in a treaty of peace. 443. Its monarchy brought to the brink of ruin, by the immoderate ambition of the branch of Burgundy. 462. *b.* 463. *a.* Makes a peace which was very dishonourable in some respects. 739. *b.* 740. *a. b.* Goes upon the ancient maxim *Divide & impera*. III. 851. *a.* Not lawful for its Kings to marry bastards. 797. *b.* Makes a peace with England, that was more useful than glorious. 800. *a. b.* More money raised in it by Lewis XI, than by any of his predecessors. 800. Why its subjects are more quiet at this time than ever they were. 815. *a. b.* A great slavery for the court of France to want the Pope's bull for the making of Bishops. IV. 100. *a.* Its limits in the county of Rouffillon. 102. *b.* Was very unfortunate in the XVth and XVIth centuries. 310. *a. b.* The office of Prime Minister there compared to a net, in which all madmen are caught. V. 95. *a.* There is hardly a word of truth in what is related of its Kings before Clovis. 494. *b. n.* (13). France is become more Popish between the year 1690, and the year 1701. II. 125. *a. b.* A new plan upon which John du Tillet undertakes to write the History of France. V. 351.
- Frankfort**; the magistrates of that city order a speech to be struck out of the catalogue of their fair. III. 169. *b.* The Dutch congregation there is entirely dispersed by persecution. 173. The Jews are driven from thence by popular commotions. 387. The divisions of the Reformed Church there. V. 450. *b.*
- Frankfort upon the Oder**, when its university was erected. III. 539.
- Franché-Comté** and the seventeen provinces of the Low-Countries, made up the circle of Burgundy. II. 222. Conquered in the year 1674. IV. 211. *b.*
- Francis I**, King of France, an extemporary harangue made to him by Alcimus. I. 194. *b.* 195. *a.* Whether he enquired what an Aristotelian Philosopher was. II. 6. *b.* Makes a progress to the coasts of Normandy. II. 6. *b.* Makes a progress to the coasts of Normandy in hopes of finding a cool air. 189. The mandy in hopes of finding a cool air. 189. The evasion which he made use of to curry favour with the Protestants. I. 721. II. 261. *b.* 262. *a.* His indignation upon reading a passage of Dante. 296. His soul goes directly to Heaven without stopping.

- ping at Purgatory. 372. *b.* 373. *a.* The merry reason which his steward gave for it to the deputies of the Sorbonne. *ibid.* He boasted that he had never seen any learned man, whose knowledge he had not exhausted in two years. 374. *b.* III paid for all his cabals, to favour the amours of Henry VIII. 435. *a.* Desires one of his mistresses to return some jewels, which having received in ingots, he sends back again to her, and approves of her conduct. 462. *a. b.* What we are told concerning his amours with the Countess of Chateau-Briand. *ibid.* What we ought to think of the protestation which he is said to have made, with regard to the Dukes of Estampes. 845. *and a. b.* His complaints against providence. III. 89. *and b.* The prudent advice which was given him, before he came to the crown, by Gouffier Boisy, or Du Prat, or Mr de Grignaux. 88. *a. b.* 89. *a.* III served by his own mother. 90. *b.* The calumnies with which he is blackened. *ibid.* 91. *a. b.* 92. *a. b.* 93. *a.* He charges his children to revenge him on pain of his curse. 95. *b.* Judgment of the Histories that have been writ of him in his own time, or in that of his son Henry. 334. *b.* 335. *a.* He grew worse humoured as he advanced in years. 395. *b.* Was very unhappy in the choice of his ministers. *ibid.* Disgraces his favourite the Comte de Montmorency, at the same time that Solyman disgraces and puts to death his favourite Ibrahim Bassa. 588. *b.* Approves Marot's version of the Psalms. IV. 157. *a. b.* 160. *b.* 161. *a.* Desires Melanchthon to come into France. 185, 186. *and a. b.* 191. *b.* Receives signal services from his sister, and has an extraordinary friendship and esteem for her. 316. *a. b.* 317. *a.* Is something shaken with the proposal of a mass of seven points. 318. *b.* Whether his love for the Dukes of Estampes, began before his confinement, or after it. II. 845. When he was set at liberty. *ibid.*
- Francis II. The Protestants had been entirely ruined in France, if he had lived two years longer. III. 400. *and b.*
- Francis de Paula; a false miracle that has been ascribed to him. III. 95. *b.* 96. *a.*
- Francis de Sales has a great esteem for Peter Fenoillet, and gives him a benefice. III. 22. Said of Lewis XI, that he was a good Catholic, but a bad Christian. 809. *b.*
- Franciscans; a continual jealousy reigns between them and the Dominicans. II. 239. *a.* Very much puzzled about a book. III. 84. *a. b.* 85. *a.* Do not observe the rules of their order. *ibid.* *b.* 86. *a.* Preach absurd things concerning their founder. *ibid.* *and b.* Can have no property in any thing. IV. 198. The concern they had in Savonarola's affair, and the generous and open proceeding of one of them, in what related to the challenge about the trial of fire. V. 62. *b.* 63. *a. b.* 64. *a. b.* The advantage was wholly on their side in this affair. 64. *a. b.*
- Frankenstein faulty in his notes upon Priolo. III. 266. *b.*
- Franco-Gallia; a judgment passed on that book. III. 519. *b.* 520. *a.*
- Francker; by whose care the garden of that university was enlarged. V. 442. Who was the first that read lectures there. *ibid.* *a.* The disputes of that university silenced by authority. 817.
- Fraffen, Cordelier, would have been puzzled to answer Spinoza. I. 26. *a.*
- Fraternity; a fraternity or brotherhood, founded upon adoption, was no less an obstacle to marriage than a natural fraternity. V. 49. *b.* 50. *a.*
- Frauds (pious). I. 726. *b.* 727. *a.* 777. *b.* 778. *a.* 793. *a.* 796. *b.* 797. *a.* II. 176. *a. b.* 177. *a.*
- Frederic II, King of Denmark, rejects the articles of Union. III. 390. *a.*
- Frederic Barbarossa, and Lewis of Bavaria; Hungerus writes an apology for these two Princes. III. 534.
- Frederic, Elektor Palatine, created King of Bohemia. V. 677. Accepts that crown with the consent of the Protestant Princes of Germany. 678. Whether, in accepting it, he acted contrary to the rules of prudence. *ibid.* *and b.* 679.
- Freedom of Rome; those who obtained it, took upon them the name of him who procured them that honour. I. 610. *a.*
- Free-will; the different ideas that people form of it. I. 661. *a. b.* There are certain articles which it is difficult not to adopt, when once the doctrine of Free-will is embraced. 759. *a.* The definition of Free-will properly so called. II. 226. *b.* Does not hinder all the actions of man's will from being unavoidable consequences of Fate. 406. *a.* Was not possible to be explained by the system of Epicurus. 790. *a. b.* 791. *a.* His motion of declination did not mend the matter. *ibid.* *b.* 792. *a. b.* Carneades invents a more subtle solution. *ibid.* *b.* Some persons have made it a doubt whether a man was endowed with it. III. 374. *b.* The Thomists, the Janfenists, and the Calvinists, maintain the same side of the question here. 548. *a.* Difficulties upon this head. IV. 94. *a. b.* 95. *a. b.* 96. *a.* Whether it can be of any use, to solve the difficulties concerning the origin of evil. 112. *b.* 113. *a. b.* 414. *b.* 415. *a. b.* 416. *a.* 517. *a. b.* 521. *d.* *b.* 788. *a. b.* 789. *a.* Ochinus's labyrinths upon this subject. 390. *b.* 391. *a.* A doctrine which seems to destroy it. 782. *b.* Whether it be a good proof of the specific difference between the souls of men and those of beasts. 907. *a. b.* to 909. *a. b.* Victorious objections are made *pro* and *con.* V. 151. *a. b.* to 156. *a. b.* Reason is against it. 208. *a. b.* One cannot see how to reconcile it with the quality of a being that is created out of nothing. 212. *b.*
- Fregosa, the French Embassador, is killed, and false instructions are forged and ascribed to him. III. 91. *a.*
- Freher (Marquard) it is said that the Jesuits played him a shameful trick, and that he complained of it in a Manifesto which is not to be seen now. IV. 726. *b.* 727. *a.*
- Freher (Paul) his contradiction with respect to Geldenhaur. III. 148. *and b.* 149. *a. b.*
- Freignis (Nicolas) particulars concerning him. III. 105. *a.*
- French are very apt to let the life of an illustrious kinsman fall into oblivion. I. 705. II. 433. It is not true that they obtained a victory over the Dutch at Bodegrave. 43. *and a.* Besieged in little Leith, are forced to capitulate, and leave Scotland for ever. 146, 147. After having rendered themselves odious there. *ibid.* So disfigure proper names, that they cannot be known. III. 722. *b.* 723. *a.* Are driven out of Italy. 766. *a.* Have extremely magnified the part they had in the defeat of the Turks at the passage of Raab. 793. *b.* Their folly set in opposition to the wisdom of the Venetians. 814. *b.* They do not idolize their monarchs, so much as they are said to do. 815. *a.* Their genius full of vivacity and variety. I. 64. *b.* It is against their inclination to be tied down to one science. *ibid.* Whether a Frenchman may give the title of King of France to the King of England. 800. *b.* 801. *a.* Whether by so doing he declares his master an usurper, and renders himself guilty of Felony and Treason. *ibid.* St Romuald, Balzac, and N. Beda affirm it, and are confuted. *ibid.* *and b.* 801. *b.* They are to blame for having esteemed Guevara's *Dial of Princes*. III. 270. *and a. b.* Compared to the Romans by Langolius. V. 417.
- Friburg and Brisac remain in the possession of France by the peace of Nimeguen. III. 720. *a.*
- Fricius (Andrew) Orichovius disputes with him. IV. 411.
- Friderickburg; the Unitarians who had obtained leave to reside there, are ordered to depart by the Duke of Holstein. III. 902.
- Friends. What judgment we ought to form of those persons who keep even the least notes of their friends, with a design to take advantage of them, in case of a rupture. III. 553. *a.* The illusions to which friends are liable. IV. 272. *a. b.* Good advice that was given to a couple of friends. V. 148. *b.* 149. *a. b.*
- Friendship; an instance of a tender friendship. I. 525. *a. b.* 526. *a.* It is seldom of a very long continuance. II. 5. *b.* A rare proof which the wife of Augustin Niphus gave of it. IV. 379. *b.*
- Frisland; the writers of that country publish a thousand fables. II. 769. *a.*
- Freila, King of the Asturias, whether his wife was daughter to Eudes, Duke of Aquitain. IV. 283. *a. b.*

V Q L. V.

10 Y

Freissard;

- Freisford*; the harangue which he puts into the mouth of Joan, Queen of Naples, contains divers falsities. IV. 303. *b. n.* (49). Quoted. 897. *a. b.* 898. *a. n.* (1), (4).
- Frontenau*, a sect of Orators. III. 107.
- Frugality*. The extraordinary frugality of Agesilaus. I. 130. *a.* A remarkable instance of that virtue. III. 1. *a. b.*
- Fruterius*; the use that was made of his manuscripts after his death. III. 159. *b.* 160. *a.*
- Fugitives for Religion*; nothing more common than to see them ringing the alarm against the sects. III. 758.
- Fulac*, a small town, erects a school. II. 536. Is plundered by the Spaniards. *ibid.*
- Fulvia* receives the Roman ladies, who had recourse to her intercession against the Triumviri, in a very rough manner. III. 489.
- Fulvii*; the origin of that family. III. 114. *a. b.*
- Fumbling* is more used in the little towns, than in the great ones. IV. 461. *b.*
- Funds*: a kingdom cannot possibly preserve its reputation abroad, and keep its neighbours in awe, if the sovereign has not the funds in readiness. V. 659.
- Furterius* has committed a gross blunder in speaking of Cassius. II. 348. *b.* 349. *a.* The satirical strokes which he levels at those writers who live by their pen. IV. 843. *a.* His Dictionary corrected and improved by the Sieur de Beauval. I. 672. *b.*
- Furius*. The Furius of Catullus is very different from the Furius mentioned by Horace. II. 395. *a. b.* Vossius censured on that head. *ibid.*
- Furmerius*; the fact which he alleges to prove that the ancient Kings of Friesland were very long-lived is altogether improbable. I. 542. *b.* 543. *a.*
- Furstenberg* (the Prince of), his being forcibly carried away dissolves the conference about the general peace which was treating at Cologne. IV. 122. *a.*
- Future events*; those who venture to foretell them, are happy when they serve a Prince whom the providence of God designs for great purposes. I. 447. *b.* A wife man ought to be extremely reserved concerning them. 749. *b.* II. 749. *b.* The difficulty of foretelling them, when they have no dependance upon a necessary cause. 332. *b.* Those who take upon them to foretell future events are the most dangerous pests of mankind. III. 321. *a.*
- G.
- Gaboy Faro* (Aaron), a Portuguese Jew that was converted to Christianity. V. 539. *a. (d).*
- Gabalus* (le Comte de), whether that piece ought to pass for an original. II. 87. *a.* A fragment of it concerning Noah and his wife. 431. *b.* 432. *a.*
- Gaguin* does not defend Joan, Queen of Navarre, well against the calumnies with which she is blackened. II. 224. *a. b.* 225. *a.* Unjustly put upon a level with Paulus Æmilius. 764. *b.* 765. *a.*
- Gaillard* (Giles) turns Protestant, and publishes the motives of his conversion. IV. 884. *a.*
- Gain*: the love of gain occasions a great deal of meanness. I. 194. *a. b.*
- Galatinus* (Peter), a Franciscan, accused of having stolen from Porcettus Salvago. IV. 168. *and a.*
- Galba* would have been thought worthy of a crown, if he had never wore one. III. 405. *and a.* His complaisance to Mæcenæ. IV. 21. *a.*
- Galaxxo* (John) dies by poison, and not by over caring his wife. I. 404. *a. b.*
- Galus*, his objection against animated atoms. II. 779. *b.* He thinks it strange that Chrysippus should trouble himself to give a serious explication of poetical traditions. III. 648. *b.* Who was the first that translated his works into Latin. 775.
- Galileo* filed First Mathematician to the Grand Duke of Tuscany. V. 499. His bust honourably placed and respected by Viviani. *ibid.*
- Galiffard* is guilty of two overights concerning John Damascen. II. 886. *a.*
- Gallant*, one that meets with the punishment of Abelard. II. 8. *b.*
- Gallantry*; what is the greatest sin that can be committed in its empire. II. 602. *a.*
- Gallantries* of the Kings of France; the author of that work has adopted all the mistakes of Vasillas, and even made them worse. IV. 697. *b.* The first edition of it has more the air of a true History than the second. V. 393. *b.*
- Gallois* (le) censured for several errors with respect to Aretin's plagiarism. I. 435. *a. b.*
- Gall-nut*, certain insects produce it by pricking the oak. V. 499. *b.*
- Gallucci* (Father) confounds himself in the description of a fight. II. 130. *b.*
- Gallus Romæ Hopes*: a book composed under that title by Lewis de Mont-josieu. IV. 245. *a. b.*
- Gameren* (Hanard), who that author was. V. 236. *a. (a).*
- Games* (Compital) re-established by Tarquin the Proud. II. 163. *b.*
- Games* (Olympic), women were forbid to be present at them. I. 761. *and a. b.* III. 964. *a.*
- Gammus*; from whence that word comes. I. 633.
- Ganges* (King) put to death by the Gymnotophists. III. 311. *b.* The evils which happened after his murder. *ibid.*
- Gantois*. The Gantois reduced to reason by Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy. II. 214. *a. b.*
- Gap*; its national Synod orders that a new article should be inserted in the Confession of Faith, importing that the Pope is properly Antichrist. III. 39. *a.*
- Garamont* (Claudius) makes puncheons, and prepares moulds for the Roman capitals. V. 388. He was Tori's disciple. *ibid.*
- Garasse*; a passage concerning alabaster quoted from him. I. 174. *a. b.* One of his calumnies against Beza refuted by a Roman Catholic. 798. *a.* The pitiful shift he made use of. 799. *a. b.* His character. *ibid. b. and 800. a.* An impertinent story in his *Doctrina Curieuse*. II. 180. *a. b.* Another that is still more impertinent. 181. *a. b.* He vents a falsehood against Calvin with respect to Servetus. 265. *a.* Is a calumniator. 361. *a.* A train of his impertinences. 666. *a. b.* His judgment of Democritus and Diogenes severely censured. 667. *a. b.* His scurrilities with respect to the Antinomians. III. 597. *a. b.* 598. *a. b.* The liberty he takes to change facts in the History of Athenais. 780. *a. b.* How he abuses the authority of Præteolus to blacken the Calvinists. 936. *a. b.* Censures Pasquier, and takes occasion to give examples of a ridiculous ignorance. 908. *b.* Is guilty of several mistakes concerning some Magicians. IV. 939. *b.* 940. *a. b.* Publishes two violent satires under the name of Andreas Scioptius. V. 98. *a. b.* Is convicted of a gross mistake, with regard to Lucan and Tacitus. 282. *a. b.* Treats as an Atheist the anonymous author who concealed himself under the name of Antony Cornelius. 536. *a. b.* A suggestion of this Jesuit examined. 523. *Sc.* His mistakes concerning the *Querela Infantium*. II. 556. *a. b.*
- Garcia* (Martin) causes the Alcoran to be translated into the language of Arragon. I. 326.
- Gard* (Guy de la) translates into French Raduel's discourse on the marriage of men of letters, and gives it a wrong title. I. 604. *a. b.*
- Garden* (George) writes the life of John Forbes. III. 69.
- Gardens of Adonis* pass into a proverb. I. 114. *b.* And those of Alcinous likewise. 201. *a.*
- Gardis* (de la) traduced by Typotius. V. 374. *a. b.* 375. *a. b.*
- Gardiner* deposed in the reign of Edward VI, for not supporting the rights of the crown. IV. 692. *a.* And restored by Queen Mary. *ibid. b.* A jest concerning John Poinet ascribed to him, but falsely. 694. *a. b.*
- Garlick*; those who had eat of it were not allowed to enter into the temple of the mother of the gods. V. 240. *a.*
- Garnier* (Giles), a man who transformed himself into a were-wolf, condemned to be burnt by an arrêt of the Parliament of Dole. I. 562. *b.*
- Gassarus* (Achilles), a Physician, was a true *Hæm Librorum*. III. 110.
- Gassendus* drops his design of writing a criticism upon Aristotle for fear of perfection. I. 470. *a. n.* (80). Censured for taking an ironical praise in Horace for a serious one. II. 389. *b.* His elogy. *ibid.* Whether he suffered himself to be deceived by the Latin translator of Plutarch, with respect to Carneades and Leontium. 782. *a.* None has wrote

- so well as he in behalf of Epicurus. 783. *a. b.*
 Wherein he differs from Des Cartes. III. 790. *a.*
 He was never in better health, than at the time
 when he should have died according to the predic-
 tions of the Astrologers. IV. 264. *a.* Was a
 dreadful adversary to that sort of men. 531. *b.*
 532. *a. b.* Peirefkius desires him to write upon
 the Astronomical operation concerning Marfeilles.
 678. *a.* Uses all his skill to enervate Des Cartes's
 arguments for the immortality of the soul. 718. *a.*
 His doctrine relating to the conservation of the
 creatures absurd. 886. *a. b.* What he observed
 with respect to Mathematicians, and particularly
 Geometricians. V. 620. *b.*
Gaffus (the Marshal de), a panegyric on him forbid to
 be spoke. III. 438. *a.* How he refuted the reflec-
 tions of the Abbot de la Riviere at the siege of
 Courtray. IV. 460. *a.* A saying of his. V.
 326. *b.*
Gauden is the author of *Icon Basilike*. IV. 221. *b.*
 222. *a.*
Gaulard (Sieur), tales under his name. I. 64. *a.*
Gaulier (James) multiplies the sects of the Protestants
 as much as he can. II. 434. *b.* Enlarges his ca-
 talogue of Heretics with the Melchiorites, an ima-
 ginary sect. IV. 193.
Gauric (Luke), what he declared to Henry II, in
 his horoscope. III. 401. *b.* 402. *a.*
Gautruche (Father), his faults remarked the more care-
 fully because he is in every body's hands. I. 77.
b. n. (38).
Gaza, what he did for Argyropilus. I. 442.
Gazetteers, their relations not to be trusted to. I. 15.
b. The most curvy ones may promise themselves
 immortality for the gross lies they invent. II. 265.
b. 266. *a.* 296. *a.* It is as difficult to reconcile
 the Gazetteers with themselves, as to reconcile those
 of different parties. III. 718. *b.* 719. *a.* The ig-
 norance of the Paris Gazetteer. *ibid.* and *b.* Their
 shifts to augment and diminish the troops of a place
 besieged. *ibid.* Those of the Imperial towns ge-
 nerally great liars. V. 504.
Gazettes; the former are more to be trusted than the
 latter in certain cases. I. 15. *b.* The invention of
 them was not the first way that was made use of to
 deceive the public. 129. Whether the Catholic
 Princes do right in suffering their vows and their
 pilgrimages in order to obtain a glorious campaign,
 to be put in the Gazettes. 161. *a.* Those of Am-
 sterдам are not used to celebrate the praises of the
 Popes. II. 475. *b.* They nevertheless praise Ale-
 xander VII. *ibid.* An observation upon the news
 which they contain. III. 271. *b.* The usefulness
 of an office that might be set up with respect to the
 Gazettes. V. 751. *a.* The judgment which Guy
 Patin passes upon the Paris Gazette. 752. *b.* Their
 use with respect to dates. IV. 211. *b.*
Gedicus has not rightly comprehended the true inten-
 tion of the author, who made it a doubt whether
 women were human creatures. III. 143. *a. b.*
Gela; by whom that city was built. III. 157. *a.*
 Its inhabitants send a colony to Agrigentum.
ibid.
Gelis (Theophilus) translates the Anatomical History,
 and several other pieces of Du Laurens. III.
 745. *b.*
Geminus (Livius), his infamous flattery, and his hor-
 rible imprecations. II. 703. *b.*
Genealogies; those of the Jews attended with insur-
 mountable difficulties. I. 41. *a.* Figures are not
 much more necessary in matters of Geometry than
 in matters of Genealogy. II. 133. *a.*
Genealogists, their impertinences. IV. 650. *a. b.* V.
 468. *b.* 469. *a.*
Genebrard treats Josephus as an impious person for
 having compared Alexander's passage through the
 sea of Pamphylia, with that of Moses through the
 Red-Sea. IV. 608. *b.* 609. *a.* A difficulty relating
 to the first edition of his Chronicle. 509. *b.* 510. *a.*
 He treated those who were not Catholics with se-
 vere calumnies. III. 733.
Gener, that word is taken indifferently in antient writ-
 ters, for father-in-law and brother-in-law. IV.
 644. *b.*
Generals of armies sometimes supply the enemy with
 an after-game. I. 764. *a.* There are a great many
 of them whose victories turn only to the profit of
 those who deal in mourning cloaths. II. 413. *b.*
 The Romans changed their Generals often. *ibid.*
 How much it concerns them to be diligent. 414. *b.*
 A political craft proves sometimes more useful to
 them than all their skill in war. 547. *b.* Their
 tricks to render themselves always necessary. V.
 126. *a.* It concerns no body so much as them to
 be free from the superstitions of Judicial Astrology.
 255. *a. b.* Too much circumspection is hurtful to
 them sometimes. 261. *a. b.*
Generation. The most excellent Naturalists before A-
 ristotle admitted no generation, properly speaking.
 I. 470. *b.* The relations which Physicians pretend
 to find between the organs of generation, and the
 throat. II. 636. *b.*
Generosity; a very singular example of that virtue. I.
 482. *b.*
Genest (St) ended his days by a tragedy. IV. 487. *b.*
n. (37).
Genova; a false preface of Scaliger with respect to
 that city. I. 794. *a. b.* Disorders prevailed there,
 notwithstanding the reformation of doctrine. II.
 264. The Italian Consistory draws up articles of
 Faith there. III. 152. *a.* Its academy resolves to
 admit no other system but that of Aristotle. IV.
 240. *b.* When, and upon what occasion, a school
 for the languages, &c. was erected there. II. 274.
a. An oration which Broughton addressed to the
 inhabitants of Geneva. 150. *a.* A Greek and
 Latin copy of that oration. *ibid.* and *b.*
Genevois (the Prince of), why so called. III. 142.
 In attempting upon Beauvois he becomes his mo-
 ther's prisoner. *ibid.*
Genii; whether they may not preserve their species by
 generation. II. 66. *b.* Whether any such beings
 really exist. 350. *a. b.* The doctrine of the Hea-
 thens touching a particular genius that attends every
 man. 249. *b.* 250. *a.* What Cardan says of his
 particular genius. 318. *b.* A small pattern of the
 Platonic doctrine concerning them. IV. 689. *b.*
 690. *a.*
Genius; men of an extraordinary genius. II. 661. *b.*
 662. *a.* That kind of genius which inclines to
 sport and toy with the Muses, is generally a pre-
 servative against the ill effects of too strong an ap-
 plication to study. III. 883.
Gennadius, Patriarch of Constantinople, receives the
 crozier from the hands of Mahomet II himself.
 IV. 53. *a.*
Genoa; that city, from Luitprandus's time, was rather
 called *Janna* than *Genoa*, and for what reason. I.
 614. *a.* Desires to have Charles VII for her Lord.
 II. 464. *a.*
Gentiles; one does not know what the Fathers dream-
 ed of, in some of their arguments against them. II.
 498. *a.*
Gentilis; his differences with Calvin are more parti-
 cularly described in the French than in the Latin
 life of Calvin. II. 274. *b.*
Genius, King of Illyricum, is led in triumph at Rome.
 I. 340. *b.* 341. *a.*
Gentlemen; most of the gentlemen of France come
 from a village. III. 137. *a.*
Geometrical exercises, a saying of Plato, that God is
 continually employed in them. V. 621. *b.*
Geometricians; the smallest degree of inattention may
 occasion a great many misreckonings in their calcu-
 lations. II. 388. *b.*
Georgians; their manners. IV. 33. *b.*
Gerard (Balthazar), what example encouraged him to as-
 sassinate William I, Prince of Orange. III. 601. *a.*
 He assassinates that Prince. II. 459. *a. n.* (27).
 III. 601. *a.*
Germain (St), Bishop of Auxerre, restored to the Ca-
 lendar by a decree of the Parliament. III. 897.
a. b.
Germanicus; to whom that surname was given, and
 for what reason. II. 716. What Tacitus says of
 him in describing his triumph. III. 921. *b.*
Germans; they require that the very hour of a per-
 son's birth should be inserted in his eulogy. II. 429.
a. But Roland Des-Marets blames them for it.
ibid. *n.* (1). Who is the most antient Historian of
 that nation. 743. The Germans, at a time,
 tricked by Pope Julius II. III. 614. *b.* Refuse
 to follow more than one profession at once. I. 64.
b. The losses which they sustained at the siege of
 Landau. III. 718. *b.* 719. *a.*
Germany; several Catholic Princes of that country send
 Deputies to Lewis XIII, to recommend to him the
 interests of their religion. II. 134. *b.* What place
 was

- was called the paradise of Germany. 816. *b.* What was the source of the war, which desolated Germany from the year 1618, to the peace of Munster. III. 657. *a.* It produced some famous Latin Poets before Conrad Celtes. 724. *b.*
- Gerfen* criticizes Ruybroeck's treatise of the spiritual marriage. IV. 942. John de Schoonhove and Dennis the Carthusian, write answers to his Critical Dissertation. *ibid.*
- Geruase of Tilbury* makes mention of the She-Pope, in his *Otia Imperialia*. IV. 738. *b.* 739. *a.* Martin Polonus takes from him the materials of his Chronicle. *ibid.* and *b.*
- Gesner* has expressed himself so ill in speaking of Tortellius, that he might easily occasion several gross faults. I. 433. *b.* 434. *a.* His inattention. II. 142. *a.* The books of an author which Gesner gave hopes would be published, have been mistaken for books actually printed. IV. 544. *a. b.*
- Geta*; their Embassadors who were sent on a treaty of peace or a truce, to persons whose wrath was provoked, presented themselves playing on the lyre. I. 83. *a.* They were the most warlike of all men, and for what reason. III. 312. *b.* Are in this respect a shame to the Christians. *ibid.* Treat Ovid with a great deal of humanity and civility. IV. 448. That Poet writes a poem in their language to the praise of Augustus. 445, 446. *a. b.*
- Ghost*. A Ghost which was said to have haunted a person every night. II. 522. and *a. b.*
- Ghost* (the Holy) why he deferred his coming into the world for ten days. I. 652. *a.* A mean and unworthy answer to that question. *ibid.* Among the Turks certain persons born of a virgin-mother, are called sons of the Holy Ghost. IV. 346. and *a. b.* The Popes moved Cardinal Pallavicini's pity, when they had no other assistance but his. V. 826.
- Gibbets*; the extraordinary height of some, and for what end. I. 591. and *a. b.*
- Gibius* (Father) enriches the works of Cardinal Beaulieu, with arguments and summaries. I. 786. *b.*
- Gießen*; the Landgrave of Hesse erects a college there, on which the Emperor did the year following bestow the title of university. III. 386, 387. The university of that town transported to Marpourg. V. 80.
- Gifanius*; a solution of the difficulties proposed about him. III. 158, 159, and *a. b.* 160. *a. b.* 161. *a.* It was he that wrote the life of Lucretius. IV. 476. *a.*
- Gifts* are commonly separated, some fall to one man's share and some to another's. IV. 758. *a. b.*
- Giges*; what his maxim was touching women who stript themselves naked. III. 331. *a.*
- Gil* (Father) a Jesuit, never knew any woman by sight. IV. 125. *a.*
- Gilles* (Peter) composes, by order of his superiors, an Ecclesiastical History of the churches of the Vaudois. III. 161, 162.
- Gymnosophists*, there were two sorts of them II. 117.
- Girac* censures Costar most injudiciously, I. 75. *a.* Does not act the part of an exact Critic. *ibid.* Does not reason consequentially. *ibid.* Is ignorant of what he should have known. *ibid.* and *b.* Explains Plutarch ill. *ibid. b.* Does not take the right way of confuting facts borrowed from the Pagan Mythology. *ibid. b.* 76. *a.* Quoted. 259. *a.* II. 813. *b.* 814. *a.* The judgment which he passes upon Amyot's translation of Plutarch. I. 259. *a. b.* He contrives into treason a passage of Costar's reply. III. 399. *a.* Justly censures Costar with respect to the two vessels of Jupiter. IV. 93. *a. b.* The History of his quarrels with Costar. V. 341. *a. b.* &c. to 346. *a. b.*
- Giraldus* miserably confounds things with respect to Parthenius. IV. 483. *b.*
- Girardus* (Albertus) translator of Stevin's works. V. 236. *a.*
- Girl*. Whether a girl that should read lectures, would promote or retard the improvement of her hearers, by hiding her handsome face. I. 325. *a. b.* The behaviour of one that was a novice in the affairs of love. II. 513. *a. b.* A girl who contradicts her father's words as to a promise which he made in her name. III. 258. *a.* IV. 87. *b.* 797. *a.* See *Maid*.
- Giseric*, King of the Vandals, takes Rome, &c. III. 759. *b.*
- Gladiators*; their shews abolished by Honorius. I. 230. *a.* They hired themselves to the first comer to kill one another. II. 196. *a.*
- Glandorpius* censured for making three Consuls out of one. I. 612. *b.* For dividing one Poet into two. II. 354. *a. b.* He censures Rutilius unjustly with respect to the Parthian war. 348. *a. b.* His notion about the time when the law Fannia was made, does not at all agree with what Pliny says of it. III. 6. *a. b.* 7. *a. b.* He imposes upon the reader twice, in speaking of Fulvia. 119. *b.* His error in taking Hortensius for Sylla's Lieutenant-General. 491. *a. b.*
- Glaphyra*; her dream; with the moral reflexions which Josephus has added to it. III. 164. *a. b.*
- Glaſi*. It was a custom with lovers, in drinking to apply their lips to the same part of the glaſs, to which their mistresses had applied theirs. III. 867. *a. b.*
- Glyceria*, a courtesan, rallies Stilpo. V. 242. *b.*
- Glory*; men are extremely greedy of it. II. 298. *a. b.* 299. *a.* It is inseparable from what is useful in affairs of war. 413. *a. b.* Those who aspire to the same glory, may very well esteem, but can never love one another. 867. *a. b.* The desire of it is the last thing which a man parts with. V. 325. *b.* There is nothing more uncommon than for a man to know how to enjoy quietly the glory that he has acquired. 365. *b.*
- Glossographers*; the great authority of those who commented upon the Civil-Law. I. 66. *a. b.* 67. *a.* Their ignorance of good literature made them fall into divers mistakes. 67. *a.* Who was the first of the French Lawyers that exploded their barbarisms. II. 721.
- Gloves* of Frangipani, whence so called. III. 102. *a. b.*
- Gnostics*; one need not scruple to believe that they admitted those powers and principles which it is said they did. II. 251. *a.* The impertinent stories which they told about the souls that ascended up to Heaven. 751. *b.* They ridiculed those who suffered martyrdom. IV. 108. *b.*
- Goat*. A Goat sacrificed to a Poet by his friends, in a carnival sport. III. 574. and *a. b.* What construction was put upon it. 575. *a. b.* A she-Goat, the mistress of an Italian General. I. 675. *a.* The she-Goats of a whole country burnt, and for what reason. *ibid. b.* Whether the blackness of a she-Goat can give any particular quality to her milk, and whether it be possible for a man to discern that quality. II. 636. *a. b.* The drinking of Goat's blood makes a man look pale. 712. *a.*
- Gobelin* (John) his judgment of Flavius Blondus. II. 32. *a. b.*
- Goblet* of the world; what the Arabian Philosophers understood by it. I. 469. *b.*
- G O D*. The doctrine of the School-men, touching the distinguishing character of God, and of his creatures. I. 136. *b.* His name called the *Tetragramma*. 244. *b.* 245. *a. b.* What the Heathens thought of a God that had died. 281. *a. b.* God has each the ideas of an infinity of worlds, different from each other, but regular to the last degree. 311. *a.* An argument to prove his existence. 345. *b.* Not to know him is a less evil than to attribute to him what the Pagans attributed to their gods. 382. *a.* His vengeance is less dreaded than that of men. 435. *b.* 436. *a.* One cannot perceive his greatness better than by despairing to comprehend it. 461. *b.* Whether the incomprehensibility of his nature, is a reason for neglecting the worship of him. 462. *a.* A maxim of some people, that we never have recourse to him, except when we distrust the valour and prudence of the Princes of this world. 573. *a.* His fore-knowledge is so far from destroying man's liberty, that, on the contrary, it establishes it. 661. *b.* Whether the things which never were, nor ever shall be, are possible to him. 759. *a.* 760. *b.* 761. *a.* God in the Scripture acts after the manner of men, and this his behaviour is answered in such a manner as if he were really taken for a man. II. 247. *a.* To obey his laws out of a due regard to his majesty, and against the strongest inclinations of nature, is the most acceptable worship.

- worship that can be paid to him. 315. *b.* 316. *a.*
 A bold and blasphemous censure passed on his works
 379. *b.* In what manner the author of that cen-
 sure was punished for it. *ibid.* 380. *a.* The uncer-
 tainty of tradition upon that head. *ibid.* Every body
 does not agree that there is a necessary connexion be-
 tween his providence, and the immortality of the
 soul. 419. *a.* The Sadducees are a proof of this.
ibid. It is possible to believe in him, and at the
 same time be persuaded that shame is only founded
 on a positive law. 670. *a.* Every objection against
 his existence, does not convince a man that there
 is no God. *ibid.* *b.* How far his glory was profited
 by the Pagan Poets. 742. *b.* The most per-
 fect way of loving him, is to love him for his
 own sake. 780. *a.* In what sense it may be said
 that he is subject to laws. III. 462. *b.* Those who
 deny his existence have less right to deny Magic
 and Sorcery than others. 471. *a.* The great effica-
 cy of his word. 625. *a. b.* Some nations are igno-
 rant of his existence. 781. *a. b.* His spirituality
 proved. 791. *b.* The belief of his existence, with-
 out the belief of his providence, can neither be a
 motive to virtue, nor a restraint to vice. 923. *b.*
 The answer that was made to a Prince who asked
 the definition of God. V. 141. *a. b.* to 145. *a.* He
 could have made things otherwise than he has made
 them. 155. *a. b.* An objection against this, and
 the answer to it. *ibid.* As soon as he declares a
 new doctrine to men, the devil opposes it. IV. 46.
a. b. It has always been lawful and even necessary
 to prove his existence. 80. *a. b.* He is perfectly
 good. 416. *b.* 417. *a. b.* 418. *a. b.* 419. *a.* 572.
a. b. 788. *a. b.* The way to be like him. 675.
b. He is incapable of envy and jealousy. I. 311.
b. IV. 574. *b.* &c. It is infinitely more advan-
 tageous to believe that he exists, than to believe that
 he does not. 489. *a.* The desire of vindicating
 him has obliged the Divines to turn themselves a
 thousand ways. 523. *a. b.* Whether the doctrine
 that should make him the author of sin, would
 lead to Atheism. *ibid.* *b.* That system which places
 him in the highest degree of glory and elevation,
 ought to be preferred to all others. 524. *a.* Two
 opposite things lead men to the knowledge of him.
 572. *b.* An examination of what is usually said,
 that we must not measure his privileges and duties
 by the line of ours. 655. *a.* Whether it be as easy
 for him to produce a new soul every moment, as
 to reproduce the same. *ibid.* *b.* None but he is
 wise. 675. *a.* Whether he can lie or deceive. 876.
a. b. Whether it can well be concluded from the
 existence of God, that there are demons. 938. *b.*
 939. *a. b.* A reflexion on the incomprehensibility
 of his nature. V. 5. *b.* His immutability inconsis-
 tent with the nature of extension. 209. *b.* He
 cannot be the subject of inheritance of the thoughts
 of men. 210. *a. b.* He must necessarily be happy.
 211. *b.* Whether he be the immanent cause of
 the alterations in the universe. 588. *b.* A reflexion
 upon the consequences from the eternity or of the
 beginning of motion with respect to his existence.
 593. *b.* 594. *a.* Whether nothing but the eternity,
 of motion can prove the existence of a mover dis-
 tinct from matter. *ibid.* *a. b.* Facts shewing that
 it is lawful for the Orthodox to dispute about the ar-
 guments for his existence. 595. *b.* 596. *a.* He
 is continually employed in Geometrical exer-
 cises, according to Plato's maxim. 621. *b.* The
 opinion of Divines touching his essence and sub-
 stance being diffused through all bodies, is liable to
 a thousand difficulties. II. 100. *b.* He may be
 present in imaginary space. *ibid.* It was pretended
 that Savonarola conversed with him. V. 72. *a. b.*
 What the God of Calvin is, if we believe the
 Catholics and Bertius. 824. What the God of the
 Socinians is, according to Mr Jurieu. *ibid.* It be-
 comes his Majesty to speak with authority, and not
 to argue. 833.
Goddesse; a tradition that prevailed concerning mor-
 tals that lay with them. I. 314. *a.*
Godau; what he says of the facility in composing.
 III. 262. *b.* Attacked by a Critic on the subject
 of an hymn. 823. and *b.* 824. *a. b.*
Godfrey (Theodore) publishes John d'Auton's History
 of Lewis XII. I. 589.
Gods; their amours. I. 454. *a. b.* Their Pederasty.
 II. 482. *a. b.* 483. *a.* Reflexions upon the Hea-
 then system of a multitude of gods. 250. *a. b.* The
 VOL. V.
 Hebraicians pretend that they have all been taken
 from the Jewish tradition. 431. *b.* The false ar-
 guments which the Fathers alleged to destroy their
 worship. 498. *a.* Chimera's touching their original.
 673. *a. b.* The Pagans accused their gods of for-
 cing them to evil. III. 374. *b.* 375. *a. b.* 376. *a.*
 Their condition was very miserable. 641. *a. b.* II.
 788. *b.* 789. *a.* Great Philosophers have assigned
 for the cause of their existence, a being that was
 not God. III. 649. *a. b.* 650. *a. b.* Others have
 deprived them of life and knowledge. 653. *a. b.*
 Cicero says that they were formerly men. V. 411.
b. See *Divinities*. Knowledge their chief privi-
 ledge. 587. *b.* 588. *a.* I. 311. *a. b.* The Romans
 were less jealous of the honour of their gods than
 of that of their countrymen. 761, 762. The Pa-
 gans represented them under the notion of beings
 which punished one crime by inducing the offender
 to commit another. IV. 229.
Gods (tutelar) of towns were called forth by the be-
 siegers, when they thought it likely that they
 would be obliged to surrender. V. 185. *a. b.*
Goldast (Melchior) his brother murders a gentlewoman
 in the high-way near Straßbourg. III. 168. *b.* 169.
a. He inserts the *Defensor Pacis* of Marfilus de
 Mamburno, in the second tome of his monarchy.
 IV. 198. *a.*
Golius (James) was a good Protestant. III. 389. His
 profound knowledge of the Oriental tongues. *ibid.*
 525.
Golius (Peter) his voyages to the Levant, where he
 is treated with great civility on his brother's account.
 III. 389. *a. b.*
Gomarus; what Baudius prognosticated, would be the
 issue of his controversy with Arminius. I. 687. *b.*
 688. *a.* What Joseph Hall says of it. III. 343. *b.*
 He procures an edition of the *Defensor Pacis* writ by
 Marfilus of Padua. IV. 198. *a. b.*
Gombauld is rallied on his being ill lodged. V.
 401. *b.*
Gomen (Ruy) by what device he acquired the friend-
 ship of Philip II. V. 326. *b. n.* (10).
Gomorrhæus; what book it is. II. 588. *a. b.* 589.
a. b.
Gonzaga (Cecilia of) despises the pleasures of the
 world, and consecrates herself to God. II.
 551.
Gonzaga (Louisa Mary de) an Astrologer promises her
 a crown, and the prediction was fulfilled. III.
 826. *b.* See *Poland* (the Queen of).
Good surpassed by Evil according to Xenophanes. II.
 834. *b.* Whether it surpasses evil in the nature of
 things. V. 576. *a. b.* &c.
Good-fortune, one of the three qualities of a good Phy-
 sician. III. 487, 488. and *a.* Reflexions on this
 head. *ibid.* and *b.* Whether good and bad fortune
 are the effect, one of them of prudence, and the
 other of imprudence. *ibid.* and 489. *a. b.* Whether
 there be in human life good-fortune independent on
 prudence. V. 367. *b.* 368. *a. b.* 370. *a. b.* 371. *a.*
b. 372. *a. b.* 373. *a. b.* People call by this name
 and impute to fortune that which is sometimes the
 effect of prudence. 371. *a. b.*
Good (Public) a cloak for avarice. II. 259,
 260.
Goodness. What is the idea that we ought to have of
 perfect goodness. IV. 416. *b.* 417. *a. b.* 418. *a.*
b. Taken for simplicity. II. 164. *a. b.*
Good. Whether it comes nearer perfection to have
 a community of goods, or to keep every man his
 own, in order to supply therewith the necessities of
 others. II. 776. *a. b.* &c. People ascribe to world-
 ly good all the defects which the Pagans ascribed
 to fortune. 369. *b.*
Good souls take it ill that a book which attacks their
 party should remain unanswered; and they are
 not able to discover the weak side of a bad con-
 futation. V. 180. *a.*
Goose. A goose in love with a boy. I. 282. *b.* 283.
a. b. Another in love with a Philosopher. III.
 697. *b.*
Gordian (Emperor) Philip causes him to be deposed,
 and afterwards to be killed. I. 593. *b.*
Gordius, what preface he had of the crown. V. 310.
 and *a. b.*
Gorgias; to whom he served as a model for the lofti-
 ness of writing. II. 571. *a.* Harangued without pre-
 paration, and for what reason. IV. 784. *a.*

- Gortynians*, an Atheistical people of Phocis, the same with the Phleggyans. IV. 626. *a.*
- Gortys*, a city of Crete; by whom it was built. II. 875. *a.*
- Gospel*; Jesus Christ was willing it should clash not only with the religion of the Pagans, but likewise with their wisdom. V. 831.
- Gospel according to St John*; a Pagan quotes the beginning of it, to confirm Plato's doctrine. I. 255.
- Gospel* (New), several of Cardinal Palavicini's maxims are censured in it. III. 326. *b.*
- Gospels* published in the Anglo-Saxon tongue. III. 629. *a.* What Luther is charged with saying of the first three gospels. 940. *a.* 942. *a.*
- Gousselin* (William), French translator of Tartaglia's Arithmetic. V. 297. *a. b.*
- Goudron* (the Marquis de) marries a prostitute enriched by the great gifts of the Duke of Vitry. IV. 499. *a. b.*
- Gouffier de Boisy* put for *Duprat* in several relations. III. 88. *a. n.* (6).
- Gouls*; his answers to a criticism on a passage of his translation of Socrates's apology, examined. I. 514. *a. b.* A Supplement to the History of his dispute with Balzac. IV. 284. *a. b.*
- Governors* besieged always send to know where a King fixes his quarters, when he assists at a siege. III. 718. *a. b.*
- Gown*: an action of damages brought against a man for disordering the pleats of a gown. III. 492. *a.*
- Gracchi*; they transfer all the courts of judgment from the Senatorian to the Equestrian order. II. 710. *a. b.*
- Grace*; St Augustin, Calvin, Janfenius, the Thomists, were, at bottom, of the same way of thinking on that head. I. 106. *a.* III. 548. *a.* Bellarmine was likewise of the same opinion. I. 729. *a. b.* There is no system which can remove all the difficulties which are to be met with on that subject. 481. *b.* 482. *a.* The inamissibility of Grace determined by the Synod of Dort. II. 70. *a. b.* It has been said, that the doctrine of Grace is a sea that has neither shore nor bottom. III. 548. *a.* The weak side of this doctrine. IV. 846. *b.* 847. *a.* A person may err in this point through good motives. V. 153. *a. b.* It is a scandal that the disputes about Grace should produce so many divisions. 153. *a.* The cause of these disputes. 821.
- Grace* (Universal), whether that hypothesis be far from satisfying reason. I. 261. *b.* 262. *a.* The disputes which it occasioned. *ibid.* and *b.* These disputes are looked upon now with another eye than they were formerly. II. 584. *b.* See *Predestination*.
- Gracian*; two sorts of readers complain of his works. IV. 457. *a. b.*
- Grævius* is mistaken about the death of Francis Junius. III. 629.
- Grammar*; the not knowing one of its rules by heart, occasions a learned man being sent back to his rudiments. II. 404. *a.*
- Grammar* (French) more exact than the Greek or Latin grammar. I. 74. *b.* V. 327. *b.*
- Grammar* (Irish), who wrote the first. I. 718. *a.*
- Grammarians*: one that was made Emperor. I. 375. Another who thought that disputing on any material questions of Divinity, was so much time ill employed. II. 190. *b.* Censured for looking after the misfortunes of other people, while they are ignorant of their own disorders. 671. *a. b.* Grammarians and Philologists are easily provoked, and difficultly appeased. IV. 476. *a.*
- Grammont* (Marthal), how he talked of the Protestant religion. IV. 276. *a.* It was thought that he lost a battle on purpose. III. 59. *b.*
- Grand* (Mr le), his vindication of Sanders against Burnet. V. 43. *b.*
- Grandeur*. Our minds are not very capable of knowing true grandeur. IV. 669. *b.*
- Grandier*; what is affirmed of him in Mr d'Artignan's memoirs. III. 880. *b.* 881. *a.*
- Grangier* (Bonaventure) writes against the frequent practice of bleeding introduced by Botal. II. 99. *a.*
- Grape-stone*; Anacreon choaked by one. I. 292. and *a. b.*
- Gras* (Henry) publishes Antony Saporta's treatise *de Tumorebus præter Naturam*. V. 44.
- Gratitude* is not subject to the same laws among Princes, as it is among private persons. II. 755. *a. b.*
- Great men* are not so happy as people imagine. II. 219. *b.* 220. *a.* V. 581. *b.* 582. *a. b.* 583. *a. b.* In all places one should ever speak of them with respect. II. 754. *b.* It is necessary to watch the favourable moments for presenting one's self before them. III. 281. *a. b.* They easily make up their differences. IV. 698. *a.*
- Greece* deserves the epithet of *lying*, of *fabulous*, and of *male feriata*. I. 74. *a.* The General History of Greece is a book full of faults. IV. 581. *b.* 582. *a.*
- Greek language*, what work deserves to be called the treasure of it. II. 295.
- Greeks*; what title they gave to the King of Persia. I. 130. *b.* 514. *b.* A precept addressed to them to live in peace, to honour the Muses, and to compose their differences, according to the rules of equity. 208. *b.* They are reproached with being always children. II. 82. *a.* Decried for their false evidences. 303. *a.* Their affection for their own tongue. 517. *b.* In what respect the Trojan war was useful to them. III. 317. *a.* Being ingenious and voluptuous, they stood in need of a religion burthened with ceremonies. V. 814.
- Greeks* (modern) complain of the little affection which the Church of Rome has for them. I. 508. and *a. b.* Follow the opinions of John Damascen more than those of any other Father. II. 587. *b.* Their Priests falsely boast of a miracle every year at Easter. 746. *a.* What was the cause of the evils which they suffered at the taking of Constantinople. IV. 55. *a. b.* Four learned men of that country fled for refuge into France, under the reign of Charles VII. 169. *b.*
- Gregory Nazianzen*; an apology for him with respect to what he says of the kind of death which Aristotle died. I. 473. *a. b.* What he said of his father. III. 729. *a. b.* See *Nazianzen*.
- Gregory Nyssenus*; some think him author of the book which goes under the name of Nemesius. IV. 346.
- Gregory the Great*; whether he was a Benedictine Monk. III. 126. *a. b.* &c. By what means he was found out in his solitude. 219. *a.* Whether he was obliged to revoke the law of Celibacy. 225. *a. b.* He once doubted of the resurrection. 267. *a.* A book of *Radulphus Flaviacensis* ascribed to him. IV. 824. The ablest men of the Church of Rome confute now-a-days the story that is told of this Pope's having delivered the soul of Trajan from Hell. V. 397. and *a. b.*
- Gregory V*, Pope, how he was a near relation to Otho: IV. 428. *a. b.*
- Gregory VII*, Pope; a supplement to one of the remarks in his article. III. 517. *b.* Another supplement. IV. 296. *a. b.* 297. and *a. b.*
- Gregory XI*, Pope; complains to the Deputies of the Faculty of Theology at Paris, against the French translation of the *Defensor Pacis* of Marfilas of Padua. IV. 198. *b.*
- Gregory* (Peter) did not understand the author he cites in speaking of Diagoras. II. 655. *b.*
- Grim* (Egbert) quotes the testimony of 135 writers for the story of Pope Joan. III. 78. *b.*
- Gryneus*; famous men of that name. III. 255. *b.*
- Grind*; what the signification of that word is among the Hebrews. V. 37. *a. b.*
- Grifons*; their edict against Heretics. III. 757. *a.* They publish an edict against the Heretics, and Scipio Lentulus writes an apology for it. 758.
- Groendal*; Ruysbroeck founds a convent of Canons-Regular of the order of St Augustin at Groendal. IV. 942.
- Groningen*. Who first preached the reformation in the territory of Groningen. I. 238. *a.* And in the great church, after the reduction of that place to the power of the States-General. *ibid.* *b.* The Lutherans there drive out all those who followed the Reformation of Calvin. II. 768. That city associates itself with the United-Provinces. *ibid.* Erects its college into an university. *ibid.* Defends itself vigorously against the Bishop of Munster, and when. IV. 211. *b.*

Gropfer

- Gropper* betrays his master. V. 559. *b.* Compared to Judas, and accused of having strangled himself. *ibid.*
- Gros* (Valerius) defends the Vaudois against the Prior Rorencio. IV. 917. *b.*
- Grotius*; whether one has reason to be surprized at his taking Caligula for that man of sin whom St Paul describes. II. 257. *n.* (i). He was in the wrong not to have sent a copy of his history to his friends. 283. *a. b.* What made King Gustavus resolve to make use of him. III. 247. *a.* His book *de Veritate Christianæ Religionis*. 394. *a.* What he says with respect to the succours which the Spanish Ambassador solicited in England for the Duke of Rohan. 397. *b.* The confession which he makes use of to refute Mahometanism. IV. 28. *a. b.* He is accused of not speaking with respect enough of the rights of Kings. 120. *a.* It was said that he followed the religion of learned or prudent men. 860. *a.* What he says of an external intelligence with regard to some of the actions of beasts. 913. *a.* An incident of his dispute with Rivet. I. 235. *a. b.* 236. *a. b.* Censured by Rivet, answers nothing to the purpose. II. 173. *b.* 178. *b.* 179. *a. b.*
- Gruterus* treated unkindly by Baudius. III. 254. *a.* And scandalously by Philip Pareus. *ibid. b.* How many cruel reproaches he threw out against one of his adversaries. IV. 476. *b.*
- Guast* (du) an arrant villain. III. 858. *b.*
- Guasto* (the Marquis del) exhorts Aretin not to spare his faults. I. 436. *b.*
- Guastala* (the Countess of) founds a fraternity, where a very singular method was taken to overcome the flesh. V. 426. *a.*
- Guineestre*; his fury and scurrilous invectives against Henry III. III. 294. *a.*
- Guelderland* (the province of) erects an university at Harderwic. III. 361.
- Guercbe* (Sylvester de la), though not learned himself, had a great affection for learned men. III. 60. *a. b.*
- Guercbi* (Mademoiselle de), the history of her amours and death. IV. 498. *b.* 499. *a. b.*
- Gueret* (John), a Jesuit; the Professor under whom John Chaffel had studied Philosophy. II. 456. *a. b.* 457. *a.* Is put to the torture, confesses nothing, and is banished for ever. *ibid. b.*
- Guevara* (Antony de) imposes upon men of sense by his falacies. III. 705. *b.* His severe rebuke to the Bishop of Zamora. IV. 456. *a. b.* He has published an infinite number of falsehoods. 927. *a. b.* A Spanish impostor. II. 400. *a.* Fathers upon Dion a falsehood touching Caligula's nurse. *ibid.* Des Caurres robs him of several things without naming him. *ibid.* He trumps up an history of Marcus Aurelius. 770. *a.* III. 270. *a. b.*
- Guibetel* (Jourdain) confutes Huarte's *Trial of Wits*. III. 528. *b.* 529. *a. b.*
- Guicciardin* (Francis), his History put in the Index, and for what reason. III. 273. *a.* Was naturally averse to jesting. 274. *b.* He shews too great an inclination to excuse Savonarola. V. 62. *b.* 63. *a.* Amply quoted with respect to that Monk's affair. 58. *b.* 64. *b.* Censured on that head. 65. *a. b.*
- Guicciardin* (Lewis) imprisoned. III. 275. *a. b.*
- Guichenon* refutes a pious fraud concerning the foundation of a monastery. I. 739. *a. b.*
- Guienne* (Eleonora, heiress of) is courted in marriage by the King of England, after she had been divorced from the King of France on account of her leudness. III. 794. The sequel of her adventures. *ibid. b.* 795. *a. b.* 796. *a. b.* 797. *a. b.* Is put in the catalogue of learned women. 797. *b.*
- Guignard* (John), a Jesuit, is looked upon as a martyr. II. 459. *a. n.* (31).
- Guilleminot* (John), his vain efforts with regard to substantial forms. III. 362. *b. n.* (6).
- Guillet* vindicates two great men ill from the reproach of jealousy. II. 299. *a.* Should not have attempted to apologize for the nakedness of the Lacedæmonian maids. III. 967. *b.* 968. *a.*
- Guyon* (Lewis), his rash judgment concerning the description which Niphus gives of Joan of Arragon. I. 399. *a. b.*
- Guyon* (Madam), an obscene story of that visionary. V. 857. *n.* (114).
- Guise* (Messieurs de), the title of Prince is refused to them. III. 285. *b.* Whether they had ever any thoughts of turning Protestants. 286. *a. b.* 287. *a.* The hatred which the Protestants had conceived against them. 286. *b.* 287. *a.* The persecution which they exercised against the Protestants. V. 478. *b.*
- Guise* (the Chevalier de) kills the Barons of Lux, father and son. III. 300. *a. b.*
- Guise* (Francis, Duke of), why his death wrought a great alteration in the Council of Trent. III. 871. *a. b.*
- Guise* (Henry, Duke of) killed at Blois. III. 408. *a. b.* 857. *a. b.*
- Guitaut* arrests the Prince of Condé. I. 184. What he said to Madam de la Trimouille. 264. *b.*
- Guitmond*, author of three books against Berengarius confounded with Guy Aretin by Vossius. I. 433. *a. b.*
- Guns*: what great guns are in kingdoms. V. 62. *n.* (f).
- Guriler* believes that Babylon shall fall in the course of the XVIIIth century. II. 125. *b.*
- Gustavus* (Adolphus), King of Sweden; a story that is told of him. II. 135. *b.* Grants a truce of fifteen days to the Princes of the Catholic League. *ibid. a.* The esteem which he had for a book of Grotius. III. 247. *a.* He calls an assembly at Leipzig, of Lutherans and Calvinists, in order to endeavour at an accommodation. 476. *a.* Received some checks in Germany. V. 581. *b.* His victories give weight to Braunbom's prophecies, which were neglected before. II. 123. *b.* His death sinks their credit again. *ibid.* See the Historical Dissertation on his life. V. 651. *etc.*
- Gustavus* (Charles), King of Sweden, had no design against the Catholic religion, when he entered Poland. II. 539. *b.*

H.

- Habermorn*, his *Anti-Valerian*. V. 741. *and a. b.*
- Habit*, how that of the maids of Lacedæmon was made. III. 968. *b.* 969. *a. b.* The fashion of wearing short habits. *ibid. b.*
- Habit* (of a Monk) does not cure a man of his inclinations. I. 345. *b.*
- Habsburg* (Rodolphus, Count of) is elected Emperor by a re-union of the suffrages which had been divided betwixt two other Princes. II. 377. And acknowledged by the Pope, who by threatnings obliges Alphonfus, King of Castille, to a renunciation of his rights. *ibid. and 378.*
- Haddarfeban*; what he relates concerning Abraham. I. 44. *b.* 45. *a.*
- Hadrian* (a Roman Emperor), relishes an old piece of flattery. I. 349. *a.* Roughly spoken to by an Architect in presence of Trajan. 376. Disperes the Jews in a very cruel manner. 648. *b.* 649. *a.* Looked upon by that people as one of the greatest destroyers of their nation. 649. *a. b.* Whether he was personally in the war against them. *ibid. b.* In what manner he travelled. III. 320. *b.* His gratitude to his benefactresses. IV. 692. *and b.* He caused his wife to be poisoned. V. 266. *b.* 267. *a.*
- Hadrian VI*, how he was elected Pope. III. 272. *b.* Was too scrupulous. I. 733. *a.* III. 326. *b.* Persists in his first opinion, that a Pope may err even in matters belonging to faith. 328. *a.* Was so far from running into the luxury of his predecessor, that his charge was not above twelve crowns a-day. 327. *a.* How he was dissuaded from demolishing the statue of Pasquin. V. 758, 759.
- Haemsted*; from whom that family is descended. III. 542. *a. b.* 543. *a.*
- Haerlem* besieged and taken by the Spaniards. III. 622.
- Hagar* is introduced into Abraham's bed by his wife. V. 54. *b.* 55. *a. b.*
- Hagenau*: which were the ten towns that made up what they call the Prefecture of Hagenau. III. 717. *a. b.* Subject to France. *ibid.* The French made it serve as a rampart in 1675. IV. 211. *b.*
- Hay* (Alexander), a Jesuit, is banished by an arrêt of the Parliament of Paris, and why. III. 333. *a. b.*
- Hailbrunnir* pretends to be sick, and for what reason. III. 656. *a.*

Haillen

- Haillen* (du) the reproaches which Du Pleix casts upon him. III. 338. *a.*
- Hair* the loss of it prejudicial to beauty. I. 292. *a.* III. 376. *b.* A man who had the power of moving his hair without any motion of his hand or head. 429. *b.* Whether it be lawful for men to wear long hair. IV. 22. *b.*
- Haicarnassius* (Dionysius) his own mistakes, in censuring those of Fabius Pictor, concerning the Tarquins. V. 290. *b.* 291. *a. b.*
- Halicarnassus*, who were the tyrants of that city. IV. 114. *b.*
- Hall* (Joseph) Quoted. III. 947. *b. n.* (126). What he wrote against Lipsius concerning his Histories of the miracles of the Holy Virgin. 846. *b.* 847. *a. b.*
- Hallier* (du) forced by the Duke of Lorraine to retire from before La Motte. IV. 278. *a.*
- Hamburg*, it's magistrates are very much troubled, on account of the disputes of their ministers, that divided the people. III. 504. *b.* 505. *a.* When that town began to have ordinary Syndics. 686. *a.*
- Hameston*, the only sanctuary of the faithful, during a certain time. III. 666. *a.*
- Hamilton*, (Patrick) the elogy of that martyr. I. 221. *a.*
- Hamilton* (John) an Archbishop, whether it be likely that Cardan foretold him he should be hanged. II. 316. *b.* 317. *a.*
- Hammon*, that god advised King Tementhis to beware of cocks. IV. 790. *a.*
- Hand*: what Anaxagoras said of our hands. I. 301. *b.* Several people send the picture of their hands in order to get their fortunes told. V. 285. *and a.*
- Handsome*: it is thought that Agesiulus II, forbid his picture to be drawn, because he was sensible he was not an handsome man. I. 130.
- Hangest* (Claudius) Calvin dedicates his Commentary upon Seneca's treatise de *Clementia*, to him. II. 260. *a.* 274. *b.*
- Hangings*, when, as it is pretended, they begun to be known at Rome. IV. 561. *a. b.*
- Hanover* (the Dukes of) discovers the impostures of James Aymar. I. 8. *b.*
- Happiness of man*, what is the formal and efficient cause of it. II. 780. *b.* Examination of Mr Arnauld's opinion concerning it. 781. *a. b.* It is one of the most evident Attributes of God. V. 828. Wherein Anaxagoras and Carneades made it to consist. I. 295. II. 332. *a. b.* Wherein Epicurus placed it. 780. *b.*
- Haran*, the brother of Abraham, how he died, and for what reason. I. 45. *a.*
- Harangues* very often displease those whom they praise. III. 823. *a.*
- Harangue*, who was the first that wrote his Harangues before he recited them. IV. 567. *b.* An indifferent one recited by an excellent Orator, may charm the hearers. *ibid.* The effect which one spoken by Callistratus had upon Demosthenes. II. 259.
- Harangues* formerly too much stuffed with Latin and Greek. II. 104. *b.* 105. *a. b.* 106. *a. b.*
- Hardouin* (Father) did very well to correct a passage of Pliny, relating to Lucilius. IV. 593. *b.* Makes a supposition concerning Pythagoras, that is inconsistent with the account given by Herodotus. 667. *a.* Prefers Plutarch to Varro and Verrius, with respect to some monuments. V. 288. *b.* 289. *a.*
- Harlai* (Achilles de) first President of the parliament of Paris, brutally used. II. 459. *a.*
- Harlotry of Rome*: the authors of such sort of books, are not original authors. I. 267. *a.*
- Harma*, what was said of that village in relation to Amphiaras, I. 274. *a. b.* 275. *a.*
- Harmony of the Gospel*, which goes under Ammonius's name, different from the Gospel-Canons. I. 269. *b.* 270. *a.* Whether Ammonius wrote it. *ibid.*
- Harpax*, the son of Boreas and Chloris. II. 82. *b.*
- Harpius* (Henry) his character. IV. 942. *b.* 943. *a.* Borrows a great deal from Ruysbroeck. *ibid.*
- Harperation*, a passage of that author corrected by Mauflac, which Vossius mentions as his own. I. 267. *a. b.*
- Hart* (Von der) his opinion of Cham's crime. II. 432. *b.* If believed might do hurt to the narratives of Moses. *ibid.*
- Hartnaccio* (Daniel) writes the life of Micralius. IV. 210. *a. n.* (2). Continues his *Syntagma Historie Ecclesiasticae*, and his *Syntagma Historie Politicae. ibid.* A criticism upon that continuation. *ibid.* and *b.* 211. *a. b.* Found fault with concerning Radulphus Flaviacensis. 824. *b.* 825. *a. b.*
- Hajenmullerus* (Elias) left the order of the Jesuits, to turn Lutheran. III. 555. *a. b.*
- Hatred*. That of sisters more violent than that of brothers. II. 701. *b.* A long digression on the accusation of a new Heresy, relating to the hatred of our neighbour. V. 642. *a. b.* & *seq.* An abstract of that accusation. *ibid.*
- Hautefort* (Madam d') Calumniated by a satirical author. V. 83. *b.* 84. *a.* But vindicated by the Abbot Faydit. 84. *a.* The sequel of her History. *ibid. b.*
- Haxart* (A Jesuit) his interest against the Jansenists. III. 245. *b.*
- Head*, a palboard head sent every year by the Egyptians to Byblus. I. 116. *a.*
- Heads brazen*, an account of several that are alleged to have spoken. I. 182. *b.* 183. *a.*
- Heads of garlic and poppies* offered in sacrifice instead of the heads of children. II. 163. *a. b.*
- Health*: better a little learning than no health. III. 342. *a.* Ought not to be neglected through a mistaken zeal for the service of the public. *ibid.*
- Hear/say*: ought never to be reported, but in two cases. I. 615. *b.* We ought to be distrustful of stories which have no other foundation. II. 475. *b.* What ought to be done with regard to such stories as are only grounded upon Hear/say. IV. 379. *a.*
- Heart*, the marks of a kind one. I. 464. *a. b.* It is malicious to search the intention of the heart, in order to judge of an action that is good in itself. IV. 571. *a.*
- Heaven*, the great men of Rome make a lottery of it. II. 713. *b.*
- Heavens*, objection against their motion. II. 29. *b.* Whether they are animated. IV. 872. *a. b.*
- Hebe*, what employment she had among the gods, and why she lost it. III. 131. *a.* 637. *a.*
- Hebraicisms*, according to them all the gods of the Pagans were taken from the Jewish tradition. II. 431. *b.* The proof which they alledge for it. *ibid.*
- Hebrew text of the bible*, when and why it was altered by the Jews. I. 173. *a. b.*
- Hecatombium*, what it is. I. 47.
- Hedge-sparrow*, Juvenal gives that name to a young fellow whose wife was unfaithful to him, and why he does it. III. 631. *a. n.* †.
- Hegesippus* attempted perhaps to ensnare the oracles. I. 132. *b.* 133. *a.*
- Hegira*, what that word signifies. IV. 27. *b.* 28. *a.* Is the *Æra* or Epoch of the Mahometans. V. 780. *n.* (10).
- Hegius* (Alexander) teaches at Deventer. II. 242. Declines the direction of the school of Munster, and proposes J. Cæsarius. *ibid.*
- Heidgger* did not well understand the thought of Father Merfenne concerning Hottinger. III. 525. *b.* Relates a pleasant story concerning St Germain and Loyola. 897. *a. b.*
- Heidelberg*, disorders committed in that town, when Tilly took it by assault. I. 239. *and a. b.* Its professors retire to Newstad, and why. III. 173. *n.* (a). The university there is restored. *ibid. n.* (b). The plundering of the Electoral library there. 252. The Pope's Commissioner has orders to transport all the manuscripts from thence to Rome. *ibid.* Ruined for opposing the Emperor, and for being faithful to him. IV. 475. *a.* Saved by Tilly's troops. 492.
- Heifer*: a brazen heifer which raised lust. V. 769. *and a. b.* 770. *a. b.*
- Heke*, a conduct worse than her's. I. 669. *a.* A thousand people talk of her, who know nothing of her being hanged. III. 367. *a.* Is guilty of a monstrous incest, which few writers have mentioned. IV. 402. *a. b.*
- Helensium*. The qualities of that herb. III. 367. *a.*
- Helinand*, a Monk of Fromond, when he lived. IV. 824. *n.* (b).
- Helioabalus* gave beautiful youths to his Magicians to be sacrificed. I. 348. *a.* Often eat peacocks and nightingales tongues. 370. *b.* 371. *a.*
- Hell*, the road to it as short from one place as from another. I. 308. *b.* All that was said concerning the

- the torments of Hell called fables and dreams by Cicero. II. 418. *b.* III. 743. *b.* And by Urceus. V. 515. *b.* Less than its porch. IV. 501. *a. b.* Prudentius believed that the damned have a day of rest every year, and that it is the day on which Our Saviour came out of Hell. IV. 787. *a.* If Spinoza had reasoned consequentially, he would not have treated the fear of it as a chimera. V. 216. *a. b.* Ruybroeck's resignation with regard to its torments. IV. 942, 943. *a. b.* Whether Trajan's soul was delivered from Hell by the prayers of St Gregory. V. 397. *a. b.*
- Hellebre* taken to render the conception free and serene. II. 328. *a. b.* A kind of it called Melampodium. IV. 183. *a.*
- Helisa*, the greatness of her grief, when she heard of Abelard's loss. III. 75. *b.* 76. *a.* What the Nuns of Paraclete do, that it may not be forgot, that she understood Greek. IV. 470.
- Hemithea* pursued by Achilles, and how the designs of the latter were prevented. V. 315. *and a.*
- Hembach*, on what occasion the Reformation was settled there. IV. 472. *a. d.*
- Henas* (Gabriel) his conjectures on the happiness of Paradise. III. 895. *a.*
- Hennius*, an head-dress of a prodigious height, which the women of the Low-Countries wore in former times. II. 544. *a. b.* What means a preacher made use of to put it out of fashion. *ibid. b.*
- Henry IV Emperor deprived of the Imperial Dignity by the Pope. III. 229. *b.* Forced to submit to the most unheard of indignities. 230. *b.* 231. *a.* Deposed a new. *ibid. a. b.* But at last prevails over his enemy. 231. *and b.* 232. *and a. b.*
- Henry II, King of France sends his protestations against the Council of Trent. I. 257. *a. b.* In vain courts the Swiss to renew an alliance. II. 195. Makes himself master of the city of Metz. 445. *b.* Undergoes interrogatories in favour of the Duke of Estampes. 843. Takes the title of *Protector of the German liberty*. III. 397. *b.* 403. *b.* Burns the fine house of Binche. 530. *b.* 531. *a.* And why. *ibid.* Is willing to give one of his daughters in marriage to John Sigismund. 533. *b.* Particulars relating to him. IV. 160. *a. b.* 161. *a.* His Differences with Pope Paul IV. 632. *b.* 633. *a. b.* Makes an edict against clandestine marriages. 636. *a. b.* To whose counsels the persecution of the Reformed under his reign ought to be attributed. 699. *a.* Employs against the Pope, a man whom he would have caused to be burnt in France. V. 457. *a.* According to John Bouchet, and the Baron du Villars, he was not the first who broke the truce of 1556. II. 104. *a. b.*
- Henry III, King of France, a discourse on the justice of deposing him. II. 100. *b.* Reprimands the Divines of Paris. 102. *b.* Provokes the Duchess of Montpensier by his indiscretion. 257. *b.* Endeavours to discover the author who disguised himself under the name of Stephanus Junius Brutus. III. 201. Some curious pieces relating to the action brought against him. 294. *b.* 295. *a. b.* Called nothing but Brother Henry in a certain Conclave. 410. *a.* Mysteries which were found in the circumstances of his death. 412. *a. b.* Particulars concerning the house where he was assassinated. 413. *a. b.* Forty-five gentlemen chosen for the security of his person. 857. *a.* Knew how to shew resolution and greatness of mind. *ibid. b.* 858. *a.* Was obliged to recompense the treasons of his subjects. *ibid. b.* 859. *a.* No Prince ever became more unlike himself than he did. IV. 132. *b.* 133. His inconstancy in point of religion. 333. *a.* Puts a barbarous affront upon his sister Margaret Queen of Navarre. 337. *b.* 338. *a.* A satire on his court, under the fiction of an island of Hermaphrodites newly discovered. V. 33. *b.* One of the most shameful passages of his reign. 254. *a. b.* An account of his death. II. 459. *a.* Acquaints the King of Navarre that his wife's behaviour had given him some uneasiness, and removes from about her the Ladies de Duras and de Bethune. IV. 341. *a.*
- Henry IV, King of France, the apology that was wrote for him, called a libel by the Leaguers. I. 739. *a. b.* Perseus's mistake in saying that this Prince entered into Geneva. 793. *a.* Ceremonies of his absolution. II. 100. *a. b.* III. 418. *a.* The Sieur d'Aubigné's raileries upon it. II. V O L. V.
100. *b.* Seditious sermons made against him. 101. *b.* 102. *a.* How he was prevailed upon to follow the advice which had been given him to go speedily to Paris. 553. *a.* His apology on account of the edict of Nantes. III. 209. *b.* A witty saying of his upon the Venetian Ambassador's burning some papers before him. 317. *b.* 318. *a.* Brings the Duke of Savoy to reason. 406. *b.* His conversation with Mr de Roui, about the qualities he thought proper in a wife. 417. *a. b.* What he is made to say concerning his wife. IV. 334. *a.* 339. *b.* 340. *a.* Did not deserve a faithful one. 336. *a.* Demands satisfaction for the affront given his queen. 338. *a. b.* And does not obtain it. *ibid.* 339. *a. b.* Through what motives he pardoned some of the Leaguers that deserved death. V. 27. *b.* Could not procure from his subjects the liberty of serving God according to the light of his own conscience. 35. *a.* A parallel between Cæsar and him. I. 631. Wounded by John Chastel. II. 456. What he said when he heard that that assassin was a disciple of the Jesuits. *ibid.* Looked upon as an excommunicated and relapsed Prince, a profaner of things sacred, a public enemy, an oppressor of religion, and consequently a tyrant and an usurper. 458. *a.* The absolution of the Pope not sufficient to re-instate him. *ibid. b.* How many degrees he was distant from the crown. *ibid.* John Guignard refuses to acknowledge him for King of France. III. 276. *and a. b.* Accused of negligence and even of fear with respect to the accusations against Guignard. 278. *a.*
- Henry II, King of England, in what manner he promised to expiate his share of the crime committed in the murder of Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury. III. 425. *b.* Breaks his promise, and why. *ibid.* 426. *a.*
- Henry VI, King of England, proclaimed King of France. IV. 730. *a.*
- Henry VII, King of England, a mad freak of his. III. 835. *b.* Desires Polydore Virgil to write the History of England. V. 496. *b.* 497. *a.*
- Henry VIII, King of England, censured in a passage of *The vanity of Sciences*. I. 150. *a.* Protestants and Papists ran equal hazard in his reign. 272. *b.* Opinion of the Divines of Wirtemberg, on his divorce. 657. *b.* 658. *a.* The design which Francis I. had to cause the Sorbonne to give a favourable opinion for it. 716. *a. b.* 717. *a. b.* Calvin complains of his being called the supreme head of the Church. II. 273. *b.* 274. *a.* He and Charles V. divide France between them. 435. *a.* Francis I. is sensibly affected with his death, which he should have looked upon as very lucky to him. III. 94.
- Henry d'Albert II, King of Navarre, begins to like the Reformation. IV. 318. *a. b.* 320. *a.*
- Henricus, a judgment of that work. IV. 808. *b.*
- Henricus (Lewis) his thoughts on the pleasures which the saints enjoy in Heaven. III. 895. *a.*
- Hens, what people first introduced the custom of cramming them. III. 6. *a.*
- Heracides, a passage of his treatise of Republics explained. I. 427. *a.*
- Heracides were forbidden to have children by a foreign woman. I. 135. *a.*
- Heracitus said that one and the same thing is and is not. I. 507. *a.* Conceals his writings in the temple of Diana, and why. II. 865. *a.* Says that the parts of the world live by the death of each other. IV. 525. *a.* Admits only fire for the principle of all things. V. 323. *b.* *a.* (23).
- Heracitus recovers by a treaty of peace the cross which the Persians had carried off. III. 425. *a.* What he did to vex Cosroës, King of Persia. IV. 350. *a.*
- Herbelet (Mr de) Regius Professor of Syriac, who it was that succeeded him. I. 756.
- Herbert (Baron) a great deist. I. 383. *a.* Scandalous annotations borrowed from a manuscript of his. *ibid.*
- Hercules, different accounts given by the Antients, of what he did with Diomedes and his mares. I. 17. *b.* 18. *a.* His stature judged of by the length of his foot. 104. *a.* Is called *The Lion of three Nigbtis*, and why. 206. *a.* A Greek Poet introduces him decrying virtue. II. 164. *a. b.* An idol of him put into the fire by an Atheist. 654. *a.* The zeal which the Agrigentines had for his statue. III. 158.

158. *b.* The prodigious bigness of his cup. 206.
a. b. There have been six heroes of this name according to Cicero, and forty-four according to Varro. 426. *a. b.* 427. *a.* Upbraid the Argonauts with their giving themselves over to their pleasures. 754. *a.* Whilst he digs the ground, he causes the head of a river to spring out of it. V. 76. *b.* The places where he was honoured most. 350. *b.* 351. *a. b.*
- Heretical Teachers*, whether it ought to be imputed as a crime peculiar to them, that they make use of methods suited to the capacities of the ignorant, in instructing them according to the false lights of their consciences. I. 478. *a. b.*
- Heresy*, whether obstinacy be its character. I. 477. *b.* 478. *a.* A contradiction, into which writers, who undertake to speak of conversions, are apt to fall in this respect. *ibid.* What Heresies were formerly the most dangerous in the opinion of the court of Rome. II. 545. Faults which are found in the catalogue of those of the XVIth century. V. 231. *a.* A common-place to assign them as the cause of the heavy strokes of Divine Justice. 473. *a.*
- Heretics*, all stories reported to their disadvantage are swallowed down, and numberless fables are raised about them among all sects, an hundred pious frauds are practised at their death, and many reflections made thereupon. I. 31. *a. b.* 198. *a. b.* 726. *b.* 727. *a.* 780. *a.* 796. *b.* II. 373. *b.* 374. *a.* Heretics who jumbled together the doctrines of the gospel and of the Philosophers. I. 253. Some people are satisfied, provided they can defame them. 290. *b.* Whether orthodox Princes can make alliances with them for the security of their States. 407. *a. b.* What methods were used against them by the orthodox Emperors. 476. *b.* 477. *a.* The ignorance or contradiction of a Protestant Divine, in relation to this point. *ibid.* It is dangerous to dispute with Heretics that are subtle and eloquent. 503. *b.* 504. *a.* Whether the Magistrates ought to punish them. 789. *a. b.* The reproaches which the French and Spaniards mutually sling upon each other concerning their alliances with Heretics. II. 338. *a. b.* Upon several occasions a man appears to be an Heretic only by his manner of expressing himself. 455. *a.* Reflexion on the punishments which some pretend should be inflicted on them. III. 147. *a. b.* Whether they ought to be tolerated in the same manner as Infidels are. 220. *a. b.* Scruples of the Church of Rome about the praises bestowed upon them. 438. *b.* 439. *a.* Those who write catalogues of them are commonly guilty of three pieces of injustice. 443. *b.* 444. *a. b.* Tolerated by the Emperor Julian. 585. *a. b.* The use of penal laws against them. IV. 96. *a. b.* 97. *a.* A dispute between Mr Jurieu, Mr Maimbourg, and Mr Ferrand, concerning the number of their martyrs. 108. *b.* as far as 112. *a.* Examination of all the pieces of this dispute. *ibid.* The usefulness of such an examination. 112. *a. b.* An account of the methods put in practice to convert Heretics. 373. *b.* as far as 376. *a.* Customary to suppose that they all come to a tragical end. 349. *a.* Whether they ought to be excused by the comparison taken from Judges and Physicians. 930. *a. b.* 931. *a. b.* Whether it be permitted to write against them in a fair, genteel manner, and to acknowledge their good qualities. V. 258. *a.* Princes do not preserve a consistent conduct with regard to Heretics. 457. *a.* Hofius would have them extirpated. III. 501. Accused of having corrupted the manuscripts of the Scriptures. 733. Accused of being almost continually guilty of some enormous crime. V. 388. *and a.*
- Hermadorvilla* (Henry de), chief Physician of Philip the Fair. II. 399.
- Hermaphrodites*; whether Adam was one. I. 102. *a. b.* Their origin, and the moral reflexions which may be drawn therefrom. V. 31. *a. b.* 32. *a.* An Hermaphrodite Monk that was brought-to-bed. 4. *b.* 5. *a.*
- Hermaphroditus*, an abominable piece. IV. 468. *b.* 469. *a.*
- Hermesianax*, an ancient Poet, writes love-verses. III. 779. *a.* And a Poem upon the city Colophon. *ibid.*
- Hermit*, one that let fall his Breviary at the sight of a couple who were diverting themselves at the sport of love. III. 63. *b.* 80. *b.*
- Hermogenus* took upon him to explain authors which he did not understand. II. 186. *a.*
- Heraclitus* never indulges his imagination more than when he makes Artabanus argue. I. 510. *a. b.* 511. *a.* Attributes envy and jealousy to the Divine Nature. IV. 574. *b.* 575. *a. b.* 576. *a. b.* 577. *a. b.* What Cicero says of him. V. 330. *a.*
- Heraclitus*, those of romance are very often ravished. III. 365. *a. b.*
- Heraclitus*, Homer had no idea of it. I. 81. *b.*
- Herald* (John) publishes Marianus Scotus from the original sent him by Latomus. IV. 728. *a. b.* (28). And Martin Polonus. 709. *a.* Accused rashly and ignorantly by Florentin de Remond of having thrust the story of the She-Pope into his edition of that author. *ibid.* *and b.*
- Hera* of an Epic Poem ought not to be buried in the Poem itself. I. 81. *b.* Ancient Heroes, dangerous fellow-travellers. V. 305. *b.*
- Herwart* (John-Henry) encourages Xylander to translate Dion Cassius into Latin. V. 588. *b.* 589. *a.*
- Hesiodus*, a man of a turbulent spirit. I. 98. The didich which was handed about against him. *ibid.*
- Hesychius*, Monks of Mount Athos. I. 89, 90. Are like the Quakers. *ibid.*
- Hesiod* becomes a Poet whilst he feeds his sheep. IV. 818. *a.* His genealogy of the gods. III. 649. *a. b.* 650. *a. b.*
- Hesse*, Fr. Lambert was one of the principal instruments employed to introduce the reformation there. III. 709. *b.*
- Hesse* (Philip, Landgrave of) his constitution obliges him to ask permission to have two wives at the same time. III. 942. *a. b.* The consequences of that affair. *ibid.* *b.* 943. *a. b.*
- Hesse* (Maurice, Landgrave of) rewards the dedication of a book of epigrams with an epigram. III. 880. *b.* See *Maurice*.
- Huicourt* (Marquis of) disclaims a letter which was wrote in his name against Mr Arnaud. I. 485. *a.*
- Hyccara* (a town of Sicily) taken, and its inhabitants sold. III. 699. *a.*
- Hilde* (Professor at Oxford) has wrote upon the religion of the ancient Persians. V. 635. *a.*
- Hierarchy*, Bucer did not condemn that in England. II. 171. *a. b.* 172. *a.*
- Hieres*, isles, called the golden isles. I. 407. Erected into a marquise by Henry II, for Gabriel d'Armont. *ibid.*
- Hierocles*, why he gives Ammonius the name of Theodidactus. I. 269. *a.* Draws a parallel between Jesus Christ and Apollonius. 380. *b.*
- Hiere*, King of Syracuse, founder of the city of Enna. II. 823. *a.* 825. *b.*
- Higinus*, a passage of that author proposed to the readers, in order to find out the meaning of it. III. 633. *a.* What advices he would have if Minerva gave to Penelope. IV. 543. *b.*
- Hilarion de Coste*, his omissions in relation to Queen Margaret. V. 532. *b.* 533. *a. b.* Quoted. III. 185. *b.* 186. *a.* (2). *and a. n.* (2). *b. n.* (6). 187. *a. n.* (1). 188. *a. n.* (4). *and a. n.* (7). *b. n.* (13). 189. *a. n.* (6). (4). *and a. n.* (1). *ibid. n.* (5). 530. *a. n.* (5). *b. n.* (13). 531. *b. n.* (26). (27). (28). (30). 532. *b. n.* (4). (6). (7). (8). 533. *a. n.* (10). (13). *b. n.* (15). (17). (18). *et passim alibi*.
- Hylobians*. A sort of Indian Philosophers. II. 117. *a.* Why so called. *ibid.*
- Hyperius*; John Pincier was his brother-in-law. IV. 647.
- Hypocrites*. Nothing is to be got by drawing their pictures and making them known. III. 204. *b.* 205. *a.* The most impious find Apologists. V. 58.
- Hypocritas*, the modern Apothecaries have profaned that word by applying it to the urine of their patients. III. 136. *b.*
- Hippias*, all he had about him was his own handy-work. II. 779. *a.*
- Hippocrates*, whether the letters that concern Democritus, which are among his, be genuine or not. II. 638. *a.* A paraphrase upon one of his letters by Alardus. V. 583. *a. n.* (105). Owes that he was mistaken. 791. *a.* (aa).
- Hippodamia*, the wife of Perithous. I. 538. *a. b.*

Hippomani.

- Hippiasus*. A dissertation on that subject. V. 766. *Éc.*
- Hippodam*. A Poet of a contemptible figure. II. 202. Represented in a ridiculous form. *ibid.*
- Hippus*, its inhabitants oblige Pinianus to promise them that he would embrace the priesthood in their city. I. 229.
- Hired mourners* who cried more than the relations of the dead. III. 842. *a.*
- Hirpi*, a people that walked upon fire. III. 466. *and a. b.*
- Hissers*, regulations to restrain their fury. IV. 646. *b.*
- Hyaspes*, father of Darius, applied himself to Magic. V. 631. *b.*
- History*, its privileges. I. 103. *b.* III. 460. *a.* V. 747, 748. *Éc.* Qualifications requisite for writing a good one. IV. 861. *b.* 862. *a. b.* 863. *a.* Writers of History are dispensed from taking an oath, their word being sufficient. I. 343. *a.* V. 748. Might clear up a great variety of particulars, without consisting of many pages. I. 422. *b.* 423. *a.* The undertaking of a general History a very difficult matter. 594. *b.* A proof of this. *ibid.* 595. *a. b.* The common fault of those who write one. V. 1. *a. b.* Whether it be permitted to relate infamous and abominable actions in a History. II. 31. *a. b.* A small matter suffices to metamorphose it into satire. 160. *b.* 161. *a.* The knowledge which is acquired by travelling, is very useful to those that compose a History. 168. *a. b.* In many cases Historical truths are not less impetrate than Physical ones. 543. *b.* We ought not to trust one written by a Domestic that has received great favours. III. 148. *b.* What rules should be followed in order to distinguish true and false facts in a History. 269. *a.* The inconveniencies of writing that of monarchs lately dead. 334. *b.* 335. *a.* In what cases it is lawful to write a History already handled by others. *ibid.* Reflexions on some facts that render it uncertain in a thousand things of importance. 856. *b.* Wherein the art of writing it well consists. IV. 126. *a. b.* Whether flatterers corrupt the truth of it more than satirical writers. 142. *b.* 143. *a.* Is nothing else but a representation of the misery of mankind. 424. *and b.* Whether the art of Oratory be of use in its composition. V. 328. *a. b.* There are authors who never would have draped of writing one, if they had not been prompted to it by personal discontent and modish passions. 362. *b.* By whom it ought to be written: great abuses in this respect. 747. 748. *Éc.* The respect which the ancient Romans had for it. 752. The difficulty of writing it. II. 310. *a. b.* A passage of Sallust on this subject. 311. *a. b.* More particularly that of our own country, and of our own times. 310. *b.* 311. *a.* If he who composes one ought to be void of all passion, he who judges of the work ought to be so too. 311. *a. b.* Books of History above all others verify that observation, *pro capto lectoris habent sua fata Libelli*. *ibid. b.* Cannot give pleasure in describing those things which gave pain when they happened. *ibid.* Is quite otherwise true than the reports of the people. 770. *b.* Writers of romances are obliged to follow it when they tell in a preface the foundation of their fictions. III. 166. *b.* Ought not to be handled, but by clean hands. 345. *b.* Its perfection consists in being unacceptable to all sects and nations. V. 846.
- History Ecclesiastical*. There is little order and exactness in it. I. 476. *a.*
- History fabulous*, full of contradictions. I. 78. *a. b.* 79. *a. b.*
- History of France*, who was the first that composed a body of it in French. III. 334. *a. b.*
- History* (Genealogical) commonly preceded by fabulous times, is often interrupted by some periods of obscure times. I. 750. *a.*
- History* (Roman) Paternus's abridgment of it is very curious. IV. 495. *a.*
- Historian Commentator*, we ought never to censure one, till after being instructed in the laws of History, and the privileges of a Commentary. V. 799.
- Historians*. Those who suppress certain facts, ought to be treated like those sellers who conceal what they ought to acquaint the buyers with. I. 13. Do not always stick close enough to the truth. 16. II. 763. *b.* 764. *a.* The ancient Historians took too great a liberty in altering and embellishing their memoirs. I. 39. *b.* III. 19. *b.* And accustomed themselves too much to relate things only in the gross. I. 422. *b.* An Historian ought to distrust pious frauds. 780. *a.* Historians deny all the facts by which they find themselves incommoded. II. 55. *b.* The laws which are prescribed to them are impracticable. 65. *b.* It is dangerous for them to speak truth. 284. *b.* There is little Chronology in most of the Greek and Latin Historians. 309. *b.* Are found to have contradictory opinions sometimes. 351. *a. b.* Which the Commentators have neglected to clear up. 352. *a.* Fall often into the sophism *à non causa pro causa*, than the Peripatetics. 403. *b.* 550. *a. b.* Particular Historians of a province are more to be credited than others, except in what is Apologetic. 463. *a.* Historians by their neglecting to circumstantiate things aright, throw us into inextricable uncertainties. 615. *a. b.* III. 485. *a. b.* The ancient Historians do not equal some of our Moderns. II. 550. *a.* Historians sometimes contradict one another so much, that it is difficult to chuse the best account. 635. *b.* Ought never to suppress any thing that may serve to discover their Authors characters, and mark the extent of their virtues and vices. 685. *a.* It is good to accustom young readers to seek among their variations for the ground of the greatest probabilities. 727. *a.* Are guilty of an unpardonable crime by suppressing some facts. 759. *b.* Deserve but little credit when they relate prodiges. 771. *b.* There are people among them as well as among the populace. 850. *b.* It fares with them as with travellers. III. 121. *a.* Their duty in relation to facts which they do not believe to be true. 226. *b.* 227. *a.* Have been very bold as to the speeches mentioned by them. 274. *a.* One of the causes of the variations which creep into their accounts. 314. *a. b.* The true character of an Historian. 336. *a. b.* IV. 861. *b.* 862. *a. b.* 863. *a.* Most of them are credulous and liars. III. 416. *a. b.* Very often vent the fancies of their own brain, in order to make use of their collections. 418. *a. b.* 419. *a.* Love to describe great events. 433. *b.* People seldom dispute about what religion they were of. IV. 104. *a. b.* 105. *a.* Ought to be disinterested. 258. *a. b.* Their variations about the most memorable adventures. 746. *a.* Ought not to disguise things through an affected modesty. V. 420. *a. b.* 421. *a. b.* That which charms most in an Historian. 263. *a. b.* And what is the most difficult part of his task. 264. *b.* Whether he ought to suppress the obscenities of those whose History he writes. 265. *a. b.* 266. *a. b.* When their mistakes ought to be excused, and when not. 359. *b.* 360. *a. b.* A satirical genius is incapable of discharging the duties of an Historian well. 362. *a. b.* Sometimes misrepresents the most essential qualities of an action. *ibid. b.* The modern ones are too prolix, and the ancient ones too concise. 744. Many of them perpetuate falsities. 748. *and a. b.* One of the causes of their illusions. *ibid.* Whether they ought to have gratitude. 531. *a. b.* Are often accused of being partial for no other reason, but because those who accuse them are remarkably so themselves. II. 310. *a. b.* It is more difficult to appear a faithful Historian, than to be such in reality. *ibid. b.* The imprudence of an Historian, who should dedicate his book to a monarch, whose misconduct he had taken the liberty to censure. 311. *b.* 312. *a. b.* Ought not to follow popular opinions, when they agree not with authors. 770. *b.* Ought to be perfectly disinterested. III. 345. *a. b.* Whoever conceives a resentment against a nation, ought to abstain from writing its History. *ibid. b.* An exact Historian always chuses his words with so much care that he does not leave his readers to guess. IV. 211. *a.* Morally and even naturally impossible, that they should all be silent upon some remarkable adventures. 734. *b.* Ought to relate not only the actions of Heretics, but likewise the strong and the weak side of their opinions. V. 810. Ought to describe people as they really were, and to suppress nothing. 812. Their highest glory is to do justice to their greatest enemies. 801. A great many people know no difference betwixt them and Encomiasts. 804.
- Histories general*, it is the custom of those who reprint them, to add such things as have happened between

- between the former editions. IV. 210. *b.* And when they find a continuation ready done, they chuse rather to copy it, than be at the trouble to compose a new one. *ibid.*
- Histories Sacred*, at the same time that the people were forbidden to see them in the book which contains them in purity, they were allowed to see them upon the stage, sullied with a thousand gross inventions. II. 477. *b.* 478. *a.*
- Historiographer*, is not to be trusted to. II. 131. *b.* A famous one who confessed ingenuously, that he did not know in what age Philip the Fair lived. 374. *b.*
- Hobbes*, his principles of Philosophy were not proper to rid him from the fear of the apparitions of spirits. III. 471. *a. b.* What he did to put the English out of conceit with the republican spirit. 467. *and a. b.* 468. *a.* IV. 581. *b.*
- Hofman* (Caspar) censured with respect to du Laurens. III. 746. *b. n.* (12).
- Hofman* (Melchior) Prateolus and Gualtier pretend that he was the founder of an imaginary sect, called Melchiorites. IV. 193.
- Hog* (Trojan) what the ancient Romans understood by that. V. 387. *b.*
- Holland* (Philemon) translates Bauderon's Pharmacopœia into Latin. I. 677. *b.* 678. *a.*
- Holland*, if Horace had seen the excessive care that is taken by the people of that country, in keeping their houses clean, he would have called it a false neatness. I. 187. *b.* Its states order a thesis concerning the sovereignty to be condemned. II. 688. *a.* Holland and Zeland offer to acknowledge Queen Elizabeth for their sovereign. 753. The Roman Catholics are promised a free exercise of their religion there. III. 675. *a.* It is the great ark of the Fugitives. 688. What a Turkish Emperor said of it. 806. *a.* It is difficult to find Printers there, except in two cases. IV. 476. *b.* 477. *a. b. n.* (7).
- Hollanders*, how vindicated from the accusation of having ruined the French army. III. 822. *a. b.* Had rather have the Spaniards for their neighbours than the French. 829. *b.*
- Homœomeritis*. The true idea that should be formed of them. I. 296. *b.* 297. *a. b.* Have consequences full of difficulties. 297. *a. b.* The very foundation of this hypothesis may be destroyed. 297. *b.* It implies many contradictions. *ibid.* Whether their formation requires an intelligence. 304. *b.* 305. *a.*
- Homer* censured for the speech of Phoenix. I. 79. *b.* One of his episodes has served Virgil as a model for one of the best passages of the *Æneid*. 80. *b.* Had no manner of idea of Heroism. 81. *b.* Obtains by his offerings a sight of Achilles, but cannot bear the splendor of the glory which surrounds him. 85. *b.* There are three verses in the *Iliad* which it is pretended are not his. 157. Anaxagoras was the first, who supposed that his poems were moral works. 306. He was too talkative and too downright. 333. *b.* Mysteries which are said to be contained in the two first letters of his *Iliad*. 374. *a.* Recourse is had to Magic, in order to discover his country. *ibid.* Arcefilaus called him his mistress. 408. *a.* His poems revised by Aristarchus the Grammarian. 450. *and b.* 451. *a.* And his two great works divided by the same author. 451. *b.* 452. *a.* The tradition concerning his death. 473. *b.* The Poets that have come after him, have made use of his inventions. II. 58. *a. b.* The ideas of reason were very much confused in his time. 139. *b.* Introduces a thousand mischiefs by his poetical impieties. III. 134. *b.* Describes no body by names borrowed from the mothers. IV. 232. *a.* His simplicity. 344. *b.* Does not make Telemachus speak with respect enough to his mother. 540. *b.* Two great provinces strive which shall have him. 594. *a.* Compares men to the leaves of trees, to birds and to flies. 657. *a. b.* Whence it happens that there has been so much difficulty in fixing upon the place of his birth. 924. *a. b.* Whether he has mentioned the Jews. V. 309. *a. b.* Was very ignorant of the globe. III. 787. J. Spondanus is the first that writes notes upon him in Latin. V. 224. *a.*
- Homonymy*, the meaning of that word. I. 232. *a.* Antient authors have wrote *de Homonymis* as well as Allatius. *ibid.*
- Honey*, who invented the secret of extracting it. I. 455. *a.* Its virtue for preserving health. II. 638. *b.*
- Honorius*, Alypius presents to him the request of the Clergy of Africa. I. 229. *a. b.* 230. *a.*
- Honour*, its laws looked upon as mere chimeras by a lady. I. 496. *a.* Some people want to enjoy it, and to have the glory of despising it at the same time. 680. *b.* What power the point of honour has over women. IV. 502. *a. b.* &c.
- Honfsdorf*, or *Hondorf*, compiler of examples of the Divine Justice. III. 573. *b.* 574. *a.* Cited. 165. *n.* (a), (d), (1).
- Hoornbeek*, that Divine's just complaint against the Antitrinitarians. II. 19. *b.*
- Horace* gives elegies to Homer which he does not deserve. I. 79. *b.* Cited with regard to Poets, that write in their old-age. 120. *a. n.* (2). Justified in his censuring Agamemnon for having left Ajax unburied. 161. *a. b.* Whence it is that he was so ingenious as to confess that he fled from battle, and threw down his arms. 189. *a. b.* Ridicules a Poet that made two hundred verses in an hour. 665. *a.* Makes use of a pitiful argument. II. 139. *b.* 140. *a.* 342. *a.* Is misunderstood concerning the laws against satires. 355. *a. b.* Whether, being himself an Epicurean, he could laugh at his brethren. 388. *b.* 389. *a.* Falls upon the admirers of the Antients with a *Sorites*. 494. *a.* Why he insults the Jewish nation, where he speaks of the miraculous stone at Egnatia. 745. *a. b.* A passage of this Poet concerning Fannius very difficult to be understood. III. 8. *a. b.* 9. *a. b.* A thought of his applied to the Guises. 292. *b. n.* (3). What he would have preferred to the reputation of being a fine writer. IV. 743. *a. n.* (16). What he says of those who affected to make use of old words. 830. *b. n.* (49).
- Horantius* writes a piece against Baius. I. 609. *a.*
- Horne* (John van), his notes upon Botal's works. II. 99.
- Hornius*, a mistake of that author's. II. 16. *b.* 17. *a.*
- Horns* (metaphorical), the Antients prayed that they might light upon evil-doers. II. 247. *b.* A very curious dispute about them. III. 631. *a. b.* 632. *a.*
- Horoscopes*, Astrologers who made that of Jesus Christ. I. 164. *b.* II. 319. *b.* 320. *a.* Their uncertainty. III. 401. *a. b.*
- Horse* which Pliny spoke of. I. 120. *b.* Mares which neighed at the sight of a painted horse. 369. *a. b.* A fatality which was said to attend the horse of Sejanus. II. 348. *b.* 349. *a.* Horses that grew better as they grew older. 309. *b.* A brazen horse that stirred up lustful desires. V. 767. A horse thirty-eight years old, whose master leaves him a pension, with a meadow, and his liberty. IV. 917. 918. Other examples of gratitude to horses. 918. *a. b.* Others. *ibid.* A contrary example. *ibid.*
- Hofmannus*, a chimerical Herefiarch which Moreti has given us, having been deceived by an error of the press. IV. 193.
- Hopinian* (Rodolphus) gives a very large detail of the variations of the Confession of Augsberg. II. 122. *b.*
- Hospital* (Michael de l'), his malis becomes a proverb. III. 506. *b.* Called an Atheist by some men. 510. *a.* Approved the doctrine of the Protestants in his heart. *ibid. b.* Discharged the duty of a Chancellor well. 513. *b.* 514. *a.* Supported the French monarchy by his extraordinary qualities. 865. Resembled Aristotle. IV. 504. *b.*
- Hoft*, a miracle which is said to have been manifested upon a host. III. 840. *a. b.*
- Hofstiensis*, the advice which he gives to midwives, touching the women they inspect. IV. 800. *b.*
- Hôtel de Flandres*, the place where they exhibited dramatical representations of the stories of sacred Scripture. II. 477. *b.*
- Hot-headed* men, how apt they are to judge rashly. III. 42. *a. b.*
- Hotman* (Antony) affirms, that the method of washing women who are to be inspected at a congress is deceitful. IV. 800. *b.*
- Hotman* (Francis) ill-defended by Beza. III. 523. *b.* 524. *a.* Turns into ridicule a question which Calderini asked his wife, and the answer that he gave him. I. 325. *b.* Criticized concerning an epigram upon

- upon Julius II. III. 610. *b.* 611. *a.* His complaints against Stouppa for want of religion. V. 247. *a. b.* Those that answered his *Franco-Gallia*. 417. *a. b.*
- Houliere* (Madam. des) cited. III. 393. *a.* What she says of Reason. IV. 440. *a. n.* (69). A ballad of her's. 503. *b.* 504. *a. n.* (64). The elevation and depth of her morality. 687. *a. b.* Gives way her self to the vanity which she blames in others. *ibid. a.*
- Houffes* (Noble), a book of John le Feron upon that subject. III. 27. *and a.*
- Houffais* (Amelot de la) refuses to reform Oflat's language. IV. 427. *a. b.*
- Howard*, Admiral of England, is the cause of the Earl of Essex's death, and why. II. 759. *a. b.*
- Huber*, his apology for the Hollanders in answer to the accusations of Cavalier Nani. III. 822. *a.*
- Huberus* (Samuel), Minister of a village near Bearn, gets himself expelled by his boldness in contradicting some of the doctrines of Beza. III. 535. *a. b.* Retires to Wirtemberg, and is expelled from thence for teaching that God has elected all men to eternal life. *ibid. b.* Retires to Ratibon, where, continuing obstinate in his errors, he is deprived of his place. *ibid.* Had the two chief qualifications of a good Disputant. V. 102. *a.*
- Huet*, Bishop of Avranches, why he did not finish his Latin translation of a Greek romance. III. 866. *a.* What he thinks of the character of these kind of writings. *ibid. and b.*
- Huguenots*, what sort of sermons they like best. II. 520. *b.* Party-Huguenots, and State-Huguenots. III. 39. *a. n.* (7). What opinions they were of each of them in the assembly of Saumur, and who the heads of those opinions were. *ibid. a.* An Abbot of the monastery of the order of Citeaux, who was a Huguenot. I. 737. *b.* 738. *a. b.*
- Humility* is not always found with the staff and the wallet. II. 665, 666. *and b.*
- Humorists*, how much their academy is esteemed at Rome. IV. 531. *a.*
- Hunaud* submits to Charles Martel, and has the Duchy of Aquitain granted him. II. 851.
- Hungary* (Lewis, King of), loses a battle against the Turks, and is smothered in a bog. III. 871. *a.*
- Hungary* (Andrew, son of Charles, King of), strangled, how, and for what reason. IV. 300, 301. *a.* How used after his death. 305. *a. b.*
- Hunting*, the Bishops of the XVIth century gave themselves to it very much. IV. 819. *b.* It was forbid them by the canons. *ibid.*
- Hurtado*, his writings are full of solecisms. IV. 829. *a.*
- Hus* (John), the advice that was given him before his condemnation. I. 165. *a. b.* By whom he was condemned to death. *ibid.* An account of his punishment given by Poggius. II. 277. *a. b.* Alledges the adventure of the She-Pope before the Council of Constance, and is not censured for it. IV. 710. *b.*
- Husband*, in what case it is a piece of leudness in him to come near his wife. IV. 761. *a.* A husband that is an author, may be either an easy husband, or a troublesome one. V. 380. *b.* 381. *a.*
- Husbands*: our laws do not suffer them to revenge the unfaithfulness of their wives, by putting them and their galants to death. II. 133. *b.* Should not be too long absent from their wives. 743. *b.* Antiquity represents those who were dishonoured by their wives as extremely good-natured. III. 306. *a.* Are very often unacquainted with the galantries of their wives when they are the town-talk. 381. *b.* 382. *a.* Are no longer affected with their wives beauty at a certain period of time. 646. *a. b.* Love their wives best when they do not approach them but by stealth. 964. *a. b.* Are kind to their spouses. IV. 220. *b.* Those who are impotent should, at least, be civil and complaisant to them. 760. *b.* The right which they had over their wives in ancient times. V. 427. *a. b.*
- Hussites* reproach the Roman Catholics with the story of the She-Pope. IV. 710. *b.*
- Hutten* (John) killed by Duke Ulric of Wirtemberg. III. 539. Is digged up four years after his murder, and bleeds when they touch him. *ibid. a. b.*
- Hutten* (Ulric) published an invective against Alcander. I. 215. *b.*
- Hutterus* loads Bucer with reproaches for his sentiments concerning Justification. II. 178. *a. b.*
- J.
- Jachens*, a subtle Peripatetic, brings the question concerning substantial forms into great repute in the university at Leyden. III. 361, 362. *and a.*
- Jacobins* of Cologne, how they were forced to give satisfaction to the Count of Nevenar. III. 473. *a. b.* Launoi said that he feared the Jacobins penknife more than their pen. 742. *b.* Those of Florence make a stout resistance when their convent is attacked in order to take Savonarola from thence. V. 66. *a. b.* The Council of Pisa promised them the canonization of this Monk, provided that they would declare themselves against Pope Julius II. 69, 70, 71. Their behaviour in the affair of Savonarola, when challenged to the trial of fire. 62. *a. b. &c.*
- Jaldabaoth*, what that is, according to some antient Heretics. II. 851. *b.* 852. *a.*
- Jambics*, a sort of verse, by whom invented. III. 464. *a.*
- James* (Epistle of St), what Luther called it. III. 939. *b.* Was suspected by a great many in the antient Church. 941. *b.* Althamerus attacks it with the utmost brutality. I. 235. *and a. b.* 236. *a. b.*
- James I*, King of England, is extremely angry with Thuanus for his History. II. 281. *b.* Commands Camden to send him a catalogue of errors concerning the troubles of Scotland. *ibid.* Whether Camden's Annals were patched and curtailed by his order. 280. *b.* 281. *a.* Causes Pareus's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans to be burnt by the hands of the hangman. IV. 473. *a. b.* Is cruelly treated in a satire. 795. *a. b.* His zeal against the Heretics. V. 509. *a. b.* How he used Lipsius's book concerning N. D. of Hall. III. 847. *b.*
- Jane* of France, prodigies which Father de Bony says were observed upon the dissolution of her marriage. III. 810. *b.*
- Jansenism*, what place it proceeded from in Holland, and who was its apostle. I. 499. *b.* What is its weak side according to the Molinists. IV. 846. *b. n.* (6).
- Jansenists*, the complaint that one of them makes against the Archbishop of Aix. I. 35. *b.* The reason of this complaint. *ibid. and* 36. *a. b.* Publish a pamphlet against Father Adam. 106. *a.* Those who censured Odoricus Raynaldus are themselves liable to censure. 179. *b.* 180. *a. b.* War raised betwixt them and the Jesuits. 498. *a. b.* 499. *a.* Some of them are drawn into Noordstrandt, which is attended with great law-suits. II. 111. *a.* The origin of their war with the Jesuits. III. 133. *a. b.* The bulls of the Popes do not hinder them from proceeding in their disputes. 390. *b.* Their Deputies, in their return from Rome to Paris, pass by Zurich, where they visit Hottinger. 526. *a.* Are very zealous in causing two decrees of the court of Rome to be printed. 567. *a. b.* Father le Tellier's Reflexions thereupon. *ibid.* The Jansenists compared in a sermon to bull-dogs. IV. 64. *a. b.* De Marca opposed them greatly. 101. *a. b.* 102. *a.* Are accused of Calvinism, for what reason. 123. *b.* Denote themselves commonly in French by *on*, and why. 492. *a. b.* Are looked upon as the best Moralists. V. 847.
- Janua* (Joannes de), whether he and Jacobus de Voragine are one and the same author. I. 614. *a.* Mistakes about this. *ibid. and b.*
- Janua Caelorum refrata*, what is made to appear in that book concerning Arianism. I. 476. *b.* Its author attacks *The System of the Church* in the title of a Peripatetic Philosopher, and quite overturns it. II. 540. *b.* What pretence was made use of for leaving it unanswered. *ibid.*
- Janna Linguarum refrata*, how many times printed, and in how many languages. II. 536. *a. b.*
- Japone*, whether there is any thing surprising in their having persecuted the Christians. III. 551. *a.*

- Jaqueline of Bavaria*. Her History. II. 211. *b.* 212. *a.* Marries Francis de Boifel. 90. *a. b.* Gives all her dominions to the Duke of Burgundy to save her husband's life. *ibid.* Died in 1436. *ibid. b.*
- Jaquinet* (Theodore) translates several of Joseph Hall's books into French. III. 342.
- Jardins* (La Demoiselle de) cited. I. 460. *b.*
- Jarrige* cited. I. 108. *b.* 109. *a.*
- Jason* chief of the Argonauts. III. 465. *a. b.* The conquest of the Golden Fleece is proposed to him. IV. 532. *b.* 533. *a.*
- Jason*, a Civilian, has given the Doctors of Law a very bad example. I. 196. *a.*
- Jaurisac*, raileries on him. IV. 284. *b.*
- Jaurisac* (John) assassinates the Prince of Orange. II. 459. *a. n.* (27). A Jacobin chuses rather to be strangled than reveal his confession. 460. *b.*
- Jhecu*, why he called the Lacedæmonian maids Phænomerides. III. 968. *b.*
- Ibis*: no piece ever discovered more gall than Ovid's poem against Ibis. IV. 451. *b.* 452. *a. b.* The best commentary extant upon that satire is Mr Boileau's. 452. *a.* The Abbé de Marolles dedicates his translation of that Poem to James Pinou. *ibid. b.* 651.
- Jarius* erects a statue of modesty. IV. 538. *a. b.*
- Jebe* (d') Governor of la Motte is taken off by a cannon-ball, whilst he defends it. IV. 278. *a.*
- Jem Baglike*, the author of that book. IV. 221. *a. b.*
- Iconoclasts*. Their proceedings against images, lessen the cruelty of the revenge which their enemies took. II. 512. *a. b.* Those that have wrote against them, have made the truth of their Histories suspected by their idle stories. 587. *a. b.*
- Ideas*: Malebranche's doctrine, that our ideas are distinct from our understanding, is an old one. I. 255. 555. *a. b.* II. 642. *b.* What difference there is between our sensations and our ideas. 781. *a. b.* Nothing is more difficult for a Prince than to answer the high ideas which a whole people have preconceived of him, and nothing more blasting to his reputation, than not to answer them. V. 654.
- Idem*: that word is sometimes used for *famile*. V. 214. *a. b.*
- Idolaters*, it is more surprizing that they have done good actions, than that Atheists have lived like honest men. V. 811.
- Idols*, who was the first that made them of clay. I. 44. *b.* What Democritus and Epicurus understood by that word. II. 388. *a.*
- Jealous*, those that are most so, trust their wives to the care of eunuchs. I. 31. *b.*
- Jealousy*, a singular example of its force. II. 277. *a.* The jealousy of men is not so copious in inventions as the love of women. 533. *a.* Disposes men so ill against the fair sex in general. 857. *a. b.* The rock which those who are possessed with it suffer. III. 643. *b.* Whether it be necessary in society. 965. *a.* Is not always uniform, in its causes and effects. IV. 48. *a.* Some considerations on this passion. V. 110. *a. b.*
- Jemison* (Robert) a Jesuit, challenges Sir Humphry Lynde, and answers his *Safe Way*. III. 971. *a. b.*
- Jeremiah*, a passage of his letter, as it is inserted in the book of Baruch. I. 597. *a. n.* (14).
- Jerem*, his friendship for Paula, makes ill-natured people slander him. I. 31. *b.* Said that the saures of beautiful women ought to be avoided by flight. III. 65. *a. b.* His maxims concerning marriage in general, and second marriages in particular. 192. *a.* How he explains what is said of David's taking the Shunamite to bed with him. 281. *a. b.* What he affirms concerning the shame that people ought to have of their own nakedness. V. 130. *b.* Was against young girls being ever absent from their mothers, in devotional watchings. 337. *a.* His invectives against Vigilantius. 471. *a. b.* Whether we ought to trust the representation which he gives us of that man's opinions. *ibid. b.*
- Jerusalem*, its destruction is a powerful argument against the Jews. I. 173. *b.* Its temple is tried to be re-built in vain. 228. The description of its temple is a very difficult thing. 618. *a.*
- Jesse*, the story which the Rabbins tell of him. II. 605. *a. b.*
- Jesters*, what those who have wit do. I. 128. *b.* 701. *b.* Prefer their jests to their frauds. 187. *a.* Never ought to rally upon a false fact. II. 527. *a.* Those who set up for jesters, find themselves obliged to divert people at their own cost. 599. *a.* Sacrifice every thing to their passion for putting off a jest. III. 137. *a. b.*
- Jesting*: the power of the habit of jesting. I. 751. *a.*
- Jests*: a jest saves a soldier's life. I. 709. *a.* Some jests examined. II. 527. *a. b.* See *Raileries*.
- Jesuits*, why they are more disagreeable to the Senate of Venice, than the other Monks are. I. 30. *b.* Some of them speak disrespectfully of St Austin. 106. *a.* 109. *a. b.* Entice away young men, whose education is committed to them. 169. 642. The answer made by their Provincial. 169. *a. b.* Their society has been hitherto the most learned of all regular societies. 220. *a.* Authors of a great many libels. *ibid. b.* Whether they are as learned now as formerly. *ibid.* 221. *a. b.* Very severe speeches made against them. 251. From whose pen their Catechism came. 484. *b.* Were formidable, notwithstanding the decree of their banishment. *ibid.* The war betwixt them and the Janseists breaks out again. 498. *a.* Whether they acted imprudently in causing the eulogies of Mr Arnauld and Mr Pascal to be suppressed. *ibid.* and *b.* 499. *a.* It is doing them service to publish calumnies against them, which may easily be confuted. 726. *b.* 727. *a.* The small number of Anti-Molinists which they suffer in their great body is of some use. 728. *a. b.* Who was the first of their order that taught Philosophy at Paris. II. 590. A certain Jesuit does a kind thing to a Protestant. 663. *a.* There are very few universities with which the Jesuits have not had some dispute. 700. *b. n.* (2). Their cabals to hinder the examination of their books. III. 133. *a. b.* A satire against them. 563. *b.* 564. *a. b.* Dispute with the other Catholics concerning Episcopal jurisdiction. 665. *a. b.* Whether their institution, as well as that of other Monks, be founded on Fanaticism. 885. *b.* Were called Theatines, and why. 887. *a. b.* Have been calumniated from their first establishment. 888. *b.* The most horrible things that can be said against them become probable without any proof. 891. *a. b.* 892. *a. b.* They turn the hatred of the world against them to their advantage. *ibid. b.* 893. *a. b.* The doctrines which have rendered them odious, were hashed before their time: they have only raised consequence upon consequence. *ibid. b.* 894. *a.* Why they have been formally and expressly charged with these doctrines. *ibid. b.* Whether there be two sorts of them, the one married and the other unmarried. 897. *b.* 898. *a. b.* And whether they have great credit with the Imperial Court. 898. *a. b.* What their motive is for teaching the immaculate conception of the Holy Virgin. 932. *a.* How they attacked Stephen Piquier, concerning his plea against them. IV. 80. *a. b.* How far some of them have carried the love of chastity. 125. *a. b.* 126. *a.* And by what means they said in Spain, that they kept themselves always chaste, though conversing familiarly with fine women. 125. *b.* 126. *a.* How the faults in the government of their society were published. 131. *b.* They decry the fathers of the Oratory in Mons and Liege, as Nestorians. 350. *a. b.* How they vindicate themselves from the accusation of corrupting Christian Morality. 475. *a. b.* Very few of them turn Protestants. 855. *b.* 856. *a.* Their plea, that the knowledge of the true God has lasted among the Chinese, for a great many ages, and that the Divine honours paid to Confucius, were purely civil, may be supported by what Mr Hyde affirms concerning the Persians. V. 637. *b.* 638. *a.* Their Chamber of Meditations, what it is. II. 457. *a.* Say that it is lawful to kill the King, as being out of the Church, and not approved of by the Pope. *ibid.* Suspected of having had a hand in the assassination committed by Châtel. 456. *a. b.* 457. *a.* 459. *b.* The difference there is in the accounts of this assassination. 460. *b.* 461. *a. b.* Banished from France by an arrêt of the Parliament of Paris. 457. Spread about an advertisement in Latin and French against that arrêt. *ibid. b.* It is from their school that Assassins proceed. 459. *b.* The

- The hardships to which they reduce their Father William Criton. 577. *a. b.* Articles proposed to Lewis XIII, for their reformation. *ibid. a.* Joseph Hall bore a great hatred to them. III. 342. *a. b.* Their colleges rise every where. *ibid. b.* Fare best when they are most curled. *ibid. b.* A prophecy concerning them. *ibid.* An examination of what Salmasius said touching the edition of Anastasius, published by the Jesuits of Mayence. IV. 726. *b. 727. a. b.* Their disputes with the Protestants were never so violent, as during the first thirty years of the XVIIth century. 727. *a.* A conjecture upon one of the reasons which obliged the Parliament of Paris to involve them in the cause of Chastel and Guignard. III. 279. *and b. 280. and a. b.* What they answered when they were reproached with giving J. Guignard a place in their Martyrology. 277. *a. b.* Extenuate the outrageousness of his tenets. *ibid. b. 278. a. b.* Do not pretend to vindicate him as to his proposition about killing the King. *ibid.* Antimonarchical maxims are attributed especially to them. 279. *b. 280. a.* Four brothers who were Jesuits. I. 747.
- Jesuitess*, a society of certain women and maids who took that name. IV. 26. *a. b.* Abolished by the bull of Urban VIII. *ibid. b.*
- Jesus Christ*, according to Antoinette Bourignon, his human nature was produced by Adam. I. 102. *b. 103. a.* Whether his birth and his miracles could have been foretold by Astrology. 164. *b. 165. a. II. 319. b. 320. a. b.* Explication of his remaining three days and three nights in the bowels of the earth. I. 174. *a. b.* The Pagans drew a parallel between him and Apollonius Tyanæus. 380. *b.* They compared his miracles likewise with those of Apuleius. 392. *a. b.* The Carpocratians had his image, which they said was procured by Pilate. 472. *a.* Whether his birth imposed silence on the oracles of Paganism. 592. *a.* What authors have prophesied attempted to calculate his nativity. II. 319. *b. 320. a.* In what sense he is called the *Word* and the *Image*. 434. *b.* Arnobius says that he spoke but one language, which every one of his auditors took to be his own natural tongue. 517. *a. b.* The history of his life written in the Persian language, by the Jesuit Jerome Xavier. 663. *b.* Some have taught that he died both as to his human and divine nature. IV. 288. *b.* Whether he be our Mediator only as he is man. V. 228. *b. 229. a. b. 230. b.* His soul did not understand the numbers of Daniel. II. 122. *a. b.* A pretended letter of Lentulus, containing a portrait of Jesus Christ, is given as an authentic piece by J. Huarte. III. 528. Rufinus says that he was subject to the influences of the stars. IV. 940. *a. b.*
- Jews*. The Apoplexy of which the Emperor Leo IV, and Pope Paul II, died, was occasioned by their weight or coldness. IV. 512. *a. b.*
- Jews*, the fabulous accounts which they have published upon the story of Abimelech's distemper. I. 38. *b. 39. a.* Are obliged to the number of three hundred thousand, to depart out of the dominions of the Catholic King in one day. 41. *b.* Believe that Adam, Abraham, and David, have had the same soul, which will likewise be that of the Messiah. 46. Their fantastical opinion about Adam's creation. 102. *a. b.* Plutarch pretends that their religion, their feasts, their ceremonies were much the same with those practised in Greece to Bacchus. 115. *a.* Think that an husband ought not to cohabit with a woman after he has found her barren, for the space of ten years. 122. *b.* The people of Alexandria complain against them to Caligula. 374. *and b.* Are the only subjects who refuse to honour that Emperor as a God. *ibid.* There were some who gave them the same original as the Gymnosophists. 466. *a.* What proof of their courage those that followed Barcochebas were obliged to give. 648. *a.* Are disturbed on account of circumcising their children. 647. *a.* Their custom at the birth of a son or daughter. *ibid. and b.* The great slaughter of this people. 649. *a. b.* Their abhorrence for the fair of the turpentine-tree. 648. *b.* Are prohibited from returning to Jerusalem. *ibid.* And even from coming near it. *ibid.* And which is still more from entering into the country of Judea. *ibid.* Have their ears cut off, and are transported into Spain. *ibid.* What they say of Aristotle. II. 644. *a.* Their absurd whims concerning
- Elijah and Elifiah. 752, 753. *and b.* And concerning Ezekiel and his tomb. 879. *and a. b. 880. and a. V. 544. b. 545. a.* The invocation of the saints has been long since practised by them. II. 879. *b.* The Jews of the VIth Century who only quote traditions handed down by word of mouth, are no more to be believed, than the Jews of the XVIIth, in things which concern the Patriarchs and Prophets. 829. *b.* Are all ordered by Tiberius to depart from Rome, and why. III. 119. *b.* Forced to be baptized. 220. *a.* What synagogues the laws permit them to possess. *ibid.* Driven from Francfort by popular commotions. 387. Are falsely accused of having pricked an host with needles, in order to draw blood from it. 840. *a. b.* The disputes which they pretend Alexander determined in their favour, are chimeras. IV. 8. *b.* Why the Turks detest them above all other people in the world. 50. *b. 51. a.* Are made to wear the letter *Thau*. 309. *b.* Whether they believed the doctrine of a future state as an article of faith. V. 8. *a. b.* Had a Sadducee sometimes for their high-priest. 12. *b.* What a Rabbin has related concerning their ancient library. 544. *b. 545. a.* The History of the Jewish religion by J. Balmage. I. 672. *a.*
- Ignatius (St), Vedelius's notes upon his letters, what character they bear. V. 445. *b.*
- Ignatius (de Loyola) his conformity with St Augustin. IV. 1. *a. b.*
- Ignorance. What Hesiod says of it. I. 411. *a.* Is one of the impenetrable shields against the darts of the Pyrrhonists. IV. 654. *a.* Whether that which they call invincible will excuse. 874. *a. b. 875. a. b. 829. a. b. 930. a.* May do a great deal of mischief. V. 229. *b. 230. a.* Distinguished from error. 372. *b. 373. c.* Is the cause that Ruybroeck is looked upon as inspired. IV. 942. *a. b.*
- Ignorance (invincible) a Monk who excuses it. V. 25.
- Islands Cyclades*, Dicæarchus attacks them against all right and justice. II. 662.
- Iliad*, Andromache's dialogue with Hector, is one of the best passages in it. I. 333. *b.* Which however has too much simplicity. *ibid.* Myrieties contained in the two first letters of this Poem. 374. *a.* Observation upon the two Poems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. *ibid. and b.*
- Iliad* (Jesler) Pindarus Thebanus is the author of it. I. 81. *b.*
- Illyricus*, his omission in his *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*, made amends for by other compilers. III. 687. *a.* Would not have sacrificed a surplice for the sake of peace. IV. 185. *b.*
- Images*, the objects of devotion are represented by these in the air and shape which workmen please to give them. II. 729. *a. b.* III. 57. *a. b.* John du Tillot, Bishop of Meaux, inveighs with great force against the abuse of them. V. 356. *a.*
- Images of wax*, made use of to cause love or sickness. IV. 936. *a. b. 937. a. b. 939. b. 940. a. b.*
- Imma*, daughter to Charlemagne, her amours with the Secretary of the Emperor her father. II. 744. *a. b. 745. a. b.*
- Immensify*. The received opinion of the Immensity of God, productive of many empty and conceited notions. III. 100. *a. b. 101. a. b.*
- Immortality*, it is not the quantity of a man's works, that procures it. IV. 598. *a.* Increases misery. III. 643. *b.* Whether the Immortality of the soul can be proved by Aristotle's principles. V. 593. *a.* See *Soul*.
- Immutability*, the idea we should form of it. V. 219. *a. b. 373.*
- Impiety*; acts of impiety. I. 160. *b. 161. a. 701. a. b.* Impieties touching the miracles of Moses, and generally touching the whole Scripture. II. 156. *a.* Great piety and great impiety are equally uncommon. 451. *b.* Dicæarchus erects an altar to it, upon which he celebrates the Divine service. 662. The Fathers of the Church relate the impieties of Heretics. III. 135. *b.*
- Impious men* bely their courage, when they lie on their death-bed. II. 12. *b. 13. a. 647. and b. 648. a. b.*
- Imposition of hands*, burlesqued in the *Acts of the Apostles* in verse. II. 479. *a. b.*

Impossible :

- Impossible* whether all that is not, all that never was, and all that never shall be, is impossible. II. 495. *b.*
496. *a. b.*
- Impostors* (public) the punishing them severely would have a good effect. I. 790. *a. b.* The advantages which factious people make of Impostors. II. 721. *a. b.*
- Impotency* reckoned a very great misfortune. II. 315. *a. b.* A wife who concealed this infirmity in her husband, and comforted him under it. III. 187. *a. b.* How dishonourable it is for women to enter processes of impotency. IV. 799. *a. b. &c.*
- Impotent*, whether the devil can make people impotent, by doing what in French is vulgarly called *nouer l'aiguillette*. I. 38. *b.* 39. *a.* A French Physician pretends that there is daily experience of this, and injudiciously quotes Tacitus thereupon. IV. 385. *a. b.*
- Imprecation*: a singular effect of an imprecation. I. 560. *a. b.*
- Imprudence*: ill success should not be always attributed to imprudence. I. 365. *b.*
- Impunity* makes some people more fierce and insolent. II. 195. *a. b.*
- Impurity*, Diogenes the Cynic endeavoured to justify this vice. II. 669. *b.* 670. *a.* Its connexion with good cheer. 822. *a. b.* A method made use of at Rome to hinder its excess. V. 268. *a.* See *Leudesi*.
- Impurities*: there are some that ought never to be described under any pretence. V. 39. *a. b.* 40. *a. b.* 41. *a. b.*
- Impute*: a rule which those ought to follow who impute certain things to an author. I. 652. *a.*
- Inattention*: remark upon the effects of inattention to which even the greatest men are liable. II. 388. *b.* 389. *a. b.* 390. *a. b. &c.*
- Incarnation*, the first prelude to it. I. 102. *a.* Whether Aristotle had glimpses of it. 471. *a. b.* An argument *ad hominem* in favour of the incarnation against the Rabbins. IV. 94. *a. b.*
- Incantations* are more rare than forcerers. II. 243. *b.*
- Incivility*, whether the inserting of obscene things in a book deserves that name. V. 848, 849.
- Incomprehensibility* of things taught by Arcefilas more expressly than was ever done before. I. 410. *b.* How far pushed by the Academics. II. 325. *a. b.* 326. *a. b.* 327. *a.* A story which is told in opposition to this doctrine. III. 697. *b.* 698. *a.* It is not men of a mean capacity who give into this opinion. V. 587. *b.* A remark which may strengthen this opinion. 610. *b. & seq.* It is not a sufficient reason for rejecting a doctrine. 820, 821. See *Pyrrhonists*, *Pyrrhonism*.
- Incontinency* is the strongest pillar of the empire of gallantry. II. 602. *a.* Is a quality of constitution. IV. 332. *a.* See *Chastity*.
- Incontinent*: an example which is proposed to all incontinent persons. I. 686. *b.*
- Incredulous*: there are two sorts of incredulous people, with respect to the existence or the non-existence of a Deity. II. 648. *a. b.* The mysteries of the gospel being above reason, the objections which they make thereto cannot be answered. V. 815. Our confessing this gives them no manner of advantage. 818, 819, 820.
- Incubus's*, hypotheses concerning those spirits. II. 113. *b.* 114. *a.*
- Independants* are against the Church's having the power of Excommunication. I. 96. *a.*
- Index of the Inquisition of Rome*: the wrong judgment of its censors. IV. 719. *b.* Ordereth to expunge all praises given to Heretics. III. 438. *b.* 439. *a.* See *Inquisition*.
- Indexes* have been called the soul of books. I. 319. *b.* A thought on Indexes. 362. *a.* Should be composed by the authors themselves. *ibid.*
- Indians*, their inclination for wine. IV. 7. *a.* The Indian Hermits drive away all impure thoughts, by a cane which they hold in their hands. 126. *a.*
- Indies*, how far known before Ptolomy's time. IV. 808. *a. b.* 809. *a.*
- Indifference* in point of religion shocks more than a false worship, and why. I. 97. *b.*
- Indiscretion* of boasting to have received favours is never forgiven. I. 315. *a.*
- Indolence*: what Crantor said against the indolence which was a doctrine of the Stoics. II. 561. *b.* 562. *a.*
- Indulgences*, a stanza on that subject. I. 139. *a.* Their credit is very little lessened in the Romish Church. III. 87. *a.* How far the abuse of them was carried in the court of Rome. 766. *b.* Were the first thing which Luther attacked. IV. 772. *a.*
- Infallibility of the Church* cannot be maintained as to facts. I. 494. *a.*
- Infamy*: Magistrates ought to be extremely cautious in inflicting a note of infamy. IV. 500. *b.*
- Infant Baptism*: in what manner Casander proves the doctrine of Infant Baptism to be apostolical. I. 288. *a.*
- Infatuated Agents* are a necessary evil to a party. II. 708. *a.*
- Inferni* (gli), a book of Doni with this title, where the different conditions of life are represented. II. 688. *b.* 689. *a.*
- Infidels* less dreaded than the promoters of Orthodoxy. I. 199. *a. b.* Whether Christian Princes ought to make alliances with them for the good of their States. 407. *a. b.* Whether they ought to be converted by force as the Heretics are. III. 220. *b.* 221. *a.*
- Informers*, the only victory that an innocent and wise man should desire over them, is to escape whole and safe out of their hands. I. 777. *a.* Their character. *ibid.* Some of them will neither retract nor make good their accusation. II. 253. *a.* Compared to dogs, who for the sake of the public good are left to bark against every body. 372. *a. b.* Which makes the fate of mankind to be lamented. *ibid. b.* Take notice of the manner how people talk of news. II. 627. *a.* See *Accusers*.
- Ingratitude* chiefly appears in the behaviour of children towards their fathers. II. 439. *b.* Produced by services which cannot be acknowledged. 737. *a. b.*
- Injuries*: a treatise about the bearing of injuries, wrote by Donzellinus. II. 690. *a. b.* It was a rule of Bion's, that we should bear injuries and civilities with the same tranquillity. 15. *a.* Princes are extremely nice and punctilious on this head. 445. *b.* An injury that is despised, falls of itself. V. 746.
- Injurious* reflexions which occasioned the destruction of a town. IV. 278. *a. b.*
- Injustice*: it is usual for those who commit one to justify it by another. I. 718. *a.* Whether it be a means of prosperity. II. 165. *a. b.* Argued for by Carneades. 330. *a. b.* Dicaearchus erects an altar to it upon which he celebrates the Divine service. 662.
- Inlaudatus*, Grammatical remarks on that word. II. 234. *a. b.*
- Innocence* proved by the fiery trial. I. 405. Oppressed innocence sooner or later finds defenders. II. 783. No innocence can be proof against the choice of judges. III. 212. *b.* Is the most necessary qualification of an accuser. IV. 781. *a.*
- Innocent X*, the Duke of Guise said that he was a very great dissembler. II. 472. *b.*
- Innocent XI*, his ill humour against the court of France was sufficient to make him say that he did not appear sufficient to make him say that he did not appear prove of dragooning. II. 475. *b.* Feared the increase of the power of France more than he desired the progress of the Catholic religion. 758. *b.* His partiality against France has done infinite service to the Protestants. IV. 430.
- Innovations* are prejudicial to the public and academical tranquillity. I. 242. *b.* 243. *a.* People should be contented to oppose fundamental innovations. 243. *a.* There are some which last long, and some which do not. IV. 353. *b.* 354. *a.*
- Innovators* boast of doing nothing but in imitation of the Antients. III. 230. *b.* A terrible maxim against them. V. 315. *b.* They are sometimes necessary. I. 577. *a.* They affect to have devotees, and to make use of their intrigues. IV. 27. *b.*
- Inquisition* has been silent with respect to a book full of absurdities. I. 138. *b.* How people ought to behave towards this tribunal, whenever they pass a sentence like that which was passed by it upon Carranza. II. 337. *a. b.* Is a real abomination introduced into the holy places. *ibid. b.* Its unjust proceedings are sometimes condemned. 656. *a. b.* Hindered from being introduced into France. III. 506. *b.* 507. *a.* A certain author proves

I N D E X.

71

- proves the justice of this tribunal by scripture, and places the first institution of it in the terrestrial paradise. IV. 3. *b.* On what account chiefly it may be always turned into ridicule. 782. *a.* Its conduct is by no means uniform. V. 551. *b.* Condemns the book of the *Taxo de la Chancellerie Romaine* only as it is corrupted by the Heretics. I. 628. *b.* Brochant says that it is the abomination of desolation foretold by Daniel and St Paul. II. 145. *a. b.* See *Index*.
- Inquisitors*, of whatsoever religion they are, make all the cities where they grow powerful, enemies to learning. I. 147. The people will not suffer any recrimination to be used against them. 154. *b.* Their partial indulgence. *ibid.* It is a great triumph to escape out of their hands. 777. *a.* A reflexion of Mr Arnauld's on their behaviour with respect to certain books. II. 37. *a. b.* Whether indulgence should be used towards them for the sake of the public good. 372. *a. b.* Their immense power. III. 473. *b.* 474. *a.* Are often imposed upon with respect to such books as people have a mind to put out. V. 293. *a. b.* The quarrels which Valla had with them. 435. *a. b.* 436. *a. b.* Their villany and injustice 453. *b.* 454. *a. b.* Their *Director* by Nicolas Emeric, of which Francis Pegma published two editions. II. 749.
- Inscription*, a proud one. III. 237. *b.*
- Inscriptions*, the jealousy which they have occasioned sometimes. V. 552. *b.* 553. *a. b.*
- Insects*, their organs are infinitely more nice than those of men. II. 636. *a.*
- Inspiration*, whether it must be allowed with regard to the expressions in Scripture as well as the doctrines. I. 106. *a. b.* 107. *a. b.* Those persons who pretend to it are dangerous to a state. 647. *b.* 648. *a.* No coherency must be expected from one that ascribes every thing to inspiration. II. 112. Excessive pride is the general fault of those who pretend to it. 538. *a. b.* There is no great glory acquired by confuting them. III. 388. *a. b.* Ruysbroeck, by reason of his ignorance, was looked upon as one who wrote by inspiration. IV. 942.
- Instability*, an example of the instability of human things. I. 566. *b.*
- Institution* (Calvin's), the Epistle Dedicatory of that book is one of the three or four prefatory discourses that are admired the most. II. 261. *b.* An account of its different editions and corrections. 262. *a. b.* 263. *a. b.* For which Bolsec insults Calvin. 262. *b.* Compared with Martyr's Common-Places. V. 86. *b.* The extraordinary esteem which people have for it. *ibid.* 87. *a.* Abridged. *ibid.* A supplement to what has been said of its different editions. *ibid.* *b.* & *seq.* Variations that are found between them. 87. *a. b.* Marlorat makes Indexes of them. 88. *a.* It has been printed an infinite number of times. *ibid.* *a. b.* Faults of the author of the Essay on Learning, touching this Institution. *ibid.*
- Institutes of Justinian*, the beautiful order, and the symmetry of that work are deservedly admired. V. 87. *b.*
- Intellect*, its unity in all men taught by some Philosophers. I. 553. *b.* 554. *a. b.* 555. *a. b.* II. 411. *a. b.* 412. *a. b.* 565. *b.* 566. *a. b.* The absurdity of that doctrine. I. 554. *b.* 555. *a. b.* Which nevertheless could only be invented by great genius. *ibid.* *a.* Averrhoë's opinion on its unity maintained by Vernias and Augustin Niphus. IV. 377. and *b.* See *Spirit*.
- Intelligence*: Anaxagoras supposes an intelligence to be the first mover of all things. I. 299. *a. b.* 300. *a. b.*
- Intelligences* charged with different employs throughout the universe. II. 251. *a.*
- Interest of party*, is generally predominant over the love of truth. II. 24. *a. b.* The public interest is the law of Policy, and the law of State. 755. *b.*
- Interim*, by whom drawn up. I. 141. and *b.* It was neither satisfactory to the Protestants nor the Catholics. *ibid.* Courageously rejected by the Ministers bordering upon the Earldom of Hanaw. III. 875. A new interim. 672. and *a. b.* 673. *a.*
- Interpreters*, the Merchants of Rome kept a hundred and thirty of them in one of the towns of Colchis. II. 678.
- Interpreters of the Canon-law*, Ginius was no friend to them. II. 507.
- Intrigues*, an instance of some of the best contrived ones. II. 417. *a.*
- Inventives*, authors who have made them. V. 438. *a. b.*
- Invention*: two persons may pretend to the invention of the same thing, though the one is not assisted by the other. III. 62. *b.*
- Inventions*, it is agreeable to know their original and progress. IV. 879. *a. b.*
- Invocation of the dead* very much used among the Pagans. II. 716. *b.*
- Joan II*, Queen of Naples, the manner in which she discovers her love. II. 312. *a.* The fable of the mare may be applied to her. IV. 309. *b.*
- Joannes Januensis*, see *Janua*.
- Joconde*, the judgment of a good Critic upon two pieces which bear that name. I. 752. *a. n.* (31).
- John* (St) would not enter into the bath where an Arch-heretic was. II. 405. *b.* The beginning of his gospel cited by Amelius. I. 252.
- John the Faster*, Patriarch of Constantinople, his ambition gives rise to a very great quarrel betwixt the Bishop of Rome and him. III. 223. *a.*
- John XXII*, Pope; the taxes of the Romish Chancery began under his Pontificate. I. 629. *b.* Excommunicates Marilius of Padua. IV. 198.
- John XXIII*, Pope; his deposition proposed in a Council. V. 590.
- John without Land* succours his mother, who was besieged in Mirebeau, takes Prince Arthur prisoner, and murders him some time after. III. 797. *a.*
- John Casimir*, Duke of Saxony, erects a famous school at Coburg. III. 660.
- Joy*, a singular effect of that passion. II. 676. *a.* They who die of it, die suddenly. III. 766. *a.* Joys of this world, a pleasant thought of a Princess thereupon. V. 383. *b.* 384. *a.*
- Joyeuse* (Admiral de) gave an Abbey for a song. I. 428. *n.* (c).
- Jouville*, they have done us an injury in changing many of the old words in his book. IV. 428. *a.*
- Joke*: an observation on a Latin joke. II. 702. *a.*
- Joly* (Claudius), his reflexions on the life of Lewis XI are very judicious. III. 809. and *b.* 810. *a.* Seems to think that the *Rexier des Guerres* was composed by Lewis XI. *ibid.* and *b.*
- Jon* (William du) ennobled for his good services. III. 623. *a.*
- Jon* (Denys du) performs a bold action, for which he incurs the hatred of the Franciscans, and is, at last, massacred. III. 623. *a. b.*
- Jonas*, in what manner he remained three days and three nights in the whale's belly. I. 174. *a.*
- Jopoli*, a city in Calabria; Augustin Niphus was a native of that place, and not of Sessa. IV. 377. *a.*
- Jordan* (William) translates some of Ruysbroeck's books. IV. 942.
- Jornandes*, his history of the Goths translated into French. III. 581.
- Joseph* (the Patriarch), the place where it is said he was buried. I. 37. *b.*
- Joseph* (St) had the gift which they call in frigidation. II. 108. *b.* Has been made a martyr of a new kind. 338. *b.* 339. *a.* Refutation of some impious opinions vented thereupon. 339. *a. b.*
- Josephus*, a Jewish Historian, contradicts Moses. I. 39. *a. b.* Several Critics rise up against his Jewish Antiquities. 374. *b.* 375. *a.* Ascribes an answer to Samuel's mother quite different from what the Scripture ascribes to her. 342. *b.* Mr d'Andilli's translation of him. 487. *b.* Has suppressed a miracle in the book of Numbers. 2. *b.* Reasons like a Jew that seems to have forgot the elements of his religion. II. 248. Thinks that a story of Moses is not sufficiently circumstantiated. IV. 133. *a.* Censured for having compared the passage of Alexander with that of Moses. 608. *b.* 609. *a.* Says that God commanded Sarah to put Hagar in Abraham's bed. V. 51. *a.* What he relates concerning a quarrel between the Jews and Samaritans. 344. *b. n.* (10).
- Joram* (King), whether Elijah wrote a letter to him from heaven. II. 752. and *b.*
- Joubert* (Claudius) forgets himself when he fancies that he knew Camden at Padua. II. 284. *b.*

Joubertus

- Jaubertus* (Laurence) what he said concerning his learning. III. 582. *b.* Restores Canliac's Surgery. II. 399. *b.*
- Jovian* (Emperor) whether before him neither Emperor nor Consul gave up an inch of ground to the enemy. III. 317. *b.* The Christians endeavour to clear him, and the Heathens to condemn him with respect to the scandalous peace which he made. 585. *b.* 586. *a.*
- Jovius*, refuted in relation to the Magic of Agrippa. I. 150. *b.* 151. *a.* Condemns Savonarola with moderation enough. V. 62. *a.* See *Paul Jovius*.
- Journal*, it is necessary to consult a good one, in order to rank things according to their dates. IV. 211. *b.*
- Journal des Savans*, censured. I. 48. *a. b.* Has spoken of the treatise de *Equales* too hastily. III. 620. *a. b.* Who its authors are. IV. 505. *b.*
- Journal de Trevoux*, the remarks which is made in it concerning the analysis of quantities infinitely small. V. 620. *b.* 621. *a.* Cited. 596. *a. n.* (37). *Et passim alibi.*
- Journalists* cited in relation to a book of the life of the Holy Virgin. I. 136. *a. b.* 137. *a.*
- Journey*: a journey remarkable both for speed and slowness. II. 716. *a. b.*
- Iphigenia*, was not a virgin when offered in sacrifice to Diana. I. 84. *a.* Two cities of Cappadocia boasted to have her true knife. II. 530. *b.*
- Ireland*, what a certain person said after it's reduction. I. 366. *a. b.*
- Iron* (hot) in what manner it was made use of to find out the truth of an accusation. II. 767. *a.* Reflexion upon that custom. *ibid. b.*
- Irrregularity*, is sometimes a happy fault in an ingenious work. IV. 619. *b.* 620. *a.*
- Irrreligion*, its source. I. 639. *a.* Robs us of a thousand comforts. II. 786. *a. b.*
- Isaac* makes his wife pass for his sister, and why. I. 40. His trick found out. *ibid. and a.* St Austin justifies his behaviour. *ibid. b.*
- Isabel* of Bavaria, Queen of France, her ill reputation. II. 209. *a. b.*
- Isabella Villamarini*, Princess of Salerno, the love she bore her husband. II. 297. *b.*
- Isidore*, King of Persia, favourable to the Christians. I. 13. Persecutes them at last, and why. *ibid. and a.* Reflexion thereupon by the author of this Dictionary. *ibid. b.* 14. *a. b.*
- Islanders* calumniated by Blokenius. III. 580. *a. b.*
- Ishmael*, of what kind of people he was an emblem. I. 123. *a.* Conjectures upon the mocking, by which he offended Sarah. *ibid. b.* How old he was when banished by Abraham. *ibid. 124. a.* There is a difficulty attending what the Scripture says of him. *ibid.* There is a stone at Mecca which passes for his sepulchre. 125. *b.* It is said that a spring of water was produced under his feet, when he was dying with thirst. IV. 179. *a.*
- Ishmaelites*: what deity the antient Ishmaelites worshipped. I. 124. *a.*
- Isocrates* the reason he gave for not saying something when he was desired. I. 453. *a.* Never had a design of making a Panegyric on Buhris. II. 235. *a. b.* Servius's want of Exactness with respect to this. *ibid. b.*
- Israhelites*, stories which some Egyptian writers tell of them. IV. 679. *and a. b.*
- Issel*. Who it was that joined that river to the Rhine. II. 717. *a.*
- Issodon*, the superior of the Franciscans of that town, preaches impudently against the Queen of Navarre. III. 622. *a.* In what manner he was punished. *ibid.* The Catholics there commit a thousand violences against the Reformed. *ibid. b.* Its walls are ordered to be demolished, but Cipierre by his interest gets the decree changed. *ibid.*
- Italy*, was the Land of Promise, which the Destinies commanded Aeneas to go in search of. I. 316. Who was the first who restored the purity of the Greek tongue there. 434. *a.* The greatest part of the Monks in Italy think of nothing less than of God. II. 649. *b.* 650. *a.* When Leandro Alberti's description of it was published. IV. 165. *b.*
- Italians* sent into France by the Pope, their leudness. I. 675. *a. b.* Some of them have made themselves ridiculous by an affected way of making use only of such terms as are to be found in the best Latin authors. 741. *a. b.* 742. *a.* II. 68. *b.* Do not in the least degrade themselves by being merchants. IV. 791. *b.*
- Libanius*, his character. IV. 780. *b.* 781. *a. b.* Declared innocent in a conventicle. *ibid. b.*
- Jubilate*, what a Jubilate religious among the Monks is. I. 753. *b.* A Jubilate author. *ibid. and 754. a.*
- Jubilee*. It was Paul II, who reduced it to twenty-five years. IV. 511. Guy Patin-ridicules Jubilees. V. 751. *b.* 752. *a. b.*
- Judicium*, the letters of that word, which are all numeral, and make 1613, induced several Divines to think, that the last judgment would be in the year 1613. II. 124. *a.*
- Judith*, a woman who took it into her head to imitate her, is punished with death. IV. 723. *a. b.*
- Judge*: there is a vast number of people, who judge of their neighbour by themselves. I. 744. *b.* 745. *a. b.*
- Judge*: a Judge who fell asleep sometimes on the bench. I. 757. *a.*
- Judgment* (last) a great many make their wills, tho' they firmly believed that this was to happen in the same year. III. 780. *b.* Several Divines thought it would be in 1613, because they found that number in the word *Judicium*, all the letters of which are numeral. II. 124. *a.*
- Judgments* (rash) the two sources from whence they proceed. I. 550. *b.*
- Judges* are not all of the same humour. I. 61. *b.* Whatever pains a man takes in studying the Civil-Law, it will avail nothing against the rashness of a corrupt Judge. 224. Men of honour always decline the office, when they are excepted against by the parties accused. 489. *b.* How rigid judges were called. II. 347. *a. b.* Ought to be ministers of the law. III. 802. *b.* People have no great opinion of the integrity of such as are created by commissions. 212. *b.* IV. 142. *a. b.* *Et.* 241. *a. b.* Whether those whose sentences are unjust contrary to their intention, deserve excuse. 929, 930. *and a. b.* 931. *a.* Judges in point of wit, disagreed formerly as well as now. V. 360. *a. b.* 361. *a. b.* Learning displayed profusely in a plea, serves but to withdraw their attention, and hide the true state of the cause. II. 105. *b.* 106. *a. b.* Judges who are men of honour, exclude themselves when they are interested in a cause. III. 345. *b.* A Judge, that meeting with a sharp contest between Barolus and Baldus put in the margin of his book, a question for a friend. IV. 733. *b.*
- Julius* II. Pope, compared to Julius Cæsar. III. 615. *a. b.* An enemy of France. 814. By what artifices he saved himself after the French had won the victory at Ravenna. 812. *a. b.*
- Julius* III. Pope, summons Henry II, King of France to appear before God, who answers that he would appear there, but that the Pope would not appear. III. 405.
- Julia*, the origin of that family. II. 424. *a. b.*
- Julia*, wife of one Marc Antony, unhappy in husbands. I. 354. *b.* What she did to save her brother. *ibid.*
- Julia*, daughter of Augustus, her answer to those who were surprized, that her children should be like her husband. V. 78. *b.* Had like to have been drowned in a river. *ibid.* Was several years gone from Rome, and become the object of her father's indignation, before he banished Ovid. IV. 443. *a. b.* 444. *a. b.* 445. *a. b.*
- Julia*. Grand-daughter of Augustus, her exile, and that of Ovid happened much about the same time. IV. 444. *a.*
- Julian* the Apostate, endeavours to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, but is obliged to desist from the undertaking. I. 228.
- Julis*, a town of the isle of Cea, has been the native-country of many great men. III. 608.
- Julius* (Canus) what Seneca relates of him. II. 66. *a.*
- Junia*, Cicero's raillery in relation to her. II. 347. *a. b.* 348. *a.*
- Junianus Majus*, was the Artemidorus of his age. I. 47.
- Junius*, the praise which Joseph Hall bestows on him. III. 343. *a. n.* (20).

Juno,

- Juno*, her temple at Argos, wholly burnt. II. 498.
 What she did out of affection for Combabus. 535.
b. Juno Lacinia, the wonders of her temple. III. 640. *a.*
- Ivory*, whether it can be made of any thing besides Elephants teeth. V. 350. *a.*
- Jupiter*, which was the first, and which the last mortal whom he lay with. I. 206. *b.* What was his employment according to Æsop. II. 832. *a.* Stole away Ganymede to gratify his pederasty. III. 130. *a.* The Celtic Jupiter is the most antient of the Jupiters. 433. *a.* Where and how Jupiter calmed the transport of his passion. 630. *a. b.* Jupiter Hammon, why he had horns upon his head. *ibid. b.* 631. *a.* What Stratagem Jupiter used to make Juno return to him. 632. *b.* That which made his adulteries more inexcusable. 646. *a.* Whether he turned the whole rabble of the gods out of heaven. 739. *b.* How he acted in the case of benefits and rewards. IV. 355. *a. b.* 572. *a.* Most people than by the distribution of benefits. III. 651. *a. b.* IV. 572. *a.* Throws Saturn from Mount Niphates into Tartarus, orders that mountain to be called Caucasus, and fastens Prometheus to it. II. 82. *b.*
- Juret*, criticised by Father Sirmond, and defended in relation to Hildebert. III. 454. *a. b.*
- Jarvis*, his sentiments concerning the inspiration of the Prophets, criticised. I. 107. *a. b.* Difficulties to which he has reduced himself in his *True System of the Church*. 476. *a. b.* In his *Preservative against a Change of Religion*. *ibid. b.* 477. *a.* And in his *Pastoral Letters*. 477. *a. b.* Has very well refuted the Calumniators of Theodorus Beza. 546. *n.* (c). Changed his opinion concerning Penal Laws against Heretics. 566. *b.* 567. *a.* Why he changed it. *ibid.* Declamation of Father Tellier against him. 784. *a. b.* Supplies the Infidels with weapons by his manner of rejecting a certain miracle. II. 587. *a. b.* What he thinks of the sentiments of the Remonstrants, and of their condemnation by the Synod of Dort. III. 174. *a.* His Paralogism touching the authority of Councils, for the decision of controversies. IV. 65. *a.* Dispute between him and Mr Maimbourg, concerning the pretended martyrdom of Heretics. 108. *b.* 109. *a. b.* 110. *a. b.* What he thinks of those who give the title of *Mother of God* to the Holy Virgin. 351. *a.* Is involved in a thousand difficulties, relating to sin and the Precidence of God. 518. *a. b.* Ridicules in a very smart manner, those who write chimerical things concerning relics. V. 252. *b.* Ascribes to the Fathers a sentiment as impious as that of Spinoza. 588. *b. n.* (165). His prophetic calculations refuted. II. 124. *b.* Finds miracles every where. 552. *a.* May cry out as long as he will, Princes will not stir an inch in the matter. *ibid. b.* Criticised touching the time when persecution was hottest. IV. 158. *a. b. &c.* Touching the manuscripts, and the editions of Martinus Polonus. 709. *a. b.* His doctrine concerning the love of our neighbour, (V. 642. *a. b. & seq.*) is one of the loosest maxims of the Jesuits. 645. *a. n.* (51). His answer to the accusation that was brought against it. *ibid. b.* 646. *a. b.* Commends his own great feats. 643. *a.* Favoured by the Walloon Synods. *ibid. b.* The Walloon Consistory grants him every thing. 644. *a.* His letters to the Duke of Montausier, and how they became public. 645. *b.* 646. *a.* A choleric, passionate, and dangerous enemy. *ibid.* His policy. 648. *a.* Chimerical conspiracies of which he accuses his adversaries, and which he does not fail to make his advantage of. *ibid. a. b.* The hypothesis of Augustin and Calvin concerning Predestination, is to him an insupportable burden, and yet he sticks to it. 822. A libel of his under this title, *The Judgment of the Public, &c. concerning the Dictionary of Mr Bayle*. 797. to 809. Part of his character. 800. to 804. Character of his books. 802, 803. He passed his judgment on the Critical Dictionary, without having read it. 805. His malice to the Bookellers. 808.
- Justice*. Whether in war it gives reason to hope for success. I. 280. *a.* The severity of the laws sometimes transgresses the bounds of justice. 313. *a. b.* IV. 502. *a.* Enjoins all things which become proper to the times. I. 616. *b.* 617. *a. b.* Whether it is a real being, and not a fantom. II. 164. *b.*
165. *a.* How Carneades argued against it. 330. *a. b.* IV. 752. *a.*
- Justified*: Bucer's judgment of this thesis, that we are justified by faith alone. II. 172. *a. b.* 173. *a.*
- Justin Martyr*, an apology for him, with relation to Aristotle's death. I. 473. *a. b.* 474. *a. b.*
- Justin* is an Historian of little judgment. I. 510. *a.* Vindicated from the accusations of Freinshemius. 763. *a. b.* Is guilty of an Anachronism, with regard to the famous battle of Cnidus, and the time when the Athenians began to recover their liberty. II. 547. *b.* 548. *a. b. &c.*
- Justinian* compared to an ass, and why. III. 429. *b.* 430. *a.*
- Juvenal* a passage of his satires explained. I. 191. *a.* Another. 768. *a. b.* His satires more apt to put one out of conceit with leudness, than the most chaste discourses against it. V. 487.
- Juvenal quarks*, observations concerning them. V. 340. *a. b.*
- Ixion*, for what reason and in what manner punished by Jupiter. III. 636. *b.* 637. *a.*

K.

- K**alendar. In what it has most need to be reformed. III. 739. *b.* 740. *a.* Reformed. V. 247. *a. b.*
- Kamea*, what the Jews mean by that word. III. 126. *a.*
- Karmatians*, a sect which having risen in Arabia, laid waste Mecca, and profaned its temple. I. 48, 49. Intend to raise scruples in mens minds. 49. *and b.*
- Kabavus*, the signification of that word. IV. 182. *b.* 183. *a.*
- Kata-py-wor*, ought not to be preferred before *Ka-ra-py-wor*, in a passage of Nicander. I. 116. *a. b.*
- Key*, the power of them never falls to the petticoat in the Church. I. 442. *b.* Those of St Peter thrown into the Tyber. III. 610. *a. b.*
- Kempis* (Thomas à) his imitation of JESUS CHRIST translated into Arabic, and by whom. III. 171. *a.*
- Kill*: whether it be lawful for a man to let himself to hire, to kill those who have done him no wrong. II. 196. *a.* In how many cases a celebrated author pretends that people may kill themselves innocently. V. 14. *a.*
- Kingdom divided against itself, &c.* How far that maxim of JESUS CHRIST is true. IV. 271. *a.*
- Kingdoms*, those which fall to the distaff are subject to several inconveniences. IV. 309. *a.* V. 519. *b.* It generally happens that a kingdom which acquires great glory abroad, is exhausted and miserable at home. 656.
- Kings*, a great many have assumed the title of the great King. I. 513. *a. b.* 514. *a. b.* The pride of eastern monarchs was not so well flattered with the title of King of Kings, as with that of the great King. 514. *b.* Their very enemies have had a veneration for them. 273. *a.* Their authority very little regarded sometimes in France. 720. *a. b.* A people that could not be without them. II. 303. *b.* 304. *a.* The reason we do not see them oftener dethroned, is, because the people have not been solicited to revolt by intrigues well enough managed. 608. *a.* The services which they cannot acknowledge commonly make them ungrateful. 736. *b.* The facility and goodness of Kings is more prejudicial to their kingdoms than rigour and austerity. III. 403. *b.* 404. *a.* 409. *a. b.* A King whose condition was very miserable. IV. 276, 277. *a. b.* It is hard to judge of their conduct. 328. *b.* See *Sovereigns*. It is more difficult for a King who has brothers and children to govern his family, than to govern his kingdom. 558. *a. b.* People change their principles concerning the right of Kings. V. 740. A practice which has been observed for a long time towards those who assist at a siege. III. 718. *a.*
- Kircher*. A contest between him, and Father Maignan. IV. 61. *b.* 62. *a. b.*
- Kiss*: in some countries it was supposed that the first kiss a maid received from her galant, was that of her betrothing. IV. 87. *b.* The Romans had a custom of kissing their kinswomen, to know whether

- ther they had drunk wine. 756. *a. b.* 757. *a.*
The power which Socrates ascribed to a kiss. 796.
b. 797. *a. b.* When, and on what occasions, it
is allowed to kiss other peoples wives, and maidens.
ibid. Parallel between the custom of kissing and
dancing. V. 24. *b.* 25. *a. b.*
Knight (William) publishes Joseph Hall's *Mundus alter*
& *idem*. III. 345. *a.*
Knight: by what means, and at what time the Roman
Knights were admitted to the Senatorial dignity.
II. 712. *b.* Their order dishonoured two manner
of ways. III. 696. *b.* A Knight who confers the
title upon another. 282. *a.* An Italian author did
not acknowledge any out of the Romish commu-
nion. V. 388.
Knobius (Christopher) praises the King of Denmark
for having thrown the book of Concord into the
fire. III. 391. *a. b.*
Know: the manner in which we know things is very
obscure. I. 555. *a. b.* Whether it be likely that
any Philosopher could be so extravagant as to main-
tain, that he knew not whether any thing existed.
IV. 206. *a. b.*
Knowledge: it is a crime to have more knowledge
than the people. I. 307. *b.* Knowledge puffeth up,
but there is another talent which puffs up yet
more. 479. *b.* The bounds of human knowledge.
III. 582. *and b.* It rendered people suspected at
the court of Rome. II. 187. *and b.* 188. *a.* Is
the principal characteristic and privilege of the gods.
V. 587. *b.* 588. *a.*
Knox accused of incontinency in the dispute concerning
the government of women. III. 670. *a. b.*
Koizig censured for referring his readers to books
which he had not seen himself. I. 547. *b.* Has
made three men of one. II. 243. *b. n.* (13).
Censured in relation to Patricius. IV. 507. *a.* and
Pereira. 546. *a.* Censured touching Rozarius, and
his native country. 911. *a. b.* Blamed. I. 603.
a. n. (i). Thinks oftentimes that a book is com-
posed the year in which it is printed, or some
translation of it. IV. 919. *a. b.*
Konigsberg, when its academy was erected. I. 223.
Koribolt (Christian), his book *de tribus Impostoribus*
magnis. V. 208. *b.*
Koribolt (Sebastian) quoted. V. 206. *a. n.* (66). 216.
a. n. (140).
Kúe, a Pagan author has given that name to God.
II. 833. *a.*
- L.
- L** *Abbadis*, a schismatic preacher, and followed as
if he had been another apostle. I. 4. *b.* By
what spirit he was led, according to Antoinette
Bourignon. II. 111. *a. b.* A story which is told
of him. IV. 87. *a.* Asserts that God will and
can deceive. 877. *a.*
L'abbé (Father), his *Pharus Gallie antiquæ* almost
ruined. I. 11. *a. b.* He exclaims against Rivetus.
21. *a. b.* Censured touching Ammonius. 269. *a.*
b. A passage of Zanchius related by him. V. 602.
a. n. (38). Pusses Marelius in an unmerciful man-
ner, touching the curtailed edition of Anastasius,
with which the Jesuits are reproached. IV. 727.
a. b. A singular answer which is made to his ob-
jections by D. Francus. *ibid.* *n.* (23).
Laberius, reflexion upon the reason, which, accord-
ing to him, moved Democritus to blind himself.
II. 641. *b.* 642. *a.*
Labienus, his books condemned to be burnt. II. 355.
b. Resolves to die that he may not survive the
productions of his wit. *ibid.*
Labyrinths, four buildings of that kind. III. 750. *b.*
Labyrinth of the Free-will. IV. 390. *b.* 391. *a.*
Labyrinth of love, a new French translation of that
book. II. 37. *b.*
Labourer (le), a passage of that writer criticized. I.
711. *b.* Censured in relation to Dolet. II. 684. *a.*
b. Has not given an impartial account of the
French Ambassador in Poland. III. 264. *a.* What
he says of the impertinencies of Genealogists. IV.
650. *a. b.* 651. *a.* Reflexion of his upon some
preachers. 722. *a.* Says something very remark-
able concerning Poltro's conspiracy. V. 186. *b.*
187. *a.* Inveighs sharply against those who assume
the name of Lands that their family does no longer
possess. 187. *a. b.*
Lacedæmon, its Kings descended from Aristodemus. I.
130. *a.* The veneration which its enemies had for
them. 273. *a. b.* The courage of the women of
Lacedæmon. II. 522. *b.* 523. *a.* The custom that
was observed there with respect to their feasts. 574.
b. The reason why the women and girls of that
city were so immodest. III. 962. *a. b.* 963. *a.*
In what manner disobedient children were punished
there. 965. *b.* &c. In what terms its decree for
the deification of Alexander was conceived. IV.
405. *a.*
Lacedæmonians took away a crown for trifling reasons.
I. 128. *a. b.* Were the best husbands in the world.
134. *b.* Their dialect was harsh. 205. *b.* Who
was the only man of their country who had two
wives at once. 312. When they began to conquer
the Tageates. *ibid.* *and a. b.* and why. *ibid.* Pre-
tended to be beholden to Apollo for their glory
and prosperity, and yet joined in a confederacy with
those who plundered his temple. IV. 622. *a.* Had
liberty to marry their sisters by the mothers, but
not their sisters by the father. V. 49. *b.*
Lacquey: it is not without example that a lacquey has
become a distinguished author. IV. 173. *a. b.*
Laetantius produces a testimony in proof of the wor-
ship, which was still paid to Apollonius, in the be-
ginning of the IVth century. I. 381. *b.* What
he says of Apollonius Tyanæus, and of Apuleius.
394. *a. b.* In what manner he pretends to destroy
all Philosophy. 411. *a. b.* 412. *a.* And particu-
larly Acatalepsy. 411. *b.* Pretends to have demon-
strated that there is no science among men, and
confesses this with relation to Physics. 412. *a.* His
answer to Carneades in the behalf of justice. II.
330. *a. b.* Upbraids the Pagans with paying infa-
mous worship to a prostitute. III. 53. *and a. b.*
Makes use of a fallacious syllogism of Cicero's
against Dicaearchus. II. 658. *b.* Is mistaken as to
an objection which he makes against the Heathens.
III. 53. *a.* Rallies them upon the greatest of the
gods at last ceasing to beget children. 431. *b.*
How he answered Hierocles, touching the slanders
which he had published against the Christian reli-
gion. 444. *a. b.* 445. *a.* Does not seem to have
understood the meaning of Aristippus in these words,
Habeo & non habeo. 701. *a.* Makes bad objec-
tions to the system of atoms. 789. *a. b.* 790. *a.*
Had no reason to charge Lucretius with contradic-
ting himself. 928. *b.* 929. *a.* His answer to Epicu-
rus concerning the evil which happens in this world
is weak and full of errors. IV. 513. *b.* 514. *a.*
His opinion about the soul of beasts. 903. *b. n.* (28).
What he thinks of Cicero's book *de Consolatione*. V.
411. *b.* 412. *a.* Finds fault with the thought
which is in the beginning of it. *ibid.* Laughs at
Xenophanes for believing that the moon is inhab-
ited. 576. *a.* How he endeavoured to convince the
Pagans that the mother of Jesus Christ was a virgin.
772. *b.*
Ladies, when they fall in love with their inferiors,
they are obliged to make all the advances. I. 315.
a. It is uncommon for great ladies, who do not
marry a second time, to live without giving occa-
sion to censure their conduct. 358. *a.* The poeti-
cal deification of a lady. 398. *a. b.* 399. *a.* The
transcendent merit of another. 781. *a. b.* 782. *a. b.*
The Roman ladies dedicate all their jewels in order
to make a vessel of gold, which the Senate had re-
solved to send to Delphos. II. 290. *a.* The honour
that was allowed them in consideration of this.
ibid. One of the most dangerous principles where-
with ladies can be prepossessed, is, that there are
conjunctures which permit them to neglect the out-
side of their honour. 381. *b.* A Spanish proverb
concerning them. 515. *a.* Explication of that pro-
verb. *ibid.* The young ones do not commonly
make the greatest noise in the courts of Princes.
632. *a.* Whether they entertain those well, who
make them taste the sweets of love. *ibid.* When
the custom of their going to court was introduced,
and the mischiefs arising therefrom. III. 93. *a. b.*
Corruption which they brought into the court of
France. *ibid.* Our modern ladies are not of the
same temper with Dido. 141. *a. b.* Are the plagues
of a court, when they intrude into state-intrigues.
304. *b.* 305. *a.* See *Women*. What kind of af-
front gives them the most sensible pain. 405. *b.*
406.

466. *a.* Are addicted to all the fortune-telling superstitious with which the citizens wives are infatuated. IV. 200. *b.* 201. *a.* A scandalous custom that was practised by the Roman ladies. V. 130. *a. b.* Immodest ladies turn devout women at last; and the effect which this produces. 533. *b.* 534. *a.*
- Ladeder*, an Engineer that betrayed the Governour of Landau. III. 721. *a. b.*
- Laelius*, his chastity. IV. 745. *b.* 746. *a.*
- Laërtius* (Diogenes) not very exact in his reasonings and narrations. II. 777. *b.* 778. *a.*
- Latet* (John) censured. II. 17. *n. (b).* IV. 803. *a.*
- Layette* (a Drawer) taken for a man. IV. 2. *a.*
- Laymen* disguised like Priests, and sent to confess criminals. II. 459. *b.* 460. *a.* Whether it ought to be believed that recourse was had to this artifice in the process against J. Chafel. 460. *b.* Have no business with things appertaining to the altar. V. 62. *a.*
- Lais*, a famous Courtesan, was a model for the finest Painters to copy after. I. 367. *b.* The answer Apelles gave in relation to her. *ibid.* In what manner she used Diogenes. II. 670. *a.* Her favours to Diogenes the Cynic. *ibid.* Whether Apelles got her maidenhead. III. 702. *b.* 703. *a.*
- Lake*, whose water bore up men that could not swim. III. 158. *a.*
- Lallemand* (John) borrows a good deal from Rattler, in his Latin version of Sophocles. IV. 848, 849.
- Lamb* (Pascal), when it was slain according to Lewis de Leon. III. 772. *b.*
- Lambert* (St) murdered, by whom, and for what reason. I. 233. *and a. b.*
- Lambinus* corrects a passage of Plutarch unnecessarily. I. 129. *b.* Had no very nice taste upon the subject of modesty. III. 920. *b.* Did not understand a passage of Pausanias concerning Sappho. V. 48. *a.*
- Lame man in the Acts of the Apostles*, his cure, and what followed after it, burlesqued in the Acts of the Apostles in rhyme. II. 479. *b.*
- Lamy* (William) accused of Heresy because he disputed against the motion of the heavens. II. 29. *b.* In a lecture of Anatomy, speaking of the virginity of those whom his auditors should marry, he fortifies them against all events. 370. *a.* Cited. I. 311. *a. n. (200).* Examination of a notion of his about the Epicurean hypothesis. IV. 438. *a.* Gives an account of two signs by which one may know whether a woman has had any children. 503. *a.*
- Lampagia*, the wife of Aimon, King of Saragossa, whether she was the daughter of Eudo, Duke of Aquitaine. IV. 282. *a. b.* 283. *a. b.*
- Lampridius*, his judicious observation upon the duty of an Historian with respect to popular opinions. II. 770. *b.*
- Lamus*, King of the Lestrygons, built the city called Formiae. III. 786. *and b.*
- Lancaster* (the Duke of) suspected to be guilty of some sinister design. V. 554. *a. b.* Whether he was superstitious. 555. *a. b.*
- Lance*, which became a tree. I. 274. *a.* The iron of the lance that pierced the body of our Saviour sent to Rome. III. 566. *and a. b.* V. 469. *and a. b.* 470. *a. b.*
- Lancelot* (Mr), his remark upon the edition of Abelard's works. I. 249. *a. b. n. (17).* 651. *n. (c).* 740. *b. n. (15).* Memoir concerning William Bigot, communicated by him. II. 7. *b.* 8. *a. b. n. (15).* Informs the author of a memoir concerning Antony Cornelius. 556. *b.* Memoir concerning Simon Morinus communicated by him. IV. 269. *b.* 270. *a. b. n. (13).* Concerning Francis Hotman. V. 417. *b. n. (2).* Concerning James Sanfon. 43. *a. n. (2).*
- Langius* explains a passage of Cicero wrong. I. 80. *a.*
- Langres*, the King's council opposeth the establishment of a Protestant Church there. II. 694. *a.*
- Language*, whenever the old is made use of now-a-days it is by way of pleasantry. I. 63. *a. b.* Is impoverished by being too much changed. III. 208. *b.* IV. 743. *a. b.* Nothing ought to be altered in that of the old French writers. IV. 428. The old ought not to be altered in the least when ancient works are published or republished. II. 838. V O L. V.
- and b.* The zeal of several Princes for the language of their country. I. 543. *b.* II. 516. *a. b.* 517. *a. b.* 518. *a.* Judgment of several languages. II. 436. *b.* There is not one which is not more or less barren. IV. 842. *a.* The judgment which Cicero passes on those who despise their own language. I. 60. *a. b.*
- Language* (unknown), it is not true that the Fathers of the Church wrote the impieties and obscenities of the ancient Heretics in an unknown language. III. 136. *a. b.*
- Language* (Latin), authors who are fond of its oldest phrases. I. 62. *b.* 63. *a. b.* 741. *a. b.* 742. *a.* Who was the Vaugelas of it. III. 319. *b.* Whether those who speak it easily, speak it likewise politely. IV. 408. *a. b.* Greater liberty was taken in the use of the words of this language than there is in the French. II. 140. *b.* It is difficult to write very clearly in Latin. I. 644. *b.* II. 681. *b.* Plutarch affirms that there were few people in his time that did not speak it. 517. *a.* From whence derived. III. 309.
- Language* (French) puzzles us when the usual order of the words is altered. I. 602. *b.* II. 134. *a. b.* Has been a long time in vogue amongst foreigners. 228. *a. b.* Is very much esteemed. 436. *a. b.* Its advantage over the Greek. 628. *b.*
- Language* (Gothic) is the mother of all the other Teutonic languages. III. 628. *a. b.* 629. *a.*
- Language* (vulgar), whether it ought to be used in works of learning. I. 741. *b.*
- Languages* (dead) lose a great deal of their force and grace in a translation. I. 216. *b.* Are obscure, and why. 602. *b.*
- Languages* (living), their inconstancy. III. 208. *a. b.* 209. *a. b.*
- Lanfus* (Thomas) declaims on the bad effects of travelling. III. 345. *b.*
- Lanuvium*, its inhabitants made Roman citizens. III. 639. *b.*
- Laodice* puts Danaë to death. III. 779. *b.*
- Laodicea*, daughter of Priam, falls in love with Acanthus, the son of Theseus, and finds means of enjoying him. I. 52. *and b.* 53. *a.*
- Laomedon* refuses to recompense Neptune, and is punished for it. III. 432. *b.*
- Lepithe*, four modern authors affirm that Phlegyas was their King. IV. 626.
- Larebonius* demonstrates, in his *Yanua Cæterum referrata*, the faults of the new system of the Church. IV. 363. *b.* Had he thought of Mr Saurin's reflection, he would have charged his adversary home. 414. *b.* 415. *a.*
- Lafus* (John), Minister of the Flemish Church at London, is banished from thence. V. 550. *a.*
- Latin*, the want of that tongue hinders Bourfault from being Sub-preceptor to the Dauphin. II. 115. The Spaniards are generally too negligent when they write in Latin: an example of it. III. 774. *a. b.*
- Latin* (antient), Victorinus of Feltre was one of its first restorers. IV. 408.
- Latomus* compared the Christian Church to a bear's cub. V. 294. *a.*
- Lavardin*, a noble family of Vendomois. III. 455. *b.*
- Lavement*, significations of that word. III. 136. *b. n. (57).* Formerly signified only gargles. *ibid. b.* Ridiculous delicacy of Garasse about it. *ibid.*
- Laudice* poisons five of her sons. II. 305. *a.* 308. *a.*
- Launoi* (John de), clamour of the Provençals against him. I. 362. Some mistakes of that learned man. II. 9. *a. b.* He did not understand Greek. *ibid. b.* The unsuccessfulness of his labours for crying down false devotion. III. 742. *b.* 743. *a. b.* 744. *a.* Is very much to blame for having bestowed so many encomiums upon a prelate who had made the *Amende honorable*. IV. 917. *and a. b. n. (a).* He, and some other writers who oppose ill-grounded traditions, displease many, and do credit to their Church. 739, 740.
- Laurea*, Cardinal. III. 390. *b.*
- Lausanne*, the Synod held there makes regulations with which Calvin refuses to comply. II. 264. *b.*
- Law*: there were but three cities in all the Roman empire, which had schools of law. I. 771. *a. b.* Who was the first that renewed the profession of the Roman

- Roman law, interrupted ever since the invasion of the Barbarians. III. 593. 594. The Civil-Law has been debated sometimes. II. 846. *b.*
- Law of Lamgo*, Princesses of the royal blood of Portugal are excluded from the crown by virtue of that law. IV. 762. *b.*
- Law* (Salique) is founded on good reasons. IV. 406. *a.* Whether it was instituted by Pharamond. III. 336. *a. b.* Those kingdoms where it is not of force, are subject to great disturbances. V. 519. *b.*
- Law* (unwritten) who it was that taught it the Jews. I. 173. *b.* 174. *a.*
- Lawyers*, their qualifications described in verse. II. 309. *a. b.* 310. *a.* Write down at length robberies which they neither approve nor practise. III. 135. *b.*
- Laws*, there are none which fustious persons will not evade to come at their ends. I. 128. *a. b.* Compared to bread and eggs. 223. *a.* And to the maxims of Physicians in their mutability. 616. *b.* Exceed the bounds of justice sometimes. 313. *a. b.* Were the spring and origin of moral good and evil, according to some Philosophers. 416. Their power. 446. *a. b.* There was a very odd one at Babylon. 597. *a. b.* There are three sorts of men, who make almost no use of the laws they prescribe to others. II. 38. *a. b.* When, by whom, and with what design that called *Lex Agraria* was proposed. 344. *a. b.* That called *Lex Tabellaria*, what the design of it was, and by whom proposed. 345. *a. n.* (6). The laws by permitting some particular things, do not free from blame those that commit them. 501. *b.* 502. *a. b.* 503. *a. b.* 504. *a.* What pretence was made use of at Rome, to abrogate such as were disliked. 713. *b.* The benefit of laws should not be stopped under pretence of some inconveniences. IV. 500. *b.* 501. *a.* 637. *a. b.* Laws are overturned for a little time, in order to make them last a very long time. 881. *b.* Are oftentimes not executed, because of the greatness of the evil. V. 17. *b.* A preamble makes them invidious: they should not dispute but command. 833.
- Laws* (Penal) in matters of conscience, are the *Ratio Ultima* of Divines. I. 285. *a. b.* 286. *a.* Whether the Church never made use of them against Heretics. 476. *b.* 477. *a.* Enacted against the Papists in England. III. 345. Odious conclusions drawn from them. 501.
- Laws* (sumptuary) how they were hindered from passing. III. 492.
- Laws of the Union of the soul and the body*, diversities which they occasion in men. II. 451. *b.* 452. *a. b.*
- Lead*, Philetas put some to his shoes, lest the wind should carry him away. IV. 616. *a.*
- League*, who was called it's Potillion. I. 718. *a.* Violence of the preachers of the League. II. 95. 101. *a. b.* What served as a pretence for it. III. 407. *b.* 408. *a.* That which the Deputy of the League was ordered to represent to the Pope. 411. *b.* 412. *a. b.* 413. *a.* The crime of James Clement, was the crime of the whole League. 412. *b.* 413. *a.* Put it into Cardinal de Bourbon's head to set up for the lawful successor to the crown of France. 520. *a. b.* Who were its Advocate-Generals. *ibid.* Who was called its Lacquey. IV. 243. *a.*
- Leaguers in France*, call the apology for the King of Navarre an infamous libel. I. 739. *a. b.* In the time of Henry IV, obtain more preferments than his old servants. II. 443. *b.* Make the Duke of Mayence their head. III. 297. *a. b.*
- Leah*, whether she committed Adultery the first time that Jacob knew her, and whether Jacob did not. IV. 540. *a.*
- Learned*: a person may be learned, tho' he cannot give an immediate answer to a great many questions. II. 374. *b. n.* (57). Reflexion upon the posterity of learned men. III. 155. *a. b.* Sometimes deny things the most easy to be known. I. 76. *a.* People through policy may affect not to pass for learned men. 353. *a. b.* Learned men, poor or unfortunate. 600. *a. b.* II. 365. *b.* 366. *a.* 617. *b.* 686. *a. b.* III. 50. *b.* 862. *a.* IV. 17. *a. b.* 294. *b.* 295. *a.* V. 400. *a. b.* 401. *a. b.* 402. *a. b.* 403. *a. b.* 589. *and a. b.* It is the misfortune of those who make themselves eminent, that sooner or later they will be publicly reproached with the least faults of their youth. I. 615. *b.* One that was famous while he was a beardless boy. 664. *b.* They ought to print books. II. 96. *a. b.* A person is not the more fit to negotiate nice affairs, because he is one of the most learned of his age. 188. *b.* Some of them are niggard of their learning. 287. *a.* It is a common thing enough for those who are born in some village, to pretend themselves natives of the next neighbouring city. 367. *b.* No persons are more to be feared by them, than great lords who love learning. 374. *b.* Some of them will not confess, that they are indebted to their censors for a little information. 503. *b.* One whose only daughter is reduced to a miserable condition. 707. *b.* 708. *a.* Which of them may be compared to rough diamonds. 646. *a.* Few of the learned will expose themselves to rash judgments. 708. *a.* They never ought to have a curiosity for the town news. III. 254. *b.* Marks of a studious disposition in some of them. 322. *a. b.* Learned men disappointed in their hopes of gratifications. 328. *a. b.* In their eulogies and epitaphs, it is generally affirmed, that they lived well with their wives, but this is not to be depended upon. 437. *a.* Women may fall in love with them upon account of their learning, without being in love with learning itself. 460. *b.* What value they sometimes set upon their productions. 658. *a.* It is a great misfortune for them to have to do with the intendants of the Finances. *ibid. and b.* There are learned men who know every thing but what they ought to know best. 882. *a.* Most of them are only fit to cultivate the lands, which have been already tilled. IV. 104. *b.* Why some learned men decline the speaking of Latin. 409. *a. b.* Too many trifling circumstances are inserted in the journals of their lives. 493. *b.* Who are the authors of the *Journal of the Learned*. 505. *b.* Learned men dishonoured by the impurities of their wives or their daughters. V. 240. *b.* 241. *a.* Hunt after remote things, and neglect that which they have as it were under their very noses. 734. What sort of writings ought to be consulted in order to find the particulars of their lives. II. 8. *b.* To excel both in business and learning, is a very rare talent. 314. *b.* Those who write the lives of learned men, never fail to praise their wives for conjugal affection. I. 796. *a.* Arrogance is ill-becoming them. II. 50. *a.* Their mercenary spirit. III. 339. *b.* 340. *a. b.* It is a great happiness for them to be free from ambition and avarice. IV. 187. *b.* See *Authors and Writers*.
- Learning*, whether it be in a declining condition. I. 220. *b.* 221. *a. b.* The character of a braggadocio in learning. 373. *a. b.* The decay of learning. IV. 209. *a. b.* Some men would be glad that the key of learning should not be imparted to the people. 629. *b.* A thing that must needs create a contempt for it. 859. *a.* Learning cannot dispel the darkness of Idolatry. V. 77. *b.* 78. *a.* Complaints against it. 229. *b.* Accused of having a bad influence on religion. 286. *and a. b.* France seems to have too great an aversion for every thing that looks like learning. 428. *a. b.* Too much learning displayed at the bar, only serves to withdraw the judges attention. II. 106. *b.*
- Leerr*. The school there becomes more famous than that of Norden, and why. II. 768.
- Legate*. The ignorance of the Legate, who condemned Abelard. I. 760. *b.* A Doctor's rallery upon it. *ibid.*
- Legendaries*, their false zeal has stuffed the History of the saints with fabulous stories. III. 708. *b.* The judgment which Melchior Canus gave about them. IV. 554. *b.* Ascribe extraordinary actions sometimes to one saint, sometimes to another. II. 770. *b.* Ought to follow the example of Lampridius in what regards popular opinions. *ibid.*
- Legends*. The origin of the false Legends of martyrs. V. 432. *a. b.* 433. *a. b.*
- Leger* (John) reproaches Quichenon with having abjured the Protestant religion. III. 275. *b. n.* (5). Justifies his uncle Antony Leger. *ibid.*
- Legislators* order and forbid the same things according to times and seasons. I. 616. *b.* Are more worthy of admiration than the greatest conquerors. IV. 669. *b.* Intended the good of the public, when they made it be believed, that they conversed with the deity. V. 69. *b.* A thought of

- of Machiavel's concerning that which makes them succeed or miscarry. 73. *b.*
- Lehman* (Christopher) observes that there are abundance of lies in William Eysengrein's *Centenarii XVI*, against Flavius Illyricus. II. 750. *a. b.*
- Leibniz*. Is a very extraordinary man. IV. 535. *a.* It is surprising that he writes so good French as he does. *ibid.* Whatever fine insights he has given us into the souls of beasts, his Hypothesis cannot well be preferred to that of Des Cartes. 909. *b.* 910. *a. b.* 911. *a.* Observations upon his reflexions. 914. *a. b.* as far as 916. *a. b.* Recurring upon his answers. *ibid.* His letter concerning the divining wand. I. 8. *b.* 9. *a.*
- Leicester* (Earl of) forms a faction in Holland, and aspires to the sovereignty. II. 687. *b.* 688. *a.*
- Leyden*, the judgment which its Divines gave. I. 242. and *b.* 243. *a.* When its university was founded. III. 241. See *University*. The Curators of that university make a decree that is criticized. III. 358. *a. b.* When the college of Divinity there was erected. 574. A present of rarities made to the university of Leyden. V. 561. and *b.*
- Leipzig*, its university at variance about the Philosophy of Ramus. II. 656. The great Gustavus calls an assembly at Leipzig, of Lutherans and Calvinists, in order to endeavour at an accommodation. III. 476. *a.* The *Journal of Leipzig*, or *Acta Eruditorum Lipsiensia*, its praise. I. 493. *a.* Quoted. V. 202. *a. n.* (25). *Et passim alibi.*
- Lela*, a name which is commonly given to the great ladies of Africa. III. 17. *a.* It is also the title of honour which the Mahometans gave to the blessed Virgin. *ibid.*
- Lemnos*. A massacre of all the men of that island, and the cause of it. III. 465. and *a.*
- Lent*, a thing which the Clergymen that preach during that time, are often reproached with. IV. 616. A supposition that would shorten it a little. V. 777. Does not begin at Milan till four days after Ashwednesday. 778. *b.*
- Lentulus*, a pretended letter of that Proconsul's containing a portrait of Jesus Christ, given as an authentic piece by John Huarte. III. 528.
- Leo Juda*, what Thuanus meant by those words. I. 802. *b.*
- Leo the Hebrew*, what he says of the two sexes of Adam. II. 856. *a. b.* 857. *a.*
- Leo I.* (Pope) confutes an opinion which had been approved by the Church in St Augustin. IV. 782. *b.*
- Leo IV and Benedictus III.* The She-Pope cannot be placed between these two Popes, the one of which was elected immediately after the death of the other. IV. 726. *a. b.* 738. *a.*
- Leo X.* Whether it be true that he published a threatening monitory against the Elector of Saxony. III. 272. *b.* By what means people got into his favour. 327. *a.* He was sometimes present at a Comedy. IV. 11. *a.* Was the first that threatened those with excommunication, who read a prohibited book. 13. *b.* His bull against such as affirmed that there was but one soul in all men. V. 214. *b.* 215. *a.*
- Leo Isauricus*, abuses the credulity of the Calif of the Saracens by a remarkable trick. II. 586. *b.* 587. *a.*
- Leontium*, a Courtesan, her letter to Lamia is a forged piece. II. 781. *b.* 782. *a.* Was at worst the concubine of Metrodorus. 782. *a.*
- Leontius* suffered martyrdom in Vespasian's reign. III. 316. *b.*
- Leopoldsdorf* (Jerome Beck of) brings the Turkish Annals from Constantinople. III. 774. *b.*
- Leotyrides*, the Lacedæmonians exclude him from the crown with great injustice. I. 128. *a. b.*
- Lepanto*, Rafario receives an order from the Doge of Venice, to make an oration upon that victory. IV. 848. and *a. b.* Zarlinu composes airs which are sung at the rejoicings made for it. V. 602.
- Lepreus*, a great eater. III. 427. *b.* 428. *a.*
- Lerida* (the Bishop of) makes a clamour against the congregation of the *Index*, on account of a Spanish Catechism. II. 337. *b.*
- Lerma* (the Duke of) Paul V, in favour of him, departs from the custom of not sending the red hat to the Cardinals newly elected. I. 604. *b.*
- Lebia* is the same with Clodia, the wife of Metellus Celer. IV. 202. *a. b.*
- Lescalopier* (Father) alleges a fact which is nothing to the purpose, and reasons against himself, whilst he is reasoning against Diogenes. III. 357. *b.* What he means by the sacred disease. 789. *a. n.* (10). His remark upon God's Incomprehensibility. V. 144. *a. n.* (42).
- Lesfiguières*, by what intrigues he endeavoured to deprive the Protestant assemblies of a good head. II. 433. *b.*
- Lesna*, a town, burnt by the Poles, and why. II. 539. *b.*
- Letter* (Pastoral) suppressed. V. 748. *b.*
- Letters*, the antiquity of their usage among the Assyrians. I. 595. *b.* 596. *a.* The changing of one single letter has dishonoured the memory of a great man. 611. *b.* 612. *a.* The suppression of two by an error of the print has robbed an author of four years glory. 633. *a.* A treatise of their proportions by Jeffery Tori. V. 388. The capital letters of the Greek, by whom brought again into use. III. 732.
- Letters*: too great a correspondence by letters, overpowers the learned. I. 625. *b.* Difference between those that are wrote to a person's self, and those that are wrote to others concerning him. 330. *b.* IV. 276. *b.* V. 566. *b.* Letters that pass between friends, ought to be kept in inviolable secrecy. III. 553. *a.* 844. *b.* The slavery which those are under, who have the reputation of writing fine letters. IV. 707. *b.* Even the Pagans detested the practice of publishing of what people wrote to one another in confidence. V. 797. It was not usual in England before the year 1613, to publish discourses in form of letters. III. 344. An author that inserts letters in a book, which are not of his own writing, leaves room for the authors of those letters to arrogate the merit of the whole performance to themselves. II. 688, 689.
- Letters* (men of) a reflexion upon their faults. IV. 859. *a. b.* A discourse on the marriage of men of letters by Claudius Badiel. I. 603. *a. b.* 604. *a. b.*
- Letters* (Historical) quoted. V. 753. *a. n.* (28). *Et passim alibi.*
- Letters* (Provincial) divers particulars concerning that book. IV. 489. *b.* 490. *a. b.*
- Lettres (the Belles)* charged with causing a great deal of confusion. V. 286. *b.* Their revival in Italy. III. 258. *a. b.* Their decay. IV. 209. *a. b.* The restoration of them opened the way for the Reformation. V. 286. *b.*
- Leucas*, people were cured of the passion of love, by leaping from the top of its promontory. III. 787. *b.* 788. *a.* Names of those that took the leap. *ibid.* Its promontory was called the Lover's leap. V. 47. *a.*
- Leucophyllus*, a plant which hinders women from committing Adultery. IV. 609. Its effect upon drunken people. 610. *a.* Its virtue more remarkable than that of the *Agnus Castus*. *ibid. b.*
- Leve* (Antony de) whether he had a correspondence with Agrippa. I. 151. *a. b.* From whence he took money to pay his soldiers. IV. 456. *b.*
- Levis*, the house of that name is one of the most noble in all France. IV. 585. *a.*
- Leviathan*, what the design of that book is. III. 469. *a. b.*
- Levites*, why they were so called, according to Plutarch. I. 115. *a.*
- Leudasi*, whether it prevails more in hot countries than cold. II. 820. *a. b.* 821. *a. b.* *Et c.* The toleration granted at Rome for this sin, compared with that granted in other countries for drunkenness. 820. *b.* 821. *a.* The way to banish it. III. 186. *a. b.* 814. *a. b.* V. 98. *b.* 99. *a. b.* A Queen recovers by her leudness, a crown which she could not preserve by her courage. II. 523. See *Incontinency*.
- Louis VII*, King of France, his scruples of conscience. III. 797. *b.* 798. *a.* Dispossesses himself entirely of the territories of his divorced Queen. V. 518. *a.*
- Louis IX*, King of France, the strange servitude to which he submits himself, in order to please the Queen his mother. II. 382. *b.* 383. *a.* The oath which it seems they would have required from

- from him. III. 92. *a. n.* (43). And which he refuses to take. 98. *b.*
- Lewis XI*, King of France, his inclinations always opposite to those of Charles, Duke of Burgundy. II. 215. *a. b.* Would not marry his son to the heiress of Burgundy. 221. *a. b.* 222. *a.* Had less courage than policy. 221. *b.* 222. *a.* His little pad carried him and all his court. 131. *b.* Let many years pass, before he re-imbursed the sums which were advanced for the funeral of Charles VII. 464. *a.* A very good thought of his. 737. *a. b.* Is afraid lest the English should repent of their having made peace. 740. *a.* Threatens the Parliament of Paris. V. 443. *a. b.* Is not the first who made it a capital crime to conceal a conspiracy. IV. 346.
- Lewis XII*, King of France, a generous sentiment of his. I. 421. *b.* III. 896. *b.* Kills himself by caring for his Queen too much. 88. *a.* A witty saying of this Prince's. 814. *b.* For what reason he saw the forces of England, Switzerland, and Spain against him. 613. *b.* 614. *a.* Is present at a lecture of Civil-Law, and embraces the Professor. IV. 67. *a.* His history wrote by John d'Auton, and printed by Theodore Godfrey. I. 589.
- Lewis XIII*, King of France, exhorts the Catholic Princes of Germany to forsake the Emperor. II. 134. *b.* 135. *a. b.* His conduct towards the Queen, his mother. 400. *a. b.* 401. *a. b.* Who it was that undertook to take away the barrenness of the Queen, his wife. 401. *b.* And to reconcile him with her. *ibid.* III. 816. *a. b.* His servitude under the Marshal d'Ancre. II. 542. *a. b.* Declares that he did not mean to comprehend the Protestants in the oath made at his coronation, of employing his sword for the extirpation of Heresies. III. 209. *b.* Is very much afraid of the Devil. 212. *a. b.* Confusions to which the kingdom was exposed under his minority. 301. *a.* A witty saying of his. 823. *a. b.* The history of him promised to us. IV. 257. *b.* A false prediction concerning the day of his death. 260. *b.* Has a fall, and will not let it be told to his Astrologer. *ibid.* Respects his mistress, and is jealous of her at the same time. V. 84. *b.* Capriata bestows so much praise on his conduct that he has been copied by a Frenchman. II. 311. *a.*
- Lewis XIV*, makes himself protector of the Heretics at the capitulation of Landau. III. 721. *b.*
- Lewis of Bavaria*, Bzovius razes him out of the catalogue of Emperors. II. 238. He, and Frederic Barbarossa: an apology for those Emperors by Hungerus. III. 534. *a. b.* Marfilus of Padua writes an apology for him. IV. 198. *and a. b.* Persecuted by three Popes. *ibid. b.*
- Liar*: the sophism called the Liar, is a mere childish subtilty. IV. 616. *b.* 617. *a. b.*
- Liars*, their ordinary fate. I. 198. *a. b.*
- Libanus*, a mount where Venus had a temple. II. 4. *b.*
- Libels* (defamatory), it is a favour to believe writers of them even upon their oath. I. 343. *a.* An advice to those that write libels. *ibid. b.* 344. *a.* What was said concerning those of Aretin. 436. *a.* Augustus was the first that ordered information to be taken against this kind of writings. II. 355. *a. b.* 356. *a.* And who involved them under the crimes of high-treason. V. 743. *U seq.* For what cause. 744, 745. Tiberius continues this innovation of Augustus. *ibid.* Why it is unlawful to publish them. II. 389. *a. b.* They do a great deal of mischief. III. 290. *b.* 291. *a.* Most of them are composed by persons very little known, and of bad characters. 291. *a.* It is of great use to display the impudence of those that write them, and the credulity of those that read them. V. 103. *a.* A thing which the authors of them do not consider. 459. *a.* See *Slanders*. Those of some private persons disowned. 738, 739. Dissertation concerning defamatory libels. 743. *as far as* 765. Should never go unpunished. 746, 747. The answer which should be made to those that write an apology for them. 747. All Legislators have agreed in punishing them severely. 758. The Council of Trent ascribes the punishment of them to the tribunal of the Church. 762. Whether they be the causes of sedition and war. 763, 764. Remarks against those that spread them about, or approve them. 764, 765. It is ordinary for all factions to produce libels. III. 517. *b.*
- Liberality*; singular effects of liberality. I. 412. *b.* 413. *a.* III. 317. *b.* 318. *a.* Should be practised towards our enemies. I. 559. *a.*
- Liberty*: there are some who love not liberty, but the person of him who declares for it. II. 167. *a.* The liberty of indifference is not an essential attribute of creatures. IV. 907. *a. b.* 908. *a. b.* 909. *a. b.*
- Liberty* (human), see *Free-will*.
- Liberties of the Gallican Church*, the history of that book. IV. 98. *b.* 99. *a. b.* 100. *a. b.* Receive a terrible blow. II. 125. *a. b.* All that was done for supporting them under Innocent XI, overturned in 1693. *ibid.*
- Libertines*, in the affair of religion, are of two kinds. II. 648. *a. b.* Those who write against them should be very careful not to afford them any subject for laughter. III. 132. *a.* A reflexion on the complaints of some persons, against those who represent the objections of the Libertines with all their force. V. 537. *a. b.* See *Mockers in point of Religion*.
- Library*: by whom the library of the college of Navarre was built. I. 164. *a.* Reflexion on the fate of some libraries. 319. *a. b.* 320. *a.* A speaking library; who was called so. II. 646. *a.* A library erected by Augustus in one of the temples of Rome. III. 8. *a.* A library that had as many books as there are stars in the firmament. 110. *b.* A fault which the overseers of public libraries are guilty of. 950. *b.* Some very noble libraries. IV. 555. *a. b.*
- Libreria del Doni*, how it is divided, and what it contains, according to Teiffier. II. 689. *a. b.*
- Librarii*, the signification of that word. V. 798.
- Lycæus*, miracles which are related concerning that mount. IV. 205. *a. b.*
- Lycæum*, Aristotle's school, its doctrines will always triumph over all others. I. 469. *a.* It is taught in Persia, and in the dominions of the Great Mogul. *ibid. b.*
- Lycettus* (Franciscus) treats Niphus with good manners. IV. 380. *b.*
- Lycians* loved to wear long hair. IV. 174. *a.*
- Lycophron*, his Cassandra is very obscure. IV. 598. *a.* Different readings of a passage in him. I. 538. *b.*
- Liebaux*, his work on the diseases of women is not a translation of that work of Marinello's, which has the same title. IV. 148. *a. b.* Accused of plagiarism by Lazarus Pe. *ibid.*
- Liebler* (George) translates a homily of Martin Eysengrein, and writes notes upon it in order to refute it. II. 749. *a. b.*
- Lige*, a town, treated cruelly. II. 216. *b.* 217. *a.*
- Lies*: there is no lie, how absurd so ever, but will be handed down from book to book, and from age to age. II. 296. *a.* There are some lies which make people angry, and others which make them laugh. 181. *a. b.* Whether it be permitted to tell a lie. V. 748. *and a. b.* How they are perpetuated. *ibid. U seq.*
- Life*, reasonings of an uncommon nature upon the shortness of it. I. 511. *a. b.* Philosophical sentiments about long life. II. 185. *b.* The principle of Christians, touching the chief end of life is only a principle in Theory. 200. *b.* A few years of life remaining, are not worth the making a false step. 384. Was a state of penance and punishment for a sin committed before men came into the world, according to some Philosophers. 561. *a. b.* 562. *a. b.* IV. 441. *b.* V. 412. *a. b.* *Uc.* Democritus laughed at human life. II. 642. *a.* Whether the good things of life surpass the evil. 832. *a. b.* IV. 844. *a. b.* V. 414. *b.* 423. *b.* 424. *a. b.* 576. *a. b.* 577. *a.* The limits of its duration, according to Hesiod. III. 348. *b.* 349. *a.* The immoderate desire which Lewis XI, King of France, had to prolong his life. 803. *b.* 804. *a.* 806. *b.* 807. *a. b.* 808. *a.* Life is short and miserable. *ibid.* Few wise men would chuse to begin the race of life afresh. V. 423. *b.* 424. *a.* Life does not consist in living, but in enjoying health. III. 342. *a.* Persons who delighted so much in retirement as to say, that during the whole of their life before, they had by no means lived. II. 430. *and b.*

Life

- Life to come*, what the Japanese believe about it. III. 550. *a. b.* According to Lucas Brugensis, the Jews had the doctrine of it from the Pagans. V. 8. *a. b.*
- Light of nature*: Divines will always be worried in a dispute that is carried on upon no other principles than those of the light of nature. V. 815. The mysteries of the gospel neither can nor ought to be subjected to its dictates. 816. 829. It is easy to reconcile the moral precepts of JESUS CHRIST with it. 815. *n.* (2).
- Likely*: Agathon's aphorism concerning what is likely. I. 126. *a. b.*
- Lilly*: a story that is told of a lilly which Charles V had planted. II. 444. *b.* 445. *a.*
- Limbo* of children, is the porch of hell. IV. 501. *a. b.* Virgil owned it. *ibid.* *b.* 502. *a.*
- Limbourg*, to whom it belongs. II. 223. *a.*
- Lindanus* created a great many sects. I. 790. *a. b.*
- Lindenbruch* was enraged against Wouwer. V. 565. *b.* 566. *a.*
- Lionne*, by what means he mounts to the chiefest places in the government. IV. 807. *a. b.* 808. *a.*
- Lions*, whether they are without marrow. I. 75. *b.* 76. *a.* The History of the Lion of Androcles is known only by the relation of Apion. 375. *a.* Notwithstanding what Tertullian says, lions are more than once fathers. 448. *a. b.* Who was the first among the Romans that yoked lions in his chariot. III. 959. *b.* In Africa some of them were nailed to a cross, in order to frighten others. IV. 908. *b.*
- Lippus* (Justus), advice which he gives to young men. I. 61. *a.* And to Badius. 678. *a. b.* 680. *b.* His judgment of Paul Emilius's History of France. II. 763. *a. b.* What is thought to be one of the principal reasons of his having turned Papist. III. 673. *b.* Is ill-used in a book, and answers nothing. 838. *a. b.* Is said to have composed books to convince the world that he was not lukewarm and indifferent in religion, as many suspected he was. 842. *a.* Addresses verses to the planet Venus in behalf of his garden. 922. *b.* Writes a letter full of malice against Holland. IV. 795. *a.* Approves of Roulliard's Capitulary concerning the validity of a marriage. 804. *a. b.* 805. *a.* His mistakes with regard to Tacitus. V. 281. *b.* 282. *a. b.* His declaration touching his reading of Petronius. 485. *b.* Approves of travelling, and has given very good instructions concerning it. III. 345. *b.*
- Lyre*, the Embassadors of the Getae presented themselves playing upon the lyre. I. 83. *a.*
- Lysander*, his character. I. 128. *a. b.* Wrests the sense of an oracle. *ibid.* *b.*
- Lyserus* conceals himself under the fictitious name of *Theophilus Alethens*. III. 973.
- Lysimachus*, the son of a daughter of Aristides, got his living by interpreting of dreams. I. 521. *a.*
- Lysimachus* puts two Princes to death for destroying their mother. II. 676. *b.*
- Lysimachus* fights with a lion, and receives several wounds. III. 713. *a. b.*
- Lisle*, the siege of that town. III. 718. *a. b.*
- Lisola* (Baron) affirms, that the States of the empire are obliged to defend the circle of Burgundy. II. 223. *and b.*
- Lysitrus*, his commentary upon the praise of Folly is disliked by a great many, and why. II. 810. *a. b.*
- Litanies*, the expressions which indiscreet zealots had insensibly introduced into them, condemned by Belarmin. I. 728. *b.*
- Live*: to live a quiet life is all we should aspire at. II. 200. *a. b.*
- Lives*, those who write them should write the lives of great criminals. V. 519. *a. b.*
- Lives of learned men*, where we are to seek for the particulars of them. II. 8. *b.*
- Livia* (Empress) carried her complaisance to Augustus too far. I. 332. *a.*
- Livia*, daughter of Nero Claudius Drusus, her History. II. 718. *a. b.*
- Livilla*, her death. I. 358. *b.* 359. *a.*
- Livius* (Titus), see *Titus Livius*.
- Lizet* (Peter) is Advocate-General in the Parliament of Paris. II. 429.
- Lloyd* ascribes to the Scholiast of Apollonius, a great many things concerning the island of Taphos, which are not to be found in him. V. 307. *a.*
- VOL. V.
- Locke*, his answer to those who blamed him for having said, that natural reason does not prove the immortality of the soul. IV. 592. *b.* 593. *a.* Wherein he makes the difference between men and beasts to consist. 912. *b.* 913. *a.* Cited. V. 616. *b.*
- Loerians*, how they appease Minerva. II. 340. *b.* In what manner they expiate the crime of Ajax. *ibid.* 341. *a. b.*
- Locusts*: the water-locusts at Minturnæ are as large as those upon the coasts of Africa. I. 372. *b.* A pleasant story concerning this. *ibid.*
- Loeffnius* makes collections of the feditious things that are to be found in the writings of the Jesuits. III. 656. *b.*
- Logic* is a great help to the other sciences. I. 163. *a. b.* IV. 189. *a. b.* It would be of great use to criticize on the false Logic of authors. I. 394. *b.* 395. *a.* Logic compared to Penelope by Chrysippus. II. 495. *a.*
- Logicians*, a good Logician is scarcer than is imagined. II. 655. *b.* The Irish and Spanish Logicians make distinctions that are too obscure and abstracted. V. 645. *b.*
- Loisel* resigns the canonry of *Notre Dame* at Paris, to Claudius Joly. III. 577.
- Lombard* (Peter), the first who was made Doctor of Divinity, in the university of Paris. III. 594. How much Stancarus esteemed him. V. 227. *b.* 228. *a.*
- Londel* (Father du), his *Faſti* criticized. V. 755. *a. b.* The usefulness of his Chronological Tables. IV. 211. *b.*
- Longiano* (Faufto da), his criticism upon Quevara's *Marcus Aurelius*, is good and learned. III. 270. *b.* He promises the life of that Prince, composed from the testimony of the ancient Historians. *ibid.* The studies to which he applies himself. *ibid.*
- Longinus*, his judgment of some Philosophers. I. 255. *a.* Had an exquisite judgment and penetration. IV. 690. *a. b.* What he says of Theopompus. V. 328. *b.* A passage where his good taste does not appear. 360. *a. b.*
- Longitude*, a great many have believed that they had discovered it. IV. 262. *b.* 263. *a.*
- Longolius*, his oration concerning the praise of the French, compared with the Romans. V. 417. He praises Peter Turel in it. *ibid.*
- Looking-glass* was one of the principal parts of Otho's equipage of war. I. 392. *a.* Fables concerning looking-glasses. IV. 672. *a. b.* *&c.* A story concerning one in which Cardinal Mazarin saw every thing that passed in Portugal. 676. *b.* The fashion which women had of wearing them over their bellies. II. 400. *a. b.*
- Loofe sheets*, it is their fate to be thrown aside among the rubbish of libraries. V. 800.
- Lopez* (Dominicus), a fictitious name which Faustus Socinus assumed, when he published his treatise *de Autoritate S. Scripturae*. V. 180. *b.*
- Loredana* (Leonard), Navagiero makes his Funeral Oration. IV. 315.
- Loredano*, his work of the life of Adam. II. 857. *b.* 858. *a. b.* Censured. V. 432. *a. b.*
- Lorenzo* (John) writes libels against Alexander VI, in Greek, his brother translates them into Latin, and is thrown into the Tyber. IV. 89. *b.* 90. *a. b.*
- Lorrain* approves the revolt of subjects, and the attempts of the court of Rome against the temporalities of Princes. I. 642. *b.*
- Lorrain* (Charles, Cardinal of), what has been said of him. I. 121. *b.* 704. *a. b.* What Brantome says of him. III. 287. *a.* 874. *b.* Glories in being hated by the Huguenots. 290. *a.* A ridiculous description of this Cardinal's tribulations. V. 29. *b.* 30. *a.* His behaviour with respect to J. du Tillet. 353. *b.* 354. *a. b.*
- Lot*: a Painter in Prussia having read in Luther's translation of the Bible, what Lot did to his daughters, behaved in the same manner to his own. IV. 723. *a.*
- Latharius* allows the Stellingi to profess Paganism, and turns Monk to do penance for it. V. 233. *a. b.* 234. *a. b.*
- Lots*: the book of the Acts of the Apostles in rhyme supposes that the drawing of lots was made use of in the election of St Matthias. II. 478. *a.*

- Loudun* (la Cordonniere de), a libel against Cardinal Richelieu. III. 212. *a.*
- Loudun*: all the devils-craft of the nuns of Loudun confounded by Ogillet. III. 212. *b.*
- Louvain*, who founded the college of three languages in that university. II. 236. *a.* and *b.* And who was the first that taught the Hebrew tongue there. *ibid.* *b.*
- Love*, its origin according to Plato. I. 102. *b.* Who was the first that introduced the custom of singing love-songs in company. 205. When love adventures began to be brought upon the stage. 313. The pursuits of ambition, secure women against the follies of love, better than they do men. 523. *a.* A lively description of love. II. 1. *b.* 2. *a.* *b.* 3. *a.* Reigns in the most icy climates. 80. *a.* Is the cause of the blackest treacheries. 333. *a.* Of all declarations of love, none costs a Queen so dear as a verbal one. 312. *a.* Heroic love, what is called so. 318. *a.* Love of women, why people stumble much more in that regard, than in all the other duties of Christianity. 382. *a.* And why this holds true with respect to Princes, much more than to private persons. *ibid.* How excessive soever the jealousy of men may be, yet it is not so copious in inventions as the love of women. 533. *a.* The work of love detested by Democritus. 638. *b.* The pleasure of love has been called a little epilepsy. 644. *a.* *b.* III. 81. *a.* *b.* 82. *a.* A man who has always his pen and books in his hand cannot find time to devote himself to it. II. 814. *a.* *b.* 815. *a.* The extent of its empire. 822. *b.* 823. *a.* *b.* One of its caprices. 857. *a.* *b.* What is its great mover. III. 13. *b.* 14. *a.* *b.* The Heathen Poets philosophized upon nothing so profoundly as upon love. 28. *a.* *b.* Its rage and brutality. 56. *a.* *b.* 57. *a.* An instance of its triumph and power. 165. *b.* 166. *a.* Commonly leaves honour in possession of all its rights. 383. *a.* People were cured of this passion by leaping from the rock of Leucas. 787. *b.* 788. *a.* *b.* Names of those that took the leap. *ibid.* The difference between a poetical love and a real one. IV. 82. *a.* *b.* V. 420. *b.* 421. *a.* *b.* There is no need of any other witchcraft to make people guilty of a thousand disorders. IV. 454. *b.* Creeps in every where. 635. *b.* Whether all would go to ruin in its empire if women were to attack, and men to stand upon the defensive. V. 31. *b.* 32. *a.* *b.* Love is a divine fury, which produces the most violent Enthusiasm. 45. *b.* The evils which this passion draws after it. 110. *a.* Guido Cavalcante's song on terrestrial love, has been commented on by several learned men. II. 398. *b.* 399. *a.* *b.* An explication of the doctrine of Cavalcante, touching the nature of love, by Marfilus Ficinus. 399. *b.* A very singular character of that of A. Niphus. IV. 378. *b.* 379. *a.* A book of Parthenius, concerning this passion. 482. The distemper of love sometimes ends in madness, or a consumption. *ibid.* *a.* What a Spanish author said of virtuous love. V. 225. *b.*
- Love* (self): a refinement upon self-love. I. 134. *a.* Reflexion upon self-love. 460. *a.* *b.* Makes people despise riches sometimes. *ibid.*
- Love of our neighbour*. A Portuguese Monk preaches that we are bound to love all men, of whatsoever religion, sect, or nation, they be, even the Castilians. V. 319.
- Lovers* ought to make use of the key of the heart to come at the enjoyment of their mistresses. I. 454. *a.* *b.* Their impertinent gallantries. III. 867. *b.* The History of two married persons, who were always called *the two lovers*. 386. *a.* *b.* A lover who by his amorous embraces cured his mistress that was infected with the Plague. 3. *a.* *b.*
- Low-Countries* lost by the jealousies, and other hidden passions of Philip II. I. 588. *a.* A project of peace which is proposed to them. III. 120. *a.* *b.* 121. *a.* Have furnished a theatre of war for two ages. 806. *a.*
- Lubbet* brings fifty heads of accusation against one of his Colleagues before the Synod of Dort. IV. 75. *a.* *b.* A great enemy to innovations. 474. *a.*
- Lubeck*, the school there decays, and why. III. 663. *b.*
- Lubin* (Father) his complaints against the gentlemen of the French academy. V. 234. *b.* And against the Dutch. *ibid.* 235. *a.*
- Lucan* affirms in a profane manner, that the Gods are only angry with the unfortunate. II. 418. *b.* For what reason he imagined that in Greece and Italy, the Deity was better known than at Mar-seilles. 678. *a.* *b.* His mistake in this respect. *ibid.* Why he joined with the conspirators against Nero. IV. 597. *a.*
- Lucar* (Cyril of) a great many of his letters were deposited in Rivetus's hands. V. 560. *b.*
- Lucian*, the answer which he puts into the mouth of a Courtesan. I. 54. *b.* 55. *a.* What he affirms to have seen at Byblos. 116. *a.* What he says of the thunder that was darted at Anaxagoras. 307. *b.* 308. *a.* Censured for a blunder, in relation to the picture of Calumny, which is attributed to Apelles. 367. *b.* 368. *a.* *b.* Let a man turn himself all ways imaginable, he will never avoid the satirical strokes of such a man as Lucian. II. 117. *b.* Does not shew much judgment on the subject of Sthenobea and Phædra. 535. *a.* Tells a pretty story concerning Democritus. 638. *a.* The character which he gives of that Philosopher. 639. *b.* 640. *a.* Tho' he ridicules false gods, he deserves notwithstanding to be detested. IV. 584. *b.* A dialogue which has been accounted one of his pieces. V. 446. *b.*
- Lucilius*, a Satiric Poet did not get satisfaction of the Comedian who had offended him, by naming him on the stage. I. 61. *b.* Did not desire that his readers should be altogether ignorant, or very learned men. IV. 593. *a.*
- Lucretius*, one of the arguments which he uses against the doctrine of the Homœomerics. I. 297. *a.* *b.* Was not aware of an objection, which would have destroyed the very foundation of that hypothesis. *ibid.* *b.* Refutes an answer of Anaxagoras tolerably well. 303. *b.* His sentence, that men pull off the mask, at the point of death, is not always true. III. 288. *b.* *n.* (26). What he says about seeing a shipwreck. IV. 34. *b.* *n.* (93).
- Lucullus* courts a lady of pleasure, in order to obtain an employment. II. 426. *a.* *b.*
- Lucumon*, from what preface his wife assured him of good fortune. V. 287. *a.* *b.*
- Lude* (Count de) what kind of shots he shot upon the government. III. 265. *a.*
- Ludolphus* (Job) acquired a wonderful knowledge of Ethiopia. III. 527. *a.*
- Lusfen* (Herman) a Physician of Rotterdam, his letter upon the sympathetic virtue. I. 9. *b.* *n.* (76).
- Lugob*, the Provost de l'Hôtel's lieutenant, disguised as a priest, and sent to confess John Chastel, plays his part ill. II. 459. *b.* 460. *a.* *b.*
- Lusignan* (Brother Stephen of) rallied upon his extraordinary learning. I. 53. *a.*
- Luffon* (Bishop of), see *Cardinal de Richelieu*. He writes a letter to Marshal d'Ancre in very submissive terms. III. 209. *a.* *b.*
- Lust*: whether courage and lust flow from the same principle in the constitution. III. 414. *a.* *b.* 415. *a.* *b.*
- Luther*. His reputation was every body's concern in Saxony. I. 140. *a.* *b.* Looked upon as a Hero by some great Geniuses of the Romish communion. 149. *b.* Accuses Aleander of being a Jew. 215. *a.* *b.* Called those Divines Anaxagorists, who find every thing in every text of Scripture. 304. *a.* Disapproves of the rebellion of the Anabaptists. 284. *a.* *b.* 285. *a.* What he reproaches the Divines of Cologne, and those of Louvain, with. 470. *b.* Reflexions upon what some people affect to say, that Luther married a very handsome Nun. II. 72. *a.* *b.* 73. *a.* Facts relating to his marriage. 73. *b.* 74. *a.* *b.* 75. *a.* *b.* 76. *a.* *b.* 77. *a.* *b.* A resolution is taken of answering him in a vigorous manner, to make him more moderate for the future. 195. *a.* *b.* 196. *a.* His translation of the Bible. 705. *a.* In what disposition he was, when he saw himself put to the ban of the empire. III. 272. *b.* The efficacy of his preaching foretold about thirty years before it happened. 456. *a.* *b.* Accused by Cochleus of having published prefaces that were injurious to the Scripture. 942. *a.* Whether it became him to dis-vert himself with jests and banter. 954. *a.* He disperses the schools of Magic in Spain and Germany. V. 385. *b.* His conferences with Vergerius. 452. *a.* *b.* Favoured by the enormity of abuses. II. 126. *a.* A book intitled, *Luther with* *from*

- seven beads*, in which Cochleus relates all his impurities. III. 136. *a. b.* Composes a preface to Fr. Lambert's book *de Minoritarum regula*. 709. *b.* Silvester Prierias succeeds very ill in writing against him. IV. 772. *a.* Controversial writings between that Monk and him. *ibid. and b.* Reflexion upon what Mr Claudé has said concerning his conference with the Devil. V. 73. *a. b.*
- Lutheranism*: what made Castellán suspected of Lutheranism. II. 372. *b.* Who was called its sword and shield. III. 218. *b.* Its preservation amidst the schisms which distracted it. IV. 271. *a. b.* When, and how introduced, and established in Dortmund. II. 121. *a. b.* Introduced into Carinthia, Carniola, and the territories of the Grand Seigneur by the Slavonian translations of Truberus. V. 405.
- Lutherans*, a great number of them refuse to communicate with the Church of Ireland. I. 718. *a. b.* The history of their eleventh schism. III. 442. *a. b.* Meet at Leipzig with the Calvinists, by order of the great Gustavus, to endeavour at an accommodation. 476. *a.* What gave rise to the thirteenth schism which happened among them. 478. *a. b.* What was the cause of their fourteenth schism. 535. *b.* The opinion which the rigid Lutherans have of Calvinism. 841. *a.* Treat the Calvinists, that were banished out of England, very ill. V. 550. *b.* Join with the Catholics to resist the Calvinists. II. 121. Their doctrine concerning the Eucharist, seemed to Bucer to attribute too much to the Real Presence. 177. *a.* The disturbance which their book of concord produces, and how it is treated by the King of Denmark, and by Queen Elizabeth. III. 390. *a.* 391. *a. b.*
- Luxury*, by what Gradations it crept in among the Romans. II. 710. *a.* When it is at the height, they treat what is said of the ancient frugality as fabulous. *ibid.* Pope Innocent XI attempts to reform it. III. 569. *a. b.* An author wishes that all those women who addit themselves to luxury were called whores. II. 400. *b.* People are readier to give it over at the commandment of the King, than that of God. *ibid.*
- Laz*, the incorruptibility of that bone, according to the Jews, and its virtue towards the resurrection of the body. I. 649. *b.* 650. *a. b.*
- Lazara*, the winning of that battle very much controverted by the writers of both sides. III. 719. *b.* *n.* (24).
- M.
- M** That letter's being ill printed, occasions a great error. II. 42. *a. b.*
- Mailillon* (Father) his indignation at seeing a famous man buried without an epitaph. II. 277. *b.* 278. *a. b.* A curious fact which he has related to us, and which had been cut off from a manuscript. 633. *a. b.* Censured for praising Episcopius. 795. *a. b.* There is an untruth concerning the Turks in the History of the Holy War published by him. IV. 41. *a.*
- Macarius*, four of his Homilies translated by Daniel d'Ange. I. 562. *a.*
- Macerata*, at what time its academy was founded. V. 167. *b.*
- Macbiavel* cited. III. 798. *b.* What he says of Peter and Jerome Riario. V. 163. *a. b.* A thought of his concerning that which makes Legislators succeed or miscarry. 73. *b.*
- Macrinus* sends Caracalla's ashes to Julia, and writes a very obliging letter to her. III. 606. *b.* But at last orders her to depart from Antioch. *ibid.*
- Macrobius* confuses over all such romances as the *Golden Ass*, to nurlcs. I. 395. *a.* Confounds the places of the Knights with those of the Senators. III. 695. *b.* 696. *a. b.* What judgment ought to be made of the stories which he relates. IV. 769. *b.*
- Madness*. The greatest wits have all a mixture of madness. II. 321. *a.* As likewise madness has sometimes a mixture of great wit. *ibid.* It is wisdom to feign it on some occasions. V. 373. *b.*
- Madmen*, persons who have feigned themselves to be so. I. 422. *b.* They have a privilege to sin with impunity. II. 254. *a.*
- Mænas*, what argument he made use of to persuade Augustus to keep the empire in his own hands. IV. 564. *a.*
- Mænius* punishes his freedman severely, for having killed his daughter. 797. *a.*
- Maestricht* subdued in the year. 1673. IV. 211. *b.*
- Maffew* (the Jesuit) repeated his Breviary in Greek, for what reason. IV. 409. *a. b.*
- Magabitti*, Cardinal Mazarin's nephew, besieges la Motte. IV. 278.
- Magdeburg*, whether the sacking of Magdeburg was foretold by a Poet. III. 877. *b.* 878. *a. b.* 879. *a.* A book published under the name of the inhabitants of this town. V. 736.
- Magdalenes* (the convent of) designed for receiving debauched women, who should be reclaimed. IV. 888. *a. b.*
- Magi* of Persia, the impostures which they used, to engage their King to destroy Christianity. I. 13. *a. b.*
- Magia Diabolica*, Elich maintains a public dispute, and writes a book upon that subject. II. 750.
- Magic*. Persons that have been accused of it. I. 145. *a.* 182. *a. b.* 384. *b.* 385. *a. b.* 392. *b.* 393. *a. b.* 598. *and a. b.* II. 51. *b.* III. 211. 231. *b.* 232. *a. b.* 233. *a.* IV. 369. *a. b.* 370. *a.* 533. *b.* 534. *a.* V. 100. Whether books of Magic be necessary. I. 182. *b.* Who are those that have touched upon natural and lawful Magic. 192. Their was a time when Magic required that beautiful youths should be sacrificed. 347. *b.* 348. *a.* Who was the inventor of it, and how it was transmitted from the old world to the new. II. 431. *a. b.* 432. *a. n.* (15). Illustrious names are prefixed to books, especially to such as treat of Magic. 640. *b.* A good many Christians laugh at it, and yet continue to own the Divinity of the Scriptures. V. 12. *b.* Called *Art Atracia*, and why. I. 538. *a.* See *Witchcraft*.
- Magicians*: whether a man's poverty may be used as an argument to prove that he is a Magician. I. 152. *a. b.* Their accusers fall into contradictions sometimes. 385. *b.* 386. *a.* Are very guilty of romancing. II. 639. *a. b.* Attack one another's reputations. 641. *a. b.* Whether they can be accused without any danger, and when this may be done. III. 211. *b.* 212. *a.* Whether the stories which are told of them be true or chimerical. V. 100. What difference there is between them and forcerers. 385. *b.*
- Magistrates*: the Magistrate has a right to punish fornication. I. 222. *a. b.* 223. *a.* Illustrious Magistrates, and good Catholics called Heretics, in the Bibliotheque of the society of the Jesuits. 220. *a.* Make several edicts against the Anabaptists. 285. *a. b.* 286. *a.* Whether they ought to punish Heretics. 789. *a. b.* Their readiness in letting themselves be led away by cabals. II. 141. *a. b.* There is no better way to gain the applause of the mob than to declaim against them. 357. *a.* Mankind could not possibly subsist without them. III. 671. *a.* Ought to be extremely cautious in inflicting a note of infamy. IV. 500. *b.* and why. *ibid.* Those who maintain that men ought to be punished by the Magistrate for their opinions, fall into a thousand contradictions. 782. *a.* When authors have recourse to them, to get their adversaries writings suppressed, it is a plain sign that they are convinced of having the worst in the dispute. V. 343. *a.*
- Magni* (Valerian) his *Judicium de Acatolicorum & Catholicorum regula credendi*. V. 741. *a. b.*
- Mabomet* of glorious memory, whether a Christian can speak of that impostor in such honourable terms. II. 760. A treaty of peace between him and the Christians. IV. 38. *b.* Was not of a base extraction. 176. *b.* Subdues Mecca. 177. *b.* 178. *a.* Could neither read nor write. 177. *b.* Commands his followers to go in pilgrimage to Mecca. 178. *a. b.* Prophecies upon his death-bed, and not at all like a false prophet. 349. *b.* Lewis de Leon applies the predictions of the apostles concerning Antichrist to him. III. 772. *b.* Some hold him to be Antichrist, and appropriate to him the number 666, in the Revelations. 733. A book intitled, *the Jés of Mabomet demolished*. I. 326.

Mabomet

- Mahomet II.** His letter to Pope Pius II. I. 54. *b.* Reproached with illegitimacy. 338.
- Mahometans,** their religion suffers a great calamity. I. 49. *a.* Cannot think it possible that a man of their sectaries call themselves men of truth. 52. *a.* Whether it be true that their women have no hopes of entering into Paradise. IV. 34. *b.* 35. *a. b.* Are greatly alarmed by a certain prediction. 43. *a. b.* 44. *a. b.* 45. *a.* Leave legacies to an unknown Prophet, who is to come and deliver the world from the tyranny of Antichrist. 123. *a.*
- Mahometism** honours the assumption of virgins as well as the Romish Church does. III. 17. *b.* Must be destroyed very soon, according to the prophecies of a great many persons. IV. 43. *a. b.* 44. *a. b.* 45. *a.* Through what motives these prophecies were published. 44. *b.* 45. *a.* There is some reason to wonder that it should be so little advantageous to the female sex. 48. *b.* The influence which that sex had upon its foundation. *ibid.*
- Maid:** the advantages of a maid above a widow. I. 393. *a. b.* Old maids are pleased with telling that they have been courted for marriage. II. 109. *b.* The Greeks and Romans called a married woman, or one that had children, by that name. 140. *b.* Whether maids should be allowed to marry very young. III. 965. *b.* The Romans would not suffer them to be present at feasts. 966. *a. b.* Signs by which one may know whether a woman that passes for a maid has had any children. IV. 52. *a. b.* 53. *a. b. c.* See *Ladies*. A maid, when she is deflowered, is like palled wine that has lost its value. III. 112. *a.* What Agur says about a maid. II. 369. *b.*
- Maid of honour** to a Queen, is a function very difficult to execute. III. 832.
- Maid of Orleans,** her history. III. 336. *a. b.* 337. *a.*
- Mayenne** (Duke of) makes himself the strongest in the council of the League. III. 297. *a. b.*
- Mayer** (John Frederic), Professor of Divinity, his Disertation upon Catherine Bore. II. 76. *a. b.* 77. *a.* Cited. I. 730. *a. n.* (37). 732. *a.*
- Maimbourg,** a great falsity of his. I. 709. *b.* Censured on what he says concerning Beza. 795. *a. n.* (80). Anachronisms of this author. II. 17. *a.* His violence against the Calvinists in relation to Cayet. 244. *b.* Is guilty of a great fault, in point of Chronology, concerning Gregory the Great. III. 219. *a.* Animadverts upon a fault of Peter du Moulin concerning the same Pope. *ibid.* and *b.* His character. 224. *b.* Confutes a falsity of Davila's, in relation to the Duke of Guise, that was murdered at the castle of Blois. 292. *b.* 293. *a.* An exceptionable witness in whatever concerns the Protestants. 397. *a.* Censured injudiciously by the author of the *News from the Republic of Letters*, in relation to the hatred which the ladies bore Henry III. 405. *b.* 406. *a.* Stuffs in an episode upon the affair of the *Regale*, in his history of Lutheranism. 454. *b.* 455. *a.* Censured in relation to John Sigismund. 533. *b.* Is mistaken in a notable fact concerning Luther's burial. 947. *a.* Falls into the same contradiction with Paul Jovius, whom he transcribes, concerning the Atheism of Mahomet II. IV. 52. *b.* Censured in relation to the mischiefs which the Greeks suffered under Mahomet II. 55. *a. b.* Has not acquitted himself like a faithful Historian, with regard to Joan I, Queen of Naples. 304. *a. b.* Is by no means exact in what he says of Ochinus. 388. *b.* Criticized in relation to those among the Calvinists that were accused of having betrayed their cause. 924. *b.* And in relation to Lelius Socinus. V. 167. *b.* A passage of his History of Calvinism examined. 474. *a. b.* 475. *a. b.* Censured and defended, touching the manuscripts and the editions of Martinus Polonus. IV. 709. *a. b.*
- Maimonides** (Moses) shews himself too nice in rejecting the proofs of the unity of God alledged by the sect of the speakers. V. 828.
- Maine** (la Croix du), Daurat's opinion of his works. II. 617. *b.*
- Mainferme** (Father de la), a She-Pope would find her apology in that which he has made for the founder of Fontevraud. III. 63. *a.*
- Major** (John) writes verses against the Divines of Wittenberg, for which he is expelled the university. III. 972. *b.*
- Majorca** (James, Infant of), his wife causes his head to be struck off for adultery. IV. 302. *a. b.*
- Maire de Belges** (John le) quoted. III. 609. *a. b.* 645. *a.* IV. 156. *a. b.* Teaches Marot the elision of the *e* feminine. *ibid.* *b.* 163. *b.*
- Maitland** (John), Chancellor of Scotland, hinders the Bishop of Dublin from succeeding in his negotiation for the marriage of James VI, with the Infanta of Spain. II. 577. William Criton endeavours to engage Robert Bruce to kill him, but cannot bring it about. *ibid.*
- Malatesta** (Paula), a lady of learning. III. 185. *a.*
- Maldonat** censured for the wrong he does the Calvinists in saying that their principles lead to Atheism. V. 440. *a. b.* 441. *a. b.* 445. *a.* Sent to Metz to make profelytes. IV. 921.
- Malefactors,** there is not an Atheist to be found among so many who pass through the hangman's hands. V. 813.
- Malherbe,** a mistake of his imitated by Sarrazin, and corrected in the latter by Menage. I. 80. *b.* 81. *a.* Expresses himself like one who is well satisfied that Achilles had but one preceptor. 78. *b.* Introduces the god of the Seine cursing Marfial d'Ancres. II. 543. *a.* Never praised, nor hardly esteemed any body. III. 855. *a.* A blunt expression of his concerning a book of Meziriac's. IV. 208. *a. b.* Would have been offended at some verses where Boileau mentions him. 596. *b.* On what account he was most inconsolable. 82. *b.* V. 384. *a.* His epitaph. 402. *b.*
- Mallebranche,** his doctrine that our ideas are distinct from our understanding, and that we see all things in God, is an antient one. I. 255. It is Democritus's doctrine unfolded and mended. II. 642. *b.* He establishes a principle of which Chrysippus had given the first draught. 496. *b.* 497. *a.* Refutes those who deny the creation. 789. *b.* What he says of the existence of bodies. V. 614. *a. b.*
- Malo,** a Minister, refuses to administer the sacrament to the lady of Montpensier. III. 864. *b.* And why. *ibid.*
- Mamaca,** an imaginary castle into which it is said the Kings of the Merovingian race retired through slothfulness. II. 744. *a.*
- Mamiliani,** there were two faints of that name, according to Marafcia. IV. 98.
- Man:** the Pagans owned that man was composed of two parts, each of which re-unites itself to its principle. I. 275. *a. b.* The opinion of some Philosophers concerning the formation of the first men. 416. *a. b.* II. 411. *a. b.* 412. *a. b.* III. 649. *a. b.* 650. *a. b.* 651. *a.* It is the nature of man to run into extremes. I. 527. *a.* In what manner he may be defined. II. 126. *a.* Men sold very cheap. 303. *b.* How diversified by the laws of the union of soul and body. 451. *b.* 452. *a. b.* They give their neighbours false reasons for their conduct, reserving the true ones to themselves. 726. *b.* Man is an undisciplinable animal. 832. *b.* To how high a degree men are wicked. III. 469. *a.* Their passions render the finest systems of politics useless. *ibid.* By what method a man may become a god. IV. 572. *b.* Man is like a little republic, that changes its Magistrates often. 657. *b.* His state and condition is one of the most incomprehensible mysteries. 187. *a.* 468. *a. b.* His deplorable condition. V. 230. *a.* 287. *a.* Suffers a perpetual conflict within himself. IV. 440. *a. b.* 441. *a.* Whether he be less perfect than the plants, as to the manner of producing his like. V. 4. *a. b.* Nothing is more mortifying than to consider that one is a man. 145. *a. b.* 146. *a.* His prerogatives described by Socrates. 583. *b.* 584. *a.* Great men do not like to speak of their mean extraction. I. 256. *a. b.* Their memory fails them very often. 369. *b.* The stars of some men have power to immortalize a story, however improbable it be. II. 7. *a.* Men deserve satire more than women. V. 426. *b.* 427. *a.* The two handles by which man is moved, are the fear of punishment, and the desire of reward. 812.
- Mancionus** (Jerom), Cesar Borgia orders his tongue to be cut out for his satirical strokes. IV. 90. *b.*
- Mandeville,** the account of his travels is fabulous. I. 46. *b.* 471. *b.*

Manducation

- Manducation* (oral), J. Poinet does not allow of it, though he allows of the word Transubstantiation. IV. 693. *a. b.*
- Manducis*, what use the Romans made of that word. I. 63. *b.*
- Manes* fled alive, and why. IV. 90. *b.* 91. *a.*
- Mania*, a goddess to whom children were sacrificed. II. 163. *b.* Her effigy hung up at the doors of the house to avert dangers. *ibid.* Prefixed at births. *ibid.*
- Manichei* revive one of the principal tenets of Zoroaster. I. 444. Become powerful under the name of Paulicians. IV. 512. Are grievously persecuted. *ibid.* Their Heresy spreads itself into all the parts of Europe. *ibid.* They cannot easily be refuted, except by reasons *à posteriori*. 512, 513. *and a.* An explanation, as to what the author had said concerning them. V. 815. to 829. Their objections are unanswerable, so long as they are discussed only at the bar of reason. 815. Why the author has not refuted them. 825. People cannot but abhor their hypothesis: it goes upon a supposition which is repugnant to our most distinct ideas. *ibid.* 829. Their doctrine is destructive of all religions. 827. Reasonings against their tenets. *ibid.* and 828, 829. Objections of Simplicius. 826, 827.
- Manicheism* arose from the contrariety of passions which toils and pull men sometimes one way, sometimes another. III. 261. *a.* People have been surprized to find it said, that they could raise puzzling objections. IV. 187. *a.*
- Manilius* degraded. IV. 755. *a.* 757. *a.*
- Manlike*, proofs of their bad taste. III. 433. *a. b.* 434. *a.*
- Manlius* expelled from the Senate by Cato, and for what reason. I. 40. *b.*
- Manlius*, how he believed that the gods assist us. V. 373. *a.*
- Manners*, whether they change with our fortunes. IV. 571. *a. b.*
- Manfield* (Count), how delivered from the trouble of a most unlucky marriage. III. 696. *a. b.*
- Manfur*, whether he is the same with Mefue. II. 587. *b.*
- Mante*: the conference of Mante between Perron and Berault. I. 756.
- Mantineans*, what sort of laws they had, and who it was that framed them. II. 654. *b.* 655. *a.*
- Manius*, by whom founded. IV. 98. *b.*
- Manneville* put for Esmandreville. II. 828. *b.*
- Manuanns*, his poem intitled *Alphonius*, what it is. V. 157. *b.*
- Manutius* (Aldus), an inscription which he caused to be put upon the door of his study. V. 521. *b.* Censured touching the cause of Ovid's disgrace. IV. 443. *b.* 444. *a.* And touching the time of his death. 447. *a.*
- Manutius* (Paulus), refutation of his opinion concerning the meaning of this phrase, *Querre conditiones*. III. 116. *b.* 117. *a. b.* Is under a mistake when he says that Atius and his daughter were not of Aricia. IV. 397. *a.* Troubles which his daughter brought upon him. V. 241. *a.*
- Manuscripts* are the sport of fortune. I. 525. *a.* IV. 833. *b.* People alter the reading of manuscripts, according to the model of their own understandings. I. 543. *b.* Some ancient ones do not contain all that is to be found in others, and yet no blanks have been left in them. II. 572. *b.* Catalogue of those of the Emperor's library at Vienna. III. 707. *b.* Application of Peraxylus in the search of them. IV. 544. Consideration on the causes of their difference. 710. *a. b.* &c. Are corrupted by additions and subtractions. 710. *a.* Want of sincerity does not always occasion their difference; several innocent causes may contribute towards it. 711. *b.* A rule whereby to judge whether they are altered from motives of interest. *ibid.*
- Manuscripts of the Scriptures* altered and corrupted by the Heretics. III. 733.
- Mar*, the signification of that word. I. 51. *b.*
- Marais* (Mr), extrañs communicated by him to the author, concerning the affront which the Queen of Navarre received. IV. 341. *a. b.*
- Marble*, a dispute betwixt Arnauld and Jurieu, whether it may be worshipped. III. 100. *b.* 101. *a. b.*
- Marca*, the judgment which has been passed on him with regard to one of his books. IV. 100. *b.*
- V O L. V.
- Marcellus* (Claudius-Marcus) his untimely death, Virgil's reflexion thereupon. III. 921. *b.* His elogy, and the consequence inferred from it. *ibid.*
- Marcellus*, by his venerable presence hinders the common people from killing the Heretic Manes. IV. 111. *a.*
- Marcellus Ficinus* sends an account of himself from the other world. II. 65. *b.* 66. *a.*
- Marcion*, neither he nor his followers did well understand the strength and weakness of the orthodox. IV. 113. *a.*
- Marcus Aurelius* (Emperor), the spurious life of that Prince by Guevara. II. 770. *a.* III. 270. *a. b.* Fausto da Longiano writes a criticism upon it. *ibid. b.* And promises a life of M. Aurelius, composed from the testimony of the ancient Historians. *ibid.*
- Mare Historiarum*, or the sea of histories, a work under that title composed by John Columna. II. 529. *a. b.* Called by mistake *Mater Historiarum*, and *the mother of histories*. *ibid. a.* Divers things have been inserted into it, and the economy of it has been changed. *ibid. b.*
- Marefol*, for what things he was indebted to the profession of Phylis. IV. 504. *b.* 505. *a.*
- Mares*, their excessive lust. V. 768. Some ladies pass a whole night in watching a mare. 773. Mares that took wind, and which people believed to be with foal. 771. *a. b.* 772. *a. b.*
- Marefus* (Samuel), his method of teaching, and his authority. I. 242. Prolegomena of his dispute against Daillé. II. 583. *a. b.* 584. *a. b.* His *Hydra Socinianismi expugnata*. V. 505. *b.* &c. Blames the English for their indulgence to the Socinians. 506. *b.*
- Mareft* (John des) a visionary, his tricks to draw another visionary into a snare. IV. 268. *a. b.* 269. *a.*
- Margaret of Anjou*, Queen of England, falls into the hands of a company of highway-men. II. 131. *a.*
- Margaret de Valois*, Queen of Navarre, sister to Francis I, intercedes for a Franciscan who had preached against her. III. 623. *a.* Transformed into a Fury in a comedy. IV. 318. *b.* Her Heptameron. 321. *b.* 322. *a. b.* Her Heroism. 323. *a. b.*
- Margaret*, sister to Henry II, and wife to the Duke of Savoy, was a learned woman, and loved learned men. III. 200. *b.* Suspected to have imbibed the new opinions. 397. *b.* 398. *a.* Suspected likewise to have feigned herself with child. 398. *a.* She bubbles the court of France very advantageously for her husband the Duke of Savoy. *ibid. and b.* Every body murmurs at it. *ibid. b.*
- Margaret de Valois*, Queen of Navarre, sister to Charles IX, was very averse to the marrying Henry IV, by reason of the difference of religion. IV. 333. *b.* Her temper. 334. *a. b.* Common fame makes her loved criminally by two of her brothers. 335. *a. b.* Almost did the office of a midwife to her husband's mistresses. 336. *a.* The counter-artifice which she employed against Catherine de Medicis. III. 419. *b.* Her gallanting humour. IV. 339. *b.* 340. *a. b.*
- Margaret*, daughter to the Emperor Maximilian, who was her actual husband. III. 323. *a.*
- Marianna*, a tragedy which cost a Player his life. V. 400. *a.*
- Marianus Scotus*, what he says of the She-Pope. IV. 725, 726, 727, 728. Many think that he is the first who spoke of the She-Pope; others maintain he said nothing about her. 727. *b.* 728. *a.* From what manuscript the edition of Marianus was printed. *ibid.*
- Mary Stuart*, Queen of Scotland, how we ought to judge of the fautes that were wrote against her. II. 181. *a.* That which encourages historical Pyrrhonism in relation to her adventures. 282. *a. b.* Buchanan publishes a book concerning her leudness. V. 857.
- Mary of Burgundy* had a desire to be married to the Dauphin of France. III. 805. *a.* Dies of a fall from her horse at hunting. II. 222. *b.*
- Mary de Medicis*, Queen of France, scruples raised in the mind of Lewis XIII, with relation to the hardships exercised towards that Princess. II. 400. *a. b.* Those who formed factions with her were altogether inexcusable. IV. 143. *b.* Answer which the causes to be published. 256. *a.*

- Mary Magdalene*, whether she be the same with Mary the sister of Lazarus, and the woman who was a sinner. III. 47. *b.* 48. *a.*
- Marindal*, Marshal Turenne is defeated there. IV. 917. *b.*
- Marigni* gives testimonies very favourable to the Prince of Condé's virtue. II. 137. *b.* The infidelity which he attributes to a governor of the Low-Countries, with respect to the ladies. V. 421. *b.*
- Marillac*, Keeper of the Seals, second Cardinal Beaulieu in opposing Cardinal Richelieu's design of humbling the House of Austria. I. 786. *a.*
- Marillac* (Marshal de) whether he was put to death for any other cause, than his having displeased Cardinal Richelieu. III. 818. *a. b.* IV. 141. *a. b.* 142. *a. b.* 143. *a. b.* &c.
- Marini* (Chevalier) his thought concerning the spots in the moon. I. 113. *b.*
- Marius* (Hieronymus Vicentius) the fictitious name that Massarius gives himself, and which Placcius has not mentioned. IV. 173. *a.*
- Marlorat* makes Indexes for Calvin's Institution. V. 88. *a.*
- Marolles* (the Abbé de) translates Ovid's Poem against His into French, and accompanies it with notes. IV. 452. *b.* Dedicates this translation to James Pinon, and a long passage in praise of that man. 651. *a. b.*
- Mars* declares that he had learned in Italy never to speak of God. IV. 154. *a. b.* Whether the Protestants ought to be reproached with the public use of his version, supposing he had been punished for his adulteries. 154. *b.* 155. *a.* What Cayet says of him is not probable. 154. *b.* His false prophecy. II. 29. *b.* 30. *a.*
- Marpurg*: when the university of Marburg was founded. III. 709. *b.* *n.* (10). And when opened. 148. *b.*
- Marry*: whether a wife man ought to marry. I. 633. *b.* Formerly people were prohibited to marry after a certain age. 120. *a.* Those who marry a second time excluded from the ministry by the canons. II. 174. *b.*
- Marriage* joined with continency. I. 34. *a.* What is its principal character. *ibid.* and *b.* Formerly the Legislators prohibited it to women of fifty, and men of sixty years of age. 120. *a.* Its efficacy. 223. *a. b.* 446. *a. b.* What it is a remedy for. 390. *b.* 391. *a.* Gives an opportunity of making experiments. 549. *b.* 550. *a.* Sentiments of Socrates, Diogenes, and Euripides, concerning marriage. 549. *a. b.* Reflexion upon the beauty and riches, or the ugliness and poverty of the woman that one designs to marry. 549. *b.* 550. *a. b.* A false dilemma against marriage. II. 13. *b.* 14. *a.* Whether it is forbidden to make choice of a handsome wife. 72. *a. b.* 73. *a.* Whether it was a recommendation among the party, at the beginning of the Reformation. 174. *b.* 175. *a.* III. 13. *a. b.* 14. *a. b.* Is a necessary troublesome state. II. 384. *a.* Speech of Metellus to recommend marriage. *ibid.* The Athenian laws allowed a man to marry his sister by the father, and forbid him his sister by the mother, the Lacedæmonian laws permitted the latter, and prohibited the former. 503. *a. b.* 504. *a. b.* Several extravagant fancies concerning the marriage of Adam and Eve. 853. *a. b.* Delusion of Heretics that professed to abstain from it. III. 63. *b.* The Theory of it is well known before a woman be marriageable. 187. *a.* Whether it is convenient and proper for Philosophers. 382. *b.* The Divinity that presided over it, according to the Poets. 641. *a. b.* A custom relating to it which was observed among some nations. 773. *a. b.* Strange superstition of the Roman ladies, in seeking after omens for marriage. IV. 200. *b.* 201. *a.* Is sometimes to irksome, that a man to free himself from it would go to the end of the world. 313. *b.* Clandestine marriages should be declared void. 636. *a. b.* 637. *a.* The Canon-Law countenances the abuses of marriage. 748. *a. b.* Those who marry a poor wife to be quiet at home, do not obtain their ends. 753. *a.* Reflexion on its consequences. 844. *a. b.* Reflexion on St Paul's words, wherein he seems to command the Bishops to marry. 856. *b.* 857. *a.* Could not be contracted between brother's and sisters by adoption.
- V. 49. *b.* Scandalous customs which were observed in relation to it. 129. *b.* 130. *a. b.* 131. *a. b.* What are the inconveniences of marriage. 425. *a. b.* 426. *a. b.* Whether it be a good remedy against incontinence. 426. *a.* It is dangerous to men of learning. 604. *a.* Edict of Henry II, concerning clandestine marriages. IV. 636. *a. b.* Is the most difficult of all things to determine with judgment. I. 603. *a.* The impatience of youth hurries us into it without reflexion. *ibid.* It is necessary to begin with earnest prayer, when we deliberate upon a point so nice and hazardous. *ibid. b.* William Bigot promises a treatise to prove the necessity of marriage. *ibid. a.* A discourse on the marriage of men of learning, by Claudius Badiet. *ibid. a. b.* This discourse full of good instructions. *ibid. b.* And translated into French by Guy de la Gard. 604. *a. b.* A common argument, that marriage divers too much from study. III. 344. *a.* It does not deaden the spirits nor slacken the hands. *ibid.* There ought to be marriage-makers in a well ordered commonwealth. 529. *b.* Leontium wrote a book against Theophrastus, because he had published several good things relating to marriage. 779. Fine pieces on the subject of marriage, must displease a Courtisan. *ibid. b.* The answer which some ladies made to those that proposed a second marriage to them. III. 189. *a.* 191. *a. b.* 192. *a.* Those who gave their daughters in marriage, demanded a wedding-present from their sons-in-law. IV. 180. *b.*
- Marriages*: the primitive Christians declared strongly against second marriages. I. 533. *a. b.* That which St Jerome said against them. III. 192. *a.* They have been subject formerly, and are still to canonical penalties. *ibid. b.* Sentences against second marriages. IV. 747. *a.*
- Married*. The first woman in Peloponnesus that was married a second time. III. 194. The advantage of those that are ill-married. II. 14. *a.* Whether those who are not married study better, and write more good books than those that are. V. 524. *b.* &c.
- Marrow*, *vin.* whether lions have any. I. 76. *a. b.* It is in the marrow, that the specific parts of the animal are contained. *ibid. b.*
- Mars* was the Patron of the countries which the Alains inhabited. I. 177. *b.* In what action the Romans pretended that this god had fought victoriously for them. III. 1. *b.*
- Marjaglia*, the success of that battle is not doubtful, Marshal de Catinat gained it. IV. 211. *a.*
- Marquises*. A poisoning liquor was kept there for those who wanted to kill themselves. V. 628. *a. b.* The people of Marfeilles could not but know what Narbonne was. I. 11. *b.* They rejoiced at Cæsar's having ordered a sacred wood to be cut down, thinking that so great an impiety would not remain unpunished. II. 418. *b.* A profane thought of Lucan's with regard to this. *ibid.* They were inspired with greater reverence and fear for their unknown deities, than for those whom they fancied they knew. 678. *a.* They are questioned concerning Britain. I. 10. *a.* IV. 677. *a. b.*
- Marsus* (Octavius) a wretched Roman Senator. II. 680. *b.* 681. *a.*
- Martean* (Peter) observation concerning the books printed by that chimerical Printer. II. 441. *b.*
- Martel* (Charles) and his son Pepin found it a very hard matter to subdue the Duke of Aquitaine. I. 16. *a.* The suspicion of having invited the Saracens into France, should fall upon him rather than upon this Duke. *ibid. and b.* It has been publicly affirmed that he was damned. III. 707. *b.*
- Martel*, Professor of Divinity at Montauban. II. 518.
- Martia* goes to Cato, after Hortensius's death, to whom Cato had lent her, and intreats him to take her again. III. 495. *b.*
- Martia*, punished with the utmost rigour, for having violated her veital vow. III. 830. *a. b.*
- Martial* supposes a false fact in relation to Catullus. II. 395. *b.* 396. *a.* Justly laughs at the behaviour of Cato with regard to the Floral Games. III. 54. *a. n.* (9). A Venetian Gentleman burns his works in a solemn manner, as a sacrifice to the Manes of Catullus. IV. 433. *a.* Martial's wish in relation to a wife. 793. *a.* Who was the first that

- that took it into his head, to clear him of his ob-
scenities. V. 136. *a. b.* Navagiero had a great
aversion against him. IV. 315.
- Martin* (John) a famous Physician. I. 171. 172.
- Martin* (St) refuses to communicate with some Bi-
shops, and why. IV. 781. and *b.* He yields to
it at last, and why. *ibid.*
- Martin* (Bernardin) author of several books on Phy-
sic, also wrote a relation of his travels. V.
442. *b.*
- Martyr* (Peter) conforms himself for some time to
Bucer's ambiguous way of speaking, concerning
the Eucharist, but at last leaves it. II. 177. *b.*
178. *a.* His account concerning Caraccioli, dif-
ferent from that of Beza. 313. *b.* Invited into
England to assist in the Reformation. IV. 381. *b.*
His Common-places compared with Calvin's Institu-
tion. V. 86. *b.*
- Martyrdom* is a doubtful sign that truth is on the side
of that religion, which it is suffered for. IV. 108.
b. 109. *a. b.* 110. *a. b.* &c.
- Martyrology*, there are some Anabaptists in that of
Geneva. I. 287. *b.*
- Martyrs*, many pious frauds are handed about con-
cerning their death. I. 780. *a.* There is one who
was a Comedian. IV. 487. *b. n.* (37). The origin
of the false legends of martyrs. V. 432. *a. b.* &c.
Disorders which happened in their churches, whilst
the Faithful were assembled there. 472. *a.* Acts of
the Protestant martyrs published by Claudius Ba-
duel. I. 603. Savonarola has been looked upon as
one. V. 66. *b.* 67. *a.* Whether he deserves that
title. 69. *a. b.* Some Protestants give it him.
ibid. The public records ought to be carefully con-
sulted before such and such a person, is declared to be
a martyr. 70. *a. b.* & *seq.*
- Martius* goes from the burial of his son to the Se-
nate. I. 683. *a.*
- Mascati*. The advantage which its inhabitants have
over the other Mahometans. IV. 48. *a. b.*
- Masi*, called the public error, and by whom. II.
252. *b.* Whether those who have no faith in it
may be present at it, as at a Comedy. IV. 391. *a.*
It is the Lord's Supper disguised, which has turned
a Nun. *ibid.* What Stuppanus thought of it.
V. 247. *a. b.* A book intitled *the Anatomy of*
the Masi. 461. *a. b.*
- Massacre* of St Bartholomew. See *Bartholomew*.
- Masso* (Papyrius) ill translated by le Laboureur. V.
592. *b.*
- Mathematicians* are not commonly well versed in the
knowledge of matters of fact. III. 461. *a.* They
are not very devout. IV. 487. *b.*
- Mathematics*: persons that learned Mathematics with-
out any one's reading lectures to them in that
science. IV. 61. *a. b.* 63. *b.* Have their defect as
well as other sciences. V. 621. *a.* Their object.
622. *a. b.*
- Matbias* (Corvinus) King of Hungary, invited all
sorts of learned men to come to him without ex-
cepting the Magicians. II. 68. *a.* Roughly treated
by Bonfinius. 67. *b.* 68. *a.*
- Matilda* (Countess) her liberality to the Popes. III.
593. *a.*
- Matignon* puts a garrison into Bazas, and some other
places near Nerac, where the King of Navarre re-
sided. IV. 341. *a.*
- Matrimonial duty*, precepts concerning it. I. 504. *a.*
b. 505. *a. b.* II. 80. *b.* 81. *a.* 447. *b.* Whether
it was superseded and suspended in the ark. 431.
a. b.
- Matrons* (sworn) curious attestations made by them,
in obedience to an order of the judges. III. 581.
a. b. 582. *a.*
- Matter*, a comparison of its three dimensions with the
Trinity. I. 29. *b.* What Philosopher supposed first
that an intelligence put it into motion. 299. *a. b.*
Those who maintain it to be increased, are very
much puzzled. 300. *a.* III. 447. *a. b.* Is uncapa-
ble of thinking. II. 661. *b.* 662. *a. b.* III. 649.
a. b. 650. *a. b.* 651. *a.* 790. *b.* 791. *a. b.* IV.
718. *a. b.* 719. *a. b.* All the Philosophers of an-
tiquity believed it to be increased. II. 786. *b.* V.
218. *a.* Upon the supposition of its eternal
existence, natural Philosophers cannot admit of a
providence, without reasoning worse than those
that deny it. II. 786. *b.* 787. *a.* Aristotle acknow-
ledges the supposition of its eternal motion to be
absurd. 787. *b.* Had a real defect, according to
- the Platonics, which was an obstacle to God's pro-
ject. 788. *a. b.* Had likewise, according to
the same Platonics, a soul before the formation of
the world. 792. *b.* If it is self-existent, we cannot
well conceive that God either could or should give
it motion. IV. 436. *b.* And if it moved itself in-
dependently of God, there is no need for employ-
ing him in the construction of the world. 437. *a.*
Whether physical evils be an unavoidable effect of
the disposition of matter. 525. *a. b.* Whether one
can comprehend that it is eternal and distinct from
God, and that it was created out of nothing. V.
211. *b.* 212. *a. b.* In what sense divisible in *inf-
initum*. 609. *a. b.* Absurdity of this opinion. 611.
b. Its existence cannot be proved by any good
demonstration. 614. *a. b.* 615. *a.*
- Matthias* (St) the apostle, his election burlesqued in
the Acts of the Apostles in rhyme. II. 478. *a. b.*
479. *a. b.*
- Matthieu* (Peter) his reflexions upon the holy Scrip-
ture, in relation to the conference of Ratisbon. III.
536. *a.*
- Matthias*, it is believed that Faustus de Longiano
had translated Dioctrides before him. III.
861.
- Mauvoix*, his French French version of Sanderus's Hi-
story of the Schism of England, is a very polite
one, and has undergone three editions. V.
43. *a.*
- Maurice*, Emperor of Constantinople, is delivered to
Phocas. III. 222. *a. b.*
- Maurice*, Landgrave of Hesse, makes verses in honour
of the youth, who took the degree of Bachelor.
II. 818. *a.* What healths he drank with other
Princes. *ibid.* and *b.*
- Mausoleum*, was one of the seven wonders of the world.
I. 524. and *a.*
- Mausiac* censures Dalechamp justly upon the translation
of a passage of Athenæus. II. 558. *a.* 563. *b.*
- Maximilian* I, deceived by Pope Leo X. III. 540.
a. Fights a duel. IV. 184. *a.*
- Maxims* clash with each other no less than errors
and truth. I. 784. *b.* II. 27. *b.* A collection of
some. IV. 778. *a. b.*
- Maxims of state*. Their appurtenances. I. 682. *a.*
- Maximus* is defeated by Theodosius, and killed by
the soldiers at Aquileia. IV. 781. *b.*
- Maximus Tyrius*, what he relates concerning Achilles,
and the place where he resided. I. 85. *a.* His
explication of the origin of evil. IV. 525.
a. b.
- Maxarins* (the Duchefs of) an expression in her
memoirs imitated, and properly applied. II. 692.
a. b.
- Maxarins* (Cardinal) desires to be acquainted with A-
myraut. I. 264. *a. b.* One of his maxims. 619.
b. Justified as to the accusation of having made an
auction of books in the palace d'Estree. IV. 172.
a. b. Used to spin out the execution of his pro-
mises to a great length of time. 417. *a.* His rea-
diness to forgive an injury. 808. *a.* Why he did
not answer all the letters which were wrote to him.
V. 94. *b.* 95. *a.* Would not be complimented
with a false genealogy. 469. *a. b.* Causes Fa-
ther Caussin to be banished into Britany. II.
403. There was not one story which people did
not believe, when it defamed him. IV.
511. *a.*
- Meaux* (the Bishop of) seems to have transcribed a
passage of Mr Daille, and made it the principle of
one of his books. II. 583. *a.* V. 294. *a.* See
Bosquet. A passage of his examined. II. 708. *a. b.*
A reflexion of his. III. 390. *b.* Upon the prodig-
al son. V. 534. *b.* Takes a great deal of pains
to set forth the alterations of the Lutheran confes-
sion. II. 122. *b.*
- Mecca*, who began to build its temple. I. 46. *a.* And
who profaned and laid it waste. 48. 49. Upon
what model the Oratory of the temple of Mec-
ca was built. 46. *a.* A stone which hung in the
air there. 49. 124. *b.* 125. *a. b.*
- Mechanics*, a surprizing effect of that science. I. 474.
a. b.
- Mechlinius* was a disciple of Albertus Magnus. IV.
940. *b.* His opinion concerning the deluge. *ibid.*
941. *a. b.*
- Medals*, there are authors who forge false ones. III.
195. *b.* Medals which have two faces upon the
same neck, what they signify. V. 314. *a.*

Mide

- Mede* (Joseph), a Visionary: his prophetic calculations seem inspired to Jurieu. II. 124. *b.* 125. *a.*
- Medea*, what she did with her children. II. 874. *a.*
- The enchantment which she used in order to make people young again. IV. 533. *a. b.* 534. *a.*
- Mediana*, how a priest of that village behaved himself in the sedition that was raised in Castille. IV. 457. *a. b.*
- Mediators* sometimes hurt the parties which they endeavour to reconcile. I. 578. *a. b.*
- Medicus* (Cardinal John de) diverted himself with the feuds of the learned. I. 202. *a.* Was but fifteen years of age when he was named to the Cardinalate. II. 97. *a.* By what accident he was chosen Pope. III. 761. *and a. b.*
- Medicus* (Cardinal Julian de), a conspiracy is formed against him. IV. 11. *b.*
- Medicus* (Lorenzo de) filled with confusion and despair, how, and for what. IV. 232. *b.* 233. *a.* His library. III. 729. *a. b.* 730. *a.* He, and his brother Julian attacked by assassins in a church, in the middle of divine service. V. 157. *a. b.* J. Savonarola sent for to prepare him for death. 57.
- Medicus* (Peter de), what he did to make his equipage appear the more magnificent. III. 151. *b.* Contrives a plot against the government. IV. 346. *and a. b.* Persons that were executed for being concerned in it. *ibid. a. b.* Driven out of Florence. V. 59. *a.*
- Medicus* (Alexander de), Duke of Florence, assassinated. V. 251. *b.* 252. *a.* And when. IV. 379.
- Medicus* (Catherine de) cured of her barrenness, and how. III. 24. *and a.* Her husband's liberality in rewarding this cure. *ibid.* Causes the Duke of Alençon, and the King of Navarre to be kept at Vincennes, and why. III. 416. *b.* 417. *a.* Did not punish the debauchery of her maids of honour, but the want of art to conceal it. 832. *a. b.* 833. *a.* Was very near being a Calvinist. V. 186. *a. b.* Bore with fatires. 760, 761. Despised injurious reflections. IV. 278. *b.* Introduces the first Rucellai into France. 410. Frightened with a sermon of de Menot's. V. 298. *a.* Banishes the lady de Mortemart for having given her advice. *ibid.*
- Medicus* (Mary de), during the four years of her Regency, she never killed, not so much as once, the King, her son. IV. 544. *b.* Distrusted by her son. III. 816. *a.* Jealous of her authority. IV. 143. *b.* Rinuccini, a gentleman of Florence, in love with her. 878. *a.*
- Medina* (Michael) suspected for having defended Ferrus. III. 43. *b.* 44. *a.* Retrenches several things from the writings of that Franciscan. 44. *a. b.*
- Megabyzus* reproved for having talked of a thing which he did not understand. I. 367. *a.*
- Magrin* (St), by whom assassinated, and why. III. 296. *a. b.*
- Melchiorius*, his collections concerning tyranny. IV. 564. *a. n.* (26).
- Meynier*, the Jesuit, an harangue which he was thought to be the author of. II. 877. *a. b.* Accuses the gentlemen of Port-Royal of holding intelligence with Geneva. V. 16. *b.*
- Melac*, whether he had a dog that was a familiar spirit. I. 151. *a.* Suspected of dealing with the Devil. III. 718. *b.* A witty answer which he made in relation to this. *ibid.* His behaviour at the siege of Landau. 720. *a. b.* 721. *a. b.*
- Melampus*, how he acquired the gift of understanding the language of birds. II. 340. *a.* IV. 182. *a.* V. 381. *b.*
- Melanchthon*, whether it became him to divert himself with jests and banters. III. 954. *a.* Was of a peaceable disposition. IV. 185. *b.* 186. *a. b.* 187. *a. b.* 188. *a. b.* 189. *a. b.* Determines to retire into Palestine. 188. *b.* His opinion concerning Grace, was contrary to that of Luther and Calvin. V. 151. *a. b.* 152. *a. b.* Wished to die. 250. *b.* Prints the Confession of Augsburg in Latin and German, and varies from the original. II. 122. *a.* The long friendship between him and Simon Grynaeus. III. 255. Pezelius publishes some extracts of his works, in which he puts the objections and answers in a very good method, and interlards some short observations. IV. 606. *b.*
- Melanopus*, an Athenian, suffered himself to be gained over to Callistratus by money, and said to the people, that he submitted to him for the good of the public. II. 259, 260.
- Melissus* could not have answered the objections of Zoroaster against those who acknowledged but one principle of all things. IV. 519. *a.* Argument which he made use of against the existence of motion. V. 615. *b.* 616. *a. b.*
- Melchiorites*, an imaginary sect. IV. 193.
- Melchites*, a name which the Eutyrians gave the Catholics, and for what reason. IV. 349. *b.*
- Mellerstat*, a celebrated Physician to Frederic, Elector of Saxony. V. 562. *a. b.*
- Melos*, all the people of that island had the reputation of being Atheists, and why. II. 653. *a. b.*
- Melvil* quoted. V. 273. *a.*
- Melus*, Amyot was mortified at that city. I. 256. *b.* Some Prelates and Doctors assemble there to prepare the instructions of those who were to be deputed to the Council of Trent. II. 372. Varillas referred in relation to this assembly. 375. *b.* 376. *a. b.*
- Memoirs* of Mr L. C. D. R. published in the year 1687; their author censured. II. 136. *a.* V. 84. *a.*
- Memory*: the surprizing memory of Alcander. I. 215. *a.* That of hearers is to be dreaded by Lawyers who contradict themselves. 352. *a.* Men of the greatest memory often forget what others remember commonly enough: an instance of this. 551. *a.* Examples of a great many, who for want of memory were at a stand. II. 191. *a. b.* People whose memory was much decayed in the last years of their life. 624. *b.* Persons of a prodigious memory. I. 215. *a.* II. 22. *a. b.* 23. *a.* 265. *a. b.* 645. *b.* 646. *a.* 747. *b.* 748. *a.* 769. *b.* III. 60. *a.* 491. *b.* IV. 196. *b.* 197. *a. b.* 198. *a.* 248. *a.* 289. *a. b.* 290. *a.* V. 140. *b.* Is the first thing that dies in a learned man. IV. 196. *b.* 197. *a.* May create us enemies. 248. *a.* Local memory, to whom the invention of it is ascribed. V. 140. *b.*
- Men of Letters*, see *Authors*, *Writers*, *Letters*.
- Menage* has made a false observation on Malherbe's Poems. I. 78. *b.* Justly censures Malherbe for the ambiguity of an expression. 80. *b.* His genealogy. 168. *b.* Knew how to make the most of his reading. 441. *a. b.* Thinks it strange to see a preacher in the pulpit with a hat on his head. II. 93. *b.* Forms a criticism upon Horace that is very well grounded. 139. *and b.* Accuses Mr Baillet wrongfully in relation to Daurat's age. 621. *a.* Quoted as to the proofs produced against Robert d'Arbriffelles. III. 66. *b.* 67. *a.* Did not know all the Ecclesiastics who have written love-verses, and of whom he has published a list. 106. *and a. b.* Says it is false that Father Sirmond ever repented the publishing a letter of Geoffroy of Vendôme to Robert d'Arbriffelles. 66. *b.* Censures Vossius in relation to the Poet Hermesianax. 779. *a.* Sounds the alarm against Montmaur. IV. 246. *a.* 251. *a.* Excuses himself for having composed a satirical piece. 248. *b.* Judgment concerning some of his Poems. 250. *b.* 251. *a.* Censures Marilius Ficinus with great reason, in relation to Prodicus. 782. *b.* Bestows two chapters to prove, that Poets, after they have sworn to write no more, do still write on. II. 83. *b.*
- Menagiana*, those who published it forgot a good jest. I. 605. *a.* A witty saying in that book. II. 534. *b.* 535. *a.* Elogy of that work, and of those who published it. IV. 195. *a. b.* That collection cited in relation to a congress. 803. *a. n.* (43). Cited again. V. 112. *a. n.* (1), (2). What is related there of one Blunet. 381. *a. n.* (8). A fault in the Continuation of that work. 739, 740. A good many things are miserably confounded there. *ibid.*
- Menestrier* (Father) cited. III. 302. *b. n.* (37). IV. 134. *a. n.* (8). *ibid. b. n.* (11). V. 269. *a. n.* (1).
- Menot*, a celebrated Physician, expresses himself in very obscure terms, in his treatise *de Sterilitate*. III. 920. *a.* Character of his dissertation upon the *Furor Uterinus*. V. 799.
- Mennonites*, see *Anabaptists*.
- Menot*, one of his sermons frightens Catherine de Medicis, and makes her cry. V. 298. *a.*
- Mentz* receives a French garrison; and the French lose it after a long siege. IV. 211. *b.* Destroyed by the Pope. V. 541. *a.*
- Mercerus* understood nothing but Hebrew books. IV. 842. *b.*

Mercure

- Mercurius Galant*, ignorance of the author of that book. III. 718. *b.* 719. *a.*
- Mercurius Swifti*, a book wrote by Frederic Spanheim. II. 551. *a.* A passage of it concerning the pretended miracles which happened during the siege of Constance. *ibid. b.*
- Mercurius Historique Et Politique*, its author has acted like an honest man, and ought to be imitated. V. 84. *a. b.*
- Mercury*, a description of his rod, and its virtues. I. 4. *b.* 5. *a.* Gets a woman with child. II. 652. *a. b.* His memory slips him in a surprizing manner. IV. 542. *b.*
- Mercurialis* cited. III. 782. *b.* 783. *a.*
- Mere* (the Chevalier de), observation upon one of his letters. V. 621. *a. b.* Cited. III. 374. *a. n.* (150). 376. *b. n.* (172).
- Merit* is very often prejudicial to those who aspire to great offices. I. 354. *a.* 733. *b.* II. 436. *a.* Examples of extraordinary merit. I. 580. *a. b.* 581. *a. b.* 781. *a. b.* 782. *a. b.* The being superior to another in merit, does not make one superior likewise in reputation. 459. *a. b.*
- Merklinus*, an error of that author's in *Lindenius renovatus*, touching Myrepsus. IV. 764. *b.*
- Messias*, according to the Jews, he ought to discern by the smell, whether a person accused be innocent or guilty. I. 650. Whether he is not yet come under the principal characters which the Prophets attribute to him. II. 175. *b.* A collection of passages which shew, that the ancient Jewish Church believed his Divinity. IV. 880. *a.* What Laurentius Valla said of him. V. 437. *a.*
- Messina*, whether it be true that the holy Virgin wrote to the inhabitants of that town. III. 563. *a.*
- Messias*, his treatise concerning our communion with JESUS CHRIST, translated into Italian by Vincent Paravicin. IV. 471.
- Mesur*, whether he be the same with Mausur. II. 587. *b.* When, where, and under what name his books were printed. *ibid.*
- Metamorphosis*, Ovid threw that book into the fire; but there were some copies of it in private hands. IV. 447. *b.* 448. *a.*
- Metaphors*: whether there is nothing real in metaphors. II. 434. *b.*
- Metaphorists*, a chimerical sect. II. 434. *b.*
- Metapontines*, their sacrifices were esteemed to belong in common to Apollo and Aristeas. I. 459. *a.*
- Metals* and minerals, how formed in the earth. V. 117. *b.* 118. *a. b.*
- Metempsychosis*, some Jews believed it. I. 46. *n.* (7). Different from that of Pythagoras. 52. *a.* Is at the bottom the same thing with Spinozism. 52. *a. b.* Destroys hell. IV. 669. *a.* Pythagoras learned it of the Egyptians. 674. *a.*
- Metiharna*, wife of Cinyras, and mother of Adonis. IV. 641.
- Metibodius*, his revelation is a mere invention. I. 23. *a.*
- Methods*: divers methods of converting Heretics. IV. 373. *b.* 374. *a. b.*
- Matx* deprived of its liberty by Henry II. II. 445. *b.* The King permits the demolishing of its temple. 525. The jurisdiction of the Judges, which were called the Thirteen, is suppressed there. III. 33. *a.*
- Maurfius* confounds two Pygmalions together. IV. 642. *a.*
- Mazeral* criticized in relation to the siege of Aiguillon. I. 162. *b.* 163. *a.* Judgment of the first and second edition of his abridgment. 319. *b.* Conduct altogether unworthy of this famous Historian. 794. *b.* 795. *a.* Is often mistaken in Christian names. II. 828. *b.* Rejects, as a mere story, the reason which is alledged why Charles V was not stopped in France. 841. *a.* His observation upon a quality that recommends us to the fair sex. III. 296. *b.* 415. *b.* Is mistaken about Munuza and Abderama. IV. 284. *b.* Criticized in relation to Joan II, Queen of Naples. 307. *a.* Perhaps it will be wondered some time hereafter how he came to be so much esteemed. 319. *b.* His mistake in relation to the Baron du Pont, and the suit of impotency which he had upon his hands. 482. *b.* 799. *a.* Censured in relation to the Ducheis of Valentinois. 699. *a. b.* Injudiciously blamed for obscenity. V. 841. Did not mind politeness of stile. *ibid. n.* (24).
- Mexiriac* answers weakly to an objection which he raises himself, concerning the praises which Homer bestows upon Penelope. IV. 543. *b.* Conduct of the author in quoting passages from his writings. V. 805.
- Michael* (Captain), Arquebuser to Charles IX, his behaviour towards the President de la Place. IV. 682. *a.*
- Mycellus* dies Professor of Greek at Basil, in 1558. V. 589.
- Midwives*, why called *Sages-Femmes* in French. V. 46. *b.* A midwife hanged at Paris for having made several women suffer abortion. IV. 498. *b.* 499. *a.*
- Migoniti*, a name given to Venus, and why. III. 368. *b.* A temple built to Venus under that name. *ibid.*
- Milan* (the Duke of) shut up in an iron cage, without having so much as the comfort of being able to read or write. III. 814. *a.*
- Milanese* abandoned by the French. III. 611. *b.*
- Milanese* look upon the Cardinals of the assembly of Pifa with aversion. III. 761. *a.* Ruin their design of setting themselves at liberty. V. 128. *a.*
- Milefians* enter into one of the mouths of the Nile, make a descent, and build a wall there. IV. 342. *a.*
- Miletus*, strange madness of the virgins of that town. I. 19. *b.*
- Milichius* cited. V. 630. *b. n.* (12). 783. *n.* (waw).
- Millenarians* have no other aim than to stir up the people. II. 539. *a.* Whether their doctrine is conducive to this. IV. 122. *b.* 123. *a.* Lose nothing of their credit though they deceive the people a hundred times. II. 539. *a.*
- Millennium*: Cerinthus's doctrine touching the Millennium. II. 405. *a. b.* When the reign of the Millennium ought to begin, according to Comenius. 539. *a. b.*
- Milliaus*, his description of Moses's song. IV. 134. *a. b.*
- Milo* vexed at losing the strength of his arms. I. 82. *a. b.*
- Milton*, his toleration-principles. IV. 223. *a. b.* Excludes the Papists from the benefit of it. *ibid. b.*
- Mimes*, what they were designed for. III. 695. *b.*
- Mind* liable to epidemical dilempers as well as the body. I. 19. *a.* And to strange extravagances. 103. *a.* III. 315. *a.* Its inequalities and caprices. II. 210. *b.* 211. *a. b.* A particular turn of mind. 317. *a. b.* 318. *b.* 319. *a.* The mind undergoes the same vicissitudes with the body. IV. 689. *a.* It is not in our power to calm it. 811. *a. b.* Some heavy minds unfold by little and little. II. 500. *b.* Whether by denying that Free-thinkers have any strength in their turn of mind, they might be brought to acknowledge it. 452. *b.*
- Minerva*, the virtue of her rod. I. 5. *a.* Who educated her. 178. *a.* How she took revenge upon a woman. 200. Cotys pretends to marry her. II. 557. *a. b.* Gives advices unworthy of a goddess, to Penelope. IV. 543. *b.* Miraculous image of this goddess. I. 6. *a. b.*
- Ministers*, several of them, recommended only by the credit of their eloquence or learning, have married to great advantage. I. 503. *a. b.* Taken to task whenever they took upon themselves the title of Pastors. 544. *a. b.* II. 39. *b.* 40. *a. b.* In what case it is permitted them to go to war. 433. *a.* They could not be beloved by their churches, and please the court of France at the same time. *ibid.* They looked upon all proposals of disputes or conferences, that were made to them in France, as a snare. 520. *b.* The Missionaries did sooner vex a Minister of great parts and learning, than one of less note. III. 36. *a.* A passage which has been strained to make the world believe that the Protestants despise them. IV. 288. *b.* 289. *a.* Ministers accused of going about a deceitful project. 923. *b.* 924. *a.* What qualities Ministers of the Gospel ought to have. I. 241. *b.* 242. *a. b.* 321. *a. b.* II. 200. *b.* 201. *a. b.* Nothing can blacken them more than a proud and vindictive spirit. IV. 272. *a. b.* When those of France began to read the Fathers. I. 756. A book where it is maintained that they have a call to bear arms. *ibid. a. b.* Are always in the wrong to meddle with politics, but chiefly in a state which is divided into factions. V. 61.

V O L. V.

11 G

Ministers

- Ministers of State*, whatever intrinsic greatness they may have, it is an advantage for them to live at one time rather than at another. II. 414. *a. b.* Their duty. III. 513. *b.* 514. *a.* When they are hated by the people, it is scarce ever believed that those whom they punish are guilty. IV. 20. *b.*
- Ministry of the Gospel*, they who devote themselves to it stand in need of all their time. I. 321. *a.*
- Minutius Felix*, what he says of the nature of God. V. 146. *a.*
- Miracles*, credulity multiplies them, and their multiplication destroys them. I. 87. *a. b.* The Romish Church has behaved in this respect just like the Pagans. *ibid.* A mere relation of some miracles makes their falsity evident. 245. The Pagans compared those of JESUS CHRIST with those of Apollonius and Apuleius. 380. *b.* 382. *a.* 394. *and a. b.* A miracle of humility opposed against all the miracles of Lessius. 607. *b.* What Montagne says of some miracles. II. 149. *a. b.* A false miracle refuted by an argument which holds as good against the true miracles of Moses and JESUS CHRIST. 587. *a. b.* One half of the world laughs at the other on this head. IV. 49. *a. b.* Whether those of the ancient law were produced upon occasion of the will of a creature. 609. *b.* What we ought to understand by them, and if they are possible. V. 215. *b.* 216. *a.* Those which are supposed to have happened during the siege of Constance. II. 551. *a.* Criticized upon by the author of the Swiss Mercury. *ibid. and b.* In all religions, people are strangely inclined to think themselves favoured by them. 552. *a.* There are some Ministers who see a miracle in all events, and who find one every where. *ibid.* Are an object of faith, and consequently an obscure object. *ibid. b.* How the Fathers of the Church proved the miracles of the Scripture against the Pagans. III. 578. *a. b.* 579. *a.*
- Myrsus* (Nicolas), his antidotary. IV. 764. *a. b.* Confounded with Nicolas Alexandrinus by Merklinus. *ibid.*
- Myron*, what he did to obtain favours from a Courtesan which had been already refused to him. III. 705. *b.* 706. *a. b.*
- Myrrha*, some say she made use of the artifice of Lot's daughters, in order to lie with her father. I. 113.
- Myrtle* forbid at the feast of the good goddesses. II. 237. *a. b.*
- Misfortunes*, whether there be any in human life that are not occasioned by imprudence. V. 366. *a. b.* 367. *a. b.* 368. *a. b.* 369. *a. b.* 370. *a. b.* 371. *a. b.* 372. *a. b.* 373. *a. b.* That which ought to be ascribed to imprudence is called by this name, and ascribed to fortune. 372. *a.*
- Misura*, the dogs do not enter into the mosques, nor into the churches of that city. III. 430. *b.* 431. *a.*
- Missionaries*, the great length which they go in their knavery. II. 585. *a. b.* From whence they draw their sharpest invectives against the Protestants. III. 218. *a.*
- Mysteries*, the greatest part of allegorical mysteries ought to be unknown to the world. I. 40. *b.* Mysteries exposed to the raileries of profane men, by the impertinence of some Divines. II. 338. *b.* 339. *a. b.* Whether the answers of a Divine about mysteries may be as clear as the objections of a Philosopher. 456. *b.* The explication of them increases their obscurity. 588. *b.* The Pagans would not suffer them to be divulged. III. 216. *b.* Whether the rejection of them be a good way to get a great many followers. V. 172. *a.* What the Pagans said of them. 173. *a.* Above, or even contrary to, reason. 815. Ought not to be submitted to the rules of natural reason. 816. 829. There would be no more mysteries if reason could solve the difficulties of them. *ibid.* The Fathers of the Church did not examine them by the principles of Logic and Metaphysics. 817. *n.* (17). The Catholics and Protestants equally reject reason, in their controversies concerning them. 817, 818. The explanations of mysteries have rather perplexed than cleared them. 819. Neither Heresy nor Heathenism can draw any advantage from the unanswerableness of their objections against mysteries. 825.
- Mysteries* (dramatical), the life of JESUS CHRIST acted and represented by mysteries and personages at Poitiers. II. 104. The mystery of the Acts of the Apostles, and of the Apocalypse printed and acted at Paris. 477. *a. b. &c.* Full of gross inventions, and expressed after a low manner, they were suffered upon the stage, at the same time that the people were forbidden to read the Bible. *ibid. b.* 478. *a.* Devils are very often introduced in them. 478. *a. b.* 479. *a. b.* Origin of this kind of theatrical pieces. 480. *b.* 481. *a. b.* Italy had public theatres for the representation of these mysteries about the middle of the XVIth century. 481. *a. b.*
- Mythics* took their unitive way from the Platonists. IV. 690. *b.* There is no doctrine for which they are so much exclaimed against as for that of consenting to their own eternal damnation. 943. *a.*
- Mistress*: a lover excuses the imperfections of his mistress. I. 77. *a.* The address and arts of a mistress between thirty and forty will secure her empire far better than the artless beauty of a girl of fifteen. II. 256. *a. b.* A lady who would think it a scandal to be a private gentleman's mistress, will glory to be the mistress of a King or Emperor. I. 586. *a.* Those who marry the mistresses they have dishonoured are nevertheless subject to satire. II. 503. *a.* Marks of bravery in a lover are very acceptable to a mistress. III. 296. *b.* 297. *a.* 415. *a. b.* The quality of mistress is more grateful than that of wife. 385. *a. b.* A great many are loved merely for their name and quality. IV. 201. *a. b.*
- Mythology*: in what manner facts borrowed from the Pagan Mythology ought to be confuted. I. 75. *b.* 76. *a.* Is very uncertain. 160. *a. b.* IV. 180. *b.* 533. *a. b.* 534. *a.* The principal difference betwixt it and our modern romances. III. 465. *b.*
- Mythological observations*, the author's reasons for those which he has made. V. 805.
- Mythologists*, their most common faults. III. 348. *a. b. &c.* Their varying from one another. 364. *b.* 365. *a.*
- Mithra*, how honoured by the ancient Persians. V. 637. *a. b.*
- Mithridates*, his treachery. II. 305. *b.* 306. *a.*
- Misère* (Francis) gives us the best edition of Marot's works. IV. 163. *b.* 164. *a.*
- Mockery*, what that of Ishmael was. I. 123. *b.* 124. *a.*
- Mockers* find some subject of ridicule in every thing. II. 117. *b.*
- Mockers in point of Religion*, a serious refutation does not near so much harm as their jests do. II. 12. *b.* When they fall sick, they run into another extreme. *ibid.* 13. *a.*
- Moderate measures* ordinarily displease both parties. III. 506. *b.* 507. *a.*
- Moderns*, a reflexion upon the parallel between the Antients and the Moderns. II. 553. *a. b.* The difference between them and the Antients, with regard to comedies. IV. 743. *a. b.*
- Modes* have their ebbing and flowing. II. 544. *a.*
- Modes*, what the Philosophers understood by that word. V. 221. *a.*
- Modesty*, a virtue rarely to be found among men of great abilities. I. 717. *a. b.* Is of no use to the making of one's fortune in the world. III. 624. *b.* When it is once turned out of doors it seldom returns again. II. 110. *a.* There is a kind of modesty, which, carried to excess, deserves our admiration. 222. *b.* Icarus erects a statue to it, and why. IV. 538. *a. b.* 539. *a.*
- Modifications* (inconsistent) require distinct subjects. V. 209. *a. b.*
- Moien de parvenir*, the title of a book cited. III. 386. *a. n.* (74). IV. 574. *a. n.* (100).
- Mogis* (Etienne le) goes out of France with leave from the court. II. 42. *a.* His remarks concerning Scaliger and Salmatius. III. 603. *b.* 604. *a.*
- Mole* (la), his crime and punishment. IV. 935. *a. b.* 936. *a. b. &c.* His answers when he was put to the rack. 939. *b.* 940. *a.* By whom his head was buried. V. 526. *a. b.*
- Molier*, author of Polixena, assassinated. I. 548. *n.* (2).
- Molier* preferred to Plautus for his fine turns. I. 283. *a. b.* His own genius could easily furnish him with incidents. IV. 234. *b.* 235. *a.* Cited. V. 485. *b. n.* (18).

Molinism

- Molinism* opposed by three sorts of people, who, though unwilling to own it, are at the bottom of the same mind. III. 548. *a.*
- Molinism*, the abjuration which a Monk who was guilty of it was obliged to make. III. 853. *a. b.* Its conformity with carnal Origenism. IV. 420. *b.* 421. *a.*
- Mollerus*, his reflexion against those who make their enemies suspected of Atheism. III. 671. *b.*
- Monarchy*, the weak side of that form of government. II. 211. *a. b.* Which a mixed monarchy cannot help. *ibid.* To be preferred before Democratical government in certain cases. 165. *b.* 166. *a.* Compared with a Republic, as to disorders and confusions which may happen. III. 467. *a. b.* 468. *a.* Whether it be the public interest that parliaments should have a great deal of authority in a monarchy. 512. *b.* 513. *a. b.*
- Monarchy* (French) on the brink of ruin, by the fault of the Princes of the blood. II. 462. *b.* 463. *a.* The Queens there preserve almost always the foreign heart which they bring with them. 542. Which has very near overthrown it a great many times. *ibid.*
- Monarchy of women*, there was a dispute concerning it in the XVIth century. III. 670. *a. b.*
- Monarchs*, contradictory doctrines concerning their authority. II. 51. *b.* 52. *a. b.* Are subject to a furious jealousy towards those of their own blood. 717. *a. b.* Whether it be a good thing that the power should be divided between them and the great Lords. III. 301. *a. b.* 302. *a.* Inconveniences in writing the History of Monarchs lately dead. 334. *b.* 335. *a.* Their ill qualities are sometimes compensated with others. 801. *b.* 802. *a.* Their passions do not always turn with the wind of their interest. 805. *b.* When a Monarch is hated by the people, it is scarce ever believed that those whom he punishes are guilty. IV. 20. *b.* How Monarchs ought to behave themselves, with respect to the punishments which they inflict, and the favours which they distribute. 354. *b.* 355. *a.* 573. *b.* See *Princes and Kings*.
- Monasteries*, their strange corruption in the XVth century. II. 276. *a. b.* 277. *a.*
- Moncaeus* in his travels, names an hundred persons who taught him receipts and secrets for cures. I. 78. *b.* Cited. 104. *a. n.* (40). Finds out the cheat of the superior of the Ursulines of Loudun. III. 213. *b.* 214. *a.* The idea which he had of God. 471. *a.*
- Money* compared with pitch. III. 596. *a.* An unlawful means of getting it. V. 163. *b.* 164. *a. b.* A piece of money changed into a serpent, which wreathes itself about a gentleman's neck, and why. III. 487. *a. b.*
- Monsieur* (Antony) causes Marafia's book concerning the two St Mamilians to be printed. IV. 98. *a. b.*
- Monks*, what Pliny said of the Essenians is every day applied to them. I. 34. *b.* There have been some Monks who wore nothing but a girdle, and who made themselves inflexible to women. 112. *a. b.* The Monks of the XVIth century were ignorant and voluptuous, and would not suffer that any one should study polite literature. 149. *b.* The habit of a Monk does not alter the inclinations of him that wears it. 345. *b.* The false zeal of the Monks was the first cause of fabulous traditions. II. 94. *a. b.* A Monk of St Sabas at Jerusalem, orders one of his disciples to keep a perpetual silence. 587, 588. How he punished him for not observing that order. 588. Good offices which they mutually do one another. III. 87. *a. b.* Persuade their Devotees to whatever they have a mind. 331. *a.* Parallel betwixt those of the East and those of the West. 549. *a.* They have no privileges by virtue of which they ought to refuse to acknowledge the jurisdiction of Bishops. 739. *a.* What must be done in order to obtain testimonials of a good life from them. 797. *a.* There is no example of any converted Monk, who continued a bachelor for want of finding a woman whom he might marry. IV. 393. *b.* Consult the chronicles of their orders with very little judgment. 394. *b.* Some of their impostures. 393. *b.* 394. *a. b.* It does not belong to them to put their hand to the helm of government. V. 61. *b.* 62. *a. b.* The life which they led in the convent of St Sulpice at Belley, and the difficulties which the Bishop of that city met with, in endeavouring to make them reform it. I. 737. *b.* 738. *n. b.* 739. *a. b.* There have been Monks who have passed whole nights with women, in order to get a complete victory over their concupiscence. III. 66. *a. b.*
- Monkey*, what Cardinal was called by that name, and for what reason. III. 616. *a.*
- Monks*, sometimes smother their young ones with caresses. I. 113. *b.* A fable of a monkey. IV. 600. *a. b.*
- Montard* the Historian, a passage which he had been forced to suppress, is restored. III. 413. *a. b.*
- Montuc*, Marshal of France, compared with Des-Adrets. I. 711. *a. b.* His impudent sayings concerning the Queen of Navarre. IV. 327. *b.* 328. *a.* Makes a great slaughter at Mont de Marfan. 328. *b.* 329. *a.* Quoted. III. 415. *b.*
- Montuc*, Bishop of Valence, what means he made use of in his negotiations with the Poles about the election of the Duke of Anjou. IV. 839. *a.*
- Monmouth* (Duke of) There were people in England who maintained that he was not taken. II. 721. *b.*
- Mons* (Father) confessor of the Duchesse of Savoy. II. 401. *a.*
- Mons* (the version of) censured by Mallet. III. 576. *a. b.*
- Monsters*, there are five which ought to be prosecuted to the utmost. IV. 669. *b.*
- Montaigne* (Michael de) cited in relation to Mahomet II. I. 54. *b.* Cited again in relation to du Bellai's memoirs. 722. *a.* Cited again. II. 366. *a.* 677. *b.* 737. *b.* 823. *a.* III. 81. *b.* V. 368. *a.* His reflexion upon the education of children. I. 80. *a.* His judgment on an elegy given to Aretia. 436. *a.* A good observation of this writer's against false miracles. II. 149. *a. b.* Had an intimate affection for Charron. 448. *a. b.* What he says of the ill effect of disputing. 848. *b.* What he thinks of women who marry old men. III. 64. *b.* How he ridicules the Catholics, in relation to certain maxims that change according to the times. 521. *b.* Did not well know the origin of an adventure which he takes from Plato. 633. *and b.* 634. *a.* Had naturally an aversion for a lie. IV. 778. *b. n.* (42). What he says of kindness of civility. 797. *b.* And of the power which the soul has to put itself alternately in opposite situations. V. 272. *b.* Laughs at those who called the epistles of Guevara golden ones. III. 270. *b.* In what manner the faculty of Divines in France dealt with his essays. V. 810. Dedicated to Cardinal Richelieu, and kept in all libraries. 798. There is not near so much licentiousness in this Dictionary, as there is in his Essays, either with regard to Scepticism or obscenities. *ibid.*
- Montaigne* (John de la) translates two books of Sir Humphrey Lynden, intitled the *Sure Way*, and the *Wrong Way*. III. 971. *and a. b.*
- Montalto* (Cardinal de) said that he would never despise a man in a cassock and little band. I. 361. His letter to the council of the holy Union. II. 459. *a.*
- Montalto*, a famous Jew, resolves to make an open profession of Judaism at Paris. III. 125. *a.*
- Montargis*. The Protestants find harbour there. III. 30. *a. b.* But however are obliged to leave it. *ibid.*
- Montausier* (the Marquis of) his elegy in two verses. I. 397. *b.* Wants to know from whom Balzac had what he says of Penelope. IV. 543. *b.* 544. *a.* Has a great affection for Bourfaix, and recommends him for Sub-Preceptor to the Dauphin. II. 115. How his letters to Jurieu, and that minister's letters to him, came to be published. V. 645. *b.* 646. *a.*
- Montausier* (Mr de) compared with A. M. Aquaviva. I. 397. *b.*
- Montbelliard*, the conference which was held there proceeded from political reasons more than from any thing else. I. 792. *a.*
- Montbriffe*, the soldiers of the garrison there thrown down headlong. I. 709. *a.*
- Montecuculi* (Sebastian) poisons the eldest son of Rancie I. II. 94. *b.*
- Montecuculi* disappoints all the designs of Mr de Turenne. V. 191. *b.* What he brought about by the taking of only one town. *ibid.*
- Monte-Major* cited. I. 354. *a.*

Monteney

- Montney* (Matthew de) a great and experienced Magician. III. 126. *a.*
- Montferrat*, two wars carried on there. II. 311. *a.* Its miserable condition in the year 1551. *&c.* V. 440. *a. b.*
- Montgomery* recovers the dominions of the Queen of Navarre. IV. 327. *b.* An article of the capitulation which he made was not observed. 328. *b.* 329. *a. b.* Passionate verses made on his punishment, by John des Caurres. II. 399.
- Montjoy* (William) a great friend of Erasmus's. III. 456. *a.*
- Montmaur* worse treated by Feramus, than by any other who wrote against him. IV. 246. *b.* 247. *a.* People were not able to make head against him with their tongue. 248. *a.* His good and bad qualities. 250. *b.* 251. *a. b.* 252. *a. b.*
- Montmor*, or rather *Mommor*, an epigram which he made on a Poet. V. 410. *a. b.*
- Montmorenci*, from whom that family is descended. I. 341. *a.*
- Montmorenci* (Anne de) Constable, his want of abilities, and the mischief he did to France. III. 395. *a. b.* 396. *a. b.* His conduct with regard to the Dukes de Valentinois, very much blamed by Thuanus. IV. 699. *a.* Was of opinion that learning made men effeminate, and gave rise to Heresies. V. 354. *a.*
- Montmorenci* (Francis de) solicits a dispensation of marriage at the Court of Rome. IV. 631. *a. b.* 632. *a. b.* His unfair dealing. 634. *a. b.* 635. *a. b.* Is crossed by the House of Guise. 637. *b.*
- Montmorenci* (Henry de) Constable, his wife hearkens to propositions of marriage while he is alive. III. 184. *b.*
- Montmorenci* (the Duke of) desires unusual honours for his wife. III. 210. *a.* Beheaded at Toulouse for treason. 817. *a. b.* To how high a degree he was beloved. *ibid.* Whether his judges could have done otherwise than condemned him. 819. *a. b.*
- Montmorisme*, that which is called so. IV. 246. *b.*
- Montpellier* is one of the principal cities of France, in which the Roman law was read publicly. I. 68. *a. b.* Its university obliges du Laurens to pass through all his exercises again, in order to take his Doctor's Degree a second time, before he is admitted. III. 745. *a.* This Physician founds a Physic garden there, where he places this inscription, *Argos esto non Briareus. ibid. and b.*
- Montpensier* (the Duke of) in what manner he used his prisoners. I. 592. *a. b.* Causes a conference of Doctors and Ministers to be held, in order to reclaim his eldest daughter. III. 864. *b.* His daughter Charlotte escapes into Germany, where she abjures Popery. 864. He uses the Protestants with the utmost severity. 865. Believes that the Dukes of Bouillon would renounce Calvinism, provided she would hear Dr. Vigor. IV. 920. *b.* 921. *a.*
- Montpensier* (the Dukes of) the true cause of her hatred to Henry III. II. 257. *b.* It was said that she was in love with her nephew the Duke of Guise. III. 299. *a.*
- Monuments* (public) particular care ought to be taken not to let Printers falsify them. II. 698. *b.* There are abundance of ridiculous stories which people endeavour to prove by them. III. 165. *a. b.*
- Moon*, a thought of the Chevalier Marini, concerning the spots that are seen in it. I. 113. *b.* The women of that region lay eggs, from whence are bred men fifteen times bigger than those who inhabit the earth. III. 369. *b.* Whether it be true that people can read in it what is written on a looking-glass. IV. 672. *b.* Whether it be inhabited. V. 576. *a.*
- Moors*, a prodigious number of them are converted by the sermons of John Andreas. I. 326.
- Mopius*: Ammianus Marcellinus confounds one Mopius with another. IV. 253. *a.*
- Moral*: combination of Moral and Physical things. II. 16. *a.*
- Morale Pratique*: whether Mr Arnauld be the author of the second volume of the *Morale Pratique*. I. 493. *b.*
- Moralis Diabolica*, the title of a book, which the author was obliged to alter. III. 122.
- Moralists* ought to be very reserved in their reflexions on the sickness and death of illustrious persons. I. 88. *a. b.* Ought not to regulate their opinions by the practice of the Civil-Law, in points concerning the relaxation of manners. III. 944. *b.* Extremes into which the too rigid ones fall. V. 797, 798.
- Morality*, maxims which overthrow it. I. 35. *b.* 36. *a. b.* Abominable morality publicly taught among Christians. III. 54. *a. b.* It is a blot on the person who is the first that introduces a relaxation in the practice of morality. 194. In what manner people ought to study it, in order to know it aright. 894. *b.* It is necessary that all men should be taught a morality, which admits of the direction of a good conscience, acknowledged by the Heathens themselves. I. 35. *b.*
- Morals*: Silvester Prierias carries the relaxation of morals too far. IV. 772. *and b.* 773. *a.* We must not judge of a man's morals by his writings. 595. They are not at all concerned in the obsequies which the author relates. V. 846. Whether ours be more chaste than those of our Ancestors. 855. *&c.*
- More* (Sir Thomas) his verses against an Astrologer who was a cuckold. V. 322. *a. b.* Favours which he grants to Gryneus, at the recommendation of Erasmus. III. 255. *a. b.*
- Moré* (Frederic) revises and augments P. Bellier's translation of Philo's works. IV. 623.
- Morellus* was of the cabal which wanted to change the discipline of the Church. V. 738.
- Moret* (the Countess de) a distich on the loss of her sight. I. 206. *b. n.* (17). On what condition she marries the Count de Cely-Sancy. III. 266. *a. b.*
- Morgues* (Matthew de) what opinion a fine wit had of him. IV. 257. *b.* Was very unfit to write the History of Cardinal Richelieu. 258. *a. b.*
- Morbos*, his words are not rightly understood in an extract that is given of his book. IV. 795. *b.*
- Morgard* (Leon) an Almanack-maker, condemned to the Gallies on account of his predictions. III. 955. *b.*
- Mornac*: the leaps of Mornac. I. 709. *b.*
- Mornai* (Du Pleffis) cited. II. 594. *b.* Refutes in a solid manner the answer of Coeffeteau, in relation to Gregory VII. III. 232. *a.* His letter to Montague. IV. 338. *b.* Cruelly used in a satire. V. 93. *a.* The wrong which d'Aubigny does him 733.
- Morocco* (the King of) admires a petition which was presented to him by the Ambassador of the United Provinces. III. 171. *a.* Shews himself particularly well pleased with the present which Erpenius sent him. *ibid.*
- Mortemar*, see *Rochebouart*.
- Morus* (Alexander) a witty saying of that Minister's. II. 520. *b. n.* (30). A passage of his against the Universalists, and particularly Amyraldus and Spanhemius. V. 822, 823. Quoted. 786. *n.* (1).
- Mosibus*, whether he was the inventor of atoms. III. 788. *a.*
- Moskovy* (the Czar of) in what manner the choice of the maid, whom he is to marry, is made. III. 117. *b.*
- Moses*, what the Poets have feigned of a great many rods, was all borrowed from the History of his rod. I. 5. *a.* Accused of overthrowing the religion of to nature. 96. *a.* What wood he made use of to sweeten the bitter waters. 105. *a.* Some assert that he was master of the profoundest secrets of Chymistry. 2. *a.* It is ridiculous to penetrate beyond the deluge, without the assistance of this Hyeronian. II. 854. *b.* A parallel betwixt him and Hercules. III. 432. *b.* In what manner his mother was chosen to be his nurse, by the daughter of Pharaoh. IV. 133. *a.* Stories which some Egyptian Historians relate of him. 679. According to Machiavel, in order to give force to his laws, he was obliged to put to death a vast number of men, who opposed him in it. V. 73. *b. n.* 1.
- Moïse le Vayer*. See *Vayer*.
- Mother*, one who hindered her son and her daughter-in-law, from performing the conjugal duty. II. 382. *b.* 383. *a.* A mother, who never suckles, breeds the more readily. IV. 449. *b.*

Motion:

- Motion*: objections against motion. I. 82. *b.* V. 608. *b.* 609. *a.* *b.* 610. *a.* *b.* 613. *a.* *b.* To which Aristotle makes an insufficient answer. 610. *a.* *b.* Cannot be produced but by creation. I. 304. *b.* 305. *a.* If God was not the first and the only principle of it, there would be no need for supposing that his interposition was necessary in the construction of the world. IV. 436. *a.* *b.* 437. *a.* *b.* 438. *a.* *b.* 439. *a.* *b.* Reflexion upon the consequences of its eternity, or of its beginning, with respect to the existence of God. V. 594. *a.* Whether its eternity be the only thing that can prove the existence of a mover distinct from matter. *ibid.* *a.* *b.* 595. *a.* *b.* There has not been a right definition of it as yet. 610. *a.* *b.* Reflexions upon the incomprehensibility of motion. 614. *a.* *b.* A proof from the impossibility of a vacuum, that there is no real motion. 617. *a.* *b.*
- Motive*: those who despise riches are more commendable than those who are covetous, tho' they act from the same motive. I. 460. *a.* *b.* Motives singular and refined against giving charities. II. 110. *a.* *b.* 112. *a.* *b.*
- Motte-Aignon* declares that he could not endure to have his books made for him. I. 624. *b.* Elogy of this author. IV. 279. *a.* *b.*
- Moulin* (Peter du) his conference with Cayet. II. 244. *b.* 245. *a.*
- Moulin* (Peter du), the son, cited. V. 426. *a.* *b.* (72).
- Moulin* (Lewis du) what he affirmed concerning the History of Camden. II. 280. *b.* 281. *a.* Causes a letter of Dury's, to Peter du Moulin his father, to be printed. 732.
- Mountain* dug quite through, by the orders of Francis I, to open a passage into Italy. III. 97. *b.* 98. *a.* *b.* Mount Genevre more convenient. 98. *a.*
- Musti* the fate of the Sultans depends upon him. IV. 425. *b.* 426. *a.* *b.*
- Mugwort*, whence that herb had the name of Artemisia. I. 523. *a.*
- Mules* which were not barren. II. 302. A mule kept by the Athenians at the public expence. III. 701. *b.*
- Mulhausen*, a Jesuit, insults David Parvus. II. 173. *b.* *a.* (14).
- Mulieres non esse homines*, a dissertation which raises a terrible outcry. I. 88. *a.* *b.* 89. *a.* *b.*
- Mulus* killed by Nestor. IV. 585.
- Muncherus* (Philip) publishes a Poem of Marcus Mufurus. IV. 295. *a.*
- Mundus alter & idem*, an allegorical book of Joseph Hall's: the Court of Rome is not spared in it. III. 345. *a.* *b.* Mr Naudé's opinion concerning it. *ibid.* *b.*
- Munus*, his birth, and by whom he was brought up. I. 52. *a.* *b.* Is made known to his father. *ibid.* *a.* His death. *ibid.* *b.*
- Munster*: facts relating to the peace of Munster. II. 472. *a.* *b.* Its Canons pique themselves upon their nobility, and skill in war. V. 13. *a.* A school founded in that city about the end of the XVth century. II. 242. A school and library established in that city. III. 724. This school serves Germany as a nursery of literature. *ibid.*
- Munus Adventitium*, what that book contains. IV. 122. *a.* *b.*
- Munusca*, a Moorish General, revolts against the Saracens, who had trusted Cerdagne to him. II. 850. Is reduced to the necessity of killing himself. I. 14.
- Muretus* makes Scaliger believe that a copy of verses, which he had composed himself, were composed by Trabeas. V. 394. *a.* *b.* 395. *a.* His invective against Sueton. 264. *b.* 265. *a.* A trick which he puts upon Scaliger. 394. *a.* *b.* 395. *a.* *b.* 396. *a.* *b.* His funeral oration by Bencius, who was his scholar. I. 747. *b.* Dedicates his Latin version of Aristotle's Rhetoric to Bencius. *ibid.*
- Murtola*, how he revenged himself upon the Chevalier Marini, for a satire which he wrote against him. III. 464. *b.*
- Musæus* (John) a Lutheran professor, why he took upon him to refute an Atheist. III. 671. *a.* *b.*
- Musarium*, the answer which Lucian puts into the mouth of that Courtesan. I. 54. *b.* 55. *a.* V O L. V.
- Misfortunes*, their courage enervated by the Germans and Livonians. II. 42. *b.*
- Musculus* his books are no longer read by any body. II. 286. *b.*
- Muses* sometimes procure large pensions for those who engage in their service. I. 329. *b.* 330. *a.* The men of learning in the city of Alexandria met in their temple. 534. *b.* The service of the Muses is in many things like the service of the ladies. II. 620. *a.* Ought to inspire their votaries with a true generosity. III. 340. *a.* Great warriors and the Muses stand in need of one another. 434. *a.* *b.* To whom they owe their birth. 652. *a.* Let out for hire. V. 148. *a.* *b.* 751, 752. Naturally tailors, but most of all so in adversity. IV. 449.
- Mushrooms*: four persons die by eating mushrooms. II. 868. *b.*
- Musæ*, who it was that invented its six notes. I. 433. And from whence they were taken. *ibid.* Its surprising effects. III. 197. *a.* *b.* The passion which Nero had for it. V. 466. *a.* *b.* Rinuccini, or Cavele-ri, looked upon as the inventors of Theatrical pieces set to music. IV. 878. *a.* *b.* 879. *a.* *b.*
- Musicians*, what a Musician said one day to Philip. I. 448. *b.* Are lucky fellows. IV. 398. *b.*
- Musso* was called the *Chrysolome* of the Italians. IV. 290. *b.* Looked upon as the right arm of the Council of Trent. *ibid.* 291. *a.* *b.*
- Mustapha*, Emperor of the Turks, how raised to the throne. IV. 425. *a.* *b.* And why deposed. *ibid.* *b.* and 426. *a.* *b.*

N.

- Narden* sacked by the Spaniards. III. 498.
- Nagelius*, a visionary who foretold surprising revolutions. V. 237. *a.* *b.*
- Naked*: there have been Solitaries who went naked. I. 112. *a.* Why the impudence of going naked is so often put in practice again among Christians. V. 415. *a.*
- Nakedness*: opinion of some Solitaries about nakedness. I. 112. *a.* A sort of nakedness of some women. II. 593. *a.* 645. *a.* A horror for nakedness even in a picture, inlaid into the female sex by all civilized nations. III. 963. *b.* 964. *a.* The curiosity of women to view nakedness in the original. 964. *a.* Scandalous customs with respect to nakedness. V. 129. *b.* 130. *a.* *b.*
- Name*: what Altingius says of the name *Tetragramma*. I. 244. *b.* 245. *a.*
- Names*: the Kings of certain countries affected all to take the same name. I. 40. *a.* The least mistake in proper names, is enough to lead the reader into an error. 108. *a.* The smallest change of the letters in proper names, multiplies writers without reason. III. 534. Milantia said, that if names were to be sold, the finest ought to be bought. I. 325. Names untractable with respect to rhyming. 620. *a.* *b.* Unfit for Poetry. II. 866. *a.* *b.* A plain name may prejudice an author. I. 622. *a.* *b.* A name changed through vanity. II. 367. *a.* *b.* The custom which people formerly had of taking a name to themselves. I. 170. *a.* *b.* 171. *a.* And of changing it. *ibid.* and IV. 477. There are some names which ought to be changed. III. 202. *b.* 203. *a.* *b.* And there are some which seem to have an influence upon the manners of the persons that bear them. 604. *b.* Prohibition of changing names. IV. 853. *b.* 854. *a.* *b.* Ought to be made use of in a free manner, according to the Stoics. 706. *b.* The French authors disfigure proper names. III. 722. *a.* *b.* 723. *a.*
- Nangis* (William de) inserts all the chronicle of Sigebert into his own. IV. 728. *b.* 729. *a.* *b.*
- Nani* (Chevalier) judges of the manners of the Hollanders, by the manners of the Italians. III. 821. *a.* *b.* 822. *a.*
- Nannius* (Peter) Justus Velsius gives lectures for him in the college of the three languages at Louvain. V. 450.

11 H

Nantes

- Nantes* (edit of), who it was that drew it up. II. 433. *and b.* What Cardinal Mazarin said concerning this edit. I. 264. *b.* See *Edict*.
- Napkin* were about the left arm, was the signal taken by the assassins at St Bartholomew. IV. 682. *a.*
- Naples* (Joan II, of that name, Queen of), by what services people obtained great employments from her. II. 312. How she discovered her passion one day. *ibid.* *a.*
- Napht*, (Ladislau, King of) dies of poison which he received in the bosom of pleasure. IV. 308. *a.*
- Napht*, who first began to practise Printing there. IV. 71. *a.* An attempt to set up the Inquisition there occasions troubles. 387. *a. b.* What was called the Portion there. 466. *b.* 467. *a.* Fables concerning that city. V. 489. *a. b.* 490. *a. b.* Some Libertines have appeared there. IV. 719. *a. b.*
- Narni* (Father), who is the author of the translation of his sermons. II. 90. *and a.*
- Nassau* (Maurice of) had great skill in Mathematics. V. 236.
- Nations*, there are some that one would take for brute beasts. I. 177. *b.* Their boundaries have been often altered. 537. Free nations are easily accustomed to slavery, provided it have not that name. II. 420. *a.* In what all nations are alike. III. 172. *b.*
- Natural Philosophers* did not admit of an intelligent Being for the first mover before Anaxagoras. I. 301. *b.* 302. *a. b.* 303. *a.* The reason of it. 302. *b.* 303. *a.*
- Natural Philosophy*, it would be ridiculous to pretend to confute, from the principles thereof, the fables of Antiquity. I. 76. *a.* An event which is explained thereby cannot be the preface of a future contingent. IV. 565. *a. b.* See *Physics*.
- Nature* observes no laws. I. 313. *b.* Where she strongly inclines to any one thing, the Monk's habit never cures a man of it. 345. *b.* Corrupt nature, when she cannot plunge men into pleasures, frequently makes it up by other faults. III. 223. *a.* The effects of nature cannot be prefaces of future contingents, unless they be appointed for that end by a particular intelligent Being. IV. 565. *a. b.* 566. *a. b.* Her secrets are impenetrable. 653. *b.* She sought not to be forced by study. III. 342. *a.*
- Navagiero*, or *Nangier*, dies of the spotted fever at Blois. IV. 316. He follows Bartholomew d'Alviano to the wars, and makes his Funeral Oration. 315.
- Navailles* (the Duke of), his behaviour to the Deputies of the Imperial towns of Alsace. III. 717. *a. b.*
- Navarre* (the King of) had law-suits and a Council in three of the Parliaments of France. III. 37. *b.* See *Henry IV.*
- Navarre* (Margaret, Queen of), how far her novels are to be condemned. V. 837.
- Navarre* (Jane, Queen of) calumniated and ill defended. II. 224. *a. b.* 225. *a.*
- Navarre* (Margaret, Queen of), spouse to Henry IV, charms the Embassadors of Poland with her beauty. IV. 40. *b.* Loved Mathematics. V. 297. *a.* See *Margaret*.
- Navarre* opens a way through a mountain for the French army to pass into Italy. III. 98. *a. b.*
- Naudi*, it does not appear that he ever believed the tales of Sorcerers and Magicians. II. 243. *b.* Quoted. 432. *b.* V. 755. *a.* (*u u u*). What he relates touching the exaltation of Pope Hadrian VI. III. 324. *b.* Censured on the head of Alexander's deification. IV. 405. *b.* 406. *a.* Who was his favourite author. 465. He censures highly the conduct of Savonarola. V. 60. *b.* 61. *a. b.*
- Navicula stultorum mulierum*: a book improperly ascribed to Badius by Valerius Andreas. I. 602. *b.*
- Navis Narragonie* or *Stultorum* of Sebastian Brandt. I. 602. *b.*
- Nazianzen* (Gregory of), the opinion which he entertains of Councils. IV. 348. *a.* See *Gregory*.
- Nearchus*, tyrant of Elea; the different sentiments of authors touching what happened to him with Zeno. V. 606. *a. b.* 607. *a. b.*
- Necklace* fatal to all that wore it. II. 257. *a. b.* By whom it was made, and of what matter. *ibid.* *a.* The fatal effects of that which Menelaus conferred in the temple of Delphes. III. 372. *b.* 373. *a.*
- Nectanebus*, when driven out of his kingdom. IV. 404. *a.*
- Newman Games* were games instituted in honour in Archemorus. I. 446.
- Nemesis*, why called *Adrastus*. I. 118. *and b.*
- Nemours* (the Duke of), a Prince of an admirable talent to win men over to his side. I. 710. *b.* He leaves France, and for what reason. III. 141. Is recalled and serves against those of the Reformed Religion. *ibid.* In what manner he was rewarded for it by the court of Rome. *ibid.*
- Nepenthes*, what it was. III. 373. *a. b.* 374. *a.*
- Nephelococgia*, or *The Cloud of Cuckolds*, a comedy wrote by Father le Loyer, where there are abundance of coarse expressions. III. 882. *a.* 883. *b.* It is full of invention and spirit. *ibid.* *a.*
- Nepos*, what it signifies in good Latin. I. 632. *b.* III. 194. *a.* It may have the same signification in Italian as in good Latin. 258. *b.*
- Nepotism*; there are times when the greater and the lesser Nepotism are not both in vogue at once. I. 343. When it gathered all its force. IV. 430. *a. b.*
- Nero*, several persons have falsely taken that name. I. 513. *a. b.* The last dying words of those whom that Prince had put to death, by whom composed. III. 9. *a. b.* He did not himself compose the Funeral Oration of Claudius, which he recited. 317. *a.* For what reason wife men connived at his disorders. IV. 398. *b.* Whether the four verses, beginning with *Torva Mimalensis*, are of his composition. 596. *a. b.* 597. *a. b.* His passion for Music. V. 466. *a. b.* He bore libels somewhat patiently. 745, 746.
- Nervus*, his reign worse than that of Domitian, and for what reason. III. 109. *a.* A very solid apophthegm of which he made a good use. *ibid.* He dies a little after he had adopted Trajan, Pliny's rebellion upon that head. 431. *b.* *a.* (67).
- Nesler*, what the size of his cup was. III. 205. *b.* 206. *a.* He kills Melius. IV. 585.
- Nestorianism*, the *Seur de Moni* believes that it is only a verbal Heresy. I. 105. *a. b.* IV. 356. *a.*
- Nevenor* (the Count of), the pleasant manner in which he obliged the superior of a convent to give him satisfaction. III. 473. *a. b.*
- Nevers* (the Duke of) is reproached with affecting to signalize himself at the King his master's cost. III. 398. *b.* Who was the first Duke of Nevers. 518. *a.*
- Newcastle* (la) affirms that Grotius had begun to mold his work anew in Holland. III. 248. *b.*
- Newcastle*; *Marot* was page to one Nicolas de Neufville. IV. 162. *b.* He dedicates the temple of Cupid to him. *ibid.*
- Newbaufel* yielded to the Turks by a treaty. III. 793. *a. b.*
- Newilly* (Stephen de), after being possessed of the President de la Place's office, strives in vain to hinder his being restored to it again. IV. 682. *a.* Made President *au Mortier* by the Duke of Mayenne. *ibid.*
- Neutrality*; the inconveniences that attend it during the civil wars either of church or state. II. 799. *b.* The Imperial towns of Alsace cannot observe it. III. 717. *b.* 718. *a.* It does not hinder an Historian's favouring one party more than another. II. 310. *a. b.* 311. *a. b.* 312. *a. b.*
- New Abfalom*, &c. to whom that libel is ascribed. V. 731. *a. b.*
- Newburg*, what motives induced a Prince of that family to change his religion. IV. 854. *a. b.*
- News*; a false piece of news, believed for three days, is capable of destroying a state, or of saving it. II. 216. *b.* V. 749. *a. b.* There are people who know all the news of a town, except what diabolically know their own family. III. 381. *b.* 382. *a.* Commends their own bidding at an auction. 414. *a.* It is a vice to know too much news. V. 820.
- News-writers* are not to be credited. I. 15. *b.* IV. 51. *a.* 179. *b.* Do not stand in need of being exhorted to acknowledge the goodness of God. III. 3. *a.* Magnify things. IV. 536. *b.* V. 493. *b.* Ought to remember a sentence of Agathon. I. 127. Carry on a kind of war with their *Arma Arserina*. V. 750. *a. b.* The artifice they make use of to inspire people with a pleasing credulity. III. 718.

718. *b.* 719. *a. b.* 720. *a.* The perplexities into which their infincerity throws them. 719. *a. b.* The siege of important places will always be a troublesome rock for them. 719. *b.* 720. *a. b.* 721. *a. b.* Their prepossession and partiality. IV. 737. *b.*
- Nicarate*, a Courtesan; illustrious for her birth and learning. V. 239. *a.*
- Nice*; the moderation of the Council of Nice, with respect to Arius. I. 475. *a.*
- Nicéphorus* is a fabulous and injudicious writer. III. 572. *b.*
- Nicias*, the fright he was in on account of an eclipse of the moon. IV. 566. *a.*
- Nicodemites* do sometimes more harm than an open enemy. II. 48. *b.*
- Nicolas*, Bishop of Mirra, gives Arias a box on the ear in the Council of Nice. II. *a. n.* (15).
- Nicolas Tolentin*, the particular devotion which Philip de Bergamo had for him. I. 769.
- Nicolle* makes use of all the same objections as the meanest missionaries. III. 945. *a.* Why he only answered one part of a book of Mr Jurien. IV. 535. *a. b.* His objections lead to Pyrrhonism. *ibid.* It is not true that the author has blackened him as having wrote certain doctrines which he did not believe. V. 804.
- Niem* (Thierry de), what he adds to the story of Pope Joan. IV. 729.
- Niger* (Pescennius), what he said to an Orator who presented himself before him to speak a panegyric in his praise. III. 335. *a.*
- Nymphs*, there were some that surpassed for length of life all other mortal natures. III. 348. *b.* 349. *a. b.*
- Ninus*, which was the last of his victories. V. 630. *a.*
- Niphates*, a mountain where Saturn took refuge, and from whence he was thrown into Tartarus. II. 82. *b.* Jupiter orders it to be called Caucasus, in honour of a shepherd of that name whom Saturn had killed there. *ibid.*
- Niphus* was of a very amorous complexion. I. 390. *b.* Is censured for the want of judgment. *ibid.* And for contradicting himself. *ibid.* He writes against Pomponatus. IV. 715. *a.*
- Nisus*, the Synod of that place gives all manner of explications to the Church of Zurich. II. 196.
- Noah*, by what means he could know that it was Cham who had discovered his nakedness. II. 431. *b.* What was the injury which he received from Cham, according to Mr Vonder Harde. 432. *b.*
- Nobilitas Famula*, how these words are to be understood in Latin elegies. I. 250. *a.*
- Nobilis* and *Plæbeius* were not inconsistent words in ancient Rome. III. 490. *a.*
- Nobility*, an invective against those who value themselves upon it. I. 360. *b.* It is generally more easy to prove that of the father, than that of the grandfather or great grandfather. 750. *a.* An oration of Philo, on true nobility, translated by Daniel d'Auge. 562. *a.*
- Noble* (he) confounds all in his romance of Zakima, or Pure Love. III. 166. *b.* 167. *a. b.*
- Noble families* generally give chimerical accounts of their first founders. IV. 888. *a. b.*
- Noël le Compté* blamed. I. 402. *b.*
- Noyon*, the Canons of that place make a solemn procession to thank God for Calvin's death. I. 783. *b. n.* (8). II. 265. *a.*
- Numerus*, the History of the Adulterers, which was wanting in his Paraphrase, has been supplied by Father Abvum. I. 47. *a.*
- Nomus* or *Nomus* (Duard), particulars touching that man. V. 319. *b.*
- Non-toleration*, in affairs of religion, the Lutherans exercised it against Altingius. I. 240. *b.* 241. *a.* The advantage that accrues from it is small, in comparison of the evils which it produces. 789. *a. b.* Condemned. III. 675. *a.* 676. *a. b.* 677. *a. b.* In what case it ought to be allowed. IV. 522. *a. b. c.*
- Non-toleration* (the Advocates for), the inconveniences which they expose themselves to. I. 13. *b.* 14. *a. b.* They resemble Cæsar, who could bear no master, and then Pompey, who could suffer no partner. *ibid.* *a.* They would have been very glad that Jesus Christ had allowed them to follow Elijah's example as a precedent. II. 750. *a. b.*
- Their unjust extravagancy. IV. 337. *d.* See *Lawus* (Penal) in matters of conscience. Being reduced to a non-plus, they have recourse to unfair means, in order to render their adversaries odious. V. 28. *a. b.* Their principle overthrows all the rules of natural equity. III. 238. *a.*
- Noradin*, his daughter falls in love with a Prince of Westphalia, makes her escape with him, and becomes his second wife. III. 166. *b.*
- Norden*, why its school was surpassed by that of Leer. II. 768.
- Notables* assembled at Fontainebleau. IV. 138.
- Notary*, in the XIVth century a Notary's place was not reckoned unfit for a gentleman. III. 747.
- Notis*, or *Scholia*, added to a book in order to confute it. II. 749. *d.*
- Not long since*, we ought never to make use of that phrase, without setting down the year in which we thus express ourselves. IV. 165. *b.*
- Novara* (John of), General of the Augustines. I. 769. *b.*
- Novella*, why John Andreas calls one of his Commentaries by that name. I. 325. *a.*
- Novella*, daughter to a Professor of Civil-Law read lectures for her father. I. 325. *a.* She hid her face while she was in the chair. *ibid.* Which may occasion a diverting problem. *ibid.*
- Novelties*: as Princes are disposed, they rarely embrace the same novelties, when they hate one another. V. 652.
- Novius*: what a novice said one day to Charles V. II. 438. *b.*
- Nûs*, why Anaxagoras was so called. I. 297. *b.* 298. *a.*
- Nanus Pompeius* forbade all lewd women to enter into the temple of Juno. III. 639. *b.* Refrained maids to the decency of their sex better than Lycargus. 962. *b.* Whether he introduced the community of women. 965. *a.* He would not have the Deity to be represented by any images. IV. 675. *a.*
- Number* (Golden), who is the author of that cycle. III. 254. *a.*
- Numerius* says that Arcusilas fixed himself in the Pyrrhonian inconstancy. I. 408. *a.* And abuses him very much. *ibid.* He has nevertheless said very advantageous things of him. 412. *b.*
- Nuns*, whose disorders Pope Sixtus IV. endeavoured to correct. II. 97. *a.* For what sum they obtained absolution from fornication. I. 628. *a.* The direction of Nuns by Monks is held in abhorrence at Rome, for reasons which experience sufficiently evince. 785. *a.* Monks who maintain that the Pope cannot give the direction of Nuns to any but Monks of the same order. *ibid.* *b.* A Bishop was obliged to nip their digs in order to examine their virginity. III. 344. *b.* 345. *a.* The singular answer of a Nun to the Bishop of Belley, and his reply. I. 738. *b.*
- Nuns*, whether they may be allowed to hear a lecture of Anatomy, on those parts which serve for generation. I. 109. *a.* They ought to be divided into two classes according to some Fathers. III. 61. *b.* What condition those who have had to do with Nuns are in after their death. IV. 125. *a.*

O.

OAK of *Mantre*, what has been said of it. I. 46. *b.*

Oaths, one of a singular form. I. 70. *b.* Whether the oaths of dying persons ought to be taken for proofs. II. 55. *b.* 57. *b.* They ought to be made without equivocations. 871. *b.* 872. *a.* The Magistrates of Athens exempt Xenocrates from an oath. V. 570. *a.* An author who had sworn never to have any thing to do with Bookellers, breaks his oath, and compares himself in this to women in the pains of child-birth. II. 82. *a. b.*

Obedience; how persons may be saved in two distinct kinds of obedience. I. 179. *a. b.*

Obedience (Passive) strongly defended. I. 264. *b.* 265. *a.*

Objections, it were to be wished that we had a general rule to distinguish those which proceed only from flesh and blood. I. 708. *b.* Complaints were made that Bellarmine proposed those of the Heretics better than he confuted them. 730. *b.* The answers of

- of a Divine cannot be so clear as the objections of a Philosopher. II. 456. *b.* An objection founded upon very distinct notions remains alike victorious, whether no answer is made to it, or such an answer as no body can understand. V. 815.
- Obliged*; there are few men who can love those to whom they are too much obliged. IV. 22. *b.*
- Obscenities*, whether it be not allowable to relate them. II. 684. *a. b.* 685. *a.* V. 132. *b.* 133. *a. b.* 264. *b. &c.* An apology for those which are to be found in some parts of this Dictionary. III. 460. *a. b.* IV. 803. *b.* 804. *a. b.* 805. *a. b.* 806. *a. b.* Necessity obliges a man to speak of them sometimes, but decency requires him to speak of them with circumspection. III. 135. *b.* 136. *a. b.* The Fathers of the Church have related those of the ancient Heretics. *ibid.* The greatest part of the Poets succeed best when they turn their Poetry this way. IV. 156. *b.* Obscenities writ by a wife and virtuous Queen. 322. *a. b.* A preferential against those of the ancient Poets. V. 99. *b.* La Mothe le Vayer makes an apology for those which he had diffused through his works. 420. *a. b. &c.* Accords is reproached with them, and justifies himself. I. 65. *a. b.* Grofs obscenities are less dangerous than such as are delicate. *ibid. b.* V. 845. to 848. Give one a disgust at the pleasure with women. I. 65. *b.* Garaffe censured for quoting them, and how he defended himself. III. 135. *b.* 136. *a. b.* There are obscenities in the *Examen des Esprits* of John Huarte, and in the translation which Chappius has made of it. 528. Naudé endeavours to excuse those of Niphus. IV. 380. *a. b.* The boundless liberty which many authors have taken in this respect. *ibid.* An explanation touching those made use of by the author. V. 837. to 858. The different ways they are made use of in books. 837. General remarks on those which are to be met with in books. *ibid. and* 838. *&c.* Obscene writings do not distinguish between honest and dishonest men. 838. Honest authors who have writ of such. 807. 837. 839. Two parties with respect to these authors. 838. Remarks upon those which are to be found in this Dictionary. 840. 841. *&c.* What method the Inquisition uses in prosecutions, where obscenities have a place. 848. *a. b.* It is impossible to exclude them absolutely. 850. Examples of those which are in the Bible. 851. *and a. b. &c.* And in profane Historians. 852, 853. And in the Fathers of the Church. *ibid.* Whether they shock modesty the less for being writ in Latin. 854, 855. The author's apology is to be found in divers parts of his work immediately after those which he relates. 858. Whether our modern Poets are less guilty this way than the ancient Poets were. 388. *a. b.*
- Obsequens* (Julius), a prodigy which he relates. V. 269. *a. b.*
- Obstinate men*, what is their fate when they fall into grofs mistakes. IV. 80. *b.*
- Ocean* (Northern), who was the first Roman General that embarked upon it. II. 715.
- Ochin*: some of his books translated by John Pointet. IV. 693.
- Ocrifia*; how she was got with child, and of whom she was brought to bed. V. 288. *a.*
- Ollavius* swears that he had not consummated his marriage with Fulvia's daughter. III. 112. *a.*
- Ollavius* of Minutius Felix; that book has been ascribed to Arnobius. I. 502. *a.*
- Odes*; a law-suit carried on about some odes that were stolen. IV. 895. *a.*
- Odium Theologicum*: that passion finds Heresies wherever it pleases. I. 605. *b.* One of its most cunning touches. 644. *b.*
- Oecolampadius*, his advice to Farel. III. 10. *a. b.* He did not trouble himself about the honour that is to be gained by the public exercises in universities. IV. 400.
- Oenomaus* reproaches Apollo for acknowledging Archilochus as a son of the Muses. I. 427. *a.*
- Officers*: history of the great officers of the kingdom of France by John le Feron. III. 27. *a.*
- Offices*; merit, credit, power, are often great obstacles in a man's way to them. I. 354. *a. b.* 733. *a. b.* II. 436. *a.* It is better to renounce them, than to obtain and exercise them at the expence of one's conscience. I. 224. *a. b.* 540. *a.* 587. *a.* The mercenary spirit of those who possess them. III. 339. *b.* 340. *a. b.* 341. *a. b.*
- Ogier* (the Prior) censures Father Garaffe. I. 798. *a.* II. 190. *a. b.* One of his funeral orations quoted. IV. 40. *b.*
- Ogier* (Charles) what he says about the incontinence of the people of the North. II. 821. *b.* The relation of his voyage to Denmark and Sweden is curious. V. 503. *b.* That relation quoted. IV. 247. *a. b.* 928. *a. n.* (1).
- Old age*; there are few people who find it so agreeable as Erasmus did. II. 814. *a.* It finds comfort in reading. IV. 630. *a. b.* Some of the inconveniences that attend it. V. 147. *b.* 148. *a.*
- Old men* never incline to die. I. 121. *b.* 122. *a.* Marry as much for the benefit of their neighbours as for their own. II. 618. *b.* Their bed is contagious to a young woman. III. 869. *a.* The imprudence of those who marry. IV. 88. *a. b.* A law which ordered them to be thrown headlong from a precipice. V. 347.
- Older*: few people like to be accounted older than they are. V. 333. *b.*
- Olympias*, what she said to a pretty lady that Philip was in love with. I. 392. *b.*
- Olivæ*, a treaty of peace carried on there. III. 901.
- Olivarez* (the Duke d') favours the amours of Philip IV. I. 589. *b.* Compared with the Cardinal de Richelieu. V. 373. *b.*
- Olive-trees*: how and upon what occasion Minerva produced an olive-tree. I. 445.
- Olivier*, Chancellor of France, said that the French resembled apes. III. 515. *a.* A funeral oration on that Chancellor by Daniel d'Angé. I. 562. *a.*
- Olivier* (Antony) Bishop of Lombes, brother to the Chancellor. I. 562.
- Olusne* (Madam d') her amours afforded matter to the authors of the XVIIth century. IV. 202. *b.*
- Omissions*; there are some which are unpardonable crimes in an Historian. II. 759. *b.* Pure omission, several Philosophers maintain that it is never free. V. 372. *b.*
- On*, why certain French writers generally denote themselves by that word. IV. 492. *a. b.*
- Onofreus* was much esteemed by Alexander, followed him in his wars, and had great posts bestowed upon him. II. 669. *b.*
- Opera*; the first essay of Opera's. II. 557. *b.* Who was the first author of them. V. 269. *a. b.* In the XVth and XVIth centuries the Opera's were the psalms and the pious devotions of the Church. II. 481. *b.* Rinuccini, or Cavaleri, looked upon as the inventors of them. IV. 878. *and a. b.* 879. *and a.*
- Opiniators*, what sort of people they are. IV. 362. *b.* 363. *a.*
- Opinions*, their diversity very often occasioned by mistakes. I. 284. *a. b.* It is by opinion alone that we judge of all things in this world. III. 57. *b.* The infatuation of men, in favour of the opinions commonly received. II. 141. *b.*
- Oppidum*; that word is equivocal, and signifies sometimes a borough, sometimes a town. I. 747. *a.*
- Oracles* of Paganism, several of them were consulted upon the same points. I. 132. *a.* And the greatest of the gods did not preserve his superiority in this respect. *ibid.* The difference between soothsayers that foretold things after the manner of an Oracle, and other soothsayers. 276. *b.* Plutarch observes that all those of Boeotia were ceased. *ibid.* 277. *a.* That of Amphiaras was very much revered. 276. *a. b.* 277. *a.* Whether they ceased upon the planting of Christianity. 281. *a.* Whether one ought to acknowledge any diabolical operation in them. 594. *a. b.* They did nothing gratis. II. 258. *a.* They were full of balderdash. III. 783. *a. b.* An oracle silenced. V. 386. Oracles that were consulted among the Pagans. 350. *b.* 351. *a. b.*
- Orations* (Funeral) when and upon what occasion the honour of them was granted to the Roman ladies by the Senate. II. 290. *a.*
- Orange*, the cruelties that were exercised in that town preceded the leaps of Mornac and Montbrison. I. 709.

- I. 709. *b.* The horrible cruelties that were committed there, when Serbellone took it by Assault. V. 120. *a. b.*
- Orange* (William I, Prince of), Brantome improperly alleges the apology of that Prince with respect to Philip II, and his ingratitude towards his father. II. 441. *a. b.* Goes to Strasbourg to sell all his plate and moveables there. V. 82. *b.* 83. *a.* Twice assassinated. II. 458. *a.* 459. *a. n.* (27). How he was treated by Richard Hall. III. 345. *a. b.*
- Orange* (Frederic Henry, Prince of) how he stood affected to Cardinal Richelieu. III. 821. *a.* The Princess, his wife, being displeased with Cardinal Mazarin, labours to procure a separate peace with Holland. II. 153. *a.*
- Oratory* (the fathers of the) cried down at Mons and Liege. IV. 350. *a. b.* The founder of that order in France. I. 785.
- Orators*, whether they should affect to pass for learned men. I. 353. *a. b.* They are not much concerned whether the facts they advance be true or not. II. 166. *b.* 167. *a.* Were rare in Cappadocia. 309. *b.* They make no scruple of extenuating or amplifying things according to the interest of their cause, to which they make whatever they can subservient. 343. *b.* 502. *b.* Are often guilty of falsifications. 406. *b.* Have great influence in causing a war to be begun or continued. 547. *b.* Are not subjected to such narrow rules as Historians are. 548. *a.* An Orator who made a strange pother to satisfy the desire he had to harangue. III. 151. *a. b.* Their art depends almost wholly upon action. IV. 567. *b.* The definition of an Orator. 581. *b.* 863. *a.* They are easily bribed with money. III. 355. Their tongue can do a great deal of mischief in a commonwealth. *ibid.* It is a kind of a miracle, when two famous Orators live together as good friends. 492. *b.* 493. *a. b.* They are always ready to declare for the party that is uppermost. 647. *a.* Those who are vehement, excite storms for nothing. IV. 479. *a. b.*
- Orbomenians*: two nations so called. IV. 626. *b.*
- Order*; it is very consistent with order that some things should be done out of order. I. 126. *a.*
- Order of the Holy Ghost*, who drew up the office of that order. I. 258. *b.*
- Orders* (Holy), who were those that might be admitted into them according to the ancient canons. III. 221. *a. b.*
- Orders of Knighthood*, a treatise on their origin and institution by Peter de Beloy. I. 740. *b.*
- Orestes*, the length of his tomb and bones. I. 312. *b.* 313. *a.* The founder of the city of Adrianople, to which he gave his name. 331. *a. b.*
- Organization*, whether the general laws of motion are sufficient for it. V. 114. *b.* 115. *a.*
- Oricovius* confesses that he had married a wife while he was a priest, but not that he had broke with the Church of Rome. V. 232. *b.* 233. *a.*
- Origen*, his opinion touching the hidden works of the Prophet Elias, rejected by St Jerome. II. 751. *b.* 752. *a.* What he answered to the Manichees concerning the origin of evil. IV. 112. *b.* 113. *a.* 416. *a. b.* 417. *a. b.* 418. *a. b.* 419. *a. b.* 420. *a. b.* 421. *a. b.* 422. *a.* Had a grain of Spinozism. 421. *b.* Whether it be proper to put him in the hands of all the world. 422. *b.* He and the other Fathers looked upon the question concerning the origin of evil, as one of the most perplexing. 524. *b.* He chose his proofs ill to maintain the virginity of the Mother of Jesus Christ. V. 772. *b.* His answer to Celsus, who laughed at the faith of the Christians. 816, 817. Nemesis espoused some of his errors. IV. 346.
- Origenism*; there were two sorts of it, the one carnal and the other spiritual. IV. 421. *a.*
- Original pieces*, the confusion that those fall into who do not consult them. II. 229. *a. b.*
- Original*; whatever helps to shew the original and progress of things, deserves to be taken notice of. II. 99. *b.*
- Orleans*, the strange disorders of the priests that were in that diocese. II. 373. *a. b.* Who was the first that settled the German library there. III. 158.
- Orleans* (Lewis of France, Duke of) assassinated in Paris by his uncle the Duke of Burgundy. III. 810. *a.*
- Orleans* (Lewis d') the Advocate of the League, VOL. V.
- what he makes the English Catholics say. III. 521. *b.* 522. *a.*
- Orleans* (Father d') much more reasonable than Sanders. II. 57. *a. b.* Quoted. 736. *b. n.* (25), (28). 737. *n.* (g). *a. n.* (31), (32). 738. *n.* (b), (i), (k), (l), (o), (p), (r), (s). *a. b. n.* (42), (43), (45). What he says of a late repentance. V. 556. *b.*
- Oropus* was a long time a matter of dispute between the Athenians and the Thebans. I. 274. *b.* Its inhabitants were the first who deified Amphiarus. 276. *a. b.* Pillaged by the Athenians. II. 329. *b.*
- Orpheus* torn in pieces by the women of Thrace, and for what reason. I. 115. *a. b.*
- Orthodox*, every orthodox person ought not to engage himself in disputes. I. 564. *a.* Nothing makes a man so much out of conceit with being so, as to see himself persecuted by other orthodox men. V. 513. *a.* In what sense the Orthodox seem to admit of two first principles. IV. 520, 521.
- Orthodoxy*, the great inconveniences to which those people expose themselves who make use of the secular arm to establish it. I. 14. *b.* The Promoters of it are sometimes more to be feared than Infidels. 199. *a.* Three things, none of which can be a mark of Orthodoxy. 287. *a.* Whether it be a right maxim that provided Orthodoxy triumphs, it matters not by what means, or how. II. 451. *a. b.* There is a Philosophical Orthodoxy and a Theological one. 662. *a. b.* By what means it is preferred against the attempts of Heresy. III. 902. *a. b.*
- Orthography*, how necessary it is to observe it exactly. II. 838. *and b.* The ancient Orthography ought to be preferred in the first or following editions of old books. IV. 427. *and a. b.* 428. *and a.*
- Orthography* (French) Laurence Joubertus was the first that innovated in it. III. 582.
- Orix*, one of the Pope's Penitentiaries sent to Ferrara on purpose to convert the Dukes. III. 31. *a.*
- Ojanna*, a saint who is held in great veneration at Mantua. III. 32. *b.*
- Olander*, what he taught concerning the mediation of Jesus Christ. V. 230. *b.* 231. *a.*
- Ofris*, where his tomb was. I. 37. There was no Music employed in the sacrifices that were offered to him. *ibid.* *a. b.* They sacrificed all the red-haired people, that they could find to his ghost. II. 233.
- Oforius* (Jerome) takes John Metel, his friend, and Antony Augustin for interlocutors in his dialogues *de Gloria*. IV. 200.
- Oforius* writes the life of Jerome Oforius, his uncle. IV. 426.
- Offat* (Cardinal d') prevailed with the Jesuits to side with him in the affair of Martha Brolier, who pretended to be possessed by the devil. IV. 883. *a. b.*
- Ostenation*, few learned men keep themselves free from it. II. 338. *a. b.*
- Ostracism*, who was the inventor it. I. 73. 74. Why that punishment was inflicted. II. 501. *b.* 502. *a.*
- Otho*, the Roman Emperor, his looking-glass was one of the principal parts of his equipage of war. I. 392. *a.* Overcome by Vitellius. V. 262. *a. b.* The inequality of his life. 273. *b.* A maxim which he quoted at his death. 628. *b.*
- Otho I*, Emperor, died in the year 973. II. 90. *b.*
- Otho III*, Emperor, loved pilgrimages. II. 58. *a. b.*
- Otho IV*, Emperor, was charmed with the chaste answer of a girl. III. 258. *a.* IV. 87. *b.*
- Ottoman*: the word Ottoman does not strike the common people so much as that of Turk; Jurieu's artifice in the use he makes of these words. V. 803.
- Ottoman Emperors*, nothing can be more precarious than their authority, although it seems to have the surest foundation. IV. 426. *a. b.* A history of them in medals promised. V. 223. *n.* (c).
- Overcome*; there are captains who know how to overcome, but not how to make use of their victory. II. 413. *a. b.* 414. *a.*
- Ovid* quoted with respect to Alcmena's lying-in. I. 207. *b.* Was a master Painter in the affair of love. II. 1, 2. Does not sufficiently observe the rules of probability in speaking of Oenone. IV. 401. *a.* What he says of Ceneus and of Hippodamia. I. 537. *a. b.* 538. *a.* Censured concerning Pygmalion, whom he is not careful to prevent his readers from taking for a meer statuary. IV. 641. *a. b.*

a. b. What he says of the prostitution of the women of Cyprus. *ibid.* *b.* 642. *a.*
Our lady of Hall and of Zibem, judgment which Joseph Hall forms of them, as well as of their Histories wrote by Lipsius. III. 846. *b.* 847.
a. b.
Oxenstern (Axel) made Great Chancellor of Sweden by Gustavus Adolphus. V. 654. One of the ablest men that ever appeared in Europe. *ibid.*
Oxford, who was the first professor of History in that university. II. 283. The title of Master of Arts is conferred there on those who have run through a course of seven years. 278. *a.* The foundation of its college. V. 554. *b.*
Oil, who invented the secret of making it. I. 455. *a.*
Offers sent to Trajan into Parthia. I. 371.

P.

P*Adia* is obliged to submit to the Republic of Venice. V. 590.
Pacti, his great merit. I. 787. *a. b.*
Paganism is founded on notions of the Deity as false as Atheism. I. 132. *a.* The Philosophers and not the Priests writ in favour of it. 255. *b.* Whether it be a less evil than Atheism. 382. *a.* Who was the cause of its oracles being put to silence. 594. *a.* Its priests feared nothing so much as the eyes of the incredulous and curious. *ibid.* *and b.* It preserved a monstrous alliance between the worship of the gods and the most filthy passions. 597. *a. b.* Was formed upon the witty conceits of some Poets. 65. *a. b.* III. 642. *a. b.* 652. *b.* 653. *a. b.* Nothing worse concerted than its system. II. 339. *a.* Wherein it made part of its Divine service consist. 531. *b.* Who were the Pharisees of it. 780, 781. Arnobius gives it a home thrust. III. 647. *a.* The venality of its oracles. IV. 405. *a.* Its religious ceremonies were rather appointed to avert misfortunes, than to draw down favours from Heaven. 572. *a.* Its priests heartily received the offerings of Courtisans. 869. *a. b.*
Pagans understood the nature of virtue thoroughly. I. 278. *b.* 279. *a. b.* What several have believed concerning the salvation of Pagans. 471. *b.* They reasoned very inconsequentially on the reality of virtue. II. 164. *b.* 165. *a.* Their doctrine with respect to guardian angels. II. 249. *b.* 250. *a.* Reflections upon their system of a multitude of gods. *ibid.* *a. b.* They could answer the objections of the Manichees better than the Christians. 251. *a. b.* IV. 519. *a. b.* 520. *a. b.* 521. *a. b.* The greatest part of them lived as the Christians do, who have faith without charity. II. 418. *b.* 419. *a. b.* Their distinction between the known and unknown gods, resembled very much the distinction that was made in the schools of Aristotle, between occult and manifest qualities. 677. *b.* Their gods were so ridiculous, that a man might laugh at them without being an Atheist. 872. *b.* The contradiction that appeared in their conduct, with respect to these same deities. 873. *a.* They have been justly reproached, on account of the utmost villany of the greatest of their gods. III. 130. *a.* They are afraid lest Christianity should be publicly tolerated, and for what reason. 320. *b.* 321. *a. b.* One of the effects of their prepossession. 578. *a. b.* 579. *a.* It may be said to their honour, that several of them were wiser and purer than their gods. 649. *a.* Those who pretended to the purest Orthodoxy, were at bottom no better than Atheists. 654. *a. b.* They could not throw the blame upon the Poets of those abominations, which were published of their gods. 653. *a. b.* They have been more easy to be converted than the Turks. IV. 41. *a.* The notions which the ancient Pagans had of the Deity, agree with sound Theology. 572. *b.* The Pagans committed as great a sin, in plundering the temple of Apollo, as the Jews would have done, in plundering the temple of Solomon. 622. *b.* 623. *a.* They can boast, as well as Christians, of having had Kings who cured distempers. 664. *b.* 665. *a.* Must have taught the Jews the doctrine of a life to come, according to the Hypothesis of Lucas Brugensis. V. 8. *a. b.* Took advantage of those passages of Scripture, which seem to ascribe some imperfection to God. 13. *b.* Their opinion about the statues

of the gods. 239. *b.* It does not appear that they asked the gods to forgive their sins, when they were at the point of death. 628. *b.*
Page, the bold action of a page. I. 712. *a.*
Page (--- le) minister at Dieppe, and afterwards at Rotterdam; author of the book intitled, *L'Impiété des Communions forcées*, dies in the year 1701. IV. 243. *a. n.* (2).
Pain; the dispute between the Stoics and Peripatetics about the nature of it, a meer dispute of words. III. 423. *a.* One may feel pain, without having ever felt pleasure. IV. 514. *a. b.*
Painters, whose pictures deceived men and beasts, are not the more excellent on that account. I. 369. *a. b.* V. 624. *b.* 625. *a. b.* Who made the goddesses like their mistresses. III. 57. *a.*
Palace (English) a house near the Vatican, why so called. III. 322. *b.*
Paladins, the fables that are writ of them, have been introduced into religion. I. 166.
Palatine (the Elector) restored to his dominions by the treaty of Munster. III. 247. *a.* Promises a retreat to the Socinians in the town of Mannheim. 903. Causes the acts relating to the affair of the Landgrave of Hesse, to be published, on account of the need in which he himself stands of them. 943. *b.* 944. *a. b.*
Palatinate, where the Ecclesiastical History of that country is to be found. I. 241. *a.* The revolution which happened there upon the death of Frederic III. V. 521.
Palavicin (Cardinal) a thought which he borrows from Aristotle. I. 126. *b.* 127. *a.* What he acknowledges with respect to the decisions of the council of Trent. 704. *a.* A disappointment that happens to him. II. 473. *a. b.* Much less prudent in refusing Father Paul, than Baronius, in refusing the Centuriators of Magdeburg. 643. *b.* He did not know that President Ferrier had changed his religion. III. 38. *b.* Several of his maxims censured in the *New Gospel*. 326. *b.* He pitied the Popes, when they had no other assistance, besides that of the Holy Ghost. V. 826.
Palestine, some Monks there had abandoned the cloaths and sentiments of men, I. 112. *a.* There is a mountain of gold promised there to the Christians, when they shall have conquered the Turks. V. 95. *a.*
Palingenius (Helias) a name which John Pincier borrowed. IV. 647. *a.*
Palladium, by whom made, and of what materials. I. 6.
Pamphlets; small Pamphlets, however good they be, are easily dissipated. IV. 652. *a.*
Pan punished by Venus, for giving the prize of beauty to another. I. 74. *a.* His birth. IV. 541. *a. b.* 542. *a.* Whole son he was, and how he comes to have goat's feet. *ibid.* *b.*
Panæti, a great Philosopher of the sect of the Stoics. III. 7.
Pancretus, the base complaisance of that Poet for Hadrian, and the reward which he received for it. I. 348. *a.*
Pandects: first book of the Pandects neglected by the Doctors. I. 477. *a.* Contains the finest laws of nature, and of Moral and Civil Philosophy. *ibid.*
Panegyrics, an easy way of composing one. II. 819. *b.* A multitude of them only serves to disguise Histories. III. 708. *b.*
Panegyrist; extravagant Panegyrist do more harm than good to those whom they praise. I. 469. *a.* Are too apt to make use of great words. 646. *b.* 647. *a. b.* Disguise what is disadvantageous to the memory of their heroes. 690. *a.* Those who praised the murderers of Kings, rewarded by the Spaniards. II. 103. *a. b.* Panegyrist who praise wicked things, Ilocrates not one of their number. 235. *a. b.* The modern Panegyrist carry their ideas farther than the Antients did. 715. *a.* Are very apt to contradict themselves. IV. 495. *a.* Love to exceed one another. 589. *a.* See *Encomium*. Panegyrist are much more ingenious than the Princes whom they praise, in heightening every thing that may tend to their honour. IV. 608. *a.* We ought not to imagine that the discourses of a Panegyrist, should influence either his conversation, or the Moral and Historical books he writes. V. 331. *a. b.*

Panglossia,

- Pangloss*, Balzac expresses some contempt for a book which had that title. IV. 531. *b.*
- Pannonius* (Johannes), his verses concerning the search which the Popes were obliged to undergo before their election. IV. 730. *b.* And upon the bastard daughter of Paul II. 510. *a.*
- Panopæia*, the author of that book, and the subject it treats of. II. 536, 537.
- Panstratia*, a book of Chamier's, how called by the author of the *Bibliothèque de Dauphiné*. II. 434. *a. b.*
- Pantaloon* corrects his error with respect to Bibliander's death. I. 803. *b.*
- Pantomimes*, when introduced upon the stage. I. 676. *a.* Zosimus places the introduction of the dances of the Pantomimes, among the causes of the destruction of the Roman empire. *ibid.* They were great provocatives to lust. 676, 677. It was under Augustus that these dances came to perfection. IV. 646. *b.* How the Antients have represented the manual language of the Pantomimes. 647. *a. b.*
- Papacy*, how difficult it is to exercise it. III. 564. *b.*
- Papebroch* has struck several faints out of the *Kalendar*. II. 740. *a.* Quoted. III. 330. *a.* 441. *b.* V. 467. *a.*
- Papers* torn in pieces and thrown into the sea, preserved by a very singular accident. II. 577. *a.*
- Paper-wars* are sometimes violent and of a long continuance. I. 322. *b.*
- Paphnuceius* converts a woman of pleasure. V. 321. *b.*
- Papists* formerly joined with the Turks and Pagans in the public prayers of the Protestants. IV. 199. *b.* Their divisions. III. 343. *b. n.* (30).
- Pappas*, Professor at Strasburg, what he asked of God for the Protestants of France, and for all the persecuted churches. V. 258. *a.*
- Paracelsus*, his notion about our first parents. I. 103. *b.*
- Paraclete*, how that word ought to be pronounced. IV. 470. *a. b.* 471. *a. b.*
- Paradise*, the great men of Rome distribute the places thereof for money. II. 713. *b.* It is pretended that Machiavel said in one of his works, that he had rather be sent to hell after his death, than go to Paradise. IV. 15. *b.* Whether that which Mahomet promised, was one of the causes that drew so many followers to him. 30. *b.* 31. *a. b.* What has been said concerning the occupations of Paradise. III. 895. *a.* What town was called the Paradise of Germany. II. 816. *a.*
- Paradise of Seneca*, a kind of union which may be so called. II. 119. *a.*
- Paradise Lost*, an English Poem which is greatly esteemed. IV. 219. *a. b.*
- Parasite*, one that runs after a good bit. II. 469. *b.* 470. *a.* The most famous Parasite of his time. IV. 246. *a. b.* 247. *a. b.* 248. *a. b.* 252. *a. b.* What is the compass and polar-star of a Parasite. *ibid. b.*
- Parcament*, the invention of it. IV. 555. *a.*
- Parcailhan* (Segur) undertakes a deputation to the Protestant Princes, and the cause of that deputation. II. 143. *a.*
- Parides* (Father), why it was suspected that he had no real design to confute Des Cartes. IV. 902. *b.*
- Pardon*; people do not so easily pardon reflecting words as injurious actions. V. 364. *b.* 365. *a.*
- Parent* (Francis), his Majesty's Greek Professor in the university of Paris. I. 562.
- Parvus* (Daniel) his *Modesta Historia Profana* is a work of Altingius. I. 241. *a.* The Devil expresses all his malice in that author's *Calvinus Oribedokus*. III. 539. *a. b.*
- Pareus* (David) insulted by the Jesuit Mulhufinus. II. 173. *b. n.* (14).
- Paris* was very effeminate. III. 297. *a.* His judgment concerning the beauty of the three goddesses. 644. *a. b.* He grows jealous of Corythus and kills him. IV. 401. *b.* 402. *a.*
- Paris*, the Comedian, was killed by Domitian's orders. II. 684. *a.*
- Paris*, what is said of that city in the *Saint-Evremondiana*. IV. 439. *b.* How far the corruption of it goes with respect to the women. 498. *b.* 499. *a. b.* *cf. seq.* It is nevertheless thought to be less impure than the greatest part of the capital cities in the West. 500. *a.* The fabulous siege of it by the giant Ilausus. 738. *b.*
- Parishes*; every parish should be summoned to produce the proofs of its devotions. IV. 556. *a.*
- Parisiens*, what judgment they pass upon books that are composed by an author who never went out of his province. IV. 458. *a.* The sedition which they carried on in the year 1648. 488. *b.*
- Parliament of Paris*; the order which that Parliament made against the Chymists. I. 469. *b.* And concerning the theses which attacked Aristotle's doctrine. *ibid.* An act which was purloined from its records. III. 297. *b.* 298. *a.* Refuses to register the edict of January. 509. *b.* 510. *a.* 512. *b.* In what stile Charles IX harangues it. I. 256. *a.* III. 512. *b.* Severely mortified. 825. *a. b.* Makes a very remarkable decree with respect to commissions. IV. 241. *b.* Remonstrances which it makes to Lewis XI. V. 443. *a. b.* A conjecture upon the reasons which moved that Parliament to involve the Jesuits in Chastel's affair. III. 279. *b.* 280. *a. b.* Its conduct justified in that respect. *ibid.* In what manner it treated Francis Surgier, a seditious preacher. V. 273. and *a. b.* 274. and *a. b.*
- Parliament of Bourdeaux*, Chancellor Hospital gives that Parliament a smart reprimand. III. 512. *a. b.*
- Parliaments* have too much grandeur for the trifling causes which are decided therein. II. 724. *b.* Parliaments of France, their stiffness is sometimes prejudicial to the state. III. 825. *a. b.* V. 443. *b.* Ought never to differ from the King in affairs of state. 444. *a. b.* Whether the interest of the kingdom requires that they should have more power than at present they enjoy in France. III. 512. *b.* 513. *a. b.* They have been long excluded from a share in the sovereignty. 825. *b.* 826. *a.*
- Parma* (the Duke of) endeavours to amuse Queen Elizabeth with secret proposals of peace. II. 662. *a.*
- Parmenides*, his opinion about the universe. V. 575. *b.* What his system was. 587. *a.*
- Parrhasius* quoted. III. 248. *b. n.* (91), (92). An examination of what is advanced there that an Origenist can reduce a Manichee to silence, in discouraging upon the origin of evil. IV. 416. *a. b.* 421. *a. b.*
- Perry* (William) being convicted of having designed to kill the Queen, is punished with death. II. 576. *a. b.*
- Partians*, a piece of conduct which shews, that they deserved the name of Barbarians, that the Greeks and Romans gave them. V. 273. *a.* Besiege Antioch, raise the siege, and their General is killed. II. 348. Fought as they fled. III. 521. *b.*
- Party*; it is difficult to preserve the affection and esteem of two contrary parties. I. 538. *a. b.* If any one fairly represents all the force of the opposite party's arguments, he draws down reproaches upon himself. 730. *a. b.* II. 456. *b.* 487. *b.* Whether a man ought to set the arguments of the opposite party in a weak light. *ibid.* 488. *a. b.* Whether it does service to a party to employ, in its defence, all sorts of reasons, good or bad. 708. *a.* Each party makes false steps which reciprocally serves to ballance and support the other. III. 954. *b.* The same things appear to us true or false, according as they favour our own or the opposite party. IV. 733. *b.* 734. *a. b.* 735. *a. b.* 736. *a. b.* 737. *a. b.* A strange effect of the spirit of party. 711. *b.* Party at all times determines the fate of dramatical performances. I. 867. *a. b.* Its ordinary artifices. 774. *a. b.*
- Partial*, oftentimes people accuse an Historian of being partial for no other reason but because they are remarkably so themselves. II. 310. *a. b.*
- Parties*, those which are termed *causales* expose people to great illusions. V. 184. *b.*
- Particular persons* are no more exempt from divisions than communities. III. 343. *b.*
- Particularism*, a great dispute raised on that subject. I. 261. *a. b.*
- Partridge*, a story that is told of the partridge. II. 725. *a.*

Paris

- Parts* (James des), Nicolas Præpositus steals from his Dispenfatory. IV. 764. *a. b.* Particulars which concern him. *ibid.* and *n.* (1), (2).
- Pascal*, the happy turn which he had naturally for the Mathematics. IV. 61. *a.* What the Abbot du Mas says of him. 491. *a.* One of his apologists would perhaps be puzzled by several remarks in the history of the five propositions. 492. *a.* Why, after having confessed himself in a disemper, he delayed communicating. 537. *b. n.* (24). What he esteemed most in Mr Des Cartes's Philosophy. 548. *b.* He despised Mathematics even before he gave himself up to devotion. V. 621. *a.*
- Paschalius* quoted. I. 577. *b.*
- Pasquier* censured for several considerable blunders. I. 25. *b.* Did not at all understand a passage of Abelard. *ibid.* A quarrel that was commenced with him. 670. *a. b.* Quoted. 792. *b. n.* (58). III. 399. *b. n.* (52), (53). 411. *a. n.* (82), (83), (84), (85), (86). V. 405. *a. b. n.* (a), (1), (2). 443. *b. n.* (4), (5), (6). Censured for the manner after which he tries to excuse Dante, with respect to the word Butcher. II. 296. *b.* He does not reason justly in the application he makes of a general thesis to Pyrrhus and Cæsar, to Pope Leo and Pope Nicolas. 414. *a.* His sons revenge his quarrel on a Jesuit who had traduced him. III. 132. *b.* 133. *a.* His judgment concerning those who have writ upon the Civil-Law. 201. *b.* He ridicules a man who was soon after canonized. 896. *b.* What account he gives of the Jesuits. 897. *b.* Is guilty of an anachronism which is censured by Garasse, and but ill defended by his sons. 908. *b.* 909. *a.* A passage of his plea against the Jesuits confuted. IV. 80. *a. b.* 81. *a. b.* 82. *a.* Censured by Garasse with respect to the word Paraclete. 470. *b.* 471. *a. b.* What he says of clandestine marriages, and of rapes. 636. *a. b.* 637. *a. b.* What he answers in defence of Mercerus who was accused of being a caballing man. 842. *b.* He disapproves of Tabourot's making additions to his Miscellany. I. 64. *a. b.* The judgment which he passes on le Feron's books of Heraldry. III. 27. *a. b.*
- Passage*: a remarkable passage left out in a second edition, but preserved by Usher. II. 94. *a. b.* The fate of passages which people copy from the first modern writer that comes in their way. 334. *b.* A curious passage of a manuscript left out in the printed edition. 633. *a. b.* One ought to distrust such as are cited by halves. V. 350. *a.*
- Passew* (the treaty of) gave full liberty of conscience to all the States of the empire. V. 672.
- Passtilaine* (John de), Bishop of Belley: Lewis XIII grants him the ancient privileges of his diocese. I. 737.
- Paster*, what the Paster of Catullus signifies in Martial. II. 396. *a.*
- Passeratius*, what he says against a certain faction of Grammarian Antiquarians. IV. 830. *b.* And against those who contemned Ovid. 432. *b.* 433. *a.*
- Passions* resemble animals which seek their food. II. 3. *a.* Cover themselves with a specious pretext. 30. *a. b.* Whoever designs to cure them must take a proper time for it. 564. *b.* Their first motions are not voluntary. 676. *a.* Their usefulness after sin. 855. *a. b.* They make us suppress circumstances which we do not like. III. 304. *a.* The greatest part of them, as well as their effects, are involuntary, and reason is too weak to destroy them. 376. *a.* IV. 440. *b.* 441. *a. b.* 442. *a. b.* 857. *b.* There is almost as much necessity for being above the passions to come to the knowledge of some kind of truths, as to act virtuously. 323. *b.* If they were once rooted up people would find no difficulty in the practice of virtue. 441. *a. b.* 442. *a. b.* Beasts are not capable of them, according to the opinion of the Stoics. 552. *b.* 553. *a. b.* 554. *a. b.*
- Pastor Fido* has produced bad effects. III. 259. *b.* 260. *a. b.* 261. *a.*
- Pastorals* (Tragi-Comic), pieces invented contrary to the rules of ancient Poetry. III. 259. *a.*
- Pastorals*, a romance upon the amours of Daphnis and Chloe, what are the faults of it. III. 866. *a. b.*
- Pastors*, wicked Pastors abuse their authority to bring about their own ends. III. 772. *b.* Good Christians are persuaded that they ought to hide their faults. V. 648. *a.* See *Ministers*.
- Pastoureaux*, the name of certain Fanatics; people did not at first discover their pernicious errors. II. 383. *a.* The most judicious reflexion of an Historian, upon that head. *ibid.*
- Patience*; examples of an extraordinary patience. I. 559. *a.* II. 674. *a.* IV. 487. *b.* 488. *a.* A patience which went beyond the necessary bounds. I. 734. *b.* 735. *a. b.*
- Patin* (Guy) his Cynical Liberty. I. 171. *b.* His mistake touching certain verses of Pasquier. 792. *b.* Quoted. II. 138. *a. b.* 268. *a. n.* (101). 650. *a. n.* (23), (24), (25). IV. 89. *a. n.* (8). His judgment with respect to Calvin's wit and learning. II. 268. *a.* We are obliged to him for the publication of that Reformer's life writ by Papyrius Masso. *ibid.* *a. b.* In what manner he speaks of Mr Tardieu and his wife. III. 40. *b.* 41. *a.* The necessity of rectifying his letters by notes. 266. *a.* A confutation of what he has said of Thuanus's death. 827. *a. b.* His invective against Joseph du Chesne. II. 468. *b.* Censured for a particular he relates of Augustin Niphus's Life. IV. 380.
- Patin* (Charles) the cause of his disgrace. IV. 505. *b.* 506. *a. b.*
- Patriarch* of Constantiaople, strangled during the session of the Council of Florence. I. 266.
- Patricius* is an equivocal word. IV. 638. *b.*
- Patrimony*: there were Philosophers that renounced their patrimonies before the preaching of the Gospel. I. 294. *a. b.* The contempt of one's patrimony, is a more valuable possession than the patrimony itself. 390. *b.* The laws of Aldera put a mark of infamy upon those who had spent it. II. 635. *a. b.*
- Pattins*, women that wore very large ones. II. 599. *a. b.*
- Pavia*: the battle of Pavia foretold to the Queen-Regent by Turrel, according to Paradin. V. 417.
- Pavia* (the Cardinal di) obliged to sign briefs which he had not seen. IV. 511. *a. b.*
- Pavin* (St) a famous Libertine, whose conversion has been put among the moral impossibilities. II. 650. *a. b.*
- Paul* (St) whether he pretended that a husband had power to dispose of his wife's body, in favour of another man. I. 91. *b.* Accused of straining his expressions. 106. *a. b.* 107. *a. b.* Compared to a great sea which swells by the impetuosity of the wind. 109. *b.* And treated with great inreverence by the Italians. *ibid.* 110. *a. b.* How Bembo treated his epistles. 743. *a.* He stood in need of a strong check and severe mortification, lest the excellency of the revelations that were communicated to him, should have puffed him up with pride. V. 367. *b.* Simon Simonius affirmed that he could propose objections, which that apostle would not have been able to answer. 150. *b.* 151. *a.* He acknowledges that his doctrine is obscure, and that he knows it but imperfectly. 816. Gets out of the difficulties of Predestination, no otherwise than by asserting the absolute power of God over his creatures. 821. This Apostle's aim, when he forbids us to name any thing that is filthy. 857, 858.
- Paul* (Father) his extream joy in beholding Mr Sommerdyk at Venice. I. 3. *a.* His jest upon one of the sessions of the Council of Trent. 469. *b.* More imbued with the Protestant than the Catholic faith. 717. *a.* His friendship for Mr Daillé. II. 580. *b.* 581. *a.* Criticized by Palavicini with respect to the letters, which the Council of Trent was to dispatch. III. 51. *a. b.* A thought of his concerning the circumstances which favoured the reformation. 948. *a.* A strange maxim of this great man. V. 14. *a.* His narrative of the interview, which Vergerius had with Luther. 452. *a. b.* And of the former's assisting at the assembly of Worms. 453. *a. b.* It is said that he made great use of Vergerius's libels. 456. *a. b.* His History of the Council of Trent, translated into Latin by Adam Newton. IV. 360. Considerations which hinder him from confuting the *Squittino della Liberta Peneta*. V. 449. *a. b.*
- Paul Jovius*, takes too much pleasure in collecting together popular traditions. II. 878. *a.* Quoted im- pertinently on the subject of Hadrian VI. III. 327. *b.* 328. *a.* Censured by Nonnius with respect to the pillars of Hercules. 431. *a.* His faults with respect to the book intitled, *Obscurorum Virorum Epistole*.

- Epistola*. 474. *b.* 475. *a.* Censured for the characters he gives Ajaxetus and Alamannus. IV. 11. *b.* Blamed for his negligence, on the subject of Alphonso, King of Naples. IV. 311. *b.* 312. *a.*
- Paul II* (Pope) treats a company of learned men cruelly, and for what reason. II. 877. Turns all the abbreviators out of their places. IV. 683. They present a petition to him, but he returns a very rough answer. 684. *and a.* In what sense he condemned the word *Academy*. 685. *a. b.* Laments the rigour of the law which binds priests to celibacy. 411. *a. b.*
- Paul III* (Pope) his indignation against the whole order of the Capuchins. IV. 388. *b.* What Alciatus says of him. III. 590. *b.* 591. *a.* Accused of Magic, and of holding intimate conversation with Magicians. II. 499. *a. b.*
- Paul IV* (Pope) refuses a dispensation of marriage from a regard to the private interest of his family. IV. 632. *b.* 633. *a. b.* The acknowledgment which he made. *ibid.* *b.* 634. *a.*
- Paul V* (Pope) in favour of the Duke of Lerma, departs from the custom of not sending the hat to Cardinals newly elected. I. 604. *b.*
- Paula Malatesta*, a very eminent lady. III. 185. *a. b.*
- Paulina* wore in her dress and on her head, jewels to the value of four millions of Crowns. III. 861. *b.*
- Paulus Samosatenus* protected by Zenobia. V. 604.
- Pausanias* assassinates Philip, King of Macedonia. IV. 404. *a.* What were the consequences of that assassination. *ibid.*
- Pausanias*, a passage of that author misunderstood by Romulus Amasæus. II. 826. *a.*
- Pe* (Lazarus) translates Marinello's book on the difficulties of women, and accuses Liebaud of Plagiarism. IV. 148. *a. b.*
- Peace*; there are circumstances, in which each of the Princes, that conclude a peace, incur a general blame. II. 740. *a.* A punishment which in ancient times was imprecated on those who should violate a treaty of peace. 742. *a.* Is easily concluded, when both parties find themselves under a necessity of ending the war. III. 90. *a.* They break the peace, not who first make war, but who fraudulently carry on secret practices. II. 104. *a. b.* The proper time for a Prince to make peace, is the time of his enemy's ill-fortune. V. 661.
- Peacocks*, who was the first among the Romans, that introduced the custom of eating peacocks in entertainments. III. 492. Those birds were extremely valued by the ancient Greeks. IV. 569. *b.* *s.* (44).
- Pedant*, his character. I. 373. *a. b.* 376. *a. b.*
- Pedraffy*, in ancient times, that sort of love was not branded with infamy. I. 292. The Heathen gods reproached with it. II. 482. *a. b.* 483. *a.*
- Peers of France*, whether the creation of them should be ascribed to Charlemagne. III. 336. *a. b.*
- Pegna* (Francis) publishes two editions of the Directory of the Inquisitors. II. 749.
- Peyrat* reproaches the Lutherans with suppressing all the copies they could find of a certain Missal. III. 558. *b.* 559. *a.* The reasons which he alleges to ground that reproach upon, are not solid. *ibid.* *a. b.*
- Pelagians*, severe decrees against them. I. 229. *a. b.* 230. *a.* Nothing can be more acceptable to them, than to say, that the fear of the false gods, was able to induce men to repent. V. 812.
- Pelagius II* (Pope), sends to Constantinople to demand succours against the Lombards. III. 219.
- Pelagi* carry off the Athenian women. III. 754. *b.* 755. *a.*
- Pelson*, the height of that mountain. II. 659. *a. b.*
- Pelisson*, a reflexion upon four verses of his making. II. 420. *b.* What he says of the difficulty there is in composing with an easy air. III. 262. *a. b.* His reflexion upon the injustice of those who condemn the occupations of others. IV. 843. *a.* While he was at Toulouse, he formed the plan of a club of wits. V. 394. *a.*
- Pellout* (Cardinal) an unlucky thing that happened to him with respect to an harangue which he had prepared. V. 778.
- Peloponnesus*, the expedition in which the Heraclidæ
V O L. V.
- retook it, precedes the Historical time. I. 241. *a.* Whether all the cities thereof were maritime cities. 657. *a. b.*
- Peloponnesian war*, the cause of it was not known. IV. 570. *b.* 571. *a.*
- Pelopi*, the wonderful qualities that are ascribed to one of his ribs. V. 289. *a.*
- Pen*, one that had lasted forty years. I. 231. *b.* 232. *a.* A pen dipt in good sense. 469. *a.* Pens consecrated to the Holy Virgin. 617. *b.* III. 841. *b.* There is nothing so execrable, which mercenary pens will not attempt to justify. II. 100. *and b.* 101. *and a. b.* The great effects of the pen. I. 720. *b.*
- Pen of gold*: a witty jest of Henry IV, upon an Historian who boasted that he had a pen of gold. III. 339. *b.*
- Pen* by way of bravado, said to be made with a sword. I. 548.
- Penance*: an example of a rude penance. I. 96. *a. b.*
- Penates* (Dii) children were sacrificed to them. II. 163. *b.*
- Penelope* governs herself much more prudently than Helen. III. 367. *b.*
- Penetration*: several people make themselves ridiculous by their affecting too great a penetration. IV. 687. *a. b.*
- Penitence* put off to death-bed, as well as extreme unction. I. 701. *b.* Is liable to be suspected. V. 556. *b.* A remarkable abuse of this sacrament, and the complaints that were made of it. II. 459. *b.* 460. *a. b.*
- Penitentiaries*, their complaints to the first President of Paris. IV. 499. *a.*
- Pennafort*, General of the Dominicans, causes it to be decreed in a chapter held at Toledo, that they should apply themselves to the study of Hebrew and Arabic. IV. 167. Is desirous of purging Spain from Judaism and Mahometism. *ibid.*
- Pennetier* (Henry) an apostate Minister. III. 735. *b.*
- Pensioners*: State-Pensioners do not enjoy their pensions without care and trouble. III. 176. *a. b.*
- Pensions* assigned on the revenues of the Church. I. 751. *a. b.* Whether large pensions procure esteem to men and their productions. III. 340. *a. b.*
- People*; their folly. I. 154. *b.* Often punished for the faults of Princes. 158. *b.* 159. *a.* II. 340. *a. b.* 341. *a. b.* Have a ridiculous fondness for every thing which they find established. I. 349. Would be formidable to the Clergy, in case they had a sufficient capacity to demand of them an account of their doctrine. 564. *b.* 565. *a.* Demand nothing but bread and public shews. 573. *b.* 574. *a.* Stand in need of being nourished with a blind and artificial hatred to the enemies of the state. 681. *b.* 682. *a.* Their rights strongly maintained by Bodin. II. 46. *b.* 47. *a. b.* 48. *a.* They sometimes do justice to oppressed innocence. 337. *a.* There are certain things in which they love to be deceived. 539. *a.* When they are mutinous, there is no possibility of making them hearken to reason. 542. *a.* There is no stress to be laid on their fidelity. 608. *a.* They will remain quiet, if not agitated by some external force. 741. *a. b.* Their capricious and uneven disposition. III. 452. *a. b.* 467. *a. b.* 468. *a.* IV. 603. *a. b.* They are fated to suffer for the follies of many others. III. 530. *b.* How far their weakness goes, when they are prepossessed and imposed upon by persecutors. 626. *and a.* Their ordinary disposition, with respect to treaties of peace, and to war. V. 104. *a. b.* The people likened to coquets. III. 798. *a. b.* Are more tender of their private interest than of the fundamental laws of the State. IV. 603. *b.* The rights of the people have fair sides, they have likewise ugly ones. V. 749. What a Cardinal said of the people. 748, 749. They easily believe what flatters them. 749. *a. b.*
- Pepin*, whether he divorced Plectrude and married Alpaide. III. 707. *b.* 708. *a.*
- Perafa*, the priestesses of that place boasted of being able to walk on burning coals without hurt. II. 531. *a.*
- Pereaus* (Charles) is mistaken with respect to Cardinal Berulle. I. 786. *b.* His judgment concerning Homer and his dialogue between Hector and Andromache. 333. *b.* He is obliged to suppress some elegies. 498. *a. b.* Laughs at a place of the
11 K
Iliad

- Iliad*. II. 481. *a. b.* His lines upon the disadvantage our lawyers lie under, compared with those of antiquity. 724. *b.* As yet there has been no answer made to his parallel. IV. 741. *b.*
- Perhaps*: it is a very common fault to change into an affirmation what an author has only delivered with a *perhaps*. IV. 381.
- Pericles* afflicted Anaxagoras with his riches. I. 295. *b.* The suspicion of irreligion is fastened upon him. 307. *a.* The answer he made when he suffered an old woman's remedy to hang about his neck. II. 649. *b.* Being thrown upon the ground in wrestling, he persuaded the spectators that he did not really fall. III. 390. *b.* IV. 567. *b.* An offer which he makes to the Athenians. V. 552. *b.*
- Perimede*, according to the Scholiast on Theocritus, is the same with Agamede. IV. 585.
- Peripatetic* (John) causes the History of Theodoric by Cochlæus to be reprinted with additions and notes. II. 523. *a.*
- Periods*: two periods bordering upon one another, and beginning with the same word easily escape the transcribers. IV. 711. *b.* There are half-periods, which may be taken out of a book, and still leave a tolerable sense behind. *ibid.*
- Peripatetic Philosophy*, why it finds so many protectors. I. 472. *b.* Could not prove the immortality of the soul. IV. 717. *a. b.* & *seq.*
- Peripatetics*, reflexions upon their substantial forms. II. 251. *a.*
- Perjury* unpunished changed a superstitious man into an Atheist. II. 652. *b.* 653. *a.*
- Perpetuity of the Faith*, who is the author of that book. I. 493. *a. b.*
- Perron* (Cardinal du) always had his works twice printed. I. 318. *b.* What he thought of Bellarmine's controversial books. 730. *a. b.* His excuse to a Princess before whom he was obliged to speak sitting. II. 422. *b.* Particulars concerning him. IV. 240. *a. b.* His invidious reflexion upon the Protestants. III. 42. *b.* He gives Mrs de Gournai a most satirical rub. 206. *b.* 207. *a.* He had notwithstanding a regard for her. *ibid. a. b.* Disputes with Michael Berault in the conference of Mantes. I. 756.
- Persecution for religion's sake*, how unjust it is. I. 240. *b.* 241. *a.* A fine passage of St Augustin against persecution. 287. *b.* 288. *a.* Whether in time of persecution it be not necessary to make outward profession of the truth. 663. *a. b.* Persecution sharpens the wit, and makes a man wonderfully clear-sighted in discovering the mystical sense. III. 772. *b.* See *Non-tolerance in affairs of religion*.
- Persecutors of religion*, their cunning. II. 30. *a. b.* The finest maxims of Christian morality, when alleged by them, become trifling. III. 289. *a. b.* The conformity between Pagan and Christian persecutors. 446. *a. b.* An instance of their peridy. 623. *b.* 624. *a.* Their different conduct according to the difference of times. IV. 815. *a. b.* They are very much puzzled how to justify their conduct, especially when they themselves complain of the persecutions that they have suffered. V. 22. *b.* 23. *a.* According to Jurieu we fulfil the command that enjoins us to love our neighbours, when we with spiritual felicity to them. 648. *b.*
- Persepolis*, who was the cause of its destruction. V. 320. *a. b.*
- Perſia*, the Christians are persecuted there. I. 13. *a. b.* The artifices made use of by the Magi in that country to destroy the Christian religion. *ibid.* The epithet that was given to the King of Persia. I. 130. *b.* 514. *a. b.* II. 513. *b. n.* (11). What the Kings of Persia did for their language. III. 172. *a. n.* (14). The women there are handsome. IV. 35. *b.* What notion the learned men in that country have of the Supreme Being. V. 201. *a. b.*
- Perſians*, whence so called, and what was the origin of their first Kings. I. 72. *a. b.* They are indebted to Zoroaster for their Philosophy. 444. What was the happiness that they expected from their principal deity. *ibid.* They very much esteemed those who could bear a great deal of wine. II. 598. *a.* They believe that Mahomet Mahadi is not dead, and that he is one day to reunite all men in the same belief. IV. 125. *a.* Their ancient religion. V. 635. *a. b.* 636. *a. b.*
- Pesla* (Dominic de) a Jacobine, hanged with Savonarola, and for what reason. V. 64.
- Petavius* (Father) why he refused to answer a Minister. II. 578. *a.* Has contradicted himself in representing the doctrine of the three first centuries. IV. 601. *b.* 602. *a.*
- Peter* (Saint); a visionary pretends that he was the Janus, the Æneas, the Romulus, of whom the Sibyl spoke. III. 529. *a. b.*
- Peters* (Father) a satire against him. I. 344. *a.*
- Petition of the Dictionaries*, Menage suppressed that petition. I. 620. *a.* Quoted. III. 208. *a. b.*
- Petitions*: an infinite number of petitions of the Protestants of France, have been printed without ever being presented to the King. I. 532. *a. b.* The qualities with which they must be accompanied, if the petitioners would obtain any thing at court. III. 341. *a. b.*
- Petra Sancta* (Sylveſter à) a Jesuit, his notes upon a letter of du Moulin to Balzac, &c. IV. 280. *a. b.*
- Petrarch* was not born when Guido Cavalcante died. II. 399. He may pass for Cæsar's Scholar, and steals some thoughts from him. 508.
- Petronilla*. Abbess of the order of Fontevraud, sometimes accompanied Robert d'Arbriffel in his travels. III. 64. *a. b.*
- Petronius* less dangerous with all his gross obscenities, than he is in the nice drefs of Count de Rabutin. V. 847.
- Peucer*, what he says concerning the death of Paul II. examined. IV. 510. *a. b.* 511. *a.*
- Phalaris*, the letters which bear his name are a supposititious work. I. 5. *a.* V. 607. *a.* On what conditions he was willing to abdicate. IV. 563. *b.* The advice which he gave Stesichorus. V. 149. *b.* His bull. 358. *b.* At what time he lived. 607. *a.*
- Phalerum* was the port of the Athenians before the Piræus was built. II. 832. *b.*
- Phantoms*, there were some that haunted a house. I. 225. Another appears to Brutus. II. 350. *a. b.* May occasion a mortal distemper. 715. *b.* 716. *a.* Whether it be not possible that a man may believe, when awake, that he sees one. III. 741. *a. b.* A story concerning them. IV. 725. *b.* Whether Spinoza had reason to deny that there were any. V. 215. *a. b.* See *Spirits*.
- Pharamond*; whether he instituted the Salic Law. III. 336. *a. b.* We have but little certainty that there ever was such a man in the world. 338. *a.*
- Pharisees* were less honest men than the Sadducees. V. 11. *a. b.*
- Pharus*; A cunning device of him that built it. V. 553. *b.*
- Pharſalia* torn in pieces by some young men. IV. 623. *b.*
- Phœvrius*, the railery which he made use of against a young man that was a great lover of old-fashioned words. IV. 830. *a.*
- Pharſua*, the feigned name of a maid of honour to the Princess of Salerno whom Augustin Niphus was in love with. IV. 380. *b.*
- Pherecydes* died of a pedicular distemper. I. 211. *b.*
- Pheros* was in love with a servant maid. II. 140. *a.*
- Phidias*, his master-piece. III. 756. *a.* Under what pretence, and with what view he drew the ladies to his house. IV. 569. *b.*
- Philemon*, killed by the Phlegians, while he strove to defend the temple of Delphos. IV. 626. *a.*
- Philopbus*, the advice which he gives to Laurence Valla. V. 435. *a.*
- Philistinus*; the History of him. IV. 554. *b.* 555. *a.*
- Philip*, King of Macedonia, the dream which he had after marrying Olympia, differently expounded by his Diviners. I. 448. *a. b.* Whether one has reason to surmise, that he had read the holy Scriptures. *ibid.* He is praised as a great drinker. II. 598. *a.* A joke of demosthenes on that head. *ibid.* An author undertakes to write his History for the use of the United Provinces. 768. *a.* By whom killed, and for what. IV. 404. *a.*
- Philip*, another King of Macedonia, an Ode writ against him. I. 191. How he defended himself against Alcæus. *ibid. a.*
- Philip*, the Consul has a great violence committed upon him. II. 711. *b.* 712. *a.*

- Philip*, the Emperor, whether he was a Christian. I. 593. *a. b.*
- Philip* I. King of France excommunicated in the councils of Autun and Clermont, and for what reason. III. 62. *a.*
- Philip de Valois*, King of France, confirms a knight-hood conferred on another person by a knight. III. 282. *a.*
- Philip of Burgundy*, natural son to Philip the Good, was not very chaste. III. 148. *a. b.*
- Philip* II, King of Spain, his jealousy and his mysterious politics did him harm sometimes. I. 588. *a.* What people thought of him after he had caused Constantius Pontius to be burned in effigy. II. 336. *b.* Upon what consideration, after having thus tarnished his father's memory, he would not however suffer him to be indicted as a Heretic. *ibid.* His answer to Cardinal de Granville touching the retirement of Charles. V. 439. *a.* His ingratitude towards his father. *ibid. b.* He causes his father's scourge to be brought to him, and gives it to his son. *ibid.* Makes a dishonourable peace. III. 419. *b.* 420. *a. b.* Aspires to the Imperial crown. II. 223. Conquers Portugal from D. Antonio. V. 319.
- Philip* III, King of Spain, censured as a lazy Prince. IV. 127. *a.* Renounces all his rights to the hereditary countries of the house of Austria, situated in Germany. V. 673.
- Philip* IV, King of Spain falls in love with an actress. I. 589. *b.*
- Philisburg* is left in the possession of France by the treaty of Munster. III. 720. *a.*
- Philistines* must have been terrible folks in love-matters. I. 40. *b.* Had nevertheless a great regard for marriage. *ibid.*
- Phylarchus*, the original of his quarrel with Balzac. III. 204. *and a.*
- Philo* would discover mysteries which we ought not to pry into. I. 122. *b.* His embassy to Caligula. 374. *b.* He condemns three sorts of legislators with respect to marriage. II. 504. *b.* His oration on true nobility translated by Daniel d'Auge. I. 562. *a.*
- Philologists* are easily provoked, and difficultly appeased. IV. 476. *a. b.* V. 92. *a. b.*
- Philosophers*: the ancient Philosophers had tenets for the vulgar, and tenets for disciples initiated into their mysteries. I. 472. *b.*
- Philosophers* (Heathen) were not impious men. I. 255. *b.* Were the only writers whom the Christians had to oppose. *ibid.* Some of them parted with all their worldly goods. 294. *a. b.* 295. *a. b.* The ancient Philosophers went back as far as the Chaos, and the first origin of all things. 302. *b.* Complain that every thing is involved in darkness. 305. *b.* Who was the first Philosopher that published books. 309. *b.* It is an axiom with the schoolmen that a Philosopher ought not to have recourse to God in order to explain the effects of nature. 310. *a.* Are not qualified to judge of the machine of the world. *ibid. b.* 311. *a.* Whether the Philosophers who used all their industry to come at the knowledge of the true God, and to honour him religiously, had that faith by which the just live. 323. *b.* The true description of a perfect Philosopher. 383. *b.* Among their disciples, there was always one that was his master's favourite. 408. *a.* The antients have left the History of the Philosophers in a wretched state. 415. *b.* 416. *a.* A Philosopher by practice and not by profession. 464. *a.* They should dip their pen in good sense. 469. *a.* It has been said that there is nothing so absurd but has been maintained by some Philosophers. II. 31. *b.* Antiquity had two sorts of Philosophers; some were like the advocates, and others like those who report a cause. 487. *b.* Their History has been intermixed with as many prodigious adventures as that of the knights errant. 637. Nothing was more worthy a Philosopher, fully persuaded of the existence of the true God, than to laugh at the superstitions of the Pagans. 670. *a.* Philosophers and Rhetoricians expelled from Rome. III. 6. *a.* There are several things which the laws tolerate in the people, and which would not be allowed in a Philosopher. 312. *b.* 313. *a. b.* Bore the punishment of the folly of the priests. 642. *b.* The difficulty they have in explaining the conduct of providence. 919. *a. b.*
- The ancient Philosophers believed the souls of men to be material, as well as those of beasts. IV. 548. *b.* 549. *a. b.* 550. *a.* Some of them made no distinction between thought and sensation. *ibid. b.* The people would not suffer them to treat of natural causes. 566. *b.* Philosophers who were of no particular sect. 860. *a.* Philosophers always accused of irreligion. V. 286. *a. b.* Undertake to give an account of their doctrine to all the world. 815, 816. St Paul does not challenge them to a disputation, on the contrary he exhorts believers to stand well on their guard against Philosophy. 816. Their disputes looked upon by the Fathers as great obstacles to faith. *ibid.*
- Philosophers* (Indian) the austerities of some among them. II. 115. *a. b.* 116. *a. b.*
- Philosophy* will destroy both errors and truths, if she be allowed to have her full scope. I. 97. *a.* II. 848. *a. b.* III. 459. *a. b.* 460. *a. b.* In what sense it ought, and ought not, to have recourse to God in order to explain the effects of nature. I. 310. *b.* 311. *a.* By what means Lactantius pretends to destroy all Philosophy. 411. *a. b.* 412. *a.* And particularly that of the Academics. 411. *b.* Who was the first that brought it over to Athens. 414. *a. b.* *et c.* Philosophy and Divinity are not well agreed upon their proper boundaries. 472. *b.* Philosophy can carry a man no farther than to make him confess at last that he is only assured of one thing, *viz.* that he knows nothing. II. 202. *a.* Whether Divinity can subsist without it. *ibid. b.* Its disputes resemble that about the oyster. 485. *b.* 486. *a.* Strabo says it could not lead us to faith. 832. *a.* It has been sometimes debased. 845. *b.* 846. *a.* Whether a doctrine that is false in Philosophy can be true in Divinity. III. 479. *a.* 951. *a. b.* 952. *a. b.* See *Reason*. The Peripatetic Philosophy is only fit to foment the divisions of the Divines. 558. *a.* Whether Theology ought to be subjected to it. IV. 419. *b.* Philosophy is at a stand in answering the objections of the Manichees, with respect to their two principles. 522. *a.* It is a remedy for impiety and superstition. V. 287. *b.* Is disfigured by the vain subtleties of the schoolmen. 339. *a. b.* It is essential to the truths of the Gospel, not to be consistent with Philosophy. 815.
- Philosophy* (Civil and Political) a book of Politics by Arrerac. I. 505. *a. b.* Judgment which is passed upon it. *ibid. b.*
- Philosophy* (Soldier's) a work of Audiguier's. I. 548. *a.*
- Philosophy* (Occult) the History of that book. I. 154. *a.* And the key to it. *ibid. and 155. a. b.* 156. *a.*
- Philosophize*: it is impossible to philosophize justly without the evidence of ideas. I. 470. *b.* One ought to observe a just medium in it. II. 847. *a. b.* 848. *a. b.* The natural consequences which a disputing and dialectician spirit produces. 848. *a. b.* 849. *a.*
- Philtre* prepared for one person and taken by another. III. 876. *and a.*
- Phineas*, whether he be still living in the terrestrial paradise. II. 750. *a.* Kills a Midianitish woman whom he surprized in the act of fornication. V. 133. *a.*
- Physic*, its success depends on the blessing of Heaven. III. 664. *b.* The Faculty of Physic at Paris were formerly very moderate in the practice of drawing blood. II. 99. *a.* They oppose the practice of frequent bleeding introduced by Botai. *ibid. b.*
- Physical*: a Physical receipt. II. 197. *a. b.* 198. *a. b.*
- Physical*: combination of moral and Physical things. II. 16. *a.*
- Physicians* ought to profit by the sentence of Agatho. I. 127. *a.* An oath which they take upon receiving their degree. 399. *b.* What are the privileges of their profession. *ibid. a.* Formerly exercised the Apothecaries trade. 465. *a.* A Physician who laid a surprizing wager. 526. 527. *and a.* In what manner the common people made use of Physicians formerly. III. 23. *a. n.* (5). Their constant practice in the XVIIth century was to bleed in the opposite side to where the pleurisy was. II. 141. A civil war raised among the Physicians of Portugal to support that practice. *ibid. a.* The Emperor's inclination to favour it, if

- if it had not been for the death of Charles III, Duke of Savoy. *ibid.* *b.* Who was the first Physician that ever came to Rome. 353. *a.* The practice of the Paris Physicians is to bleed very much. 696. *a. b.* They had formerly a public library in their schools. III. 497. The Physicians formerly were wont to ascribe much to the influence of the stars, in discoursing upon distempers. 621. *b.* A multitude of Physicians kill the patient. 318. *b.* Banished from Rome. IV. 752. *a. b.* Whether those whose remedies prove mortal, notwithstanding their honesty and learning, deserve to be punished. 931. *a. b.* It is an infamous thing in a Physician to make himself work. II. 259. *b.* 260. *a. b.* The three qualities of a good Physician. III. 487, 488. Reflections upon the question whether they have good or bad fortune. 488. *a.*
- Physicians* who wrote in verse: a list of them published by Bartholinus. III. 351. *b.*
- Physic*; it is thought Alcmaeon was the first who wrote upon that science. I. 210. Lactantius confesses that with respect to Physics, there is no science. 412. *a.* What is the source of the defect in Aristotle's Physics. 470. *a. b.*
- Phocas*, his usurpation and cruelties. III. 222. *a. b.* The praises which the Pope bestows upon him. *ibid.* *b.*
- Phocæans* seize upon the temple of Delphos, to enable them to make war with the Thebans. IV. 621. *and a. b.* *Éc.* They are supported in that war by the Athenians and Lacedæmonians. *ibid.*
- Phocion*, what he said to the officers that attended him when a fellow spit in his face. I. 460. *b.* His integrity. III. 355.
- Phœaciens* led a voluptuous life. I. 201. *b.*
- Phœbas*, King of the Phlegians, his cruelty: he is conquered by Apollo. IV. 626. *a.* Divers persons of that name. *ibid.* *a. b.*
- Φορτικώτης*, ill rendered by the word *impertunus*. II. 12. *a.*
- Photius*, what he relates concerning a man, whose name was Oe. I. 101. *a.* He makes Josephus say things, which he has not said concerning Antipater. 349. *a. b.* 350. *a.* His translator has not entered into his thought, with respect to the chaste loves of Theagenes and Chariclea. III. 379. *a. b.* Who first published his *Bibliotheca*. 478. *a.*
- Phrases*; young scholars take more notice of ill phrases, and barbarous expressions, to divert themselves, than of such as are polite. II. 555. *a. b.*
- Phrygians* adored a plain stone for the mother of the gods. I. 124. *b.*
- Phryne*, a Courtesan, makes an offer to the Thebans. V. 553. *a. b.* Could not triumph over the chastity of Xenocrates. 568. *a. b.*
- Pianesse* (the Marquis de) obliges Guichenon to insert in his works whatever he thinks fit. III. 275. *b.*
- Pibrac*, his speech ill received in the Council of Trent. I. 235. Was in love with Margaret de Valois, the Queen of Navarre. III. 419. *b.* IV. 340. *b.* 341. *a.* Extracts of a speech which he made to Henry III, to justify the King of Navarre's conduct. III. 341. *a. b.*
- Picardy*, all put to fire and sword there. II. 217. *a.*
- Picighione*: the castle where Francis I. was shut up after the battle of Pavia, before he was carried into Spain. III. 97. *b.*
- Picinin* massacred by the order of Ferdinand, King of Naples, and with the consent of Paul II. IV. 509.
- Pictor* (Fabius) his negligence, with respect to Tanquil and two of the Tarquins, censured by Dionysius Halicarnassensis. V. 290. *a.*
- Picture*: Agestilaus II, by his last will, forbade his picture to be drawn. I. 130. What people conjecture to have been his reason for it. *ibid.* Other persons that would not suffer their pictures to be drawn. II. 191. *a.* V. 97. *b.* 98. *a.* 449. *b.* 450. *a. b.*
- Pictures of Adam and Eve*, two verses writ in praise of it. II. 728. *a.*
- Picus* (Johannes) Count of Mirandola, is reproved for having entertained a favourable opinion of Origen's salvation. IV. 412. *a. b.* 413. *a.* Ruffianus tries to imitate him, and renews several of his propositions. 940. *a. b.* He dies, notwithstanding the contrary prediction of Savonarola. V. 61. *a.*
- Picus* (Johannes Franciscus) writes the life of Savonarola, and is extremely warm in his defence. V. 66. *a.* 67. *a.* Divers extracts of that life, diffused through the whole article of SAVONAROLA. Father Quetif publishes it in the year 1674, and Dr Bates cautions it to be reprinted. *ibid.*
- Pieté*; it does not belong to a profane person, to compose works of piety. I. 439. *a. b.* Great piety and great impiety are equally uncommon. II. 451. *b.* To labour at bringing about a coalition of religions, is an undertaking that requires a great deal of piety. I. 689. *a. b.*
- Piety* (liberal) the artifices which the Clergy make use of, in order to raise it. I. 738. *b.* 739. *a. b.*
- Pignas*, how far he carried his seditious fury against Henry III. III. 293. *b.* 294. *a.*
- Piginius* falls upon the Council of Constantinople, and for what reason. IV. 350. *a.* Whether he was orthodox on the article of justification. 638. *b.* 639. *a. b.* 640. *b.* 641. *a. b.*
- Pignoral*, France was happy in possessing that place, at the time of the alliance which the Duke of Savoy entered into with the house of Austria, *Éc.* in the year 1690. III. 407. *a.* Besieged by the allies, who were not able to take it, and whose bombardment did no great mischief to it. IV. 211. *a.*
- Pylades*, he and Bathyllus were inventors of a new manner of representing all sorts of Dramatic pieces in dances. I. 676. *a. b.* An answer which he made to Augustus. 677. *b.*
- Pilate*, the sentence that is ascribed to him, found at Aquila. II. 556. A book in which they have taken a great deal of pains to prove that the said sentence is fictitious. *ibid.*
- Pylatus* (Leontius) what he was. II. 34. *a. b.*
- Pilgrims* gave occasion to the devout representations that were exhibited on the stage, in the XVth and XVIth centuries. II. 480. *b.* 481. *a. b.*
- Pillar*: the pillar of fire which went before the Israelites, had nothing in common with the fire which Timoleon saw in a dream. V. 364. *a. b.*
- Pin*, Secretary to the King of Navarre, how he treated the Catholics. IV. 336. *b.*
- Pin* (Lewis Ellis du) the judgment which that Doctor passes on the miracles related by St Gregory. III. 226. *a. b.* His dispute with the Abbot Antelmi, touching some of St Prosper's writings, that were ascribed to Pope Leo. 760. *b.* His recantations. IV. 356. *a.* Some people were offended with Mr du Pin, for publishing in French, a new Bibliothèque of Ecclesiastical writers. 457. *b.* Censured for some obscure expressions, which he makes use of in speaking of Hœrschelius and Persons. 599. *a.* He believes that the story of Pope Joan has been added to the chronicle of Martin Polonus. 709. *a.*
- Pinczovia* was looked upon as the Athens of Poland. IV. 825. *b.* Two reformations in that city. V. 233. *b.*
- Pindarus Thebanus* is the author of the lesser Iliad. I. 81. *b.*
- Pine*: a pine-tree adored by the Esthonians, a people of Livonia. IV. 928. *a. b.*
- Pineda*, a Spanish Jesuit, his scandalous reflexion upon Job. III. 573. *a.*
- Pinedo* censured for his explication of a proverb. I. 17. *a. b.*
- Pinet* (Antony du) makes two Roman gentlemen of two sorts of marble. IV. 651. *b.* Censured. V. 135. *a. b.* His edition of the taxes of the Roman Chancery, is different from the others. I. 628. *a.* The author's conjecture on that head. *ibid.* *b.*
- Pinianns*, a promise is extorted from him, but he does not keep it. I. 229.
- Piracy* (Literary) is not in all things like to that of Privateers. II. 773. *b.*
- Piræus*, when built. II. 832. *b.*
- Pyramid*: a pyramid or pillar, raised to perpetuate the memory of the parricide, attempted on the person of Henry IV, by John Chastel. II. 457. *b.*
- Pyramidi*, the principal one was built before the reign of Amasis. IV. 869. *a.*
- Pyrenean peace* was concluded without the Pope's intervention. II. 474. *a.*

Pint

I N D E X.

- Pier* (Father) it is easier to perceive that his book intitled, *Apologie des Casuistes*, contains dangerous doctrines, than to answer the objections contained therein. III. 894. *b.*
- Pyrrho*, it has been objected that his article in this Dictionary, contains Libertine principles; the author's answer. V. 830. *to* 836.
- Pyrrhonism* is sometimes poorly attacked, and as poorly defended. I. 462. *a. b.* Prevails in most disputes. II. 27. *b.* Pyrrhonian objections. III. 416. *a. b.* 424. *a. b.* What is sufficient to make one give into it. IV. 188. *a. b.* 189. *a.* The advantages it draws from the New Philosophy, and from Divinity. 653. *b.* 654. *a. b.* 655. *a. b.* Whether it be a good means to make us submit to the authority of faith. 655. *b.* 656. *a.* What seems to have given birth to it. V. 586. *b.* Seneca relates all the degrees of it. 607. *b.* 608. *a.* See *Incomprehensibility of all things.*
- Pyrrhonism* (Historical) observations that might strengthen it. I. 118. *a. b.* II. 260. *a.* III. 485. *a. b.* V. 608. *a.* In what case it is the wisest course. II. 829. *a. b.* An abuse that favours it. V. 753. Battles are more subject to it than sieges. III. 719. *b.* Why we are so often obliged to adopt it. IV. 562. *b.* 563. *a. b.* 564. *a. b.*
- Pyrrhonists* are exposed to the raillery and insults of banterers. I. 410. *a.* Had a theory favourable to virtue. 413. *b.* Took advantage of an invention of Chrysippus. II. 495. *a.* An example which they make use of. 630. *a. b.* Democritus supplied them with all that they said against the testimony of the senses. 642. People have always endeavoured to turn them into ridicule. III. 698. *b.* Favoured by those who demonstrate a vacuum. 793. *a. b.* Sometimes forgot themselves in the exercise of their doctrines. IV. 657. *b.* 658. *a.* Under pretence of confuting only the arguments of the Dogmatists, they actually undermined the doctrine of the existence of a God. 935. *b.* An explanation concerning what the author has said of them. V. 830. *to* 836. Their character. 830. Divines ought not to be ashamed of refusing to enter the lists with them. *ibid.* The author's answer to those who ask what need there was to set forth their difficulties. 833. *to* 836.
- Pyrrhus*, what he said upon his viewing the Roman army. I. 511. *b.* Compared to those gamesters, to whom chance gives a fair game, but who know not how to make use of it. II. 414. *a.* Besieges Lacedæmon without success. 522. His Physician makes an offer to the Romans of poisoning him: the different accounts which authors give of that affair. III. 2. *a. b.* How many battles were fought between that Prince and the Romans. *ibid. b.* The chimerical foundation of his hopes. IV. 662. *a. b.*
- Pisa*: the Council of Pisa sends Cardinal Cajetan's book to the Faculty of Divinity of Paris, to be confuted by them. I. 232. That Council declared to be a pretended Council by Lewis XII. III. 611. *a. b.*
- Pisaurum*: the Colony of Pisaurum was not settled till four years after that of Bologna. I. 62. *a.*
- Piscopia Cornara* (Helina) studied to tread in the steps of Minerva. III. 662. *b.*
- Pisqueton*. See *Picigbitons.*
- Pisibagoras* extorts a confession from Abaris by a trick. I. 4. *b.* His prophetic spirit, and his power to work miracles. 6. *b.* What he says of the transmutations, in which he had a share. IV. 580. *b.*
- Pytheas*, what he was. I. 10. *b.* IV. 676. *a. b.* *to* 678. *b.*
- Pytheas the Orator*, his quick repartee. IV. 678. *b.*
- Pythias*, a woman servant, the answer she made to Tigellinus. IV. 398. *b.*
- Pythois* had been a Friar Minimæ, and was professor of Philosophy at Sedan: he is the author of the *Apocalypse de Meliton*. V. 57. *a. n.* (2).
- Pythion* is commended at Athens for a murder which he had committed, but he ascribed all the glory of the action to a deity, pretending that he had been no more but the instrument. II. 558. *a.*
- Pittacus*, his moderation. I. 190. *b.*
- Pius II* (Pope) his letter to Mahomet. IV. 55. *b.* 56. *a.*
- Pius IV* (Pope) why he refused to terminate himself a dispute about Precedency. IV. 574. *a.* Of what family he was. V. 118. *a.*
- Pius V* (Pope) had a mind to signalize the beginning of his reign, by the punishment of some famous Heretics. IV. 463. *n.* (7). His brief touching children baptized by the Innovators. V. 27. *a.*
- Placcius* has only judged of the *Rabelais Reformed*, by its title; which has led him into a mistake. III. 133. *b.* 134. *a.* Was ignorant of several things, touching disguised names. IV. 832. *b.* 833. *a.*
- Place* (Président de la) censured with respect to John du Tillet's book of the King's Majority. V. 352. *b.* 353. *a. b.*
- Place* (John de la) approves of Laurence Joubertus's answer, with respect to the falling of Moses, Elias, and Jesus Christ. III. 582. *b.*
- Place* (Native) why that of great men who are meanly born, is uncertain. I. 570. *a.*
- Places* (important) their siege will always be a troublesome rock for the News-Writers. III. 719. *b.* The taking of them is not subject, like the gaining of battles, to Historical Pyrrhonism. *ibid.*
- Placcius*, his judgment upon Mr Nicolle's method. IV. 536. *a. n.* (13).
- Plagiar*, that term taken in an improper sense. II. 39. *a. b.* The faults which Plagiarists are commonly guilty of. 685. *a. b.* 686. *a. b.* The Plagiarist of a book who got a pension by it. V. 474. *a. b.*
- Plagiarism* in the affair of books, when is a person guilty of it, and when not? II. 168. *b.* 169. *a.* Observations upon the various ways of it. 773. *b.* 774. *a.* The justification of a person that was accused of Plagiarism, considered. IV. 375. *b.* 376. *a.* Plagiarism approved of by Strigelius. V. 250. *b.* The remarkable Plagiarism of Alcyonius. I. 202. *b.* Of Alstedius. 234. Of Daniel Pareus. 241. *a.* Of John Andreas, of Durandus. 326. *b.* Of Leonard Aretin. 435. Of Gerard Vossius. II. 276. A great law-suit about a theft of that kind. 682. *a. b.* Whether it be a sin, and if an honest man may be guilty of it. IV. 294. *a. b.*
- Plagus*, Philip de Bergamo believes that he was cured of it by the intercession of Nicolas Tollentin. I. 569.
- Player*: a Player punished for having mentioned Accius on the stage. I. 61. *and b.* The extravagance and luxury of another Player. II. 835. *and a. b. to* 836. The riches he left at his death. 836. To what pitch he suffered himself to be transported. *ibid. b.* Players may be buried in holy ground. I. 328. *a. b.* Have furnished a martyr to religion. IV. 487. *b. n.* (37).
- Plays*: what sort of men are most affected with the representation of Plays. I. 19. *a. b.* The Romans were very apt to apply particular sentiments of a Play to the present times. 60. *b.* Politian's verses against those who condemned the Plays that were acted in colleges. V. 752. *b.* 753. *a.*
- Planche* (Regnier de la) what sort of a man he was. IV. 699. *b.*
- Plane*: a plane-tree, from which every body desired to have plants. II. 876. *a. b.*
- Planets*: those persons confuted, who say that every planet is a god. V. 571. *b.* 572. *a. b.* 573. *a.*
- Platin* reproached with a piece of negligence. III. 779. *b.*
- Plants*, the secret of raising an appearance of them from their ashes. II. 467. *a. b.* 468. *a.*
- Planudis*, his gross ignorance in a point of Chronology. II. 829. *b.*
- Platina*, his mistake in speaking of the Councils of Soissons and Sens. I. 29. *b.* 30. *a.* Quoted. III. 223. *b. n.* (60). IV. 51. *b. n.* (22). What he adds to the story of the She-Pope. 729. 712. *a. n. to* Some pretend that the said story has been added to his book. 711. *b.* 712. *a.* That pretension sifted. *ibid.*
- Plato*, a very tender distich which he composed. I. 127. *a. b.* His doctrine confirmed by the beginning of St John's Gospel. 255. He alleges the doctrine of Anaxagoras as a symbol of the chaos. 304. *a.* Why he never cited Democritus. II. 643. *b.* He supposes that matter had a soul even before God had framed the world. 792. *b.* V. 634. *a. b.* 635. *a.* What he says of the licence which the Poets

- Poets take. III. 134. *b.* 634. *a. b.* Whether he admitted two principles collateral, eternal, and independant of one another. 447. *a. b.* His contempt for the dexterity of Amiceris. IV. 10. *a. b.* Quoted. 568. *a. n.* (29). His laws concerning the two sexes. 802. *b.* His judgment of Aristotle and Xenocrates. V. 568. He is in the wrong to accuse Zeno of having been Parmenides's Minion. 605. *a.* For which he is censured by Athenæus. *ibid. a. b.* His sentiments touching Palamedes. *ibid. b.* 606. *a.* He admitted two souls of the world. 634. *b.* 635. *a.* Demosthenes quits his academy to attach himself to Callistratus. II. 259. His Republic translated and reduced to a more distinct order by John Sozomenes. V. 193.
- Platonists*, the agreement between that sect and the Aristotelians. I. 268. *a. b.* Ascribed to good Genii what people now a days only ascribe to bad ones. 390. *a.* Said that there was in matter a real defect, which was an obstacle to God's project. II. 788. *a. b.* Their hypothesis about the origin of evil. IV. 524. *b.* 525. *a. b. &c.*
- Plantus*, an unluckly alternative for him. I. 207. *a.* Quoted. V. 577. *a. n.* (54).
- Pleadings*: there are some which, without counting the Greek and Latin verses, have almost as much Latin as French in them. II. 104. *b.* 105. *and a. b.* When too much learning is mixed with them, it can only serve to withdraw the judge's attention. 106. *b.*
- Pleasure*: one may feel pleasure without having ever felt pain. IV. 514. *a. b.* Pleasures of the senses, whether they can be spiritual. II. 781. *a. b.*
- Plebeians*, in what year of Rome they obtained to be admitted to the Consular dignity. I. 343.
- Plebeius* and *Nobilis* were not inconsistent words in ancient Rome. III. 490. *a.*
- Pleiad* imagined by Ronfard. II. 619. *a. b.* Who are the persons that were comprehended in it. *ibid.*
- Plex* (du) his recantation touching Antony Arnauld the Advocate. I. 484. *b.* 485. *a.* He is ill rewarded for having been so partial to the Jesuits. *ibid.* What he has published concerning the wife of Henry IV. V. 530. *a. b.* Vindicated in that point against those who censured him. *ibid. b. & seq.* Censured with respect to what John Chastel replied to his judges. II. 460. *b.* 461. *and a. b.*
- Plenipotentiary*, one at the age of ninety-five years is a much rarer thing than a man of a hundred years of age. II. 464. *b.*
- Plessis Mornay* (du) writes to Father Paul, and recommends his grand-children and their governour to him. II. 580. *b.* 581. *a.* He meets with a very cold reception at the court of England, and for what reason. 754. *a. b.* Quoted. III. 231. *b. n.* (30). 232. *a. n.* (32). *& alibi passim.* Reflexions on one of his Epistles Dedicatory. II. 126. *b.* 127. *a. b.* Censured, and ill defended by Rivet. *ibid.* Looked upon as an incendiary. *ibid.* Deputed by the King of Navarre to Henry III. IV. 341. *a.* Held intelligence with all the Protestant world. 727. *a.* The weak confutations of his book on the Eucharist cause it to be esteemed. V. 179. *b.* His extracts from Mutius touching the Celibacy of Priests. IV. 296. *a. b.* 297. *a.*
- Plessis Pralin* (du) for what enterprize he was made a Marshal of France. IV. 919.
- Pliny*, quoted. I. 306. *a. n.* (138). II. 253. *n. (a).* 254. *b. n. (4).* V. 579. *b. n. (73).* *& passim alibi.* Only glanced upon the subjects which he treated of. I. 212. A passage in him corrupted. 595. *b.* 596. *a. b.* Hermolaus Barbarus corrects near five thousand passages of that author. 633. *and b.* 634. *a. b.* The place of his birth. 637. *a.* What he calls Magical romancing. II. 639. *a. b.* Ought not to have believed that Democritus was the author of several works that went under his name. *ibid. b.* In what manner he speaks of the Astronomers. III. 462. *a. b.* What he relates concerning Apelles. 836. *b.* And concerning the cause of Sappho's love for Phaon. V. 47. *a.* He seems to condemn those who write annals. 133. *a.* Censured with respect to the time in which he places Zeuxis. 622. *b.* Several of his faults in a few words. 781, 782. Six books of him translated into French by Peter de Changy. II. 435. *a.* The summary of his first sixteen books by the same de Changy. *ibid.*
- Pliny the Younger* has almost exhausted in his panegyric all the ideas of the perfection of a Prince. II. 819. *b.* 820. *a.* Very possibly he may have gone beyond the truth in some things which we find there. IV. 691. *a. b.* Was one of the greatest wits, and one of the worthiest men of his age. V. 840. His justification with respect to some loose verses which he had writ. *ibid.* Quoted. I. 121. *b. n.* (10).
- Plutarch* relates two ridiculous facts. I. 54. *b.* Applies facts sometimes one way and sometimes another. 83. *a.* The reason he assigns for the Jews abstaining from swine's flesh. 115. *a.* Makes a reflexion that is both impious and contradictory. 300. *a.* Contradicts himself touching the death of Cæsius. II. 349. *a.* Is no good guide in Chronology. 506. *b.* Quoted. 414. *a. n.* (14). 785. *b. n.* (148). 786. *a. n.* (150), (151). He ascribes to a King of Libya things which only concern Dejotarus. 630. *a.* Made the same History serve several ends. 869. *a. b.* His judgment concerning the Poets. III. 135. *a.* How he came to understand the Latin Historians. 195. *b.* He did not understand a passage in Livy concerning Camillus and Juno. 638. *a. b.* Wherein he contradicts Aristotle, while he is speaking of the laws of Lacedæmon. 967. *b.* 968. *a.* Full of sophisms. *ibid.* His paralogism with respect to Sylla, and the reason for which he had divorced Cælia. IV. 201. *b.* 202. *a.* He pretends that it would be better to say that Jupiter wants power, than to say that he wants goodness. 519. *b.* Solidly confutes the paradox of the stories concerning the usefulness of vice. *ibid.* 520. *a. b.* He was of opinion that beasts do reason. 550. *a. b.* That passage examined where he says positively, that, in the opinion of Diogenes, beasts had no sense. *ibid. a.* 552. *b.* 553. *a.* He defends the vulgar opinion concerning prelates in a specious manner. 565. *a. b.* His reflexion on the difficulty of finding out the truth in History. 570. *b.* 571. *a.* He ascribes only a bountiful providence to God. *ibid. b.* 572. *a.* But his opinion in this respect was not the most common. *ibid.* He accuses Herodotus of impiety. 574. *b.* 575. *a. b. &c.* Plutarch censured, with respect to certain monuments that were to be seen in the temple of Sancus. V. 288. *b.* 289. *a.* What idea he gives of Zeno's Logic. 605. *b.* James Pinon procures an edition of his works translated by Amyot. IV. 651.
- Plutarch* (French) who had that name given him. V. 419. *a.* And for what reason. *ibid.*
- Pocock*, it is hard that we cannot depend upon him as a sure guide in the eastern learning. I. 49. *b.* What he relates concerning the black stone which the Saracens honoured. 124. *b.*
- Poem*, one rewarded with a bag of money which the author had much ado to carry upon his shoulders. I. 329. *b.* Poems in which there was wanting but one syllable. 330. *a.* A Poem must be very good when it is ascribed to an excellent Poet. II. 572. *b.* A Poem for which the author received no more than half the price that was agreed upon. V. 140. *a.*
- Poems* (French) the Booksellers are very ready, to make collections of such as had the good fortune to please separately, but they are not so with respect to Latin Poems. IV. 652. *a. b.*
- Poet* (*Heteroclit*) to *Monsieur* only brother to his Majesty, who styled himself so. IV. 357. *a.*
- Poeta Regius*, who was honoured with such a title. II. 618. *a.*
- Poetry*, contrary to the acquisition of riches. II. 33. *a. b.* A new kind of Poetry which has been added to the antient. I. 752. *b.* Whether its only aim should be to divert us. II. 377. *a. b.* The judgment that Daffouci made of the most impertinent Poetry. 603. *b.* 604. *a.* It has introduced a thousand impieties. III. 134. *a. b.* 135. *a. b.* Impieties expressed in Poetry are as criminal as those which are expressed in prose. *ibid.* The antient Pagan Poetry burnt at the instigation of the Priests. IV. 345. *b.*

Poetry

- Poetry* (genteel) who was looked upon as the father of that kind of Poetry. I. 205. *a. b.* Its profane licence. 752. *a.* Was not in Augustus's time an enemy to all gross ideas. V. 768.
- Poetry* (Iambic) by whom invented. I. 427. *and b.* *Poetry* (Italian) is greatly obliged to Cavalcante. II. 399. *a.* Lyric Poetry receives a grace from Cinus. 508. Enriched by the inventions of Rinuccini. IV. 878. *a. b.* 879 *a. b.*
- Poetry* (Epic) Homer did not keep up the majesty of it. I. 79. *b.*
- Poets*: the ancient Poets adjusted their Chronology very ill. I. 80. *a.* They ought to quit betimes the service of Apollo. I. 120. *a. b.* II. 620. *a. b.* Formerly carried their fictions very far on the stage. I. 158. *b.* A Poet who furnishes a singular example. 329. *b.* 330. *a.* All those who are lovers of Poetry are not Poets. 375. *b.* They every where find flowers to crown Princes with. 516. *b.* Whether they formerly recited their verses in a hired house. 535. *a. b.* The poverty of their trade. *ibid. b.* Their are several of them who have a two-handed pen. 653. *a.* They very often exaggerate their necessities. II. 9. *a. b.* The affection which they have for their works. 232. *b.* The liberties which they take in them. 234. *b.* 235. *a.* Give themselves a great jurisdiction over time. 388. *b.* Their fondness for their own productions. 395. *a.* They are not fit authors to prove a fact. 502. *b.* They give themselves the liberty to touch upon great mysteries under too bold metaphors. 543. How Charles IX treated the Poets. 617. *b.* A French Poet who prepared sonnets for books that were to come out. 620. *b. n.* (58). A court Poet does not avoid fabulous hyperboles, but when he does not want them. 715. *a.* A Poet whose verses did a signal service to soldiers that had been overcome. 866. *b.* 867. *a.* They ought never to set up for Prophets. III. 29. *b.* 30. *a.* Gambara lays a heavy yoke upon them. 128. They produce bad effects in France. IV. 322. *b.* They are easily put in a passion. 323. *a.* Are always ready to declare for the party that is uppermost. III. 647. *a.* Their fictions were transplanted into the Pagan system of Divinity. 642. *a. b.* 652. *b.* 653. *a. b.* Whence it comes that they appear to be so much inflamed with love in their verses. 876. *b.* 877. *a. b.* Poets that are natural Philosophers have a greater liberty than others, to speak of natural things. 920. *a. b.* What judgment we are to form of their mistresses. IV. 82. *a. b.* 83. *a.* They have always taken the liberty of praising themselves. 86. *a. b.* The greatest part of them never succeed better than when they lay aside all modesty. 156. *b.* The ostentation of learning has often drawn impertinent things from them. 181. *a.* Make no scruple of anachronisms. 183. *b.* They sometimes boast of their good fortune in love intrigues, which are only fictions of their brain. 332. *a.* Poets that hit upon making the same verses. 822. *a. b.* Can write passionate verses, without being in love with the person that is the subject of them. 894. *a.* It often falls out that their second thoughts are not so good as the first. 896. *b.* 897. *a.* The ancient Poets were not ashamed of praising their own wives. V. 76. *b.* A preservative against their obscenities. 98. *b.* 99. *a. b.* It is a common thing to jest upon their poverty. 400. *a. b.* *&c.* What it is that reduced several of them to poverty. 402. *b.* 403. *a.* Whether such whole verses are not chaste, ought to be looked upon as leud persons. 420. *a. b.* *&c.* There are no authors more subject to forget that they promised to print no more. II. 83. *a.* La Fontaine's verses on that subject. *ibid. a. b.* Two chapters of Menage on the same subject. *ibid. b.* Good Poets reserve the most exquisite strokes for the fifth act of their tragedies. III. 720. *b.* The vicious liberty which they take to write obscene verses. V. 840. *and n.* (16).
- Poets* (Christian): there are some, who, though they are banished for their religion, do not not cease their leud courses. IV. 448.
- Poets* (Greek and Latin) the reading of them necessary towards forming the refined taste of a complete Poet. II. 399. *a. b.*
- Poets* (Latin) there were some famous ones in Germany before Conrad Celtes. III. 724. *b.* 725. *a.*
- Poets* (Italian) there once reigned a great licentiousness among them. IV. 235. *a. b.* 236. *a.*
- Poggius* (John) writes a book upon the false predictions of Savonarola. V. 61. *a. b.*
- Poggius* (Florentinus) one of his facetious stories. I. 324. *b.* 325. *a.* Lashes on all sides in his dialogue against hypocrites. II. 275. *a. b.* Gives an account of John Huf's punishment. 277. *b.*
- Poet* (Chancellor) the cause of his disgrace. II. 841. *a.* Accused of having basely offered incense to Fortune. 761. A severe satire against him. *ibid.*
- Point*: some have pretended to shew that it is not possible to find the fixed point, which determines precisely the nature of every thing. II. 493. *a.*
- Pointing*: the false pointing of a passage has given occasion to its being said that Aristotle was a Jew. I. 466. *b.* A person cannot be too exact in it. II. 703. *a. b.*
- Points*: whether the points of the Tetragramma are proper to that name. I. 244. *b.* 245. *a. b.*
- Poires*, what he has writ on the dispute about the eternity of the world. V. 596. *a. b.* Quoted. IV. 910. *a. b. n.* (82), (83), (84), (85), (86).
- Poissy*, See *Conference of Poissy*.
- Poitiers* besieged by the Protestants. II. 300. *a.*
- Poitiers* (Diana of) the chief of a faction opposite to that of the Dukes of Etampes. III. 401. *a.* See *Diana of Poitiers*.
- Poitiers* (Apology of the Bishop of) who is the author of that piece, and how it was called. V. 13. *a. b.*
- Pol* (St) killed by the Duke of Guise. III. 299. *and a. b.*
- Poland* erected into a kingdom. II. 58. *and b.* Intrigues formed to place the crown of Poland on the head of the Duke of Longueville. I. 171. *a. b.* Those who began the work of the reformation there, made a strange false step in opposing the marriage of Sigismund Augustus. III. 847. *a. b.*
- Poland* (the Queen of) takes upon her to elect a successor in the King's life-time. III. 852. *a.* She gives two thousand crowns towards the charge of publishing a book of Astrology. IV. 265. *a. b.*
- Polemo*, his conversion. V. 570. *a. b.*
- Polyander*, Professor of Divinity at Leyden, was the most moderate adversary that the Arminians had. I. 654. *a. b.*
- Polyanthea*, the History of that work. III. 725. *a. b.*
- Polybius*, what he relates of Prusias. IV. 556. *a. b.* The judgment which Casaubon passes on Perot's translation of that author. 585. *b.* 586. *a.* What he says of the duty of an Historian. V. 359. *b.* Peraxylus publishes an edition of him. IV. 545. *b.*
- Policy* makes use of the most ridiculous pretences. I. 54. *a. b.* Frequently occasions the breach of promise. 419. *b.* It is oftentimes the truest policy to pay one's court to persons in disgrace. 422. *a.* Every thing is sacrificed to it. II. 103. *a. b.* The policy of Princes, has something that is capricious, when it consists in debauching each other's subjects. 360. *b.* It requires sometimes that persons should declare themselves betimes enemies to the strongest party. III. 569. *a.*
- Polycrates* caules Smerdias to be shaved. I. 292. *a.*
- Polygamy*: there is a spiritual Polygamy which churchmen fall into. I. 56. *a.* Polygamy allowed by a Pope. III. 166. *a.* Made a capital crime by Henry II. 404. *b.* 405. *a. b.* The nations which practice it, have a frightful idea of the Christian doctrine in this point. IV. 57. *a. b.*
- Polygamia Triumphatrix*, how the author of that book explained these words, *increase and multiply*. III. 709. *a. b.* It was condemned, and the author banished from Denmark. 973.
- Polygamites* never formed a sect. IV. 392. *b.* 393. *a.*
- Polyneetes*, by his fall Amphiarus obtains the victory. I. 446. *a.*
- Politian*, his retrograde Latin verse. II. 248. *a.* A thing which John Lascaris reproaches him with. IV. 705. *b.* How his vanity was checked. V. 165. *a.* Quoted. 265. *b.* 266. *a. n.* (29).

Politian's

- Politens* very much neglected. V. 540. *a.*
Politicians have a language peculiar to themselves. V. 753. *a.*
Politics: a disorder unavoidable in Politics. II. 224.
b. Why the finest systems of Politics fail in practice. III. 469. *a.* How defined by some body. V. 751. *b.* &c.
Politics of the Clergy of France, a character of that book. I. 490. *a. b.*
Polixena took care to spread her gown about her feet, that she might fall decently. II. 56. *a.*
Pollio (Afinius) his judgment of Cæsar's Commentaries. II. 417. *b.* By pleading well he acquired the facility of pleading, and by pleading often, he rendered himself the less capable of pleading well. IV. 408. *a. b.*
Polanus (Martin) enlarges upon the story of Pope Joan. IV. 728, 729. Takes his materials from the *Otia Imperialia* of Gervase of Tilbury. 738. *b.* 739. *a. b.* Remarks upon the editions and enlargements of his Chronicle. 708. *a. b.* The manuscripts of his Chronicle very different: some of them contain the story of the She-Pope, others not, the testimony of celebrated authors on that head. *ibid. b.* to 712. *a. b.*
Pompey, it was thought that he would not have made a good use of the victory, in case he had obtained it. II. 167. *b.* From a desire to spare blood-shed, he lost an opportunity of putting an end to the war. 416. *a.* It has been observed that he did not begin to be unfortunate, till such time as he defended the best cause. 565. *a.* What Flora said of him. III. 56. The women were fond of him. 57. Marc Antony orders his goods to be sold by inch of candle. 119. *a.* He knew nothing of his wife's intrigues, tho' they were publicly talked of. 382. *a.* What he did in order to aggrandize himself. IV. 281. *a.* He was not very happy in his marriages. *ibid. b.* Flies to Egypt for refuge. 282. *a. b.* His ability, as a General, was eclipsed in the battle of Pharsalia. V. 372. *a. b.* Cæsar said that he had acquired the surname of Great, for having vanquished some people, that knew nothing of war. 180. *a. b.*
Pompeia placed Cæsar in the same category, wherein he had put so many other husbands. II. 424. *b.*
Pomponiacus treats Augustin Niphus, with a great deal of respect and good manners. IV. 380. *b.*
Pompona, Anne of Austria liked the fruit which came from that place. I. 487. *b.*
Pomponius Latius, impeached at Rome, for changing the names of young men. IV. 685. *a.*
Ponceau (James) causes the works of James Des Parts to be printed. IV. 484. *a.*
Poneth, what he preached at Paris against a new fraternity. III. 410. *a.*
Poneropolis, a city which a King of Macedonia caused to be built. II. 248. *a.*
Pons (the Bishop of St) esteemed by the Protestants, and for what reason. IV. 243. *a.*
Pons (Antony de) Count de Marennès, the change that appeared in him, after the death of his first wife. IV. 480. *a. b.* His family deemed as ancient as that of Aest. *ibid. b.*
Pontanus (Jovian) the story that he tells of a Spanish Monk. II. 386. *b.* 387. *a. b.* What he says of Fortune. V. 371. *b.* 372. *a.* Verses which he made upon a lady that shewed her breast. 421. *b.* 422. *a.*
Pontbieu, who is the author of the Genealogical History of its Counts. I. 11.
Pontifical, Gratius is sorry at its being made public. III. 217. *a.*
Pontifs, who enjoyed a very great power among the Heathens. II. 531. *a. b.*
Pontius (Constantius) his conviction gave ground for some suspicions relating to Charles V. II. 336. *b.* Whether he was that Emperor's confessor. *ibid.* His death. *ibid.* Facts that concern him. 440. *b.* 441. *a.*
Pontius (Herennius) what he declared in relation to the conduct of his son. I. 732. *a.*
Poor; Michael Savonarola took no fee for prescribing to them. V. 57.
Pope Joan, the book which Blondel published concerning her, gave offence. II. 24. *a. b.* Matters of fact concerning that book. *ibid.* 25. *a. b.* Mr Spanheim writ a book, to re-establish Pope Joan. 25. *a.*
Veres in old French about her. III. 77. *a. b.* 78. *a. b.* John des Caurres, a Roman Catholic author, tells the story of Pope Joan, without the least doubt of the truth of it. II. 400. A little part of the controversy concerning that woman. 530. *b.* The Protestants now-a-days write books to maintain the story of Pope Joan. IV. 732. This Controversy has been thought an affair of the utmost consequence, but when all is done, it is a trifle. 733. Conjectures about the origin of the said story. 738, 739. It was forged by Priests and Monks in the breast of Popery. 728. *b.* 736. *a. b.* 737. *a.* 709. *a. b.* And adopted by a vast many others. 709. *a. b.* &c. The story of Pope Joan, according to the most circumstantial account that is given of it. 730. *a. b.* 731. *a. b.* Protestant authors who maintained the truth of it, after Florimond de Remond's book, and that of Father Labbe, came out. 732. *a. b.* 733. *a. b.* Protestant authors who have not believed it. 733. *a. b.* Whether the said adventure, reflects ignominy on the Church of Rome. 736. *a. b.* The most ancient author that has mentioned it, is posterior by two hundred years, and inconsistent with the cotemporary authors. 738. *a. b.* It was a proper story for all sorts of authors. *ibid. b.* The Protestants are accused of obstinacy, with respect to it. 739. *b.* 740. *a. b.* It is to be found in the Chronicle of Martin Polonus; although some learned men do not believe that part of the Chronicle to be his. 708. and *b.* 709. *a. b.* & seq. Peter du Moulin did not believe the story of Pope Joan. 280. and *a. b.* Its partizans reckon Radulphus Flaviacensis among their evidences. 824. *a. b.*
Popeliniere (la) draws a bad parallel. II. 764. *a. b.* Had like to have been crushed to pieces, for some things which he had related. IV. 862. *b.* Quoted. V. 496. *a. b. a.* (38). Promises to publish the memoirs of Villegaignon's life, and does not do it. 478. *b.*
Popery has repaired one of its breaches in France. II. 125. *a. b.* The conduct of the Romish Clergy, contributed much to its destruction. V. 482. *a.* A digression against those who have so often foretold its fall in vain. II. 122. *a. b.* 123. *a. b.* 124. *a. b.* 125. *a. b.* 126. *a. b.* 127. *a. b.* No body imagined that it would fall by its own craziness. 123. *a. b.* It has not been weakened in the last ten years of the XVIIth century. 125. *b.* The intrigues and plots of the Jesuit William Criton, to re-establish it in Great Britain. 576. Joseph Hall was very zealous against it. III. 342. *a. b.* Two authors both alike foolish, wrote the one upon the destruction of Popery, and the other upon the destruction of the Protestants. V. 237. *a. b.* 238. *a. b.*
Popes; how persons may be saved, that obey two different Popes. I. 179. *a. b.* Privileges which their flatterers ascribe to them. 231. *a. b.* An instance of great submission to their censures. 606. *a. b.* It is an article of the Roman faith, that the Pope may depose sovereigns. 656. *a. b.* The medium which Bellarmin chose, with respect to the Pope's power over the temporalities of Kings, pleased no party. 731. *b.* 732. *a.* Whether it be necessary that a Pope should be scrupulous and devout. 732. *b.* 733. *a.* The interval of time between the death of one Pope, and the election of another, produces a thousand disorders. II. 238. *b.* 239. *a.* They concur with the Princes, in extending the Latin tongue. 517. *a.* Ought not to oppose the Emperors with temporal arms. 588. *a.* Nor usurp a power over the temporalities of Kings. 594. *a. b.* As sovereign Princes, they follow the principles of the religion of a sovereign. 758. *b.* The authority which they have acquired in Rome, is much more surprising than that of its ancient Emperors. III. 228. *a. b.* Who it was that freed them from a servile dependence on the Emperors. *ibid. b.* Whether the establishment of their executive power, must have been a difficult undertaking. *ibid.* 234. *a. b.* 235. *a. b.* 236. *a. b.* To be a good Pope, it is not enough to have all the virtues of a good Clergyman. 326. *b.* The corruption of morals that appeared in the persons of some Popes. 328, 329. What glory they may promise themselves, if they set up to reform abuses. 330. *b.* Who was the first Pope that gloried in having bastards. 565. *a.* They can do nothing against

- against the Canons of Councils. 741. *a.* The custom of kissing their hand, changed into that of kissing their feet. 760. *a.* The acknowledgment which a Pope made. IV. 633. *b.* 634. *a.* When a person may lawfully exhort the Princes who are not Catholics, to make war upon the Pope. II. 127. *b.* Their authority restored to its first splendor. 125. *a. b.* Verses upon the search, which they were formerly obliged to undergo, before their election. IV. 730. *b.*
- Popes and Cardinals* accused of making a jest of the Christian religion. II. 274. *b.* 275. *a. b.* Priests of the Pope's palace, make a jest of it likewise. *ibid.*
- Peppæa*, Nero kills her by a kick on the belly. II. 256. *a.*
- Populace*: to what lengths the populace, when in a mutiny, are capable of carrying their fury. III. 39. *b.* 40. *a.*
- Porcian* (the Prince of) what he desired of his wife, not long before he died. III. 296. *a.*
- Porphyry*, his prepossession. I. 268. *a.* Upon what it was grounded. 269. *a.* He speaks only of Ammonius's Philosophical doctrine. *ibid.* *a. b.* Whether he believed that beasts were no more than *Automata*. IV. 553. *a.* Having resolved to kill himself, his master dissuaded him from it. 690. *a.* He believed that beasts had the faculty of reasoning and speaking. 911. *b.* What he says of Theopompus. V. 332. *a. b.* He accuses the Christians of forging several books. 638. *b.*
- Portail* (Mr) Advocate-General in the Parliament of Paris, marries Mr Rose's daughter. IV. 917. *b.*
- Portico*: there went a proverb, that without Chrysippus, there would be no Portico. II. 492. *a.*
- Port-Royal*, Historical facts relating to that monastery. I. 485. *b.* 486. *a. b.* Whether the children of quality, of twelve or thirteen years of age, were suffered there to read the Socinian books. 492. *b.* What arguments the gentlemen of Port-Royal made use of to persuade Mr de Turenne, to change his religion. II. 518. *a. b.* 519. *a.* They had once schools, but those have been suppressed. IV. 364. *a. b.* Accused of having intelligence with Geneva, by Father Meynier the Jesuit. V. 16. *b.* Reflexions on the Controversy between the gentlemen of Port-Royal and Mounfier Claude, about the Devil's conference with Luther. 73. *a. b.*
- Portugal* (Sebastian, King of) upon the persuasion of the Jesuits hazards a battle with the Moors, who were three times stronger than he. III. 871. *b.*
- Portugal* (the Infanta, daughter to Dom Pedro, King of) dies a maid in the year 1690. IV. 762. Her marriage with the Duke of Savoy, had been concluded upon, reasonings which that occasioned, and a confutation on that head pointed out. *ibid.*
- Portus* (Francis) his answer to Peter Charpentier, contains many particulars that are greatly to the shame of the latter. II. 447. *b.*
- Potidonius*, we must not rely on his testimony, as to what concerns the invention of the Atomical system. III. 788. *a. b.* What honours he had paid to him by Pompey. IV. 67. *a.*
- Possessed persons*, who neither understand Greek nor Latin. II. 148. *b.* 149. *a.* An observation upon the knowledge of tongues, that is ascribed to them. III. 211. *a. b.*
- Possuin*, an anachronism which that author is guilty of. I. 651. *a.* He gets a book, which he had never read, to be condemned by the inquisition. IV. 13. *b.* 14. *a.* Sets up for a Converter in the valleys of Piedmont. III. 944. *a. b.* Sometimes judged of books which he had never read. V. 68. *b.* Censured. I. 769. *a.*
- Possible*: whether a thing that never was, nor ever shall be, is possible. I. 759. *a.* 760. *b.* 761. *a.* II. 495. *b.* 496. *a. b.*
- Possel*, a learned man, and a fool. III. 883.
- Posthumous*: a model proposed to those who publish posthumous books. IV. 594.
- Positi*, who settled them in France. III. 801.
- Poverty* obliges several persons to cultivate learning. V. 589. *a. b.*
- Powers* (Jeremiah de) a Walloon minister, quoted. I. 1. *a. n.* (3). III. 330. *a. n.* (92). IV. 158. *a. b. n.* (82), (83), (84). 159. *a. b. n.* (85), (86), (87), (89), (91), (92), (93). 160. *a. n.* (94), (95). V O L. V.
- Power*: the Civil and Ecclesiastical power, stand in need of each other. I. 244. *a.* V. 514. *b.*
- Power* (Regal) Althusius quoted as one that had spoken disrespectfully of it. I. 237. *b.*
- Powerful*: the benefit of mankind requires that no Prince should become too powerful. V. 670.
- Powers* (Ecclesiastical) designed by the Watchmen of the city, in the Song of Solomon, an explanation occasioned by the author's imprisonment. III. 772. *a. b.*
- Poxed*: who is the Patron of such as are poxed in the Church of Rome. III. 573. *a.*
- Pragmatic Sanction*, the abuses under it, were not fewer than they have been since the Concordate. IV. 766. *a. b.*
- Pray*: it was the custom of the Eastern people, to turn their faces towards one particular point of the heavens when they prayed. IV. 176. *a.*
- Prayers* are opposed by counter-prayers. I. 161. *a.* The doctrine of the Peripatetics, concerning prayers and sacrifices. 468. *a.* The prayers of the slothful are unacceptable to God. II. 691. *a.* There are difficulties to be examined touching their efficacy. V. 181. *a. b.* A person should begin with them, when he is deliberating upon such a dangerous point as that of matrimony. I. 603. *b.*
- Praise*: the desire of praising people, occasions many faults. III. 489. *a.*
- Praise* is seldom the only end of those, who are not satisfied with the testimony of their own consciences. I. 279. *a.* Extravagant praises do more hurt than honour to a person. 601. *a. b.* It is not an easy matter to renounce praise. II. 298. *a. b.* 299. *a.* A person cannot be said to be worthy of praise, when he only abstains from doing a perfidious action. 437. *b.* We should delay bestowing praises on people till they are dead. IV. 431. *b.* The praises that are bestowed on people, are not always in a just proportion to their merit. II. 515. *b.*
- Praeficius* (Luke) behaves handsomely to Augustin Niphus. IV. 380. *b.*
- Prateolus* censured in point of Chronology. I. 90. *a. b.* Ascribes an extravagant doctrine to the Anabaptists. 290. *a. b.* He put in his alphabet a great many sects that never existed. 790. *a.* Trumps up an imaginary sect of Melchiorites. IV. 193.
- Pratum Spirituale*, its visions. IV. 415. *b.* 416. *a.*
- Preach*: a singular manner of preaching. II. 287. *b.* Formerly it required a prodigious deal of learning to preach very ill, and now a man needs but little to preach well. 105. *b.*
- Preacher*: the ignorance of a Preacher. I. 101. *a.* Another is mortified at being told that he hired the patience of his hearers. II. 287. *b.* Another produces surprizing effects. 299. *a. b.* 374. *b.* 375. *a.* One that was prodigiously followed. 544. *a.* A Preacher, who upon an extraordinary occasion, preached seven times in one day. 695. *b.* One who coughed exactly at such and such a period. III. 18. *a.* One who composed in Latin, the sermons he was to preach in French. 839. *a. b.* A turbulent and factious Preacher, does not deserve the name of Orator, and why. IV. 581. *b.* One that drinks in the pulpit. 725. *a.* Another whose way of preaching was somewhat comical. 722. *b.* Preachers have a great advantage over Lawyers. I. 61. *b.* Are to be feared. 89. *b.* They are very ill used. 654. *a.* Nothing more fatal to a State, than hot-headed Preachers. II. 95. *a. b.* 96. *a.* Preachers like much to see the churches full of hearers. 112. *b.* They get nothing by being obdurate against the torrent of the fashions. 544. *b.* 545. *a. b.* Whether one ought to take every thing they say in a literal sense. III. 895. *b.* 896. *a.* There are some of them who may be compared to the nightingale. IV. 290. *b.* Whether those that are famous should print their sermons. 315. *b.* Tycho Brahe wished that a good many of them were Mathematicians. 680. *a.* Preachers who can enter into the interest of the people, are to be feared. 722. *a.* The most famous Preachers, generally speaking, are not very profound Divines. 757. *b.* 758. *a. b.* There are some of them, who rather chuse to be banished, or not to preach at all, than to cut short their sermons. 759. *b.*
- Preachers* (seditious) France was full of them in the year 1594, and in the year 1595. II. 95. *a. b.* 96. *a.* 101. *b.* 102. *a.* A passage of Cardinal d'Ossat,

- d'Offat, and of his Commentator, on that head. III. 279. *b.* Supported by the people, they are capable of bringing about any revolution whatsoever. *ibid.* The adventure of one who had foretold the end of the world. V. 236. *and a. b.* 237. *and a. b.*
- Pre-Adamites*, some of their difficulties. II. 246. *a. b.* 247. *a. b.*
- Pre-Adamites*, who is the author of that book. IV. 529. *a.* And what happened to him and it. *ibid.* *a. b. &c.*
- Predetermination*; there is no Hypothesis, touching the doctrine of Predetermination, which removes all difficulties. I. 481. *a. b.* 482. *a.* The doctrine of St Augustin, of Janfenius, of Calvin, and of the Thomists, is entirely the same on that subject. 564. *a. b.* Bellarmine did not follow the doctrine of the Jesuits on that subject. 728. *a. b.* Bolsec inveighs against it. II. 59. *a. b.* The disputes about the consequences of Predetermination, had a being among the ancient Philosophers. 332. *b.* 333. *a.* Had the disputes which it occasions at this day, prevailed in the time of the Manichees, they would have given great advantages to them. IV. 517. *a. b.* 518. *a. b.* 519. *a.* Absolute Predetermination is not a fit subject to begin with, in preaching the Gospel to Infidels. 846. *b.* 847. *a.* One may err in that point, through a good motive. V. 153. *a. b.* 154. *a.* It is a scandal, that the disputes about Predetermination, should produce such an inveterate hatred. 154. *a.* St Paul has no other way to get rid of the difficulties that attend it, but by having recourse to the absolute power, which God has over his creatures. 821. It is one of the mysteries that bear hardest upon reason. 822. The disputes on that subject have only proceeded from this, that people have handled them, as if they could be reconciled with reason. *ibid.* and 823. Passages of Morus and Mr Peñet, touching the incomprehensibility of it. *ibid.* and 824. See *Grace*.
- Predictions*: what Poetical predictions resemble. I. 794. *a.* Astrological predictions, tho' in themselves they be no more than chimeras, do nevertheless produce real evils. II. 380. *a. b.* Philosophy is nonplussed by what is said of them. 392. *a. b.* Those who cry them up have too much neglected to guard against an incredulous reasoner. *ibid.* *b.* 393. *a.* A Dilemma against the authors of predictions. III. 232. *a. b.* The most chimerical have had some parts of them confirmed by the event. 481. *b.* What is the universal spirit of the makers of predictions. IV. 116. *a. b.* The answer that one of them made to an objection, started by the Queen of Poland. *ibid.* *b.* The weakness of the argument that is made use of to prove the certainty of them. 182. *b.* Reflexions on what is said of them. 369. *b.* 370. *a.* It would be of great use to keep a register of some predictions. 431. *b.* We ought not to be surprized, if several of those which have been made by false Prophets, come to pass. 899. *a.* Whether Savonarola's predictions were grounded upon his knowledge in Scripture and human reasoning, or on Divine revelation. V. 64. *b.* 65. *a. b.*
- Prefaces* and Epistles Dedicatory, ought never to be left out in the editions of books, *cum Notis Variorum*. I. 225. *b.* Should be dated with exactness. V. 256. *a.* There are falsehoods in prefaces, which ought not to pass for venial sins. I. 496. *b.* 497. *a.* It is a greater fault than is commonly believed, not to read them. II. 142. *b.* There is nothing more necessary to be consulted by the author of such a work as this. 8. *b.* Prefaces that are most admired. 261. *b.* They ought not to be left out in the new editions of books. I. 225. *b.* IV. 164. *a. b.* A piece of railery upon those who affirm in their prefaces, that they have been forced to publish their works. 173. *b.* 174. *a. b.* Pelisson's preface to the works of Sarasin, is a master-piece. 538. Excellent prefaces. *ibid.* *n. (c).*
- Prejudices*: things are praised or blamed, according to the different prejudices of men. I. 294. *b.* How difficult it is for a man to get the better of them in his search after truth. IV. 537. *a.* Their bad consequences. V. 153. *a. b.* 154. *a.* The strange effects of prejudice. IV. 46. *a.*
- Prejudices in religion*, their bad effects. I. 784. *a. b.*
- Prejudices*: who is the author of the book intitled, *Lawful Prejudices against the Calvinists*. I. 493. *b.*
- Prelates*: the advice that was given to a Prelate one day by his mistress. I. 743. *b.* At what time they began to frequent the Court, and the ill effects it produced. III. 93. *b.* Their residence in their Dioceses, has no manner of influence towards the reformation of manners and abuses. 591. *b.* They are often made a sacrifice to the Pope, in the quarrels that Princes have with him. 611. *b.*
- Premonstratensis*, the founder of that order, converts a great many Heretics. V. 292.
- Presages*, the vanity of them. II. 445. *a. b.* Reasons against the doctrine of Presages. 629. *a. b.* 630. *a.* Reflexions on what people commonly think of them. IV. 565. *a. b.*
- Prescience*: God's Prescience is no ways inconsistent with the liberty of the creature. I. 661. *b.*
- Prescription* is sometimes an invincible proof that a fact is false. II. 61. *a.*
- Presence* (Real): John Poinet admits a Real Presence, but he will have it to be no more than sacramental at the same time. IV. 693. *b.*
- Presents* ought to be made by the persons who love, and not by those who are loved. II. 508. *a.*
- Presi*: famous men that have been correctors of the prefs. II. 893. *and a. b.* III. 731. *b.* 732. *a.* IV. 295. *a.* 843, 844. The abuses of the prefs. V. 764.
- Prester John*, why the Emperors of the Abyssines have been called by that name. I. 36.
- Pretorship*, when that office was instituted in Rome. II. 290. *a.* Whether a Consul ever descended to that employment. 346. *a. b.* In what case this happened sometimes. *ibid.*
- Preuil* (St) whether he was put to death for no other reason, but because he had displeased Cardinal Richelieu. III. 818. *a. b.* 819. *a.*
- Priam*, wherein his happiness consisted, according to Tiberius. II. 719. *a.* Where, how, and by whom he was killed. IV. 659. *a. b.*
- Pride*, it may have some share in our most commendable actions. I. 460. *a. b.* It is the ordinary passion of those who are not addicted to pleasures. III. 223. *a.* Called *the Sacred Disaffection*. 789. *a.* It is the failing of most great wits. *ibid.*
- Prideaux*, Quoted. IV. 47. *b. n.* (267), (269), (270). 48. *a. b. n.* (271), (273), (274), (275). 176. *a. b. n.* (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7). 177. *a. b. n.* (8), (9), (10). 178. *a. b. n.* (11), (13).
- Priest* (Sylvestre) confounded with Ferraricus. III. 32.
- Priester*, a village in Italy, where situated. IV. 772. *n. (a).*
- Priest*: a reflexion on the Jewish High-Priest not being allowed to marry unless with a virgin. I. 533. *a. b.*
- Priesthood*: what excluded people from the priesthood, even at the time when married persons were not excluded from it. I. 533. *a. b.*
- Priests* are the most terrible of all accusers. I. 468. *a.* According to Montagne, there is nothing more ridiculous than their square caps. II. 93. *b.* A Priest turns informer against an Abbot whom he was in love with. 277. *a.* There are a great many of them who go about, and offer themselves from door to door, to say Masses at a low rate. 373. *a. b.* What they opposed to Farel's eloquence. III. 11. *a. b.* The Priests of the North are more difficultly brought to undergo the yoke of Celibacy than those of the South. 229. *a.* There was a time when concubinage was not looked upon as shameful among them. 887. *a.* A Priest who beat Viret in such a violent manner that he was left for dead. V. 481. *a. b.* George Braun's oration against the Priests that kept concubines. II. 121.
- Priests* (Salian) what Quintilian said of them. IV. 161. *b.*
- Prince*, A reply that a Prince made. I. 130. *b.* A Prince cannot express any sort of a command more absolute than that of a request. 583. *b.* People pay dear sometimes for attacking a Prince by libels. II. 216. *b.* Their goodness contributes more than their wickedness towards dethroning them. I. 273. *b.* II. 100. *a. b.* 739. *a.* They are not acquainted with every thing that is contained in books dedicated

- cated to them. I. 338. People ought to be cautious how they behave to young Princes. 377. *b.* What we look upon as their unhappiness, is only a less evil. II. 220. *a.* We ought not to be surprised at their being less deserving than they should be. 256. *b.* 257. *a.* Their politics have something that is capricious, when it consists in debauching one another's subjects. 360. *b.* The necessity to which they are reduced of doing certain things is more the cause of their unhappiness than glory. 416. *b.* 417. *a.* They have no greater enemies than Flatterers, Poets, Panegyrist, Soothsayers, and Astrologers. 437. *a.* They neglect those whom they think themselves sure of, and labour chiefly to gain those whom they distrust. 443. *a. b.* III. 421. *a.* One word from them will have a greater influence towards reforming the fashions, than all the sermons in the world. II. 545. *b.* It is not sufficient to make our court to them in order to obtain something from them, if we do not likewise make our court to their favourites. 602. *a. b.* 603. *a.* They are served with more zeal than God, and are nevertheless very often the slaves of their slaves. *ibid.* The most part of great Princes are unfortunate in their own families. 607. *b.* 608. *a.* They play upon the Public. 675. *b.* They govern the people, but interest governs them. 754. *b.* 755. *a.* A man ought to wish for good Princes, and bear with those that are bad. 785. *a.* Their honour is very often sacrificed to the interest of a Minister. III. 59. *b.* Their persecuting edicts expose them to great inconveniences. 397. *a.* Their infidelity disapproved of by Henry the Great. 422. *a. b.* They seldom end their quarrels with the Pope, but to their own confusion. 611. *a. b.* They have few enemies whom they ought to look upon as inconsiderable. 715. *b.* They have had a power to make laws concerning the obstacles of marriage, and no body has taken it from them. 741. *b.* Whether it is proper that they should be scrupulous. 797. *b.* 798. *a.* Their interviews do more harm than good. 809. *a. b.* Their jealousies. 816. *b.* 817. *a. n.* (22). They cannot always govern their states with their beads in their hand. IV. 13. *a.* It may be said with respect to them that people generally forsake the setting sun, and shew respect to the rising sun. 21. *a. b.* Their edicts often contain honourable things which are nothing but lies. 147. *b.* There are Princes, who are much more at a loss than other men, what resolution to take when their wives are unchaste. 339. *a. b.* They ought never to expose their Majesty unguarded. 429. May share the cares of the government with a Minister. 494. *b.* 495. *a.* It is scarce possible to be sincere when we speak of those that are living, or of those whose sons do still reign. *ibid.* Good Princes take pleasure in distributing their favours themselves, and intrust their Ministers with the care of punishing people. 573. *b.* They make war upon one another, and are reconciled when they please. 698. *a.* See *Kings*. It is dangerous to advise them. 795. *a.* They should never offend any body with raileries. V. 278. *a. b.* 279. *a. b.* A book where there are some good things concerning the qualities which they ought to have. II. 403. Different authors who have writ for their instruction, and the different methods which they have taken. IV. 918. *a. b.* People rather chuse to commit a sin than to displease those who have it in their power to make or ruin their fortune. V. 811. We cannot form a certain judgment of them from the writings that are published against them in the heat of factions. III. 516. *a. b.* The attachment of their enemies to a new religion, is to them a strong argument of the falshood of it. V. 652. There are a great many occasions, when they have the disadvantage, without deserving to be blamed for it. 655.
- Princesses* are obliged to make the first advances in love to their inferiors. II. 312. *a. b.* Cannot conceal their age. IV. 333. *a.* Could never succeed in any intrigue of gallantry, if they had not their confidants. 335. *a.*
- Principalities* (Electorate) generally those who are raised to them are men of very aspiring minds. I. 364. *a.*
- Principle*: divers opinions concerning the principle of all things. II. 298. *b.* 299. *a.*
- Principles* to embrace one we must not wait till it be free from all difficulties. I. 241. *b.* Most persons alter their principles as they change their country and interests. 642. *b.* Men are little governed by their principles. IV. 39. *b.*
- Principles* (the doctrine of two) the one good, and the other bad: the origin of that doctrine IV. 517. *a. b.* 518. *a. b.* to 522. *a.* 571. *b.* 572. *a.* Empedocles was the first who supposed two principles. IV. 584. *b.* See *Evils*.
- Printers* (famous). I. 602. *a. b.* Their errors are sometimes of great consequence. 633. *a.* How they multiply writers. II. 541. *b.* Which may lead compilers into strange mistakes. *ibid.* The confusion that one of their blunders occasioned. 734. *b.* 735. *a. b.* Authors are greatly disturbed thereat. V. 582. *b.* They are not to be charged with all the faults that are to be met with in books. III. 661. *a. b.* Authors should not apply to a Printer the moment they are passed their childhood. IV. 164. *b.* 165. *a.*
- Printing*, when it was invented. I. 166. *a.* Was not used in Europe, till about the middle of the XVth century. 578. *b.* Illiterate persons judged incapable of exercising that art. 755. *b.* 335. *b.* 336. *a.* Tori contributed greatly to the bringing the Printing types to perfection. V. 388. A book which he writ on that subject. *ibid.*
- Prints*: authors ought not to put false prints into their books. II. 100. *b.*
- Prisolo* (Benjamin) what he says of the Princess of Condé. II. 137. *b.* 138. *a.* And of the lady de Guebriant. III. 265. *a. b.* 266. *a.* And of four court ladies. 265. *b.* 266. *a.*
- Priorato* (Galeazzo Gualdo) what he says with respect to the consequences of the victory of Avein. III. 829. *b.*
- Priscianensis* (Franciscus) published the first edition of Arnobius's works. I. 503. *a.*
- Priscillian* is put to death for his heresies. III. 758. *a. b.*
- Privileges to Books*, why the States of Holland grant them. V. 804. The privilege to this Dictionary was not granted, till after a long examination of the opposition which the Printers of Moreri made to it. *ibid.*
- Probity*, how Seneca the Father defines it. I. 185.
- Procefs*: A singular procefs raised about a pension left to a cat. IV. 918. *b.*
- Procession*: A procession made by Francis I, to expiate the wicked attempt of the Heretics. II. 191. *a.*
- Proclus*, whether he believed that beasts were no more than *Automata*. IV. 553. *a. b.*
- Procopius*, who first published his History in Greek. III. 478. *a.*
- Proculus*, his lasciviousness. III. 415. *a.*
- Prodicus* was the founder of the sect of the Adamites. I. 110. *a. b.* 111. *b.*
- Prodigies* multiplied through the facility of the Pagans. I. *a. b.* Frequently make more noise in remote countries than in those where it is pretended that they happened. III. 487. *b.*
- Πεσνεγγιας*, sacrifices which the Athenians offered in behalf of all the Greeks. I. 5. *a.* And for what. *ibid.*
- Profanation*: an horrible profanation of several holy things under Hadrian. I. 648. *b.* 649. *a.*
- Professions*: an important advice to those who exercise any particular profession. I. 337. *a.* A man ought to keep himself within the bounds of his profession. V. 367. *b.* The Germans learn but one. I. 64. *b.* The French apply themselves readily to several. *ibid.*
- Professors*, the meanness of some, and their sordid love for gain, which makes them run from one post to another. I. 56. *a. b.* 193. *b.* 195. *a. b.* II. 622. *a. b.* A professor who makes an extraordinary acknowledgment. I. 488. *a. b.* The professors of Philosophy in the universities of France do not explain Politics. II. 6. *b.* The death of one professor may restore peace to the societies. 29. *b.* There are some professors who reserve the solution of the greatest difficulties, for those who give them most money. 287. *a.* The greatest part of them have their writings under their eye, when they read a lecture. 722. *a.* What some of them put over the doors of their schools.

- schools. 861. *a.* Some of them permit their boarders to do what they please, and for what reason. III. 663. *a. b.* A book which contained nothing but the reproaches which two famous professors divulged one against another. IV. 122. *a.* Complaints against the multitude of professors. V. 229. *b.* 230. *a.*
- Prognostics*, the credulity with which people collect and apply them. III. 811. *a.*
- Prometheus*, how punished by Jupiter, and for what. III. 630. *a.* Fastened to mount Caucasus. II. 82. *b.*
- Promises*, which are often made, but very rarely kept. V. 659.
- Pronunciation*: a professor whose pronunciation was exceeding agreeable. IV. 477. *a.* The country pronunciation does prejudice to a man's eloquence. V. 183. and *a. b.*
- Proserpina*, women that Venus infligated to prostitute themselves, because they would not own her to be a goddess. IV. 642. *a.*
- Properties* of things, no reason can be given for them, but when these things have been made freely by a cause, that had some reasons and motives in producing them. II. 644. *a.* There are many natural properties which are ascribed to miraculous causes. III. 645. *b.* 646. *a.*
- Propertius* criticized. IV. 181. *a.*
- Prophecies*, those who explain them will never own themselves to have been in the wrong. I. 7. *b.* What excuse St Bernard made for his false prophecies. 774. *b.* Are trumped up for political ends. II. 387. *a. b.* An example of prophetic cheats. *ibid.* A specimen of the frauds which are committed by the help of prophecies. 444. *a. b.* The most chimerical may bring about great revolutions. 693. *b.* Prophecies have at all times been forged by those who had a mind to induce people to a revolt. III. 684. *a.* Braunbom's new discoveries on the explication of them. II. 122. To talk of accomplishing them is endeavouring to introduce slaughter and massacre every where. 127. *b.* Those who have the sovereign authority among the Protestants have no regard to the vain interpretations that are put upon them. *ibid.*
- Prophets*, the imperfection of their knowledge. I. 280. *a.* In the colleges of the Egyptian Priests, they were called prophets, who were in the nature of Deans or Superiors. 347. *a.* The illusions and evasions of the modern prophets. II. 692. *b.* The Princes who laugh at them most, do nevertheless make use of them with great success. 693. *b.* How they come to be so often misled. III. 436. *b.* A good touch-stone to know whether they be true prophets. IV. 36. *a. b.* Some people endeavour to vindicate the new prophets, at the expence of the old ones mentioned in the Scripture. 889. *b.* 890. *a.* Their end and design in balloting the numbers of the Apocalypse. II. 123. *b.* Are as bold as ever, when they find themselves contradicted by the event. 124. *a.* One of their artifices. V. 72. 73. Those who are not supported by the secular arm, are exposed to terrible changes of fortune. 73. and *b.*
- Propositions* that are condemned should be each of them particularized. I. 340. *a. b.* A reflexion on the indeterminate way of censuring them. *ibid.* and 607. *a.* The method of extracting them when there is a design to have a book censured. 606. *a. b.* Whether two contradictory propositions are sometimes true and sometimes false. 506. *b.* 507. *a.* Whether it follows that every proposition being either true or false, all things happen by the force of destiny. II. 790. *b.* 791. *a.*
- Prosperity*, whether it be a mark of the true church. IV. 31. *b.* 322. *a. b.* 33. *a. b.* 50. *b.* 51. *a. b.* 52. *a.* An instance of the vanity thereof. III. 815. *b.* 816. *a.* The inconstancy of mens reasonings with respect to adversity and prosperity. IV. 51. *a.* The false consequences that are drawn from prosperity and adversity. 55. *a. b.* 216. *a. b.*
- Protector* looked upon religion as a problematical thing. II. 652. *b.*
- Protection*, gratitude towards a Prince that affords it, renders a man unfit to write of those things in which that Prince is interested. III. 345. and *a. b.*
- Protestant*, a name given to Hugh Capet's son-in-law, and for what reason. I. 9.
- Protestants* Domestici; to enter into that body, it was necessary for a man to be of a good family. IV. 104.
- Protestant Religion*, there are some persons, who could wish that we had the History of the growth and progress of it, written neither by a Roman Catholic, nor by a Protestant. IV. 862. *a. b.*
- Protestants*; when and where their ruin was projected. I. 119. *a. b.* It has been said that after they had shaken off the Pope's yoke, they found that the yoke of the Secular Power is not easier. 214. They have always maintained, that there was no need of miracles to justify the Reformation. III. 737. *b.* An assembly of them is detected at Paris, in the year 1557, to the number of four hundred persons, seven of whom were burnt. I. 790. *a.* They obtain almost every thing they please, after the flight of Charles V, before Duke Maurice. II. 440. *a.* Those whom the Emperor had banished out of his dominions, were always in hopes of being restored. 691. *b.* Their affairs cannot fail to be in a happy situation, and why. 758. *b.* How useful the emulation of Charles V, and Francis I, proved to them. III. 94. *a. b.* The Duke of Orleans, Francis the first's second son, offers to allow them the free exercise of their religion. 96. *a. b.* Favoured by the Roman Catholic Princes. 94. *a. b.* 397. *b.* 403. *a. b.* Their design to form a kind of league against the enterprizes of the Jesuits. 504. *a.* They do not calumniate the Catholics, when they reproach them with the miracles that are to be found in their Legends. IV. 28. *b.* Their re-union is treated of. 286. *b.* Should leave off writing controversial books against one another. 680. *a. b.* 681. *a. b.* They very much mistrust the Jesuits that are willing to embrace their religion. 855. *a.* Informations against some of their meetings at Paris. 882. *a. b.* There was nothing captious in the clause of the confession, which they presented to the King at Poissy. V. 28. *a.* Why a Pope prognosticated that their religion would be of no long continuance. 172. *a.* Pensioned by the Cardinal of Lorraine. III. 874. *b.* Every one of them has received an order like that which Ehud received. II. 123. *a.* They become masters of several cities. *ibid.* Weakened and oppressed by the Catholics, during the last ten years of the XVIIth century. 125. *b.* When a man may lawfully exhort them to make war upon the Pope. 127. *b.* Those who have the sovereign authority among them, do not measure their conduct by the predictions of their writers. *ibid.* They still write books to maintain the story of Pope Joan. IV. 732. Have not understood the interest of their party, in relation to that story, which is of little moment to them. 739. Are not equitable in their behaviour to Blondel, whom they should have imitated. *ibid.* Their disputes with the Jesuits were never so violent, as during the first thirty years of the XVIIth century. 727. *a.* Protestant authors, who maintained the story of Pope Joan, after Florimond de Remond's book, and that of Father Labbe came out. 732. *a. b.* 733. *a.* Protestant authors who have not believed it. 733. *a.* They speak very disadvantageously of Pope Paul II. 509. Did not add the story of Pope Joan, to the Chronicle of Martin Polonus. 709. *a.* Esteem Raynbroeck's works. 942. *b.* Their way of proceeding, with respect to the obscenities related by their own writers, or by the Papists. V. 857. Have declared for Savonarola, but they only considered him on his fair side. IV. 67. *a. b.* 68. *a. b.* Gave him the title of Martyr. 69. *a. b.* 70. *a. b.* Accused of a violent and seditious humour. 89. *a. b.* Two authors, both equally mad, write the one upon the ruin of the Protestant religion, the other upon the ruin of Popery. 562. and *a. b.* 563. and *a. b.* They make use of Windeck's maxims, as a handle to throw the blame of the wars in Germany, upon the Court of Vienna. 263, 264. *a. b.*
- Protoplast*, a Painter who was never satisfied with his own works. III. 836. *b.* V. 135. *b.*
- Provençals*, their clamours against Mr de Launoi, upon his attempting to cure them of some errors. I. 362.
- Provence*; Peter de Quiqueran, writes a book on the praises of that Province. IV. 818.

Proverb,

INDEX.

III

- Proverb*, the original of the Proverb *Græcum est, non potest legi*. I. 67. *a.*
- Providence*, the vanity of man makes him doubt of it. I. 24. *a.* The axiom of a modern author on Providence. 94. *b.* Is superior to all our designs however well concerted. 361. *b.* Whether a man may be virtuous, without fearing it. 541. II. 783. *b.* 784. *a.* People dispose of it a little too rashly. I. 776. *a.* And are too ready to search into its counsels. IV. 55. *a. b.* 73. *a.* Whether the Providence that made the world, made also the diseases and vices to which men are liable. II. 496. *b.* 497. *a.* The Poets speak of it under too bold metaphors. 543. The prosperity of wicked men, never makes those question a Providence, who share in that prosperity, or who at least receive no damage from it. 652. *b.* The reasons which are drawn from the common course of Providence to prove it, are not good for all sorts of unbelievers. 655. *b.* It has been said that the punishment of some impious persons, was a sentence of abolution for Providence. 670. *b. n.* (93). We very often see those, who fancy themselves inspired, distrusting it. 691. *a. b.* Providence does not hear the prayers of the slothful. *ibid.* Whether such as deny it are not capable to live in society. 776. *a. b.* 777. *a. b.* In what respects it is easy for Providence to please every body. III. 2. *b.* 3. *a.* Its decrees break through all obstacles. 293. *a.* A complaint against it, on account of the prosperity of the wicked. 357. *a. b.* A sect which denies it, and goes even farther than Epicurus. 550. *and a. b.* How far Providence raises and depresses men, when it pleases. 747. The ill qualities of men, are at some seasons more proper than their good ones, to execute the decrees of Providence. 945. *a.* Whether it can be said that Providence overthrows worldly greatness and prosperity, to shew it is a power. IV. 575. *a. b.* 576. *a.* Is called in question, on account of the prosperity of wicked men. II. 670. *b. n.* (93). IV. 932. *b.* 933. *a. b.* 934. *a. b.* 935. *a. b.* Considered one way, it is of no great use to lead worldly people to virtue. V. 181. *a. b.* 182. *a.* How much the doctrine of Providence can contribute towards making us virtuous and happy men. 326. *a. b.* It sometimes blinds men. 373. *a.*
- Province*: on what the glory of a Province depends at certain times. I. 482. *a.* It is a sign that a man is of a mean extraction, when he bears the name of his Province. IV. 173. *a. b.*
- Provinces*, their boundaries have often been altered. I. 537.
- Provinces of the Low-Countries*, together with Franche Comté, formed the circle of Burgundy. II. 222. Charles V had a design to erect them into a kingdom, and give it the name of *Regnum Lothinum*. *ibid.* 223.
- Provinces* (United) who was their first Ambassador at the Court of France. I. 3. And what rank was given to their Ambassadors there, after that time. *ibid.* The affairs of the United Provinces went on better and better every day, from the time that a Visionary had threatened them with the vengeance of heaven. III. 690. *b.* They are the bulwark of the empire, the strongest support of the Netherlands, and the mediators and guarantees of peace. 851. *b.* Very ill treated in a speech, under the name of Herimannus Conrad. II. 550. See *States General*.
- Provincial* (letters to the) See *Letters* (Provincial).
- Provincials* (or country Squires) ridiculed by Moliere, and for what. I. 188. *a.* Are great fumbler. IV. 461. *b.*
- Prudence*, whether it allows us to resist violent spirits. I. 195. *b.* Human prudence is, properly speaking, the sport of the Providence of God. V. 678.
- Prudentius*, a short account of that Poet's life. IV. 786. *b.* 789. *a.*
- Prussia* erected into a kingdom. V. 194. *a.*
- Psalm* translated into French verse, to what tunes they were sung. I. 478. *b.* Facts concerning Marot's translation of them. IV. 157. *a. b.* 158. *a. b.* 159. *a. b.* 160. *a. b.* 161. *a. b.* And concerning Beza's translation. *ibid.* The church of Geneva, which was the first that made use of Marot's and Beza's version, was also the first that forsook it. 161. *b.* 162. *a.* Reckoned inferior or equal to Pindar. 704. *b.* 705. *a.* Sainte-Aldegonde's translation had the same fate with that of Conrart. V. 20. *b.* An
- alteration of taste, with respect to these spiritual songs. 446. *a. b.* Translated into Italian verse by Giulio Cesare Paschali. IV. 492.
- Psalm* and *prose* divisions of the Church: they were the Opera's of the XVth and XVIth centuries. II. 481. *b.*
- Psalter*, the Protestants reproached with an alteration which they had made in their's. IV. 164. *a. b.* When the Psalter of the Protestants was printed with a licence. *ibid.*
- Psammenius* weeps not for the misfortune of his children, but weeps for that of his friends. IV. 570. *b. n.* (52).
- Psammiticus* brings the whole kingdom of Egypt under subjection to himself. IV. 343. *a.*
- Pterelau*, observations on his cup. V. 307. *b.* 308. *a.*
- Ptolemy*, the intricacy and confusion of his system, with respect to the celestial spheres. II. 379. *b.* Who first published his *Almagest* in Greek. III. 255. *b.*
- Public* was imposed upon, long before the invention of the Gazette. I. 129. The ingratitude of the Public. 212. *a. b.* For the instruction of the Public, it is necessary to discover both the good, and the bad, of great men. 564. The capricious humour of the Public, with respect to the works of the learned. 625. *b.* II. 523. *a. b.* 524. *a.* Deserves respect. I. 668. *b.* Whether vices are sometimes more beneficial to the Public than virtues. III. 293. *b.* The mercenary spirit of those who serve the Public. 339. *b.* 340. *a. b.* 341. *a. b.* With what boldness people impose upon the Public. V. 643. *a.* A girl married at the public expence. I. 56.
- Publican*; the character of a Publican decrined in the Gospel, and profane authors. V. 465. *a.*
- Puer*; in good Latin authors, a person goes sometimes under that denomination, at twenty years of age. IV. 171. *b.*
- Puis* (Madame de) leaves a pension to her cat, and thereby occasions a remarkable law-suit. IV. 918. *b.*
- Pulmo Marinus*, what it is. IV. 677. *b.* 678. *a.*
- Pulpit*, formerly a prodigious deal of useless reading was displayed there. II. 105. *b.*
- Punish*: a whole people punished for the crime of a particular person. I. 158. *b.* 159. *a.* What Bion said with respect to the common observation, that Divine justice punishes the faults of the Fathers in their children. II. 12. *b.* The Pagans represented their gods under the idea of Beings, who punish one crime by inducing the offender to commit another. IV. 229. *and b.*
- Punishment*: consideration on the eternity of punishment. V. 175. *b.*
- Puns* are at present quite out of doors. II. 616. *a.*
- Purgatory*: what a banterer said of Francis I, with respect to Purgatory. II. 372. *b.* 373. *a.*
- Purists* have impoverished the French language too much. III. 208. *a. b.* 209. *a.* Their strange principles. V. 840, 841, 844, &c. Do not consult the interest of modesty in their affected expressions. 846. There have been some such in all ages. 851. The inconsistency of their conduct. 856, 857.
- Puritans*, whence so called. I. 256. *a. b.*
- Purum Putum*, the meaning of that expression. I. 227. *a.*
- Putianus* (Erycius) has written concerning the point of day. V. 779. Has expressed himself ill in speaking of those who go round the world eastward. 780. Confuted by Michalor, who forgets to object one thing to him. *ibid.*

Q

- Q** A benefited man is deprived of his revenues, for his manner of pronouncing that letter. IV. 837. *a. b.*
- Qualities*: the effect of the proportions and disproportions, between the qualities of one and the same man. I. 698. *a. b.* The difference there is between manifest and occult qualities. II. 677. *b.*
- Qualities* (Corporeal) are not in the objects. IV. 654. *a. b.*

11 N

Quarters:

- Quarters*: an answer which has been made at different times, concerning the King's Quarters. III. 718. *a. b.*
- Queen of France*: a title given to Elizabeth, Queen of England; and Beza ridiculously charged with it as a crime. I. 800. *a. b.*
- Queens*, what they ought to do, in order to place their sex upon a good foot. III. 814. *a.* Considerations upon their unlawful amours. IV. 308. *b.* 309. *a.* A Queen that was nurse to her son. II. 382. *a. b.*
- Queens Dowagers* often raise cabals to the prejudice of their children. IV. 558. *a.*
- Queens of Spain*, that have been educated in France or Germany, fall into a kind of servitude. IV. 368. *b.*
- Queretanus* has a very bad character given him by Patin. IV. 58. *a.*
- Querle Infantum*, there are divers copies of that book in the libraries of Paris. II. 556. *a. b.*
- Quernus* promoted to the dignity of Poet Laureat, and solemnly crowned. III. 763. *a.*
- Question*: it is almost impossible to determine any question by verbal disputes. IV. 688. *b.*
- Question Royale Et sa Decision*: an explanation touching that book. V. 15. *b.* 16. *a. b.*
- Quaestorship*, persons that had been Consuls, did not decline that office, though it was a dignity inferior to that of a Praetor. II. 346. *b.*
- Quid pro quo*: nothing is more frequent among authors, than *Quid pro quo*'s. I. 78. *b.*
- Quick* commended for his collection of the Synods of France. I. 671. *b. n.* (6).
- Quietism*, notions that come very near it. I. 155. *a. b.* Its conformity with spiritual Origenism. IV. 421. *a.* We find the seeds thereof in Plato. 690. *b.* Taught in the east as well as in the west. V. 202. *b.* 203. *a.* 302. *a. b.*
- Quietists*, a specimen of their visions. II. 118. *a. b.* 678. *a. b.* They pretend that their principles are as ancient as mythical Divinity. *ibid. b.* What they say of the falsity of the notions, under which the Deity is commonly represented, approved of by some Philosophers. *ibid.*
- Quinaus*, verses wrote upon him. V. 400. *a. b.*
- Quintilian*, the judgment that he passes on Pacuvius and Accius. I. 61. *a.* Has preserved a reflexion full of good sense. *ibid. b.* What he says of a professed accuser. II. 356. *b.* And of facility in writing. III. 262. *b.* And of a writing which the author is continually mending and new-molding. 837. *a. n.* (21). He censures those authors who can never be satisfied with themselves. IV. 85. *b. n.* (49).
- Quintin* (John) his judgment of the annals of Aquitain, by John Bouchet. II. 103. *a. b.* 104. *a.*
- Quintus Curtius* had a greater effect in curing a sick person, than Avicenna, and the other writers upon Physic. IV. 311. *a.* A translation of that author into the Turkish language promised. V. 223. *b. n.* (c).
- Quisterpius* blamed without reason by Mr Arnauld. III. 246. *a.*
- Quotation*: sometimes those who undertake the correction of a work, strike out certain things in one place, and leave elsewhere a quotation of the very same things. V. 276. *b.*
- Quotations*, reflexion on those that are falsified. III. 203. *a.* It would be a very useful thing to make a collection of false quotations. IV. 108. *b.* It is dangerous to trust them, when they have not been compared with the original. V. 255. *b.* The ridiculous practice of those who heaped quotations on quotations, and intermixed the sacred and profane. II. 105. *b.* 106. *a.*
- Quote*: people should stick religiously to the words of the authors whom they quote. I. 338. *a. b.* 610. *a.* V. 307. *b.* 308. *a.* It is a bad custom not to quote authors. I. 453. *a.* II. 324. *b.* Balzac's artifice in this point. 398. *b.* What a perfect exactness requires of us in quoting a book. 634. *a.* The impertinence of those who quote Plato and Aristotle, to prove a thought common to all ages and nations. IV. 209. *b. n.* (24). An advice to those who quote authors. 231. *b.* A reflexion upon a certain way of quoting. 376. *a.* Rules to be observed in quoting. 770. *a. b.* A wrong way of quoting authors. V. 325. *b.*
- Quoters* reduced to two classes. II. 778. *b.* 779. *a.* Whether they have more trouble in composing, than authors that do not quote. *ibid.*

R.

- RABBI**: a famous Rabbi converted by a learned woman in a regular disputation. V. 298. *b.*
- Rabbins*, their idle stories with respect to Adam's lamenting the death of Abel, and abstaining from any carnal commerce with Eve. I. 23. *a.* How some of them explain the seventh verse of the 51st Psalm. II. 612. *a.* Their explication of that verse does not well agree with the doctrine of Original Sin. *ibid.* What they have imagined in order to explain the variations of nature. IV. 94. *a. b.* What they say about a small bone which is in the human body, and which they call *Lux*. I. 649. *b.* 650. *a. b.* IV. 376. *b.* 665. *b.* Thoughts of some Rabbins upon the souls of beasts. 904. *b.* 905. *a. b.* 906. *a. b.*
- Rabec* suffers martyrdom. V. 197. *a. b.*
- Rabelais*, what Girac says of him. IV. 542. *b.* The author was not much pleased with him: he is nevertheless read and esteemed by many people of honour and worth. V. 802.
- Rabelais Reformed*, what that book is, and by whom composed. III. 133. *b.* 134. *a.*
- Rabutin* (Bussi) quoted. I. 446. *a. n.* (2). V. 76. *a. n.* (8). What an Abbot wrote to him. III. 166. *a.* A Latin epigram writ against him. IV. 196. *a.* Facts that concern him. 753. *b.* &c. What he says about the contrariety of ingredients in the human composition. IV. 441. *a.* Whether he be author of the book intitled *Amours du Palais Royal*. V. 753. *b.* 754. *a.* An acknowledgment that he makes. 756. His *Amours des Gauls* more dangerous than the satire of Petronius. 847.
- Racan*, what thing about him he set the greatest value upon. V. 384. *a.*
- Rack*, the inconveniencies that attend the use of it. III. 238. *b.*
- Racovia*, when and upon what occasion the college which the Unitarians had erected there, was demolished. V. 168. *a.* 173. *b.* 174. *a.*
- Ragguagli di Parnasso*, who is the author of that book. II. 38.
- Ragotki* (Sigismond) what commission he received in the name of God. II. 691. *b.* His perplexity with regard to the war that he was solicited to make. 692. Revelations are published after that Prince's death, which supposed him still alive. *ibid. a.*
- Ragotki* (George) initiated into the mysteries of Drabicius, II. 693. *a. b.*
- Ragunau*, a satire against him. II. 604. *a.*
- Raileries* of persons that were burnt in effigy. II. 85. *b.* Cannot be good if they have no other foundation but lies. 527. *a.* III. 378. *b.* 379. *a.* 631. *b.* See *Jefti*. There are some raileries so ingenious that though a person be nettled at them, he has not a good pretence to complain. IV. 777. *b.*
- Raynaud* (Theophilus) concealing himself under the name of S. Emonerius, writes against John Barnes's treatise of equivocations. I. 660. *a.* Accused of having censured the Apostles creed. III. 144. *a.*
- Raynolds* (William) what is reported of him and his brother. V. 275. *a. b.*
- Ralph Higden*, a Benedictin Monk, confounded with *Radulphus Flaviacensis*. IV. 824. *a. b.*
- Ralph the Black*, otherwise called *Radulphus Flaviacensis*. IV. 824.
- Rambouillet-Houffe*, an encomium upon it. III. 177. *a.*
- Rambouillet* (Madam de) her virtue. IV. 83. *a.*
- Ramis* involved in Theological disputes. II. 696.
- Ramis* involved in. Flourishes in Switzerland. IV. 842. *b.*
- Ramists*, their disputes involved in the disputes of Divines. II. 696. *a. b.* 697. *a.* We justly laugh now-a-days at their quarrels with the Peripatetics. 697. *a.*
- Rampalle* (the Sieur de) what he tells us of a King of Lydia. IV. 563. *a.*
- Ramus*, an epigram writ against him. IV. 474. *b.* 475. *a.* He was one of the heads of the cabal which

- which endeavoured to change the form of church discipline. V. 738. His method greatly esteemed by William Adolphus Scribonius. 100.
- Rapes*: punished with death in France. IV. 636. *b.* Cannot be justified. *ibid.* 637. *a. b.* Reflexion upon the rapes of fair damiels in romances. III. 365. *a. b.* 366. *a.*
- Rapin* (Nicolas) Lieutenant of the short robe, his conversation with the Jesuit Guignard, as the latter was going to be executed. III. 276. *b.*
- Rapin* (Father) is of opinion that the XVIIth century is superior to the XVIth, in knowledge and ingenuity. I. 92. *b.* Censured for several errors touching the studies and different employments of Aristotle. 464. *a. b.* 465. *a. b.* He did not give himself the trouble of consulting originals. 472. *a.* A fine reflexion which he makes upon great men. 619. *b.* His error with respect to a passage of Plutarch where Epicurus is mentioned. II. 775. *b.* 776. *a.* Quoted. 849. *a. b.* *n.* (40), (42).
- Ratan*, a very malignant ulcer. I. 39. *a.*
- Ratibon*: the History of the conference of Ratibon. III. 535. *b.* 536. *a. b.* 537. *a.* Baillet's judgment upon what passed in that conference. 530. *a. b.*
- Ravallac*, whether he could have been induced by the doctrine of the Jesuits to assassinate Henry IV. IV. 128. *b.* 129. *a. b.* 130. *a.* What moved him to commit such a Parricide. 131. *a.*
- Ré*, the confounding of that ill with the ill of Ré, occasions an anachronism. V. 188. *a.*
- Readers* are seldom mortified when they do not understand an author, and why. I. 218. *a. b.* The most part of them are seldom sensible of an error in reasoning. 419. *a.* What sort of readers are most prone to criticize. III. 337. *a. b.* An author should wish for such as are neither ignorant nor very learned. 905. *b.* 906. *a.* Are sometimes more prejudiced than the author whom they accuse of partiality. II. 310. *a. b.* Are not candid enough. *ibid.* *b.* 311. *a.* There are some readers so warm that they tear out of their copies such things as are ignominious to their sect. IV. 711. *b.* Many of them do not compare one whole book to another whole book. V. 180. *a.* There are some who in the margin of their books write abusive reflexions, or give the authors the lie. 846.
- Reading*: one of the greatest uses that may be drawn from it, is to learn the weaknesses of the heart of man, and the ill effects of prejudices in point of religion. I. 784. *b.* Too profusely displayed towards the beginning of the XVIIth century. II. 105. *b.* 106. *a. b.* A passage of la Bruyere on that head. 105. *b.* A passage of Balzac on the same subject. *ibid.* 106. *a.* An advocate who pleaded thus, pleaded more for himself than for his Client. *ibid.* *b.* It could only serve to withdraw the Judge's attention. *ibid.*
- Real* (the Abbot de St) unjustly censured, with respect to the *Squittino della Libertà Veneta*. V. 449. *a. b.* Quoted. III. 808. *a. b.* *n.* (124), (125), (126), (127), (128), (129). IV. 657. *a. n.* (36). V. 366. *a. b.* *n.* (26), (27), (28).
- Reason* has different faces. I. 681. *b.* Whether the light of reason ought to be consulted. II. 111. *b.* The vanity and weakness of it. 799. *a. b.* IV. 95. *b.* 96. *a.* 323. *a. b.* 513. *a. b.* 514. *a. b.* 515. *a.* A reflexion upon its weaknesses. III. 459. *b.* It can only discover to us our ignorance and weakness, and the necessity of a revelation. IV. 96. *a.* It wages a continual war with the body and the senses. 440. *a.* Is not able to make us do what she makes us approve. 442. *a.* The Philosophers observed the slavery of reason, and suspected the cause that produced it; they were not ignorant that the power of reason is lost, and its light nevertheless preserved. 441. *a. b.* How deplorable its fate is. 514. *b.* 515. *a.* It is useful to humble it. 519. *a.* Its weakness should conduct us to the light of revelation. *ibid.* What Cotta says of it. 516. *b.* 517. *a.* Is a source of deception as well as the senses. 592. *a.* V. 441. *a. b.* It is not reason but faith that makes us Christians. IV. 591. *b.* 592. *a.* Whether evidence which is the *Non plus ultra* of reason can be what they call *Criterion Veritatis*. 654. *b.* V. 586. *b.* Whether by following the light of reason, and shaking off the yoke of tradition a person is led to Atheism. 441. *a. b.* See *Philosophy*. The best reasons lose their weight, when they are alledged by a person in miserable circumstances. IV. 852. *b.* 853. *a.* The mysteries of the Gospel are above it, or even contrary to it. V. 815. Divines will always have the worst in a dispute where they shall only appeal to the light of reason. *ibid.* It cannot furnish answers to its own objections, we must have recourse to the authority of God. *ibid.* The Catholics and Protestants agree to reject it in the controversies about the mysteries of religion. 817. Such Protestants as study to make more room for it in Divinity, are suspected of Socinianism. *ibid.* Its strange mistakes, when it treats of divine matters. 820. A person should renounce it, in order to receive faith. 834. The ludicrous way in which this reflexion has been expressed, and the authors confutation. *ibid.* Reason should be silent when the word of God speaks. 817. 830.
- Reasonings*, there are some which one may elude by turning them into a jest. I. 639. *b.* 640. *a. b.*
- Re-baptize*: whether children, baptized by a woman, should be re-baptized. I. 704. *b.*
- Rebellion*: the head of the rebellion, requires a greater submission than the true master. III. 299. *b.*
- Rebels*, whether they do all that they can, whereas those who fight for their Prince do no more than they ought. I. 711. *a. b.* Their artifices. 265. *a.* Their common protestation that they have no design against the King. II. 735. *a.*
- Rebenstock*, his *Colloquia Menfalia*, the History of that book. III. 938. *b.*
- Recollis*: Aloisio de Leon draws up their rules. III. 772.
- Recommend*: it is very dangerous to recommend as able person than one's self. II. 372. *a.*
- Reconciliation*, a feast which the Jews solemnize by the oblation of a cock and other ceremonies. III. 125. *a. b.*
- Red-bair'd People* sacrificed to the ghost of King Oflis. II. 233.
- Redi*, his book on the generation of insects, quoted. IV. 517. *a. n.* (38).
- Reform*: an attempt to reform abuses may sometimes have criminal motives. V. 459. *b.* 460. *a.*
- Reformation of the Church*, what it was that gave several persons a dislike to it. I. 139. *a. b.* And retarded the progress of it. 285. *a.* Persons who all their life-time made profession of the Catholic religion, though they wished for a reformation. 659. Baudouin writes a treatise of the means of attaining to a good reformation. 697. *b.* Cameron found many things in the Reformed Church, which wanted a farther reformation. II. 288. *and a. b.* A person may believe that the Church stands in need of reformation, without approving a certain manner of reforming it. 374. *a.* What judgment some passed upon it in the beginning. 799. *a. b.* 810. *b.* 811. *a. b.* Persons that were not far from it in their hearts, but who disapproved of the conduct of those that were establishing it. 799. *a.* It was supported by the emulation of Charles V, and Francis I. III. 94. *a. b.* The reformation which Queen Elizabeth established. II. 754. *b.* Attacked in Holland. III. 675. *a. b.* It could not have been undertaken at a more favourable time. 947. *b.* 948. *a. b.* 954. *b.* V. 482. *a. b.* Inconveniences that sprung up at its birth. IV. 46. *and a. b.* What faults Erasmus observed in the measures that were taken against it. III. 954. *b.* Melancthon did not approve all the manners of it. IV. 185. *b.* Favoured by Margaret de Valois Queen of Navarre. 317. *b.* 318. *a. b.* 319. *a. b.* 320. *a.* 321. *a. b.* And by Joan Queen of Navarre. 324. *b.* 325. *a. b.* 326. *a. b.* 327. *a. b.* *&c.* The progress it made by means of the King and Queen of Navarre. 325. *b.* 326. *a. b.* 327. *a. b.* The restoration of polite literature made way for the Reformation. V. 286. *b.* The project of reformation which was drawn up at Cologne. 557. *a. b.* 558. *a. b.*
- Reformation of Manners* is of a short continuance. IV. 353. *b.* 354. *a.*
- Reformed*: Thuanus calls them a suspicious people. I. 119. *a.* Some of them would have adopted the flanders that were published against Beza, if he had written against their party. 797. *a. b.* They had very near got the upper hand in France. III. 507. *b.* 508.

- b.* 508. *a. b.* Whether they behaved at that time in too ostentatious a manner. *ibid. b.* 509. *a.* To what they ascribed the perfection which they suffered under the reign of Henry II. IV. 698. *b.* The libel which George Boquet writ against them condemned to be burnt. II. 95. *a. b.* They laughed at Brocard's Prophetic visions. 144. *b.* Acknowledged Caraccioli as a Bishop, after he had publicly embraced their religion. 313. *a. b.* 314. *a. b.* An Arrêt of the Parliament of Paris, by which any one is permitted to kill them. 458. *b.* Censured with respect to an alteration made in their Psalter. IV. 164. *a. b.* Their affairs were not in a bad situation at the time of the conference of Poissy. *ibid. a.* Banished out of England, and cruelly persecuted in Germany. V. 550. *b.* They are very jealous in the point of a total submission to the mysteries of religion, and defend it zealously against the Socinians. 817. Accused of a violent and seditious humour. 89. *a.*
- Reformers*; they clamoured loudly against the Peripatetic Philosophy, and for what reason, according to Father Rapin. I. 472. *b.* 473. *a.* The keen style of two among them did them great service. II. 60. *b.* 61. *a.* A reproach cast upon them, as if they warred against Rome for the same reasons the Grecians did against Troy, for the sake of a woman. 266. *b.* The violent disposition of some of them has been looked upon as necessary. III. 11. *a.* The calumnies published against them are destitute of all probability. 935. *a. b.* 936. *a. b.* 937. *a. b.* 938. *a. b.* 939. *b.* 945. *a. b.* 946. *a. b.* 947. *a. b.* 948. *a. b.* 949. *a.* The fabulous impertinencies that were published against them. *ibid. b.*
- Refuge*, See *Asylum*.
- Refugees*, Abraham is their Patriarch. I. 44. *a.* They hoped that their re-admission would be made an article of the peace of Munster. II. 691. *b.*
- Refutation*: a flight refutation of a book does only serve the more to recommend it. V. 179. *b.*
- Refutations*: certain refutations have contributed to the increasing of Socinus's sect. V. 179. *a. b.* There is no refutation so pitiful as not to discover some defects in the book of an adversary. 180. *a.*
- Refute*: there are people who take a much greater pleasure in refuting what was advanced by others, than in laying down any thing certain of their own. I. 620. *and b.* The most frank and fair way of refuting an adversary's book. V. 505. *b.* 506. *a.*
- Regius*, his maxim, when the question is to speak of God exactly. IV. 876. *b.*
- Register to the Parliament of Paris*, that office was enjoyed by the Tillet family for above a century. V. 354. *and b.*
- Regius* Professor at Utrecht, brought into trouble for a Thesis concerning the union of the soul and body. III. 195. *and a. b.* 196. *a. b.*
- Regius* (Raphael) frequents Greek lectures at seventy years of age. IV. 292. *a. b.* 293. *a.*
- Regnier*, some of his verses. III. 517. *b.* 518. *a.* An examination of what he says, that every one is the author of his own fortune. V. 368. *b.* 369. *a. b.* &c. Quoted. 402. *b. n.* (26).
- Regnier Desmarais* (the Abbot) quoted. V. 582. *b. n.* (102).
- Regnum Leoninum*; Charles V. had a design to erect the provinces of the Low-Countries into a kingdom under that name. II. 222. 223.
- Regular*, his maxim ought to be followed in a special manner when the question is how Heretics are to be dealt with. I. 789. *a. b.*
- Reign*: it is not always sure to judge of the reign of a Prince by the first years of it. V. 655.
- Reign*: the desire of reigning stifles all sentiments of humanity. II. 381. *and b.* Why it is a difficult matter to reign well. I. 573. *b.*
- Reineccius* composes the elogy of James Horstius. III. 487.
- Relations*; whether such truths as may appear shocking to modesty should be suppressed in them. II. 30. *a. b.* 31. *a. b.* After what manner people flourish upon them. II. 405. *b.* 406. *a. b.* &c. The false relations that are given of public misfortunes serve as a foundation to Historians. 749. *a. b.*
- Relations in Prose*, it would be often necessary to give notice that they are set off with poetical fictions. I. 747. *b.*
- Relicks*, several Pagan cities boasted of having the same. II. 530. *a. b.* 531. *a.* What Pomponatius said of them. IV. 716. *b.* Certain relicks lost, and others substituted in their place. 826. *a. b.* 827. *a.* A collection of relicks that was made with great pains: the price of them falls after Luther's reformation. V. 457. *b.* 458. *a.* Calvin's advertisement concerning the general inventory that it would have been proper to make of them. II. 274. *b.* The destruction that was made of them in France. *ibid.*
- Religio Medici*, the religion of a Physician; a book which according to some might be intitled: *The Physician of Religion*. V. 835. Passages of that book. *ibid.* The author of it: what his notion was concerning the manner after which men propagate their species. 6. *a.*
- Religion* is so far from making the sovereigns masters of their subjects, that it gives their subjects a power over them. I. 13. *a.* It is not a mere human invention. *ibid.* Disputes in religion cause terrible disorders. 23. *b.* 24. *a.* Policy dares not commit the support of it to God only. 94. *a. b.* Indifference in the point of religion is a very odious thing. 97. *b.* It is the fate of all religions to be the worse for age. 223. *a. b.* Religion often serves for a pretence to accusers. 307. *a.* Mockers at religion are apt to mislead young persons. II. 12. *b.* Whether a man deserves praise for resisting temptations to change his religion. 27. *a. b.* It comes in every where, and even in the most fierce duels. 128. *b.* The ill custom of interesting religion in the disputes of the learned. 141. *b.* The goodness of a religion is not to be judged of by the good or bad success of a battle. 195. What Charron said of it. 453. *b.* 454. *a.* A piece of a parallel between different religions. 465. 466. It cannot be concluded whether a man has any religion or not, from his witty sayings either for or against it. 670. *a. b.* 671. *a.* It is a more common thing than people imagine, to be wholly ignorant in matters of religion. 677. *b.* 678. *a. b.* Revolutions in religion seldom happen, but when people at first ask for themselves a toleration which they refuse to others. III. 147. *a. b.* Religion is divided into factions, just as commonwealths are. 172. *b.* The inconveniences that attend the disputes which Divines raise about religion. 360. *a. b.* 361. *a.* Religion alone can furnish us with strong weapons against the Sophistry of the Cynics. 459. *b.* Many people leave their country for it, without renouncing their vices. 586. *b.* An inconvenience arising from the unity of religion. 642. *b.* Disputes about religion that were carried on in Holland. 675. *a. b.* 676. *a.* The maxims of a Latitudinarian on that head. *ibid. b.* 677. *a. b.* There are nations which have no religion at all. 781. *a. b.* Whether the great changes that happen sometimes in religion should be attributed to the constellations. 948. *a. b.* Controversies about religion make but few Sceptics. *ibid. b.* 949. *a.* Who those are, that ought carefully to consider the mischiefs which are produced by civil wars on account of religion. IV. 18. *a. b.* 19. *a.* In the affair of religion heaven has been represented as resembling the earth. 354. *a. b.* A man should never change his religion, unless he can be a gainer by the change. 375. *a. b.* It is more advantageous to believe than not to believe what it teaches. 489. *a. n.* (55). The disorder in which it leaves the hearts and minds of men, when it is false. 562. *a. b.* There is one which is called the religion of prudent men. 859. *b.* 860. *a.* False religion in some sort degrades a man to the condition of a brute beast. V. 77. *b.* There are some men whose religion is in their mind, and not in their heart, and there are others whose religion is in their heart, and not in their mind. 208. *a. b.* Persons accused of abtaining from the public exercises of religion. 257. *and a. b.* 258. *a.* The design of changing one's religion carries with it something astonishing, and even those who are fully resolved to execute it, can hardly bring themselves to do so. 539. *a.* How remarkably Lucius Junius Brutus mitigated an article of religion. II. 163. *a. b.* The United Provinces accused of taking no care of religion, but as far as it appears useful to them to aggrandize themselves. 550. *a. b.* We

- We ought not to affect subtilties in matters of religion. III. 343. *b.* Persons who have fled for their religion: nothing is more common, than to see them ringing the alarm against the sects. 758. Persons that have no religion, by what they are excited to a good moral life. V. 811. The end and substance of religion, is to imitate God. 812. Without the true religion, there is no true virtue. *ibid.* Reflexions upon the slanders that are published against those who change their religion. 225. *a. b.* 226. *a.* The extravagancies of romances have crept into religion. I. 166.
- Religion** (the prevailing) has its state-tricks as well as temporal Princes. III. 948. *a. b.* A maxim against a man, who goes about to oppose it. V. 314. *a. b.*
- Religion of the Sovereign.** See *Sovereign.*
- Religion** (Natural) a false way of reasoning, may bring a man to deny it. I. 97. *a.* What it is. *ibid. a. b.*
- Religion** (Christian) the Celsus's and Porphyry's would have attacked it with the weapons which Mary d'Agreda furnishes them with. I. 137. *b.* What Hierocles wrote against it. III. 444. *a. b.* 445. *a.* The Popes and Cardinals accused by Calvin, of making a jest of it. II. 274. *b.* 275. *a.* Erasmus quoted on that head. *ibid. a. b. n. f.* (189). There are good proofs of the truth of it, in Socinus's treatise de *Autoritate S. Scripturæ*. V. 180. *b.* Its principle. 830. Its discussions, disputes, and controversies cannot be carried to the Tribunal of Philosophy, but only to that of Revelation. *ibid.*
- Religion** (Romish) the exercise of it is absolutely forbid in Bearn. IV. 327. *a. b.* See *Church of Rome.*
- Religion** (Reformed) the testimony which a Libertine finds himself obliged to give to it. II. 649. *b.*
- Religion** (Jewish): Bodin in his dialogue concerning religions, gives the advantage to the Jewish. II. 45. *a.*
- Religion** (Mahometan) profaned. I. 49. *a.* How much larger the extent of it is, than that of the Christian religion. IV. 26. *a.*
- Religions:** a treatise on the toleration of Religions by Mr de Beauval. I. 672. *a.* A work designed to effect the coalition of Religions. 689. *a. b.* In all Religions, people are strangely inclined to think themselves favoured by miracles. II. 552. *a.*
- Remedy:** it is a remedy for some people to discharge their choler upon paper. I. 43. There are remedies which do more harm, than the disorders which they are designed to cure. IV. 578. *a.* A Physician who implored the blessing of God upon his remedies. III. 486. *a. b.*
- Remond** (Florimond de) what he relates touching a project, to re-unite Sweden to the Church of Rome. III. 138. *b.* 139. *a.* Quoted with respect to the Psalms. IV. 157. *a. b. n.* (69), (70), (71), (72), (73). The answer that was made to him concerning the conformity of the tunes of some Psalms with those of ballads. 159. *a. b.* 160. *a.* Is the Purveyor-General of the Roman Catholic writers, who speak of the Reformers of the XVIIth century. 393. *a.* What he says of Brocardus. II. 144. *a. b.* 145. *a.* A gross blunder which Blondel reproaches him with. IV. 106. *a. b.* What he says with respect to what Beza had advanced, concerning the She-Pope, at the conference of Poissy. 736, 737. The Protestants were not confounded at his work concerning the She-Pope, they despised it. 732. *a. b. & seq.* The work is not bad, but too full of digressions and declamations. 733. *b.* Many ascribe it to the Jesuit Richeome. *ibid.* He unjustly accuses Heroldus, of having added the story of the She-Pope, to the Chronicle of Martin Polonius. 709. *a.*
- Remonstrants,** their five articles are no fundamental Heresies. III. 174. *a.* Accused of having troubled the Church. 343. *a. b.*
- Renatus,** King of Sicily, was a Painter. IV. 307. and *b.* 308. *a.*
- Renaudie** (la) harangues his accomplices. III. 285. *a. b.* The causes of John Du Tillet's aversion for him. V. 353. and *a. b.* 354. *a. b.*
- Renaudot** (the Abbot), reflexions upon his judgment concerning this Dictionary. V. 797. to 809. The characters of him, and of the judgment which he passes. 797, 798. There are falsities in that judgment: the reason for which the author does not V. Q. L. V.
- point them out. 804. What sorts of faults he imputes to the author. *ibid.* and 805.
- Rennes,** the disorders of that diocese occasioned by the Clergy. III. 60.
- Renou** (John de) his *Antidistary* quoted. I. 677. *a. b. n.* (1), (2). He pretends that there are certain words, which prevent a man's enjoying a woman. IV. 385. *a. b. n.* (2). Cites Tacitus ill. *ibid.* The censure which he passes upon Nicolas Præpositus. 764. *a. b.*
- Repentant maids:** a house where persons are shut up, who very often are neither the one nor the other. II. 373. *a.*
- Reports:** town reports are little consistent with truth. I. 243. *a.* Historians ought not to follow popular reports, when they agree not with authors. II. 770. *b.* A judicious observation of Lampridius upon that subject. *ibid.* Trusting too rashly to common reports, is the general fault of those who suffer persecution for their religion. V. 42.
- Reprisals** necessary in war. I. 709. *b.* 710. *a.*
- Reprobation** (absolute) why Arminius would needs insist upon it, in his dispute with Gomarus. III. 174. *b.*
- Republic of Rome,** to what Cæsar had reduced it. II. 420. *a.*
- Republics** become corrupt as they grow old. I. 223. *a. b.* Cannot endure a distinguished merit. II. 547. *b.* Have an advantage which kingdoms want. III. 420. *b.* Are liable to horrible confusions. 452. *a. b.* 467. *a. b.* 468. *a.* IV. 481. *b.* How it is possible to retain some shadow of liberty in them, after they have been reduced to a Monarchical form of government. 204. *b.* We ought not to be curious in a foreign Republic. V. 820. See *Commonwealths.*
- Reputation:** a stratagem, to shew of what consequence a good reputation is. I. 432. *b.* A great reputation for integrity in a person, displeases many. 460. *a.* Its influence is of great efficacy, either in advancing or retarding events. 498. *b.* Is an incumbrance to men of letters. 626. *b.* It is difficult to have a great reputation, without being exposed to the lash of censorious tongues. V. 337. *b.* 338. *a. b.*
- Res,** what was the signification of that word, among the Latins. III. 691. *b.* 692. *a.*
- Rescius** (Stanislaus) publishes the works of Cardinal Hosius, and affirms that they had been printed thirty-two times. III. 501. *b.*
- Resentment:** whenever a man conceives a resentment against a nation, he ought to abstain from writing its History. III. 345. *b.*
- Resident:** the Resident of a Court, who quarrels with a person, and sends him a challenge. II. 408. *a. b.*
- Restitution:** whether any pretence whatsoever, can excuse a man from making Restitution. I. 13. *a.*
- Resurrection:** the Jews reckon that there is a small bone in us, out of which God will restore our bodies at the Resurrection. I. 649. *b.* 650. *a. b.* IV. 376. *a. b.* 665. *b.* The possibility of it taught by Chryppus. II. 496. *b.* It seems that Democritus promised a Resurrection to bodies buried in honey. 638. *b.* A singular notion concerning it. IV. 376. *b.* Believed by learned men among the Heathens. V. 332. *a.*
- Retreat:** few persons know how to retreat in time. I. 120. *a.* Poets and Orators ought to be most careful of doing it. *ibid. a. b.* II. 620. *a. b.*
- Reuchlin,** the History of his differences with Hochstratus. III. 473. *b.* 474. *a.*
- Revelation,** without it, reason can avail us nothing, with respect to our getting over difficulties in point of religion. IV. 95. *b.* 96. *a.* The disputes of Christians should be carried to its tribunal only. V. 830. Accusations against the author, with respect to it, and his justification. 807.
- Revelation of St John,** what we have seen concerning an explication of that book. I. 7. *b.* Those who promise the greatest successes, as if they were foretold there, are apt to be mistaken. 127. *a.* It would be difficult to find sureties to warrant the explications of it. 188. *a. b.* The needless labour of the Commentators upon it. *ibid.* Calvin's opinion concerning this book. II. 265. *b.* Some have believed that St John was not the author of it. 405. *b.* III. 595. *a.* The Commentators upon it

- lose nothing of their credit, though they have deceived people an hundred times. II. 539. *a.* The reason of it. *ibid.* The most chimerical explanations of it, may be of great use to stir up the people. 693. *b.* Sovereigns generally manage the interpreters of that book. III. 476. *b.* The judgment that we ought to pass upon those who vary in their explication of it, according to the different turn which affairs take. IV. 47. *a. b.* The whole story of it embroidered upon a garment. 430. There has always been people, who pretended to know the secrets of this book. 899. *a.* Those who pretend to explain it, would have Ministers of State neglect all their affairs, to hear them, or read their writings. V. 94. *b.* 95. *a.* The first Reformers did not understand it. II. 122. *a. b.* The design of those who ballot the numbers of it. 123. *b.* The ill success of the Commentators on it, does not restrain the temerity of others. 124. *a.* The explications of it are oil to the fire. 127. *b.* Put in French rhyme, and fitted for the stage. 477. *a. b. &c.*
- Revelations* (Divine); Savonarola pretends to partake in them. V. 57.
- Re-union* of the Lutherans and Calvinists, attempted in vain. II. 731. *a.* Dury said that only some ministers opposed that work. III. 34. *b.*
- Re-union of the Catholics and Protestants*, a book wrote for the bringing it about. III. 595. *a. b.*
- Re-union of the religions*, persons who have been full of that scheme. IV. 213. *a. b.* 214. *a. b.* 215. *a.* 231. *a.*
- Re-united*: the new re-united were scandalized at the weak and timorous censure that was passed upon the mystical city of Mary d'Agreda. I. 138. *b.* 139. *a. b.*
- Revolutions of State*, the greatest commonly proceed from a trifle. II. 711. *b.* Their principles and springs. 741. *a. b.* 742. *a. b.* The ordinary preparatives towards them. III. 138. *b.* 139. *a. b.* What is almost continually the chain of the greatest revolutions. IV. 281. *a.* The tricks that are employed to make them succeed. IV. 467. *b.* 468. *a.*
- Reward*: a man must seek the reward of a fine action in the action itself. I. 559. *a. b.* How an author ought to behave, in order to obtain rewards from the Public. III. 339. *b.* 340. *a. b.* 341. *a. b.*
- Rhadamanthus* marries Alcmena, who was transported for that end, to the fortunate islands. I. 208.
- Rhan* (George) his apology for the confession of Augsburg, published by Chytraeus. II. 122. *b.*
- Rhefuparis*, his perfidiousness. II. 559. *a. b.*
- Rhetoric* has rules that are little conformable to the laws of History, or to sincerity. II. 341. *b.* 342. *a.* Demosthenes quits Philosophy, to apply himself to Rhetoric. 259.
- Rhetorical*: a Rhetorical figure occasions the loss of a cause. I. 185. *a. b.*
- Rhetoricians*: who was reckoned the most famous Rhetorician of the XVIIth century. II. 499. An example of their Legerdemain. 678. *a. b.* Commentators should take notice of their artifices. 679. *a.* The Rhetoricians and Philosophers expelled from Rome. III. 5. 6.
- Rhimes*: a Dictionary of French Rhimes. I. 65. *b.* 66. *a.*
- Rhinfeld*: John de Wert taken prisoner at the battle of Rhinfield. V. 539.
- Rhodes*: an error in computing the weight of its Colossus. II. 390. *a.* Its form of government changed by the authority of Mausolus. III. 359. The History of the violences and debaucheries that were committed there afterwards. *ibid.* and *a. b.* 360. and *a. b.* Its Democracy changed into an Aristocracy, during the confederate war. IV. 174.
- Rhodiens* send Ambassadors to King Ptolemy. I. 71. *a.* Thought themselves so sure of defeating the Romans, that they had prepared chains for those they should take prisoners. II. 349. *b.* Their temples pillaged by Cassius. *ibid.*
- Rhodiginus* (Lewis Caelius) uses the labours of Erasmus with ingratitude. II. 813. *a. b.* Convicted of a falsity with respect to Euripides. 874. *b.* Commits a gross solecism. V. 624. *a.*
- Riario*: what has been said of Peter and Jerome Riario. V. 163. *a. b.*
- Riario* (Cardinal) assists Marfus in the revival of his Commentary on Tully's Offices. IV. 165. *a.*
- Ribadameira* retracted what he had said about the miracles of the founder of the order of the Jesuits. III. 889. *a. b.* 890. *a. b.*
- Ricaut*, his error touching the hopes of Mahometan women. III. 341. *b.* He misunderstood Busbequius with respect to the ignorance of the Turks, in point of Chronology. 572. *b.*
- Richard* (the Abbot) quoted. II. 589. *a. b. n.* (8), (9). III. 954. *b. n.* (173), (174), (175), (176), (178), (179). V. 542. *b. n.* (18). His answer to Jurieu, with respect to the taxes of the Romish Chancery. I. 629. *b.* The insufficiency of that answer. *ibid.*
- Richardus* (Stephanus) Nivernensis designed to have composed forty-two chapters upon Ovid's invective against Ibis. IV. 452. *a.*
- Richelieu* (Cardinal de) desires to confer with Amyraut. I. 261. *a.* Did not love to be asked. 418. *b.* Never forgave any one. 488. It is reported that he was continually reading the Argenis. 645. *b.* He paid an author well for his eulogy. 653. *b. n.* (3). It is surprizing that he should lay any stress on Bertelier's pretended act, with respect to Calvin. 783. *b.* 784. *a.* II. 62. *a.* And on Bolsec's calumnies against the said Calvin. 265. *b.* He makes use of some of the rhapsodies of Beza's calumniators. I. 800. and *a.* Required a great deal of complaisance from those who belonged to him. II. 134. *b.* Secret practices to expel him from the court. 401. *a. b.* His method. 518. *a.* What Lewis XIII said to him, after the Marshal d'Ancre's death. 542. *b.* His amours with Marion de Lorme. 647. *a.* His design to reconcile both religions, hindered by his death. III. 34. *a.* His friends and enemies lost battles, the latter with a view to hurt, and the former with a view to serve him. 59. *b.* The Ministers of Languedoc wait upon him, and tell him that they saw but little probability of effecting a re-union in matters of religion. 123. *a.* He was very liberal to the Muets. 176. *a.* The reproaches he casts upon the Protestants, with respect to the majesty of Kings, and the answers which have been made to these reproaches. 668. *a. b.* 669. *a.* Whether under his ministry people were put to death, whose only fault consisted in their misfortune to displease him. 818. *a. b.* 819. *a.* IV. 141. *a. b.* 142. *a. b.* 143. *a. b.* 144. *a.* His power lasted longer than his life. III. 827. and *b.* He was vastly hated. IV. 141. *a. b. &c.* Was of a delicate taste and haughty spirit. 85. *a.* How he employed himself, after he had spent some hours in settling affairs of state. 114. *a.* It was for the good and service of Lewis XIII, that his troops should be commanded by the friends of that Cardinal. 146. *a.* He was extremely affected by satires. III. 212. IV. 256. *a.* Was obliged to spread his snares every where. 257. *a.* The speech which Gueret puts in his mouth. *ibid. b.* Those who have had to do with that Cardinal, have left us wretched pictures of him. 258. *b.* All the misfortunes of Europe are imputed to him. 260. *a.* He makes use of Silvius's writings, for finding out the Philosopher's stone. 262. *b.* What he said to a Captain of the guards. V. 370. *b.* He would not allow any other cause of unhappiness than imprudence. 373. *b.* Procures a pension to a plagiarist Genealogist. 474. *a. b.* Opposed in his design of humbling the House of Austria, by Cardinal Berulle. I. 786. *a.* Charged with having poisoned that Cardinal. *ibid. b.* Mr le Vassor does not adopt this calumny. *ibid.* There was no story which people did not believe, when it defamed him. IV. 511. *a.*
- Richelieu* commits a mistake advantageous to his design. IV. 79. *a. b.* Quoted. III. 956. *a. b. n.* (18), (19). IV. 81. *a. n.* (51), 930. *b. n.* (8). Looked upon as the author of Florimond de Remond's book, intitled, *L'Anti-Pape*. 733. *b.* The Jesuits looked upon him as their best French writer. *ibid.* Disguises himself under the name of Francis de Montaigne, in his answer to the plea of Antony Arnauld. III. 278. *b. n.* (24). Divers extracts from his books touching the affair of John Guignard. 277. *a. b.* 278. *a. b.* 279. *a.*
- Richer*, John Boucher was one of his adversaries. II. 103.

Richerians,

- Richerians*, a chimerical sect. IV. 870. *b.* 871. *a. b.*
- Richer*, there were Philosophers who renounced them, before the doctrine of Jesus Christ. I. 294. *a. b.* *See*. Some despise them from a principle of self-love. 460. *a. b.* It requires a great deal of magnanimity to despise them. II. 269. *b.* It is much easier for us to renounce riches than praise. 298. *b.* They have sometimes been the cause of the persecution of great men. 351. *b.* 352. *a.* An answer of Simonides, wherein he said that riches were better than learning. V. 146. *b.* 147. *a.*
- Ride*: the only thing young Princes are intrusted in, is how to ride the great horse. II. 334.
- Ridiculous*: a person can never be ridiculous who follows only the common custom. II. 527. *a. b.*
- Riga*, the capital city of Livonia, besieged and taken by Gustavus Adolphus. V. 657, 658, 659.
- Right*: the only measure of right (or law) in states is the advantage they can get by it. I. 130. *a. b.* Some Philosophers did not admit a natural right. 416. What it is. II. 30. *a. b.* Whether there is a natural impression which enables all men to distinguish between right and wrong. III. 581. *a. b.* 604. *a. b.* Certain nations are ignorant of it. 781. *a. b.*
- Rigorism*, what it is. IV. 874. *and a. b.*
- Ring*: the reason why the Antients wore a ring on the finger next to the little finger of the left hand. I. 375. *a.* A ring sold at an auction had almost occasioned the ruin of the Roman Republic. II. 711. *b.*
- Ris* (Martin del) censured for several falsities touching Agrippa. I. 152. *a. b.* Quoted. V. 597. *n. (a).* *and b. n. (2).*
- Riolan* writes some books against Joseph du Chesne. II. 468.
- Ripeness*: when the regulation of the ripeness of girls and boys by inspection, was forbidden. IV. 802. *b.* *See Maidenhead.*
- Rise*: the Egyptians or Phœnicians used to say, that they who recovered from a great fit of sickness rose again out of the grave. I. 116. *b.*
- Rishius* (Edward) publishes Sanders's History of the English Schism, and adds a preface of his own to it. V. 41. *b.* 42. *a.* Dies at St Menchou in the year 1585. *ibid.*
- Riswick*: the treaty of Riswick advantageous to the Allies. III. 683. *a.*
- Ritual*, that of the Jews contains rare observances. I. 174. *a. b.*
- Rivierius*, Physician to Henry IV, treated as a mountebank by John de Renou. IV. 864.
- Rivers*: a river whose water makes those immortal who drink of it, but which is always covered with a dark night. II. 465. Rivers at this day may be very unlike what they were in antient times. V. 78. *b.*
- Rivus* (Andrew) harshly censured by Father Labbe. I. 21. *a. b.* His opinion about Abimelech's distemper. 38. *b.* 39. *a.* His reflexion against St Augustin for his loose morality. 91. *b.* It is surprizing that such a man as he should have been ignorant that Calvin was a father. II. 267. *a.* His judgment upon a work of Sedulius. III. 84. *a.* How he refutes Coëffeteau's answer to du Pleffis Mornai, with respect to the praises which Langius bestows on Luther. 723. *b.* He has not exactly traced Campan and Whitaker's dispute. 940. *a.* Is one of those who quote from the modern writers, without consulting the originals. V. 183. *b.* Was the depositary of several of the Patriarch Cyril's Letters. 560. *b.* An incident of his dispute with Grotius, where he cavils ridiculously. I. 235. *a. b.* 236. *a. b.* His defence of the two Epistles and Preface of Mr du Pleffis. II. 127. *a. b.* He does not bring him off in one particular. *ibid. b.* Endeavours to justify Robert Stephens. 173. *a. b.* Is mistaken with respect to the statue of Pope Joan. 530. *b.* Quoted, and censured, for what he says of Harchius. III. 352. *b. n. (8).* A partizan of the tradition of the She-Pope. IV. 280. *b.* The most curious man in the world about books of controversy. 727. *a.*
- Rivinus* makes his complaints to the magistrates against Reinefius. IV. 858. *b.* 859. *a.*
- Robbers*, two famous ones. V. 198. *a.* Physically speaking, they may deserve some esteem. IV. 843. *a.*
- Robert*, the King's Attorney at the Chatelet of Paris, his letter concerning James Aymar's wand. I. 8. *a. b.*
- Robert d'Arbrissel*; *see Arbrissel.*
- Robertwal* answers the objections of Des Cartes against a piece of Mr de Fermat. IV. 485. *a.*
- Rochebournart*, persons of note in that family. V. 298. *and b.*
- Rochebournart* (the Duke de la) his memoirs will ever be esteemed better than those of Caesar. II. 418. *a.*
- Rochelle*, its national Synod. II. 196. *b.* That city is not allowed to have any others pastors than such as are born there. 694. *a.* It is besieged by the Duke of Anjou. III. 178. *a.* The tumultuous resolutions of its assembly. IV. 212.
- Rochemaillet* took care to have the arrears of George Louët printed, from the manuscript which Antony Seguer had given him. III. 882.
- Rochester* (the Earl of), a famous Atheist, converted by Dr Gilbert Burnet; particulars that concern him. V. 820, 821. *n. (35).*
- Rochus* (John), General of the Augustins. I. 769. *b.*
- Rock of the accused*, who and what was so called. I. 167. II. 345. *a.*
- Rod*, that of Moses was the model of the Devil's apish tricks. I. 5. *a.*
- Rodon* (David de) taught certain sophisms only to those who paid him for it. IV. 783. *b. n. (18).*
- Rodriguez*; his book of Christian Perfection translated by d'Audiguer. I. 548. *a.*
- Rodriguez* (John), *see Gabay Faro.*
- Robault* describes the natural consequence of the method of philosophizing contracted in the schools. II. 848. *b.* 849. *a.* What he says of the Guisics. III. 298. *b.* 299. *a. b.*
- Roi* (Lewis le), Greek-Professor in the university of Paris, his death. I. 562.
- Royalty* is a very chargeable thing. IV. 755. *a.*
- Roy* (Eleonor de) dies of grief. III. 833. *a.*
- Roland*, where statues are erected to him. III. 256. *b.*
- Romance* of Theagenes and Chariclea, an original and plan for almost all other romances. III. 377. *a.* The author of it severely rallied. 378. *a. b.*
- Romances*, their extravagancies have crept into religion. I. 166. Reflexion upon the rapes of fair damsels in romances. III. 365. *a. b.* 366. *a. b.* IV. 636. *b.* 637. *a. b.* Wherein consists the chief difference between Mythological authors, and the writers of romances. III. 465. *b.* Those of the new fashion spoil the taste of young people. 552. *a. b.* IV. 365. *b.* 366. *a.* The authors of them very often shew a want of judgment in their fictions. III. 296. *a. n. (32).* The new romances make true history extremely obscure. IV. 366. *a.* How tender the author of a romance should be of his heroine's virtue. 114. *b.* The heroine of a romance, with a big-belly, or lying-in, is a strange image. III. 866. *b.* The writers of them are obliged to follow History, when they tell in a preface the foundation of their fictions. 166. *b.* Those of the Countess d'Aulnoi have been universally read. I. 569. *b.*
- Romans* were very apt to apply particular sentiments of a play to the present times. I. 60. *b.* Their first conquests compared with those they made afterwards. 163. *a. b.* They did not approve, that a superior magistrate should be accused by his Subaltern. 186. *a. b.* Are cruelly insulted by the Parthians. 515. Who were called the last Romans. II. 164. *a.* What person had this encomium given him, that he was called the last of the Romans. 347. The antient Romans had not laid down those polite rules in point of debauchery, which prevail now-a-days. 394. They shewed much less regard to those who gained battles, than to those who finished a war. 413. *b.* It was for that reason a part of their good policy to change their Generals often. *ibid.* Their ambition with respect to the propagation of their language. 516. *a. b.* 517. *a. b.* By what gradations they passed from frugality to luxury. 710. *a. b.* Would rather have chosen to lose their lives than their virility. III. 75. *b.* Were not very religious observers of treaties. 584. *a. b.* Allowed the honour of a triumph only to those who extended their frontiers. *ibid.* 586. *a.* Their policy to extend their conquests. *ibid.* Called *Ravenous Wolves*, by Telefinus, General

- General of the Samnites. 686. *b.* The ancient Romans were as ridiculous in point of Genealogy, as people are at present. 711. *a.* The difference between the ancient and modern Romans, and the occasion of that difference. IV. 50. *b.* To save Italy, the Romans carry the war into Africa. 193. *a.* They forbid the Poets to abuse their magistrates, and permitted them to ridicule their gods. 568. *b.* 569. *a.* When they attempted the abolition of certain nocturnal feasts. V. 336. *b.* Called forth the tutelary gods of the towns which they besieged, and which they expected to take. 185. *a. b.* Their cruelty to the Britons. 260. *a. b.* They had recourse to *Venus Verticordia*, that a stop might be put to the prevailing lewdness of the times. 268. *a. b.* Were more jealous of their honour, than of the honour of the gods. 761, 762.
- Rome*, the end of a war is sooner heard of there, than the beginning of it. I. 340. *a.* Who was the first Senator there that embraced the gospel. 341. *a.* Changed from a monarchy to a commonwealth. II. 161. Its first inhabitants had need of a monarch. 163. *a.* It could not be any longer without one, when Julius Cæsar was murdered. 165. *b.* Who was called her second founder. 289. Who first practised Physic there. 353. *a.* Who was the first of its Generals that embarked upon the northern ocean. 715. The limits of its empire shrink contrary to the preface of idolaters. III. 317. *a.* St Augustin's railery on that head. *ibid.* *b.* It submitted to the will of Cæsar at the very first. IV. 203. *a. b.* 204. *a.* The conformity between the foundation of Rome, and that of the universe. 424. *b.* A judgment concerning the most celebrated writers of ancient Rome. 778. *b.* 779. *a. b.* The statues of its deities in the beginning were made of base materials. 925. *b.* It had two names, the one known, and the other unknown. V. 184. *a. b.* 185. *a. b.* Was scarce known to the Greeks in Alexander's time. 329. *b.* Why the maids who married there, were followed by a person who carried a distaff and spindle, with wool and yarn upon them. 288. *b.* To what an excess they had carried the vice of Drunkenness there. 387. *a. b.*
- Rome* (Christian), who was the first Greek that taught Philosophy there. I. 443. *a. b.* The harshness of that court with respect to the Patriarch of Babylon. 105. The rewards wherewith the court of Rome pays the zeal of those who declare for her. 157. *b.* Those who had been courageous enough to exclaim against the usurpations of that court overthrown. II. 125. *a. b.* The strange corruption of its Popes and Cardinals described by an unsuspected author. 370. *b.* 371. *a.* That court is no less concerned than others to preserve the balance of power between all the powers of Europe, whether Catholic or Protestant. 758. *b.* 759. *a.* Its avarice and impurity. III. 76. *a. b.* The monarchy of the Popes there is more to be wondered at than that of the Cæsars was. 228. *a. b.* We may apply to New Rome what Virgil observes concerning the Old. 235. *b.* That city alarmed at a bull that was going to be published against Sodomites. 327. *a. b.* A very smart letter writ against the court of Rome. 455. *a.* A description of that city in verse. *ibid.* The mode, with respect to women, has very much changed there. 458. *a.* The court of Rome has as much to fear from certain Catholic Princes, as from the Protestant ones. 568. *b.* Rome, notwithstanding the residence of its Bishops, is more corrupt than other cities. 591. *b.* Rome sacked by the troops of Charles V. 615. *a.* The court of Rome maintains its rights with greater policy than the court of France. 742. *a.* A consternation caused at Rome by the victory of Ravenna. 812. *a.* The partizans of the court of Rome alarmed at the volume of the liberties of the Gallican Church. IV. 98. *b.* 99. *a. b.* 100. *a.* That city presents a woman with the privilege of its freedom, on account of her rare qualities. 237. *a. b.* 238. *a. b.* To what the yearly income which the Pope draws from the Courtizans there, amounts. V. 162. *b.* Its acquisitions in the Indies, by the vast number of Christians that were in that country. 267. *a. b.* With what violence its inhabitants discovered their partiality for the Emperor or France. II. 310. *b. n.* (5). *No peace with Rome*, a treatise of Joseph Hall under that title. III. 342. *b.*
- Romish Divinity*, Cardinal Bellarmine reckons up two hundred and thirty-seven contrarieties of doctrine among them. III. 343. *b.*
- Rommelin* (James de) takes Simonetta, a gentleman of Milan, prisoner, and afterwards gets the better of him in a duel. V. 139.
- Romarin*, the edict of that name. III. 506. *a. b.*
- Romulus*, laws which he established for divine service, according to Dionysius Halicarnassæus. III. 914. *b.* 915. *a.* His retrograde horoscope. V. 295. *a. b.*
- Rondel* (du), the author of this Dictionary proposes a point of Chronology for him to clear up. II. 15. *a.* What is his profession, and what his works are. 782. *b.* He deserves the praises of all the Journalists. *ibid.* Two observations that he makes examined. III. 914. *b.* 915. *a. b.* 916. *a. b.* He sends a memoir touching the souls of beasts to the author of this Dictionary. IV. 547. *a. b. n.* (20). His objection against the necessity of believing a providence, in order to embrace virtue and shun vice, and the answer to that objection. V. 180. *a. b.* 181. *a. b.* 182. *a.* His judgment of Balzac. 345. *b.* 346. *a. b.*
- Rondelet* trusts Joubertus, his favourite disciple, with his manuscripts, and desires him to publish them. III. 582.
- Ronfard*, his sonnet on the privileges which Physicians have with the fair sex. I. 400. *a.* His *Trouvel Croqueried*. III. 868. *a. b.* On what occasion he wrote a poem against the Atheists. IV. 845. *b.*
- Roque* (the Abbot de la) ascribes to Father le Tellier a thing which he does not say of Quintus Curtius. IV. 809. *a. b. n.* (6). Censured. 242. *a. b.* Quoted. V. 122. *b.* *Et alibi*.
- Roque-laure*, what he said upon hearing a satire against Henry IV read. IV. 482. *b.*
- Rorence*, his books against the Vaudois. III. 162. *a.*
- Rose* (the romance of the), who is the author of it. I. 28. *b.* Was written an hundred years after Abelard. III. 381. *b.*
- Rosfo* (Mambrin) makes an imperfect translation of Guevara's Dial of Princes into Italian. III. 270. *b.*
- Rosier*, whence they sprung. IV. 45. *a. b.*
- Rosier* (du), a Minister, changes his religion during the massacre of Paris. IV. 76. *b.* And contributes a great deal to the abjuration of several persons of the first quality. 77. *a.*
- Rosni* does all he can to disengage Henry IV from Mademoiselle d'Entragues. V. 391. *a.*
- Rossano* (the Princess of), widow to Prince Borghese. II. 471. *a. b.*
- Roswilde* ascribes to Drusus a letter of Broughton. II. 150. *b.* His mistake censured by Sixtinus A-mama. *ibid.*
- Rotbe* (John), a Fanatic, who was first a proselyte of Labadie's, but afterwards separated from him. III. 689. *a. b.* 690. *a.*
- Rovere*, an illustrious family in Piedmont, which possessed a strange prerogative there. V. 162. *b.* 163. *a.*
- Rouillard* (Sebastian) confuted, as to what he says of Amyot, and his journey to Trent. I. 257. *a. b.* His capitulary concerning the validity of a marriage. IV. 804. *a. b.* 805. *a. b.* 806. *a. b.*
- Rouxier des Guerres*, what that book is. II. 838. *a. b.* A remark concerning it. III. 809. *b.* 810. *a. b.*
- Ruarus*, his conjectures about the pretended Mahometism of Alciatus. I. 198. *a. b.*
- Rubens* (Leonard), what he says of Blandrata's death. II. 20. *b.*
- Rudolph II*, his weakness in giving credit to the predictions of Tycho Brahe. V. 672.
- Rufinus* (Cornelius) degraded from the dignity of Senator for his luxury. II. 710. *a. b.* III. 2.
- Ruy* (the Monks of) their possessions seized on by a British Lord, on account of their vicious lives. I. 31. *a.*
- Rule of equity* which those ought to follow, who impute certain things to an author. I. 652. *a.* A rule to know whether it is out of weakness or contempt, that a person does not answer an adversary. II. 90. *b.* 91. *a.* The application of rules is more difficult than the art of discoursing well of them. 38. *a.*

Rumours:

- Rumours*: the secret springs which excite certain rumours. II. 721. *a. b.*
- Rufbach* and *Rufberus*, two chimerical authors formed from the corrupted name of *Rufusbeck*. IV. 944. *a. b.*
- Rutilius*, his generous way of thinking, with regard to his countrymen who had banished him. II. 259. *a. b.*
- Ruxi* (Dr) would not allow some Ministers to begin a conference with a prayer. IV. 921. *a.*
- S.
- Sabbati Tubbii*, a false Messiah, a book where we find some very extraordinary particulars touching his impostures. V. 539.
- Sabbatical Affirmations*, a confutation of those who doubt of people's being really carried to them. II. 750. *a. b.*
- Sabina* (a Roman Empress) poisoned by her husband's orders. V. 266. *b.* 267. *a.*
- Sacri* (Mr de) succeeds Mr Rose in the French academy. IV. 917.
- Sacraments*, some people put off that of Penitence to their last hours. I. 701. *b.* Laymen have a right to administer them in certain cases of necessity. III. 267. *a. b.* When the custom of using wafers in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was abolished at Geneva. 343. *a. n.* (16).
- Sacrifices*: the Pagans boasted that fire from heaven fell upon their sacrifices. I. 25. *b.* A tenet of the Peripatetics concerning sacrifices and prayers. 468. *a.* See *Vitium*.
- Sadducees*, whether they wholly denied a providence. V. 9. *a. b.* 11. *a. b.* 12. *a. b.* The Jewish High Priest was sometimes one of their sect. 12. *b.*
- Sadi*, the Prince of the Persian and Turkish Poets. IV. 872. *a.*
- Sadolet* (Cardinal) writes a letter to the people of Geneva. II. 264. *n. (d).*
- Sagacity*: proofs of an extraordinary sagacity. II. 636. *a. b.* 637. *a.* If there were any such thing as a certain sagacity, it would be odious to all mankind. 636. *b.*
- Sage of the Stoics* exists only in idea. II. 310. *b.*
- Sayings*: remarkable sayings are ascribed sometimes to one person, sometimes to another. II. 770. *b.* People cannot bring themselves to lose a witty saying. 671. *a.* People are apt to report a good saying, not as it was spoken at first, but according to the form which they believe to be the best. I. 460. *b.* Persons that excelled for witty sayings. 308. *a.* 609. *a.* 753. *a.* IV. 754. *b.* 755. *a.* Bion's witty sayings. II. 12. *a. b.* The general fault of most witty sayings. *ibid.* *b.* V. 152. *b.*
- Saints*: a faint created by ignorance and chance. I. 230. *b.* 231. *a. b.* There are numberless faints in Turkey, who have each of them a particular office. II. 466. *a. b.* The invocation of them has been long since the practice of the Jews. 879. *b.* They are always beautiful according to their pictures. III. 57. *a. b.* Their credit is very little diminished in the Church of Rome. 87. *a. b.* The precipitation wherewith miracles upon miracles are crowded in their legend. 95. *b.* 96. *a.* IV. 556. *a.* The compilers of their lives have been the boldest of authors. III. 577. *b.* Not long since the question was discussed at Rome whether the faints of the Old Testament deserved the worship that is paid to the canonized faints. 573. *b.* There is less certainty in the ancient than in the modern faints. 740. *a.* It is not by their miracles, but by their charity that we are to judge of their sanctity. 889. *b.* An unlucky inconvenience which sometimes attends the worship that is paid to them. 896. *b.* How the worship of faints has been introduced. IV. 353. *b.* 354. *a. b.* 355. *a. b.* A notion upon the invocation of faints. 376. *a. b.* There have been faints of all professions, excepting that of an attorney. 487. *b.* The invocation of them is still excessive. II. 126. *a. n.* (40).
- Saints-Aldegonde* writes to the States the false news of the Duke of Alençon's marriage with Queen Elizabeth. V. 19. *a.* See *Aldegonde*.
- Saint Brigid*: the fort of St Brigid was besieged in form, and the French defended it many days. IV. 211. *a.*
- Saint-Evermonian*. See *Evermond*.
- Saint Remond* (Peter de) brings a ridiculous charge against Beza. I. 800. *a. b.* His errors. *ibid.*
- Saint Sulpice*, an abbey of the order of Cîteaux at Belley: the disorders which the Bishop of that city found there. I. 737. *b.* 738. *a. b.* The pious fraud that was published concerning the foundation of it. *ibid.* *b.* 739. *a. b.*
- Saiu*, a city, where situate. IV. 342. *a.*
- Saladin*, his gallantry with Eleanor of Guienne spouse to Lewis VII. III. 794. *b.* 795. *a. b.*
- Salamina*, a town in Cyprus, why so called, and when the custom of sacrificing men to Jupiter was suppressed there. V. 318. *a. b.*
- Salamis*, how that island came to be the property of the Athenians. V. 304. *b.*
- Salernitana*: the *Schola Salernitana* forbids the eating of beans. IV. 671. *b.*
- Salus* (Francis de) proposes the elephant for an example of chastity. I. 641. *b.*
- Salian* (Father) censured for several epitaphs. I. 705. *b.* Censured by Noldius for what he says of Juba. III. 164. *a.*
- Salian Priests*, what Quintilian said of them. IV. 161. *b.*
- Salic Law* condemned to castration slaves taken in adultery and theft. III. 77. *a.*
- Salis*, what he says of Allatius's taste. I. 232. *a.* A thought of that Journalist. II. 643. *b.* His reflexion on that book of the Liberties of the Gallican Church. IV. 100. *a.*
- Sallust*, the lie given to one of his maxims by the manner in which Sanches King of Castile exercised an usurped authority. II. 378. *b.* How he was treated at Faust's house. IV. 201. *a.* Has been censured perhaps too severely for making use of old words. 831. *a.* It does not become him to declaim against the corruption of his age. V. 420. *a. b.* Why Accursius called him his countryman. I. 69. *a.*
- Salmastus* has learnedly corrected an epigram inserted in Plutarch. I. 205. *a.* Is often misled by trusting too much to his memory. 369. *b.* Censures Solinus for one blunder, and falls himself into another. 424. *b.* 425. *a.* A great mistake which he mentions. 656. *b.* Did not answer Blondel's treatise concerning Pope Joan, after he had promised to do it. II. 25. *a.* Was of opinion that Æschylus is more obscure than the Holy Scripture. 827. *a.* His contradictions with respect to Grotius. III. 246. *b.* 247. *a.* To whom he was a scare-crow. 310. *b.* He chuses rather to reason ill than to lose his discoveries. 319. *a.* How one of his adventures boasted that he had made him lose his life. IV. 217. *a. b.* His Latin verses on a thing that has been said of monkeys. 600. *a. b.* He believed that Brutes were endowed with reason. 912. *a.* An examination of what he said touching the edition of Anastaſius by the Jesuits of Mayence. 726. *b.* 727. *a. b.*
- Salmeron* accused of Plagiarism. III. 44. *b.*
- Salmasius* (Henricus) censures a very obscene epigram of John Antony Campanus. II. 293. *b.*
- Salt of Agrigentum*, its qualities, and the use that St Augustin made of them. III. 157. *b.* 158. *a.*
- Saltatricula*, that word of Aulus Gellius is very ill rendered Grashopper. III. 491. *b.*
- Saluces* (the Marquise of) is a part of Piemont. II. 16. *a.*
- Savian*, his opinion touching the impurities of the stage. V. 40. *b.*
- Sameil* falls in love with Eve. II. 855. *b.*
- Sammaritani* suppress in their *Gallia Christiana* the elogy which they had made on the Abbot of St Cyran. V. 16. *b.*
- Sammaritani* (Abelius) writes an elogy on the family of Schomberg. V. 83. *n. (b).*
- Samos*, island, why called Parthenia. III. 635. *a.*
- Samofatenians* solidly confuted by Lascius. III. 732. *a. b.*
- Sauar*, Sultan of Egypt, dispossessed by Dorgan. IV. 383.
- Saucerre*, the memorable History of that town by John de Leri. III. 781.
- Sanches* counts it a venial sin to see one's own nudities, and a mortal sin to see those of another person. I. 112. *b.*

WOL, V.

11 P

Sauvion:

- Sancium*: there were as many abuses under the Pragmatic sanction, as there have been since the Concordate. IV. 766. *a. b.*
- Sanctuary*, whether it be more exempt from the caprices of fortune, than other things. I. 607. *b.*
- Sancus*, whose were certain monuments that were to be seen in his temple. V. 288. *b.* 289. *a.*
- Sanders*, his calumnies against Anne Bullen. II. 56. *a. b.* 57. *a.*
- Sandis* (Edwin) quoted. I. 109. *b. n.* (35.) 730. *b. n.* (46).
- Sandoval* is not comparable to Thuanus in the praises which he bestows on Charles V. II. 442.
- Samaritanus*, his Poem intitled *Christi Lamentatio* is printed with notes by Daniel d'Auge. I. 562. *n.* (4).
- Sansverino* (Robert de) invites Augustin Niphus to Salerno. IV. 378. *a.*
- Sansjon* (Nicolas) his mistake touching the capital of Ponthieu. I. 10. *a.* Attacked by Father Labbe. *ibid. b. n.* 11. *a. b.* Censured on a point of Chronology, in relation to Pytheas. IV. 677. *a. b.* Answers Father Labbe. *ibid. b.*
- Santeuil* writes verses which bring him into a quarrel with the Jesuits and Janfenists. I. 497. *a. b.* 498. *a.*
- Saccondarius*, how his chief city was called. II. 628. *a.*
- Saporis*, King of Persia, his son dies in the arms of Manes. IV. 91. *a.*
- Saraceni*, how vast their dominion was. I. 14. *a.* A prodigious victory which they obtained over the Christians. 15. *a.* They honour a stone, which they call Brachtan. 124. *a.* Are defeated before Thouloufe. II. 850. Destroy the city of Aix. *ibid. b.* Spilt left blood in all their persecutions of the Christians, than was spilt in the massacres alone on St Bartholomew's day. IV. 39. *a.*
- Sarah*, her diffimulation commended by the Fathers of the Church. I. 38. *a. b.* It is pretended that she was a convert. 45. *a.* Compared with the wife of Deiotarus. II. 630. *a. b.*
- Saranita* (Andrew) an impious fanatic. III. 281. *b.*
- Sarrafsn*, his famous sonnet. II. 857. *a.* Quoted. III. 366. *a. n.* 38. The preface to his works by Peliffon is a master-piece. IV. 538.
- Saryavius* suppresses a circumstance that was not favourable to the Count de Coligni. III. 304. *a.* Concludes, after a careful examination of the manuscript Anastasius in the King's library, that the story of the She-Pope had been tacked to it. IV. 726. *a.*
- Satires* want commentaries from the time that they are composed. I. 35. *b. n. f.* It is a favour done to the writers of them, when they are believed upon their oath, confirmed by witnesses. 343. *a.* The fatal effects which they produce. 426. *a. III.* 464. *a. b.* 465. *a. b.* Satire may easily be metamorphosed into History. II. 160. *b.* 161. *a.* Is one of the plagues of History. IV. 142. *b.* Who were the first authors of satire. III. 905. *b.* They publish a thousand things in them, which it was impossible should have come to the writers knowledge. V. 755. A general answer to those persons who complain of the satires that are published in Holland. *ibid. and* 756. As to the profit which may arise from the art of being formidable by satire, it is a disputable point. 225. *b.*
- Satirical*: it is a satirical stroke to mention the particulars of some peoples estates. II. 543. *b.*
- Satirists* are too sparing in the article of spy-money. I. 682. *b.* Necessary qualifications for a good satirist. 727. *a.* They often vent slanders which may very easily be confuted. II. 56. *a. b.* 57. *a.* Their impudence in lying. 136. *a.* Their method. 148. *a.* They should not be let go unpunished. 528. *a. b.* Ought to be no less subject to the laws of reasoning than others. IV. 136. *a.* Do not pretend to any exactness. *ibid. b.* Are not to be depended upon. *ibid.* It often happens that magistrates who neglect to punish them, are punished for their unconcernedness. 251. *a.* They put criminal interpretations upon the most pious actions. V. 459. *b.* See *Calumny*. A true picture of these writers. 756. All legislators concur in punishing them severely. 758. They would attempt upon the lives of their adversaries, if they had the same opportunities which they have to attempt upon their honour. 765.
- Saturn* was dealt with according to the *Lex Talionis*, in being dethroned. III. 646. *a.* His leudness. IV. 617. *a. b.* He escapes to the mountain Niphates, and kills there the shepherd Caucasus, from whom that mountain afterwards took its name. II. 88. *b.*
- Saul*, King of Israel it was thought strange that he did not know David, when he was going out against Goliath. II. 606. *a.*
- Savoy*, one of its Dukes spent an hundred thousand crowns to find incantations. II. 243. *b.* There is a dispute concerning the precedence between the Duke of Savoy and the Republic of Venice. III. 216.
- Savoy* (Charles Emanuel Duke of) a medal which he caused to be struck. III. 406. *b.* 407. *a.*
- Savoyard* (the) a famous finger of the Pontneuf. II. 600. *a. b.* V. 540. *b.*
- Sawrin* (Elias) quoted. I. 107. *a. n.* (12). 501. *b. n.* (9). (10). 502. *a. n.* (11). (12). Censured. V. 155. *a. b.* His dispute about the principle of faith. I. 706. *a. b. n.* (12). (13). (14). 707. *a. n.* (18). (19). (21). 708. *b. n.* (28). What he says of invincible ignorance. IV. 875. *b. n.* (10). (12). (13). The particulars of his dispute with Jurieu. V. 642. *a. b.* to 648. *a. b.* Declared orthodox by the Synodal assembly of Brill, notwithstanding Jurieu's accusations. 800.
- Saxen* (John) Rector of the university of Wittenberg, publishes in a Programma, lies unworthy the Gazette. III. 93. *a.*
- Saxons*: Lotharius grants leave to those Saxons who were called Stellingi, to make profession of the Pagan religion. V. 233. *and a. b.* 234. *a. b.*
- Scaliger* (Julius Cæsar) does not speak in a very complaisant manner of the Neapolitans. I. 237. *b.* 238. *a.* The judgment which he passed on Cardan. II. 317. *b.* 318. *a.* He is censured for writing only to gratify a spirit of contradiction. 321. *b.* 322. *a.* And for several other considerable faults. *ibid.* The original of his hatred to Dolet. 683. *a.* A book which he boasted to have read. 765. *a. b.* His extreme warmth in defending the Ciceroians. 804. *b.* 805. *a. b.* 806. *a. b.* He valued himself upon having been in the wars. 805. *b.* The History of his orations against Erasmus. *ibid.* 806. *a.* He did not well understand Horace's meaning, with respect to Laberius's Mimes. III. 695. *b.* His invective against the government of Athens. IV. 582. *b.* In the letters of his naturalization he bears only the character of a Physician born at Verona. V. 463. *n. (c).* *and a. b.* Confounds himself in speaking of those who surround the world eastward and westward. 781. Confutes Cardan's book *de Subtilitate*. II. 322. *b.*
- Scaliger* (Joseph) has collected a great deal of curious learning touching Jacob's Stone. I. 124. *b.* Every thing that he says is not to be depended upon. 139. *b.* His temerity in judging of the thoughts of the heart. 731. *b.* His prediction proves false. 794. *a. b.* His inattention when he computed the weight of the Colossus of Rhodes. II. 590. *a.* He commits gross faults in speaking of Helen. III. 371. *b.* 372. *a.* Is called the top-critic. 837. *b.* His judgment was not always to be relied upon. *ibid.* Being ready to give up the ghost he declares the abhorrence he had for an affected style. 846. *b.* A thought of his examined. IV. 331. *b.* He is mistaken when he says that after the passage of the Rubicon Cæsar went no more into Gaul. II. 394. *b.* Tells a ridiculous story. 707. *b.* He relates things of his father, which are confuted by public and original pieces. 805. *b.* 806. *a. b.* Is to be commended for suppressing certain of his father's letters against Erasmus. *ibid. a.* Has writ about the squaring of the circle. III. 50. *a.* Censured by Father Morin and Mr de Maulac, for what he says of Raymond Martini. IV. 168. *b.* He writes with his own hand several gross abuses in Junius's books. III. 627. *b.* What Scioppius reproached him with. V. 99. *b.* Intrapped by Muret. 394. *a. b.* 395. *a. b.* 396. *a. b.*
- Scaligeranus*, there is little exactness in that book. II. 617. *a. b.* Several things are miserably confounded in it. IV. 727. *b.*
- Scandalize*: people are not scandalized enough at the writings which authors publish against one another. I. 244. *b.*

Scanderberg

- Scanderbeg* lays siege to Belgrade. IV. 313. *a.*
Scarron quoted on ludicrous subjects. I. 315. *a. b.* III. 644. *b.* 645. *a.*
Scaxson, a kind of verse, who was the inventor of them. III. 464. *a.*
Sceptici, Scepticism. See *Pyrrhonists* *Pyrrhonism*.
Scerax, the Baron Gregory Horwath, sets up a new college there. III. 218. *a.*
Scervola (Mutius) his jest. I. 185. *a. b.*
Schedia, a town, where situated. IV. 342. *a.*
Schegkius, his disputes with Simon Simonius. V. 151. *b.*
Schenk surprized by the Count of Embden. III. 820. *b.*
Schlusfilburg (Conrad) calls the change from a Lutheran to a Calvinist, apostacy. III. 841. *a.* Quoted. I. 790. *a. n.* (27). III. 600. *b.* V. 258. *a. n.* (26).
Scholars, masters who desire to have a great many, should not set up for authors. I. 337. *a.* A scholar who has wit, and loves disputing, gives a great deal of trouble to his master. II. 622. *a.* Formerly a scholar, that learned Philosophy before he was twenty, was thought very forward. III. 26. *a.* A good lesson to encourage their studying hard. IV. 103. *b.*
Scholastic: who among the Greeks began to handle a subject according to the Scholastic method. II. 587. *b.* 588. *a.*
Σχολαστικός in Aristotle's time, was not used to signify a Scholar, a Disciple, or a Student. I. 465. *b.*
Schomburg, his memorial. III. 411. *a. b.*
Schwinberg (the Marhal de) a story that is told of him. IV. 676. *b.*
Schoockius (Martin) prosecuted by Des Cartes for gross scandal. I. 327. *a.* Centured for a mistake. 618. *b.* Quoted on the subject of dancing. V. 23. *a. n.* (63), (65), (67), (68). 24. *b. n.* (81), (82), (25). *a. b. n.* (83), (84), (86).
School-masters, who did not become Pedants. II. 183. *b.* The servitude of their condition. V. 738. *b.* 739. *a.* A School-master, who does a courageous action. II. 645. *a.*
School-men: what Democritus and Epicurus call *σῖσκαλα*, the School-men call intentional species. II. 388. *a.* Religion does not stand in need of their jargon, for the defence of its fundamental doctrines. III. 196. *a.* Their chimerical qualities banished. 790. *a.* They debate very needless questions and things that never happen. V. 41. *a.* Retort against the Cartesians, the arguments about substantial forms. 116. *b.* They only studied the art of raising objections and answering them. 339. *a.* Their wrangles neglected by OEcolumpius. IV. 400. Their subtleties on Transubstantiation, the Trinity, &c. V. 819. Have more confounded than explained the mysteries of religion. *ibid.* The strange perplexity to which the Abbot Faydit has reduced them. 620. *n.* (30). Their answers only serve to render difficulties more obscure. 821.
Schools, those who teach and dispute most in them, are not the most strongly convinced of the truths of Christianity. I. 51. *a. b.* In order to raise a great school, a man must apply himself entirely to his profession. 337. *a.*
Scotch: a Scotchman beaten for Passive Obedience. II. 286. *a. b.*
Scotland delivered from the Danish yoke, by the valour of a countryman. III. 332. How many Kings have reigned there, and what treatment they met with. 669. *a.* The Catholics of that country form a design. II. 577.
Scottus (Andrew) ridicules the Frenchmen for esteeming Guevara's works. III. 270. *b.*
Sebucker cuts off his brother's head. I. 286. *a.*
Sebuldingius (Cornelius) publishes a letter of Broughton to Theodore Beza, and several other things. II. 151. *a. b.*
Schurman, the modesty of that lady. IV. 148. *and a. b.*
Science or Learning: better a little of it than no health. III. 342. *a.*
Sciences: Lactantius pretends to have demonstrated, that there is no science in men. I. 411. *a.* An attempt to run down all science, is the boldest that ever was formed. 412. *a.* The trial of wits proper for the sciences, a book of John Huarte. III. 528. *and a. b.* See *Knowledge and Learning*.
Scientia Media does not mend the matter against the objections of the Manichæes. IV. 518. *a. b.* A reflexion upon that head. 519. *a.* How it was looked upon by Pope Clement VIII. 824.
Scioppius acts the part of a Divine unseasonably, with respect to a witty saying that is ascribed to Charles V. II. 438. *a.* Rallies Strada for saying that the whip of Charles V, is yet stained with his blood. 439. *b.* Insults the two Scaligers. V. 99. *b.* Was very satirical. II. 817. *b.* 818. *a. b.* 819. *a. b.* His tricks and plagiarisms with respect to Gifanias. III. 161. *a. b.* His exaggerations. 169. *b.* His blasphemy against the Holy Scripture. 500. *a.* His jest upon a part of Peter Deza's sermon. 896. *a.* He writes a most abusive satire against King James I. IV. 795. *b.* Is translated by Ogier. V. 91. *a. b.*
Scipio, Abderame is compared to him in point of continence. I. 14. *b.*
Scythians, what they told Alexander. IV. 572. *b.* A stupid people, needed only to despise pleasures, or not to know them. V. 814.
Sytianus, an Arabian, his impieties. IV. 90. *a. b.* 91. *a.*
Slavonian: the Bible translated into the Slavonian tongue by George Dalmatin, and Adam Bohoritch. II. 585. Truberus was the first who taught the art of writing in it. V. 405. A book which he translated into that language. *ibid.*
Scitist, their opinion concerning the nature of Universals, is only a disguised Spinozism. I. 26. *a.* II. 412. *b.* 413. *a. b.*
Scorus, his subtilties despised by OEcolumpius. IV. 400.
Scourge: who was called the Scourge of Princes, and for what reason. I. 435. *and a. b.*
Scribere, what is to be understood by that word. I. 351. *a. b.*
Scripture (Holy): a doctrine, which attacks the authority of it. I. 106. *a. b.* 107. *a.* Alabaster's method of explaining it. 174. *a. b.* 175. *a.* Whether the materials and principles of all arts and sciences may be fetched from it. 234. *and a. b.* Whether in the intention of the Church of Rome, the Laity were excluded from reading it. 495. *a.* The simplicity of its style, disgusts St Augustin. 563. Whether the Laity are obliged to understand it in the originals. 599. *a. b.* According to certain Controversists, the interpretation of it should be accommodated to the time. 616. *b.* 617. *a. b.* Whether the Divinity of it can be proved. 706. *a. b.* 707. *a.* Bedell sets on foot a translation of it into the Irish language. 718. *a.* Salmasius declares that the Holy Scripture is less obscure than *Æchylus*. II. 827. *a.* Unworthily treated by some Roman Catholic Doctors. III. 500. *a. b.* A thought of the Historian Peter Matthieu, concerning the manner of teaching it. 536. *a.* How a visionary would have had it read to the people. 672. *a. b.* 673. *a.* It is not always to be explained according to the rules of Grammar. IV. 857. *a.* Has been handled by the Christians, much after the same manner as Justinian's Code. *ibid.* There are certain things and expressions in it, which will confound the deepest Metaphysicians. 876. *a. b.* What free-thinkers say of the spirit that dictated the Holy Scripture. V. 35. *a.* Is not afraid of shocking modesty, by expressing things naturally, and without circumlocution. 133. *a.* See *Bible*. A singular example, to prove that the letter of it killeth. IV. 723. *a. b.* The Socinians should be attacked by it, since they acknowledge its authority. V. 820. Should be the principle of the disputes among Christians. 830. The variations and corruptions which the Heretics have introduced into the manuscripts of the Holy Scripture. III. 733.
Scriuerius, what he cites from Scaliger. V. 395. *a. b.* &c.
Scuderi, his complaints that his pension was ill paid. III. 176. *a. b.*
Scuderi (Madam de) writ all her works out of her own head. II. 778. *b.* Delivered romance from an economy injurious to her sex, and to decorum in general. III. 867. *a.* What she says of authors who love to dedicate their books. IV. 843. *b.* Is called the Sappho of our days. V. 44. *b.*
Scullion: the story of a Scullion's conversation with Lewis XI, King of France. III. 803. *a.*

Sculptors

- Suspens*: who were never pleased with their own works. V. 134. *a. b.*
- Scallatus* was extremely desirous to see the Lutherans and Reformed re-united. IV. 681. *b.*
- Sea*, whether it ought to be subject, as well as the earth, to the dominion of some States. III. 217. *a.*
- Sea of Histories*. See *Mare Historiarum*.
- Sebasta* changes its name into that of Eleusa. I. 421. *b.* A conjecture concerning that alteration. *ibid.*
- Seckendorf*, a particular which he found concerning Aleander. I. 215. *b.*
- Secret*: a secret discovered, which was pleasing to many. I. 36. *b.* It is a great misfortune to know secrets that are disagreeable to one's sovereign. IV. 443. *a. b. c.* The best course a man can take is to behave, as if he had entirely forgot them. 444. *b.*
- Self*: a new sect think themselves happy at first, if they can obtain liberty of conscience, but they soon want to be upon an equal footing with others, and last of all to be masters. I. 13. *b.* 14. *a. b.* II. 121. *a. b.* Nothing is more common than to see persons, who have fled for their religion, ringing the alarm against the sects. III. 758.
- Selfish*, when they quarrel, hate one another more than they hate those from whom they have separated themselves. I. 198. *b.*
- Self*, a prejudice which prevails in all sects. I. 51. *and a. b.* A sect may very soon become unlike its founder. III. *b.* The means employed to hinder their growing powerful, are pretty much alike every where. 288. *a. b.* 289. *a. b.* 290. *a.* Why tolerated by the States-General. 288. *b.* 289. *a.* The desire of revenge may induce a man to embrace a sect. III. 29. *b.* Sects that are tolerated, have generally this injustice done to them, that they are suspected of ill designs. 42. *b.* It is natural for a sect that is ill used, to rejoice at the troubles in which the State is involved. 396. *b.* 397. *a.* There is no sect which entirely triumphs over the others. IV. 908. *b.* They change their spirit and maxims, in proportion as they change their state and condition. V. 454. *a. b.* 473. *a.* The divisions that reigned among those which are separated from Popery. 450. *b.* Several sects are formed among the Protestants at Lyons. 483. *and b.* Viret employs the authority of the Papists to curb them. *ibid. and n.* (25).
- Secular Games*, when the fifth were celebrated. II. 397. *a.* Vossius affirms without any foundation, that they were celebrated in the beginning of the VIIIth century of Rome. 396. *b.* 397. *a.*
- Seditious*: a sedition quelled by the silence of a Pythagorean. I. 379. *a. b.* 380. *a.* What they are in Republics. V. 62. *n. (f).*
- Seditious*: how criminal seditious persons are in the sight of God. IV. 488. *a. b.* The Catholics and Protestants mutually accuse one another of a seditious spirit. V. 89. *a. b.*
- Seed*, whether that of all living creatures be animated. V. 114. *a. b.* 115. *a.*
- Seem*: persons who rather chose to be virtuous, than to seem virtuous. I. 278. *b.* 279. *a. b.* II. 420. *b.* 421. *a.* III. 697. *a. b.* 729. *and a. b.*
- Segrais* quoted. V. 488. *a. n.* (39). 490. *n. (d).*
- Seguin* (Peter) a famous Physician in the faculty of Paris. I. 172.
- Segur-Pardailan* deputed to the Protestant Princes. II. 142. *b.* 143. *a. b. c.* He revered Brocard as a second St Paul. 144. *b.*
- Sejanus*, a fatality which was said to attend a horse of that name. II. 348. *b.*
- Sejanus* kept up a criminal correspondence with the wife of Drusus. II. 718. *a. b.* His artifices. 719. *a. b.* 720. *a.* Is praised immoderately. IV. 494. *b.* 495. *a.*
- Sene*, the god of that river curses the Marshal d'Ancre. II. 543. *a.*
- Self-murder*. III. 911. *a. b.* 912. *a. b.* 913. *a. b.* A furious doctrine concerning it, and the murder of our neighbours. V. 14. *a. b.* Authorized by the laws of a country. 627. *a. b.* 628. *a. b.*
- Selim*, Emperor of the Turks, was a Painter. IV. 307. *b.* 308. *a.*
- Seller*, we ought not to take advantage of his ignorance, when he does not know the just price of his merchandise. III. 440. *a. b.* A law to punish those sellers who conceal what they ought to acquaint the buyers with. I. 13.
- Selvaggi* (Ricciarda de') we are obliged to her for the preservation of Cinus's *Canzoniere*. II. 508. *n. (d).*
- Semiramis* was prodigiously lascivious. I. 523. *a.* Whether the built Babylon. 596.
- Senate* (Roman) divests two consuls of their office, for the disrespect which they had shewn to a letter from them. II. 291. *a.* Makes Cæsar proud by the honours which they confer upon him, and then hate him for being proud. 422. *a.* Was subject to all the laws made by the people. III. 490. *a. b.*
- Senators* censured for appearing in an unbecoming dress. II. 384. *b.* 385. *a. b.* Deprived of all their tribunals of justice. 711. *b.* Restored to the possession of them. 712. *b.*
- Senef*: particulars of the battle of Senef. V. 190. *b.* 191. *a.*
- Seneca* makes use of a thought of Agathon. I. 126. *b.* How he defines probity. 185. An excellent rule which he prescribed. 278. *b.* 279. *a.* A thought of that Philosopher. 453. *a.* Is censured for having ascribed to Aristides what he should have applied to Phocion. 460. *b.* Recommended poverty in the midst of opulency. 751. *b.* A judicious criticism of his. II. 483. *a. b.* 484. *a.* He looked upon what the antients have said of Jupiter's thunderbolt as a pious fraud. 573. *b.* His anachronism, with respect to Alexander, and his conversation with Diogenes. 667. *a.* What he says of Ephorus, and in general of all Historians. 771. *b.* 772. *a.* Quoted. 847. *b.* 848. *a. n.* (31). How he could lay it down for matter of fact, that no Roman had applied himself to write fables. 833. *b.* His rules concerning the chastity of women. III. 601. *b.* 602. *a.* In what case he thinks a man commits adultery in lying with his own wife. IV. 540. *a.* He has refuted himself in his writings, as to what he says of the souls of beasts. 549. *b.* According to him, none can be a good man without the assistance of God. 573. *a. b.* He laughs at the great number of books which had been writ on the Sophism called the *Liar*. 617. *a. b.* Displays all the degrees of Scepticism. V. 607. *b.* 608. *a.* Some fine maxims which he lays down. II. 259. *a. b.* His works translated into French by Matthew de Chabert. 430. *and a.* The judgment that was made of that translation. *ibid. a.*
- Seneca* (Christian): a good piece of Joseph Hall under that title. III. 345.
- Sensaray*, Prevost de l'Hotel; his behaviour to President de la Place. IV. 682. *b.* 683. *a.*
- Sensation*: why custom blunts the edge of our sensations. IV. 514. *a. b.* If it be a modification of body, then all bodies are sensible substances. II. 658. *a. b.* 660. *b.* 661. *a. b.* It cannot be the effect of the sole disposition of the organs. *ibid. b.* Is distinct from all the modifications of body that are come to our knowledge. *ibid. and 779. b.* Whether it depends upon our free will. V. 764. 765.
- Sense* (common) there are persons who lose it with regard to some things, and who nevertheless shew their judgment through all the rest of their conduct. V. 405. *b.*
- Sense* (Mythic) persecution makes a man wonderfully clear-sighted in discovering it. III. 772. *b.*
- Senses*: whether the pleasures of the senses are not spiritual. II. 781. *a. b.* Whether the evidence of the senses is proved by these words of JESUS CHRIST, *Handle me, and see*. V. 614. *b.* 615. *a.*
- Sentences* strongly affect the mind. I. 461. *a.* Should be incorporated with the thread of the discourse in an imperceptible manner. V. 327. *and b.*
- Sepher Jexirab*, a book of great weight with the Cabalists. I. 173. *a.*
- Sequer*, a strange accident occasioned by the pronunciation of that word in a tragedy. I. 175.
- Serarius* (Nicolas), a Jesuit; Broughton communicated to him copies of very harsh letters which he writ to Beza, with full liberty to publish them. II. 150. *b.* 151. *a. b.*
- Serarius* (Petrus) deposed from the ministry for his errors. IV. 123. *a.*
- Serius*, discourses supposed to have passed in evening conversations; a book writ by William Bouchet. II. 103.

- II. 103. There is a good deal of learning in it, mixed with many jokes, puns, and gross obscenities. *ibid.*
- Sereia* (Stilicon's wife) marries her two daughters to the Emperor, who both die maids. III. 482. *a. b.* 483. *a. b.*
- Sermons*, what Peter Aretin said of them. I. 436. *a.* What kind of sermons are most approved by the Protestants. II. 520. *b.* Bloody sermons. III. 874. *a. b.* Sermons preached upon the letter O. IV. 828. *b.* The great success of Savonarola's sermons. V. 57. *a. b.*
- Serpents*: divers reflexions on the serpent which tempted our first parents. II. 851. *a. b.* 852. *a. b.* A faculty that is ascribed to them. IV. 182. *a.* Serpents that grew tame and familiar with women and children. 403. *b.* Several have passed for the fathers of several great men. 407. *b.* 408. *a. b.* A singular story about a piece of money that was changed into a serpent. III. 487. *a. b.*
- Serranus* (Joannes), a false name taken by Francis Lambert. III. 709. *a. b.*
- Serris* (John de) adds a particular to the story of Pope Joan. IV. 731. *b.*
- Serris* (Lewis de) translates into French John de Renou's tracts. IV. 864. *and a. b.* Was of Dauphiné. *ibid. b.*
- Servant-Maids*: persons that have married their own servant-maids. I. 446. *a. b.* II. 139. *b.* 140. *a.* 618. *b.* V. 403. *b.* Are more liable to be debauched than other women, and are likewise in great danger of being punished. IV. 503. *a.* One that lies with her master, is not punished, but rewarded. II. 508. *a.*
- Servetus*, in what year he was burnt at Geneva for his Heresies. IV. 388. *a.* Strange consequences are drawn from an axiom of his concerning the presence of God. III. 100.
- Servetus*, that cannot be rewarded, produce ingratitude. II. 737. *a. b.*
- Servien* (Mr) loses his temper in an assembly of the States-General. II. 153. *a.*
- Servin* (Lewis) Advocate-General of the Parliament of Paris, treated in a brutal manner. II. 459. *a.* Censured for displaying too much reading and learning in his pleadings. 106. *a. b.*
- Sesterce*, its value reduced to the French Coin. II. 837. *a. b.*
- Sethians*, Heretics, vented an Apocalypse of Abraham. I. 46. *a.*
- Severus* (the Emperor) complains to the Senate of the honours paid to Clodius Albinus. I. 395. *a.* What enquiries he chiefly made, when he resolved to marry again. III. 603. *a.* Why he so patiently bore with his wife's lewdness. 604. *b.*
- Severus* (Sulpicius) highly disapproves the punishment of Heretics. III. 758. *a. b.*
- Severity*: the strange severity of a father to his own son. II. 343. *b.* 344. *a.* Different accounts of that matter. *ibid.*
- Seville*, when the admiralty was established there. I. 362.
- Sexus*, a Monk that had both sexes. V. 4. *b.* 5. *a.*
- Sforza* (Lewis) his wickedness and cruelty. I. 403. *b.* 404. *a.* He falls into the hands of the French. III. 811. *a. n.* (17). 814. *a.* Would have no soldier that set up for a wit in his service. IV. 460. *a.*
- Sforza* (Bona), Queen-Dowager of Poland, dies in poverty and infamy. I. 405. *b.* Rewards a dedication with a pension of 300 crowns. II. 462.
- Sforza* (Galeazzo) assassinated, by whom, and for what. III. 715. *and a. b.* 716. *and a. b.*
- Sforza* (Blanche) is killed by a fall from her horse while she was a hunting. III. 530. *a.*
- Shame* is no less subject than other things to the caprice of the fashion. III. 453. *a. b.* 454. *a. b.*
- She-Pope*, if ever the Church of Rome should make one, she will find her apology ready drawn up in Father Mainferme's works. III. 63. *a.*
- Ship*: what the ancients said of the tree that served to build the first ship. IV. 363. *a.*
- Shipwreck*: it is pleasant to see a shipwreck, which we are not in fear of. IV. 34. *b.*
- Shock*: men know not whom they shock when they reprehend the ignorance of those, who would pass for artists in the presence of greater masters. I. 377.
- Shumamite*: how we are to understand the History of the Shumamite, according to St Jerome. III. 281. *a. b.* 860. *a.*
- Siam* (the King of) is pulled down from the throne for having too much favoured the Christian missionaries. I. 13. *a. and n.* (6).
- Siam's* acknowledge no Deity, though they believe the apparition of spirits. IV. 939. *a.* By what motives they may be prevailed upon to embrace virtue and fly from vice. V. 180. *a. b.* 181. *a. b.* 182. *a.* They believe that Jesus Christ and Thevathat are the same. 183. *b.*
- Sibil of Cumes* tempted by Apollo. II. 339. *a.*
- Sicbarbas* marries his niece Dido, and is killed by his brother-in-law Pygmalion. IV. 642. *and a.*
- Sick People*, the tricks which are put upon them sometimes. III. 614. *b.* Whether we ought to pray to God for their recovery, when sickness makes them better men. IV. 487. *b.*
- Sickness*: there are people who put off believing in God till sickness presses them. II. 12. *b.* 13. *a.* 647. *b.* 648. *a. b.* 649. *a.*
- Siege*: a custom which has been observed for a long time with respect to Kings, who assist at a siege. III. 718. *a. b.*
- Sigebert*, what he says of the She-Pope. IV. 728. *b.* 729. *a. b.* It is not to be found in some manuscripts. 728. *b.* Spanheim owns that it is a parenthesis, which may be taken away without injuring the thread of the discourse. 729. *a. b.*
- Sigeb* besieged and taken by Sultan Solymas, in the sight of the Emperor. III. 780. *a.*
- Sigismund* (Augustus) gives over his project of a reformation in Poland. III. 848. 849. Whether he banished all the Antitrinitarians out of Poland. 901.
- Sigismund* (John) embraces the doctrine of the Socinians. II. 17. *a.*
- Silence* quells a sedition. I. 379. *a. b.* 380. *a.* Justified by shameful nonsense. 758. *a.* Whether we ought to keep silence, when we have to do with people of an impetuous temper. II. 195. *b.* It is the most difficult thing in the world to an author that is attacked. IV. 839. *a.*
- Silens*, what he thought of life. V. 414. *a. b.*
- Silk-worms*, who invented the art of spinning their production. V. 627. *a.*
- Sylla* sends Apellicon's library to Rome. I. 335. *a.* His library-keeper permits the Bookellers to get Aristotle's works transcribed. *ibid. b.* What he said of Caesar. II. 417. *a.* Though he was very far from Atheism, he paid no regard to things sacred, when his interest was concerned. 419. *a.* He knew nothing of the gallantries of his wife, when they were the town-talk of Athens. III. 382. *a.* Treats the city of Athens very harshly, and for what reason. IV. 200. Boldly transgresses the Sumptuary laws which he himself had enacted. 202. Thought fit to assume the surname of Fortunatus. V. 366. *b.* 367. *a.*
- Syllogism*, what is the foundation of it. II. 327. *b.* Carneades strongly opposed it. *ibid.* Chrysippus undermined the foundation of it. 494. *b.* 495. *a.*
- Sylva Nuptialis*, the History of that book. IV. 358. *and a. b.* 359. *and a. b.*
- Sylvanus* (Plantius) being accused of the murder of his wife, puts himself to death, in order to escape condemnation. V. 516. His wife being accused of having occasioned his distraction by witchcraft, is declared innocent. IV. 385. *and a. b.*
- Sylvester II*, Pope, his genealogy. II. 240. *b.* 241. *a.*
- Sylvester of Florence*, a Jacobin Friar, hanged with Savonarola, and for what reason. V. 64. 65.
- Sylvester de Laval*, a Capuchin, reproaches the Protestants with their obstinacy in the article of Pope Joan. IV. 739. *b.* 740. *a. b.*
- Sylvius*, a Chymist, condemned for his crimes. IV. 262. *b.* Cardinal Richelieu makes use of his writings. *ibid.*
- Sylvius* (Æneas) who was afterwards Pope under the name of Pius II, is the first who called the story of the She Pope in question, and that too very faintly. IV. 731. *and b.* 732. *a.* 710. *b.*
- Similaris*, his epitaph. II. 430. *b.*
- Simon* (Richard) quoted concerning the Dutch translation of the bible. I. 246. *a.* His judgment of St Augustin. 565. *a. b.* 566. *a.* And of le Fevre's commentaries

- commentaries on the Bible. III. 48. *a. b.* And of a book of Father Petavius. IV. 601. *a. b.* What he says of the Benedictines. III. 126. *a. b.* 127. *a. b.* And of a pretended disciple of Port-Royal. V. 178. *b.* 179. *a.* Quoted. IV. 77. *b. n.* (20), (22). 78. *b. n.* (26). 79. *a. n.* (32), (34). 391. *a. n.* (56). *Et passim alibi.* Praised and afterwards abused by Jurieu. V. 802.
- Simone* advises the Pope not to send a new Legate to Trent, and why. III. 499. *a. b.*
- Simonides*, one of his sayings. II. 726. *b.* IV. 654. *a. n.* (9).
- Simonis Religio*; a conjecture concerning that book. V. 151. *a.*
- Sympathy*: an instance of a surprizing sympathy. III. 305. *b.* 306. *a.*
- Simplicity* without elegance is much better than a fine Latin style which corrupts the sense of the original. V. 60. *a.*
- Simplicius*, the difficulty about the origin of evil was thought by him to be of great importance. IV. 527. *b.* His reasonings against two principles. V. 826.
- Sin*, a whole nation punished for that of a particular person. I. 158. *a. b.* 159. *a.* What was Eve's first sin. II. 856. *a. b.* 857. *a.* How the sin of uncleanness is successfully resisted. III. 64. *b.* Whether it be an accident of the soul. 558. *a. b.* The unnatural sin. 612. *b.* The origin of sin explained by a new hypothesis. 904. *a.* The difficulty of finding the origin of it. IV. 513. *a. b.* 514. *a. b.* 515. *a. b.* 516. *a. b.* 517. *a.* What use is to be made of the dispute on that subject. 519. *a.* There is no sect which does not abhor the doctrine that makes God the author of sin. 522. *b.* 523. *a. b.* The question about the sin of ignorance is surrounded with precipices on all sides. 874. *a. b.* 875. *a. b.* People rather chuse to commit it, than to disoblige a Prince who can make or ruin their fortune. V. 811. See *Ignorance*.
- Sin* (Original) an explication not agreeable to that doctrine. II. 605. *a. b.* 606. *a.* A tenet which differs from the doctrine of Original Sin, in its circumstances only. V. 412. *a. b.* *Et c.*
- Sin* (Philosophical) a maxim that would carry it to the utmost point. III. 705. *a.*
- Sin against nature*, who is said to have been the first inventor of it. V. 325. *a.*
- Sin*: whether a man that sins mortally, ceases to believe the truths of the Gospel. II. 176. *a.*
- Synagogue*, a specimen of its ceremonies. I. 96. *a. b.* What are the synagogues which the laws suffer the Jews to possess. III. 220. *a. b.*
- Synagogue of Amsterdam* is supposed to have writ a letter to Mr Jurieu. II. 175. *b.*
- Synodus*, his institution of a Christian Prince translated by Daniel d'Auge. I. 562. *a.*
- Singers*: a famous singer of the Pontneuf at Paris. II. 600. *b.* 601. *a.* How they lived in former times. III. 224. *a.*
- Synod of Dort*, its decision. IV. 64. *b.* 65. *a.* Its correspondence with the court. V. 513. *b.* 514. *a. b.* The Arminians except against it. II. 793.
- Synod* (Walloon) complains to the Synod of the isle of France, and for what. II. 583. *a. b.* No longer looks upon the doctrine of Universal Grace as a dangerous opinion, and why. 584. *b.*
- Synodicon in Gallia Reformata*, remarks on that book. I. 671. *a. b.*
- Synods* attempts made to strip them of their authority. IV. 839. *b.* 840. *a.*
- Synods* of France; their decree relating to the Oriental tongues. I. 246. *b.* 247. *a.* There were four persons in them, who formed what was called the Table. 265. *b.* The national Synod of Charenton gives a particular charge to its deputies, not to deliver their speech to the King on their knees. 261. *a.* And after several contests an audience, such as they desired, was granted. *ibid.* A great difference between the Synod of Rochelle in the year 1581. And that which was held at Mid-elburg in the same year. II. 144. *a.* Calvin refuses to comply with the regulations of the Synod of Lausanne. 264. *b.* The Synod of the isle of France makes an act, forbidding all flights of imagination, in expounding the word of God. IV. 274. *b.*
- Sinope*, a city of Paphlagonia, and a city of Pontus at the same time. IV. 113. *b.*
- Sinaita* (Gabriel) a Maronite, his quarrel with one of his brethren. II. 733. *a.* Whether it could be of any service to Mr Claude in his dispute with Mr Arnauld. *ibid.* *b.* 734. *a.* When he was a professor at Paris, he had not three auditors, though his reputation was great in foreign countries. IV. 493. *a.*
- Syracusa* cautes Sanar to be assassinated, and makes himself master of Egypt. IV. 383.
- Syracuse*, confusions that happened there. III. 452. *a. b.* 467. *b.* 468. *a.*
- Syracusians* put two tyrants to death. V. 365. *a.*
- Syriscus*; Orichovius remonstrates to Pope Paul III, the injustice of his law touching the celibacy of Priests. IV. 296. *a. b.* 411. *a. b.*
- Sirmond* (Father) what he called Blondel. II. 27. *a.* Whether he repented of having published a certain letter of Geoffroy of Vendôme. III. 66. *b.* 67. *a.* unjustly attacked by Mr Tollius, and defended by the Jesuits. 853. *a. b.*
- Syrnabam* was an interpreter of dreams. I. 87.
- Surname*, what was the use of it among the Romans. I. 357. *a.* Several families have taken their surname from some defect. 610. *a.*
- Sirvela* (Martin Vafques) had a fine library at Seville. IV. 615. *a. (c).*
- Sifenna*, an Orator affected to make use of obsolete expressions. I. 63. *a. n.* (62).
- System of the Church*, that book fully justifies the Church of Rome. I. 476. *a. b.*
- Systems*: false systems are incoherent. I. 210. If we depart from the system of a God who freely created the world, we must necessarily admit of a multiplicity of principles. II. 644. *a.* What it is that makes the system of Atoms less absurd than Spinozism. *ibid.* The usefulness of the system of occasional causes to solve certain difficulties. 767. *b.* The inconveniences and motives of the reformation of systems. III. 863. *b.* They require two things to make them good. IV. 94. *a.* Their reasonableness consists in including nothing repugnant to evident ideas. V. 825.
- Sisters*, their hatred is more violent than that of brothers. II. 701. *a.*
- Sixtus* IV, Pope, one of his first cares after his exaltation. II. 97. *a. b.* His answer to Wesselius, who only asked him a copy of the Bible. V. 545. *b.* 546. *a.*
- Sixtus* V, a witty saying which is attributed to him. I. 34. *b.* His bull against the King of Navarre and the Prince of Condé. II. 71. *a. b.* His esteem and desire with respect to Queen Elizabeth. 758. *a. b.* How he stood affected to the King of Spain and the League. *ibid.* *b.* 759. *a.* What he said of Henry III, III. 408. *b.* He chose rather to countenance Henry IV, and Queen Elizabeth, than to suffer the King of Spain to grow too powerful. 568. *b.* Introduced the custom of not lending the hat to Cardinals newly elected. I. 604. *b.* Causes an offer to be made of the Infanta of Spain to James VI, King of Scotland, and upon what conditions. II. 577.
- Sixus* (Francis) translates the Anatomical History of Du Laurens. III. 745. *b.* Why that translation has no figures. 746. *a.*
- Slander* does not even spare the greatest actions. I. 14. *a.* That of Archilochus occasions proverbs. 425. *a. b.* Every body has reason to be afraid of it, and why. 490. *b.* It is impossible that persons of different sexes should have frequent conversations together, without being exposed to it. II. 767. *a.* The mortal effects of it. III. 464. *a. b.* 465. *a. b.* It spares certain women. 601. *b.* 602. *a. b.* Great men despise it out of policy and a greatness of soul. IV. 569. *a. b.* It is a very difficult matter to confute slanders that have the air of probability. 692. *a. b.* Slanders ought not to be slightly credited. V. 334. *a. b.* See *Satires*. Princes that have despised them. 759. *Et c.* They are to be feared when they are accompanied with witty sayings. 759. Reflexions upon those that are published against men who change their religion. 224. *b.* 225. *a. b.* 226. *a.*
- Slanderrers* do not even spare themselves sometimes. I. 426. *a. b.*

Slaves,

- Slaves*, the practice of the ancient Romans in enfranchising them. II. 100. *a. b.* Slaves who gave occasion for a proverb. 302. *b.*
- Sleidan* justified against Father Maimbourg's accusations. I. 721. *a. b.* His History. V. 255. *b. n.* (10). 293. *a.* Censured on the head of Gaucicus's country. II. 499. *b.* Confuted as to what he says of Gropper's having once inclined to Lutheranism. III. 240. *and a. b.* Translates ill a passage of Philip de Comines. V. 60. *a.* Pezelius writes a Commentary intitled, *Mellificium Historicum*, on his treatise *de Quatuor Monarchiis*. IV. 606. *b.*
- Shane* (Sir Hans) a Physician of London; his fine library. II. 477. *a. n.* (1).
- Sloth* offends Heaven, which does not hear the prayers of the slothful. I. 94. *b.*
- Smalcalde* (the League of) their army overcome by Charles V, at the battle of Mulberg. III. 878. *a.*
- Smerdians* shaved by an effect of jealousy. I. 292. *a.*
- Smetius* (Martin) runs over all Italy, to make a collection of inscriptions. III. 251. *a.* Is hanged at Brussels by the soldiers. *ibid. a. b.*
- Smiglecius*, a Jesuit, unjustly ranked among the Sociinians. III. 661. *a.*
- Smith* (Richard) Bishop of Chalcedon, being sent into England, is obliged to leave it, and for what reason. III. 665. *a.*
- Smyrna*, a woman of that city poisons her husband, and for what reason. II. 681. *a. b.* There is a wild cherry-tree there, which the Greeks say was the staff of St Polycarp. III. 431. *a.*
- Sober*: whether a man may be so, and yet drink a great deal. I. 567. *a. b.* 568. *a. V.* 576. *a.*
- Sobieski*, King of Poland, two or three hundred leagues off, destroys a book which was just ready to be put to the press. III. 680. *a.*
- Societies*: in all Societies there must be a tribunal, to give sentence without appeal, in the disputes of private persons. IV. 65. *a.*
- Societies* (Religious) how they are kept pure. III. 903. *a. b.*
- Sociniansism* begun to take root in Poland and Transylvania. II. 16. *a.* Why there is no reason to fear that Princes will embrace it. V. 171. *b.* It is only fit for some persons. 172. *a. b.* Whence it took its rise in Poland. 229. *a. b.* Those who are for making use of reason in matters of Divinity, become suspected of it. 817.
- Socinians*, the difficulties into which they involve themselves by denying the creation. II. 789. *a. b.* Their sect not calculated, to answer the objections of the Manichees, touching the origin of evil. IV. 419. *b.* By denying the Preſcience of God, they reduce him to a pitiful form of government, without removing the grand difficulty, which makes him the author of sin. 518. *a.* They have drawn great advantages from a book of Father Petavius. 601. *a. b.* Their sentiments touching the souls of beasts. 905. *a.* They commend in the Dutch, a conduct which Socinus had very much blamed. V. 170. *b.* 171. *a.* A general objection that is raised against them. 178. They take advantage of their adversaries forbidding the reading of their writings. 506. *b.* Their sentiments touching the mutability of an eternal nature. 588. *b.* Kester successfully employed Logic in refuting them. III. 660. *a. b.* 661. *a. b.* The difficulty of confuting their Philosophical objections: we must attack them by Scripture, the authority of which they acknowledge. 820. What their God is, according to Jureu. 824.
- Socrates* played with his Children. I. 131. *b.* The way that he proposes for attaining to virtue. 279. *a.* He ridicules the Sophists of his time. 294. *a. b.* Says that the Fanatics resemble Poets. 303. *a.* His censure on a book of Anaxagoras. 309. *b.* 310. *a.* And the answer to that censure. *ibid. a. b.* 311. *a.* His way was to dispute *pro* and *con*. What he says on occasion of the palace of Archelaus being beautified. 417. *b.* 418. *a.* He refuses to go to the Court of Macedon. *ibid. a. b.* His maxim, *quod supra nos nihil ad nos*. 462. *a.* The faults of some of his scholars unjustly imputed to him. II. 569. *b.* 570. *a.* Why firnamed *the Melian*. 653. *a. b.* What he did to obey the god of dreams, who had ordered him to apply himself to the Muses. 830. *a. b.* Whether Euripides had an eye to him in his *Palamedes*. 874. *a. b.* What he said of Beauty. III. 65. *a.* What he did, in order to lay in a good stock of patience. 312. *b.* What he said of a kiss given to a fine face. IV. 796. *b.* 797. *a.* Why his marriage with Xantippe did not interrupt his lectures. V. 165. *a.* The description which he gives of the prerogatives of human nature. 583. *b.* 584. *a.*
- Sodomy* committed in temples, as a pious action. III. 773. *b.* Whether it be true that a petition was presented to Sixtus IV, for leave to exercise it, during certain months of the year. V. 157, 158. *and b.* 159. *a. b.* 160. *a. b.* *Sc.* Whether John della Casa intended to make an encomium upon it in his detestable *Capitolo del Forno*. 422. *a. b.* 423. *a. b.* Abolition from that crime, what it costs. I. 628. *a. b.* The Dominicans take a resolution to exclaim loudly against it. 855. *a. b.*
- Soldier*, one who saves his life by a jeft. I. 709. *a.* Women prefer soldiers to all other men. V. 664.
- Solyman* cuts in pieces Ferdinand's army, which besieged Buda. III. 532. Puts to death his favourite Ibrahim Basha. 588. *b.*
- Solipsians*, or *Monarchia Solipsorum*. III. 563. *b.* *and n.* (5 *a.*) 564. *a. b.*
- Solitar*, an abbey in the county of Hanaw, how reformed. III. 875.
- Solitude* (the love of), what judgment some people have made of it. I. 583. *a.*
- Solicitors* in the affair of love, generally pay themselves with their own hands. II. 632. *b.*
- Solomon*, the Jews and several Mahometans maintain that he understood the language of birds. V. 382. *a.* His views in causing Adenijah to be put to death. 803.
- Solon*, his answer to Pisistratus. II. 384. *b.* Unacceptable to Croesus, and why. 831. *a.* His answer to those who represented to him, that his tears could be of no service. III. 73. *b.* One of his maxims examined. 777. *b.* 778. *a.*
- Son*: a son reproached on his exposing his mother's love-letters. I. 388. *a.* Sons, to whom their father left no portion of inheritance, and why. II. 32.
- Son of God*: a man burnt for taking that title. IV. 269. *b.*
- Song of Songs* (the book of) Castilio's judgment upon that piece. II. 361. *b.*
- Songs* may be useful to States. V. 20. *a. b.* A song rewarded with an abbey. I. 428. *n.* (1). Those of which John de Wert was the burthen, have been revived several times, and the original of them. V. 540. *a. b.*
- Songs* (spiritual) set to the most burlesque ballad-tunes, by whom composed. I. 478. *b.* Whether we are to condemn such as are set to the same airs with prophane ballads. *ibid. a. b.*
- Sonnet*, what Boileau says of it. III. 177. *b.* The Sonnet of Job compared with that of Urania. I. 752. *a. b.* Sonnets prepared for books that were to come out. II. 620. *b.* A devout Sonnet. 647. *a. b.* Sonnet of the Abortive, by whom composed. III. 392. *a.*
- Soothsayers*. See *Diviners*.
- Sophisms*, that called *the Liar*, was only a vain subtilty. II. 846. *b.* 847. *a.* IV. 616. *b.* 617. *a. b.*
- Sophocles*, the circumstances of his triumph over Æschylus. II. 825. *a. b.* Why he brought none but good and honest women on the stage. 868. *a.* He esteemed it a great pleasure, that old age had delivered him out of the hands of the fair sex. IV. 84. *a. n.* (24), (25). Rattall makes a fine Latin translation of him. 848. *a. b.* 849. *a. b.*
- Soracte*, a mountain where the Hirpi walked once every year on fire. III. 466. *b.* 467. *a.*
- Sorberiana*, a false thing advanced there concerning Bagni. I. 604. *b.* 605. *a.*
- Sorbiere* quoted. II. 87. *a. b. n.* (13), (14), (17). Complaints occasioned by his account of England. 278. *b.* He sees nothing at Rome but what edifies him. 475. *b.* An extract of a letter which he wrote on that subject, ill told by the author of the *Preservatif contre le changement de Religion*. *ibid.* 476. *a.* What he says of the absence of mind, for which Poets are remarkable. V. 402. *b.* 403. *a.*

Sorbonne :

- Sorbonne*: the censure which the Sorbonne passed on the works of Mary d'Agreda, betrays a want of resolution. I. 137. *a.* A little book on that subject. *ibid.* b. 138. *a.* Had not the courage to publish the censure without qualifying it. *ibid.* *a. b.* Censured by Agrippa, on occasion of Henry the eighth's divorce. 150. *b.* Taught as an article of faith, the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin. IV. 77. *b.* 78. *a.* Censures the book intitled, *Curiosities inouies, &c.* III. 122. *b.* Its decree against Henry III. 294. *b.* Strongly censures three sermons, upon the beatification of Loyola. 895. *a. b.* 896. *a. b.* Marot's verses against that society. IV. 153. *a. b.* Who are allowed to propose arguments against the Theſes that are maintained in the Sorbonne. 276. *b.*
- Sorcerers* are much more numerous than Inchanters. II. 243. *b.* What is the difference between them and Magicians. V. 385. *b.* A discourse on their impostures. I. 64. *b.* See *Inchanters, Magic, Magicians, Witchcraft, and Witches.*
- Sorcery*, what a Roman citizen, that was accused of it, did. V. 524. *a.*
- Sorel*, the censure which he passes on the obscene collections of the Poets. I. 65. *b.* And upon Paulus Æmilius's History of France. II. 763. *b.* 764. *a.* He blames those who alter the language of the old French authors. IV. 427. *b.* 428. *a.* Quoted. I. 65. *b. n.* (18), (19). His judgment of d'Audiguier. 548. and *a. n.* (1). And of John Huarte. III. 528. *b.* 529. *a. b.*
- Sorites*, a sophism which puzzled the Philosophers much. II. 492. *b.* 493. *a. b.* &c. What that sophism was. 846. *b.* 847. *a.*
- Sotades*, an ancient Poet treated with contempt, and why. I. 478. *a.*
- Sotuel* [or *Southwell*] (Father) latinizes a name after a wretched manner. I. 108. *a.* Read but few books of Controversy. *ibid.* Is inferior to Alegambus. 219. *a. b.* Confounds two Jesuits, Father Fevrier with Father Ferrier. III. 43. *a. b.*
- Souches* (de) was a Frenchman indeed, but not General of the French. III. 793. *b.*
- Sovereigns*, religion enervates their authority. I. 13. *a.* III. 624. *a.* Whether a person be obliged to restore to them what he has taken from them. I. 13. *b.* A good book might be wrote on the religion of sovereigns. 130. *b.* 460. *a.* II. 440. *a.* They commit faults, for which their subjects are punished. I. 158. *b.* 159. *a.* In punishing transgressors, are not directed by the sinfulness of the action. 223. *a.* The taking up arms against them condemned by Amyraut. 264. *b.* 265. *a. b.* We ought never to slight those, who have a chance for rising to that dignity. 421. *b.* 422. *a.* Authors engage them in their petty quarrels. 670. *b.* An article of their religion. 721. *a.* What their religion is. II. 754. *b.* 755. *a.* III. 94. *a. b.* They are often tricked by their Generals. I. 764. *a.* The necessity of the times dispenses them from the obligation even of an oath, according to the laws of policy. II. 213. *a.* III. 182. *a.* IV. 698. *a.* Their unavoidable dependence on the clergy. II. 149. *b.* Whether a private person may lawfully bear arms against his sovereign. 106. *a.* A case wherein it is lawful to depose sovereigns. 254. *a.* They are often unfortunate in their families. 607. *b.* 608. *a.* Whether they ought to depend upon the fidelity of their subjects. *ibid.* Their gratitude is not subject to the same laws, with the gratitude of private persons towards one another. 755. *b.* There is a great difference between their passions and those of private men. III. 182. *a.* IV. 698. *a.* They sacrifice to their temporal interest that of their religion. III. 234. *b.* 235. *a.* 397. *b.* 403. *a. b.* V. 457. *a.* They do not always suit themselves in their rewards, to the extent of their dominions. III. 275. *a.* Have at all times been curious to know the secrets of families. 320. *a. b.* The Protestants and Catholics have been observed to change maxims with respect to the right of sovereigns. 670. *a. b.* See *Monarchs.* They may be good, if we consider them as sovereigns, and bad, if we consider them as men. 767. *b.* 768. *a.* It is a crime to consult the future events of their lives. 955. *a. b.* They are generally unhappy at home. IV. 691. *b.* Whether they have children, or no children, their condition is still to be pitied. 758. *b.* 759. *a.* What their prerogative is, when their lives are concerned. V. 501. *a.* It is become customary to flatter them in dedications. II. 312. *b.*
- Sovereignty*, whether the rights of it belong to the people. I. 236. *a. b.* 237. *a. b.* 499. *a. b.* 500. *a.*
- Soul* (human) converted into a star by the Pagans. I. 348. *b.* 349. *a. b.* Is an aerial being according to Anaxagoras. 311. And according to Diogenes, the Natural Philosopher. II. 672. *b.* Is part of the substance of God according to Celsapinus. 412. *b.* The doctrine of the propagation of souls, substituted to the end of the Xth century. I. 345. *a.* An inquiry into the original of the soul, is a very obscure subject. 555. *a. b.* The mortality of the soul taught by Averrhoes. 557. *b.* 558. *a.* What it is according to the same Averrhoes. II. 316. *b.* What St Bernard believed concerning the state of the soul, when separated from the body. I. 774. The nature of the proof, drawn from the apparition of a soul, to evince the immortality of it. II. 66. *a. b.* 67. *a. b.* All the world does not admit of a necessary connexion between the immortality of the soul, and the providence of God. 450. *b.* 451. *a. b.* Notable diversities of the strength of the soul. *ibid.* b. 152. *a. b.* The strongest proofs of its immortality, are taken from the word of God. 455. *a.* Whether the eternity of it can be maintained, in case Aristotle's opinions were to be followed. 567. *a. b.* An invincible objection against Dicaarchus, who would not allow the soul to be distinct from the body. 658. *a. b.* Objections to the objection against Dicaarchus. 660. *b.* 661. *a.* Is distinct from all the modifications of body, that are come to our knowledge. *ibid.* *b.* Where you must find the principles of the greatest souls, without the help of Revelation. 673. *b.* Whether it be possible for a soul, separated from the body, to feel the same pain that a person feels when burnt. 781. *a. b.* Impious sentiments touching its mortality. III. 392. *b.* Mock of the Pagan Philosophers supposed that it was material. 650. *b.* Was composed of several parts, according to the doctrine of Epicurus. 790. *b.* 791. *a.* Other Philosophers are divided on that head. *ibid.* *b.* He who denies it to be a substance distinct from matter, reasons childishly, unless he supposes that all the universe is animated. 919. *b.* What becomes of it, when the man dies, according to Epicurus's system. 929. *a.* Luther's opinion touching the state of the soul. 949. *a.* Whether it be subject, as well as the body, to certain distempers. 948. *b.* Whether it separates locally from the body, at the moment the man expires. IV. 320. *b.* It has strange inequalities. 322. *b.* The ancient Philosophers believed that the souls of men, as well as those of beasts, were material. 548. *b.* 549. *a. b.* Reflexions concerning the immortality of the soul. 591. *b.* 592. *a. b.* Whether God creates a new soul, or reproduces the same. 655. *b.* Whether its immortality can be proved by good natural reasons. 714. *a. b.* 715. *a. b.* 720. *a. b.* Whether the doctrine of its mortality, would induce men to all manner of crimes. *ibid.* What idea the Pagans had of it. 787. *b.* 788. *a.* Whether the soul, being united with matter, can form to itself an organized habitation. V. 114. *a. b.* 115. *a.* Its unity in all men taught by some Philosophers. 214. *b.* 215. *a.* Whether a Spinozist ought to believe that it is immortal, and subject to the caprice of some invisible persecutor. 216. *b.* 217. *a.* Its capacity, whereby a man may turn his mind sometimes one way and sometimes another. 272. *b.* Francus pretended, that not only beasts, but the inanimate creation partook of a general soul, that was Divine. III. 100. Too much subjected to corporeal qualities, by John Huarte. 528. *b.* 529. *a.*
- Soul of the world*, the doctrine of it is not new. It made the principal part of the system of the Stoics. V. 200. *b.* 201. *a. b.*
- Souls of beasts*, Anaxagoras said they were intelligences, and gave them the same name which he gave to the first mover of matter. I. 301. *a.* Celsapinus affirmed that they were part of the substance of God. II. 412. *b.* Authors who believed that they are endowed with reason. IV. 911. *b.* 912. *a. b.* 913. *a.*

Space,

- Space*, whether it be nothing else but the immensity of God. V. 616. *a. b.* Suarez endeavours to explain how God may be present in imaginary space. III. 100. *b.*
- Spain*, several false Chronicles have been published there, to impose upon the credulity of people. I. 362. *b.* The women of that country are very glad to be alone with a man, who desires the last favour of them. II. 27. *b.* A smart repartee which an Ambassador of that Court made to the Pope. 474. *b.* Its Ambassador solicits succours in England, for the Duke of Rohan. III. 397. *b.* There is a certain convent in that kingdom, which every year furnishes a Monk that shuts himself up in a hot oven, and comes out in the sight of a multitude of people. 467. *b.* Its ascendancy over France in the XVth and XVIth centuries. IV. 310. *a. b.* Who were the first that discovered the darkness of Spain. 723. *a.*
- Spanheim* (Ezekiel) his learning and considerable employments. V. 194. *a.* 793. *n. (ii).*
- Spanheim* (Frederic) his Swifts Mercury. II. 551. *a. b.* He refutes there the pretended miracles, which were said to have happened during the siege of Constance. *ibid. b.* 552. *a. b.* If he had wrote the History of a siege, sustained by a Protestant town, perhaps he would have made observations, not unlike those which he confutes. *ibid. a.* Inherits the books of Samuel Durant, whose sermons he prints. 727. He does not answer the questions which Father Labbe proposed to Marelius, touching the maimed edition of Anastasius, which the Jesuits were reproached with. IV. 727. *a. b.*
- Spaniards*, their complaints against France, for concluding alliances with the Protestant powers. II. 338. *a. b.* And the answer that was made to their complaints. *ibid.* They are reproached with doing the very same thing, which they had found so much fault with in France. 755. *a.* The cause of the antipathy between them and the French. III. 809. *a. b.* The stratagem they made use of, when they re-took Maastricht. IV. 373. *a.* The Spaniards taken for gods by the Americans. 572. *b.* Are still more to blame than the French, on account of their esteem for Guevara. III. 270. *b.* The barbarity with which they treat Christopher Marcellus. IV. 106. An expression which discovered Texera's strong hatred against them. V. 319. They are generally negligent, when they write in Latin: an instance of it. III. 774. *a. b.*
- Sparrow*, one that gives notice to the other birds, by his singing, that a cartful of millet was broke near Porta Maggiore. III. 232. *b. n. (40).*
- Sparta*, *Spartans*. See *Lacedaemon*, *Lacedaemonians*.
- Speakers*, a sect of Philosophers, who give five proofs of the Unity of God. V. 828.
- Speech*, one abridged in a very short time. I. 633. *a. b.* Another struck out from the catalogue of the fair of Francfort. III. 169. *b.*
- Species* (Intentional) how called by Democritus and Epicurus. II. 388. *a.* Are the shame of the Peripatetics. 643. *a.*
- Speacles of Devotion*. See *Mysteries* (Dramatical).
- Spectres*, how the Pagan Exorcists used to drive them away. II. 775. *a. b.* That trade was looked upon as mean and mercenary. *ibid.*
- Sperlingen* (John) defends du Laurens against the extravagant censure of Colladon. III. 746. *a. b.*
- Speusippus*, his zeal for Plato. I. 467. *a.*
- Spies* have at all times taken notice of the manner how people talk of news. II. 627. *a.*
- Spigelius* translates into High-Dutch the Turkish Annals which Jerome Beck of Leopoldsdorf brought from Constantinople. III. 774. *b.*
- Spinoza*, his conformity with Aristotle. I. 470. II. 412. *b.* And with the Scotists. *ibid.* What he says of a man that should be in the condition of Buridan's ass. 227. *b.* There is no system which can less dispense itself from acknowledging, what is said of good and bad angels, among the people, than his. 251. *a.* 412. *b.* There is scarce any age, wherein his doctrine has not been taught. IV. 688. *b.* 689. *a.* A list of those persons who had the same opinion with him. V. 199. *a. b.* 200. *a. b.* 201. *a. b.* And of those who have confuted him. 207. *a. b.* 208. *a. b.* 213. *a. b.* His shifts and equivocations. 208. *b.* 209. *a. b.* 210. *a. b.* 211. *a. b.* 212. *a.* According to him, God and Extension are the same thing. 208. *b.* V O L. V.
209. *a. b.* 250. He deprives us as much as in him lies, of a principle, without which all our reasonings would be insignificant. 223. *b.* A demonstration against his system, taken from the principles of Xenophanes. 574. *b.* 575. *a. b.*
- Spinocism*: a disguised Spinozism. I. 26. *a.* Hypotheses which differ not at all, or very little, from it. 52. *a. b.* II. 672. *a. b.* III. 550. *a. b.* V. 186. *a. b.* 574. *a. b.* 575. *a. b.* An opinion that is more dangerous than it. 587. *b.* How it is unanswerably confuted. I. 553. *b.* 554. *a. b.* 555. *a. b.* Is more absurd than the system of atoms. II. 644. *a.* Was at bottom taught by some Philosophers, and almost in all ages. III. 649. *b.* 650. *a. b.* 651. *a.* IV. 688. *b.* 689. *a.* Origen had a tincture of it. 421. *b.* It is incompatible with the hypothesis of a vacuum. V. 617. *a.*
- Spinocists*, wherein their fallacy lies. I. 26. *a.* An absurdity to which their hypothesis reduces them. II. 496. *b.* A thought of Seneca, which they would easily approve. 573. *b.* They would be strangely puzzled, if they were forced to admit Mr Newton's demonstrations. III. 793. *b.* Have no solid consolation against death. 928. *b.* May take advantage of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, nay perhaps, they will have recourse to the mystery of the Trinity. V. 223. *a.*
- Spirits*: persons who lodged in rooms that were haunted with spirits. I. 225. II. 522. and *a. b.* 638. *a.* Whether it may be said that there are spirits of a more limited nature than man. I. 520. *b.* In what their motion consists according to the Cartesians. IV. 288. *a. b.* Hobbes's principles are no ways proper to make one deny the existence and operations of spirits. III. 471. *a. b.* 919. *b.* 920. *a.* Nor yet Spinoza's principles. V. 215. *a. b.*
- Spirits* (familiar): what was Plato's doctrine concerning such sort of spirits. IV. 689. *b.* 690. *a.*
- Spiritual substances*, whether among such as are created, the soul of man only is subject to change. II. 767. The Cartesians maintain that we can form no idea of a spiritual substance. V. 144. *a.* See *Soul*, understanding.
- Spiritualia* (Heteroclitia) the title of a book. IV. 833. *b.*
- Spizelius*, what he tells of an impious person, to give some idea of his impiety. V. 138. *b.*
- Span* (Dr) was unwilling to have it believed, that he made the study of antiquity, his principal employ. I. 337. *a.*
- Spondanus* (John) his answer to Calvin, touching the small regard which the Popes and Cardinals had for the Christian religion. II. 275. *a.*
- Spondanus* (Henry) confuted, as to a premeditated design, which he imputes to Theodore Beza. I. 776. *a.* Is as much accustomed as any one, to dispose of the particular providence of God. *ibid.* What he did, when he perceived the artifice of the Spanish Historians, with respect to Charles V. and Carranza. II. 336. *a.* Appears altogether Ultramontane. 594. *a.* His mistake touching Illyrius, and his *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*. III. 559. *b.* 560. *a.* He goes beyond the bounds of an Historian, as to what he says of the advice which King James gave to his son. 667. *a.* His negligence with respect to Ochinus, and his adventures. IV. 388. *a. b.*
- Sponges*: three holy Sponges sent by the Pope to Eudes Duke of Aquitain, and for what use. I. 16. *b.*
- Squittinio della Libertà Veneta*, opinions concerning the author of that book. V. 448. *b.* 449. *a. b.*
- Staff*, whether the Devil has chosen it for one of his occasional causes. I. 4. *b.* 7. *a. b.*
- Stage*: it was necessary to condemn the impurities of the stage, without describing them. V. 49. *b.* When they began to introduce love-adventures on the stage. I. 313. Who first practised the rule of not staining it with blood. II. 824. *b.* No piece could be recited on the stage at Rome, without being first approved. V. 295. and *a.* The French stage is more nice than that of Athens. 304. *a.* St Augustin is unjustly censured, with respect to the licentiousness of the stage. IV. 568. *a. b.*
- Stage* (French) some fragments that shew what it was in the time of Francis I. II. 477. *a. b.* 478. *a. b.* 479. *a. b.* 480. *a. b.* A passage of Boileau on that head. 480. *b. n. (18).*

- Stancarus*, Calvin and he gave one another the same hard words. V. 230. *b.* He married a wife being a Priest. 232. *b.* 233. *a.* Stanislaus Orichovius disputes against him. IV. 411.
- Stars*, the ancient Poets made them often the subject of their metamorphoses. I. 348. *b.* 349. *a.* In what part of the world the science of the stars had its beginning. III. 311. What the longitude and the latitude of the stars are. 461. *b.* Whether revolutions in religion are to be imputed to them. 948. *a. b.* The star which led the wife-men to Bethlehem has nothing in common with the burning torch which Timoleon saw in a dream. V. 364. *b.*
- State of Innocence*, the duration of it. I. 22. *a. b.*
- State-Catholic*, a book highly esteemed, who is the author of it. III. 41. *a. b.*
- States*: it is generally speaking the maxim of states to observe no other law but what tends to aggrandize them. I. 130. *a. b.* Those who govern them find themselves oftentimes obliged to commit acts of injustice. 448. *a. b.* The great revolutions which happen in them often proceed from a trifle. II. 711. *b.* A temperature that is often to be observed in the government of states. III. 506. *b.* 507. *a.* Their temporal good is generally preferred to religion. IV. 621. *a. b.*
- States-General of France* limit the royal authority in some respects. III. 409. *a.* Whether it be for the interest of France that they should meet. IV. 139. *a. b.*
- States-General*, or the United Provinces of the Low-Countries, make an edict, prohibiting the public exercise of the Romish religion in Boisleduc. III. 548. *a.* A dispute which that edict occasioned. *ibid. and b.* Send an Ambassador to Muley Zidan King of Morocco. 170. *b.* 171. *a.* What they did in favour of the Grecians. 172. *a.* How they justify themselves with regard to libels. V. 755.
- Statistics*, Stevin's treatise on that subject is excellent. V. 236. *b.*
- Statius* congratulates himself on having writ 278 Hexameters in two days. I. 664. *b.* A commentary on that author, in *usum Delphini*. 756. Navagiero's aversion against him, which was strange and full of prejudice. IV. 315. *a. b.* 316. *a.*
- Statius* (Achilles) may very possibly have made the same trial of the public taste, that Muretus made of Scaliger's. II. 353. *a.*
- Statues*: A statue which appeared with a quite different countenance to those who came into the temple, than it did to those that went out. II. 203. It was a very rare privilege for great men to have their statues placed in the Forum, during the first ages of the Roman Republic. 290. *b.* Cities have been ravaged for insulting the statues of a sovereign Prince. 605. *b.* Statues hung in the air by virtue of the load-stone. IV. 41. *b.* 42. *a.* Cato the censor's answer to some who wondered that there was no statue erected to him. 750. *a.* Pygmalion falls in love with one, and how he behaved to it. 641, 642. Clemens Alexandrinus and Arnobius allege that, to shew the Pagans the vanity of their idols. 641. *a.*
- Statues*: persons that were of a very small stature. I. 184. *a.* 326. *b.*
- Step-Mothers*, there is a certain fate which inspires them with a great deal of ill-humour. III. 189. *a.*
- Stephens* (Charles) passes an error upon us, which has been bandied from one Dictionary to another. II. 258. *b.* Dies in the Chatelet, greatly in debt. III. 830. *b.* His mistake concerning Pyrrhus. IV. 660. *a. b.* Did not understand a passage of Philokrates. 784. *a.*
- Stephens* (Robert) his house was always full of people who spoke nothing but Latin. I. 602. *a. b.* Protected by Castellan against the Sorbonnists, and afterwards given up to them. II. 372. *b.* Being persecuted by the Sorbonnists, he retires to Geneva. III. 830. *b.* Accused of having altered a passage in Bucer's commentary on the second Psalm. II. 173. *a.*
- Stephens* (Henry) how he expresses himself, in speaking of the good tables of the Clergy. II. 815. *a. b.* His cavillings on the death of Lucretia. III. 911. *b.* 912. *a. b.* He makes bad defence for Herodotus, who had ascribed envy and jealousy to God. IV. 575. *a.*
- Stephens* (Nicole) a learned woman. III. 830. *a.*
- Stefichorus* loses his sight, and recovers it again, for what, and how. III. 368. *a.*
- Stetius* besieged in vain by the troops of the Emperor and those of Brandenburg. III. 901. *a.*
- Stevinus* (Simon) censures Peter Nonius, whom he nevertheless acknowledges to be a great Mathematician. IV. 382. *a.*
- Stewarts*, Cayet accused of having writ an apology for them. 242. *b.* 243. *a.* 246. *and a. b.*
- Style*: affectations in point of style. I. 63. *a. b.* There was a time when a barbarism of style was much in vogue. 432. *a. b.* An author does not much entertain the world, when by changing his style, he gets out of his element. 438. *a. b.* The pompous style is generally not the style of a man of quality. 722. *a. b.* Who boasted that his style was of a high strain and glittering. II. 191. *b.* The deceitfulness of proofs drawn from a likeness of style. 808. *a.* We ought to avoid a style that is too concise, and for that very reason obscure. III. 248. *b.* There are several degrees of decency with respect to the style. V. 841. The author declares that he did not pretend to politeness of style, which was likewise neglected by Mezerai and le Laboureur. *ibid. and n.* (24).
- Stock-fish*: some people at Rome valued that fish, in compliance to the Pope. III. 327. *a.*
- Stoics*, no Philosophers were farther from the truth than they. II. 63. *b.* Confuted with respect to religion. 331. *a. b.* Accused by Plutarch of perverting the common conceptions, more than the Academics. 495. *a.* Said that Cynism was the shortest way to attain to virtue. 671. *b.* The pain which they feel from their evils, is the best objection that can be made to them. III. 423. *a.* They spoke too pompously of the empire of Reason. IV. 441. *a. b.* Are strongly refuted by Plutarch, with respect to the usefulness of vice. 520. *a. b.* Were more orthodox than Arnobius, with respect to matter considered as one of the principles of all things. 521. *a.* Their maxim concerning the use of words. 706. *b.* Their sage exists only in idea. II. 310. *b.* They laughed at the distinction of words. V. 847. An objection which they made use of. 858.
- Stones*: a black stone carried away out of the temple of Mecca by the Karmatians. I. 49. The same sent back. *ibid.* How it was proved to be genuine. *ibid.* The author's reflections upon that head. *ibid. a. b.* A stone honoured by the Saracens. 124. *a. b.* Another worshipped by the Arabians. *ibid. b.* Falls of stones foretold and revered. 306. *a. b.* Transparent stones. II. 303. *a. b.* Miraculous stones which people formerly pretended to have in several places. 745. *and a. b.* 746. *and a. b.* The Ligurians are knocked on the head by a shower of stones. III. 434. *a. b.* 435. *a. b.*
- Stories*: little stories are very proper to entertain a company pleasantly. I. 666. *b.* Some men have the power to immortalize any story, whether it be true or false. II. 7. *a.* However ridiculous the story may be that a person confutes, he ought to be exact. 267. *a.* Stories that were forged in the times of ignorance, for good ends. IV. 615. *a. b.* It is not allowed to alter any thing in those that are to be found in the best ancient writers. *ibid. b.* How a person ought to behave, with regard to such stories as are grounded only upon hear-say. 379. *a. b.*
- Stopp*, author of a book intituled *La Religion des Hollandais*. V. 203. *a.* Was killed at the battle of Steinkerken. *ibid.*
- Strabo*, what he says of fables. II. 832. *a.* His judicious reflections on the miraculous statues which cities boast of having. V. 156. *a. b.*
- Straßburg*, the indulgence of its Magistrates for fornication. I. 222. *a.* Its school. V. 256. *a. b.* 257. *a.* That city neither will, nor can always preserve its neutrality. III. 713. *a. b.*
- Stratagems of the Devil*, what is said of that book and the author of it. I. 92. *a.*
- Stratocles* persuades the Athenians to offer a sacrifice to the gods by way of thanks for the defeat of their enemies, the news of which he knew to be false. V. 749. *b.*
- Stratonice*,

- Stratonice*, Queen of Syria; what reasons induced her to make herself drunk. II. 533. *a.*
- Stratonice* advises Dejotarus, her husband, to make use of another woman. II. 630. *a. b.*
- Strutius*, why his book, intitled, the *Anti-Ancient*, has never been printed. I. 341. *a. b.*
- Strong*: there is nothing more advantageous than to be always for the strongest faction. V. 250. *a.*
- Strozza* (Charles) dies, notwithstanding Savonarola's cap and contrary prediction. V. 61. *a.*
- Stuart* (Mary), Queen of Scotland; the Historical Pyrrhonism that one has reason to chuse, with respect to her adventures. II. 282. *a. b.* How she eluded the design which her uncle had of keeping her jewels. III. 873. *b.*
- Study*, the most libertine youths, and those who have no inclination for it, do not fail to succeed therein sometimes. I. 562. *a. b.* 563. *a.* Extreme application to study. II. 370. *b.* 637. *b.* 638. *a.* The stratagem that a father made use of to make his son resume his studies. 687. *and a.* Whether study raises leud thoughts. III. 260. *a. b.* Happy are they who can study fourteen or fifteen hours a day, without being ever sick. 342. *a.*
- Studying*: a method of studying. I. 319. *b.* 320. *a.*
- Stupid people*, a man of wit is sometimes incapable to deceive them. V. 147. *a.*
- Stupidity* is not such a great misfortune as people imagine. I. 480. *b.*
- Sturmus* writes things to the disadvantage of Hotman. III. 523. *a. b.* Had been several years without receiving the communion. V. 257. *b.* What he tells us of Cæsius, and some other Saxons. II. 242. *a. b.*
- Swann* went through his course of Philosophy with so little success, that he thought he never should be able to attain to any competent knowledge in it. II. 802. *b.* Endeavours to explain how God may be present in imaginary space. III. 100. *b.*
- Subjects* are not pleased to see their prince bestow his treasures and favours on his friends, in an extravagant manner. I. 571. *a.* The doctrine of their obedience proposed with too much indifference. 687. *a.* Whether they ought to take up arms to deliver themselves from tyranny, or wait till their neighbours come and deliver them from it. II. 52. *b.* Maxims about their obedience. 423. *a. b.* Loyal subjects are generally neglected. 443. *a. b.* III. 421. *a.* It would not be a hard matter to make them approve of conquests and battles, provided they cost them no money. V. 656. A subject cannot make himself formidable to his master, without having committed a thousand acts of injustice. II. 541. *a. b.*
- Substance*: the idea which the Philosophers form of a substance. V. 221. *a. b. &c.*
- Subtilties* (sophistical) are only fit to corrupt the mind. V. 241. *a. b.* 242. *a. b.* We ought not to affect subtilties in matters of religion. III. 343. *b.*
- Success*, that of an enterprize is not always answerable to appearances. I. 365. *b.* 366. *a. b.* Vanity does not hinder men from allowing God to have been the cause of a good success. II. 298. *a. b.* 299. *a.* Several have ascribed the glory of a happy success to God, only for a political end. V. 366. *a. b.* 367. *a. b.* People often judge of matters by the success. 369. *b.* 370. *a. b. &c.*
- Suessa*, there were two towns of that name. III. 905. *a.*
- Suetonius* (Tranquillus) his candour and sincerity. V. 263. *a. b.* 264. *a. b.*
- Suffridus Petri*, his credulity. I. 36. II. 769. *a.*
- Suidas*, that author is so mutilated and corrupted that there is no depending upon him. I. 44. *b.* His gross ignorance, with respect to Dejotarus. II. 628. *b.* He is ill understood, as to the cause which obliged Æschylus to retire into Sicily. 825. *b.*
- Sulmo* respected by Alphonso, King of Naples, and why. IV. 433. *a.*
- Sulpitius* (Servius) exceeded his masters. I. 613. *b.*
- Sultans*, who was the only one amongst them that durst send a body of regular troops into Italy. IV. 50. *a.*
- Sum*, what it is, according to Anaxagoras. I. 307. *a. b.* An example of a very particular sympathy with the sun. II. 402. *b.* 403. *a.* The Spanish Historians say, that the sun stopped its course in favour of Charles V. 443. *b.* 444. *a.* There are several persons to whom the sun is a sensible god. 449. *a.*
- Superfation*, an instance of superstition often quoted. I. 283. Who was a famous instance of it. *ibid.*
- Superintendent of the Finances*; the sincere and ingenious confession of such a superintendent's wife. V. 16. *b.*
- Superiors*, their bad life is imitated, but not their good. III. 385. *a.*
- Superstition*; nothing is accounted too costly, when once people are intoxicated with superstition. I. 2. How useful it is to a General, when he employs it either to rouse or moderate the ardour of his soldiers. 542. *a. b.* Those who are infatuated with it, generally make no scruple to commit the greatest crimes. II. 629. *a. b.* It is difficult to be extirpated when it is a source of gain to private persons. IV. 178. *a. b.* It destroys good sense. V. 77. *b.* It is a misfortune that we do not know all the superstitions of the antient Romans. III. 646. *b.* There are two ways of ridiculing it, the one good and the other bad. IV. 584. *b.*
- Supplements*: some readers write, in the margin of an History or Calendar, a great many supplements. IV. 728. *a.*
- Supralapsarians* and Infralapsarians maintain the same thing at the bottom. IV. 524. *a.*
- Sura* composes orations for Trajan. III. 317. *a.*
- Surena*, what conclusion one may draw from his perfidious behaviour to Crassus. V. 273. *a.*
- Surius* (Laurence) translates all Ruybroeck's works. IV. 942. *a.*
- Suspicion*: people are very ready to give the reins to suspicion. I. 479. *b.* Prejudices against those who are apt to entertain suspicions. 745. *a. b.* Their bad effects. 588. *a.*
- Sutcliffe* is mistaken, as to the time in which Cicero lived. II. 499. *a. b.* Falsely ascribes to Agrippa some things which he has not said concerning Sixtus IV. V. 164. *b.*
- Susa*; it is not true that Catinat was obliged to raise the siege of that place; on the contrary he took it, and kept it till the peace. IV. 210. *b.*
- Sweating-Sickness* in England, what kind of sickness it was. I. 271. *b.* A dangerous distemper which has frequently made great havoc in England. V. 42. *b.* Confounded with the pox by a person who translated Sanders into French. *ibid.*
- Sweden*, what Maimbourg tells us of a treaty about the reduction of that kingdom to the obedience of the Church of Rome. III. 139. *b.*
- Swedes* invade Poland. III. 553. Make so many conquests upon the King of Denmark that they force him to give up to them three fine provinces. *ibid.* Had no good opinion of the Emperor's intentions, when he offered them his mediation. 851. *b.* Besiege Constance without success. II. 551. *and a. b.*
- Swerinus* taken for a Calvinist, and confounded with the author of the *Abusæ Batavæ*. IV. 942. *b.*
- Swift* in running was antiently an heroic quality. I. 77. *a.*
- Swine's Flesh*, what reason Plutarch gives for the Jews not eating it. I. 115. *a.*

T.

T*abellaria*: the design of the *Lex Tabellaria*. II. 345. *a. n.* (6).

Table, that of Alcinous passed into a proverb. I. 201. *a.*

Tableau de l'Amour considéré dans l'état du Mariage, who is the author of that book. III. 581. *b.* Quoted. IV. 801. *b. n.* (24).

Tables (Alphabetical) See *Indexes*.

Tables (Akronomical) called *Alfonlines*, cost the author of them the empire of Germany. II. 379. *a.*

Tables (Chronological) censured by Tanaquillus Faber. III. 388. *a.*

Tabourat (William) Father to Des Accords. I. 66.

Tabule Novæ, what they were among the antient Romans. II. 679. *a.*

Tachard quoted. V. 182. *a. b. n.* (12), (13), (14), (16), (17), (18). 183. *b. n.* (20), (21).

Tacitus, the difference of opinions with respect to a Spanish translation of that Historian. I. 180. *a. b.* What

- What he says, on the statues of Brutus and Cassius not appearing at a funeral solemnity. 498. *b.* II. 94. *b.* n. (11). Swallowed the marvellous. I. 518. *b.* His style is too concise and obscure. III. 248. *b.* What, according to him, is the strongest inclination of the Deity with respect to man. IV. 572. *b.* 573. *a.* Whether he was much more scrupulous than Suetonius in describing obscene actions. V. 264. *b.* 265. *a.* *b.* 266. *a.* *b.* A judgment upon that Historian. 330. *a.* Alchamers publishes notes upon his *Germania*. I. 235.
- Tacitus*, Emperor, the speech that he made in the senate. I. 575. *b.* 576. *a.*
- Taffin*, Minister of Metz, consults the Ministers of the conference of Poissy, touching the baptism of children baptized by women. I. 704. *b.*
- Tagueit* (John) enlarges and improves the chirurgery of Guy de Cauliac. II. 399. *a.* His Latin as pure as that of Cicero. *ibid.* *b.*
- Tabureau* (James) greatly ridicules the Astrological books of Peter Turrel. V. 417.
- Talents*: the story of talents multiplied. I. 47. *a.* *b.*
- Talents*: there is a certain mixture, which hinders the finest talents from advancing us. I. 698. *a.* *b.* It is a very considerable and a very useful talent to be able to receive a languishing conversation. 701. *b.* 702. *a.*
- Tallard* (Count) takes Traerbach in the year 1702. V. 396.
- Talmudists*, their opinion concerning Adam's stature before and after he had transgressed. I. 103. *b.* They are so obscure, that they are not to be understood. IV. 598. *a.*
- Talon*, Advocate-General, taxes the Janfenists with having zealously adhered to the cause of the Popes. III. 567. *a.*
- Tamerlane* causes his daughters to learn Magic, in order to facilitate his conquests. IV. 940. *b.*
- Tammux* in Ezekiel was the same with Adonis, according to St Jerome. I. 125. *b.* 116. *a.*
- Tandemus*, the head of a sect. IV. 629.
- Tandler* (Tobias) his harange *de Fascino & Incantatione*, and his answer to Elich. II. 750. *a.* *b.*
- Tapestry*; Garaffe sharply censured for publishing the tale of the Tapestry of Queen Joan d'Albret. III. 134. IV. 332. *b.*
- Tappri* had a law, by which the husbands gave their wives to others, when they had two or three children by them. III. 495. *a.*
- Tapper* (Ruard) how he cried out one day, on account of Baius's doctrine. I. 608. *a.*
- Taranto*: Lewis, son to Philip Prince of Taranto, kills himself by immoderately caressing his wife. IV. 301. *b.* 302. *a.*
- Tarantula*, Mambria Rofeo continues his History of the world. IV. 918.
- Tardieu*, Lieutenant-Criminal at Paris, murdered with his wife. III. 40. *b.* 41. *a.*
- Tartarini* fall out with the Romans without a cause. IV. 662. *b.*
- Targum of Jerusalem* relates to us what the dispute was between Cain and Abel. I. 23. *b.*
- Tarpas* an interpreter of dreams at the King of Egypt's court. I. 87.
- Tarquin*, King of Rome, was a tyrant in two respects. II. 162. *b.* 163. *a.* He and his brother were very different in their manners. V. 290. *a.* He re-establishes the Compital games. II. 163. *b.* Causes children to be sacrificed in honour of the *Dii Penates*, &c. *ibid.*
- Tasso* was subject to fits of madness, which did not hinder his writing excellent verses. III. 918. *a.* Spoiled his Poem by too much correcting. IV. 897. *a.* Whether he lived in lodgings. V. 401. *a.*
- Tassoni* (Alessandro) quoted. III. 700. *b.* 701. *a.* n. (35). 773. *a.* n. (7). IV. 835. *a.* n. (8).
- Taste*, an instance of its capriciousness. V. 374. *a.* *b.*
- Tatian* reasons ill against the Gentiles. II. 653. *b.*
- Tavares*, Confident to the Duke of Orleans, brother to Henry II, performs a considerable exploit against the garrison of Calais. III. 401. *a.* IV. 17. *and a.* *b.*
- Taulerus* praised immoderately by Luther. V. 301. *b.*
- Taxation*, that for which Cyrenian had a special commission. IV. 820.
- Taxes of the Romish Chancery*, facts concerning that book. IV. 649. *a.* *b.* 650. *a.* The edition of it that was published by Laurence Banck. I. 627. *b.* 628. *a.* *b.* 629. *a.* *b.* Other editions of it, and among the rest, that of Rome, in 1514. 628. *b.* The difference of those editions. *ibid.* Put in the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*. *ibid.* The just reproaches of the Protestants, with regard to that book. *ibid.* 629. *a.* The Romish Controversialists are much puzzled what to say about it. *ibid.* *b.* A Chancellor of Bois-le-duc, who promises to abjure his Catholicism, if any one could shew him those abominations which the Protestants quote, as taken from that book. *ibid.* *a.* There are several observations upon it, in a work translated by Laurence Tuppiss. V. 415. *a.* *b.*
- Taxites*, a custom that they observed, with respect to their daughters. V. 131. *a.* n. (39).
- Teachers* are obliged to avoid ambiguous maxims, and to prevent false glosses. I. 463. *a.*
- Teatb*, William Bigot was born with two. II. 7. *b.*
- Teians* built Abdera. I. 17. *a.* *b.*
- Teiffier* (Antony) censured. I. 747. *a.* n. (1), (10). IV. 848. *and a.* n. (3). Should have added corrections to the passages, where Thuanus is mistaken, in the eulogies he bestows on learned men. *ibid.* *b.*
- Tekeli*, the correspondence which France carried on with him. I. 171. *a.* *b.* His misfortunes. III. 682. *b.*
- Telamon* never laughed. V. 317. *a.*
- Telemachus*, an eastern Monk so called, his adventure, his courage, and his martyrdom. I. 230. *a.* *b.*
- Telemachus*, the author of his adventures, censured for the character he gives to Pygmalion. IV. 643. *a.* *b.* 644. *a.* *b.* 645. *a.* *b.*
- Telissius*, General of the Samnites, for what reasons he wanted to destroy the city of Rome. III. 686. *b.*
- Tellier* (Father) takes advantage of some stories, which are spread abroad, without knowing whether they be true or false. I. 727. *a.* His reflexions on the zeal which the Janfenists shewed to have two decrees of the Court of Rome printed. III. 567. *b.*
- Temerites* advised by the god Hammon, to beware of cocks. IV. 790. *a.*
- Temurus*, one of the chiefs of the Heraclidæ in the expedition, in which they retook the Peloponnese. II. 240. *b.* 241. *a.*
- Temerity*, whether a lucky rashness deserves that name. V. 370. *b.*
- Temermans* (Antony Antonine) suffers himself to be strangled, rather than he would reveal the confession of Jaureguy. II. 460. *b.*
- Temper*: a man's temper has a great influence upon his mind. II. 452. *a.* *b.* It is almost always the first and principal spring, even in persons who are God's instruments. III. 81. *a.*
- Temperance*, a discourse on that virtue converts a famous Debauchee. V. 570. *a.* *b.*
- Tempest*, an Atheist's answer to those who reproached him with being the cause of one. II. 655. *b.*
- Temple of Jerusalem*, Julian the Apostate could not rebuild it. I. 228. Ezekiel's description of it is a difficult matter. 618. *a.*
- Temple of the Earth*, facts concerning it. II. 344. *b.* 345. *a.*
- Temple of Ephesus*, the reflexion which an Historian makes, on Diana's suffering it to be burnt. III. 59. *a.* *b.* IV. 405. *b.* V. 360. *a.* How the Ephesians eluded the desire which Alexander had, to appropriate the whole inscription of that temple to himself. 553. *a.*
- Temporal*: the Temporal character generally abhors the Ecclesiastical, when they are joined together. III. 768. *a.* *b.*
- Tennis*, the antiquity of that play. IV. 344. *a.*
- Terab*, some Fathers of the Church, have thought that he neither was a believer in his life, nor at the point of death. I. 45. *b.*
- Tercera Iles*, a bloody affront which the French received there. V. 254. *a.* *b.* No satisfaction was required for it. *ibid.* *b.* Which is a shameful passage of Henry the third's reign. *ibid.*
- Terebintus*, heir to the estate, money, and impieties, of Scythianus, comes to a tragical end. IV. 90. *a.* *b.*

Terence

- Tereus* commended for having wrote no Tragedies. I. 59. *b.* Who is the author of the verses, prefixed to his Comedies. 375. *a.* How he wrote his Comedies. II. 39. *b.*
- Terentia* divorced by Cicero. V. 380. *b.*
- Terminus*, a Heathen god, stands more in fear of Hadrian, than of Jupiter himself. III. 317. *a. b.*
- St Augustin's railery on that head. *ibid.*
- Tertullian* makes use of a miracle of Achilles against the Epicureans. I. 85. *b.* His imaginary triumph over the wife Heathens, considering the fact he goes upon. II. 642. *a.* What he says of the connexion between gluttony and lust. 822. *a.* And of the privileges which the Heathens granted to women, who had married but once. III. 192. *a.* An examination of a proposition which he affirms, *viz.* That the meanest Christian tradesman, finds God and declares him. V. 141. *b.* & *seq.* A thing that he reproaches the Pagans with. 454. *a.*
- Ter. Fer.* See *Vera*.
- Testament* (the New) some body said that there is not a jot in it, but what is taken from the Jewish antiquities. IV. 880. *a. b.*
- Tetragramma*: whether the points of the Tetragramma are proper to that name. I. 244. *b.* 245. *a.* Abuse reflexions on that head. *ibid.*
- Text* (Hebrew) whether the Jews altered it. I. 173. *a.*
- Texelius* (John) is the person who wrote first against Luther. IV. 772. *b.*
- Thales*, whether he acknowledged a God, who had formed all things. I. 300. *b.* V. 321. *a. b.* 322. *a.* He taught that water was the principle of all things. III. 650. *a.* An answer which is ascribed to him, touching the definition of God. V. 141. *b.* 142. *a.*
- Thalia*, a Poem, what the matter and form of it are. I. 478. *a. b.*
- Thames*, in less than nine hours, ebbs and flows three times contrary to custom. V. 42. *b.*
- Thargelia* gains the affection of the principal Grecians by her wit and beauty. IV. 578. *b.*
- Thaumafius* (Mount) the wonders that were told of it. IV. 205. *b.*
- Theagenes*, the hero of a romance, gives his heroine a box on the ear. III. 378. *a. b.* See *Romance*.
- Theatins*, their quarrel with the Jesuits. III. 887. *a. b.*
- Theatrum Urbium*, who is the author of that work. II. 121.
- Thebans* were forbidden to sleep in the temple of Amphiarus. I. 277. *a.* Paid Divine honours to Alcmena. 208.
- Thebes* called the *City of the Sun*, by the Egyptians. II. 233.
- Theft* was allowed among the antient Egyptians. I. 464. *b.*
- Thelin*, his Divine essays. I. 562. *a.*
- Themistocles*, his answer to an inhabitant of Seriphus. II. 414. *b.* The envy which people bore him, was one of the causes of Cimon's advancement. 504. *b.* 505. *a.*
- Theocritus*, his answer to the question, why he did not write. I. 453. *a.*
- Theocritus*, the Poet, a passage in him, corrected by Mr de Longe-Pierre. I. 113. *b.*
- Theocritus* of *Chios*, his judgment of Anaximenes's speeches pleasantly expressed. I. 330. *a.*
- Theocritus*, the Sophist, his railery upon hearing of Alexander's death. IV. 404. *b.*
- Theodidastus*, why that name was given to Ammonius Saccas. I. 269. *a.*
- Theodorus*, the Atheist, boldly denied there were any gods. II. 652. *b.* After what manner he answered the objection which a woman made to him at a feast. III. 460. *a. b.*
- Theodorus Studita*, his testament translated by Father Sirmond, and by Livineius. III. 853. *a. b.*
- Theodoret* decides a point like a bad Divine. I. 13. *b.* 14. *a. b.* He should have built upon the authority of Iocrates, when he reproached the Pagans with the Divine honours which they paid to Helen. III. 368. *a.* Alleged an author who is against him, with respect to the impurities of Prodicus. IV. 784. *a. b.* 785. *a.* What he says against Plato's laws, concerning the two sexes. 802. *b.*
- Theodoric*, King of the Ostrogoths, his History wrote by Cochlæus. II. 523. *a. b.*
- Theodosius*, Emperor, was offended, when he found his son sitting at his lesson, while his master stood. I. 507. How St Ambrose treated him. 593. *a.* An edict of this Emperor. V. 760.
- Theodosius the Younger*, Emperor, his sudden change with respect to Nestorius, gives room to believe what Acacius of Bercea says of it. IV. 348. *b.*
- Theology*, what Accursius says of it. I. 67. *and b.* Cannot subsist without Philosophy. II. 202. *b.* Ramism and Cartesianism involved in its disputes. 696. *a.* It ought not to be subjected to Philosophy. IV. 419. *b.* See *Divinity*.
- Theology* (Pagan) what it made a tyrant expect. II. 557. *a. b.* 558. *a.*
- Theon*, the Sophist, a precept of Rhetoric which he gave. II. 341. *b.* What he tells us concerning Ephorus. 772. *b.*
- Theophilus*, a French Poet, reproaches Balzac with two or three unpleasant adventures. I. 623. *b.* It is pretended that he was in love with Des-Barreaux. II. 646. *b.* Of what kind his impieties and obscenities were. III. 135. *b.* 136. *a.*
- Theophrastus*, a leud woman wrote against him, which occasioned a proverb. III. 779. *a. b.* The reason which Vives gives, why Leontium wrote a book against him. *ibid. b.*
- Theopompus*, his double dealing, in saying one thing with the tongue and another with the pen. IV. 174. *b.* His vanity. V. 332. *b.* 333. *a. b.* He and Timæus are looked upon as a couple of satirical and fabulous Historians. 358. *b.*
- Theory*, opposite to Practice. I. 130. *b.* 131. *a.* A Theory which engages a Doctor to practice. II. 193. *and a. b.*
- Thesus*, one of his wives has been multiplied into four. V. 305. *a.* He is obliged to prove his Divine original. *ibid. b.* 306. *a.*
- Thespius* led a good life after his resurrection. I. 282. *b.*
- Thessaly* was very much cried down for witchcraft. V. 310. *a.*
- Thetis* pimps for her son. I. 84. *a.* Is at variance with her husband the Ocean. III. 634. *b.*
- Thevatbat*, the History of that man. V. 182. *a. b.* 183. *a. b.*
- Thout* confused, as to the Magic art, of which he accuses Agrippa. I. 151. *a. b.* 152. *a.* His want of judgment in recommending certain books. 165. *a.* His dishonest proceeding. 736. *a.* He censures the ingratitude of great men, who overlook the misery of several persons of distinguished learning. III. 50. *b.*
- Thomas Aquinas*, his authority among those of the Church of Rome. I. 470. *a.* Censured. IV. 877. *b.* 878. *a. b.*
- Thomas à Becket*, his persecutor becomes his votary. III. 797. *b.*
- Thomasius* (James) his harangue concerning the predictions of the new Prophets. III. 436. *b.* 437. *a.*
- Thomasius* (Christian) is about an apology for those who have been unjustly accused of Atheism. III. 671. *b.* V. 323. *a. n.* (16).
- Thomasius* (Lewis) one of his sentiments examined. I. 302. *a. b.* His reflexion touching the original of the Manichees, Nestorians, and Eutychians, that are in Asia. IV. 513. *a.*
- Thomisti*, their Hypothesis about Transubstantiation. V. 819.
- Thonis*, an Egyptian Courtezan, summoneth a young man before the judges, and for what. III. 714. *b.*
- Thornax*, a mountain of Laconia, why called *Coccyus*, or *Coccyx*. III. 632. *a.*
- Thorns* (fabulous) whose flowers were of the shape of a crown. I. 37. *and b.*
- Thought*, the formation of it is a very difficult subject. I. 555. *b.* If it be a modification of the body, then all bodies are thinking substances. II. 658. *a. b.* 660. *b.* 661. *a. b.* V. 215. *a. b.* It cannot be the sole effect of the disposition of the organs. II. 661. *b.* Is distinct from all the modifications of body that are come to our knowledge. *ibid. and* 779. *b.* Can only be found in an indivisible Being. III. 790. *b.* 791. *a. b.*
- Thoughts*, there is not less wit required in applying them right, than in being the first authors of them. II. 779. *a.* A thought must be true in order to be fine. 527. *a.* There are no thoughts so much to be suspected, as those which are put off in an assuming

- suming manner, and with a majestic tone. III. 809. *a.* There are thoughts, which being essentially good, are relished every where, and at all times. IV. 741. *b.* 742. *a.*
- Thoughts of Morinus*, a book which brought its author to the stake. IV. 269. *b.* 270. *a. b.*
- Thorns*, those who sit upon it, have more need than others of the assistance of a happy temper, to become saints. II. 767. *a.*
- Thuanus* (James-Augustus) a fault which must needs have crept into his History, corrected. I. 22. *b.* He calls the Protestants a very suspicious people. 119. *a. b.* His son was so sharply reproached by King James, that it threw him into a fit of sickness. II. 183. *a.* He forgets an essential thing, in speaking of Busbequius. 232. *a.* An examination of what has been said, as to Camden's having furnished him with memoirs different from what he (Camden) published afterwards in his Annals. 283. *b.* 284. *a.* A precaution which he took to hinder his History being suppressed. 283. *a. b.* He admired the judgment which Julius Cæsar Scaliger passed upon Cardan. 317. *b.* 318. *a.* One page of Thuanus, upon Charles V, is to be preferred before a volume of Sandoval. 442. He is mistaken in his judgment of the *Brutum Fulmen*. III. 521. *a.* His contradiction with regard to Charlotte, daughter to the Duke of Montpensier. 864. *b.* 865. *a.* He would not speak Latin. IV. 409. *a. b.* Disfigured proper names. III. 722. *b.* 723. *a.* He inveighs strongly against the conduct of the Constable de Montmorency, with respect to the Dukes of Valentinois. IV. 699. *a.* Censured. II. 399. IV. 848. *b.* Did not sufficiently enquire into what concerned the lives of the learned. *ibid.*
- Thuanus* (Francis), some particulars relating to his trial. III. 802. *a. b.* 827. *a. b.*
- Thucydides*, whether or not his style was imitated by the writers of his time. II. 570. *b.* 571. *a.* He has gained immortal honour by doing justice to his greatest enemies. V. 891.
- Thuringia*, the Archbishops of Mentz renounce their right to that country. II. 815.
- Tiana*, the inhabitants of it built a temple to their countryman Apollonius. I. 380. *b.*
- Tiara* (Pontifical), whether the word *Mysterium* was writ upon it. II. 708. *a. b.*
- Tyber* (Pontus de) censured. IV. 609. *a. b.*
- Tyber*, projects formed to prevent its inundations. V. 499. *a. b.*
- Tiberius* (the Emperor) conceals a most dangerous snare under the appearance of frankness. I. 422. *a. b.* Is very ill-used by Artabanus II, King of Parthia. 511. and *b.* 512. *a.* Puts an author to death for having praised Brutus and Cassius. II. 355. *b.* Is flattered in full Senate. 356. *a.* One of his best-conducted intrigues. 559. *b.* Was destitute of all natural affection. 719. *a.* Lays aside his ordinary dissimulation. 720. *b.* 721. *a.* Rejects a petition very harshly, and his severity is disliked by the Senate. III. 497. What he did to conceal his being the death of the accused. IV. 21. *b.* Praised immoderately. 495. and *a. b.* Grants the honour of a triumph to Blesius, and refuses it to Dolabella. V. 277. *a. b.* 278. *a.* His conduct with respect to Sejanus's daughters. 824.
- Tiberius* was a Pagan deity. V. 350. *b.*
- Tycho Bræhe* settles in Bohemia. III. 657. Withed that the number of Mathematician Preachers was greater. IV. 680. *a.*
- Tigranes* put to death by Tiberius. III. 164. *b.* Another Tigranes made King of Armenia by Nero. *ibid.*
- Tigre* (Le), a fatire which occasioned the death of two persons. III. 290. *a. b.*
- Tilbury* (Gervase of) quoted. IV. 738. *b.* 739. *a.*
- Tilens* conspires with Cameron. II. 285. *a.* His advertisement to the assembly of Rochelle. IV. 212. *a. b.*
- Tillet* (Lewis de) engaged Calvin to compose short exhortations, which were read as homilies in some parishes. II. 261. *a.* Was only Canon and Archdeacon of Angoulême, and not a Bishop or Archbishop. IV. 681. *a. n.* (1). V. 356. and *a. b.*
- Tilly*, General of an army, was very chaste. III. 414. *b.* V. 357. Acquired honour, partly by his own good conduct, and partly by the bad conduct of his enemies. 180. *a.*
- Timæus*, what he said of Aristotle's shop. I. 465. *a.* He does not do justice to Agathocles in his History. V. 359. *a. b.*
- Timanthus*, how he drew the face of Iphigenia's father, in order to represent his grief. IV. 505. *b.*
- Time*; a Grammarian was of opinion, that disputing on any material questions of Divinity, was so much time ill employed. II. 190. *b.* It is difficult to avert things which passed in remote times. 386. *b.* Whether time be divisible in infinitum. V. 609. *a.*
- Time to come*, God has very wisely covered it in thick darkness. II. 126.
- Time* (unseasonable), all those who are to prevent their works to great men, ought to avoid unseasonable time. III. 281. *a. b.*
- Timocrates*, the calumnies which he vented against Epicurus. II. 782. *b.*
- Timoleon*, the eulogies which Timæus bestows upon him. V. 360. *a.* A dream that he had. 364. *b.* What answer he made when some persons in Syracuse publicly accused him. 365. *a. b.*
- Timotheus*, how he answered those who reproached him with his mother's scandalous life. II. 548. *b.* What Plutarch relates concerning that Athenian General. V. 367. *a.*
- Tyndarides*, a story that is told of their apparition. V. 140. *a.*
- Tyndium*; whence it came that the thorns which grew about the temple of Tyndium, were thought to be always in bloom. I. 37. *b.*
- Typographical errors* in names multiply persons. IV. 193. An error of that kind is the reason that Mr Moreri has given us a chimerical Herefarch. *ibid.*
- Tyre*, the cruelty which Alexander exercised upon the inhabitants of that city. IV. 7. *a.*
- Tyranny*; in destroying one, people very often establish a greater. III. 452. *a. b.* 467. *a. b.* 468. *a.* Who invented most of the ways by which it is established and kept up. IV. 562. *a.* One of the greatest misfortunes that attend it is, that there is no way to renounce it. 563. *b.* 564. *a. b.* Tyranny exercised without arms. 566. *b.* 567. *a. b.*
- Tyrants*, whether faith is to be kept with them. II. 164. *a.* There are who hate the tyrant, but not the tyranny. 167. *a. b.* They would have us fear lest the walls and floors of our chambers should witness against us. 627. *a.* Can lay no stress upon the fidelity of their subjects. III. 139. *a.* It is lawful to put them to death. I. 237. *b.* Authors who maintain that doctrine. II. 458. *a. b.* 459. *a.*
- Tiragallus* produced every year a book and a child. III. 662. *b.* 663. *a.* V. 380. *a.* Quoted. 129. *b. n.* (26), (27), (28). He was one of the most illustrious men of the XVth century. 799. The character of his Commentary on the laws of matrimony. *ibid.*
- Title* of a book, which alarms the Court of Rome, and which the author reforms. III. 122.
- Titles*; how fond people are of pompous titles. II. 170. *a. b.* Titles given to Princes, are only according to the usage. I. 800. *b.* A private person who gives Princes the titles which they usually assume, does not set himself up as a judge of their pretensions. *ibid.*
- Titus Livius*, what he said of the Republic of Rome. I. 138. *a. b.* The difference there is betwixt him and Valerius Maximus, with respect to the marble tiles, which had been taken from the temple of Juno Lacinia. III. 640. *a. b.* 641. *a.* He contradicts himself in speaking of Alexander. IV. 9. *a.* An estate sold to purchase him. 467. *b.* 468. *a.* Quoted. 749. *a. b. n.* (18). His maxims incorporated in the body of the discourse. V. 327. *b.* He and Ovid die in the same year. IV. 447. *b.*
- Tobacco*, when and by whom made known in Italy. V. 26. and *a.* A Poem on that subject. *ibid.* *a. b.* and 346. *a.*
- Toledo*, flies do not enter into the shambles there, and why. III. 430. *b.* The fifth Council of Toledo makes decrees against those who are inquisitive about the succession, in a Prince's life-time. 955. *a.*
- Toleration in point of religion*, a justification of that which the States-General grant to the Mennonites. I. 288. *b.* 289. *a.* A comparison between the toleration of the Mahometans, and that of the Christians. IV. 39. *a. b.* 349. *a. b.* Milton's principles on

- on that head. 223. *a. b.* Whether the Roman Catholics should be excluded from it. *ibid. b.* 224. *a. b.* That which the Jews granted to the Sadducees, was an excessive toleration. V. 11. *b.* 12. *a.* The *Sieur de Beauval's* treatise on that subject. I. 672. *a. b.* Opposed by Viret, who employed the authority of the Papists, to curb the sects of Lyons. V. 483. *and b.*
- Toleration* (the Advocates for), it is not true that they pretend to take from Princes the power of the sword, which they hold from God. III. 147. *b.*
- Tollius*, the blundering mistake of that Critic, with respect to Father Sirmond. III. 853. *a. b.*
- Tomb*; some miraculous adventures have been related concerning Ajax's tomb. I. 161. *b.* And concerning that of Alcmena. 208. *b.* The Pagans believed that it was not safe to remove them. *ibid.* A memorable tomb. 210. *b.* Lightning falling upon them, is looked upon as a glorious accident. II. 870. *a.* Three famous Lawyers in the same tomb. 507. *a. b.*
- Tongue*: a boy who continued to speak, after he had lost his tongue. II. 410. *b.* It is a fine victory to be able to command it. 438. *a. b.*
- Too much*: the maxim *too much of nothing* suffers infinite varieties, when the question is to fix the bounds between too much and enough. I. 766. *a.*
- Tooth* (golden): it was a meer imposture. III. 486. *a.* Horatius was grossly deceived about it. *ibid.*
- Top-knots*, their antiquity. I. 333. *a. b.* II. 544. *a. b.* 545. *a. b.*
- Torigni*, confidant to Margaret de Valois, Queen of Navarre, is removed from that Queen. IV. 335. *a. b.*
- Torstenjón* besieges Brin, loses 4000 men there, and abandons the siege. V. 192. *b.*
- Torture*, whether the use of it should be allowed. III. 238. *and a. b.* 239. *a. b.*
- Torvaldius*, the fictitious name of Des Accords. I. 66. *b.*
- Totan* (William) believed to be author of the *Fortitium Fidei*, of which he published a new edition. V. 197. *a.*
- Totile*, the History of him wrote by Cochlæus, was never published. II. 523.
- Toulous*, the Inquisition there, punishes certain Heretics, on account of their lewdness. III. 280. *b.*
- Tour* (Count la) seizes on the suburbs of Vienna, and besieges the city. V. 677.
- Tournament*, it does not suit the majesty of a King, to be one of the Combatants. III. 399. *b.*
- Tournæur* (le) was the name of the family of Verloris, which is no more than that French word turned into Latin. V. 464. *a.*
- Tourensi* (Gregorius) cited about a son Ham. V. 632. *b.* 633. *a.*
- Tours* was not plundered by Abderame. II. 851. *a.*
- Touche*. See *Bigarrures*.
- Tower of wood*, which defended the Pyreum. I. 424. *a. b.* And which was said to have been proof against fire. *ibid.* An Architect who could transport an entire stone tower from one place to another. 474. *and a. b.*
- Towns* (Imperial) of Alsace, whether they can retain their immediate holding of the empire, under a protector or guardian that is King of France. III. 717. *b.* 718. *a.* Cannot preserve a neutrality. *ibid.*
- Traetus de Libertatibus Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ*, who is the author of that book. I. 157. *a. b.*
- Trade*, what is the science necessary to make one succeed in it. II. 33. *a. b.*
- Traditionaries*, who was the chief of them among the Jews. I. 173. *b.*
- Traditions*, we cannot be too distrustful of such as are only grounded upon hearsays. II. 473. *b.* 474. *b.* 475. *a. b.* Whether they ought to be credited, when they concern things that are supposed to have happened a great while ago. 829. *b.* What weight the Pagans laid upon them, when they were to prove the existence of a Deity. 872. *b.* Whether we ought to have any regard to fabulous traditions. III. 743. *b.* 744. *a. b.* The long duration of the most fabulous. 751. *b.* An author who carefully followed them in his Dramatical representations of the mysteries. II. 480. *b.*
- Traditions* (ill grounded) Lausot and some other writers who oppose them, do credit to their Church, and displease many. IV. 739. 740. Baronius and Bellarmine maintain with might and main, several traditions as ill grounded as the story of the She-Pope. 734. *a.* One does not much examine those that may serve for an ornament to the subject one treats of. 738. *b.* Sometimes people blame and reject them, at the same time that they admit very childish ones. 864. *and b.*
- Traditions of Slender* are more to be mistrusted than traditions of praise. IV. 511. *a.* At the end of three or four generations they ought not to be received. *ibid.*
- Tragedy*: the last word of a tragedy occasions a terrible accident. I. 175. The alterations which the antients made in tragedy. II. 824. *a. b.* Several women with child miscarried at seeing the tragedy of the Eumenides acted. *ibid. b.* What was the finest part of the ancient tragedy. 872. *a.* It is unreasonable to charge the author of a tragedy with all the sentiments he puts in the mouth of the actors. 873. *a.* Plato is against any tragedies being acted, wherein the gods are abused. 825. *a.* We are not to place what we find there among Historical facts. IV. 660. *a.* How it was defined by Gorgias. V. 147. *a.* Tragedies upon religious controversies. IV. 299. *a. b.* Rattall represents in a very noble manner the usefulness of tragedy in the Epistle Dedicatory of his Latin translation of Sophocles. 849. *b.* Some Poets do wonders in the four first acts of a tragedy, and succeed very ill in the last, for which good Poets reserve their most exquisite strokes. III. 720. *b.*
- Trejan*, what was the most magnificent of all his buildings. I. 376. An extraordinary action attributed to him by Lampridius. II. 770. *b.* Though none of the Historians of that Prince speak of it. *ibid.*
- Transcribers*: hasty transcribers fall into the greatest mistakes. I. 209. *b.* To how many faults they are liable. 536. *a.* The author mentions divers things only to serve for a warning to transcribers. II. 232. *b.* A story that is told of the fault of a transcriber. V. 106. *b.* 107. *a.* They introduce alterations. I. 538. *b.* Confound facts with their own conjectures, &c. IV. 609. *a.*
- Translations*: one single point, either taken away, or added, or altered, produces quite opposite things in a translation. I. 525. *a.* They require more capacity than one would think. IV. 873. *and a. b.* How difficult they are. V. 409. *a.*
- Translations of the Bible into the Vulgar Tongue*, a surprising instance of the abuse that may be made of them. IV. 723. *a. b.* Blamed by Mr Ponsot; his advice on that head to Peter de Gondy Bishop of Paris. *ibid. a.* The book which Ponsot writ on that subject is extremely trifling in Mr Arnauld's opinion. *ibid. b.* A collection of authors who have disapproved them, and Mr Arnauld's judgment of that collection. *ibid.*
- Translators* often assume a right which they have not. I. 77. *a.* Some times sow dissension, when they least think of it. 205. *a.* A rule which they ought to follow. 510. *a.* They ought never to paraphrase, nor depart in the least from their original, without being thoroughly acquainted with the matter in question. II. 43. *b.* Are generally the Panegyrist of the authors whom they translate. 590. Cannot well be trusted. IV. 169. *a. b.* How liable they are to commit great blunders. V. 384. *b.* Their mistakes. 820.
- Translations*, how difficult it is to manage them well. IV. 619. *b.*
- Transubstantiation*, John Poinet admits that word, but so as not to include Oral Manducation. IV. 693. *b.* Those who maintain it, confound the notion of things, and the signification of words. V. 219. *a. b.* 220. *a. b.*
- Trappe* (Abbot de la) his prodigious progress in the study of the Greek Poets. I. 299. *a. b.*
- Travellers*: what a traveller answered to those who made a jest of his unsettled temper: and the answer that was made to another traveller. I. 540. *a.* Their relations ordinarily shew us what is their prevailing taste, whether they are Antiquaries, Physicians, Geographers, &c. III. 342. *b.*
- Travelling*, the bad effects of it complained of. III. 345. *b.* Condemned by Joseph Hall, Lausius, &c.

Approved

- Approved of by Lipsius, who gives good instructions concerning it. *ibid.*
- Treacle*, who invented it. I. 334. *and a. b.* 335.
- Treaties of Peace*, it is their fate to be found fault with. III. 420. *b.* The ancient Romans made no great scruple to violate them. 583. *b.* 584. *a.*
- Trebatius* treacherously put to death at Smyrna II. 680. *b.*
- Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil*, what the prohibition to eat of it signified. II. 856. *a.*
- Trees*: an extraordinary tree planted by Abraham. I. 46. *a. b.* The great age of certain trees. 281. *b.* The Gentiles had a religious veneration for such as they believed to be very ancient. III. 349. *b.*
- Trent* (the council of) they were willing to conclude it by acclamations. III. 870. *b.* 871. *a.* See *Council of Trent*.
- Treflon* incensed against the Duke of Alba, and for what reason. IV. 453. *and n. (b).*
- Treus* (Servilius) a Venetian Lawyer, excelled both in business and learning. II. 314. *a. b.*
- Trexenians* eat their fruits too green, that oracle explained. III. 965. *b.*
- Tribes*: one of the tribes of Athens was named Acamantis. I. 53. *and b.* Another of them bore the name of Ajax. 161. *b.*
- Tribunals* favourable to fornication. I. 222. *a. b.* 223. *a. b.* In all sorts of tribunals men of honour decline sitting as judges, from the moment that they are excepted against. 489. *b.* The people generally presume in favour of tribunals. 610. *b.* A tribunal which was called *the Rock of the Accused*. II. 245. *and a.*
- Tribunes* of the people, the ordinances made at their request, were not properly called laws but *Plébiscita*. III. 490. *a.*
- Tribunship* of the people, an employment peculiar to Plebeian families. I. 356. *a. b.*
- Tribunitian Power*, a name given by Augustus to the supreme authority. II. 718. *a.*
- Tribute*, it sometimes has the specious name of a pension. I. 541. *a. b.*
- Triceffus* (John) a man of learning and quality, clandestinely sows the seeds of the Reformation at Cracow. III. 147.
- Trifles*: a person ought neither to dwell upon them, nor return to them: they should be the amusements of youth. I. 64. *a.*
- Trifling particulars* do not want their use. II. 309. *a. b.* Are inseparable from criticism. 773. *a.*
- Trimouille*, the pretensions of that house to the kingdom of Naples. IV. 313. *b.* 314. *a. b.*
- Trinity*, most people are not satisfied with words upon that mystery. I. 29. *a.* The doctrine of the Trinity compared to the three propositions of a Syllogism. *ibid. b.* And to the three dimensions of matter. *ibid.* According to some authors Aristotle was not ignorant of it. 471. *a.* What was the belief of the Fathers of the three first centuries concerning it. 477. *a. b.* A collection of passages, which shew that the ancient Jewish Church believed it. IV. 880. *a.* The Spinozists will perhaps have recourse to that doctrine, in order to save their hypothesis. V. 223. *a. b.* What it was that opened a door in Poland for the overthrow of this mystery. 228. *b.* 229. *a. b.* The subtleties of the schoolmen on this head. 819, 820, 821. Some Protestant Divines could wish that the whole doctrine of it had been expressed in five or six lines. 819. A strong invective of the Abbot Faydit on this subject, against the explications of the schoolmen. 820. *and n. (30).* There is no subject that has been more perplexed by the Spanish schoolmen. 820. The answer of the lesser Catechism of the Reformed Churches on this subject. 826.
- Tripoli* besieged and taken by the Turks. I. 406.
- Triflan* falls into two gross mistakes in a passage of Lampridius touching the Emperor Hadrian. III. 318. *b.* His mistake, with respect to Julia, wife of Septimius Severus. 603. *a. b.* Censured by Perizonius, for what he says of Marcellus's mother. IV. 397. *a. b.*
- Trihemius* (Abbot) his catalogue. III. 559. *b.* 560. *a.* Convicted of a falsehood with respect to Platina and his imprisonment. IV. 685. *b.*
- Triumph*: who was the first stranger honoured with a triumph at Rome. I. 611. *b.* A taste different from that of an ancient Father, who wished he had seen a triumph at Rome. III. 646. *a.*
- Triumph* (Naval) who was the first Roman that had it decreed to him. II. 726.
- Triumvirate* dispossessed of their lands, those who had cultivated them. I. 319. *a.*
- Triumvirate* mentioned in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, of whom it was made up. III. 269. *a. b.*
- Triumviri* condemn 1400 Roman Ladies to declare what estates they possessed. III. 489. *and a.*
- Triunclio* causes a passage to be made through a mountain for the introduction of the French army into Italy. III. 98. *a. b.*
- Troy*: all the misfortunes of the war of Troy were occasioned by women. II. 481. *b.*
- Trojans*, how they treated the daughters of the Locrians. II. 340. *a. b.* 341. *a. b.*
- Trophy*, religion forbade the violation of it. I. 525. *b.*
- Truchses* (Gebhard) Elector of Cologne, under what name the Spaniards are employed against him. II. 224. *b.* His complaints on that head. *ibid.* Waramund writes in his defence, and Gonzalez Pontius de Leon confutes him. III. 774.
- True*: what appears true to us to day, may not appear so at another time. IV. 188. *b.*
- Truguis* (the President) obliges Guichenon to insert in his works whatever he pleases. III. 275. *b.*
- Truth*, is centered in an impenetrable abyss. IV. 653. *a. b.* 654. *a.* Evidence cannot be the rule and measure of truth, or what they call its *Criterion*. *ibid. b.* V. 586. *b.* Whether it be not necessary to make outward profession of it in time of persecution. I. 663. *a. b.* There are truths against which the most prejudiced and the most passionate men will not dispute. 708. *b.* The depositaries of truth compared to the dogs of the Capitol. 773. *b.* Those truths, which are called maxims, no less clash with each other, than errors and truths. 784. *b.* They are two very different things, to love truth in itself, and to love the party which one takes for the true one. II. 24. *a. b.* It avails little that there should be such a thing, if we have no rule to distinguish it from falsehood. 327. *a. b.* Whether it ought to be suppressed. 451. *b.* We lose it by disputing too much. 485. *b.* It does not need to be supported by ill means. III. 55. *a. b.* There are some who preserve it as they do a piece of China-ware. 902. *b.* The soul is more strongly fastened to it by the weight of the passions than by the charms of light. IV. 188. *b.* Whether we ought to own disadvantageous truths. V. 824. 825.
- Truths* (Evangelical) it is essential to them not to be squared by the rules of Philosophy. V. 815.
- Truths* (Historical) are not less impenetrable than Physical ones, on many occasions. II. 543. *b.* Who were called the three pillars of truth in Spain. IV. 723. *a.* The suppression of a truth is a real lie, when it is done with an intention to deceive him who asks a question. V. 51. *b.* 52. *a.*
- Tudensis* (Benjamin) makes David the co-temporary of Romulus. IV. 763. *b.*
- Tudisque*, the signification of that word, according to Menage and Bouhours. V. 540. *a. n. (2), (3).*
- Tullius* (Servius) what was the preface of his rise to the kingly dignity. V. 288. *a.*
- Tunic* of JESUS CHRIST, Bajazet boasted that he had it. V. 469. *a. b.* 470. *a. b.*
- Turenne* (the Marshal de) is fond of re-uniting both religions. I. 705. *b.* The gentlemen of Port-Royal are very busy to make him change his religion. II. 518. *a. b.* He did not pretend to learning. 520. *b.* The impertinence of a country squire in speaking of that great Captain. 774. *a.* On what occasion his gallantries were talked of. III. 265. *b.* 266. *a.* His meals reckoned too short. V. 35. *b.* Killed. IV. 211. *b.* Macaron composes his funeral oration. 172. Beaten at Mariendal. 917. *b.* Puts Colonel Rosen under guard. *ibid.*
- Turenne* (Madam de) her character. IV. 331. *b.*
- Turin*, by whom and when its citadel was built. IV. 453. *b.*
- Turk*, that word strikes the common people more than the word Ottoman; Jurieu's artifice in the use he makes of these words. V. 803.
- Turks* cannot forbear laughing, when they see the image of St George in the Christian Churches. II. 466.

II. 466. Very much in conceit with their own language. 517. *b.* Are not so destitute of books as people imagine. III. 171. *a. b.* Some of them believe the transmigration of souls. 341. *b.* They introduce the ministry of religion into the design of making conquests. 586. *a.* Their defeat. 682. *b.* 683. *a.* They are defeated at the passage of Raab. 793. *b.* Have a greater aversion to the Jews, than to any people in the world. IV. 40. *a.* Several among them pull out their eyes, after having seen Mecca. *ibid. b.* Have a great veneration for a camel. *ibid.* Who was the first of their Emperors, to whom the western nations gave the title of Grand-Seignior. 49. *a.* Who are those called among them the sons of the Holy Ghost. 346. They have no sort of moderation in their passions, with respect to their Princes. 425. *a.* Sacrifice to the reigning Prince, the life or the liberty of all his brothers. 558. *a.* When and for what reason they solemnly curse the Christians. V. 390. *b.* Conceive a jealousy against Falkreddin, and put him to death. III. 3.

Turn: the turn which sometimes popular injustice gives to things. V. 188. *b.*

Turnebus, in what superior to Bodin. II. 44. *b.* Makes a speech against an Atheist. IV. 845. *b.*

Turraus (Peter) Regent at Dijon, tried for a conjurer, but defended by Castellani, and absolved by the Judges. II. 368. *a.*

Tzarlus, the family name of Tilli. V. 356, 357.

Tutus is too modern an author to deserve to be followed in a matter of fact, which can neither be reconciled with Homer, nor with the ancient authors. I. 79. *b.*

V.

V*acuum*: a Vacuum, and the Hypothesis of atoms, admitted by some Philosophers in the East. III. 792. *a. b.* Gets the start of Des Cartes's doctrine by degrees. *ibid. b.* Those who demonstrate a vacuum, do a pleasure to the Sceptics. 793. *a. b.* Reasons against the existence of a vacuum. V. 615. *b.* 616. *a. b.* 617. *a. b.*

Vayer (la Mothe le) cited upon the Pagan Oracles. I. 132. *b. n. (3).* Censured for what he says of Socrates and Alcibiades. 131. *b.* He commits several faults, in speaking of Stratonice and Comababus. II. 535. *a. b.* His answer to Garasse's invectives against two Philosophers. 667. *b.* 668. *a.* Censured with respect to Augustus's successor. III. 816. *a.* He translates ill a passage of Quintilian touching the contempt which Alexander had for a man of extraordinary skill. IV. 9. *b.* 10. *a.* Blunders in explaining a passage of Homer concerning Ulysses and Penelope. 540. *a. b.* Is mistaken with respect to Pyrrho. 658. *b.* His blunders in speaking of Tacitus, and his Anachronism with respect to Thucydides and Demosthenes. V. 282. *b.* He makes a strange clamour against Alciatus and Ferret, for what they say of Tacitus's Latin. *ibid.* 283. *a. b.*

Vair (du) one of the decrees pronounced by that president. IV. 747. *a.* What he quotes from St Jerome. 799. *a. b.*

Val (du) the Physician, sent to the galleys, and for what reason. III. 954. *b.*

Valdagna (Joseph) a Physician in Brescia, is driven from thence, together with his defender Donzellinus. II. 689.

Valenciennes taken by assault the eighth day of the siege, but not by treachery. IV. 211. *a.*

Valentina of Milan suspected of practising against peoples lives by poison. II. 205. *a.*

Valentinian, (Emperor) although a very chaste man, composes a most lascivious Poem. I. 583. *b.* 584. *a. b.*

Valentinois (the Duke of) orders the hand and the end of the tongue of a man, who had spoken ill of him, to be cut off. IV. 89. *b.* Causes Lorenzo to be thrown into the Tiber. 90. *b.* Orders the tongue of Jerome Mancionus to be cut out. *ibid.*

Valera (Cyprian de) his Spanish translation of Calvin's institution. II. 262. *b. n. (39).*

VOL. V. No. CXLVIII.

Valery: how the estate of Valery came into the family of the Princes of Condé. III. 832. *a.*

Valerian, Emperor, durst not put his son under the direction of Aurelian. I. 570. *b.*

Valerius (Marcus) why surnamed Corvinus. II. 290. *b. n. (6).*

Valerius Maximus, we find a thought of his in a satire against the French Academy. I. 59. *a.* He is far from being an exact compiler. II. 343. *a. b.* Speaks too negligently of the temple of the earth. 344. *b.* Cannot be excused for what he says of the riches of Democritus's father. 635. *a.* Has taken Diagoras for Protagoras. 652. *b.* His mistake concerning Aristophanes. IV. 577. *b.* What he does to improve a jingle of Antitheses and Parallels for his purpose. V. 569. *b.* 570. *a.*

Valfiana quoted. III. 569. *a. b. n. (29).* 740. *b. n. (44).* IV. 246. *a. n. (4).* *Et passim alibi.*

Valerius (Henricus) censured. I. 100. *b.* His defence of Herodotus, who had attributed to God a jealous humour. IV. 576. *a. b.* His character. V. 805.

Valette (the Duke de la) condemned to lose his head, and for what reason. III. 59. *b.*

Valiere (Madam de la) what family she was of. V. 390. *a.*

Valla (George) his translation of Nemefius's book *de Natura Hominis*, treated with the utmost contempt by Nicæus Eliebodius. IV. 345. *b.* 346. *a.*

Valla (Laurentius) to be commended for his modesty. II. 432. *b.* A story that was applied to him. IV. 600. *b.* An ill-natured jest that was made upon him after his death. V. 434. *a. b.*

Vallier (St) what family he was of. IV. 694. *a.* Where and by what means he received his pardon, after being condemned to lose his head. *ibid. a. b.* His punishment of death changed into a perpetual imprisonment. 700. *a. b.*

Valois (Prince Charles de) is prevailed upon by the Pope to compose the confusions of Florence. II. 296. *a.*

Valour: the extraordinary valour of a young gentleman fighting against the Saracens. II. 136. *a. b.*

Van Dale, his answer to an objection. I. 281. *b.* He supplies the author with some remarks. IV. 424. *b.* V. 536. *a.*

Vasini, what he would have to be done in great cities. II. 627. *b.* A professed Atheist. V. 813.

Vanity: the foolish vanity of men, with respect to providence. I. 24. *a.* In what the vanity of human occupations chiefly consists. II. 671. *a. b.* It does but too much prevail among the most pious persons. IV. 331. *b.* How many crimes it is the cause of. 684. *b.* A vanity that bought flattery by a testamentary legacy. V. 566. *a.*

Vanity of Sciences, a book which gave great offence to many. I. 153. *a. b.* 154. *a.*

Vannucci says that the Italian writers should not discover their mother's nakedness. III. 273. *b.*

Vardes, Governour of la Cappelie, condemned to death for contempt of the court, and afterwards declared innocent. III. 263. *a.*

Vardes (the Marquis de) disgraced by reason of some intrigues mentioned in a book. III. 263. *a.*

Variations, the History of the Xth century is quite full of them. IV. 429. *b.*

Varillas censured for his paraphrase on a passage of Paul Jovius. I. 57. *b.* Commits several remarkable blunders in speaking of Agricola. 144. *a. b.* And about the learned men whom he has mentioned in his Anecdotes of Florence. 201. *b.* What he says there concerning the book *de Gloria*, is inconsistent with what he has said of it in the life of Lewis XI. 202. *b.* 203. *a. b.* He has translated ill a passage of Jovius. *ibid.* Quoted. 403. *a. b. n. (4), (5), (6), (7).* 404. *a. n. (9).* 405. *b. n. (18).* III. 151. *a. b. n. (2), (4), (5).* *Et passim alibi.* His moderation commended, and the liberty taken by the author of the second edition of the Menagiana, censured. I. 586. *b.* 587. *a.* He is censured for several mistakes, with respect to Calvin. II. 62. *a. b.* And to Luther. 75. *b.* 76. *a.* In the public confession which he makes of a fault, he commits several others. 137. *a. b.* Censured for a mistake both in a point of fact and in a point of right. 184. *b.* 185. *a.* His errors touching one of Calvin's books. 260. *a. b.* They are so enormous, that they are enough to make one renounce the study of History. *ibid.*

11 T

- ibid.* *a.* He advances things that do not deserve to be confuted. 266. *b.* Had not the courage to publish his sentiments of a story published against Calvin. 267. *b.* A passage of his concerning the life of that Reformer, wrote by Papirius Masso, examined. 268. *b.* 269. *a.* His manner of reading the books which he consulted, must be unaccountable. *ibid.* His dispute with Dr Burnet about Camden's History, examined. 283. *b.* 284. *a.* He is censured for two faults, which he commits in speaking of Castellan, and the Assembly of Melun. 375. *b.* 376. *a. b.* Reflexions on his account of the Calvinism of the Ducheſs of Eſtampes. 843. *a.* His mistakes touching the motive from which that lady's husband caused a juridical enquiry to be made against her. 844. *a. b.* He is censured with respect to Calvin's going to see the Ducheſs of Ferrara. III. 28. *b.* 29. *a. b.* And with respect to the motives which engaged that Princess to renounce Popery. *ibid.* *b.* Commits several faults in speaking of Mademoiselle de Rohan, and the Duke of Nemours. 142. *a. b.* 143. *a. b.* He did not know all those who have wrote the conspiracy of the Count of Fiesque. 196. *b.* Makes a curious observation upon the massacre of Goudimel, whom he improperly calls Claudin. 197. and *b.* 198. *a.* Maintains against the Spanish Historians, that Charles V was not ignorant of the Latin tongue. 323. *b.* Censured with respect to the correspondence which Henry II, while he was Dauphin, kept up with the Constable of Montmorency. 395. *a. b.* Is liable to censure, with respect to a certain speech which is said to have been pronounced by Pompey Colonna against the Popes. 614. *a. b.* Whence come all his different Hypotheses. 864. *a.* He would have no reason to complain that his History of Heresy had been taken for a romance. IV. 192. *b.* His Romantic flourishes on the story of Musurus. 293. *b.* 294. *a.* He takes one Alphonso for another, in the preface to his Anecdotes. 312. *b.* 313. *a.* He relates a very singular fact, tho' a little doubtful, touching Macrin. 19. *a. b.* Tells a great many falsties of Ochinus. 392. *a. b.* Did not know that a certain satire pointed at Henry IV. 482. *b.* Censured for what he says of Platina. 687. *b.* And of the reason why the Calvinists hated the Ducheſs of Valentinois. 696. *b.* He is fit to spoil a great many authors. 697. *a.* Does not spare the mother of Charles IX. 803. *a.* It is not easy to apprehend why he has struck the Count de Laval out of the house of Montmorency, after having once made him descend from it. 887. *b.* He has put in his History of Heresy a marginal note, which has been a snare to some learned men. 920. *b.* Is criticized with respect to Charles IX, and the cause of his death. V. 392. *b.* 393. *a.* Loves to say what is not to be found in common Histories. 748. Did not publish all that people had seen in his manuscripts, and why. IV. 712. *a.*
- Varietum*: the editors of books, *cum Notis Variorum*, should never leave out the Epistles Dedicatory, and the Prefaces. I. 225. *b.*
- Varro*, what he said of the nuptials of virgins, and of the nuptials of widows. IV. 192. *b.* Nigidius was reckoned not inferior to him. IV. 368. *a.* Stories that are attributed to him. 370. *a.*
- Varus*, the Tragic Poet, recites, for his own performance, a Tragedy composed by another. V. 485. *a. n.* (13).
- Vass*, to whom the massacre, that was made of the Huguenots there, ought to be imputed. III. 287. *b.* 288. *a.*
- Kaffer* (le) what he relates, concerning the Duke of Orleans, Francis the first's second son. III. 96. *a. b.*
- Vatican*, its thunders highly contemned. II. 378. *b.* 379. *a.* Who was the founder of the Vatican Library. V. 545. *b.*
- Vocatſſeur* (Father) the oversight that author falls into in his treatise of the burlesque stile. I. 350. *a. b.* He knew authors who would rather have lost the greatest advantages, than have given up the praise which they thought they had merited by their romances. III. 379. *b.* His reasons against the liberty of inserting obscenities in an epigram. V. 839. *n.* (15).
- Vauban* (Mr de) employs his whole skill in fortifying Landau. III. 718.
- Vaudis*, the History of their Churches by Peter Gilles. III. 161, 162. Translated by Guichenon. 275. *b.* Send Yfe into England. 597. Teased by Possievin, and persecuted by Calrocaro. 757. and *a. b.* 758. and *a. b.* Persecuted by Marco Aurelio Rorencio. IV. 916. *a. b.* Calumniated by Samuel de Cassini. *ibid.* *b.* And defended by the Sieur Valerius Gros. 917. *b.* Sums of money raised for them. III. 595. *b.* 596. *a.*
- Vangelas*, his excellent advice, with respect to the French language. II. 775. *b.* Who was the Vangelas of the Latin tongue. III. 319. *b.*
- Vautier* proposes the erecting a place of Court-Astrologer. IV. 260. *b. n.* (26).
- Uberti* (Farinata de gli) lodged in the shades by Dante. II. 399. *b.* Guido Cavalcante married his daughter. *ibid.*
- Ubiquity*, who were the first authors of that doctrine. IV. 288. *a. b.* V. 549. *b.* The troubles which it occasioned in Germany. III. 391. *a. b.*
- Ugalric*, his letter deserves to be rejected. III. 225. *a. b.*
- Vedelius* (Nicolas) confutes Elias Schiller, and does it in eleven days. V. 81. and *b.*
- Venator*, the description he makes of Divines. III. 250. *b.* 251. *a.*
- Vendôme* (Geoffrey, Abbot of) whether it be true that he put Robert d'Arbrissel in mind of his faulty conduct, with respect to women. III. 63. *a. b.* 66. *b.* 67. *a.*
- Vendôme* (the Duke of) Henry IV designs him for his successor. III. 184. *a.*
- Venitians* order their Ambassadors to make very advantageous offers to the Emperor Maximilian. III. 274. *a.* Several States confederate to humble them. 811. and *a. b.* &c. They repulse the Emperor Maximilian, who had besieged Padua. IV. 293. *a.* Being animated to wage war with the Turks, they hinder the peace which the Emperor was desirous of concluding with the Porte. 430. It is not the custom of their nobles to have private mistresses. 775. *a. b.* Complained of being ill used by Capriata in his History. II. 311. *b.* How he justified himself in that point. *ibid.* Digby takes several prizes from them, and beats their fleet near Scanderon. 664.
- Vengeance*, that of men is oftentimes more dreaded than the vengeance of God. I. 435. *b.* 436. *a.*
- Venice*: why the Senate of Venice is pleased with the irregularities of the clergy. I. 30. *b.* That Senate is offended, because Pope Innocent VIII, bestowed the Patriarchate of Aquileia, without consulting them. 634. The laws of that Republic forbid all her ministers at Rome to accept any benefice. *ibid.* Its Senate inflexible on that head. *ibid.* The Republic of Venice disputes the precedence with the Duke of Savoy. III. 216. Its Ambassador burns, before Henry IV, all the papers in which he owed himself indebted to that Republic. 317. *b.* 318. *a.* Its Ambassadors arrive in Holland, to congratulate King William. IV. 505. *a. n.* (77).
- Venus* rising out of the sea, painted upon the model of one of Alexander's mistresses. I. 368. *b.* Augustus remits the inhabitants of Cooe an hundred talents, which they were indebted to him, for the purchase of that picture. 369. *a.* A doubt concerning the said Venus. *ibid.* Fault found with the temple of Venus built by Hadrian. 377. *a.* She had a temple on mount Libanus. II. 4. *b.* How people were initiated in her mysteries. 507. *a. b.* What the Fathers said of the Venus that was adored in Cyprus. *ibid.* The Paphian Venus, when, and for what reason her priesthood began to be in the hands of a Prince of the blood. 507. Her vengeance against Diomedes and Clio. 742. *b.* A continual miracle performed in one of her temples. 746. *b.* Incroaches more upon Bacchus in the North, than Bacchus does upon Venus in the South. 823. *a. b.* Bacchus does upon Venus in the South. 823. *a. b.* Venus Mignonitis, where, and by whom, a temple was built to her. III. 368. *b.* 369. *a.* The original of the pretended Divinity of Venus. 375. *b.* She obtained the golden apple. 644. *a. b.* 645. *a.* There was a Venus surnamed Melanitis. 700. *a. b.* Venus was the best served of all the Pagan deities. 701. *b.* The temple of Venus Homicide, what it was. 702. *a.* Venus Urania, her temple plundered by some Scythians. IV. 790. What is the proper way to mortify her. V. 98. *b.* 99. *a. b.* A sacrifice which the Roman ladies offered to her. 130. *a. b.* An

- An honour which was done to her, that she might put a stop to lewdness. 268. *a. b.*
- Vercel*, the capitulation of that town faithfully observed. V. 504.
- Vercoid* (Dulcineus of) an impious Fanatic. III. 281. *b.*
- Vercingetorix* comes to the relief of Alexia with 300000 men. II. 413. *a.* Defeated by Cæsar. *ibid.* A fine observation which Plutarch makes on that defeat. *ibid.*
- Verdier* (Antony du) Sieur de Vau-Privas, censured for his negligence, with respect to the Acts of the Apostles, wrote in French rhyme, and fitted for the stage. II. 478, 479, 480.
- Verdier* (Claudius du) Censor-General, is angry with Lycophron, for what he says of Penelope. IV. 542. *b.*
- Vere*, a Lordship in Zealand, vulgarly called Ter-Veer. I. 781. *a.* II. 90. *a.*
- Verger*: See the article *VERGERIUS* (*Angulus*).
- Vergerius* (Peter-Paul) challenges an Apostolic Nuncio, to a public dispute. III. 840. *b.* The reason why it was declared to him, he could not take his place in the Council of Trent. V. 454. *b.* His abridgment of the Anatomy of the Mals. 455. *b.* 456. *a.* His book against the proclaiming of the Council. *ibid.* His books quickly lost their credit. 457. *a.* They very much galled the Court of Rome. 456. *b.* A book is dedicated to him, to congratulate him for having abandoned the party of Antichrist. II. 749.
- Vernias* (Nicoletus) Professor of Philosophy at Padua, his dangerous opinions. IV. 377. He maintained the opinion of Averrhoës, on the unity of the Intellect. *ibid. b.*
- Veron*, a Missionary, according to Rivet, was ignorant both in Greek and in Hebrew. II. 40. *b.*
- Verfus*: amorous verses, and well sung, have a great efficacy in touching the hearts of women. I. 27. *b.* Verses upon the loss of a battle, which offended the victor as well as the vanquished. 191. To be fond of verses, is not enough to make a man a Poet. 375. *b.* Amorous verses thrown into the fire. 560. *b.* Ecclesiastics who have wrote such verses. 630. *b.* It does not follow that a man who writes such is a Pagan. 584. *a. b.* A wonderful facility in making verses. 664. *b.* 665. *a.* III. 573. *a. b.* Ephorus writes a verse in the same place, where he condemns the cadence and numbers of discourse. II. 772. *b.* The recital of some verses inspired conquerors with humanity. 866. *b.* 867. *a.* Hexameter verses were not used in Tragedies. IV. 596. *b.* The same verses wrote by several Poets. 822. *a. b.* Verses composed at four livres a hundred, and others at forty pence. 873. *b.* Profane and leud verses, rewarded with church-benefices. 896. *a. b.* Making verses which we can read to no body, and walking in the dark, is the very same thing. 450, 451. Who first begun to comment on the verses of another composed in the vulgar tongue. II. 398. *b.*
- Verses for Interludes*, Benéfede was an original in that kind. I. 752. *b.*
- Verseans*, there are authors who only consult them. I. 205. *a.*
- Vernus* (*Ælius*) Emperor, what were the books he read most. III. 260. *a.*
- Vesalius* (Andrew) Borganutius finds the manuscript of his *Great Surgery*, and publishes it. II. 83. *and b.*
- Vespasian*, Orators were pretty well paid in his time. I. 196. *a.*
- Vessels*: some fine vessels of earthen ware broke, and for what reason. II. 558. *b.*
- Vestal Virgins* condemned for Incest. II. 345. *b.* A noble piece of History on that subject, lost. *ibid.* It was the custom of the High Priests, to appoint certain ladies to take care of the vestal virgins, that were obliged by sickness to leave their convent. III. 5. *b.* It is surprizing that they should ever have fallen into incontinence. 830. *b.*
- Ugbelli* (Abbot) takes the chronicle of Martin Polonus from him, and gives it to one Martin, a Monk of the order of Cîteaux. IV. 708. *b.*
- Vial of Rheims*, Paul Emilius has said nothing of it. II. 763, 764. *and a.*
- Vic* (Mr de) his turn of mind. II. 817. *a.*
- Vicinitus*, the meaning of that word. III. 777.
- Vices*, there is a less affinity between them than people commonly imagine. I. 232. *b.* II. 719. *a.* The benefits which arise from them do not hinder their being in their own nature evil. I. 159. *b.* IV. 188. *b.* Some prevail in all countries, religions, and ages. I. 561. *a.* There are some which are vices of the climate, and not vices of religion. II. 820. *a. b.* Whether, without vice, there could not be such a thing as virtue. IV. 519. *a. b.* 520. *a. b.* 521. *a. b.* Whether vice is always punished with adversity in this world. V. 11. *a. b.*
- Vicissitude of human affairs*, how surprizing it is. III. 547. *b.*
- Vico* (the Marquis del) causes the Anatomy of the Mals to be translated from Italian into French. V. 461. *a. b.*
- Vidimus* (human) were acceptable to the gods. III. 651. *b.* See *Sacrifices*.
- Victoria*, or *Victorina*, called in her armies the mother of the camp. III. 531. *a.*
- Victories*, few of them can by their consequences decide the disputes of Gazetteers. II. 413. *a.* Many obtain victories, but few know how to make a good use of them. 414. *a. b.* IV. 3. *a.*
- Vidal* (Mr du) complains of the oppression which the Protestants suffer in the Palatinate, &c. II. 125. *b.* n. (34).
- Vienne*: a Bishop of Vienna changes his maxims, on his becoming a Minister of State. IV. 13. *b.*
- Vignere* (Blaise de) translates and comments on Cæsar's Commentaries. I. 631. Mistakes the meaning of a passage in Martial. 18. *b.* And of another in Plutarch. 75. *b.* A curious passage of his concerning an enterprise of the Amazons. 85. *b.* 86. *a.*
- Vignol Marville* quoted. III. 145. *and a. b. n.* (15). *Et passim alibi.* What he tells us of a certain Philosopher. IV. 913. *b.* Judges too harshly of La Mothe le Vayer's works. V. 427. *b.* 428. *a. b.*
- Vignier* (Nicolas) not to be excused for a fast he relates concerning Francisca. III. 99. *b.* Confounders Radulphus Flaviacensis with Ralph Higden. IV. 824. *a.* Censured on that head. *ibid. a. b.*
- Villars* (Francis de Boyvin Baron de) his maxim, *that they break the peace, not who first make war, but who arm privately, and use secret practices in prejudice of treaties and alliances.* II. 104. *a. b.*
- Villars* (Abbot de), see *Gabalii*.
- Villaviciensis* accused of plagiarism. III. 456. *b.*
- Villagaignon*, his character. IV. 870. *a.* He puts three Protestants to death. V. 477. *a.*
- Villena* (Henry de), a story that goes in Spain relating to that Marquis. V. 480. *a. b.*
- Villanus* (the Marquis de) pretended to Astrology. IV. 263. *a.*
- Villeroi* (the Marquis de) obliges the governour of La Motte to capitulate, and the Queen-Mother does not observe the capitulation. IV. 278.
- Villeroi* (the Marshal de) prisoner in the castle of Ambres. II. 97. *b.*
- Villiers* (Peter de), Chaplain to William I, Prince of Orange, reckoned the author of the apology for that Prince, and of a letter against the book of Concord. III. 392. *a. b.* Gerard de Renesse reprints the said letter with notes. 391. *b.*
- Villon* posts up theses against Aristotle's doctrine. IV. 262. *a.*
- Vincent*, Minister of Rochelle, his reflexion upon a comedy. IV. 324. *b.* 325. *a. n.* (13). V. 82. *b.*
- Vindingius*, a fault of his adopted by the author of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*. I. 657. *b.*
- Vinnius* (Arnold) writes notes on Peckius's Commentary *ad tir. d. Nautæ*, &c. IV. 528. *a. b.*
- Violence*: in what case violence should be used towards people. IV. 526. *a. b.*
- Vires* (Peter), the method he made use of in attacking Popery. V. 482. *a. b.* He turned his arms likewise against Deism. *ibid. b.* 483. *a.*
- Virgil* has taken one of Homer's episodes for a model. I. 80. *b.* No Poet, before him, ever said what he says concerning the dead body of Hector. 81. *a.* A precept of his applied to old authors. 120. *a. b.* He gave orders to burn the *Æneid*. 375. *a. b.* Is criticized and defended, with respect to the word *illaudatus*. II. 234. *a. b.* Cento's have been made of him. 298. *and a.* What sect of Philosophers he was of, and who was his master. 390. *a.* A design

- design to justify him at any rate. III. 127. *a.* It was pretended that some of his words had the power of driving out devils. 890. *b.* 891. *a.* A supplement to his *Aeneid*. V. 446. *b.* Malatesta causes his statue to be thrown down. 451. *a. b.* The honour which the Roman people did him one day. 487. *a.* Parthenius taught him Greek. IV. 483. *a.*
- Virgil* (Polydore) his book *de Inventoribus Rerum* contains several things which the Inquisition disliked. V. 495. *a. b.*
- Virgin*, the Antients used that word in a more general sense than we do. II. 140. *b.* The Turks call certain persons, born of a virgin-mother, the sons of the Holy Ghost. IV. 346.
- Virgin* (the blessed) the Monks are not her only indiscreet votaries. I. 36. A book full of visions concerning her. 136. *a.* Whence it comes that no one has yet said that she governs the world alone. 137. *a. b.* To what danger they expose themselves, who disapprove the errors that magnify her honours. 138. *a. b.* Her epithet of *Mother of God* leads one to troublesome consequences. *ibid.* and IV. 356. *b.* One is sometimes more speedily saved by invoking her name, than by invoking that of *JESUS CHRIST*. I. 198. *a.* The expressions of her indiscreet votaries condemned by Bellarmine. 728. *b.* She is put as a fourth person of the Godhead. II. 85. and *a. b.* Had a penetrative chastity. 108. *b.* Of what efficacy the prayers are, which are addressed to her, the first of April, at eight in the morning. 316. *a.* Her immaculate conception received as an article of faith, by the Faculty of Divinity at Paris. IV. 77. *b.* 78. *a.* 366. *b.* 367. *a. b.* Drawn after the model of women, such as pleased the Painters. II. 729. *a. b.* III. 57. *b.* How much people are puzzled to defend her worship. 84. *b.* Whether she wrote a letter to the inhabitants of Messina. 563. *a.* And to St Ignatius. *ibid.* A book wherein Orisons are addressed to all the parts of her body. 569. *a.* Idle traditions concerning her father and mother. 570. and *a. b.* 571. and *a. b.* 572. and *a. b.* Whence proceed the extravagant honours which so many Christians pay to her. 636. *a.* A contract made in her favour, by Lewis XI, King of France. 808. *a. b.* Whether exemption from Original Sin be comprehended in the quality of the Mother of God. 931. *a.* From what motive the Jesuits teach her immaculate conception. *ibid.* The Protestants enter themselves into one of her fraternities. IV. 121. *a.* The abuses that have been committed, with respect to her, were equally to be feared, whether she was called the Mother of *JESUS CHRIST*, or the Mother of God. 347. *a. b.* 352. *b.* 353. *a.* Conjectures upon the causes of the progress of her worship. 354. *a. b.* 355. *a. b.* People are obliged to her for all the benefits they receive, and not to God. 354. *b.* 355. *a. b.* What Clemens Alexandrinus says of her. 805. *a.* She has not been able to escape calumny. V. 84. *a.* It is not probable, according to Mr Patin, that St Luke drew so many pictures of her as he is said to have done. 156. *b.* Stiled Generalissima, and by whom. 679. How the Fathers of the Church proved her virginity. 772. *b.*
- Virginity*, whether the loss of it makes any alteration in the outside. II. 636. *a. b.* A Bishop that was fain to explore the virginity of certain Nuns by squeezing their dugs. III. 344. *b.* 345. *a.*
- Virtue*, a good reputation is not always the consequence of it. I. 279. *b.* Virtue and vice are sometimes in alliance. 413. *b.* A distinguished virtue never fails to raise envy. 460. *a.* The candor of an Athenian in owning this. *ibid.* It must be acquired by the sweat of our brows. 573. *a.* Whether it be no more than an empty name: the complaint of Brutus examined. II. 164. *a. b.* 165. *a.* V. 9. *b.* 10. *a. b.* 11. *a. b.* One of the greatest victories which it can obtain over nature. II. 269. *b.* Cannot be without a conflict. III. 620. 889. *a.* It is sometimes easier to have the reality than the appearance of it. I. 279. *a. b.* III. 602. *b.* There is no virtue but what proceeds from a victory disputed with the passions. 889. *a.* It is discouraging virtue, to rob it of its temporal recompence. 814. *a.* Its bad consequences on some occasions. IV. 188. *b.* Who are those who maintain, that virtue ought to be followed by reason of its excellency. V. 204. *b.*
- Virtuous*; it signifies nothing for a man to be virtuous, if he is not master of a noisy blustering eloquence. I. 459. *a. b.*
- Vision*: a vision may occasion a mortal distemper. II. 715. *b.* 716. *a.*
- Vision ratified*, what is meant by it. II. 113. *b.*
- Visionaries* (les) a dramatic piece, who is the author of it. IV. 114.
- Visionaries*, the chimerical notions of a visionary. II. 84. *b.* 85. *a.* Visionaries and interpreters of prophecies are very often impostors and incendiaries. 143. and *a. b.* Their true character. 538. *a. b.* They will always be well received, provided they have cunning enough to accommodate themselves to the passions of the times. 693. Are never at a loss. 692. *a.* Our age seems to be more terrible to them than the preceding ones. III. 691. *a.* What lengths they carry their knavery or folly. *ibid. b.* And their extravagance. 692. *b.*
- Visits* are an incumbrance to learned men. I. 626. *b.*
- Vitellius* foresaw the advancement of those whom fortune had a mind to favour. IV. 397. *b.* 398. *a.* Gains the battle against Otho. V. 261. and *b.*
- Vitex*, what name it has at present. V. 334. *a.*
- Vitruvius*, his sepulchre found near Formium. IV. 311. *a.* Particulars concerning his book. V. 269. *a. b.* 270. *a. b.*
- Vives* (Ludovicus) what he says of the false zeal of the Legendaries. III. 708. *b.* His Institution of a Christian woman translated into French by Peter de Changy. II. 434. and 435. *a. b.* Translated also by Lewis Turquet. *ibid. b.* The reason he gives why Leontium wrote a book against Theophrastus. III. 779. The translation of his work *de Famina Christiana* is defective. *ibid. b.*
- Ulysses*, what punishment he inflicted on Penelope's maids. IV. 542. *b.* 543. *a.*
- Ulm* surprized and taken by the Elector of Bavaria. III. 719. *b.* It is said that Spinoza lived there, and there begun his *Traictatus Theologico-Politicus*. V. 225. and *n. (c).*
- Ulmus* (Marc-Antony) author of a treatise *de Barba humana*, quoted. III. 81. *b. n. (21).*
- Unbelievers* are not always induced to unbelief by the motives of self-love. II. 350. Perhaps there never were so many as in the XVIIth and XVIIIth centuries. III. 267. *a.* See *Libertines*.
- Uneartheness*, a passage of St Evremond on that subject. V. 585. *b.* A criminal remedy that is often made use of to remove it. 584. *a.*
- Unheard*: no man ought to be condemned unheard. I. 757. *b.*
- Unitarians* excluded out of the amnesty granted to others that were not Catholics, in Poland. III. 901. The history of their establishment, growth, and destruction in Poland. V. 168. *a. b.* 169. *a. b.* & *seq.* The different attempts which they made to settle in Holland. 173. *b.* 174. *a. b.* 175. *a. b.*
- Unitarians*, in what sense the author takes that word. V. 825. and *n. (67).* Their system preferable to that of the Dualists. *ibid.*
- Univcrsalia*, the danger there is in denying the reality of them. V. 542. *a.*
- University of Paris*, the History of it. II. 106. *a.* Verloris pleads for the Jesuits, in the trial they had with that university, and gains the cause. V. 464. and *b. n. 1.*
- University of Leyden* revives the degree of Doctor. I. 239. Pronounces a judgment worthy to be taken notice of. 242. *b.* A reflexion upon that judgment. *ibid.* 243. *a.*
- University of Upsal*, Gustavus Adolphus's liberalities to it. V. 660.
- Universities*, the debauchery which prevailed in some. I. 247. *a. b.* Their interest should be preferred to that of the churches. 260. A good agreement there among the colleagues is a thing rarely to be met with. 261. A great many brag of a familiarity in the university with such or such an one, who is grown into reputation for his writings. II. 284. *b.* The greatest part of the quarrels which divide universities, are ridiculous. 697. *a.* There are very few verities, with which the Jesuits have not had some dispute. 700. *b. n. (2).* Luther turned the universities and their doctors into ridicule. III. 953. *a. b.* Complaints against the multitude of them. V. 229. *b.*
- Universities of England*, an encomium on them. V. 513. *b.*

Volunt.

INDEX.

139

- Vicius*, his disputes with Marefius. IV. 121. *a. b.*
 122. *a.* Quoted. 583. *a. n.* (3). 584. *a. b. n.* (7).
 (8). *Et passim alibi.*
Vogelfang confutes an explication of Wolzogue. IV.
 877. *b.* 878. *a. b.*
Vulture, it has been said of him, that he had a simple
 look, but nevertheless agreeable. II. 617. *a.* The
 great ease which appears in his works cost him no
 small pains. III. 262. *a.* What he writ to the
 Duke of Enguieu. 748. *a. n.* (2). What he would
 have done, if he himself had published his works.
 939. *a.* His friends threatened with military ex-
 ecution those who should dare to censure him. V.
 344. *b.* The liberty he takes in his Poems. 840.
a. (16). Charged with using obscene expressions.
 844. *a.*
Voices: a fine voice has a great influence upon the fair
 sex. I. 27. *b.* One of the finest in the world.
 662, 663. and *a. b.*
Volaterra, what he relates of Francisca, a Roman lady.
 III. 98. *b.* 99. *a.* The table of his book is not
 good. *ibid.* He roundly affirms that Savonarola
 was a cheat, *etc.* V. 60, 61.
Voluntarius, facts concerning his life. III. 958. *a. b.*
 959. *a. b.*
Voluptuous persons, it is a matter indifferent to them
 what way they obtain pleasure, provided that they
 do obtain it. IV. 30. *b.* 31. *a. b.* How they use
 their riches. 87. How they endeavour to justify
 themselves. V. 30. *a.* They may be brave and la-
 borious. 271. *a. b.* *etc.*
Voragius (Jacobus de) whether he and Joannes de
 Janua are one and the same author. I. 614. and
a. b.
Vorsius (Conrad) gives an account of his faith before
 an assembly of the Faculty of Theology at Heidel-
 berg. IV. 606. Causes Socinus's treatise *de Anti-*
ritate S. Scripturae to be reprinted, with his notes.
 V. 180. *b.*
Vossius is very particular in his apology for the Abbe-
 rites. I. 18. *b.* 19. *a.* Censures Pliny. 82. *a.*
 His inattention. 57. *a.* 62. *a. b.* He refutes him-
 self in writing against Corradus. 59. *a. b.* Com-
 mits a fault in censuring that of Sigismund Gele-
 nius. III. 711. Consults Grotius about an ob-
 jection against one's changing his religion. IV. 375.
a. Censuring Quintilian, with respect to the questions
 that were put to Xenophon's wife, he is mistaken
 in his turn. 580. *a.* Complains of the great num-
 ber of overights which he found in ancient and
 modern authors. 594. *a. b.* Is censured for a thing
 which Sandius has taken no notice of. 600. *a. b.*
 Censured for the liberty he takes in quotations.
 783. *a. b.* He follows Rhodomannus in what he
 says of Cointus, and commits the same mistakes.
 817. *b.* Very judiciously censures the perverse hu-
 mour of Julius Cæsar Scaliger. II. 321. *b.* 322. *a.*
 Advances a conjecture touching Craterus, which is
 not probable. 563. *a. b.* For want of attention he
 falls into a mistake touching a passage of Lactan-
 tius. III. 55. *b.* Why he would not justify his
 father-in-law against the mistakes of Thuanus. 627.
b. 628. *a.* Quoted with respect to the severity of
 the Lutherans against the Flemish Church banished
 from London. V. 550. *a. b. n.* (24), (25), (26).
 Found fault with. II. 32. *a. n.* (6). 173. *a. n.*
 (10). 179. *b. n.* (72). IV. 713. and *b. n.* (69).
Vossius (Isaac), Francis Junius dies at his house. III.
 629.
Vows made at sea are too commonly forgot on shore.
 II. 83. *a.* An Italian proverb on that head.
ibid.
Vows (Monastical) are prejudicial to the state. II.
 174. *b.*
Ur, that word has given occasion to several fables. I.
 45. *a.*
Urban VI (Pope) is pleased with the news of Charles
 of Durazzo's death. IV. 305. *a.*
Urban VIII (Pope) writes verses in praise of Aldro-
 vandus. I. 213. *b.* Causes a Poet to die with grief
 by reproaching him for his impudence. III. 465.
a. b. Complains to the King of France of his al-
 liance with the Swedes. 819. *b.*
Urſi (the Marquis d') censured by Astræa for exposing
 her quite naked to the eyes of Celadon. III. 866.
b. 867. *a.*
Urſiola (John-Baptist de), an instance of the singu-
 larity of his Latin orthography. III. 774. *a. b.*
 VOL. V.
- Urraca*, the eternal disgrace of Spain. V. 518. *b.* 519.
a. b. The French Ambassadors would not chuse
 for their master a Princess of that name. 519.
 520.
Useful: people prefer what is useful to justice and re-
 ligion. I. 130. *b.* 131. *a.* 460. *a.* IV. 618.
 621. *a. b.* 622. *a.*
Usher, his mistake touching Lollia Paulina. II.
 256. *b.*
Usher, it is seldom seen that those who raise one to
 the throne, do long enjoy his favours. II. 737. *a.*
Utrecht, the French carry away a book out of its
 library. IV. 235. *a.*
Vulcan, upon what conditions he made a suit of ar-
 mour for Achilles. I. 80. *b.* Is thrown headlong
 from heaven to earth. III. 751. *a. b.* What the
 vessel was which he made a present of to Pelops at
 his marriage. 373. *b.*
Vulgar: the vulgar suffer themselves to be easily im-
 posed upon. II. 148. *b.*
Vulgare, its authority is not preferred to that of the
 originals. I. 246. The author of it commended
 by Lewis de Dieu. II. 663. *b.*
- W.
- Wafter*, at what time they left off making use
 of them in the Sacrament of the Lord's
 Supper at Geneva. III. 343. *a. n.* (16).
Waggers, what is a good bait to draw them in. I.
 76. *a.*
Wagnus (Tobias) Chancellor of the University of
 Tübingen, writes against Hottinger's book about the
 Re-union. III. 526. *b.* 527. *a.*
Way (Milky) how formed. III. 637. *b.*
Wand, the cause of several fine discoveries. I. 4. *b.*
 5. *a.* A reflexion on its usefulness. 6. *b.* 7. *a.* Whe-
 ther that of James Aymar lost its credit. *ibid.* *b.* 8.
a. b. 9. *a. b.*
War, what are its usual fruits. I. 239. *a. b.* The
 consequence of a war raised in a communion. 241.
b. Whether in a war justice gives us reason to
 hope for good success. 280. *a.* Its laws are very
 cruel. 518. *b.* Which makes people detest the
 causes of it. *ibid.* An unfair war occasioned by the
 vengeance of the Duke of Montpensier. 591. One
 of its calamities. II. 159. *b.* An advantage possessed
 by the widows of those who had been slain in the
 wars. 289. There is nothing like the tongues of
 orators to cause a war either to begin or to continue.
 547. *b.* To conduct a war according to the laws
 of religion, is a Platonic idea. 511. *b.* Dicae-
 archus said that it destroyed more men than any
 other thing. 657. *b.* Those whose professions ought
 to lead them to dissuade from war, are often the
 instigators of it. 811. *a. b.* The wickedness of
 some particular persons, and the folly of the people,
 are the source of almost every war. *ibid.* *a.* It is
 a disgrace to return from a long war with empty
 hands. III. 396. *b.* Reflexions upon the wars
 which Clergymen advise. 871. *b.* The Cardinal's
 war, what it was. 873. *b.* A person that has
 learnt the art of war only by reading, ought to
 keep to the theory. IV. 14. *b.* The sacred war,
 by whom occasioned. 621, 622. War has maxims
 which become pernicious, when applied to the
 affairs of religion. 178. *a. b.* 179. *a.*
Waramund (Leonhart) writes in defence of Gebhard
 Truchses Archbishop of Cologne, and is refuted by
 González Pontius de Leon. III. 774.
Warriors, there are a great many who know how to
 conquer, but few who know how to make use of
 their victory. II. 413. *a. b.*
Wars (Civil) sometimes produce good effects. I. 577.
a. b. Whether in civil wars the Prince's party
 gives itself more liberty than the rebels. 711.
b. The scruples which Bogars had about the
 civil wars of the Protestants. II. 70. and *a. b.*
 The usual protestations that attend them. 515.
a. b.
Wars (Religious) are horrible. I. 648. *a.* From
 whence proceeded the first religious war in France.
 III. 513. *a.*
Wars (Literary) are sometimes violent and of a long
 continuance. I. 322. *b.* The hostilities that are
 committed

- committed in them. II. 433. *a. b. &c.* Resemble much those of Princes. 798. *b.*
- Warsaw*, Gustavus Adolphus makes incursions to the gates of that city. V. 666.
- Watchings*: impurities were committed in the devotional watchings that were observed in the ancient Church. V. 337. *a. and n.* (35). 472. *a.*
- Watchmen of the City*, in the Song of Solomon, explained by the Ecclesiastical powers: an explication occasioned by the author's imprisonment. III. 772. *a. b.*
- Water*, who taught men to mix it with their wine. I. 284. *b.* A certain water, which had a wonderful property. II. 876. *b.* It was the principle of all things, according to Thales. III. 650. *a. V.* 323. *a. b.* A health drunk and pledged with a large glass of water. 346. *a. b.* The proof of water in the prosecution of witches held lawful by William Adolphus Scribonius. 100.
- Wavre* is a Priory of Benedictines, and not a monastery of Canons regular. IV. 943. *b.*
- Weeks of Daniel*, Peter de Beloy's exposition of them. I. 740. *b.*
- Were-Wolf*: a discourse on the sentence that was passed on a man accused and convicted of being a were-wolf. I. 562. *b.* A man who transformed himself into one condemned to be burnt by an Arrêt of the Parliament of Dole. *ibid.*
- Wert*, a village of the province of Guelderland, to which the General, who bore that name, belonged. V. 539.
- Wessalus*, his life is little known. V. 544. *b.* Albert Hardenberg writes his life. III. 353.
- Whitaker* retracts part of what he had advanced in giving Campian the lye. III. 940. *b.* 941. *a. b.*
- Whole*: the word *all* or *whole* has both a collective, and a distributive sense. I. 298. *b.*
- Whores*, whether that word be more shocking than the word courtesan. V. 848.
- Whore* (Royal) what person was so called. II. 381.
- Whoredom*, whether the magistrate may and ought to punish it. I. 222. *a. b.* 223. *a. b.* What the abolition of it cost. 628. *a.* See *Fornication*.
- Whores* occasion a general war in Greece. IV. 579. *a.* An author wishes that it were permitted to give that name publicly to all women who are guilty of luxury. II. 400. *b.*
- Wicked Men*, their prosperity has at all times made people murmur against the providence of God. IV. 932. *b.* 933. *a. b. &c.*
- Wickedness*, in what manner God restrains it. II. 736. *a.*
- Wickliff* expelled from the University of Oxford. V. 556. *b.*
- Wicquefort*, a thought of his. I. 129. *a. n.* (16). The judgment which he passes on the greatest part of those who attempt to write the History of the United Provinces without permission. 170. *a. b. n.* (1). His morality is a great deal purer and more evangelical than that of some Divines. II. 154. *a.*
- Widows*, how much of their riches must be abated, when they have had no children. I. 393. *b.* An advantage possessed by those whose husbands had been slain in the wars. II. 289. Such as would never marry again, have always been most admired. III. 191. *b.*
- Widows of the Kings of France*, what they were obliged to do, till such time as their husbands were buried. III. 874. *a.* 828. *b.*
- Wierus*, his testimony concerning a black dog which Agrippa had. I. 151. *a.* And touching a fourth book attributed to the same Agrippa. 154. *a.*
- Will*: the will is not distinct from the understanding according to Spinoza, and has no liberty. V. 206. *b.* 207. *a.*
- Will*: sick persons put off making their will, as a bad omen. IV. 537. *b. n.* (24).
- William the Conqueror*, his laws condemned to castration those who forced a woman. III. 77. *a.*
- William I*, Prince of Orange, consults Baudouin. I. 692. *b.* His manifesto. III. 674. *b.*
- William III*, never besieged a place, the governor of which acknowledged him as a King. III. 718. *a.*
- Willis*, his doctrine concerning the souls of Brutes. IV. 912. *a. b.*
- Wilmot* (John), See *Rocheester*.
- Wimpfen*, when the Margrave of Baden was defeated there by Count de Tili. V. 357. *b.*
- Winchester*, the foundation of its college. V. 554. *b.* 555. *a.*
- Wind*: it has been found by observation, that there reigns a constant wind from east to west in the Torrid Zone. V. 782.
- Windet* censures the French and English translations of the Alcoran. IV. 872. *b.*
- Windsor*, who had the direction of the building of that castle. V. 552.
- Wine*, who taught men to mix water with it. I. 284. *b.* Made serviceable in the cure of distempers. 526. The faculty of bearing much wine, is, physically speaking, a good quality, but it is most commonly attended with a moral irregularity. II. 598. *a.* Priest-wine, what it is. 815. *b.* Effects of wine with relation to impurity. 822. *a.* The Romans forbid their women the use of it. *ibid.* *a. b.* 823. *a. b.* III. 967. *a.* IV. 756. *a. b.* 757. *a.*
- Wings* that a person made use of to fly with. II. 598. *and a. b.*
- Winter* of life, when it begins. I. 125. *b.* IV. 163. *a.*
- Wirttemberg* (Ulric Duke of) kills the Marshal of his court. III. 539. Seizes the Imperial town of Reutlingen, which occasions his being driven out of his dominions. *ibid.*
- Wirttemberg* (the Duke of) promises to abandon the Calvinists of France. III. 287. *b.* 288. *a.* Kills a gentleman, whose wife he was in love with. 541.
- Wife*: whether none but wife men live free from servitude. II. 427. *b.* Whether a wife man ought to marry. III. 382. *b.* What the infensibility of a wife man ought to be. IV. 669. *b.* The different significations of that word. V. 46. *b.*
- Wish*, one becoming a Philosopher. I. 560. *b.*
- Wishgots* had a law which condemned Sodomites to castration. III. 77. *a.*
- Wit*: a bar should be opposed against all the subtilties of human wit. I. 481. *a.* Whether let's wit be required to apply than to invent a thought. II. 778. *a. b.* 779. *a.* Wit may prevent the effects of ugliness. IV. 869. *b.* Your greatest wits have a mixture of madness. II. 321. *a.*
- Witchcraft*, a woman accused of it, and put to the torture. I. 147. *b.* Little credit is to be given to it. 621. *a. b.* The most incredulous Philosophers are puzzled on that head. III. 214. *b.* There are some people who believe nothing that is said about it. IV. 716. *a. b.* A posture that was taken for a kind of witchcraft. I. 207. *b.* 208. *a.* See *Magic*.
- Witches*: a witch filed a broomstick rider. I. 4. *a.* They steal children, and consecrate them to the Devil. II. 838. *a.* A confutation of those who doubt of the truth of what is said of them by Elich. 750. *a.*
- Witnesses*: what is said of the witnesses of some countries. II. 302. *b.* 303. *a.* There is a great difference between a hear-say witness and an eye-witness. 708. *b.* Their retractions should not be admitted as an evidence, and why. IV. 761. *a.* A person is not obliged to produce more than one witness, after making use of the phrase, *there are who have said, &c.* I. 236. *b.*
- Witnesses of the Truth*: a remark upon the character of authors, to whom the Protestants have given that title. II. 252. *b.* V. 71. *b.*
- Wittenberg*, its Divines do not reason at all consequentially upon the divorce of Henry VIII. I. 657. *b.* 658. *a. b.* Who first introduced the study of Chymistry into that University. V. 113.
- Wives*, there are some who make use of drugs to cause abortion. II. 314. *b.* A young and beautiful wife is not at all convenient for a traveller. IV. 282. *a.* Disloyal wives generally make some amends for the injury they do their husbands, by their flatteries and submission. 760. *b.* An uncommon instance of a wife's affection for her husband. 379. *b.*
- Wolfius* (Jerom) causes the Rectorship of the new college of Altorf to be given to John-Thomas Freigius. III. 105.
- Wolzege* advanced this proposition, that God might deceive, if he would. IV. 876. *b. &c.*
- Woman in Labour*, the story of one who caused the blessed candle to be put out, in order to make it serve her another time. II. 83. *a.* An author who compares himself to one, after having violated the oath which he had taken never to have any thing to do with the Bookfellers. 82. *a. b.* The reasons which

- which very justly discharge a woman from any thing she may have sworn on such an occasion. 83. *a.*
- Womb*: a seal fixed to all the wombs of the house of Abimelech. I. 38. *b.* What the Scripture means by the opening and closing of the womb. 448. *b.*
- Women* have in all ages been the occasion of several wars. I. 24. *a. b.* Are easily gained by verses and music. 27. *b.* A woman who prostitutes her honour, with her husband's consent, in order to save his life. 90. St Augustin's loose principle of morality on that head. 91. *and a. b.* A woman put to the torture, purely because she was suspected to be the daughter of a witch. 147. *b.* Women are sometimes obliged to hear very disagreeable things in certain judicial proceedings. 391. *a. b.* 392. *a. b.* 393. *a. b.* What are the parts of their happiness. 392. *b.* 393. *a. b.* What is the most dangerous rock for their honour. 405. A doctrine more extravagant than the community of women. 290. *a. b.* The story of the woman that was twice carried to be buried. 526. *b.* 527. *a.* A reflexion upon the qualities of handsome and rich, or poor and ugly, with respect to marriage. 550. *a. b.* What punishment the ancient Romans inflicted upon women taken in Adultery. 592. *a. b.* They seldom fall into Atheism. 639. *a.* Were not permitted to assist at the Olympic Games. 761. *and a. b.* Are very fond of fine cloaths and ornaments. II. 98. *a. b.* 99. *a. b.* III. 185. *b.* 569. *b.* 570. *a.* Whether it be praising a woman, to say that she rejected an immodest proposal. II. 27. *a. b.* How a modest woman was revenged upon her seducer. 220. *a. b.* There are some who are neither young nor handsome, and who nevertheless inspire men with as much or more passion, than those who have these qualities. 256. *b.* Those of high quality are forced to make the first advances in love to their inferiors. 312. *a. b.* They occasion a great many misfortunes. 481. *b.* The courage of those of Lacedæmon. 522. *b.* 523. *a.* It is a mortal offence to them, to see the advances which they make to men despised. 535. *a.* III. 20. *b.* 21. *a. b.* A woman that makes use of a strange remedy to kill her concupiscence. II. 556. *a. b.* 557. *a. b.* III. 99. *a.* Another bites her tongue off, and spits it in the tyrant's face. II. 557. *a.* A kind of nakedness for which some were blamed. 593. *a.* 645. *a.* Of a very small stature. 599. *a. b.* The Romans forbid them the use of wine. 822. *a. b.* 823. *a. b.* III. 967. *a.* IV. 756. *a. b.* 757. *a.* And left the punishment of their crimes, to the discretion of their husbands and relations. 756. *a.* Such of them as are cruel and ambitious, exceed men in those two vices. II. 862. *b.* One must fly them, in order to avoid temptation. III. 65. *a. b.* 66. *a.* The complaint which one made at a time. 75. *b.* 76. *a.* One of the surest ways to draw them, is to set up fraternities of an austere reformation. 103. *a. b.* Men who lay with them, in order to prove their continence. *ibid.* *b.* 104. *a.* In what manner the women of Mentz expressed their grief for the death of an author, who had bestowed great praises on their sex. 105. *and a. b.* It has been maintained that they are not of the human species. 144. *a. b.* And that they are not made after the image of God. 145. *a. b.* A Pope grants a dispensation for a man to have two at the same time. 165. *and a. b.* What influence they have towards establishing or overthrowing religious opinions. 220. *a.* There are some very learned women. 249. *a. b.* Thirty things requisite to make them perfectly handsome. 364. *a. b.* French women are less scrupulous in their child-births, than those of other countries. 453. *b.* What is the greatest encomium that can be bestowed upon a woman. 601. *b.* 602. *a. b.* They are capable of reigning well. 530. *a.* A chaste woman frights away calumny. 601. *b.* When they have a share in the government, they are more honoured and respected, than their husbands themselves. 636. *a.* Who was the first woman that prophesied among the Greeks. 712. The ancient Greeks would not suffer them to be present at feasts. 966. *b.* Such as love study, ought not to marry. 855. *a.* They sell their modesty sometimes at a very dear rate to their husbands. 814. *b.* Are very ill taken care of by Mahomet's law. IV. 34. *a. b.* 35. *a. b.* Books published upon the excellency of their sex. 147. *and a. b.* 148. *a. b.* The sovereign power ought not to be lodged in their hands. 308. *b.* 309. *a.* 406. *a.* V. 519. *b.* A severe law against those that should conceal either their pregnancy, or their lying-in. IV. 499. *b.* *&c.* Whether religion has more power over them, than the point of honour, to engage them to Continency. 500. *a. b.* An admirable Plant which hindered them from committing Adultery. 610. *a. b.* They are suspected of love-intrigues so soon as they shew their affection to a man. 692. *a.* A poor woman that a man marries, is very often not the less proud on that account. 753. *a.* The Romans were obliged to repeal a law which forbid the women to wear any ornaments. 769. *b.* 770. *a.* Privileges granted to them. II. 217. *a. b.* How they suffer themselves to be seduced by leud Heretics. 779. *and a. b.* 780. *a. b.* An impudent action of some women. V. 131. *and a. b.* A woman that swam quite naked over the Seine. 393. *a. b.* A supposition concerning their souls. 139. *a. b.* A collection should be made of such as were a scandal to their sex and country. 519. *a.* See *Maid*. They would seldom do evil, if they were not enticed to it by the men. 426. *b.* The confession of their sins is always defective. 533. *a. b.* A time when they wore looking-glasses over their bellies. II. 400. *a. b.* An author who wishes that it were permitted to call all those Whores, who give themselves up to luxury. *ibid.* *b.* They would rather abandon their luxury for the King than for God. *ibid.* *b.* There is such a one, that debauches as many women as he can, that yet would cruelly use his sisters and sisters-in-law, and even his mother, if he caught them in the fact. IV. 609. *b.* They can so straiten themselves that no man can have to do with them: examples. 800. *b.* 801. *a.* A woman that lies with her footman, deserves to be punished. II. 508. *a.* Drunkenness, a common vice among them. V. 540. *a. b.* Why a virtuous woman is not offended with veiled expressions, and is angry with a filthy word. 850. 856. It is not for their honour, to enter into such proceedings as the congress is. IV. 799. *a. b.* 800. *a. b.* *&c.* V. 799.
- Wood*, the price of it raised in England, by the great number of Heretics burnt there. I. 272. *b.* What those Heretics were. *ibid.* Whether allum can make wood incombustible. 424. *a. b.*
- Word of God* is to Divines, the foundation and source of their proofs and solutions. V. 818. It ought to satisfy every good Christian, that his faith is founded on the Word of God. 829.
- Words*, people run more eagerly after the new than the old. I. 63. *a.* Words that were made use of to frighten little children. 63. *and b.* Their significance may vary from time to time. 568. *a.* Complaints which have been made against the change that happens to them, and which are very ill grounded. III. 208. *a. b.* 209. *a. b.* They will sometimes go as far as the sword. IV. 663. *b.* The stage is a good forge for new words. 743. *a. b.* A dialogue wrote to ridicule those who make use of antiquated words. I. 69. *b.* 70. *a.* IV. 831. *a.* They ought to be ranged with great nicety. V. 327. *b.* Some of them are obscene in certain books, and not obscene in others. 844. What makes them obscene. *ibid.* and 845. The Stoics laughed at the distinction of words. 847. The nicest fully the imagination, as much as the most obscene. 849.
- Workman*: the Civil-Law requires that a workman who excels in any art, should have his life given him, though he may have deserved to lose it. I. 197. *b.* 198. *a.*
- Works*, when an adversary attacks them by way of the secular arm, it only strengthens the good opinion which people had of them before. I. 544. There are some excellent ones which have great imperfections. 752. *a.* The posthumous works of an author are ever faulty, when enlarged by means of his undigested memoirs. II. 429. *b.* A work, how ever strong in itself, will hardly appear so in the fragments that an adversary alledges out of it. 488. *a. b.* A work, the loss whereof ought to be regretted. 562. *a. b.* They ought not to be compared with one another by bits, but a whole work compared with a whole work. 553. *a. b.* The first work that a man publishes may be a most accomplished piece. 582. *b.* We ought to speak with great caution of a work, that we know only by the report of others. 589. *a. b.* People

People are frequently mistaken about the names of the true authors of them. 808. *a.* Works by which people are imposed upon. III. 236. *b.* A man should study the rules well, before he pronounces that a work is good or bad. 337. *b.* There are works of such a nature, that there is no avoiding mistakes in them. 622. *b.* Easier to be understood by the abstracts which are given of them, than by themselves. 344. *a. b.*

Works: of the merit of good works. II. 172. *a. b.* Bucer's ambiguous expressions and variations, on the merit of works. 178. *a. b.* 179. *a. b.* The difficulties to be met with in that matter. 178. People would easily agree on that subject, according to Grotius, if they would but banish Chicanery. *ibid. b.*

World, the calculation of its duration, according to the Greek Bible, preferred before the calculation of the Hebrew text. I. 165. *a.* How many great conjunctions there have been since its creation. 164. *b.* 165. *a.* The eternity of it taught publicly at Alexandria in the VIth century, by a Pagan Philosopher. 270. *b.* We cannot demonstrate by particular reasons, that each body in the universe is in the best state it could possibly be in. 310. *b.* 311. *a.* An egg had been employed in the production of it, according to the Pagan Theology. 444. *a. b.* Was too narrow for two brothers. II. 249. *b.* Hypotheses touching its origin and production. 119. *a. b.* 672. *b.* 673. *a.* 786. *b.* 787. *a. b.* 788. *a. b.* 789. *a.* One half of the world laughs at the other. 697. *a.* The world is a true wheel of fortune. 832. *a.* IV. 435. *a. b.* Had not two principles collateral, eternal, and independent of one another. III. 447. *a. b.* A tradition about its end. 780. *b.* 781. *a. b.* A mark of its depravation. IV. 83. *b.* It does not grow worse and worse. 305. *a.* To reason well upon the production of it, we must acknowledge that God is the author of matter, and the first and sole principle of motion. 436. *b.* *cf. seq.* Its end foretold on Jesus Christ's being born under the watery triplicity. III. 780. *a.* An Astrologer foretells the end of it, after which he affirms that all the powers will fall into the hands of the Turks. V. 246. *b.* The principles of the Pagan Philosophers, touching the production of the world, were incoherent. 324. *a.* Ambiguities that are to be met with in the controversy, concerning the eternity of the world. 596. *a. b.* 597. *a. b.*

Worms, its council declares the election of Pope Hildebrand to be void. III. 229.

Worship: a religious worship that consisted in weeping. I. 114. *a. b.* And where the mourning ended in joy. *ibid. b.* and 116. *a.* What is the most acceptable to God. II. 315. *b.* 316. *a.* How difficult a matter it is to correct the abuses of worship. III. 743. *b.* 744. *a. b.*

Worthies: the expedition of the seven Worthies. I. 117.

Wotton (Dr) convicts Thomas Elyot of a fraud. II. 770. *a.*

Woven disliked several things in the reformation of Luther and Calvin. V. 565. *a.*

Write: an expedient which the ancient Arabs made use of for writing. IV. 177. *b.* Persons who could write a whole speech, though the Orator spoke never so fast. 811. *b.* Persons who excelled in that art. 883. *b.* The reputation of writing well, is a great burthen upon a man. 707. *b.*

Writers: ancient writers have been made to say several things, which they never thought of. I. 309. *a. b.* Several of them make use of the property of other men, without mentioning their benefactor. 396. *a.* II. 78. *b.* Give us inconsistent accounts of one and the same person. I. 525. *a. b.* Some of them please at first for their novelty, and at last for their antiquity. 556. *a.* They should relate matters so, that there may be no need of having recourse to conjectures, in order to understand them. II. 180. *a.* One of the faults of a writer. *ibid. and a. (2).* A writer is very negligent, when he only quotes the title of a book in a general manner. 136. *b.* Neither the French nor Spanish writers thought much of what was to come, in what they wrote against one another. 338. *a.* A line of Virgil applied on that head. *ibid.* Writers too fruitful, and who compose too hastily. III. 69. *b.* 70. *a.* When passion governs them, they never think of the future, and thus they furnish arms against their

own party. 520. *a.* There are many of them who quoting an author, make him say whatever they think he should have said. 636. *b.* They often banish moderation and sincerity from their writings, when they are of a different religion. IV. 54. *a.* How we ought to explain their complaints against the ingratitude of their own time. 454. *b.* 460. *a.* A judgment concerning the most celebrated writers of ancient Rome. 778. *b.* 779. *a. b.* Some of them are glad to hear that their works have been put into the Index. 827. *b.* A specimen of the fidelity of several. V. 569. *b.* 570. *a.* Many of them add divers things to the testimonies which they quote. 234. *b.* How those ought to do, who are not bigotted to their own opinions. 811. See *Authors.*

Writing (Greek) which was made use of as an original or pattern, by those who engraved the types of that language. V. 461.

Writings: which may be called inlaid work. I. 188. *b.* How we ought to judge of some sort of writings. II. 279. *a. b.* We cannot give much credit to posthumous writings, especially when they come from remote countries. IV. 833. *b.* The good fortune of some writings. V. 779. What sort of writings are necessary to be consulted by the author of such a work as this. II. 8. *b.*

X.

Xanthippus is the first man to speak ill of his own father. IV. 570. *a.*

Xenades, what he said, after he had bought Diogenes. II. 669. *a.*

Xenocrates, his continence occasions his being called a statue. III. 704. *b.* Rallied by Aristotle. I. 112. *b.*

Xenocrates (the Carthaginian) did not deny that beasts had the knowledge of God. IV. 904. *a. b.*

Xenophanes, his principles in their natural connexion. V. 585. *b.* 586. *a. b.* 587. *a. b.* 588. *a. b.*

His genius unjustly despised by Aristotle. 587. *a.*

Xenophon makes an end of the sacrifice, notwithstanding the news of his son's death. I. 683. *a.* Said that God humbles the great and raises the little ones. 575. *a. b.*

Xerxes, a witty saying of that Prince. I. 522. *and b.*

Xiphilin should not have suppressed the feigned madness of Archelaus. I. 422. *b.*

Y.

YEAR, the English do not begin it in their public records till the 25th of March. II. 576. *a. b. (3).* According to Albatagni and Lucides, every hundred and six years occasions the difference of a day in the Solar and the Julian year. III. 904. *b.*

Yang: whether it be the part of a wife man, to wish to grow young again. IV. 755. *b.*

Yang men ought to have many superfluities, which might be pruned. I. 61. *a.*

Yauts: persons that come to distinguish themselves, are often upbraided with the follies of their youth. IV. 724. *b.*

Yauts: a new author to be added to the famous youths of Mr Baillet. III. 33. *a.* A person who has been justly reckoned among illustrious youths. IV. 184. *a. b.*

Z.

Zabarella (Francis) his book *de Schismate.* V. 591. *a.*

Zachary, (Pope) ranks the antipodes among the chimera's prejudicial to religion. V. 493. *a. b.*

Zalucus, his law against those who proposed any innovation. V. 314. *b.*

Zamoski (John) the greatest Hero that was in Poland, chooses Simon Simonides for his Secretary, and procures him the honour of Knighthood. V. 149.

Zanchius (Jerom) makes use of a mental reservation, in signing a formulary. V. 599. *a. b.* 600. *a. b.* The confession which he drew up. 601. *a.* A passage quoted by Father Labbe, where Zanchius speaks very ill of the Protestant writers. *ibid. b.* 602. *a. b.*

Zaphira

- Zaphira* (John) on the news of the birth of a son, drank to such excess, as occasioned his death. III. 532. *and a.* Soliman had an inclination to see that child, made him rich presents, and caressed him much. *ibid. a. b.*
- Zeal*: unseasonable zeal, how fatal to the Church. I. 13. *b.* 14. *a. b.* The effects of false zeal. 140. *a. b.* 545. *b.* 546. *a.* 790. *a. b.* II. 246. *b.* IV. 517. *a. b.* 518. *a. b.* 856. *a. b.* It sometimes suffers real or pretended impieties to lie dormant a great while. I. 468. *a.* Religious zeal, to what a furious excess it proceeds sometimes. 545. *b.* 546. *a.* Most of those who have a great zeal, become credulous and suspicious. 758. *a.* What zeal makes people believe to the prejudice of Heretics. II. 796. *b.* A reflexion upon the effects of false zeal. III. 624. *a.* Religious zeal, to what excess does it not proceed, when it is false. 947. *a. b.* What is sufficient to moderate it. IV. 188. *b.* An instance of a furious zeal. 270. *a. b.* 271. *a.* A strange instance of its extravagance. 698. *b.*
- Zealots*, in point of religion, are dangerous enemies. I. 29. *b.* 30. *a. b.* 31. *a.* False Zealots have recourse to accusations of impiety, in order to support themselves in a most unjust authority. 374. *b.* The greatest part of them fear nothing more than the Orthodoxy of those, whom they accuse. 491. *b.* The character of many of them. 716. *b.* They would have people to be determinate and resolute, when the question is about embracing or anathematizing an opinion. II. 706. *a.* The passions raised by them is more formidable to Princes, than the arms of the Infidels. III. 624. *a.* Their usual
- artifice. IV. 815. *a. b.* They condemn in their neighbour what they themselves do. V. 471. *b.* 472. *a.* The most honest find accusers. 58.
- Zemzem*, the sacred well of Mecca. IV. 179. *a. b.*
- Zeno*, chief of the Stoics, maintained opinions directly opposite to those of Arcefilas. I. 409. *b.* 410. *a.* One of his tenets was far from being just. 462. *b.*
- Zeno of Elea*, a difficulty which he proposed against the reality of motion. I. 82. *b.*
- Zeno*, the Epicurean; it is pretended that the Poet Lucretius was his disciple. III. 924. *b.* 925. *a.*
- Ziglerus* got nothing by curtailing Aventine's Annals. I. 549. *a.*
- Zindikites* (a Mahometan sect) whence so called, and what their sentiments are. V. 199. *a.*
- Zocotora*, an island, the religion of its inhabitants. II. 677. *and a. b.* 678. *a. b.*
- Zones* are all torrid with respect to love. II. 80. *a.* 823. *b.*
- Zoroaster* teaches the Persians Philosophy. I. 444. He lays down two first principles, one of good and the other of evil. *ibid.*
- Zosrianus*, an ancient Heretic. I. 255.
- Zuinglians*, to procure peace between them and the Lutherans, Bucer chose general and ambiguous expressions. II. 177. Bucer thought their doctrine concerning the Eucharist too narrow. *ibid. a. b.* John Schutze's rancour against them. V. 89. *a. b.*
- Zurich*, the disputes occasioned by the agreement, which the Lutherans and Calvinists entered into there. V. 548. *b.* 549. *a.*
- Zuski* (Basil) Great Duke of Muscovy, is dethroned and confined in a monastery. V. 653.

II X

